

HST 203: History of the United States Sp17 (Escobar Meta 41054 41053)

Home ► My courses ► HST 203 Sp17 (Escobar Meta 41054 41053) ► Week 4 ► Forum 2 ►
The Role of the U.S. in the World

 Search forums

Forum 2

The Role of the U.S. in the World

[• Subscribe](#)[◀ Taxation](#)[Taxation ▶](#) Display replies in nested form Move this discussion to ...

The Role of the U.S. in the World

by Joe Escobar - Friday, April 21, 2017, 11:29 PM

This thread is for discussions on the The Role of the U.S. in the World topic.

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, something that describes which question(s) you are addressing . Do NOT simply leave it RE: The Role of the U.S. in the World

Sum of ratings: -

[Permalink](#) | [Edit](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



The Role of the U.S.; non-intervention or intervention and my opinion to them

by Katie Fuller - Saturday, April 22, 2017, 4:11 PM

In the case of non-intervention, Ron Paul supports this case as he does not want to be involved in other country's affairs. In his case about intervention, I would agree with his statement that spreading democracy worldwide doesn't work as it has "unintended consequences..to spread our goodness overseas requires force. We're spreading.. In Iraq, we can't do that without dropping bombs and killing people." (Ron Paul, 0:54). I would definitely agree with his claim about there being consequences in the war in Iraq, as, once we bombed Iraq to collapse the government led by Saddam Hussein, the occupation there led to violence between the religious groups there and caused insurgency against the U.S.

coalition forces (Wikipedia). These problems, along with the many deaths caused by the bombings, lead me to agree with Ron Paul's claims to not get involved in foreign affairs through military means and force, but rather through negotiation. For example when there was the threat of nuclear weapons with the Soviets had nuclear weapons "we were able to talk to them; we took our missiles out of Turkey, they took them from Cuba.. and they had a lot of them, but we didn't invade them in order to get rid of those weapons. It is the lack of diplomacy that is the greatest threat, not the weapons themselves" (Ron Paul, 7:10). His statement here, goes to show that force is not always necessary, and in his case with John McCain about isolationism, he stated he was not isolationist but rather that he didn't want to use troops to force other nations on what to do. However, in the case of communists attacking democratic nations, such as in Korea, I would not agree with Ron Paul's statement of simply standing by and letting people suffer or become overruled by another government.

It is through Alan Keyes claims in regards to ending genocide in Darfur that I come to change my stance of leaning towards Ron Paul's claims as he states that "we are a nation of nations..if somebody is being hurt somewhere in the world, somebody in America grieves for them.. We don't have to send troops, but we need to support and reinforce the sense of local regional responsibility in both humanity and military order (Alan Keyes on Darfur, 1:00-1:28). This statement is also true, in a sense that the United States is a place of many nations, especially with all of the immigrants that come here to this day, so to just opt out of any and all nation's problems is not something I would agree with. It is in the case about "The Crisis in Foreign American Policy" that I come to find a standing that better fits my own; one that does not demand control of other nations, but would aid those nations when they needed it. Anne-Marie Slaughter describes Wilsonism in the ideal toward self-determination, that enabled people to choose their governments, that satisfy the wants of their people, but if the government is unable to provide and fails drastically to protect them, then it is the nation's responsibility to act. I agree that the U.S. should act in such cases and there is a distinction between a corrupt government that severely violates human rights versus one that is just simply opposed due to it's lack of democracy.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3

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



Intervention against another nation's government

by Katie Fuller - Saturday, April 22, 2017, 4:23 PM

It is in the case of intervention against a nation's government that some might claim that if the United States were to intervene, that they would continue doing so even in cases where it is not necessary. I would agree, that the possibility of our nation to take up an army against a new government is plausible, though I would argue that there is a distinction between such opposition of a nation and a legitimate reason of intervention. Anne-Marie Slaughter states that "there is a line between, cases of severe human rights violations, severe systematic of genocidal proportions. In those cases, the international community can decide to intervene without licensing any government" (8:43). Such cases would be reasonable to intervene in without the government, though, the fact that the League of Nations was originally meant to send the U.S. into war without the consent of Congress, which was one of Wilson's claims that Slaughter agreed toward and referred to through this video, does not seem constitutionally correct to me as it goes over the rights of the people to vote in on the government's decisions to go to war, which, just as Henry Lodge had, would need some revising to reform this portion on the statement.

