

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](#)

The Role of the U.S. in the World ►

Display replies in nested form ▼

Move this discussion to ... ▼

Move

Pin



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](#)



mend our economy from being an isolationist?

by Michael De Nitto - Saturday, April 22, 2017, 1:51 PM

The role of the United States since World War 1 has been something like a guardian angel, who comes only when absolutely needed. I can see a balance between aspects of being isolationist and internationalist. Showing military force in other countries today, reminded me of Theodore Roosevelt's display of the Great White Fleet. This was seen by some countries such as Japan as a form of intimidation, although the intentions were for training up the navy. I agree with Rand Paul's argument of military presence abroad saying " Under the authority of the constitution we don't have authority to put troops in foreign countries when we're not at war, where does this authority come from? The other major reason is we can't afford it

anymore we're going BROKE!" this idea of taking troops out of foreign countries that are not at war with us, could probably do some good for our economy. (5:20-5:40 ABC News Interview Rand Paul)

Sum of ratings:2 (1) 2

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



Re: mend our economy from being an isolationist?

by Jason Pickens - Tuesday, April 25, 2017, 5:14 PM

Michael,

I agree with you in some ways. However, with a large presence of troops in South Korea, Okinawa, and mainland Japan, we are able to add stability to the region. I understand we need to help our economy, but if we were to pull out of many countries, the world may be turned upside down and our trade with those nations as well. Sure, some of the fights we have been involved in were not the greatest idea like Iraq in 2003, but if we were to pull out completely ISIS fighters would run the entire country creating an even larger problem for us and the world. It's complicated but I can agree about the economy ending help. I would imagine every American could have health care if we cut a bit of defense spending.

Sum of ratings:2 (1) 2

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



Re: mend our economy from being an isolationist?

by Andrew Trott - Wednesday, April 26, 2017, 9:03 PM

I agree that it would be nice to see defense budget cut, especially in regards to pentagon administration. However, I am inclined to think that if we really put to many cuts on our military or pulled out of to many places this would have devastating effects on the American economy, due to the military-industrial complex the United States is currently involved in. The US military is the largest employer in our country. If we were to pull out we would have to completely restructure the way our economy works.

Our country actually makes money off of war. This is evident with all the wars we have been in. We go to the right as far as becoming reactionary and our economy tends to grow, especially for larger companies.

I am not opposed to withdrawing from other countries, and am really not opposed to limiting our defense spending but it may not help the economy the way we are hoping.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) 1

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



Re: Then and Now

by Edward Billings - Monday, April 24, 2017, 3:09 PM

The United States of America's role on the worlds stage has evolved as many times or more then the scenarios that this nation has been involved in. This is in part to the nations standing in any given situation. Back in 1914 the U.S. had been more involved in the industrial and commerce aspects of the world stage. The U.S.'s interest were not at this point directed to a

military mind set because of the successes it was having in the world markets. The U.S. had to make a gut check and it, in turn, ended its neutrality in 1917. After entering Europe's war on the side of the Triple Entente (Great Britain, France, and Russia) making this the world's war. Fighting the Triple Alliance Germany, Austria-Hungary, and the Ottoman Empire which replaced Italy early in the conflict. The U.S.'s break in neutrality was influenced by the need to protect our trade partners of the Triple Entente while the Triple Alliance was looking to make major land grabs to expand their borders for resources is where there was a paradigm shift that was directed by some feeling of moral obligation. (Chpt. 23 P. 745) I think that the policies developed at this point in time have set the tone of many future scenarios. The U.S. has logistically allied itself to democratic ideals that allow it to be resourceful in the world scene. This, as well as an abundance of resources and sound democratic governance, have left the U.S. as a sort of role model that less fortunate societies look to in times of need. That being said there are many circumstances where the U.S. has overstepped its presence. Many situations could have been best resolved internally, or with some guidance. Then there are the circumstances that old sayings come from A.E. "you can lead a horse to water, but you can't make it drink." In these sort of interactions where there is no amount of diplomacy that will lead to any resolve. The U.S. has had the role of the enforcer to varying degrees of success in too many of these situations, but I would not want to see the alternative to doing something. This is why I think that it is hard to talk about the U.S., and its role in the world because of the interconnection, multifaceted reality of the world. All and all the United States of America wears many hats on the global stage then and now.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3



