



Search forums

Display replies in nested form

Move this discussion to ...

(Non-intervention as a ...) Next >



U.S. Role in the World

by Joe Escobar - Thursday, April 18, 2013, 11:01 PM

This forum thread is for The Role of the United States in the World posts and replies.

After studying the required materials, address the individual questions in SEPARATE posts.

To make your POSTS, click the reply link in this, MY post.

To reply to another student's post, be sure to click the reply link within in THEIR post.

IMPORTANT - SUBJECT LINES

Since there are multiple questions, BE SURE to use an informative subject line for your post. Don't simply leave it RE: U.S. Role in the World

Sum of ratings: -

Edit | Delete | Reply



Wilson's Internationalism vs. Lodge's Reservationists

by Sarah Lafferty - Monday, April 22, 2013, 9:58 PM

In regards to foreign policy, I would have to side with Wilson and the Internationalists who supports the Treaty of Versailles in its original form and the proposed League of Nations. Though I would lean more towards the Limited Internationalist position, because I don't believe the League of Nations was constructed by the hand of God, and I certainly do not see Wilson as "The Moses from Across the Atlantic". Yet still I find Wilson's Fourteen Points commendable, especially the proposal for resolution of disputes through peaceful mediation and the return of national sovereignty to the subjugated peoples of the Austro-Hungarian, Ottoman and Russian empires. I realize many would argue that's a bad thing, to return power to developing nations that could potentially want to war with us in the future, but in all fairness and coupled with the League of Nations, I think that was a wise and bold move. After reading Thomas Fleming's article about Henry Cabot Lodge, my stance does not change, in fact the article helped solidify my position. I personally despise, "Lodge's vision of an America that is prepared to work with the international organizations such as the

World Bank and the United Nations but retains the freedom to act independently when necessary, seems remarkably close to President George W. Bush's approach to war in Iraq and Afghanistan" (<http://hnn.us/article/1580.html>). What Fleming is basically saying is that the U.S will be a part of international organizations, like the U.N and WTO, if it can choose to opt out of any unfavorable terms or agreements. As Wilson would say, any amendments to the treaty were just opposition to the treaty and Wilson would not compromise, which eventually led to the treaty's final defeat and his subsequent death. But as the book points out, "the judgment of history lies heavily on these events, for many believe that the flawed treaty and the failure of the League contributed to Adolf Hitler's rise in Germany and the outbreak of a second world war more devastating than the first" (792). I am one to agree with this, in fervent favor of international peace.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



A Clarification

by Sarah Lafferty - Tuesday, April 23, 2013, 12:27 PM

Clarification: although I do support Wilson's Internationalists foreign policy, I want to let it be known that I am absolutely against Wilson's domestic policy towards African American segregation and Women Suffrage. I find it interesting that Wilson could get it so right internationally speaking yet be so dead wrong in regards to domestic issues.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Wilson's Internationalism vs. Lodge's Reservationists

by Gregory Vandelune - Tuesday, April 23, 2013, 8:05 PM

Could you please repost that link? I copied it into my browser and it said the page was not found. Thanks.

Sum of ratings: (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



About the link

by Sarah Lafferty - Wednesday, April 24, 2013, 8:31 AM

Yeah your right, it doesn't work...I just tried it too. But I got that quote/link from the bottom of the Thomas Fleming article "So Henry Cabot Lodge Was One of History's Villains?" in the forum topic section of 'The Role of the U.S in the World'

Sum of ratings: (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Wilson's Internationalism vs. Lodge's Reservationists

by Gregory Vandelune - Wednesday, April 24, 2013, 4:14 PM

I believe to say that President Bush acted unilaterally in the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq is incorrect. The following is a list of supporting nations by conflict.

Afghanistan: Albania, Armenia, Australia, Belgium, Bosnia, Bahrain, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Herzegovina, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jordan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Macedonia, Malaysia, Mongolia, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Korea, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Tonga, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, Uzbekistan

(http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Operation_Enduring_Freedom,
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/International_Security_Assistance_Force#Contributing

Iraq: United Kingdom, Australia, Romania, El Salvador, Estonia, Bulgaria, Moldova, Albania, Ukraine, Denmark, Czech Republic, South Korea, Japan, Tonga, Azerbaijan, Singapore, Bosnia, Herzegovina, Macedonia, Latvia, Poland, Kazakhstan, Armenia, Mongolia, Georgia, Iceland, Nicaragua, Spain, Dominican Republic, Honduras, Philippines, Thailand, New Zealand, Portugal, Netherlands, Hungary, Norway, Italy, Lithuania, Slovakia

