

HST 203: History of the United States Sp14 (Escobar Meta 41237 41238)

Home ► My courses ► Spring 2014 ► HST 203 Sp14 (Escobar Meta 41237 41238) ► April 21 - April 27

► Forum 2 ► The Role of the United States in the World

Search forums

Forum 2

Display replies in nested form Move this discussion to ...

< Previous (Non-intervention as a ...)

(Taxation by the Federa...) Next >



The Role of the United States in the World

by Joe Escobar - Saturday, April 19, 2014, 5:50 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 questions in your 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

BE SURE to use an informative subject line for your post. Do NOT simply leave it RE: The Role of the United States in the World

Sum of ratings: -

Edit | Delete | Reply



Re: The Role of the United States in the World

by Alexis Adair - Monday, April 21, 2014, 9:19 PM

After reading through the information and rereading the chapter I feel that I placed myself a little further right than I'd like to be on the poll. There are instances where I do agree with the reservationist. That is that is the "lack of such a league in 1914 threw the world in the chaos of this world." Right there is a good point, but it is also a point that we as a nation should probably be more cautious with the negotiations that we are making. If you look at what was not fulfilled in the "Fourteen Points" you see things like his fifth point, reduction of armaments to the level needed only for domestic safety. Just coming out of the Great War the need for that "Safety" feeling won't be satisfied on a domestic level. Yes, maybe there was an over production of military weapons that we did not need, but we are a nation that we can not just leave unprotected.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: The Role of the United States in the World

by Karla Miller - Monday, April 21, 2014, 9:38 PM

I don't feel that the role of the United States in the world has changed from the first World War. It seems that our role as the Great Protector started then. I think I placed myself in the right spot of the spectrum. When I see things like what Assad did in Syria by using chemical weapons on his people, I feel that we need to take care of the situation. The hard part is not wanting to see our military in a unnecessary war.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Alternative measures

by Jesse Flannery - Saturday, April 26, 2014, 6:37 PM

This is how I feel too. I can't get behind the unnecessary occupation of other countries, but to sit back and watch people tortured is just as inhumane. I definitely believe everyone is granted natural rights, and if we believe in that here why shouldn't we believe in it for all people? I wouldn't even say we have to go to war per say, but encourage support of NATO to get involved in certain situations. We don't always have to use our military. We are an influential country. We can use that influence to help get other countries involved in some of the same issues.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



The Fight for Sovereignty

by Ren Rasmussen - Monday, April 21, 2014, 10:44 PM

I originally saw myself on being a limited internationalist but after reading Lodge's article I started to lean more to being a strong reservationist. With an ideal world limited internationalist seems to be better to have a collective agreement with other nations to avoid war, but realistically I believe we need to protect our investments. With being the number one super power and probably having the greatest influence in the world, by today's standards, I believe we have an obligation to participate in the world. Unfortunately with so much involvement we are bound to have some resistant's but nevertheless our "intentions" are to bring peace to hostile places.

I would first like to look at our treaty with Panama involving the Panama Canal. The U.S. spent a great deal of money, time, and effort in building the ten-mile passageway connecting the Pacific with the Atlantic Ocean. We weren't about to let that go to waste in letting Panama get full control over in the treaty. Although we no longer own the canal the U.S. has a joint operation of the canal as well as the right to protection the canal from anyone or nation trying to seize control over it.

Secondly we definitely need to look at WWI. Germany essentially had beaten Great Britain and France and was on the verge of winning. If the United States didn't get involved who really knows what Europe would be like. I personally think Wilson should have got involved sooner which probably would have left Russia still on the winning side making them maybe not so hostile today with the United States. I will have to disagree with Lodge

in the fight of “good and evil” with Germany being seen as overwhelming evil. I respect their allegiance in obeying set alliances they had in place. On a geographic level I personally think they were out of their minds to fight a two front war but to be so successful in doing so is crazy. In protecting the U.S. interests and two allies I think our actions for war on Germany was the right thing to do but I wonder on the possibility if we didn’t get involved and let them take Great Britain and France. I think I could go as far as WWII could have been prevented. One of the main reasons for the WWII was because Germany couldn’t pay back that 33 billion in the terms of the Treaty of Versailles.