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



Re: Intervention on just causes are a good idea

by Jason Pickens - Monday, April 24, 2017, 4:06 PM

After watching the Ron Paul and John McCain debate, I must say that I was going into this subject SOMEWHAT agreeing with Ron Paul and his isolationist views. However, after McCain said " Its this kind of isolationism that caused World War II. We allowed Hitler to come to power with that kind of attitude of Isolationism." (CNN video :28 seconds into the video). I changed my mind a little bit. I am not 100% sure if that was indeed the cause for WWII, but if it was, I think we should be selectively involved as a nation in world affairs. I specifically remember what was going on in Darfur. I felt bad at the time and still do because we did not intervene and help out the people who were getting wiped out by the genocide that was going on in South Sudan. This clip of Ron Paul saying that " We should not get involved for feel good reasons" (Allen Keys video : 30 seconds) was in my opinion an insensitive way at looking at the situation in South Sudan at the time. I thought, and still do think we are a nation that should stand up for people who could not fight for themselves. However I do agree with Ron Paul in the way that some of the wars we fight are not the greatest of ideas.

-Jason

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2



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



Re: Intervention on just causes are a good idea

by Michael De Nitto - Wednesday, April 26, 2017, 12:34 PM

Jason,

I completely agree with the U.S being selectively involved as a nation in world affairs, there should be a good reason we get involved. It takes the attack on pearl harbor for the U.S to get involved in WW2, Sadly among all the other atrocities Hitler was committing in WW2. If the U.S only gave humanitarian aid and not its own military force in WW2, Germany would have been a powerhouse. Bringing me to my next point of what the International mission is for the U.S which Alan Keyes saying " We don't have to send troops, but we do need to support and reinforce local responsibility of humanitarian and regional order" (Allen Keyes video : last 14 seconds). Crimes against humanity is my lean towards the internationalist side of the spectrum. Appreciate your response and feedback

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

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



Re: Intervention on just causes are a good idea

by Andrew Trott - Wednesday, April 26, 2017, 8:52 PM

"Its this kind of isolationism that caused World War II. We allowed Hitler to come to power with that kind of attitude of Isolationism." (CNN video :28 seconds into the video). What I would assume Senator Paul is referring to here is that most of the world, especially the United States stood by as Germany went against the Treaty of Versailles and began rearming his troops. He created an army well beyond the bounds of what the treaty allowed. But The Allies did nothing in hopes of "peace for now." Where this discussion of foreign intervention always goes is to Germany recapturing and remilitarizing the Rhineland back from France. Many historians would suggest that if The Allied nations stopped Hitler here this would have stopped much, if not all, of the war. The term appeasement can really be traced back to this moment in time. I'm sure we will discuss this in much greater detail in class in the coming weeks.

To me claiming that because we didn't stop Hitler when he took the Rhineland is justification that anytime a nation steps over boarders they need to be stopped militarily is a false equivalency; it is a fallacy of inconsistency. Hitler was an enigma. Certainly we should learn from the past, but Hitler was something special. He laid out his ideals before he even did anything. This is why I am a reserved isolationist in many sense of the definition. I think we need to have heavy reservations before America intervenes with anyone so we don't create a worse situation like the one we are seeing with ISIS currently.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3

