



Search forums

Display replies in nested form

Move this discussion to ...

< Previous (U.S. Role in the World)

(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](#)


my views the same

by Tyler Kennedy - Monday, April 22, 2013, 4:22 PM

This doesn't really change my view. I have always felt that the U.S. is internationalist (at least in my time) and that there is always people who disagree with the idea. You can see the at the beginning of this article where it has the examples of foreign policy factions that stretch from against the idea of joining the league of nations, to those who oppose it outright, and with people who find themselves somewhere in the middle.

As for where this puts us today we can look back the bush administration, specifically with the war in Iraq and Afghanistan. Henry lodge had a vision of America that would "work with the international organizations such as the World Bank and the United Nations but retains the freedom to act independently when necessary" we went into Iraq with the un to find weapons of mass destruction, although none were found the united states invaded anyway.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: U.S. Role in the World

by Joseph Standridge - Monday, April 22, 2013, 11:07 PM

I personally sided with, and still do, the internationalists. While I do agree that America, with it's size and power, should be involved in the world to a certain degree, I don't however feel that the right to do so should be solely up to us. Especially to masses that are extremely vulnerable to propaganda. I'm not trying to say that we shouldn't listen to the people's opinion but it's important to take other countries into consideration.

At the time in the readings I would have been all for joining the League of Nations. I think that it would have been a great policy and I agreed with a lot of Wilson's 14 points. Between WW1 and WW2 we've learned that a single country can make a significant impact on the world and no world power should set it's own rules to prevent similar disasters from arising in the future. Assuming we learn from history, we should be able to prevent another world war from happening.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Limited Internationalist type of view

by Kaylee Garman - Monday, April 22, 2013, 11:16 PM

Originally I had placed myself at the "Limited Internationalist" part of the spectrum. For the most part I still believe I am, but Thomas Fleming's article on "So Henry Cabot Lodge Was One of History's Villains?" did make me rethink my view a little bit. Fleming shows Lodge in a negative light from the very beginning. Since Lodge might be one of history's villains I feel like siding with him would be considered wrong. Even though there was some obvious bias in the article, I still felt compelled to side with Wilson, the good guy. I think if I had been around during the meeting of the League of Nations, I would have been in favor of most of the Fourteen Points. As for in the world now, I would say that I'm pretty back and forth on how much of an internationalist I am. I think it really just depends on how well things are going. I'm all for whatever seems to be working the best at that moment.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Limited Internationalist type of view

by Lina Flores-Perez - Wednesday, April 24, 2013, 10:18 PM

You and I seem to share similiar thoughts on the treaty and where we stand on the spectrum. Most of Wilson's points are very good to stand by, but when reading Fleming's article we were questioned on those points and how Wilson thought. I could say from what we learned in class with how Wilson turned

towards the end of the war doesn't put him under the greatest light. I think its good that we have an open mind to some changes and also have our best interested on what is right for our country.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Limited Internationalist type of view

by Ruby Kalamas - Thursday, April 25, 2013, 11:27 AM

Kaylee,

When I read the article on Henry Lodge Cabot, I got a totally different impression on it. I thought the title was sarcastic, and to me it seemed like he was more dissing Wilson and showing the Lodge was a forward thinking man ahead of his time. The author of the article might have been slyly dissing Fleming's book, and obviously had a totally different stance. The author of the article seemingly had some issues with the way Fleming portrayed Henry Cabot Lodge. Nothing seemed to say "Yay Wilson!". I think that the author was putting some bias into the article, but also pointing out the bias in how Wilson is viewed and often depicted.

Fleming did not write that "review". In the first line of the article, the title Fleming's book, [The Illusion of Victory: America in World War I](#), is a link to the actual book for sale on Amazon with a description of what Fleming wrote in his book.

So I clicked on the link to the book by Fleming and read the description of it on Amazon. It also sounds like that description, although not discussing Cabot at all, depicts Wilson as a two faced leader who "sacrificed his noble vision to megalomania and single-mindedness" and on the other side of the coin depicted him as a "visionary".