Third and probably most important is Americas fight for independence. We don’t like others telling us what to do but we contradict our selves by telling other nations how to act and run their internal affairs. When Lodge says he wants to fight for what’s right really what he stating is not what is moral but what is the best interest we have for the United States. Every country is fighting for what they believe is “right” and that always presents huge conflicts between nations. There is no fine line to what is right and wrong. Other nations have different circumstances and they deal with them differently and those differences are seen as evil, confuses me. Don’t get me wrong I am truly glad to have my freedom under our democracy but try to apply that to China’s population and maybe a whole nation collapses.

<http://personal.ashland.edu/~jmoser1/usfp/wysocki.htm>

<http://web.bryant.edu/~ehu/h497/lioeanjie/tritinfo.html>

<http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2010/11/what-is-america-s-role-in-the-world>

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: The Right Move Or The Wrong Move

by Cole Richardson - Tuesday, April 22, 2014, 1:04 AM

i honestly don't know where i would place myself, but i do know that i would be a sinner in Senator Lodge's eyes. I would maintain a neutrality on some global issues. However, in the case of the war, I probably would have stepped in a bit sooner as the severity of the situation was made apparent and that the war could spread to a global catastrophe.

Sum of ratings: (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



everything in moderation

by Kevin Wright - Tuesday, April 22, 2014, 1:27 AM

I think that the U.S. should be involved with what the rest of the world is doing. I don't think that the U.S. should be involved on the scale in which it is doing it though. If the United States is stretching their resources thinner and thinner to help those countries in need,or figing a hopeless war, it won't have enough resources left to give to itself. I do belive the U.S. should be its first thought for concern when it comes to forein affairs that directly effect domestic situations. If it means the United States needs to be friends with someone they don't agree with in order to gain resources to help with situatuions domestically I believe it should do that.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Lodge and his ideals

by Mitchell West - Tuesday, April 22, 2014, 7:51 AM

as i was reading about Lodge i found myself agreeing with his policies and those of others like him, such as Roosevelt, for how we should act on the world scale. Lodge wanted us to fight for justice and the side of good, and although i disagree with him calling Wilson " a weak indecisive leader" i agree with most of his ideals, lodge wanted us to be able to defend ourselves, which history shows has been necessary at times, he wanted us to lead the world, and absorb the culture to give america new energy, which although throughout the 1900s with the restrictions on immigration was not the case sadly. finally Lodge wanted us to lead in the business arena and thought because of our special qualities that we could become a power house and indeed we did.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Our Role Has Become Obscure

by Logan Herman - Tuesday, April 22, 2014, 7:56 AM

I think after looking at Ron Paul's arguments and similar ones that I looked up, made by Ronald Reagan years ago it makes sense in the fact that we are wasting money by staying over seas "Nation Building." When we can make our country better as a whole by staying home and worrying over domestic problems. I mean how can we be the example of democracy, when we are spending almost all of our resources building other countries that dont even want us to be there. When they don't want us to be there doesn't that make us look like we are being imperialists and exerting our presence known when there is no need to.

Ronald Reagan's Speech Link: <http://youtu.be/Fi3x7mmywDE>

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: The Role of the United States in the World by Jeremy Zoll

by Jeremy Zoll - Tuesday, April 22, 2014, 8:23 AM

I would have to take the positions of a limited internationalist, as the fact of the matter is that time and time again, We as a nation have chosen to act as a part of various wars, for little to no reason beyond some scapegoat of an incident, i.e. the sinking of the lusitania, after the American public had been warned of the dangers of sailing in warring waters, and on top of that, they had the gall to carry military supplies on a civilian cruise, knowing full well the possible consequences.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: The Role of the United States in the World by Shayna Hargett

by Shayna Hargett - Tuesday, April 22, 2014, 8:53 AM

As I was reading more and more about the different roles people took and trying to understand them better while putting myself in those positions, I couldn't come up with where I stand on the Role of the United States in the World or even why I would stand there. I think that it's important for the United States to know and pay attention to what the surrounding world is doing because we never know what lurks in the shadows, but I also think that we should limit our involvement in certain worldly affairs that aren't ours to get into but only because it might end with a lot of unnecessary casualties and fighting. I think unless we truly don't have a choice in what we choose to do then we should really limit on the amount of wars we go into with others and why.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: The Role of the United States in the World by Shayna Hargett