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

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1



Pros v. Cons Isolationist/ Interventionist

by William Mc Mahon - Monday, April 24, 2017, 3:41 PM

I found the exchange between John McCain and Rand Paul a great synopsis for the problems in both interventionist and non-interventionist foreign policy. (Video - John McCain on isolationism.)

The two different perspectives on foreign policy both have advantages and problems. From John McCain's perspective, force is justified based on threat. This is clear in his remarks referencing WWII and Adolf Hitler's rise to power. (:12 Video - John McCain) It is hard to argue that, given the United States' military power, we shouldn't intervene in international conflict. Especially when human rights violations are involved. But where do we draw lines in regards to foreign nations and their behavior? What about the chaos and unfortunate consequences that come as a result of engaging in foreign conflicts?

I think Ron Paul has a good answer. Defending himself against being branded an isolationist, he states that he is more than willing to trade, communicate, and work with other nations. He just doesn't advocate force. (1:40 Video - John McCain) There is a problem though. What about belligerent nations or genocidal leaders? Are we really supposed to sit back and allow that to happen?

Personally, I lean towards isolationist/ non-interventionist. I'm idealistic in the sense that I think diplomacy can mitigate many conflicts. Despite some people's protestations, we live in a global society. As a result, we have to communicate and interact with other nations. I think there should be more of a focus on communication than military force.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2



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



Re: Pros v. Cons Isolationist/ Interventionist

by Angela Yackley - Wednesday, April 26, 2017, 3:08 PM

I'm totally in agreement with you on all points and I appreciate how you spelled out your opinion very simply. McCain, Keyes, Lodge all have this, "with great power comes great responsibility" morality in common that you sum up as the idea that: because we have the military ability, we should use it to help. How do we justify helping some nations and not others, especially when our own citizens aren't getting adequate food, shelter, safety and care? I appreciated Teddy Roosevelt/Lodge/Paul's approach to diplomacy as opposed to Wilson's idealism of world peace- in terms of practicality. (Text, page 864, 2nd paragraph). It seems very naive to believe every group of people will gain their own brand of self-determination, though I wouldn't wish ill of them for trying. It is their right. But by intervening on their behalf by sending our people to fight, especially against their will by instituting a draft (Text, page 853, 2nd paragraph) and using propaganda to get citizens to pay for a war (Text, page 856) and stretching limits at home is democratic hypocrisy and undermines our own citizen's sovereignty.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3



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



by William Mc Mahon - Saturday, April 29, 2017, 7:39 PM

It's very hypocritical.

In the Ron Paul Interview at 4:14 he says that if another nation, he uses China as an example, did what we do and occupied our country to "protect their interests," we would lose our minds. There is this mentality that the US is always the good guys, but if you think about what we're doing a little deeper it gets scary.

Bottom line is, we're invading countries, we're occupying countries, we're dropping bombs and killing people.

Are these things justified? It's hard to say. I do think it's obvious that using military force against other nations is serious and these situations can become very complicated.

To me, it seems like we're invested in every foreign conflict around the world. I think that's absurd. I don't see any reason why we can't at least scale back our military presence and trying working with other countries diplomatically.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Do I stay or do I go now?

by Angela Yackley - Monday, April 24, 2017, 6:02 PM

It was easy for me, during this last election to side with Bernie Sanders. Gathering only snippets of history here and there and how our nation handles foreign affairs, the question of why we intervene and where continues to linger on my mind. If our intentions are to pave the way for democracy and instill peace, I believe there are more diplomatic ways that don't involve invasion and the use of arms to "help people to be better." (3:03 into Ron Paul Interview). Knowing the reasoning behind our sense of "moral obligation" and exceptionalistic ideologies to police the world, I simply do not agree with any interventionist method on the part of our government. But I don't know if the U.S. could, at this point in time, become more isolationistic. Like what Ron Paul said when he was asked about pulling out of the several countries and territories in the world we were currently occupying (7:16 into Ron Paul Interview)- I don't think it's going to happen but I don't agree that it's our duty.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Do I stay or do I go now?