(http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Multi-National_Force_%E2%80%93_Iraq)

The idea of the U.N. efficiency is a “pie-in-the-sky” fantasy. The individual member nations have a history of using individual agendas to influence their votes and actions within the U.N. “Separately, Israel for many years was barred from serving on UN commissions and panels because Arab states blocked it from meeting with the Mideast regional group at the United Nations. This changed in 2000 when Israel was permitted into another regional group.” (<http://www.cfr.org/un/role-un-general-assembly/p13490>) “Taiwan has been denied UN membership for more than two decades due to objections from China, which holds a permanent seat on the Security Council and considers Taiwan part of its sovereign territory.” (<http://www.cfr.org/un/role-un-general-assembly/p13490>) The UN Oil-For-Food debacle is another well-intentioned (Clinton administration) idea given to a collective ripe with greed and corruption without much forethought. “Kuznetsov, a former chairman of the UN budget advisory committee, is charged with laundering hundreds of thousands of dollars in criminal proceeds. Yakovlev has pleaded guilty to bribery charges. U.S. officials have also detained a Bulgarian, Ludmil Dionissiev, for alleged involvement in illicit payments to Saddam's government, as well as Tongsun Park, a South Korean, and charged him with conspiring to act as an unregistered agent for Saddam when the oil-for-food program was created.” (<http://www.cfr.org/un/impact-un-oil--food-scandal/p10675>)

President Bush had no obligation to secure the approval of the United Nations, just as President Obama had no obligation to secure approval from the U.N. to violate the sovereignty of Pakistan to kill/capture bin Laden. World peace would

be great but it has never happened and never will.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Wilson's Internationalism vs. Lodge's Reservationists



by Robert Sappington - Wednesday, April 24, 2013, 6:03 PM

The idea of the U.N. efficiency is a “pie-in-the-sky” fantasy.

This is true, but what would you say about NATO or other organizations? I think the reason the U.N. fails so much is because of the isolationist-internationalist controversy. It appears alot of these countries want to remain isolated, but want the benefits of internationalism. World welfare?

"The individual member nationswithin the U.N."

Your right, as long as nations vote based on their own needs and not the worlds needs, no world issue will ever be really resolved.

"President Bush had no obligation ... just as President Obama had no obligation to secure approval from the U.N."

Again, your right. Even with executive power he can still do military intervention, and with congress the U.S. can decide what WE think is right. Regardless if its approved from the UN or not.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Wilson's Internationalism vs. Lodge's Reservationists



by Sarah Lafferty - Thursday, April 25, 2013, 1:53 PM

Thank you for the info demonstrating how many nations were involved in the war on Iraq and yes the U.S did not act alone or unilateral. However, the invasion force in 2003 was led primarily by the United States, under then Pres. Bush, Jr. under the pretense that Iraq was harboring weapons of mass destruction (WMD's) which was seen as a threat to U.S and its' allies. Also due to the attack of 9/11, which there is growing evidence was an 'inside job', the U.S declared 'War on Terrorism'. Given the attack on 9/11 I would argue the U.S was the leading force, or primary player in the war on Iraq, even though other nations were involved. To this day, no WMD's have been found, but plenty of oil was 'found'. Furthermore, there were serious legal questions surrounding the launching of the war against Iraq and the Bush Doctrine of preemptive war in general. On September 16th, 2004, Kofi Annan, the Secretary General of the United Nations, said of the invasion, "I have indicated it was not in conformity with the UN Charter. From our point of view, from the Charter point of view, it was illegal". Then in November 2008, Lord Bingham, the former British Law

Lord, described the war a serious violation of international law, and accused Britain and the United States of acting like a "world vigilante" (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Iraq_War). This is what I was referring to in the quote in the Thomas Fleming article about the negligence of the Bush administration to follow U.N protocol.

As we have learned in the past, peace has not been seen as patriotic, or in popular favor. However, today there's a much larger following. According to French academic Dominique Reynié, between January 3rd and April 12th, 2003, 36 million people across the globe took part in almost 3,000 protests against war in Iraq, with demonstrations on February 15th 2003, being the largest and most prolific (Bush planned invasion March 10th, 2003) (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Iraq_War). So for all the nations for the Iraq war, even more so were against it. The Pew Global Attitudes Project reports that "in 2006 majorities in the Netherlands, Germany, Jordan, France, Lebanon, Russia, China, Pakistan, Spain, Indonesia, Turkey, and Morocco believed the world was safer before the Iraq War and the toppling of Hussein" (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Iraq_War). Furthermore, according to a January 2007 BBC World Service poll of more than 26,000 people in 25 countries, 73% of the global population disapproved of U.S. handling of the Iraq War (http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/shared/bsp/hi/pdfs/23_01_07_us_poll.pdf) So is peaceful diplomacy ludicrous? Perhaps, but it depends on who you talk to...