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



Re: Intervention on just causes are a good idea

by Eric Walston - Saturday, April 29, 2017, 1:45 PM

With all due respect to the Senator McCain is wrong. America's isolationism had little if any effect on what caused World War Two. The outcome of WWI caused WWII. The rise of anarchism and old border hostilities led to the cause of WWI. Numerous other centuries old disputes and wars led to WWI. IF anything a greater argument can be made that the Hundred Years War had a greater impact on what caused World War Two than whether America's hand played into its beginning. Ron Paul in his interview, 9.40 minutes in the alternative link,makes what I believe to be the most powerful argument as to why we should not have troops overseas, it is Unconstitutional. It isn't a matter of what is right or wrong but rather what is legal by our own standards. We either have to accept that we are a

country of laws and we abide by them wholeheartedly, or we must change the very foundation of our government. We can not govern by feeling, but rather rational. I can understand a feeling of wanting to do something to help the people of Darfur, just as I feel for what happened to the Jews, Homosexuals, mentally ill and Romani of Germany during World War Two, but there is a huge difference between those two issues. In World War Two we were attacked, thus giving us legal ability to enter into an engagement with a foreign government, the Sudan however never gave us proper reason to enter into war. So hypothetically if we did enter into the Sudan and we intervened, to what extent? Do we go in and overthrow the government? Do we simply settle in as peace keeping troops? Do we force a foreign entity to adhere to our political and cultural ideals, that's pretty audacious if you ask me. That begins to blur the lines between liberator and conqueror. If anything we have seen over the last 80 years how that only creates more problems for us abroad. This does not mean that I do not feel for the world, or the people that suffer in it, it only means that I realize that as a nation we have a responsibility to live by the fundamental laws we have chosen for ourselves. If we the people no longer want to live this way, then that is an entirely different discussion.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



The past of Lodge with the present Keyes

by Alicia Lundeen - Monday, April 24, 2017, 6:38 PM

The most common idea shared by most including Henry Cabot Lodge, is the America we know to have an active foreign policy. "Lodge saw an active foreign policy as crucial to forming America's national character" (Lodge villain article). Other similarities can be shown between Keyes and Lodge much more than other candidates. "Lodge's vision of an America that is prepared to work with International organizations" (Lodge villain article). Keyes concept that "We need to support and reinforce a sense of local and regional responsibilities of humanity and military orders for the world" (1:10 Keyes audio). Another major similarity between Keyes and Lodge is the impression America has on others. "Lodge, the worst foreign policy sin was inaction and pale neutrality (Lodge villain article). According to Keyes, "We are in touch with every people on the face of the earth....I don't believe we can turn our backs on that universal significance of helping (:49-1:10 Keyes audio). Acting on and speaking about are two different things, Lodge wanted to and did act upon whereas Keyes was presenting his rules of an America that is helpful and not hurtful.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: Why must I choose

by Eric Walston - Monday, April 24, 2017, 6:39 PM

The entire notion that I can somehow identify whole heartedly with one group as described, is difficult for me. Morally I am a isolationist, but I am pragmatic and realize that if we wish to have a thriving economy we have to be able to trade. I believe with every ounce of my being that we must adhere to the Monroe doctrine, and only become embroiled in conflict outside of our hemisphere if there is an absolute viable threat to America and her allies that would lead to a destruction of our way of life. I am not a strong supporter of ideas like the League of Nations. I find them to be extremely ineffectual despite their good intentions. When I was younger I was

idealistic and thought that we could solve the worlds problems, however the older I get, and the more I have seen of the world, I feel like we should only worry about our own affairs before we meddle in the dealings of other nations.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Why must I choose

by Edward Billings - Wednesday, April 26, 2017, 1:12 PM

The thought process that leads to a black or white decision is where I believe the answer is to the Question "why must I choose". In the scale model that is used in this class there is a great visualization of just how much latitude there actually is in any given circumstance whether it be Individuals opinions, or the difference in political parties. The space between polar opposites is where the discussions that make or break any given scenario; a.k.a. the gray area of any given decision. There has to be a common belief, or idea that is shared between the two, or more parties for any sort of meaningful resolve to be reached. It is my belief that too many of these "isms, ideals, etc." are based off beliefs and feelings that are held to very tightly. This presents a closed mind to any sort of negotiation which in turn often leads to one party dominating another, or a black and white outcome. Often times through compromise all parties involved could give a little, and in turn walk away with their beliefs/Ideas intact. This can be a slippery slope because here it comes another old saying "give them an inch they'll take a foot" These sayings don't become old for no reason at all; they are often true. This is why I believe that if there is a president set that has proven itself factual time and time again it is often easier to decide where to land on the spectrum of any given scale.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Why must I choose