by Katie Fuller - Tuesday, April 25, 2017, 9:28 PM

I agree in siding most to Bernie Sanders as well as your statement of paving way for democracy with peace, which is a point of Wilson's fourteen points in which it states a "covenant of peace.. After which there will surely be no private international action.. But diplomacy shall rule" (Wikipedia, Fourteen Points Speech). And I would agree that we should someday remove our troops, I do not think we should be completely isolationist. Perhaps this is not what is being proposed, but, even so, it is important to note that, as in the case of the rise of Hitler, and other cases where another nation's government, or force in the nation, was harming the people there severely, I would agree towards

intervention in those cases. For, as pointed out by Anne-Marie Slaughter, there is a distinction between such a government and a potentially unfavorable one ("The American Foreign Policy video, 8:12).

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Do I stay or do I go now?

by Dakota Brotherton - Saturday, April 29, 2017, 4:33 PM

I find myself leaning towards the side of isolationism as well in terms of our country getting tangled in foreign involvement due to our 'world police' mentality. While I find that it is morally and ethically sound getting involved in foreign affairs in the spread of equality and in some cases democracy, I can't seem to forget the mention of Russia and their pull out from the war. Vladimir Lenin had published texts of certain Allied treaties that revealed part of the true nature of Britain and France and their similarities to Germany (text pg. 753). Wilson had entered America into the war for the fight for democracy and the spread of peace while the other Allied countries sought the retention of land and resources to enrich their nations. This just goes to show that even the most "reputable" nations can easily take advantage of our willingness to get involved into just about any situation for the "fight for democracy".

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: The Role of the U.S. in the World

by Dakota Brotherton - Monday, April 24, 2017, 8:47 PM

Ron Paul's interview altered my perspective on the isolationist vs internationalist dilemma when he gave the example of a scenario in which China was occupying American soil to protect one of its commodities in a time of civil strife (4:17). He goes on to argue that he feels that American intervention in foreign affairs is only appropriate when it is under the justified conditions of our constitution, for example being attacked or threatened. Even when there are horrific things going on in the globe like genocide and government corruption, to extend our influence/spread of democracy often times causes more harm than good because those ideals are basically being forced upon another people. Overall Ron Paul's interview really highlights the hypocrisy in some of the statements made by American internationalism.

To pursue in the spread of democracy and goodness, there are unintended consequences that accompany some of those implementations. While it's all fine and good to take a moral stand on a particular issue or topic on a personal level, ultimately to try and force another population to view the issue in the same light doesn't coincide with the values of democracy at all. In the spread of our American ideals to other parts of the world, it almost seems as if we are employing imperialistic tactics at times and for this reason I have strongly reconsidered my view on America as the world's police force.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: The Role of the U.S. in the World

by Austin Muller - Thursday, April 27, 2017, 1:02 AM

After watching these videos clips and reading these articles, I found myself somewhat surprised at the affect they had on me. Prior to this videos I would have placed myself in the middle of the internationalist and and reservationist spectrum. However after reviewing the materials provided, especially what was given to us covering Ron Paul, I am much further on the reserved side. He states, "It is ok to have a personal responsibility to help others." (0:40 of 20/20 interview) By this Paul means that one may choose to aid a foreign countries plight, no matter how insignificant or major, by way of first hand help, sending money, or some other appraoch. He prefaces his statement with this because he does not believe that our government should intervene without prescribing to the allowances of the Constitution. I agree with him entirely on this point, as well as you. We try and spread democracy and "good" through many different means. This includes dropping countless bombs and a multitude of other military actions. It is hard to defend ourselves as an advocate for democracy by bombing a country, but when it is not even under the pretense of war? It verges on nonsensical.