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Wilson's Internationalism vs. Lodge's Reservationists



by Gregory Vandelune - Thursday, April 25, 2013, 5:10 PM

"Also due to the attack of 9/11, which there is growing evidence was an 'inside job', the U.S declared 'War on Terrorism'." Seriously? I can't wait to hear theories about the JFK assassination. I challenge you to present credible evidence that shows that the US government planned the murder of roughly 3,000 US citizens. Which government agency was responsible for planning and executing such a dastardly mission?

Regarding the 2003 invasion of Iraq being led by the US and the US playing the dominant role, you are right. There is a simple explanation for this that does not involve a right-wing conspiracy for anything other than to mitigate friendly casualties. Look back at World War II, who played the dominant role in the invasion of Normandy? The US did. British and Canadian with French augmentation secured three beachheads, while the US secured two, but the US took the two most dangerous ones and provided command and control under the

auspices of the Supreme Allied Commander (source: common knowledge, feel free to research it). Mogadishu 1993, under the U.N. the U.S. lost 18 soldiers because it was not a US controlled operation and it took an extreme act to get the aid of U.N. forces during the battle to use their armor to save American lives. The Pakistani and UAE contingents were more concerned about shooting one another (source: my eyes). During the Gulf War, the US led the coalition and supplied the majority of forces. Why would the US allow another nation's military to devise a plan that puts Americans in harm's way? Then there is the point of military capability. If the US has the most effective weapons and communications on the battlefield, would it be better to let other nations send people to die needlessly for the sake of equity? None of these reasons have anything to do with right-wing conspiracies.

Kofi Annan is hardly a credible source, in my opinion. He is a dejected man who took shots at the US anyway he could get them. His legacy will always be the corruption. Additionally, he speaks off the cuff to slight the invasion of Iraq and the US. This is not taken lightly by Iraqis, who are more pro-Iranian than pro-US. Your list of countries cited from the Pew foundation also can be argued. You listed twelve countries, hardly a large number. I don't even care what French public opinion is. China allowed an anonymous free response poll to be conducted? Were they provided any information other than that provided by their government? Turkish citizens would feel that way because the aggressiveness of the PKK circa 2006. Russia? They lost a customer for weapons sales. Pakistan? Um...harboring bin Laden, giving refuge to Haqqani Network cells, the land of hellfires being fired into their country, those are just a few reasons to ignore that statistic.

The number of people protesting doesn't even amount to more than 6% of the world's population, I'm not impressed. Split over 3,000 protests impresses me even less.

As far as the lack of WMD in Iraq, I have to bite my tongue on personal experience. Look at this article.
(<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2012/jan/22/assads-fall-could-solve-iraqi-weapons-mystery/?page=all>)

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Wilson's Internationalism vs. Lodge's Reservationists

by Sarah Lafferty - Thursday, April 25, 2013, 6:24 PM

To tell you the truth I don't have proof on that statement, and I

may have overstated my opinion. I was just engaging in a friendly debate, but want to say I have no disrespect to our soldiers that have served and also respect your opinion. As for my sources, it sounds like you've done your research and seen first hand, in some cases, so apparently I need to reevaluate. Thanks for the link too...I found it interesting.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split |
Delete | Reply



Re: Wilson's Internationalism vs. Lodge's Reservationists



by Robert Sappington - Thursday, April 25, 2013, 9:39 PM

“To this day, no WMD’s have been found, but plenty of oil was ‘found’.”

Yes, no WMD’s been found, yet, but no oil was ‘found’ either. I assume that by saying oil was found, you’re suggesting that was the reason for invasion? There is no evidence that the U.S. went into Iraq for oil. If you have legit sources, please list them.

Best Conspiracy’s starting points:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rationale_for_the_Iraq_War#Oil_a_factor_in

“Furthermore, there were serious legal questions surrounding the launching of the war against Iraq and the Bush Doctrine of preemptive war in general.”

Who can question whether it was legal or not?

Only 2; US federal courts and the United Nations

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Iraq_Resolution#Legality

U.S

I suggest you read about the Iraq Resolution. It was passed by U.S. Congress. Signed by Bush. The US federal courts reviewed the issue and it was determined to be “legal.”

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Iraq_Resolution#U.S._law

UN.