by Karla Miller - Saturday, April 26, 2014, 10:22 PM

I do understand your point of view, but when we don't get involved soon enough, things like Apartheid happen in South Africa. This went on for, I think, at least twenty years before it was brought to world wide attention. We do need to pay attention to everything happening in the world, but we also need to get involved sooner than later to prevent such things like chemical weapons being used. If we had made a move sooner than so many people of the Jewish faith would not have died at the hands of the Nazis. This was an example of what can happen, and it is still going on.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Don't forget your stick!

by Jesse Flannery - Tuesday, April 22, 2014, 8:56 AM

I feel like on the spectrum I would definitely be a reservationist. I agree with Woodrow Wilson to the point that we should definitely be willing to work with other countries to come to some sort of peace agreement. I think negotiations should always preemptively try to diffuse any hostility in the world. I also believe we should be allowed to make decisions as a individual country. We can't win everyone's approval. This will never be a possibility. We could say we are the world police and go around making sure people that are being oppressed are safe, or we could sit back and watch. In either case someone somewhere is going to slap us on the wrist and tell us we are over stepping our boundaries, or being unjust. This is why in my opinion, there should be some exceptions, and reservations to the treaty. We'll never be able to make everyone happy, we are a world power, and with power comes extra responsibilities. I definitely originally thought I would be far far left on the spectrum assuming that we should never go to war with other countries. This is an unrealistic view. There are some countries that are just nonnegotiable. We need to hold on to some sort of power for these circumstances. We didn't become the most powerful

country in the world by letting countries push us around. One of my favorite quotes thus far is by Theodore Roosevelt: "speak softly, and carry a big stick.". I feel like this explains how I feel perfectly. Be willing to negotiate, but not only because you can't back yourself if needed.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Don't forget your stick!



by Karla Miller - Saturday, April 26, 2014, 9:57 PM

The sentence that stuck out for me was the one about, "We can't win everyone's approval." The fact is that we never will. In the years that I have lived there are numerous occasions where we were told not to do anything, but when something bad happens we are asked how could we let that happen. As I said in my original post, we are considered the Great Protector. Which also leads to the fact that we get condemned for interfering.

Sum of ratings: (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Don't forget your stick!



by Ren Rasmussen - Saturday, April 26, 2014, 10:04 PM

When you state that we should "always try to defuse any hostility in the world" through a peace agreement I would disagree. Any act of terror on the U.S. or to our alliance members should not get a pat on the back and having us say don't do that again is unacceptable. We can not be easy on these sorts of things other wise countries will not take us seriously and try to take advantage of us. I agree with you that we are a world power but we are the number one world power and we can't afford to show any weakness or go easy on anyone even if they are an ally. If an ally steps out of line they too need to be held accountable because the U.S. will be seen as a support of that action. For me you contradict yourself when you throw in the quote of Roosevelt's with being a little more left spectrum to become far right spectrum. Starting this entry I was disagreeing with you then started to agree towards the end not letting other countries push us around. Roosevelt's quote says it all that the U.S. doesn't mess around.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



World Power



by Jesse Flannery - Saturday, April 26, 2014, 11:21 PM

Well I would definitely agree that we should never let another country "push us around". When I stated, "I think negotiations should always preemptively try to diffuse any hostility". I meant before an act of terror, or war has to happen. Also an act of war on us, or an ally wouldn't warrant just a slap on the wrist. We can all agree punishments should fit crimes. We definitely would need to get in touch with said ally to come up with terms and a plan of action. We are the number one world power, but we don't need to go stomping around the planet like godzilla