While responding to a question on whether he believes we should pull our troops out of every foreign country, he responds, "I would, for several reasons. One, under the Constitution, we do not have the authority to put troops in foreign countries when we are not at war." (5:18 of 20/20 video) This is where I have an issue with our countries overwhelming foreign intervention. We are the worlds guide to democracy, and we want to impart our version of it on other countries? We can't even follow our own idea of what democracy is. Everyday, we knowingly decide to defy our most scared document, the Constitution, to a larger and larger degree. Again, nonsensical.

Directly following the statement that I quoted in paragraph two, Paul continues, "We are on the verge of doing what every great empire in history has done, spread ourselves too far." (5:35 of 20/20 interview) Again, could not agree more. He explains that monetarily we can not afford to keep doing this sort thing. The money we keep spending is directly effecting the people within our borders. By ignoring this perspective, I would argue that we are putting lives of other nations peoples in front of our own. That is not the kind of government I want running the country I live in. It may seem like a cold stance, but it is one that Ron Paul has thoroughly convinced me of.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



We are a nation of nations

by Jaclyn Bahn - Monday, April 24, 2017, 11:07 PM

The case for intervention I find myself agreeing with most on the internationalist and isolationist spectrum. The argument by Alan Keyes brings up that "We are a nation of nations we are a people of many people", and we can't turn our back on them I see as being very strong (0:50 in Keyes video). The United States is made up of so many different ancestries that it's true, "If someone's being hurt somewhere in the world, someone in America greaves for them" (0:56 in Keyes video). I see the side for non-intervention as a position of not wanting to put our people in anymore danger than they need to be. In the 20/20 interview of Ron Paul at 5:06 he states that, in regards to spreading our democracy and goodness, "It doesn't work [and] there's too many unintended consequences".

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

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2



Re: We are a nation of nations

by Katie Fuller - Tuesday, April 25, 2017, 9:40 PM

Perhaps it is true that getting involved does have some unintended consequences, and I think, towards an extent, that this kind of caution is necessary as it keeps us from getting into more than we can handle, so to speak, however, it is also true that if we just stand by and do nothing, things would only get worse, to which I agree with Alan Keyes statement of "I don't believe we can turn our backs on that universal significance..we don't have to send troops, but we need to support.. and reinforce the sense of local, regional responsibility for both humanitarian and military order" (Keyes, 1:16).

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1



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



Re: We are a nation of nations

by Dakota Brotherton - Saturday, April 29, 2017, 4:58 PM

This reminds me of a point that Ron Paul brings up in the 3rd minute of his interview. He states that there are better ways of spreading diplomacy and peace than occupying other nations and enforcing our will upon them and the example he uses is the bombings of Iraq. However, it seems as if Paul feels that one of the only reasons for getting involved in foreign affairs is when we are under attack from another nation or under the threat of war. Because of his experience in the 50's while in the air force, Paul places a high value in communication when it comes to resolving foreign conflicts and he mentions the disarmament of nuclear missiles during the cold war being carried out because of the communications involved (Paul, 6:50).

I definitely think that in certain cases, Pauls ideology would be best for the rest of the world but there is no denying that after we have opened up the sphere of influence as wide as we have that it will be very difficult indeed in reducing the amount of involvement in foreign nations. After all of the failed attempts at changing world views and spreading peace and equality accompanied with all of the unintended consequences of 'assistance', I think it would be best for our governments to focus on issues being reflected on the home front. However, because of the responsibility that so many Americans feel for the problems (rightfully so in certain cases) I believe that wealthy benefactors and philanthropist will (and should) continue to heavily pursue and promote the well being of people all around the globe.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2



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



Re: We are a nation of nations

by Matthew Brownlee - Saturday, April 29, 2017, 5:49 PM

I agree with the point that it is difficult to reduce our global involvement. With how complex and developed our relationships with other nations are, moving towards non-interventionism is a difficult task. Over time I believe it's still possible, though.