Even the description of the book doesn't paint Wilson as being much of a good guy. Ouch.

What Fleming wrote and what the author of the article wrote were very, very different things.

I do have something to say separate from this though, the author of the article did a terrible thing by tricking the reader into thinking he was reviewing Fleming's book! I didn't read a single mention of Fleming whatsoever, or even the book (save from the very first sentence in the article). If I were an editor at the History News Network that published this article, I would have deleted entirely the line that mentions Fleming's book and just put the article out purely as a discussion on Henry Lodge Cabot. Mentioning Fleming's book as the topic sentence in the VERY beginning of the article is deceptive to the reader when you don't actually discuss or reference the book at all throughout the rest of the work.... Shameful....

If that article is a review of Fleming's book, then the author of the article should be fired, because they did a terrible job actually talking about the book. They just got on their soapbox and talked about Henry Lodge Cabot and how great he was. Lame!

Generally, a book review is going to be opinionated, that's sort of the point of a book review. It's the opinion of the reviewer. A description that is linked to the book on a website trying to sell it will generally at least attempt to stay true to an honest accurate descriptive summary of the book to try and entice readers into buying it.

So, yeah, the "review" is biased, but it sounds like Fleming was too when he wrote his book, although without having read it, I can't fully say that because neither the review of the book nor the description on Amazon cites anything specifically.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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



Re: Limited Internationalist type of view

by Ruby Kalamas - Saturday, April 27, 2013, 4:54 PM

Man, that article got me soooo confused. It is an excerpt from Fleming's book?

I got that part wrong, and I'm surprised nobody called me on it. I still believe the author of the article (Fleming), wasn't talking down on Lodge as much as drawing a comparison to him and Wilson. It seems like, (still, even after my mixup) Fleming is using his discussion of Cabot to point criticism at Wilson, or at least defend Lodge.

He defends him from "demonization" and also points out Wilson's weak 'flip-flopping' and lack of early involvement in WW1.

Just the fact that Fleming is telling the story from Henry Cabot Lodge's side rather than Wilson's side makes me think that he certainly supported Lodge and not Wilson.

I apologize to any student that got confused reading my first post. I obviously got confused too. We can re-hire that writer, (Fleming). Oops!

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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



Re: Limited Internationalist type of view

by Alex McNeil - Saturday, April 27, 2013, 10:03 PM

I wish we could base our international policy on "whatever seems to be working the best at that moment," but it's hard to figure out what's effective if we don't have a baseline against which to measure changes in our policy. What did you mean by the part of the post I just quoted? I'm interested to hear more.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Problems at Home

by Michael Shaw - Monday, April 22, 2013, 11:34 PM

I still think that America shouldn't get involved in other nation's problems unless it directly involves us, like if they declare war. As I said before in another forum last week, the only reason America should get involved the way we have been is take swift action against possible threats.

If I were around during the end of WWI, I would have been all for the League ONLY if it meant that they wouldn't try roping us into every single skirmish that took place thousands of miles away from our fair Columbia. So I guess that shuffles me in with the irreconcilables and isolationists of the time.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Problems at Home

by Mercedes Shutt - Tuesday, April 23, 2013, 12:06 PM

I agree with you. I believe we should only enter another country if there are threats but at the same time I would not want another countries army entering the us which I don't think would happen because of how strong we are. we have so many problems in our own country that we should concentrate on that and once we can fix out own problems then maybe we go else where if they need ou help.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Problems at Home

by Joseph Standridge - Saturday, April 27, 2013, 9:40 PM

Problems in other countries still directly involve us. While they may not be attacking us directly, America can not thrive if completely isolated. We rely on other countries in a multitude of ways. We have the second largest amount of imports, and the third highest exports in the world. (Source) A large chunk of our economy comes from dealing with other nations, and if we stopped concerning out self with other nations, namely our trading partners, we would suffer if they suffered.

