

HST 203: U.S. History Sp18 (Escobar Meta 41002 43590)

[Home](#) / [My courses](#) / [HST 203 Sp18 \(Escobar Meta 41002 43590\)](#) / [Week 4](#) / [Forum 2](#)
/ [The Role of the U.S. in the World](#)



Forum 2

The Role of the U.S. in the World

[Subscribe](#)[◀ Taxation](#)[Taxation ▶](#)

The Role of the U.S. in the World

by [Joe Escobar](#) - Thursday, April 19, 2018, 3:41 PM

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

To make a new POST, always 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. (Don't reply to your own posts in an attempt to make a new post.)

IMPORTANT - SUBJECT LINES

BE SURE to use an informative subject line for your post, something that describes which one of the questions 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](#)

**Ron Paul**by [James Croxton](#) - Sunday, April 22, 2018, 12:08 PM

The main idea that I grabbed from the many videos and articles in "The Role of The U.S. In The World" thread was, honestly, how uninformed I was during the 2016 election. I thought I understood the different parties foreign policies and such, but I clearly did not. I was simply taught the Democrat/Republican dichotomy in schools growing up.

I appreciated the Forum documents inclusion of Ron Paul, whom I normally wouldn't have given any second thought towards based (and I don't want to admit this) on my families own bias towards him. I literally grew up hearing that "Ron Paul was a joke" and "he runs every f***ing year." It was an eye-opener when in the video in a response to being called an Isolationist by Senator John McCain (@1:35) he says "I am not an isolationist. I want to trade with people, talk with people. People travel. But, I don't want to send our troops overseas using force telling people how to live. We would object to it here, and they're going to object to us over there."

While I don't follow a lot of Ron's views, I certainly did with this one - which bring me to my next point: I now understand why I was one of the many who were attracted to the policies of Bernie Sanders. I simply wanted us to focus on just that - us. But, not in the Donald Trump kind of way.

This is all a little much to comprehend at one time and I look forward to reading others' responses.

I greatly look forward to reading others' responses over the course of the week. This is a forum topic I'm really interested in.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)
[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)
**Re: Ron Paul**by [Madison Cook](#) - Thursday, April 26, 2018, 9:51 PM

I definitely had the same experience for the election. It is interesting how our family views and bias' carry on within many of us as we get older.

I believe many of the conflicts today are surrounded by miscommunication or mistrust education or lack there of and people dont quite understand our history

mistrust education, or lack thereof and people don't quite understand our history and how it effects our decisions now.

I also agree with not sending troops over seas to push our government systems and beliefs on them. Honestly it reminds me a lot of the Spaniards taking over many civilizations, or when the Native Americans were pushed into reservations while their land was taken over. I believe that we should reserve our troops for when they are needed to protect.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

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



Weigh the Outcomes. Limited Internationalist

by [Shane McClintock](#) - Sunday, April 22, 2018, 3:49 PM

After looking over the material for this week, I consider myself to be a limited internationalist. Limiting military involvement and not having a military presence all over the world could help with the issue of government spending. The views of an internationalist aren't necessarily wrong but seem to relate to the protestant views that we discussed earlier in the term. The world is full of different cultures and religions. I do not believe that it is an American responsibility to say which views are right and which ones are wrong. When it comes to the topic of intervention, the word that would best describe the approach that I can agree with is humanitarian. Allan Keys brought this word to my mind towards the end of his interview (1:14, Allan Keys on Darfur). If innocent people are being negatively affected by an unjust leader that no other nation is willing to stand up to, or the security of the United States and its citizens are being threatened; I believe that action should be taken. However, this is not to say that we should jump directly into conflict. Ron Paul made a statement pertaining to his time in the military, "They were ninety miles off shore, and they had nuclear weapons there. But we were able to talk to them." (6:43, Ron Paul Interview). I understand that the world is not a bouquet of flowers, and some problems cannot be simply negotiated. However, as a nation we should not react to a situation before weighing the possible outcomes.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

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



Re: Weigh the Outcomes. Limited Internationalist

by [Tanner Wiese](#) - Thursday, April 26, 2018, 2:00 PM

I also consider myself a limited internationalist. And, yes it would clearly help government spending, and, even save some American lives. I do not necessarily think the views of internationalists or isolationism are wrong. A part of me agrees with both viewpoints. I wish America could go help every other place in

the world become a better place. And, at the same time a part of me doesn't want to risk any American lives for other places. But, I think the right balance is somewhere in the middle of those. In the beginning of the Ron Paul interview he was asked if we have a responsibility or obligation to help others (10 seconds, Ron Paul video). And, I think we do have that obligation. I just believe once our soldiers lives are being taken, that is the time to back out. However, I think that innocent people are being negatively affected in so many different places, and, they always will be. It is very sad, but, I believe it is true. And, yes America should try and help solve these issues, just not at the expense of American lives. Once an unjust leader poses a threat to us, then we have no choice but to respond. A quote from the comparing Woodrow Wilson and George Bush by G. John Ikenberry I really liked is, "I think there will be a kind of sobered more cautious view of how the U.S. could use its hard power, but probably a greater appreciation of how important it is to use its soft power. Its ideals, its willingness to work through diplomacy." (7:10, Comparing Wilson and Bush). I wish I was able to put my thought on paper as well as G. John Ikenberry did. I would just like to avoid putting American lives at risk, along with, preventing going to countries and using force while taking lives to try and change other places.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3