rampaging innocent people to make a point. As the number one world power we know we can back ourselves up. What we should be doing is setting an example for the world. You can't blame an entire culture for the actions of an extremist group. Look at America today we just talked about it in class. Is it fair to give freedom of speech to the KKK. I agree it definitely is. It would be completely unfair to take rights away from a certain group of people. Do I look at this extremist group and judge all white people in America? The answer is simply no. We need to read deeper into actions taken against us, and allies. We need to set an example for the world that we are a nation of fair trial, and reason. We cannot be a reactionary country. We hold too much power to act that careless. What I take from Roosevelt's quote is yes the U.S. does not mess around. We are willing to negotiate because we have the military to back up any outcome and persuade an outcome in our favor, but lets talk before we swing.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Strong Reservationist



by Paige Nibley - Tuesday, April 22, 2014, 9:34 AM

I hold my original position on the spectrum of American involvement in international affairs as a Strong Reservationist. In order to be a leading nation America must have some involvement in world affairs, whether we like it or not. American involvement internationally holds the same importance today as it did following WWI. Most important then and now, however, is remaining a separate body in regards to decisions such as entering war and conflicts in other nations. In the article, "So Henry Cabot Lodge Was One of History's Villains," Fleming points out that lodge disagreed with "Wilson's concept of a League of Nations that would obligate the United States to fight future wars without the consent of congress." He believed, contrary to Wilson, in American "united will" and that the choice should be in the hands of the people. In other words, Lodge argued in favor of an "international commitment but [retained] control of America's sovereignty" (Fleming).

My view on international affairs today is very similar to the views of Henry Cabot Lodge at the turn of the century. I think that Lodge's requirement of America to remain just involved enough so that we can take part in international affairs while keeping sovereignty of our nation through the democratic process, is hugely important now as it was during the Paris Peace Conference following WWI. With out the ability to make our own decisions regarding war and other hugely important decisions on international affairs, what power as a world leader and protection of our people would we have left?

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Preserving a National Identity



by Roy Fernandez - Tuesday, April 22, 2014, 11:41 AM

After further analyzing the information presented, I found myself leaning from a Limited Internationalist toward a Strong Reservationist. The reason for this was the importance of the United States maintaining its own identity as a nation, preserving its interests, and reserving the right to choose when to go to war. In a perfect world, war would have no

longer been a threat and the League of Nations would have prevented the need for building large armies. Unfortunately, this wouldn't have been the case and nations would have ultimately looked for what met their own people's best interests. It is only natural for a nation to look after its people and to do what benefits it the most in order to progress and improve.

Originally, I sided with Limited Internationalist because I believed in the importance of the United States being involved in foreign affairs and I admired Wilson's boldness in creating something such as the League of Nations to make the world a better place. But upon reading the article on Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, I learned that Lodge was an advocate of the United States' involvement in foreign affairs and saw an active foreign policy as "crucial to forming America's national character." I also agreed to his thoughts in giving America a sense of leadership in the world as well attracting its youth to a "new ideology of leadership." This would serve to motivate Americans to make their presence known and to make a positive change in the world. What I did still strongly disagree with though, additional reasons why I originally sided with Wilson and the Internationalists, were Lodge's views on Wilson being a "weak indecisive leader" and his outrage at Wilson claiming there was "no moral difference" between the European nations. I believe Wilson's statement to be 100% true, and it adds to why I still have a greatly positive view of him, that all of the nations had obligations to protect the countries they had treaties with and that they all were equally locked in a power struggle. Lastly, Lodge's rejection of any peoples' right to form their own nation and that "every state, regardless of size, its economic condition, and the vigor and intelligence of its people, should have a voice in world affairs (Textbook 790)," is another point that I disagree with. I believe that the only way to achieve world peace is to give all people an equal opportunity to form their own nation and the ability for their voices to be heard.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



What should our policy be?

by Kylie Stiglbauer - Tuesday, April 22, 2014, 11:49 AM

As I read through the categories of separation in terms of foreign policy as well as their testimonies, I seemed to be placing myself as a Mild Reservationist. When reading the descriptions alone, I did not know where to place myself. It was the quotes by the individuals from these groups that allowed me to somewhat place myself (I was still a little hesitant however). After I read the article that followed however, I found myself siding with it to some extent. The problem that I had with simply wholeheartedly taking one stance or the other is that my opinions seemed to vary, depending on the issue. I do believe that the United States should be involved in foreign affairs (we do all share this planet after all), but I believe there should be limitations. I agree with having a league that can join together for the better good, but not one that is meant for intimidation or simply negative outcomes.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Fail of US involvement in the League of Nations

by Miranda Townsend - Tuesday, April 22, 2014, 12:22 PM

I found the Lodge article to support my original self placement on the internationalist to

isolationist spectrum. The essence of my agreement is outlined when in the article, Henry Cabot Lodge Jr., the senator's grandson, notes in his biography, "The United Nations of today fall squarely within the limits of the [Lodge] proposition.