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

Sum of ratings:0 (1)



The Constitution and The Internationalist

by William Mc Mahon - Saturday, April 29, 2017, 12:15 PM

My main critique of interventionist policy is that it's unconstitutional. The last time Congress formally declared war was WWII. (Declaration of war by the United States - Wikipedia - (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Declaration_of_war_by_the_United_States#Formal) We've had a lot of major conflicts since then.

When Ron Paul speaks about using force in foreign conflicts he states, "We should only do those things under the prescribed conditions of the Constitution." :53 Ron Paul Interview)

It's a difficult choice to make, but I think there is room for improvement. In instances of significant use of force, I.E. invading a country and occupying it indefinitely, there should be a formal declaration of war. And if politicians aren't willing to do that I think it says something about whether or not we should be there in the first place.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: We are a nation of nations (edit myself)

by Jaclyn Bahn - Saturday, April 29, 2017, 9:29 PM

Im really sorry, I meant to say "The case for intervention I find myself agreeing with most on the internationalist side of the internationalist and isolationist spectrum.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

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



Stuck in the Middle of Reservationist & Internationalist

by Marisa Wyman - Monday, April 24, 2017, 11:48 PM

Even after hearing every position, mine had not budged much. Personally, I identified more as a mild reservationist which I guess means I relate more to Clinton's foreign policy. Especially where it says she sees us as, "the indispensable nation, but consciously restraining its exercise of power through multilateralism and near-obsessive legalism." (9th paragraph of Four Foreign Policies Article) I do believe there are issues we must focus on internally before we attempt to save the rest of the world as well. On the other hand, I can see where in some scenarios it could in fact be necessary and morally right to help other nations in need. This is where I could not fully agree with isolationist. Something that worries me about full-blown irreconcilables is that we may indeed "spread ourselves too thin" (10:05 into Ron Paul interview). Ron Paul does appear to lean more towards isolationism, although he denies it (1:35 into John McCain video) but his particular logic is much more appealing to me than Lodge's view that "an active foreign policy as crucial to forming America's national character."

That being said I do think the League of Nations was a good idea that may have been successful had it gone through properly.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Stuck in the Middle of Reservationist & Internationalist

by Angela Yackley - Tuesday, April 25, 2017, 6:35 PM

I can understand your intellectual quandary here. I think though, from a personal (as opposed to national) stance, it's easy to concoct moral judgements on the way other nations conduct their affairs. If it were more popular, we would probably get involved as private citizens but our government has sought to make it a military affair instead of let that notion develop. So it gets trickier to implement arms as means to "help" solve the world's issues and I believe our presence has only stirred the pot in parts of the world we have sought to assist (3:32 into Ron Paul Interview) and entangled ourselves further in disputes we had no business dispensing ourselves to. I don't see that Ron Paul leans more towards isolationism, as he states that he believes in taking a diplomatic approach (3:39 McCain vs Paul Debate Video) as opposed to the imperialistic, "let us win" stance McCain declares earlier in that debate. I would ask of you, which scenarios are we morally justified to intervene in? Or rather, what gives us the moral obligation to get involved, granted that we would not be incited to do so except on grounds of defense?

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Stuck in the Middle of Reservationist & Internationalist

by Katie Fuller - Tuesday, April 25, 2017, 9:56 PM

I just want to say that I am also rather like you in your political position, as I am more between Reservationist and Internationalist, as I agree that we should work on improving our nation, and I think we should help nations that are struggling with an oppressive or otherwise negative government. However, I do not think I would side with Hilary, based on the statement towards her being more aggressive and wanting to "keep troops in Iraq.. and the arming Syrian rebels" (The Four Foreign Policies), which I would not agree with as I don't want our soldiers stuck in war away for such a long time, as would be suggested, and though arming the rebels may have aided in the war, it may have caused potential issues as well. I also agree that the League of Nations would have worked well, and even been agreed upon, if negotiation could have been made more and that the Nation was not given the ability to overrule congress to go into war (History News Network, Henry Cabot Lodge, Paragraph 8).