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


Intervention for the US and how the video clips contributed to my opinion

by [Madison Cook](#) - Sunday, April 22, 2018, 8:12 PM

The video clip about Ron Paul describes most accurately how I feel about involvement of the United States in foreign matters. I feel as though it is not our place unless attacked. The only thing that I also feel should be included in that is our allies and when they need help, we should help them. This is what we would expect from them therefore I think it is a reasonable request from us.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

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


Re: Madison's opinion about US intervention.

by [Shane McClintock](#) - Friday, April 27, 2018, 10:22 AM

Would you say that you share the position of a limited internationalist? In the forum material for this week a limited internationalist was suggested to believe that, "The combined pressure of the world's nations will prevent the unlikely possibility that the

combined pressure of the world's nations will prevent the unlikely possibility that the U.S. could be forced into a war against its will." You seem to want to focus on United States interest, but care about our allies as well. Suggesting that you would support fighting alongside our allies if necessary in order to keep them as allies and insure the safety of United States territory.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1

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



Re: Madison's opinion about US intervention.

by [Madison Cook](#) - Friday, April 27, 2018, 11:48 PM

I do see myself as a limited internationalist. I think that there are certain issues that we should address outside of our own nation. Such as countries in need. I do think that we need to raise our own standards within our country of what is acceptable and what is not. We should not have such a high poverty rate with how much we pay to the government and to each other. Many systems in place don't help the majority of people they are supposed to. That is where my limits come in.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1

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



Re: Intervention for the US and how the video clips contributed to my opinion

by [Kayla Hadden](#) - Friday, April 27, 2018, 6:05 PM

So if a country that is not one of our allies, asks us for help because they are being oppressed by their government or their government is just treating its citizens horribly, should we help them? Even if it is technically none of our business, I feel like if people need help then we should help them. Not necessarily send troops there, but trying to help them in other ways such as trying to reason with their government. I don't think it's completely right to get involved in other people's problems, but I also don't think it's right to turn a blind eye to those who need help.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1

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



whats the benefit of joining triple entente

by [Jeewon Kim](#) - Sunday, April 22, 2018, 8:35 PM

Why did U.S. joined the triple entente? U.S used to sold their weapons to both of triple entente and central powers and U.S could join either side.

Sum of ratings: 0 (1)

0

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


Re: Jeewon, the benefit of joining triple entente

 by [Shane McClintock](#) - Friday, April 27, 2018, 10:38 AM

The U.S. did sell their weapons to both sides before their decision to join the war. However, the graph that Mr. Escobar showed us in class illustrated that they sold more supplies to the triple entente. In the textbook it states, "In 1914 the United States exported more than \$800 million in goods to Britain and its allies, compared with \$170 million to Germany and Austria-Hungary." (3rd paragraph under American Neutrality, p. 748). The textbook also mentions that, "Many Americans, especially those with economic and political power, identified culturally more with Britain than with Germany." (2nd paragraph under American Neutrality, p. 748). I believe these two factors had a large influence in the United State's decision to join the Triple Entente, which later became known as the Allied Powers.

 Sum of ratings: **1 (1)**

1

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

Limited Internationalist

 by [Sydney Plaza](#) - Sunday, April 22, 2018, 8:59 PM

I agree that the Bush administration did "use force to promote democracy in the middle east" (Ikenberry 2:21) I also think that this was a wilsonesque technique for them to do. However, if failed from president Wilson who often times infringed too much upon the personal rights of people. (In class notes) Slaughter argues that Bush's intervention was unlike Wilson but I think there were similarities between the two which she does acknowledge. I think that the treaty of Versailles post WWI is a good example of the failure of the US to back Wilsons League of Nations and to sign the Treaty helped lay the bricks for WW2. I think that if a country divides itself from being a part of a whole then the gap between the severance from the whole will begin to grow. I think a certain level of involvement is necessary in protecting and maintaining world democracy, however, I think that Emma Goldman was right in her stance against the war. Goldman suggested that wars are fought for the politics and men are used to win their personal wars. (In Class Notes) This makes me want to say I am a limited internationalist. I do see the benefit of having foreign relationships but I also think that it is important that a country must first be able to take care of all of it's people before focusing so heavily on others.