However, I do not agree with the ongoing feud of personal attacks between Lodge and Wilson. This is illustrated in the textbook when it says, "It soon became clear, that several Republicans, including Lodge, were as interested in humiliating Wilson as they were in developing an alternative foreign policy. (Textbook pg. 790)

Lodge proposed nearly 50 amendments to the Treaty of Versailles. I found it ironic that Wilson's refusal to compromise ultimately wound up costing the US participation in the League of Nations. "Many believe that the flawed treaty and the failure of the League contributed to Adolf Hitler's rise in Germany and the outbreak of the second World War more devastating than the first. (Textbook pg. 792)

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



Re: Fail of US involvement in the League of Nations



by Kylie Stiglbauer - Saturday, April 26, 2014, 9:36 PM

I very much liked how you incorporated the textbook to strengthen your argument. I actually was able to see where you were getting your points from more clearly because of it. The Textbook often brings points such as this one into perspective for me. The fact that Wilson did not compromise and thus compromised the US involvement in the League of Nations was something that I found to be very interesting. It could have been something completely different had we been apart of the league, possibly preventing the second world war (or at least making it less likely).

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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



Re: The Role of the United States in the World



by Alex Quadrini - Tuesday, April 22, 2014, 12:26 PM

I'd say that my current placement on this spectrum scale for US foreign policy would have to be that of the Mild Reservationist. Throughout the debate and somewhat political campaign of the "Treaty of Versailles" and proposed stance with the "League of Nations" Our nation divided its Political Perspectives on what America's interest were and what values should hold most predominant in the time of war. America had a lot to gain by joining this League and becoming a collective member of this European conglomerate group of nations and powers. The US wanted very much to keep its physical sense of Free will not to be backed into a corner where in future political predicaments the US would be forced into War due to their standing within the League of Nations. At this point in time The US and its leaders had made a strong effort to keep our nation's sovereignty but to which state would aligning with such an International Organization take away from that stays we've held and firmly established. Senator Henry Cabot Lodge was a great example of playing devils advocate to Wilson's aspiration of Globalization and alignment with European nations in The League of Nations. He wasn't opposed to becoming involved in foreign affairs by any means. He was a man with a strong sense of moral comparison and contrast with Political

