

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 (The Role of the United...)

(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



Lodge's Group was Right to Fight Against Wilson's Foreign Policy

by James Price - Sunday, April 20, 2014, 6:01 PM

After reading all the material, I believe that it helps support my position on the internationalist to isolationist spectrum, which is more in tune with Lodge's way of thinking. What stuck out the most for me was the rejection, by many, of Article X (textbook P.790). The textbook brings up an interesting point when it discusses whether or not Article X violates the U.S. Constitution by taking "war-making power" away from Congress (textbook p.790). This point is also discussed in the forum article when it states that "Wilson's concept of a League of Nations... would obligate the United States to fight future wars without the consent of Congress...." I believe that Lodge was right in fighting against this. U.S. sovereignty should not be sacrificed on the altar of international diplomacy.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



irreconcilables



by Morgan Reid - Sunday, April 20, 2014, 7:36 PM

After reading the article, I would say it strengthens my position on the irreconcilables end of the spectrum. In my opinion, the leader of the irreconcilables, William Borah was right to refuse the treaty to take place, particularly because it would only commit the United States to the rest of the world, thus bringing about international predicaments (Woodrow Wilson and the Defeat of the Treaty of Versailles). I feel that the well-being of the United States of Americas should be our countries first priority.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Lets just stay friends



by Kira Iantorno - Monday, April 21, 2014, 3:50 PM

World War one was the first total war interaction for the United States. People like Roosevelt were at the time important to show that America had its place as a global power while still keeping foreign relationships strong. Wilson tried to stay at peace while still being a vital role in the war by trade yet the Zimmerman telegram and other events ended that idea. His intention of the treaty was in the right place but I do feel it was somewhat naive to ask after a war things like point #1 "Open covenants of peace, openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view."

There are no similarities today, in the era of communication and technology we should not have to step out alone and literally fight with another country to accomplish anything. We should be able to do what Ron Paul mention in the video to communicate our side. Not only can our country not support a foreign policy that has us make sure planet earth has freedom and democracy, but we are neglecting our home in huge ways by stretching so thin. Education, medical system and unemployment are all issues that us as Americans should turn to and ask why they are not being taken care of. I only see differences, in time, people, and the economy.

I sided mostly with this statement from the textbook "They subscribed instead to Theodore Roosevelt's vision of a world controlled by a few great nations, each military strong secure in its sphere of influence, and determined to avoid war through carefully negotiated balance of power"pg 790. Now don't get me wrong not all of Teddy's ideas were gold. From my point of view I do not believe that we should be putting ourselves into others issues, but we should take note and be prepared by keeping communication with nations. Keep America the number one priority when making decisions. Not by going to war but to keep financial sustainability and keep our ear to the ground. Reservationist is more what I would place myself, where peace and communication is important not at the price sharing all information with the world of our affairs especially during Wilson's time period.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Lets just stay friends



by Bryan Sandreth - Tuesday, April 22, 2014, 6:46 AM

I agree with you; however, I believe Wilson was supported by people across the globe but was not supported to his fellow political members. This was particularly true with Germany and France as they believed there are winners and losers. This was contrary to Wilson's 14 Points where he believed people were equally with no lose of power or pride. Because of the lack of political support, most of the points were disregarded. Germany felt let down. With France and Britain felt punished and Germany was not punished more with paying for the cost of the war.

I agree mostly with your statements regarding our involvement with war and other countries. Unfortunately, I am not confident other nations are as willing to get involved in atrocities such as genocide. We are are bullies and certainly get more involved than many countries which does not always have its place. NATO has been a good to help America not take or appear always the leading force in war but rather a united front.

Bryan

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Lets just stay friends

by Anh Nguyen - Saturday, April 26, 2014, 10:05 PM

I totally agree with your idea that there's no similarity between today's society and during the WWI era. As I shared the same idea with you in my reply, the development of communication and technology should be able to drag the U.S out of any war's involvement. I too believe that freedom and democracy is a matter of choice, the U.S do not have to use the power that it is blessed with to bring such illusion images of freedom to other countries. Internal problems are the ones that American should truly be concerned about, as you stated, education, medical system and unemployment rate.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Looking back vs. Looking now

by Matthew Wunderlin - Monday, April 21, 2014, 7:58 PM

While reading the material and decided which side I would ultimately choose, I looked at it from how I believe I would have in 1919. I chose a limited internationalist from that time periods stand-point, but I would support Lodge's position as a strong reservationist more in the present day. The reason I would support Lodge's position today is because of his belief, as it states in the article, that "Wilson's concept of a League of Nations that would obligate the United States to fight future wars without the consent of Congress violated Lodge's belief that the use of force should spring from the united will of the American people." I completely agree with Lodge's point of view that the use of force should stem from the citizens of our country because if we look at the present day and how the wars our country has been involved with have been completely ridiculed by the American people, it is hard to not support the idea that these kinds of acts should be supported and brought to life from