 Sum of ratings: **2 (1)**

2

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

Solidify answer

 by [Casandra Fountain](#) - Sunday, April 22, 2018, 10:13 PM

 by [Kayla Hadden](#) - Sunday, April 22, 2018, 10:10 PM

The videos and articles only made me solidify my view on the spectrum. I identify more closely to the reservationist side of things. The candidates in the 2008 election and Ron Paul's interview spoke to how I feel how our foreign policy should be. Ron Paul is questioned about the United States being the world's policeman, and he answered:

"It's ok for us to have a responsibility personally to help people. If we didn't have an income tax you would have more money and you could help as many people as you wanted. But to go around the world and spread democracy and spread our goodness, no. I think it doesn't work, there's too many unintended consequences to spread our goodness overseas that usually requires force and we're spreading our goodness in Iraq. We cannot do that without dropping bombs on them and killing a lot people. I think we should only do those things under prescribed conditions of the constitution." (:25, Ron Paul interview).

Throughout the video he states multiple times, if a country isn't directly harming us we need to stay out of it with some limited exceptions.

I agreed to a certain extent with Alan Keyes opinion on the Darfur debate video clip. But again I side more with Paul's initial comments. Keyes states:

"I am applaud by this suggestion that we retreat into this fortress America and forget who we are. We are a nation of nations, a people of many peoples. We are in touch with every people on the face of the earth. If somebody is being hurt in the world somebody in America grieves for them. (:40, Alan Keyes on Darfur).

Yes, this may be true but we became this nation by other populations coming here to find peace and start over from their war ridden native lands. I believe, nothing can become of forcing nations into submission or "helping" with civil right wars. We just become more engulf in an issue that wasn't ours to deal with from the beginning.

Sum of ratings: 3 (1)

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



My Position on the Spectrum

by [Kayla Hadden](#) - Monday, April 23, 2018, 3:08 PM

Before I watched and read the clips and articles for this topic, I thought that they push me toward a certain position. I had honestly hoped for it since I have mixed feelings about this topic. After reading and watching the clips, I still had mixed feelings about

about this topic. After reading and watching the clips, I still had mixed feelings about where I stand on this topic. I definitely agree that the US should use it's power to help other countries and people who cannot help themselves, but a part of me still thinks there are certain conflicts that we should not get involved in. I guess I could say that I relate to Bernie Sanders' policy the most out of the four candidates. I think the "stay away, but if we must get involved, let others lead" is most aligned with how I feel we should handle foreign affairs (Four Foreign Policies Article). I think it is important to give the country in which the issue is occurring the opportunity to fix the issue on its own. If the country cannot fix the issue, and asks for help then we should help them if possible. I think this should be the standard for general problems, but it gets more complicated with issues that are going down the path towards war.

I believe all of this discussion is related to the aftermath of WWI. The people of the US were divided in what the best way to handle another conflict similar to WWI was. There were people who thought we should not get involved in foreign issues, especially if it meant war, and there were people who thought it was our duty as a world power to play the role of a world police. This division is seen in today's society as well. Some of the 2008 candidates (Keyes and McCain) have a bit in common with Henry Cabot Lodge. All three of them believed that the US should be involved in foreign affairs, but in different ways. Lodge believed that we should only get involved if it is to support justice and freedom and that it should be the people's choice. Keyes believes that we should help others, not indefinitely with military support, but with whatever support the people who are suffering need (Alan Keyes on Darfur~0:40). McCain thinks that we should be involved with whatever means are necessary to help resolve the issues- whether it be food/supplies or military support (John McCain on Isolationism). Ron Paul has the opposite view- he thinks we should not get involved at all with foreign affairs, even if it is just food because he says "it ends up in the hands of the military and they use it as weapons" (Alan Keyes on Darfur~0:20).

I agree that history does not repeat itself completely, but there are definitely similarities. After WWI, Woodrow Wilson (democrat) did not get reelected because people no longer agreed with his foreign policy. They wanted change and so they voted in Warren G. Harding (republican). I believe the 2016 election had a similar outcome. People want change and Donald Trump was promising that. A lot of people disagree with how Obama handled issues during his presidency, so just like after Wilson was president, there was a big change. Obama was cautious with his foreign policy so when it came time to elect a new president, people were ready for change. Donald Trump provided the biggest change. His foreign policy is based on making America rich which will then make us strong (Four Foreign Policies Article).

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



The Internationalist/Isolationist Spectrum

by [Miya Pomeroy](#) - Tuesday, April 24, 2018, 2:49 PM

I tend to side with the limited internationalist position. Even after watching/reading the materials I still agree with my decision, although I have a much better understanding of the reservationist/isolationist arguments and can agree with some of those viewpoints. I really enjoyed Ron Paul's interview that discussed the involvement of the federal government involvement not only in other countries, but also in our own personal lives and I agreed with a lot of his views. I agreed with the ideas that our personal lives should not be a huge concern to the federal government but should be left to ourselves and the state governments in some cases. In regards to America's involvement with the rest of the world, I agreed with Paul's argument when he said America should not be the "World's policeman," meaning we should not get involved in every little conflict around the world. Of course it would be a different story if the issue directly involved our country, then of course something should be done. He also said that the lack of diplomacy is the greatest threat, which I thought was a very great argument. If possible, I think that nations need to have more communication and understanding before war breaks out.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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



