

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 (Taxation by the Federa...)

(The Role of the United...) 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



Right or Wrong?

by Matt Hauge - Monday, April 21, 2014, 7:19 PM

This weeks forum presents very interesting questions. Personally, I think that I would align with the Strong Reservationist Position. My reasoning behind this position is mainly because we, the United States, would not be forced to go to war if the League or United Nations decided it wanted to. As stated in the forum materials the Strong Reservationist Position would be ". . . the League must be considered suggestions only." What I find most interesting about foreign policy is nations that currently are allies, and enemies that both have and do not have representation in the UN. I would be curious to learn more about how the United Nations deals with these issues in a diplomatic way. As we have seen in the past, the UN has helped and abandoned countries like Sudan in the midst of a "civil war" or genocide.

I cannot agree with the Isolationists or Irreconcilables of the era. The stance of not wanting to be involved in anyway with the world just does not sit well with me. I can understand not

wanting to be involved in wars with small countries that have different political values or cultural differences to the United States. The major issue, in my opinion, is forcing countries to believe in democracy and "freedom". In a way, it is almost quite the opposite of freedom when we force a country to change their political ideology, but when horrible atrocities like genocide, or mass torture occur, and it is provable I believe there must be some kind of intervention with force.

After reading the article about Henry Lodge the part that struck most interesting to me was the final paragraph comparing Lodge's political stance which I believe to be Strong Reservationist. My only issue with this political philosophy is the U.S. did defy the UN and we invaded Iraq. In 2004 the Secretary-General Kofi Annan stated, ". . .the US-led invasion of Iraq was an illegal act that contravened the UN charter."
(news.bbc.co.uk/2/middle_east/3661134.stm)

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Right or Wrong?



by Tran Nguyen - Friday, April 25, 2014, 3:15 PM

I think that if The U.S. joined the League of Nations would lead to some good consequences. The U.S. at the end of WWI was on the top with its army, both in quantity and quality, while the other big powers were at their vulnerable stage. It would reduce a chance of starting another war who allied with the U.S at that time. It is not only about fighting for a foreign culture and forcing ourselves to believe in alien political values. The U.S.'s army would be the guarantee of preventing wars among the Europeans.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Right or Wrong?



by Daniel Halverson - Saturday, April 26, 2014, 10:03 PM

I would agree with you that joining the League could help in avoiding possible wars in the future, but I also would say if the US was to join the league that it would be giving up a lot of it's power and the US is not one to hand over power that easily. The other countries who were in the League wanted the US to join knowing they were the more powerful country. Losing power as a county though would not have went well during the WWI time.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Lodge- wiser than you might think...



by Daniel Hovet - Monday, April 21, 2014, 7:35 PM

After considering Fleming's article on Senator Lodge, who was written off as an isolationist for refusing to support joining the League of Nations, I surprisingly found myself sympathizing heavily with Lodge over Wilson with regards to America's role in the world.

First of all, Lodge was no isolationist- he understood America needed to be involved in world affairs through international diplomacy and the like, for many reasons listed in the Fleming article. Lodge was a reservationist, and for good reason- think for just a moment about what Wilson's internationalism would have brought about: The League of Nations. Wilson's League was not the magical peace machine some people of the time seemed to believe it would be, as referenced in the video, "Wilson Goes to Versailles" (It was not realistic of W.E.B. DuBois, or of Ho Chi Minh, for example, to believe that Wilson or the European leaders would use the League to enfranchise Africa, or allow Indochina to have a seat at the table).

In addition, Wilson's claims of moral equivalency between the Triple Entente and Germany disturbed Lodge- and that concept would be key in shaping Wilson's vision of the League. While the Entente forces of France, Britain, and especially Russia could hardly be described as exemplary nations, Germany was a militaristic monarchy that intended to make the most of the war by conquering Europe. Next, Lodge was right to question Wilson's strength and wisdom as a leader- how realistic was it of Wilson to believe America had "the right" to dictate the terms of peace, as stated in the video? Did he think the Entente would happily accept?