the citizens of our country. But looking back in time and how the country was fresh out of a war I also agree with the idea of a "league" that could potentially keep our country out of another war.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Mild Reservationists were realistic

by Blake Taylor - Monday, April 21, 2014, 9:27 PM

Of the factions, it seems that the mild reservationists had the most rational outlook. I mean, even their name implies a lack of extremism. At the time, the world had never seen the staggering number of casualties that resulted from WWI, and to a certain extent, extreme opinions on either side were understandable. The mild reservationist quotation - "The question of this hour therefore is not whether a beautifully phrased and perfect document has been written, but whether it is the best hope we have." - so resonates with the realist (some may say "cynic") in me, though, that I'd like to hope that I would have fallen into that camp, were I around at the time. Certainly, it's easy to put beautiful intentions on paper, but it's something else altogether to carry them out, across oceans and continents, through different languages and disparate cultures. At a somewhat dismal and desperate point in global history the "best hope" was a far sight better than the reality they were dealing with.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Reservationists were realistic

by Connor Fields - Tuesday, April 22, 2014, 2:12 AM

I agree, to the extent that I would include all Reservationists. Wilson's fourteen points were fairy tales to the countries of France and Britain. They would never agree to the moralistic unbiased nature of the treaty. They wanted revenge. The treaty's 14 points needed a revision for it to work as we see in the final draft of the treaty agreed upon by all parties.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Reservationists were realistic

by Kira Iantorno - Friday, April 25, 2014, 7:44 PM

I agree with you on it being "fairy tales to the countries of France and Britain." This is also why when they took over the treaty and changed it that the US senate was going to make sure it wouldn't put the US in a bad place for the future. It confuses me a little on why he would let Great Britain and France change the treaty so much but then get so offended when the US senate needed to. "He refused to consider any of the Republican amendments to the treaty, even after it had become clear that the compromise offered the only chance of winning US participation in the League of Nations." pg 791. Parts of it like Covenant (article X) was defiantly dangerous territory for the US on the

implication that we would have to go to war if another nation was attacked.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Irreconcilables



by Justin Guinan - Monday, April 21, 2014, 10:40 PM

I believe I stand as a irreconcialables point of view on foregin policy. I to believe that William Borah was right in not believing in the treaty. We were a pretty new nation and government at the time and the treaty would make us have to worry about the rest of the world. I think we had enough to figure out on our own.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Best Way to Look at it



by Cameron Holliday - Monday, April 21, 2014, 11:46 PM

I 100% agree with you on the fact that we were a new nation and we needed to focus on ourselves. I also believe that this topic correlates a lot with the times that are we are facing now. It seems that we are only focused on being the World police when really we cant even control our own debt, and unemployment problems. I definitely stand with the irreconsialables.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



How Lodge changed my position on the spectrum



by Andrew Betz - Tuesday, April 22, 2014, 8:16 AM

Originally I held the position of being a Strong Internationalist. However after reading the Lodge article I greatly reconsidered my position. Lodge believed "that the use of force should spring from the united will of the American people." This point of view as it states in the article contradicts the policy that the League of Nations would establish. I am personally for the concept of having a revised form of the League of Nations like we have today. That is why I changed my position to a Mild Reservationist. Still remembering that the "lack of such a League in 1914 threw the world into the chaos of war." While still questioning whether or not the League's current guidelines are the best hope we have for maintaining peace.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

An illusion of a freedom foreign policy:





by Anh Nguyen - Tuesday, April 22, 2014, 11:59 AM

"So Henry Cabot Lodge was one of history's villains?" – the article really captured my attention just by its title. We all know that Woodrow Wilson had one implacable political foe, and it was the Senator from Massachusetts, Henry Cabot Lodge. Lodge and Wilson were at odds over foreign policy. He also opposed Wilson's Fourteen Points peace plan. Without receiving Wilson's compromise toward the idea that specific and limiting changes should be made to protect U.S interests, Lodge used his power and position to ensure the defeat of the treaty and prevent American participation in the League of Nations. After all, was he a real villain? Not at all, Lodge was, in fact, a strong advocate of American involvement in world affairs and he did enthusiastically supported Theodore Roosevelt on his internationalism. However, after president Wilson let American involve in the big war, Lodge believed that the use of force should only spring from the united will of the American people. I totally agree with his will back then, even though there is no doubt that the big war did bring huge advantageous effects for the U.S, negative effects were also the ones that you could not ignore. The idea of president Wilson toward WWI as the "war to end all wars" is not true at all, since later, the U.S was still drawn into an even far worse war, WWII. I sided mostly to Lodge's concept of reservation, despite the fact that I have nothing to do with American political system back then and even today. Standing on a native view-point, citizen's interests should always be protected no matter what. In today's society, with the increasingly development of technology and communication, provisionally, there's no need and there's no way for America to be in such situation where we have to choose one faction, we better off to think of the way to solve the internal problems, rather than external, which meant sacrifice resources that we need to get the illusion of a freedom foreign policy.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: An illusion of a freedom foreign policy:

by James Price - Friday, April 25, 2014, 11:39 PM

I agree with you that Lodge shouldn't be considered one of history's villains. As you stated "Lodge and Wilson were at odds over foreign policy." Lodge took a strong position on the subject and, as stated in the class lecture, Wilson as unwilling to compromise and the issue was further complicated by the stroke he had campaigning for his position. In my opinion there is no "villain" in this situation, it's just one of those times where two strong opinions clash and no real compromise could be reached. In a way, it's not unlike the political strife we are witnessing in Washington right now.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Policing the Globe, and New World Order

by Robert Johnson - Wednesday, April 23, 2014, 7:44 PM

I can remember hearing on the television, speeches from America's former President, Bush Sr.

Mostly what I remember is how Bush was all into, encouraged and promoted the idea of a New World Order, to be supported, defended, and enforced by the coalition forces of the United Nations, and of course the need for the United States of America to lead the worlds way into the New World Order.

Bush was a great speaker (salesman, so to speak), who became an oil millionaire, before becoming America's 41st President. For a short time I found what Bush said about a New World Order, somewhat compelling. As a voting citizen in America, I began to buy into Bush's ideas about the new world, and his justifications for going to war with Iraq, in Operation Desert Storm. But before long, all that wore off, and it was like America was back to policing the globe again, and her liberty's government forcing its will in other parts of the world. Is this similar to Wilson's ideas as president ?

I can see where Bush's ideas about New World Order, and the United Nations, had some things in common with Wilson's principles for a New World Order, p 787, and his League of Nations to establish rules of international behavior, p 790.

For now I can say in regard to the role of the United States in the world, I think Bush and Wilson's Ideas about America's role in the world were very similar.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Policing the Globe, and New World Order



by Andrew Betz - Thursday, April 24, 2014, 4:19 PM

When I read your post it raised a few questions. You give adequate support, and site information for how you believe Bush Sr. and Wilson share similar ideas about Americas role in the world. I am not disagreeing, or negatively responding to your post I just have a personal inquiry. Aren't Bush and Wilson dissimilar in the fact that Wilson wanted to avoid war, unlike Bush; and wasn't Wilson's main argument for the League to promote world peace and end war?

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Policing the Globe, and New World Order



by Robert Johnson - Thursday, April 24, 2014, 7:15 PM

yes, while I do see some similarity's between Wilson and Bush Sr in regard to the position they both took, and stood on when it came to New World order, those similarity's are based on my opinion only. But I do also see some differences between the two.

To mention one difference right off the bat, Bush was a republican, and Wilson a democrat.

About being for war or not, well I think neither president wanted war, but they did both want to sign America up, to agree that she could be required as a member

to fight another country's war.

Sum of ratings: (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



The League of Nations, Mother of its Child, The United Nation's

by Robert Johnson - Thursday, April 24, 2014, 7:03 AM

It seems like President Wilson's dream of a New World Order, p. 787, 788, and his League of Nation's idea paved the way for, What I want to call its future Child.

From our material provided for this forum, It is clear that, Strong Reservationists in 1920 America opposed Wilson's League of Nation's. I would call the 1920 defeat of Internationalists, a victory for the largest faction mentioned in this forum, The Reservationists. I would also call it a victory for the Irreconcilables here in The U.S, back in that time.

I think it is worth noting here that, Strong Reservationists in The U.S., enabled America to avoid what was a key point of opposition, with the final defeat of Wilson's League of Nations, p. 791, 792. We know that one of the main concerns of strong Reservationists in America then in 1920, like Senator Lodge, didn't happen as a result of the treaty's defeat, but did sort of go ahead and happen in the decades to come. For example, during the Bush Sr administration, when America's military fought a war that belonged to Iraq

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: The League of Nations, Mother of its Child, The United Nation's

by Robert Johnson - Thursday, April 24, 2014, 7:44 AM

This posted to make a correction to the end of its parent post (my post just prior to this correction post.

The last example, at the bottom of my last post, I put my meaning more clearly.

For that Example I should have said, During his administration, as America's Commander in Chief, Bush.Sr, Activated her military to go ahead and lead the way for the United Nation's coalition of forces, in order to fight in a war between Iraq and Kuwait.

Sum of ratings: (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Reservationist-ables

by Robert Johnson - Saturday, April 26, 2014, 12:04 PM

What is the role of the U.S in the world? My original selection in the spectrum was on the far left, but after further consideration of all the material provided, I couldn't even accept the 1st sentence under the internationalist position, and feel more comfortable moving to the

right.