John McCain vs Ron Paul, Lodge vs Wilson

by [Shane McClintock](#) - Tuesday, April 24, 2018, 9:33 PM

Ron Paul and John McCain's debate reminded me of the relationship that Woodrow Wilson had with Henry Cabot Lodge pertaining to their positions on foreign policy. In response to Senator John McCain, Ron Paul stated, "I don't want to send our troops overseas using force telling people how to live. We would object to it here, and they're going to object to us over there." (1:44, watch John McCain on isolationism). Woodrow Wilson seemed to have shared similar beliefs as Ron Paul. Wilson was against joining the war, but also advocated for the League of Nations. Ron Paul believes we should bring our troops back to the U.S. but advocates that we should communicate and trade with other nations as well. Henry Cabot Lodge whose conviction was that, "the use of force must always be on behalf of justice and freedom." (last sentence, So Henry Cabot Lodge Was One of History's Villains?) Seemed to be somewhat like John McCain. However, I found this statement kind of hard to comprehend considering that earlier in the article it stated that Lodge, "believed American idealism could become a more significant force in world affairs than the often "sordid" imperialism of Britain, France and Russia, who dominated two thirds of the globe." (5th paragraph, So Henry Cabot Lodge Was one of History's Villains?) John McCain and Henry Cabot Lodge don't necessarily have the same political stance on foreign policy, and Ron Paul's ideas

differ from Wilson's; however, the debates between each other seem to strike enough of a similarity for me to post it in this forum.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



2016 foreign policy I relate to.

by [Chris Castro](#) - Wednesday, April 25, 2018, 12:25 PM

After reading the article about the 2016 candidates and their views on foreign policy I can more clearly see where I am on the spectrum of the issue. For Bernie Sanders I can only slightly agree. I do like the idea of not getting involved in any dispute unless we have to, however I disagree with letting other countries or powers "take the lead". If the U.S is getting into a war, I do want us to be the dominant force in control. As for Ted Cruz's policy, I can't agree with it at all. The idea of a cold war U.S military coming back is ridiculous. It seems like he advocates for having the U.S everywhere and knowing what's happening at all times with all disputes, as well as snuffing out anything bad before it even happens. I don't think this is our job as a country, Nor do I think it's a good idea to attack before something even happens. I say that because if we preemptively attack the other country or power can play innocent and this gives them the chance to demonize the U.S. For Trump's policy I semi disagree, but his policy makes sense. I disagree with the fact that we still need to be occupying other countries just because, however I do agree that if we are doing that we need compensation. If we as a country are helping to protect your country or your regime why aren't we getting more money from it. If the U.S really wants to play "bodyguard" we should at least be getting paid well to do so. Finally with Clinton's point I find myself agreeing the most. I think that by all means we can get involved with the countries power struggles or wars, and I also agree that we should do so through diplomacy. We don't need to go and occupy other countries with force to be involved. We as a nation can just as easily keep all our troops at home and spend no money, while diplomatically trying to work things out between countries. I also agree with the fact that she says we will get involved if absolutely necessary because that should be the only reason we ever invade or use our force on other countries. It's an option only to be used when no other options are left.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



Arguments for and against intervention.

by [Chris Castro](#) - Wednesday, April 25, 2018, 12:50 PM

When it comes to foreign policy you can boil it down to two crude points. Intervention and non-intervention. In the videos and articles I looked at the arguments for both

seemed to be split but on closer inspection I saw a lot more people going for intervention than against it. First off in the case of Lodge back in the 1920's he was demonized as someone who was very against intervention and was deemed an isolationist. After further readings though I began to see that he was very pro intervention. In one article it even states that "his greatest ambition was to become chairman of the senate foreign relations committee". Also stated in the article was that "for Lodge the worst foreign policy was inaction and pale neutrality". He actually backed most of Woodrow Wilsons ideas but he disagreed with the fact that the U.S congress should give up its right to declare war and I agree with that. The U.S should be in control of when it goes to war or not. In fact i think every country should be in charge of that themselves. So already we have one pro interventionist. Another (and very strong) interventionist is Ted Cruz. The 2016 republican candidate basically wanted America to go back to a "cold war" situation in which the U.S is everywhere at all times taking care of all problems as they arise. Another interventionist is Hillary Clinton. She also agreed that the U.S should be involved in world affairs, however she believed it should be on a less harsh scale. She believed the U.S should be involved by means of diplomacy. Even the "pacifist" Bernie Sanders thought we should be interventionist. In one article is states that he said the U.S should "stay away, but if we must get involved we must let others lead". Meaning we should resist intervention at all costs unless absolutely necessary. My final conclusion is that basically all of the people we read and heard about for this forum believed in interventionism, and i agree with that view. Now with interventionism we have two sides. The extreme interventionist, and the less extreme interventionist. Lets say the two extremes are Ted Cruse and Bernie Sanders. For me I think its more reasonable to be on the Bernie sanders side. I say this because I don't think the U.S needs to be world policeman. It is not the U.S' job to intervene with force wherever we deem necessary. We should however intervene with diplomacy. This would be beneficial in many ways. First off we are trying to help the countries still and we are doing so without force or violence. Second we are saving money by not instantly sending our forces over to said country or countries. Lastly we are not being insensitive to other countries needs. What I mean by that is if people are suffering we aren't turning a blind eye to them, we are simply trying to solve the issue without force. This leads me into my next point which is that the U.S should only get involved with other countries through force only if absolutely necessary. An example of this would be if a country was committing genocide against its people we could try diplomatically to get them to stop, and if all of your attempts fail we could then go in to help those people. For the most part i think that is what is being done today and I agree with that, but there are some instances which we should get out of. In all i think that the U.S should be limited interventionists when it comes to international affairs.