by Andrew Trott - Wednesday, April 26, 2017, 8:34 PM

The Monroe Doctrine places America as having the right to intervene and pursue its influence in the Western Hemisphere. This would put you as possibly a "mild reservationist" or more possible as a "limited internationalist." The Monroe doctrine was a way to stop European powers from colonizing areas where we felt our influence should be able to take root without having to fight for it. The League of Nations could potentially be made of treaties such as the Monroe Doctrine. If world powers all join together and decide who's influence is allowed where this seems along the lines of what the Monroe Doctrine was doing. One difference with the UN currently is that in the UN smaller nations have a voice as well.

I also think it is an important point that one can be a isolationist on military might but not so much on trade or travel. In the sense of trade or travel I think it is impossible for America to retract in on itself. Though I would not identify as a neoliberal, globalization has taken hold and is impossible to simply stop. What may be easier than attempting to stop Global warming is putting regulations on trade and who is controlling this trade globally. i.e. Governments have more control than international corporations. This is where I would love

to see a more effect UN, in regards to regulations on international corporations; I would love to see regulations that uphold the autonomy of nations and limit the power of these international corporations.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Why must I choose

by Alicia Lundeen - Thursday, April 27, 2017, 12:33 PM

I too resisted with identifying whole heartedly with one group over another as well as understanding concepts and ideas differently as I have gotten older. My pick came without hesitation after listening and watching the video between Ron Paul and the other 2008 candidates as well as the personal interview with Ron Paul. One thing he stated stood out more than anything else for me, "Personal morals and giving can help but spreading our goodness overseas usually requires force. This doesn't work and there are many unattended consequences". The notion that our goodness is so good that other countries require it to thrive is wildly unrealistic. The world's problems shouldn't start or end with America.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Why must I choose

by Eric Walston - Saturday, April 29, 2017, 2:19 PM

Everything you have stated is spot on. For me I am always reminded of the old adage "The road to Hell is paved with good intentions" However, the most important thought process is to judge between what is moral and what is just. I look at WWII, everyone quickly takes the position of of course we should have fought in WWII because Hitler was exterminating the Jews. This as we all know now was horrendous and disgusting, however at the time we did not know for certain that this was the case. My uncle was in the European theater during the war and never spoke about his experience until months before he passed away. My brother and I were both joining the military at the time (just after the first Gulf War) and he began to open up. We found out that he was part of the liberating troops and both Buchenwald and Dachau. During his conversation about it, he broke down several times, something I had never seen this man do, but he said something that has stuck with me every since. He just said " We didn't know, if only we had known earlier" He also said something that took me a long time to fully appreciate, " I'm so glad they (Japan) attacked us and gave us the reason to fight". I was only 18 at the time and couldn't quite comprehend it myself, until shortly thereafter I was placed in Turkey as part of Operation "Provide Comfort". We were tasked with helping Iraqi refugees from the first Gulf War flee to safety, away from retribution of Saddam. I interacted a great deal with these people, primarily Yazidis and Kurds, people I had never even heard of, and during the conversations about the horrors these people had to bear, all I could think was, " We didn't know, if only we had known earlier". So While yes I am an isolationist, my heart still feels for the people of the world who must endure the horrors of brutal regimes. However, I have also witnessed the ineffectual endeavours that lead to more problems that we must then come into fix. It does not mean that I want these people to suffer or be exterminated, it only means i see the futility of it all.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



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

by Andrew Trott - Monday, April 24, 2017, 9:23 PM

After WWI, Wilson took a more hardline interventionist, internationalist, Approach. His vision was one of idealism. He felt that the League of Nations and his 14 points would lead to “a new world order in which relations between nations would be governed by negotiations rather than war and in which justice would replace power as the fundamental principle of diplomacy.” (Murrin p. 751). This is a hope that soft intervention would be route taken by nations towards peace.