Another thing of note is the point of the League was to avoid little skirmishes from happening. If there were public alliances, and a large force opposing skirmishes from happening, hopefully they would cease to happen. The League wasn't invented to win fights, it was to prevent them.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



U.S. Role in the World

by Tianren Wei - Monday, April 22, 2013, 11:36 PM

In my point of view, the internationalists, no doubt. America should be involved in the world and plays an important role with its size and power. However, under this circumstance, it is quite essential for America to set a standard of using its power. Otherwise, a peaceful diplomatic solution may be regarded as an aggressive negotiation.

As my opinion, I think it will be a good choice to join the League of Nations. And I agreed with a lot of Wilson's 14 points. Due to the learning of WW1 and WW2, I have found that an aggressive move of a single country could bring a huge disaster to the whole world. In that case, it is necessary for all human beings to prevent another worldwide disaster from happening.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



U.S. Role in the World: Where I stand

by Lina Flores-Perez - Tuesday, April 23, 2013, 12:42 AM

Similar to one of last week's forum, we talk about America's power. American being one of the strongest and most intelligent countries in the world, I believe the combination could be shared to help other countries. I don't believe we should be seen ignorant to allies out there. Of course I would want America to go in with a strong head, because like Henry Cabot Lodge noted, "He thought America's role in the world was to fight similar battles beyond its shores". I don't want to ignore the fact that this could be a possibility when trying to help other countries. This was a part from the article read that had leaned me towards rethinking where I stand. Even though Lodge was portrayed as a tense and spiteful man, I saw some of his points to be considered. My message here isn't trying to say I am one for war. I am trying to look at this in the most realistic way possible, and considering different viewpoints seen.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



From Limited to Mild

by Kristin Sledge - Tuesday, April 23, 2013, 9:05 AM

Yesterday I answered a poll about where I thought I stood on the Internationalist to Isolationism scale. Clinging to my American Exceptionalism from last week I answered the poll as a Limited Internationalist. Upon reading the article about Henry Cabot Lodge I find myself changing to a Mild Reservationist. One of the reasons I originally felt I was more of a Limited Internationalist is that I felt that Internationalism is important for America to remain a power. I believed that having a reservationist view would be hurtful to the nation in a way that if we were not involved where everyone else is that it would be possible to be forced into a war. If I found myself on the reservationist side that it would mean that I want America to be a shut in country. I now realize after reading about Lodge how untrue my opinion was. Lodge supported everything that I would hold true including the facts that "He pushed hard for a big navy and an expended army. He supported the Spanish American War...He backed the creation of the Panama Canal and Roosevelt's role as a mediator in the Russian-Japanese War." (So Henry Cabot Lodge Was One of History's Villains, Fleming, 03). In reading this article I found myself nodding in agreement upon reading that Lodge saw inaction as the worst foreign policy sin. Agreeing with him and looking back at my reasoning for choosing the Limited Internationalist views, my main reason fits together with his biggest sin. As an "isolationist" he did not want to shut America off to the world and keep any kind of foreign policy out, but he did want to keep America in control of its decisions when it came to foreign affairs. I find myself now on the Mild Reservationist end in absolute agreement that foreign policy is critical to any nation, but keeping the power in foreign exchanges is also highly important and totally achievable if we set our limits and keep to them.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: From Limited to Mild

by Lina Flores-Perez - Wednesday, April 24, 2013, 10:24 PM

We can definitely agree that our Country is the most powerful and we like to keep it that way. I also like your idea of keeping that power in foreign exchanges. It's important to help others so when needed, we are helped too. Though sharing what we know to an extent and keeping America's head strong. I also questioned myself when I read the article. He brought up very good points and the one you mention is the one that stuck most with me. His thought in that quote was to keep our big and powerful army big and powerful. Especially if we were gonna be put in unexpected wars.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Internationalist

by Matt Blackshear - Tuesday, April 23, 2013, 9:17 AM

I still stand closer to the Internationalist side of the spectrum. America is a great country and we can help the world. However signing a treaty with other nations doesn't mean that we should have to help them with every little fight or struggle they get into. We need to know when to step in and when to keep to ourselves. Events such as when Roosevelt stopped the argument between Japan and Russia was a good example of an appropriate time of when America should intervene. Modern day events such as North Korea, Japan and the US. is another example of international affairs that need to be dealt with.