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Henry Cabot Lodge's Legacy

by Austin Muller - Monday, April 24, 2017, 11:57 PM

Henry Cabot Lodge's view on America's role in the world have gradually gained more and more support since the unfortunate tarnishing of his ideas nearly a hundred years ago. The majority of American citizens, and the politicians elected to govern it, have grown to agree with Lodge's sentiments about American international intervention. That is to say that they have, "backed Henry Cabot Lodge, not Woodrow Wilson, in affirming an international commitment but retaining control of America's sovereignty." (Henry Cabot Lodge Article) Lodge also saw the Civil War as a fight between good and evil, and, "that America's role in the world was to fight similar battles beyond its shores." (Henry Cabot Lodge) That is where former Republican presidential candidate Alan Keyes views are similar with Lodge's. He says, in regards to

international intervention, that, "...we don't have to send troops, we need to send support and reinforce the sense of local and regional responsibilities for both humanitarian and military order." (1:05 of Alan Keyes video) Both of Keyes's statements here agree with Lodge, that we should reserve our right to send military force, and whatever our plan of action is, it should be for good. Ron Paul on the other hand, would take a much more reserved approach to intervention. He stands on the stronger side of the reservationists. He doesn't believe unless directly attacked, should the United States engage in combat or even have troops overseas, for it is unconstitutional. Paul does not believe in Lodge's feeling that America should fight the evil in the world, he would rather us worry about domestic issues. That is not to say that Paul would want to run America as a hermit nation, which would fall into isolationism. He says in a debate, "I am not an isolationist, I want to trade with people, I want to talk with people.." (1:33 into John McCain video).

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3

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



What presidential rep. I relate to most

by Katie Fuller - Tuesday, April 25, 2017, 8:31 PM

I think I would relate most toward Bernie Sanders as his pacifism and idea towards giving nations back their freedom as well as keeping out of war, unless necessary, that is similar to the limited internationalists in which it states "the combined pressure of the world's nations will prevent the..possibility that the U.S. could be forced into a war" that holds an idea against the U.S.'s involvement in war. Some issues today were issues back then as well, such as immigration into the U.S., in which the U.S. blocked out people from Eastern Europe and Asia for a while back around the time of the 1918s and the issue of stopping immigration from Mexico into the U.S. today.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

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



Intervention and Reform

by Matthew Brownlee - Tuesday, April 25, 2017, 11:08 PM

After looking over the materials, I lean towards isolationism, but I'd consider myself more of a non-interventionalist in that it can be useful to communicate and trade with other countries. Unfortunately, this can make it difficult to stay out of conflicts overseas. Will other countries that the US cooperates and trades with perceive the US as turning their back on them if we stay out of their conflicts? I like the idea of isolationism because of the effects we see when America intervenes in foreign conflicts, and how we often try to force others to live a certain way under a governmental system that we deem is right for them, like in Afghanistan. It reminds me of the Social Reform movements that I learned about in 202, where some reformers took a Calvinistic view towards reform. These reformers attempted to control behavior and acted as though they knew what was best, what was right, for others. The United States doesn't have a moral high ground or inherent knowledge of what is best for other countries, yet we act as though we do.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

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



by Marisa Wyman - Thursday, April 27, 2017, 1:00 PM

After reading your post you've brought up points in a way that has slightly shifted my stance. For example, when you mention forcing others to live the way would like and assuming we have some sort of knowledge above other countries. I wonder why it is that our country's arrogance gives us this right to disrupt others current way of living, because who is to say that it is right for them? Like mentioned in class on Tuesday, state laws can differ from other states depending on each states need. I feel that should apply to nations as well. But one idea I cannot budge on is if others are desperately in need of assistance. If another horrific genocide such as the Holocaust were to occur once again, myself, and hopefully others, would sympathize and feel some sort of need to help. I don't necessarily mean we must use arms and force and send all of our troops to save the world, but simply standing by and letting something like that happen wouldn't sit right with me. Again, I do know there are a significant amount of other things that we could utilize our time/money for here in the U.S. before we set out to help others.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1