Sum of ratings:2 (1) 2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**My opinion on the role the US should have, and who I agreed and disagreed with.**by [Tanner Wiese](#) - Wednesday, April 25, 2018, 1:27 PM

I find myself going back and forth on what role the U.S. should have in the world. My father raised me to always try and do the right thing in every situation. Clearly trying to help others and make the world a better place is the right thing to do. And, my father always tried to show by example helping people when he could. However, I know for a fact if helping someone else could possibly harm his family, he would never consider it. So, it is very hard for me to decide what our role should be. Because, I think the right thing to do is try and help, but, if it is harming americans im not sure it is the right call. I understand comparing examples of my father is at a much smaller scale than the decisions the government has to make. But, I believe that the government should view the people, and soldiers of america the same way my father views his family when making these big decisions. So, after debating my position I think I end up in the limited internationalist category. Because, I do believe that we should be trying to help make the world a better place at all times. However, the second american lives start being put on the line for the benefit of a different country I think we should pull back. Because, American lives should always be the number one priority. Ron Paul said, "the united states should not be the world's policeman" (5 seconds, ron paul video). He also stated that trying to spread democracy and our goodness around the world doesn't work, and, usually requires force. And, he used a great example of the US trying to spread our goodness to iraq, while having to drop bombs and kill people to try and do so (40 seconds, Ron Paul video). And, I agree with Ron Paul that America should not try and be the world wide police. Especially, when it results in violence. Ron Paul said several things that I was very fond of. Another statement he made that I agreed with is, "you can't use force of arms to invade other countries to make them better people, our job is to make us better people" (3 minutes, Ron Paul video). Although, I think Ron Paul would probably like less involvement than I do. I still agree with almost everything he says. I don't we should be using force on other countries to try and help them. The interviewer asked Ron Paul if we have an obligation or responsibility to help others at the beginning of the video. And, yes I do believe we have an obligation as the most powerful country in the world to help others. But, just not when we are risking american lives. Our most important priority should always be the betterment of America. In the John McCain video he said the troops message was "let us win" (John McCain video). And, although I thought had a decent point or two in his statement. I don't think the troops wanting to win should have any influence on the decision to keep troops somewhere and take them away. But, then I think Ron Paul just smashed McCain with

his response. I did find it weird that McCain implied that Ron Paul was an isolationist. And, Ron Paul made it very clear he wasn't an isolationist but instead he was a non-interventionist, that still believes in trading and talking with others. And, he simply does not believe in sending troops overseas using force to tell others how to live. Because, they don't like it over there and we would object to it if it happened to use (Last 35 seconds, John McCain Video). Which I 100 percent agree with.

Sum of ratings: 3 (1)

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



Re: The Role of the U.S. in the World 2016 Election

by [Sydney Plaza](#) - Wednesday, April 25, 2018, 6:44 PM

During the 2016 election I most related to Senator Bernie Sanders. I felt like Bernie was limited internationalist but wanted to focus his energy inwards towards creating more equality within the US health care, educational system, and tax issues. I think that Bernie Sanders wanted to reform government and our sense of it. He wanted to limit the control of government and big businesses. I liken this to the progressives who fought against giants like Rockefeller who we see now currently have great power over our political system. I think that Bernie Sanders wanted to cooperate internationally, and I think that Bernie Sanders would have continued his fight for cooperation in the Paris agreement. I think that international cooperation for the greater good is something we are not currently seeing with the president elect. I think that a failure to cooperate globally within a global economy will have severe impacts.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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



What faction would Trump be associated with?