Peace can be accomplished but only if everyone participates. As long as we are involved with the right frame of mind as using our force for justice and freedom, as stated in the Lodge article we will be ok.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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



Re: Internationalist

by Mercedes Shutt - Tuesday, April 23, 2013, 12:10 PM

I agree with you a 100%.

Sum of ratings: (1)

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



Teamwork in the world

by Kaylee Garman - Wednesday, April 24, 2013, 9:27 PM

There would be so many problems resolved if all the people in power thought this way! I completely agree with you, especially on everyone needing to participate. If the countries gave a little more and worked together in the League of Nations, the world would probably be running a lot more smoothly, and the organization would still be active today. Sadly no one liked the idea of giving up their toys (not even the U.S.) for the sake of peace.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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



Internationalist? Really?

by Ruby Kalamas - Thursday, April 25, 2013, 11:40 AM

Matt, after reading the descriptions of the different foreign policy factions in the forum materials, it sounds like you aren't an internationalist. Not quite.

The description of Internationalist is: **Democrats loyal to Wilson wanted the treaty to be ratified in its original form without any amendments or reservations; some within this group were receptive to a small number of minor changes.**

This doesn't exactly go along well with your thoughts that " However signing a treaty with other nations doesnt mean that we should have to help them with every little fight or struggle they get into."

I think that if that is your main point within your stance, you might actually fit more closely into the group of Stong Reservationists. Here's what they might have said that is VERY similar to what you said that I quoted from you:

The League would threaten U.S. sovereignty by requiring the U.S. to follow directions from an international body, so all decisions of the League must be considered suggestions only.

Basically that means, " Hey Europe, we like supporting peace! But not if it means we have to fight your wars if we're not directly involved. So... unless we want to fight in the war, leave us out of it."

Your stance directly conflicts with an Internationalist stance based on the details you provided. An Internationalist, according the forum materials Escobar provided for this topic, would have never have changed any part of the League of Nations(Like, being required to participate in the conflicts and wars of our Allies. Every single one of their conflicts!), because to them that was a total rejection of the League, and not in the the spirit of God's vision and America's path.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Internationalist? Really?



by Matt Blackshear - Saturday, April 27, 2013, 5:11 PM

Ruby:

I see what your saying. I guess I didn't make it to clear in my first post. But yeah I would be a mild reservationist. I believe we need to be involved in other nations affairs to a certain degree. One country can any hold so much on their back. When getting involved with other countries we need to make sure that they arent going to be 100% reliant on us. They are going to need to take care of some of their problems on their own. If we get involved in every little conflict we will be overwhelmed. We should wisely pick and choose our involment in issues. Which issues do we have more economic interests in or which issues can help us with our American idealism (making the world safe for democracy) ect.?

I believe in internationalism but we need to do it carfully so yes i would consider myself a reservationalist

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Internationalist

by Kristin Sledge - Thursday, April 25, 2013, 2:34 PM

I agree with you when you say that peace can be accomplished only if everyone participates, but I respectfully disagree with the US having to be involved. Just look at Wilson's League of Nations. Suppose that the House and Congress had been with Wilson and such had been passed, I believe your views would change drastically. It's one thing for us as a country now to be able to choose whether or not to participate in such things, but think back to the draft. If the League of Nations had been successful I believe that the draft would still be around, not giving a choice to whether or not we want to participate. Looking at it from today's perspective we can't really put ourselves in the shoes of the soldier's who were drafted into WWI. Sure we should deal with international affairs, but when is it really necessary for us to send out citizens instead of our political leaders. Who is it that REALLY does the fighting? Just a thought.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Internationalist

by Veronica Wilkens - Friday, April 26, 2013, 8:12 PM

"Events such as when Roosevelt stopped the argument between Japan and Russia was a good example of an appropriate time of when America should intervene"