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



"Gospel of Power"

by Andrew Erkert - Wednesday, April 26, 2017, 4:12 PM

I am having difficulty in finding myself in one point of the spectrum. In the spectrum poll, I chose Mild Internationalist because of some of the ideas that I had previously thought of and that were brought up by Joe in the previous class period. The idea that the world might "go to hell" if the U.S. retracted from foreign intervention and just focused on itself. I do think that some of powerful groups around the world would take advantage of us leaving and escalate the violence and abuse of the innocent people that they were already harming. I like the idea of us being able to just focus on improving ourselves but at the same time, I wouldn't feel good about the things happening around the world.

In my last term with Joe in HST 202, we discussed the idea of the Gospel of Wealth with Carnegie and Rockefeller and how their methods to become wealthy were immoral but their contributions to society afterwards arguably helped better society. I see this as a sort of Gospel of Power with the U.S. The U.S. has amassed all of this power in their military and economy over time in questionable ways, like the removal of Native Americans, exploitation of African Americans as slaves, child labor, minority discrimination, etc. but they have also used their power in the fight against Germany in the World Wars, the second of which was to stop Hitler from mass genocide, and religious oppression. In the long run, I have to agree a little more with McCain that we have to be a part of it. It has essentially become our duty, rightfully or not. I see the future of our government as a struggle to find the balance of helping its people vs. helping the rest of the world. I don't see us becoming isolationists as we were in our early history.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3



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



Occupation: Hypocrisy?

by Andrew Erkert - Thursday, April 27, 2017, 11:33 AM

I do agree with some of Ron Paul's points made in the interview. I think he is right about groups hatred and hostility towards the U.S. being caused by our occupation in their countries. It certainly seems to be a valid point. I am glad he made the example of how we would feel to be occupied by an outsider. I certainly wouldn't like it and I think most of the country would agree with that sentiment. On the contrary, the civilians of these occupied lands may truly believe that U.S. intervention could improve their lives and democracy might just set things right for them. I don't think it is accurate to assume that they all hate us for occupying their country. I don't think they necessarily "love it" but I think many of them would prefer it over what the current regime was established to be. This is the part that sways my position of the spectrum. I want us to improve and help our citizens but I also don't want people to go through the horrible, oppressive systems in place in other parts of the world and have to deal with it when we have the power and resources to potentially make things better for them.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

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



Re: Occupation: Hypocrisy?

by Austin Muller - Saturday, April 29, 2017, 4:29 PM

The title of your post is my exact sentiment towards the discussion we have had about this topic of US intervention. I think it is very hypocritical to be occupying foreign lands and subjugating others to what we believe to be is right. I agree with both Ron Paul and yourself about how the hatred that certain groups hold against the US is likely worsened by our presence in their lands. However before reading your post I had not fully considered the idea that some of a country's citizens may actually want the US to help them establish a just ruling government. Ultimately though, if we are waging a "war on terror" and justifying our actions to fight this war on the basis of these groups's existence, agitating them by occupying regions of their homeland seems counterintuitive. I would even say hypocritical.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

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



Let's Build Relationships not guns

by Jordan Selker - Thursday, April 27, 2017, 12:52 PM

I personally identify with Bernie Sander's pacifistic foreign involvement platform, similar to that of Ron Paul's; although I do think that aid in the form of food and other vital supplies to be well justified foreign involvement. In relation to the post world war era, we are dealing with a different situation in today's politics. We recall that the end of the war was much more of cease fire and tensions between world powers remained high (see WWII). Today's issues of foreign involvement are more based around conflicts in less developed and less powerful countries. The debate on involvement is much more based around the morality of when to help a warn torn people, rather than how to prevent world wide war. While political propaganda may try it's best to influence us that certain countries have their hands on nuclear weapons and pose a real threat to American lives, the biggest threat to the livelihood of our citizens, and those of other world powers, comes in the form of lives lost during foreign intervention. (See wars since WWII; Korea, Vietnam, Afghanistan, Iraq.) The question is now how much foreign involvement, through military, monetary, and diplomatic means, is most suitable for improving life for other nations overseas, spreading our ideals, or in the case of the middle east, American capital gain. Throughout our history of foreign involvement, we see patterns emerging of a moral cause, and a less than ideal ending. (See american imperialism, Cuba, the Phillipines, panama,