by [Shane McClintock](#) - Wednesday, April 25, 2018, 9:56 PM

When considering foreign policy, I cannot help but think about the Cuban missile crisis. The way President Kennedy handled the situation saved countless lives. He weighed the outcomes before he made his move. Time is obviously a huge factor in many global events, but decisions should always be made with a clear state of mind and the willingness to listen to other opinions. G. John Ikenberry stated, "I think there will be a kind of sobered more cautious view of how the U.S. could use its hard power, but probably a greater appreciation of how important it is to use its soft power. Its ideals, its willingness to work through diplomacy." (7:10, Comparing Wilson and Bush). I think that if our current president was elected into office in 1960, the situation in Cuba may have not been handled with nearly as much care and consideration as it was. I believe that President Trump would use hard power, rather than soft. Out of the foreign policy factions listed in the forum material, I would

consider President Trump to be comparable to a strong reservationist. He tries to communicate with other leaders, but he intends to act upon his own interests. The first sentence posted in the forum pertaining to strong reservationist is, "If the League ever adopts a plan to reduce armaments, the U.S. must reserve the right to increase its armaments without the consent of the council whenever it is threatened with invasion or engaged in war." President Trump has not been faced with an imposed plan to reduce armaments. However, he is a strong supporter of the military and plans on having a parade to flaunt U.S. military power. The last sentence pertaining to strong reservationist in the forum material is, "The League would threaten U.S. sovereignty by requiring the U.S. to follow directions from an international body, so all decisions of the League must be considered suggestions only." This faction of foreign policy seems to be the most fitting for our current president, because he seems to be a man that plays by his own rules. A man that in many cases simply accuses people of lying if they do not agree with him. I know that these actions do not necessarily reflect the tendencies of a strong reservationist. However, our president's actions suggest to me that he is a man that would respond to a decision from a committee as a suggestion rather than an agreement.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)
**Re: What faction would Trump be associatd with?**by [James Croxton](#) - Thursday, April 26, 2018, 11:19 AM

I certainly agree with your above post and especially when you say:

I would consider President Trump to be comparable to a strong reservationist. He tries to communicate with other leaders, but he intends to act upon his own interests.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)
**Re: James**by [Shane McClintock](#) - Friday, April 27, 2018, 10:40 AM

Thank you, I appreciate the feedback. These terms are new to me and I want to make sure that I understand them correctly.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

0

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

**Re: What faction would Trump be associated with? Agreement**by [Sydney Plaza](#) - Thursday, April 26, 2018, 8:17 PM

I agree with your stance on Trump's political spectrum. I also think that he is a strong reservationist because I believe that president Trump would increase armaments without the consent of his council. I also see touches of Trump practicing 'specific and limiting' changes to the Covenant in order to protect US interests. I see this example pertaining to Trump dismantling National Monuments in favor of exploiting coal and oil reserves. I think that Trump views the supreme court as something that he should only take suggestions from instead of respecting it's law. His own priorities will be put first over the council's.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: The Role of the U.S. in the World 2016 Election**by [James Croxton](#) - Thursday, April 26, 2018, 11:26 AM

Bernie Sanders was also who I related to the most during the 2016 Election.

Along with you, I received his messages on US health care, the education system, and taxes in a positive way. At the time, this kind of alarmed me as I'm a more moderate and he was a bit more liberal that I was accustomed to.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: The Role of the U.S. in the World 2016 Election**by [Shane McClintock](#) - Friday, April 27, 2018, 10:50 AM

A large reason for my support of Bernie Sanders during the 2016 election was his position on the Trans Pacific Partnership and Net Neutrality. Bernie Sanders seems to be an internationalist in my opinion. In an earlier forum post that I made, I compared Trump to a strong reservationist.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: The Role of the U.S. in the World 2016 Election**



by [Kayla Hadden](#) - Friday, April 27, 2018, 5:51 PM

I agree! I believe (and hope) that Trump is doing what he thinks is best for our country, but I can't help doubting his stance on foreign policy. I think putting money above all of our alliances and everything will end badly. We should care about more than just money! I know that the US has a huge amount of debt, but there are ways to get out that don't include forgetting about our allies and our duties as a world power. I think our country would have benefitted by having a president like Bernie Sanders. We need someone to fight for us in a good way, not a reckless way.

Sum of ratings: **0 (1)**

0

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



Re: The Role of the U.S. in the World 2016 Election

by [Kyle Schmidt](#) - Friday, April 27, 2018, 6:58 PM

Hello, I like your thoughts about why Bernie Sanders' point of view is so important. I personally also identified most closely with Sanders although I do not agree completely with his ideas. Pacifism can be really important to America at this point in time. I think the United States has a short temper so to speak. In war and in other affairs the U.S. is quick to intervene and because of this it does not always have a positive affect. I really enjoyed your point about how America should be involved in other countries for trading and sharing ideas and commerce, which is I wanted to respond to your post. Ron Paul shared a similar idea that I really liked stating that he was an internationalist despite being anti Iraq war. He said that America needs to be more involved with other countries in non military ways. I believe this could be very healthy for our country and spread sense of community and neighborhood internationally.