Also, Lodge feared that by joining a League of nations of whom several members were even less inclined towards the strong (RELATIVELY SPEAKING FOR THAT TIME PERIOD) ideals of peace and freedom that America held, the U.S. could be sucked into enforcing the wars and wills of foreigners and whatever dark justifications they were being fought for. If Wilson's counterarguments against Lodge were all as emotionally driven as his charge that Lodge was ready to "break the heart of the world" or as petty as dismissing those agreed with Lodge as "bungalow minds", then Wilson was in desperate need of a geopolitical reality check.

In conclusion, if Theodore Roosevelt felt that America was the world's policeman, then Wilson arguably felt America was the world's judge, or at least a member of the jury (forgive the hyperbole). Then again, maybe had Wilson's 14 points been ratified, arguing against the League of Nations would have been a badge of shame today, instead of what I believe to have been a reasonable fear. I have to say I'm more of a reservationist on this one.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



how Lodge viewed the Presidents

by Kellee Harbour - Monday, April 21, 2014, 9:29 PM

I found it fascinating how Lodge was viewed as an isolationist yet he was strongly interested and promoted America's involvement with other countries. It was interesting how he opposed Wilson's decision to remain neutral and how he supported Roosevelt's internationalism. Lodge, like many people were strongly opinionated on how the German's were in 'the wrong' and even though Wilson entered the war it was fascinating to me how Lodge's ill opinions of Wilson remained. It's also interesting how people and politicians ended up siding with Lodge and not President Wilson.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: how Lodge viewed the Presidents



by Daniel Halverson - Tuesday, April 22, 2014, 8:52 AM

I would agree with you on this. I also found it very interesting how at one point Lodge agreed and supported the decisions of Wilson up until he would not originally go to war, and even after Wilson finally entered, Lodge still feels the same. With the landslide victory despite Wilson's efforts for Lodge to lose, I thought it showed where the view points of Americans were from and siding with Lodge showed how the people wanted to go to war and fight. Lodge stating that the Germans were wrong and also evil makes them sound a lot nastier to Americans so it doesn't surprise me that so many people agreed with Lodge and in his thought process and decision making.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Reservationist: For the better or Worse?



by Tran Nguyen - Tuesday, April 22, 2014, 12:13 AM

The text about Henry Cabot Lodge strengthens my belief in internationalist. When it comes to international affair, I strongly believe the discussion and the making-decision committee should be for the mutual benefit and operated over non-violent methods.

What I have learnt from the text is that The United States since after World War has grown the ego to be the big brother of all other nations. Its newly-developed army and wealth have overcome the belief in the mutual benefit for all other countries with the growth of Reservationist. "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," the text reads; despite accepting to be involving in other nation's affair, America refuses to be control by any other nations. Combined with the Nativism that existed in the 1800s, The United States got out of its way in the Cold War, especially in the Vietnam War. Taking the stand point of against Communist, The United States sent troops to the South of Vietnam, replacing the French, to overrule and separate Vietnam into half. Flashback to inclass material about American's need of experience new weapons in the field and the prohibition of using chemical weapon after World War I, the Vietnam War demonstrated clearly the U.S.'s intention of protecting "U.S. sovereignty" under the Reservationist view point. Claimed by History.com, the U.S. had used weapons that are more devastating than those of any previous conflict, including B-52 bombs and highly toxic chemical defoliants or herbicides.

Source: <http://www.history.com/topics/vietnam-war/weapons-of-the-vietnam-war>

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

Coalition of the Willing Vs International Diplomacy





by Kenneth Green - Wednesday, April 23, 2014, 4:04 PM

It is appropriate Fleming offers us a modern example of "Reservationists" such as Lodge, mentioning President George Bush and the Neo-Con faction of the Republican Party at the end of his article. He says the difference between Lodge and Bush is not nuanced however, because Lodge did believe in the Civilian over-sight of our Military aspirations and deployments around the world. There would seem to be a spectrum within this group, "Reservationists," from Bush on the Right to Mild-Reservationists such as Bill Clinton. Both used the military even though other Countries did not approve, but Neo-Cons believe organizations like the United Nations either exist to support US Foreign Policy or "Screw 'em."