and more recently Iraq, Afghanistan, Lybia.) We continually fail to learn from history and realize that our good intentions do not necessarily yield good results for those we've "helped" and many lives, both of those we fight against and our own, could be saved by a more pacifistic, diplomatic approach.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3

Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Ron paul and Alan Keys

by Dana Lowder - Thursday, April 27, 2017, 3:35 PM

I agree with Ron Paul in his interview. Not getting tangled up with small border problems is one thing, but we cannot let Genocide, death and destruction go unnoticed in countries with people just like us who need help. Small issues are where I can understand Paul's position. Getting involved with ALL of these countries essentially puts our military in foreign places that we don't belong in. We are responsible for the U.S. I also strongly agree with Alan Keys stand point when he says: "applaud by the suggestion that we retreat into some kind of fortress American and forget who we are." We are a people of many people, and a nation of many nations, but meeting in the middle of Ron Paul's argument and Alan Keys could be the answer as to what is best for America. Alan Keys relates to Henry Cabot Lodge the best with their shared view on involvement in world affairs. Keys explained in the video that turning our back on other countries was turning our back on our own people, and after reading the *History News Network*, Lodge seemed to have the same idea. One of his ambitions was to become chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and "...Saw an active foreign policy as crucial to forming America's national character."

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Bernie Sanders Wants Peace

by Jaclyn Bahn - Saturday, April 29, 2017, 10:14 PM

I see myself siding most with Bernie Sanders the most on the topic of foreign policy. I found a quotation from Senator Sanders on <https://berniesanders.com/issues/war-and-peace/>. He states that, "America must defend freedom at home and abroad, but we must seek diplomatic solutions before resorting to military action. While force must always be an option, war must be a last resort, not the first option". I agree with this because I believe we can not be a defenseless nation but I believe the world should move towards an understanding of peace and that situations should be first addressed with the intent of peace and if that is not seen by both sides or we are then threatened, we should be able to feel comfortable that we can defend ourselves and our people. Sander also addressed this later in the quote when he says, "While we must be relentless in combating terrorists who would do us harm, we cannot and should not be policeman of the world, nor bear the burden of fighting terrorism alone". He also brings to light the idea of not defending ourselves alone, "The United States should be part of an international coalition, led and sustained by nations in the region that have the means to protect themselves. That is the only way to defeat ISIS and to begin the process of creating the conditions for a lasting peace in the region." Which I also find myself agreeing with. When it comes to fighting a organization set for war we need allies or we will need help just like in the First World War when we were allied with Great Britain, France, and Italy. I believe we achieve the allies by peace and comradery.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

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



2016 candidates

by Matthew Brownlee - Saturday, April 29, 2017, 11:39 PM

The foreign policy stance I agreed with most is Bernie Sanders (well, the article had a very pessimistic tone, so I felt like I was choosing what I disagreed with the least). Overall I agree with the idea that it's best to stay out of international conflicts and look to solve problems with negotiation and diplomacy first. However, he does support international involvement to some degree. The Washington Post article *Yes, Bernie Sanders has a Foreign Policy Vision. Here are its Three Central Ideas*, Sanders believes Americans are safest and most secure when US policy helps people worldwide escape fear and deprivation. His approach would involve sending aid and helping in nonmilitary ways. I'm open to this method, as there are some situations where serious human rights violations are taking place. My objection to interventionism has more to do with the poor execution of it throughout US history than the fundamental idea itself.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

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

◀ Taxation

Taxation ▶

Moodle Docs for this page

Accessibility at Lane

You are logged in as Joe Escobar (Log out)

HST 203 Sp17 (Escobar Meta 41054 41053)