I am an idealist in many sense of the word. But I am also a realist and realize that sometimes confrontation is unavoidable; that unless people are willing to take the violence and a possible massive loss of life that confrontation is unavoidable. So in this idealist frame I subscribe to pacifism and nonviolence. However in the realist framework, with the structure of modern American society, intervention is maybe the only way to avoid a larger loss of life at times. I am however a fan of soft interventionism.

I see the idea of interventionist vs non-interventionist as one that can easily be made into a false dichotomy. To think that one has to be one or the other is to ignore that it is a spectrum. There is times when interventionism is important, and other times when it can make the issues worse, even if it does help America’s own interests. When intervening in a place it is important to know about the culture we are intervening with. When American goes straight into war without a proper grasp of the culture where we are intervening there is the possibility that the situation will become worse, for American and, for the nation we are attempting to help.

There is also the question of who is America intervening for; it the intervention to help the citizens of that country, the leaders of ours, or the business interests of American countries. In the video discussing the comparisons between Wilson and Bush G. John Ikanberry states that the “Iraq war was not really about democracy” (6:48) and this is something I agree with.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: The Role of the U.S. in the World; Creating Title for Above Post

by Andrew Trott - Wednesday, April 26, 2017, 8:19 PM

Title: **Idealism Vs Realism**

I Forgot to add a title when I posted and it just occurred to me me to add one here.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

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



Fine line of internationalism

by Joshua Grigsby - Monday, April 24, 2017, 10:43 PM

Isolationism versus internationalism. After reading the material, I feel it would have been nice for us to determine which definition of each we are going to use. I feel like I have come to a fork in the road, and knowing the destinations of each path, I'd rather just turn around. On one hand we have guys like Ron Paul who think that it MIGHT be okay to defend MT if it were

invaded. But then on the other hand our situation in the Middle East and all the Issues in African communities came about by our presence in those areas. Right off the bat, before understanding the two, I would have chosen to be a limited internationalist. However, thats if we are using the word today. Now that I have begun to grasp the two ideas on foreign policy, I'd still lean more towards internationalism then isolationism. But I would agree with Anne-Marie Slaughter from the youtube video when she brings up how it can be a slippery slope. As a country with the ability to do help, it would be an injustice not to do so should the occasion arise. The problem, however, is that often I am uncertain of our motives. Overall, Id say its our job as a more developed nation to Help others as well as to know when not to.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Fine line of internationalism

by Andrew Trott - Wednesday, April 26, 2017, 9:20 PM

One way to avoid this "slippery slope" brought up is through the UN and their Declaration of Human Rights. Perhaps this declarations is even to vague in some ways. Anne-Marie Slaughter said "there is a clear line between severe human rights violations... (and ones that aren't)," (8:09). However I'm not so sure that line is all that clear to everyone. I think most would agree that genocide is an atrocity and humans rights violation but then we still do not intervene always in those case. Or with the Assad using chemical weapons on the Syrian people. This seems like a clear cut case for when intervention would be necessary, however it is not. This is where I think that all nations, with a seat at the table and a enfranchised voice, should figure out when and how intervention is justified.

I personally think that rarely should countries intervene militarily. I think that most of the time Soft internationalism is going to be the most effect way at least for both parties. It can be counterproductive for a country to go deeper and deeper into debt to be the moral parents of the rest of the world.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Republican candidates and Henry Cabot Lodge

by Marco Leon-Cobian - Monday, April 24, 2017, 11:03 PM

While reading and watching the material provided, I found that only one republican candidate did not have something in common with Henry Cabot Lodge and that was candidate Ron Paul. He believes that we should mind our own business and not get involved with other countries or their problems while Henry Cabot Lodge was a strong advocate of American involvement in world affairs. He saw an active foreign policy as crucial to forming Americas National Character. (Lodge Article Third Paragraph) Paul states in one of the videos, "To go around the world and spread democracy and spread our goodness, I think it doesn't work." (Ron Paul Interview 0:36)

The republican candidates in 2008 who have something in common with Henry Cabot Lodge are John McCain and Alan Keyes. They both believe that the U.S. needs to support other countries and be involved. Lodge was a strong advocate of American involvement in world affairs and had no problem being in other countries. Alan Kayes stated in one of his videos, "We need to support and reinforce the sense of local regional responsibility for both humanitarian and military order."