This article did not change my position, I tend to be a Mild-Reservationist on this issue, because it is important for the entire world community to work together to ensure peace. But the United States certainly had the moral right to go after the terrorists of 9-11, despite what any other Country said about it. (Obama got Bin Laden, is the best example.) But again, Neocons turned 9-11 (about a group of radicalized Muslims) into an issue of protecting "American interests" in the Middle East. The Iraq war was over-reach (God bless our troops.) According to a Mild-Reservationist.

In the end, (according to the text pp 790-791,) both Wilson and Lodge shared some blame for not ratifying the Treaty. It was about partisan politics. And this ties in with how Fleming points out that our Military is subject to CIVILIAN over-sight. We, the citizens decide when and how our Military is to be deployed. We learned this lesson in Vietnam. Love our men and women in uniform they exist for our protection. But know damn sure how our Elected officials intend to deploy them, and for what reason.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



How an Internationalist melds with a Reservationist



by Zachary Ogborn - Thursday, April 24, 2014, 3:23 PM

According to the 'definitions' material provided for this Forum topic, I find myself leaning towards a Limited Internationalist Position **AND** my original self identified position of a Mild Reservationist. I say this for a very good reason. The definition of an Internationalist has some small text towards the end of it: *"some within this group were receptive to a small number of minor changes."* This for me, justifies Henry Cabot Lodges original position (*As described in the provide article by Thomas Fleming, 9th paragraph down*) that America as a nation **SHOULD** have an international commitment but also have **FULL** control of our nations Sovereignty.

I also side with the Mild Reservationist position based upon my more modern leaning Centrist positions. According to our text book (*Chapter 24 specifically*) This era was a turbulent time for the majority of Americans. The majority of the population was described as being Urban, had an influx of 'luxury' goods, and began seeing the automobile in mass. They also had to deal with some unfortunate legislation and the rise of the Ku Klux Klan. This for me shows

that the best thing for a Nation/Society undergoing unpredicted and rampant change is to tread cautiously when dealing with foreign affairs, but keep peace, prosperity, and justice in mind when dealing with those situations.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Lodge and things



by Serena Williams - Friday, April 25, 2014, 9:48 PM

Before starting this class, none of this ever crossed my mind and we never learned about it in high school so I had no opinion on what I am as far as Isolationist-Internationalist position. After reading the article about Henry Cabot Lodge I came to the conclusion that he was an Isolationist and didn't want the treaty to happen which was odd to me because I don't see why anyone wouldn't want to make peace between these countries at the time in history. I guess that would make me sort of a Limited Internationalist. The fact that Wilson and Lodge were such opposites was surprising to me. I don't really see why we should get involved in the rest of the world's problems unless it happens to involve or affect the United States so maybe that changes what I actually am on the scale.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Lodge and things



by Tristan Smith - Saturday, April 26, 2014, 1:34 PM

Before coming into this class I to had no opinion on internationalism, or isolationism. It is very interesting to me that Lodge is viewed as being an isolationist, because he has very strong views and opinions making him seem like an internationalist. As far as making peace with these countries at this time in history I feel like it has everything to do with dominance and becoming the world leader. I would to agree with being a Limited Internationalist, I think we should be involved with other countries of the world only if it concerns, effects us, or is a threat to us.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: The Role of the United States in the World



by Tristan Smith - Saturday, April 26, 2014, 1:23 PM

I found Lodges views on Americas involvement with the rest of the world very interesting. At first I was sure of myself that I was for isolationism, but in further reading of lodge I found myself leaning more towards internationalism.

I agree with lodge and his backing of President Roosevelt, on the position that being involved with the rest of the world is somewhat of a necessity. Though my beliefs on internationalism are to a certain extent, I disagree with Wilson on staying out of the war for so long. I feel that postponing are involvement made the situation worse going in to the second world war. Though it could easily be argued that staying out of the war completely would of been the better solution, I think as a world power or upcoming world power

involvement is needed to a point.