Sum of ratings: **1 (1)**

1

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



Re: The Role of the U.S. in the World 2016 Election

by [Miya Pomeroy](#) - Friday, April 27, 2018, 9:10 PM

I also agreed with a lot of Sanders' views, however, the one thing I was hesitant about with Sanders was the fact that he is a pacifist. Although I do agree with you that America could use some restraint when jumping into conflicts, I don't think pacifism is the solution to America's issues. Pacifism is the belief that violence, including war, is unjustifiable under any circumstances (Dictionary.com). Although it would be wonderful live in a world that doesn't have any violence, it simply isn't realistic. Our world is constantly going through conflict after conflict for various reason and our government should know when

getting into war is necessary or unnecessary. With Sanders being a pacifist I think it would be a struggle for him to accept that sometimes war is important for the safety of our country. Although it does say in the article that "if we must get involved, let others lead," so he is not totally a pacifist. But with that I think he would be more on the mild reservationist side of the spectrum instead of the limited internationalist. Just because it seems that he would avoid conflict as much as possible.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1

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



Henry Cabot Lodge Compared to 2008 Rep. Candidates

by [Miya Pomeroy](#) - Wednesday, April 25, 2018, 9:23 PM

I think the candidate that had the most in common with Henry Cabot Lodge was Alan Keyes. Mainly for what he said during the Republican primary on the crisis in Darfur: "If someone is being hurt somewhere in the world somebody in America grieves for them" (Alan Keyes on Darfur video). He wanted America to help those who were getting hurt and that is very similar to what Lodge believed. Lodge wanted to fight the battle of good and evil and thought that the use of force must always be on behalf of justice and freedom. Ron Paul's ideas were quite opposite in that he believed America should stay out of other countries affairs until we absolutely have to get involved. And to Lodge that is one of the worst foreign policy sins: inaction.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1

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



Re: Miya Pomeroy

by [Shane McClintock](#) - Friday, April 27, 2018, 10:56 AM

I think this is a good comparison. Especially when considering that Lodge's conviction was that, "the use of force must always be on behalf of justice and freedom." (Last sentence, So Henry Cabot Lodge Was One of History's Villains?) I think Lodge would agree with Alan Keyes that Americans grieve with unjust events that cause people to be hurt in other nations.

Sum of ratings: 0 (1)

0

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



Government Non-Intervention

by [Sydney Plaza](#) - Thursday, April 26, 2018, 9:15 PM

I agree with Ron Paul that federal government and the role of the government should not be to tell people what to do. The interviewer cites that the illegalization of alcohol

during the prohibition led to more crime. (1:16 of interview with Ron Paul) I think that if the government seeks total control of many areas of human life that it infringes upon the very idea of a free democracy. I think that Ron Paul would be under the category of being an irreconcilable because of his hesitance to have government oversee great areas of decision making. Rather, he believes that the people, should decide for themselves. I also agree with Ron Paul regarding the issue that "America should not be the world's policemen." (4:38) I think this is especially relevant to a current issue today of the unknown status if a chemical gas attack was used on Syria. President Trump chose to take force and action against Syria using aggression, which now opens the gate to another potential war. Paul likens "spreading goodness and democracy" to having to "drop bombs in Iraq" (5:18) which is the truth of world policing. It is called fighting for peace and democracy but instead it destroys local communities and kills many innocent people. Paul poses a great question, "where does the authority come from?" he continues, "It is unconstitutional to have troops in foreign land if there is no war." (9:39) I think that this mentality goes back to pre WWI where American core values stated that the country should focus inward on itself and not focus on other territories or "policing them." If the Treaty of Versailles had been signed than I think that would have dramatically shifted the outcomes of the 20th century.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



Re: Government Non-Intervention

by [Casandra Fountain](#) - Friday, April 27, 2018, 11:08 PM

I agree that Ron Paul fits under the category of irreconcilable but like he said in his reply to John McCain he is not an isolationist. He wants to trade with people, talk with people and travel. (1:23, Isolationism video) He doesn't believe in invading other countries to make them a better people, our priority is making ourselves a better people. (3:00, Paul interview) I also agree with his foreign policy view about pulling troops out of countries where there is no war. Why are we occupying lands we have no business in? If this was done to us, as Dr. Paul states, we wouldn't like it and we would probably do some shooting. (4:20) Dr. Paul follows up with constitutionally we have no authority putting troops in foreign countries when we are not at war. His second argument for removing troops is we can't afford it anymore. Like all great empires in the past, we have spread ourselves too far and we need to come home because the money and it's value is not longer there. (5:30) Here we are in 2018 and the money still isn't there.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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

**Re: The Role of the U.S. in the World**by [Kyle Schmidt](#) - Thursday, April 26, 2018, 10:10 PM

Reading and watching the material especially the article about our leaders views on internationalism today opened my eyes to aspects America's policies I had never realized. However my position on the spectrum was relatively unchanged, being slightly less radical of an isolationist.. I particularly liked Ron Paul's various arguments about the war in Iraq as well as his stance as being against intervention. "I don't want to send our troops overseas and use force to tell them how to live their lives" (John McCain on isolationism 1:47) I love his viewpoint that America is imposing culture and government on other countries and it reminds me of imperialistic countries that we have studied. I agree that we should have many relations with other countries however I don't like how imperialism has shaped our ideas about world power. I think America's presence in countries around the world is mainly used to acquire natural resources or to play the hero than as an international police force like it is portrayed. American's often feel the need to be the "good guys" in many of the world's affairs and end up getting involved situations that were completely almost completely unrelated to them. I also agree with Ron's point that if attacked war can be necessary in defense and I found it interesting that he voted for the war on terror post 9/11 he is just against the way it is carried out. While I appreciate Ted Cruz's no nonsense approach I have to side mostly with Bernie Sanders. While I am not a pacifist because I can sympathise with his anti-imperialist stance and reasoning for opposing the Iraq war.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: The Role of the U.S. in the World**by [Kyle Schmidt](#) - Friday, April 27, 2018, 6:44 PM