dilemmas, foreign and domestic. In the article for this forum it states "*Lodge saw America's world role as a way to attract young people to a "new ideology of leadership" where they would find "fresh sources of energy" more ennobling than the commercial and material ethos of American big business. He believed American idealism could become a more significant force in world affairs than the often "sordid" imperialism of Britain, France and Russia, who dominated two thirds of the globe.*" He wanted America to take a new approach to its battles and advances of profession instead of following the shadows of what powers have molded the spectrum of supreme dominance. His biggest disapproval of Wilson was his sense of "pale neutrality" in which he set the tone that there was no difference, morally speaking, between the European antagonists. This was unspeakable to Lodge due to his clear perspective of the "Allies" being in the right and German forces in the wrong and even being of an evil origin. After finally entering the war and dismantling German forces Wilson proposed his concept of a League of Nations. This League would entrust and politically motivate if not force the United States to engage in future wars with no voice of additional input from Congress. This potential treaty and "League" completely violated Lodge's political belief that "*The use of force should spring from the united will of the American people.*" This is where I find myself standing in terms of my own Political standpoint with Foreign affairs and obligations as a leading nation in our world. This article definitely didn't change my viewpoint on any political matter it is my opinion that our government if not most have become infrastructures to hold these immoral agendas and has institutionalized government to do the back door biddings of corporate America. We fight overseas with a clear distinction of prevailing against other nations and controlling the resources that obscure our every day lives into a screenplay of control and societal norm. It doesn't matter what politicians say or do, to me the institution of government has become a violent entity that signs away the fate of the world with a legislative paper or document that will be seen first hand by the politicians doing its bidding, or signing. I don't take into regard the factions and contrast between separate parties even. It seems to all be one conglomerate script that is being so ever well played by an all star cast of actors that we call our politicians. This is why I myself can't stand the idea of Imperialism and the underlying onslaught of greed and corporate bigotry that becomes applicable to the very political actions of our nations leaders. Our sense of Nationalism and need to spread "Democracy" has become a veil in which Imperialism has set its fingers on. On page 775 of *Liberty, Equality, Power* there's a quote of Woodrow Wilson just before the entrance of the US into WW1, "*We shall fight for the things which we have always carried nearest our hearts-for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own Governments, for the rights and liberties of small nations, for a universal dominion of right by such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free. To such a task we dedicate our lives and our fortunes.*" It's quotes like this that make me ponder the illusion of a moral agenda set out by politicians regarding foreign policy when really vital assets and interest of our more concealed government are liable and need to be secured. With foreign policy imprinted with Imperialistic aspects there always is an agenda, a next move or an act of ignorance that leaves people stripped of their resources, land, culture, essence of existence just to ensure valuable US amenities and interests. It's my speculation that the majority of US foreign affairs have a distinct goal beyond that of what the media or even our leaders themselves tell us. We say were not an imperialistic nation but yet we divide and conquer war after war after tragedy after US intervention. Were made to look as the good guys, riding our Horse of Democracy and freedom into the foreign lands of nations in need. Whats the real objective and not the one constantly being obscured with a need for US intervention. From my perspective politics is theatrics in it's finest moment and because of that our foreign

policies leave its US citizens subject to the wrath of the rest of the world just watching us take our role and place as the United States of America.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Lodge's idea, Wilson's idea and my idea

by Hao Nguyen - Saturday, April 26, 2014, 10:47 PM

After reading through the information and the article about Senator Henry Lodge, I would place myself as mild reservationist position on the spectrum.

Lodge's idea is that:

"America's role in the world was to fight similar battles beyond its shores. This meant America had to be strong. He pushed hard for a big navy and an expanded army. He supported the Spanish American War. Lodge saw America's world role as a way to attract young people to a 'new ideology of leadership' where they would find 'fresh sources of energy' more ennobling than the commercial and material ethos of American big business."

Lodge wanted to led American to the more advanced and stronger nation, the newer nation leading by a newer generation. He wanted America to fight for the good as well as building a strong relationship with other nations at the same time. Moreover, the reason why his desire as "push hard" for a stronger navy evolved due to his idea as "a world controlled by a few great nations, **each military strong**, secure in its sphere of influence, and determined to avoid war through a carefully negotiated balance of power" (Text pg 790).

But in this idea, I find some disagreement as "world controlled by a few nations" since my belief is "each nation has a right to form their own nation; that every state, regardless of its size, its economic condition, and the vigor and intelligence of people, should have a voice in world affairs; and that disputes between nations could be settled in open, democratic forums" (text pg 790) which as similar as Wilson's belief.

I chose to place myself at the mild reservationist spot on the spectrum because I believe that in order to build up world peace and friendship between nations, negotiating and considering "what it would be if that or this happens?" are necessary.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: The Role of the United States in the World

by Jaalen Johnson - Saturday, April 26, 2014, 10:52 PM

Throughout America's history we have had a tendency to overreach our hand. The United States, being a notable world power for centuries now has always been pressured by its citizens to have a higher moral standing. Even before America became the world super power it is today there seemed to be some unmentioned obligation to become world peacekeeper. I like a more hands off style of government with limited intervention into foreign nations. Tampering with foreign affairs often leads to long term commitment and struggle on the home front. So while America was founded upon basic rights and principle

of what fair and democratic, I think we should let other countries decide for themselves how to live. This rule of course does have its exceptions.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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

[< Previous \(Non-intervention as a ...\)](#)

[\(Taxation by the Federa...\) Next >](#)

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

[i](#) Moodle Docs for this page