Sum of ratings: (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



a power trip?



by Kellee Harbour - Saturday, April 26, 2014, 9:27 PM

I first sided with the Limited Internationalist view. Now, as I study the other views, I'm leaning more towards the reservationist side. I think that changes should to be made according to circumstances. I think that being involved in international affairs is not necessarily good unless it is beneficial to us, yet we place ourselves in other countries business so much it puts us in bad financial and economical positions and gives us a twisted view of power. How is war really beneficial to us? Being placed in international affairs affects the whole country and the people. Changes should be made in order to protect the people and finances of the country. It seems the US gets involved in war to prove power.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: a power trip?



by Daniel Halverson - Saturday, April 26, 2014, 10:45 PM

I agree with you and feel the same way. I believe that the more and more that the US gets involved with other countries issues that don't concern or have and impact to the US, the more that it looks like the US is trying to control all of these ther countries and force them to change the way they handle things like US does and I believe the US does have imperialistic ways as they have since the turn of the century before the 1900s. The less that the US is involved the more time it will have to worry about it's own issues within their own country and less on worrying about trying to fix everyone else's problems.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



What is this world really coming to?



by Amanda Daniels - Saturday, April 26, 2014, 9:27 PM

I'm don't know if I am on either side honestly. Lodge seem to not support the United States joining the League of Nations because of his personal dislike for Wilson and his decision to stay out of the war for as long as he did. It wasn't necessarily because he didn't believe in what they were about, it was just that he personally just didn't like Wilson and therefore he wasn't going to support anything that had to do with him. I don't see that being as anything more than him

willing to support any side, right or wrong, as long as it wasn't the side Wilson's supported, which is really pretty childish. This is why I say I just don't see myself supporting either side on this issue because I certainly don't support Wilson's idea of joining the League of Nations by any means.

Before there was the League of Nations there was League to Enforce the Peace and of course now we have the United Nations. Both The League of Nations and The United Nations are a type of one world government that was originally brought into existence once again by, the bankers. I hate to sound so repetitive, but it is true. And what this group of individuals likes to do, is first cause a crisis, so that they may be called upon by that country to come in and solve it. It's a brilliant scheme when you think about the fact that they can create any scenario in the world you can think of, blame it on whoever they want and then go in take over and fix it. It would be like me owning the only auto body shop in the entire city and then having my friend driving around causing accidents so that people are forced to bring their cars to my shop to be fixed. This global government with its own court, and its own police will ultimately shift all power and control of all nations around the world into the hands of a few select individuals, and completely destroying the sovereignty of our nation.

If you believe the United Nations is a good thing well then you probably won't mind paying the new Carbon Tax that is soon to be on its way. I not saying that were should totally isolate ourselves as a country and have no foreign policy, but the one we've got going is definitely no good. I would hope that all of you are at least curious enough to do just a little bit of your own investigating before you just chalk this up to another conspiracy because I guarantee you this, the only thing the United Nations is really depending on, in order to implement their plan, is very simply the total ignorance of the majority, not all, just the majority, to just be unaware of their existence and their agenda.

None are so hopelessly enslaved, as those who falsely believe they are free.

[Johann Wolfgang von Goethe](#)

[The United Nations' Agenda](#)

[Infowars.com](#)

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: The Role of the United States in the World



by Daniel Halverson - Saturday, April 26, 2014, 10:18 PM

After reading the article on Lodge I would say I am at the same spot in my position. I feel

that it is important to have a good relationship with other countries around the world, but I also believe that the US should not get involved too deep. I do not see Lodge as an isolationist at all and agree with him in not wanting to join the league. Whenever the US tries to "help" other countries it turns out bad and eventually that adds another country that dislikes the US. Being tied to something like the League is restricting the power for the US as we would have to do things with permission from the other countries and I dont think that another country should have power over what another one does. Unless those decisions were to harm an ally or cause more bad than good, that's when another country should have the right to step in.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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

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

[\(The Role of the United...\) Next >](#)

You are logged in as Joe Escobar (Logout)

 Moodle Docs for this page