The fact that the United States never joined the League of Nations or even ratified the treaty of Versai shows the country's tendencies to lean towards isolationism unless the situation can benefit the country in some way. The material in and out of class expanded my ideas about how America handles international affairs. In the past America generally did not get involved in wars or other matters until it's borders or citizens were endangered. During World War one America was completely neutral until German U boats began sinking merchant ships. In World War two America also avoided conflict until the attack on Pearl Harbor. It seems to me that the image of America portrayed today as the world's police force and standing up for countries that cannot themselves is mainly a farce. For this reason I agree with Ted Cruz's viewpoint however radical it may be. Even in Cuba America claimed that no land would be taken from the Cubans. We know now that America's motives were not only to liberate the Cuban people and spread democracy and imperialistic goals played a hand in America's involvement. Today America's internationalism is much less cautious about

intervening in other countries politics. However I don't think this is necessarily a good quality, I think America was tentative for good reason in the past. Also I think our motives have changed since the 1920's. Instead of seeking land to build sea ports and natural resources America seems more motivated by international influence and power. One common theme has lasted over the last century is that America loves to play the hero. In World War one and two the U.S. swooped in at the last minute to be ultimately victorious. Since then I believe America has viewed itself as the "good guys" and this (along with the red scare) has been the main factor causing United States involvement in the Iraq war and keeping soldiers in Vietnam for so long.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1) 1

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



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

by [Casandra Fountain](#) - Friday, April 27, 2018, 10:23 PM

I believe America does love being the hero. Vietnam war last for nearly 25 years and was the one war America did not win. I want to believe we learned from that war but part of me says that when our international involvement started with us trying to "help" spread democracy when in actuality we wanted power. I am a mix of the 2016 candidate's foreign policies. I believe we should stay out of other countries unless we are directly under attack from said country. We have enough problems in our own nation and should not be trying to babysit the rest of the world. I identify a lot more with Ron Paul's words and his view than any of the 2016 candidates. When we get involved trying to spread democracy, ie Vietnam then decades later Iraq, it typically entails violence. Paul describes the justification for various wars in his interview and called Vietnam a horror and that first Iraq war was border dispute, all of which was not our business (2:00, Paul interview). If we were to keep our nose out of other nation's business, would today's issue and policies be different?

Sum of ratings: 1 (1) 1

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



Re: Meddling and American Foreign Policy

by [Emily Hemmerle](#) - Friday, April 27, 2018, 10:24 PM

Alan Keyes was a Republican who talked sense in believing we should prod at other countries and how we should focus on issues on the homefront. He makes great points that the money going overseas doesn't go to the best of places and it's agreeable that we should withdrawal from the Middle East countries. McCain however states the opposite and says we need to be involved with other countries because it "keeps order." McCain's ideals mirror Henry Cabot Lodge because of his views on foreign policy. The similarities are to stay involved in affairs but keep your distance when

needed.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

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



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

by [Emily Hemmerle](#) - Friday, April 27, 2018, 11:17 PM

Also, America was originally neutral in the beginning of WWI but selling arms to both sides was their biggest mistake in involvement. America was not truly neutral in doing this and therefore it became more inevitable that they were going to get involved.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

0

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



Three against One

by [Casandra Fountain](#) - Friday, April 27, 2018, 11:34 PM

I would say John McCain and Alan Keyes have the most in common with Henry Cabot Lodge and Ron Paul is on the opposing side of the spectrum. I see both McCain and Keyes as internationalists. McCain disagreed with Paul on staying out of foreign territories. Keyes also disagreed with Paul by stating, "I am applaud by this suggestion that we retreat into this fortress America and forget who we are... We need to reinforce the sense of local and regional responsibility." (:40, Darfur) Lodge's idea of the worst foreign policy sin was inaction and pale neutrality (para 7, Lodge article) Being profoundly influenced by America's Civil War, he thought America's role in the world was to fight similar battles beyond its shores. Lodge believed that having an active foreign policy was crucial to forming America's national character. (para 3/4) With these beliefs, this is how Lodge became thought of by Wilson as a mean spirited narrow man.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

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

◀ [Taxation](#)

[Taxation](#) ▶

i [Moodle Docs for this page](#)

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

[HST 203 Sp18 \(Escobar Meta 41002 43590\)](#)