



Search forums

Display replies in nested form

Move this discussion to ...

< Previous (Taxation by the Federa...)

(U.S. Role in the World) 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



U.S. Role in international politics and affairs

by Michael Maxey - Monday, April 22, 2013, 7:01 PM

My placement doesn't change where I put myself, in fact it's in agreement of what I think what our role is in the world of international politics and affairs. I will agree with some of what the strong internationalists on the point that the United States has to have a role in foreign affairs as long as they concern U.S. interests, and our allies, and that is as far as I will go with agreeing with them. I believe we have to do what is right humanely and support human rights, and not back those countries who have dictators that harm their own people for the interest of simple economics. And we can't help anyone even our own allies increase the size of their territories if it violates our beliefs and interests. No where Henry Cabot Lodge is concerned, I don't think he was a villain, more of a man who knew what needed to be done in our role as a world leader. When it comes to foreign affairs and politics he was a progressive advocate to being involved, and that showed when he supported Teddy Roosevelt on the Panama Canal and parading our great white fleet around the world and his dealing with other foreign policies. I would definitely agree with Lodge about Wilson

taking to long to get into WWI, when we could have just jumped on in on the side of our allies and ended the war sooner rather than later. Thomas Fleming is right, and I think that our current leaders could learn something from Lodge about the use of force, and only using it on the behalf of justice and freedom. I do believe we have to be involved in world politics and affairs just on the behalf of justice and freedom as Thomas Fleming wrote especially when it comes to humanitarian affairs and our interests, even though we can cut some our foreign aid we give and put it towards domestic aid.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



U.S. Role in worldwide affairs

by Tracy Tunnell - Monday, April 22, 2013, 9:12 PM

I would have to say that my role or belief stays the same on the internationalist spectrum. It is important for our country to involved foreign affairs as long as we are protecting ourselves. We need to make that we put America's best interests first and then our allies. There is a need to keep foreign policy in play for all countries involved. I don't think Senator Lodge was a bad man. He supported the Great White Fleet and Roosevelt on the Panama Canal. Foreign Policy can only go so far and be good on a certain level. There are those countries that have leaders that harm their own people and only want what's best for them. These are not allies. A lot of these leaders are the reason we go to war. The war we are fighting today is a good example of that. I have to agree with Lodge that Wilson should have jumped in with our allies right away instead of holding back for so long. It showed that we were are weak country who only helps at the last minute and can't be counted on to take the lead on such things. I think Flaming had the right idea when he says we need to put more of our foreign aid towards our domestic aid. If we are not helping ourselves be strong as a country, how are we supposed to help other countries? It's not possible. It's important for us to be involved in foreign affairs and politics around the world. We have an obligation to fight for our freedom and liberty. It's important to jump in where needed as soon as a problem arises with another country. This is how we will stay up to speed on foreign policy and not be oblivious to what is going on around the world.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Invovled to a Degree

by Sara Dombrosky - Tuesday, April 23, 2013, 9:48 AM

After looking at the information given I find that the interaction between great nations is something that cannot be avoided. It is true that making allies had a hand in adding to WWI, however making allies is an unavoidable happening. America should stay involved with other countries, and come to their allies' aid when needed. But before they do, the interest of America as a nation and Americans should be taken

into consideration. In that respect Flaming had a point in saying that America should focus a bit more of its attention of domestic happenings, for if we are not strong from the inside how do we defend ourselves from the outside and aid other countries in defending themselves. Those who help others must also help themselves seems to be appropriate.

Lodge was not a bad person, if anything I think he was right; Wilson waited too long when it came to forming an alliance with other nations. It made us look weak in the faces of others, it also made us look unorganized (not sure if that is the correct word, but I'm using it.)

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Involved to a Degree

by Leah Livesay - Tuesday, April 23, 2013, 3:18 PM

Sara-

I agree with your response greatly. There is no way that each nation can be isolated from the others, there has to be interaction. We all live on the same Earth, therefore we can not easily avoid each other. I think that it is important for us to have allies, as with other countries. I do believe that countries should help one another when or if the need rises, seeing how we all just can't seem to get along. However just as with anyone, our country needs to be strong within itself before we can be strong for others. Not only that, but as a country of our own, we need to be aware of our own people and their needs first. It's just like with any single person, in order for them to be happy, successful, etc. in the social, outside world, they have to first be happy and pleased with themselves as an individual person.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Involved to a Degree

by Sara Dombrosky - Wednesday, April 24, 2013, 10:56 PM

There is also something to consider in this day in age, America could not become isolated. If we were to do so, it would infringe upon the rights of American citizens. What with the internet, computers, telephones, etc. The world is far more connected than it was in the past. The government would be hard put to try and make us an isolated nation without people revolting. We also have trade ties, not everything is made in America.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: U.S. Role in the World: beliefs vs. reality