This is what I agree with most. Not because it's necessarily a great example of when to intervene, but more because of **how** we did it. There was no military involved. We didn't march into their countries and start "protecting" their citizens. We used discourse as a way to come to a mutual agreement that, while benefiting the United States, also provided peace for these countries.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



League of Mutual Bullies

by Ruby Kalamas - Thursday, April 25, 2013, 10:57 AM

I had originally considered myself a mild reservationist, but after reading the materials for the forum, especially the article discussing Henry Cabot Lodge. I found myself developing a deeper understanding of the different stances, and realized that I agreed with a particular stance within strong reservationists more so than some of

their other points. I don't like the idea of our nation's citizens having no control or say in the case of joining a war or not. I understand the theory behind the huge alliances to prevent war, but since that did not happen, it's difficult for me to see it being successful today.

I have a hard time believing that I am alone in this. When I try to set the same standards of the League of Nations on a smaller scale it doesn't work. For example, imagine if we had a league of neighbors. If you got pissed at your neighbor for their dog crapping on your lawn, and you went and had a huge argument with them about it which led to a feud, would all of his neighbors join him to let all their dogs crap on your lawn? Would all of your neighbors grab their dogs to crap on his lawn?

What if the neighbor you are in league with is doing something you don't support, and starts a feud, and you end being forced to support a stance that you morally oppose! Or you are the child in the house, and have no say over any declarations of neighborly feuds, but when they occur, suddenly you're not allowed to talk to the neighbor kid, and next year when you're old enough you have to throw rocks at him.

I agree with Lodge that "the use of force should spring from the united will of the American people." (See article on Lodge via Moodle). I don't like the idea of fighting other people's battles if I don't agree with them. I personally am not much a violent person, but I certainly do like to debate. I like the idea of a league that fosters discussion rather than the threat of violence to prevent violence.

I think that my original leaning towards mild reservationist came from the idea I agreed with some of the ideas with having a league of nations. Wouldn't it be nice to support a lasting peace? But in reality, I don't think that the League was the way to achieve that. The article on Cabot reminded me of the United Nations, which seems more up my alley. We must foster a common ground between nations rather than sign a pact that forces us to use the threat of basically ganging up on each other to ensure a lasting peace. I just have a hard time thinking that the League of Nations would actually work with that emphasis.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: U.S. Role in the World

by Alex McNeil - Saturday, April 27, 2013, 9:54 PM

This discussion topic bears several similarities to last week's discussion of American Exceptionalism. The extent to which the United States should exert power over sovereign nations is one of the great debates that have underscored our country's history.

Our world is complex, and it's only become more so over the last century. Globalization has unified once disparate economies, and the importance of foreign

policy has increased in magnitude as our world markets have become more connected and interdependent. Because the actions of one nation have resounding consequences for other nations, it makes sense for the United States to be an active player on the global stage and to adopt foreign policy that dictates it engages globally when the need arises.

I think that the League of Nations was a conceptually valuable. It would have stabilized the region and probably preempted World War II. That being said, I'm wary of any treaty that commits the US to military action without the consent of the citizens of the United States. I know that there's not a direct vote to determine whether or not the US goes to war, but there IS an indirect electoral process that allows citizens to install leaders of their choice into government—these leaders in turn are the ones who send the US to war.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



role of the united states in the world

by Robert Badewitz - Saturday, April 27, 2013, 10:57 PM

I believe i would be an some what of an isolationist, irreconcilable . I do not feel that the United States should get involved with other countries buisness. I feel that doing such pulls us into conflicts that we do not need. Centralizing power does not do anything good. I do not agree with the US being part of the United Nations nor would i have agreed with joining the Leauge of Nations.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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

[< Previous \(U.S. Role in the World\)](#)

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

You are logged in as Joe Escobar (Logout)

 Moodle Docs for this page