**Re: Republican candidates and Henry Cabot Lodge**

by Eric Walston - Saturday, April 29, 2017, 4:07 PM

My issue with Keyes is he is doing what every politician does, they disregard reason, logic and law of the land and instead appeal to the morality of an issue, to the voters sense of what is right and wrong. Not to say there isn't merit to such actions, but in essence he is doing nothing more than waving the bloody shirt. Ron Paul lays out his logic based on the law of the land, he is telling us that even though there are horrors in the world we are first and foremost a country of law and we must abide by it. We can not allow ourselves to become entangled in other countries affairs, that our interference causes more harm than good. Why is it so important that we go into Darfur yet we turned a blind eye to other mass genocides, Here is a list of countries we have not interfered with who have killed more than had died in Darfur:

Greek Genocide 1914 estimated 289,000 - 750,000 Killed

Assyrian Genocide 1915 estimated 275,000 - 750,000 Killed

Armenia 1915 estimated 8000,000 - 1,5000,000 Killed

Holodomor (Soviet union) 1932 estimated 1.8000,000 - 7,500,000 Killed

Croatia 1941 estimated 357,000 - 385,000 Killed

Guatemala in 1962 estimated 35,000 - 175,000 Killed Cambodia in the 1975 estimates 1,700,000 - 3,000,000 Killed

Bangladesh in 1971 Estimated 300,000 - 3,000,000 Killed

Kuridsh Genocide 9 Iraq) 1986 estimated 50,000 - 400,000 Killed

Rwanda (limited military presence for humanitarian aid only) 1994 Estimated 500,000 - 1,000,000

Darfur estimated dead 100,000 - 300,000 Killed.

I am not suggesting by any means that these people deserved to die, or did not deserve help in some way shape or form. I am however, suggesting that we, as Americans, choose our outrage. We get a tid bit of information on something and then run with it with such passion as to suggest that it is the greatest atrocity that has ever happened. Guatemala alone, per the Monroe Doctrine, should have received our help, and yet we turned a blind eye to it. There are however reasons we did not intercede. The biggest reason is that this brings us into direct conflict with those countries allies which can cause a huge, if not a world war. This does not mean we can not help, this does not mean we do not ever have a valid reason to go to war, this doesn't even mean we have to turn a blind eye to world affairs, it does however mean that we must tread lightly when stepping on the global stage.



Is war appropriate here?

by Tyler Ingram - Wednesday, April 26, 2017, 10:11 PM

I disagree with Anne-Marie Slaughter's view of her "when war is appropriate" example. Not that I disagree with her view that people should intervene with serious human rights violations, but specifically her argument getting there, as she combats the following quote:

"Once you open that door to the violation of another country's sovereignty, in cases of extreme human rights violations, there is no way to stop: you will then slide down the slope to approving interventions to approve of getting rid of a government you don't like." (Youtube Video 7:49)

I would completely agree with the speaker if it wasn't for the "violation of another country's sovereignty" section of the quote, and her idea that *"there is a legitimate line between cases of severe human rights violations [...] of genocidal proportions. We can say in those cases the international community can decide to intervene without licensing any government [...] to simply going in and invading countries at will."* (Youtube video 8:08)

I believe that any time troops are sent to a nation, the government of the invaded nation will not respond kindly to whoever is responsible. (and keep in mind that our country is the largest contributor to the UN (class notes April 26), leading conflict more heavily towards us than any other nation.) Congressman Paul agreed with this standpoint as well: *"I don't want to send our troops overseas using force to tell them how to live, we would object to it here, and they're going to object to us over there"* (McCain Video 1:40)

I believe that war should be a last-case scenario after diplomatic means have been exhausted, even for these extreme human right violation scenarios. Otherwise, you are guaranteeing a government to attack your country, until you conquer them in war, or allow the government to be overthrown by people you like more (we've seen a few vaguely similar examples of strategies like this in Mexico and Panama).