by Ashley Bacon - Tuesday, April 23, 2013, 11:35 AM

The U.S. has a certain role that countries all over either admire or criticise. In forum 1 I talked about how the US infact has the feeling of being number one and in many ways it it...but many things have changed since the early 1900s where we truly were on top of everything becoming the place everyone wanted to be. The joke is, if there is conflict in other countries it automaticly becomes our job to help take care of whatever is going on. If two countries are about to declare war on eachother we take it upon us to be the big and grand USA and spend our time, money, and peoples lives to help others with their problems rather than taking care of the people of the United States first. I understand that it is not realistic for the US to ignore world problems but I feel that its not fair to the citizens of the US to not be taken care of first. We are wayyyy in debt from all of the wars that we have fought cause of other countries having problems with their own government. I feel that it is not our job to take care of everyone elses problems for them just because we are admireable and have the power to do so. We need to take care of the people back home and fix our problems before starting other things.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: U.S. Role in WW1/Wilson

by Kristina Meza - Tuesday, April 23, 2013, 1:02 PM

Regardless of this, Wilson continued to fight for peace based around the idea of a League of Nations. In mid-January 1917, he set up secret negotiations with both Britain and Germany to obtain their agreement for America's mediation in a peace plan. Wilson had a very clear idea of what he wanted:

Wilsons Quote:

"Peace had to be a peace of reconciliation, a peace without victory, for a victor's peace would leave a sting, a resentment, a bitter memory upon which terms of peace would rest, not permanently, but only as upon quicksand."

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: U.S. Role in WW1/Wilson

by Barry Sommer - Thursday, April 25, 2013, 8:55 AM

Interesting you use that quote from Wilson, I had always found the concept of "peace without victory" similar to a recent phenomenon where, at kids baseball/football/soccer games the goal is to not win, but leave with your self-esteem intact. With no endgame goal there is no need to strive to do your best, it is enough to survive and walk away. The concept of being more concerned with how your defeated enemy feels instead of how to utilize the win in order to

try and prevent another episode is usually a sure way to keep losing, think Vietnam where we declared peace and left, only to see the Vietnamese people brutalized by the enemy we tried to defeat. I appreciate Wilson's attempt to assuage all sides, ultimately this turned to a disaster, as the vanquished took the overture as a call to re-arm and continue their belligerent ways. Wilson's peace did rest on quicksand, and that sand slowly eroded away to expose a new and more dangerous Germany.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: U.S. Role in WW1/Wilson

by Sara Dombrosky - Saturday, April 27, 2013, 4:13 PM

I couldn't agree more with this, Wilson wanted peace, but his concern and others concern for how we defeated our enemy feels made him and America come off as weak. In the case the of war, we do in a sense become conservative. Though looking back, in the way we handled our own people was not the right way to go about keeping the enemy and their way of thinking, out of the country.

In war, and in the case of declaring peace, if you want a definite win for you and yours, you need to think ahead and leave no stone unturned. To want a peace to rest on quicksand, as Wilson stated, was a dangerous placement. It left room for someone to take a stand with Germany, resulting in the actions of monsters in WWII.

Your reply was very well said.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Internationalist Nation?

by Leah Livesay - Tuesday, April 23, 2013, 3:52 PM

I don't think that I would reconsider my placement on the spectrum, I feel pretty confident about where placing myself more on the internationalism side. I believe that it is important for our nation to have allies, as with any other nation. I think that for the most part, Lodge was on the right track. Although Lodge didn't support Wilson, I definitely don't think that that made him an "isolationist", everyone is entitled to their own opinion, not everyone thinks that war is the answer. No nation can be completely isolated from the rest of the world, we all need each other, in one way or another.

With this, I believe that yes, we should help our allies if they are in need, just like we would like them to help us if we were in need. As Lodge had stated, "America had to be strong". That meant that the navy and the army had to be expanded. If America was going to be a strong arm, we had to have a strong arm. We needed other

nations to ally with, we needed to look and be strong from the outside.

Another important aspect however is keeping our nations people in mind through all of this. This is why I chose limited internationalism on the spectrum. A country's people have to be at mind, their best interest is what should come first. I think that a country need to be united with it's people as a whole, and be able to make important decisions together. The people are what help make a nation strong, their support is extremely important.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Internationalist Nation?

by Kristina Meza - Thursday, April 25, 2013, 7:55 PM

I completely agree with you when you say that the our country should not be seperated from the other countries around us. It is very imortant to help eacother out, because when we all come together is when things work out more smoothly. If we all just let go of our pride and realize that we all have strengths and weaknesses, and that we all need each other, then this world would be a better place. Too bad that is not the way things work. :/

Sum of ratings: (1)

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



Re: U.S. Role in the World

by Zhongheng Wang - Saturday, April 27, 2013, 11:02 PM

First of all, I'm not a American citizen. For my opinion, i agree with Internationalists specture. Every country is a part of the world. It's neccessary to get invold into the world. International issues is inportant to every country. Since america is a strong country, it's important to get into the international and play the role it need to be. Like Wilson said, america should pay more attention on internaional issues. Mr. Fleming also said that "Maybe it's time to revive one of Massachusetts' most famous men. From a distance of almost a hundred years, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge may have a lot to tell us about how to conduct America's foreign affairs in a chaotic world."

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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

[< Previous \(Taxation by the Federa...\)](#)

[\(U.S. Role in the World\) Next >](#)

You are logged in as Joe Escobar (Logout)

 Moodle Docs for this page