Also, No legal tribunal with legal authority or legal jurisdiction found that any laws were violated. Also International Law allows pre-emptive strikes.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Iraq_Resolution#International_law_-_right_of_pre-emptive_self_defense

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete |
Reply



Wilson vs Lodge

by Drew Peters - Tuesday, April 23, 2013, 8:41 AM

After reading the material, I would have to side with president Wilson and his internationalism who supported both the Treaty of Versailles and the League of Nations. Even though I don't believe that the League of Nations was created by the hand of god, I do believe that Wilson's Fourteen Point plan was a necessity to keep peace in Europe. Wilson Treaty focused on the resolving confrontations with peaceful resolutions and the return of the nations sovereignty. Wilson's his failure to include amendments to the the treaty was ultimate its doom. The failure of this treaty lead to the second uprising of the Ottoman empire which stated in the text book that the second world war was more devastating than the first. I am in favor of international peace and the United States should be able to help weaker country's fend of evil but not only because of personal benefits but to keep the world in peace and happiness.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Wilson vs Lodge

by Travis Jones - Saturday, April 27, 2013, 12:44 PM

I disagree greatly with your last statement “ I am in favor of international peace and the United States should be able to help weaker country's fend of evil but not only because of personal benefits but to keep the world in peace and happiness.” The reasons I disagree with this whom is to decide what is evil? And by way of the US intervening to help weaker countries fend off “evil” that creates a cycle of dependency on The United States, and also in our past this idea of helping others fend off countries we deem to be our enemies has backfired. Case in point the former USSR invading Afghanistan and how we armed and helped train the Afghani's, including Osama Bin Laden for the sheer fact of helping to stem off the spread of communism. By disallowing the Soviets to control Afghanistan, we spared them only to see our ally become our enemy later down the line once our usefulness to them was gone.

The US should not play world police and try to dictate to other countries what they can and cannot do, we alone defy other nations in the UN, and do what we want. The only reason we do such is because we feel there is no one is to oppose us.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: U.S. Role in the World

by Francisco Reyes - Saturday, April 27, 2013, 10:54 PM

In Mr. Fleming's, The Illusion of Victory: America in World War I, talks about Lodge being a strong advocate of American involvement in world affairs. As he was one of

the first to advocate support for Teddy Roosevelt's involvement in building the Panama Canal as well as fighting the Spanish American War. Lodge believed that America was the fighter of good vs. evil and that they would upkeep peace by building a strong navy. Unfortunately he was labeled as an isolationist because he led the fight against President Woodrow Wilson 1919 attempt to create the League of Nations. As Lodge believed, that Wilson was a weak and indecisive leader.

In my opinion both men wanted USA to have strong involvement in foreign affairs in the world. Instead of supporting one another, both of them didn't accomplish what they wanted by simply opposing one another. This happens all the time in politics today and back then. We often forget that the one's that make a law to take action is the senate and not necessarily the president. That is why in my opinion many things in this country don't get accomplished.

However I believe that I am a limited Internationalist who thinks that the combined pressure of the world's nations will prevent the unlikely possibility that the U.S. could be forced into a war against its will. Groups like the United Nations who sends aid to countries that needed, is a strong example of not just letting the USA be the only ones to aid others. Unfortunately it seems that the USA is the one that tends to lead and put most of its resources to aid other. A good example of this type of involvement was the revolution in Libya where the USA put a lot of its resources to find Gaddafi.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: U.S. Role in the World

by Lorena Hernandez - Saturday, April 27, 2013, 11:54 PM

I completely agree with two leaders fighting against each other, and not accomplishing a goal! They both could've sat down and talked and both Lodge and Wilson could have expanded something better than the treaty. They had the right intentions of foreign affairs, but both with different approaches. I see this happening today, and with the past wars.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Lodge's Vision vs. Wilson's acts

by Lorena Hernandez - Saturday, April 27, 2013, 11:55 PM

After studying the chapter on WWI, and reading the article on Henry Cabot Lodge, my opinion on our foreign policy positions remains as a "mild reservationist". Lodge saw the pro and cons of the treaty before Wilson ever did, while America was behind the president's back during the war. He was misjudged for this but as we read in the article, he had an insight to his opinion in the senate.

Lodge wanted to fight with the allies before hand, but he did not want the treaty to

pass for the cons it could bring against fighting a war without congress. He found this moraly wrong to his country, and knew it was against the American way.

Of course, at this time, Wilson would misjudge his debate during the election.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

(Non-intervention as a ...) [Next >](#)

You are logged in as Joe Escobar ([Logout](#))

 [Moodle Docs for this page](#)