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2



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



Playing Devils Advocate

by Eric Walston - Saturday, April 29, 2017, 4:46 PM

While I can say that I for the most part I am an Isolationist, I can also say that the reality is that America has always been at the center of the world's wars since its discovery. From England's War with Spain in the 16th Century to The French and Indian War this part of the world has been at the forefront of Europe's long history of War. So if this is the case, then an argument can be made that foreign entanglement is the very foundation on which this country was built. The real question then becomes , should we continue that practice, or separate ourselves and truly become isolationist. If we do become isolationist then that means we can not partake in the UN or even Nato. But does that work? It did not under Woodrow Wilson. Despite not being part League of Nations, we still wound up in foreign entanglements, we saw it all come crumbling down prior to WWII. Too which there is a bit of irony, as it was Henry Cabot Lodge who called Wilson's 14 points weak and blocked America from joining the League of Nations. He also said we should militarily and economically crush Germany and warned that if we did not we would see their rise again.

I can sympathize with Wilson, who wants to send men to war, who wants to see countless dead return home with that flag draped on their coffin. Yet on the other hand I can appreciate Lodges stance. It reminds me of Roosevelt's "Walk tall and carry a big stick" approach.

Perhaps neither are correct, perhaps both have merit. All I know is that while we sit here and post in this forum, we are seeing the events of North Korea, the Ukraine, Iran and Russia unfold before our eyes, and I am just reminded of how World War one came to be.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Paul, Keyes and McCain; Lodge Comparison

by Andrew Trott - Saturday, April 29, 2017, 9:16 PM

Keyes and McCain are closer ideological descendants of Henry Cabot Lodge. Senator Paul has a ideology that is closer related to that of Wilson before 1917 (pre-ware). Both Senator Paul and Woodrow Wilson are not isolationists in the full sense but they are non interventionist. Senator Paul speaks to this distinction when he responds to Senator McCain in the 2008 debate. "He doesn't even understand the difference between non intervention and isolationism. I'm not an isolationist; I wanna trade with people, talk with people, travel. But I don't wanna send our troops overseas, using force to tell them how to live." (1:30). It does seem however that Senator Paul would be a Irreconcilables if we were debating about the League of Nations today. I do not think he would be opposed to the council itself, as he said "I wanna trade with people, talk with people, travel," (1:30 McCain vs Paul), It seems as if he is close to a pacifist as far as his foreign policy is concerned. He seems similar to Senator Sanders in the way that "his reaction to all such dilemmas is the same anti-imperialist/pacifist reflex: Stay away, but if we must get involved, let others lead." (Charles Krauthammer). When asked what the federal governments response would be if Canada invaded Montana, Senator Paul responded "I think that *might* be a little bit different. Montana probably could take care of it, but we'd probably help them out from Washington if that happened." (7:28 Ron Paul Interview). He follows this up with saying that Montana could probably take care of it, so even he is following the pacifist foreign policy of "if we must get involved, let others lead."

It seems that Keyes from the little I heard would align closes with Henry Cabot Lodge and his branch of opposition. Senator Lodges opposition wanted the world to rely on the monroe doctrine, "a world controlled by a few great nations, each militarily strong, secure in its influence, and determined to avoid war through carefully negotiated balance of power." (Murrin 766). This is what it seems like Keyes is implying when he says "we need to support and reinforce the sense of local regional responsibility for both humanitarian and military order in that region." (1:10 Keyes vs Isolationism). It seems like he would support larger nations being the agent of peace in a their given region. This is what Lodge wanted after WWI as well, "to let Europe return to the power politics that had prevailed before the war rather than experiment with a new world order that would recognize the rights of numerous new and weak nations and that might constrain and compromise U.S. power and autonomy." (Murrin 766).

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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

The Role of the U.S. in the World ►

Moodle Docs for this page

Accessibility at Lane

You are logged in as Joe Escobar (Log out)

HST 203 Sp17 (Escobar Meta 41054 41053)