Under strong internationalists -The league of nations has come about by no plan of our conceiving. - I imagine Woodrow Wilson saying this to the multitudes of people around the world, at this point I'm not too much of a Woodrow fan. What a crock of bull that sentence sounds like to me, because it was totally blue printed by the likes of Wilson, and after research, I seriously think he may of had a hidden agenda.

I feel more comfortable in the irreconcilables position because it seems way less risky, yet I think somewhat paranoid, closed minded, and leaves no room for growth or progress.

Long story short here, my position in the spectrum must be my own made up position... Reservationist-ables, somewhere between far right and the middle.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



“Thank God we’re not involved in this war, a war that represents everything evil in the world.” —President Woodrow Wilson, August 1914  

by Jennifer Rose - Saturday, April 26, 2014, 4:39 PM

Wilson and Hodge obviously had some ideological differences - Wilson was an idealist and a Democrat who enacted reforms while Hodge was a conservative and in imperialist who sought to increase American power. I agree with another student who said that Wilson was naive in some of his beliefs. However, I do like the *idea* of the Fourteen Points... but some good ideas aren't always practical, or aren't good ideas in the grand scope of things. Article X sounds good in some ways, but it would not be constitutional for the US to submit to that and would obligate the United States to fight wars overseas.... not preserve peace.

I wouldn't describe myself as an isolationist, although at the time I might have been considering Europe's incessant wars. After doing more research I probably would have been a mild reservationist during the 1910's. I think the United States should be VERY choosy about the foreign policies and politics we choose to align ourselves and be entangled in. Article X would violate this, and force the US to intervene and enforce post-war borders.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: “Thank God we’re not involved in this war, a war that represents everything evil in the world.” —President Woodrow Wilson, August 1914  

by Laura Newman - Saturday, April 26, 2014, 8:06 PM

I agree with what you said about the Fourteen Points not being practical. This is true.

It was a document that seemed like an ideal conclusion. It was logical, as Wilson was a scholar, but it doesn't take into account how the other countries included in the League would feel or react. That's the problem with being all logic and no heart.

I appreciate the idea that Wilson addressed all the causes of the war and tried to make a connection with the solutions that he posed, but there is no way to expect that everyone would agree to the terms of the document. And as history tells us, they didn't.

Mild reservationist seems to be the most practical stance on this issue. I don't believe the United States should put itself in the position of "world police". It's just asking to be confronted with conflict constantly, and not always for the greater good, which is America's over all moral.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Reservationists



by Brendan Gibbons - Saturday, April 26, 2014, 8:45 PM

For me personally this is a very difficult question to answer. I have been stuck on the fence over the past few years about what side I personally believe in. In a perfect world I would 100% agree with Internationalists point of view. I think it is hard to argue against the position of spreading american democracy and freedom over abusive dictators or other evil world powers. But what makes this question so difficult to answer is the fact that we live in a far from perfect world. It sounds like it should be a pretty simple task to spread the idea of freedom or democracy around the world, but it is not. In some cases a dictator or leader or army may stand in the way, or sometimes a countries infrastructure may not be good enough to implement all of our "american ways". As I have thought about my position on this issue I find myself agreeing with the Reservationists. My main reason for this is that I agree with their point that the US shouldn't be forced or pushed into doing what the league agrees is correct. Rather, the League of Nation's ideas and decisions should be seen as only mere suggestions. I would also argue that in today's modern time the United States should focus on all the problems they have domestically before putting their nose into other peoples/nations problems. As I look at the United States of America today I see a struggling education system that is quickly being overtaken by a number of nations. In a recent PISA (Program for International Student Assessment) study taken in 2012 The USA is 30th in mathematics, 19th in reading and 20th in science. My argument would be shouldn't we attempt to fix our education system here at home so that the future of our nation can be given the education they deserve? Instead of spending millions or even billions of dollars on military expenses and foreign affairs? So all in all I would have to side with the Reservationists. One because I feel the USA needs to make decision on its own not through a group like the league of nations. Secondly and most importantly because I feel that the many struggles and problems that we face here at home in the United States should be fixed or at least addressed and attempted to fix before dealing with other nation's and countries problems and affairs.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Reservationist and Lodge



by Emily Kiernan - Saturday, April 26, 2014, 9:15 PM

After reading the material my position on the internationalist to isolationist spectrum was definitely changed. Before I read I saw myself having an internationalist point of view but as I read my views shifted more towards a Mild Reservationist perspective. I agree with many of the points that Lodge made about America's involvement in foreign affairs especially about his ideas about "the use of force should spring from the united will of the American people" and that "the use of force must always be on behalf of justice and freedom".

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

[< Previous \(The Role of the United...\)](#)

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

You are logged in as Joe Escobar (Logout)

 Moodle Docs for this page

