

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](#)[◀ The Role of the U.S. in the World](#)[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](#)

**The Ron Paul/McCain Conundrum**

by [William Perdomo](#) - Friday, April 20, 2018, 12:24 PM

This debate about America's role in the world is one that cleaves right to the question we started the class with: We had our revolution, the American nation expanded from sea to shining sea, and with the Civil War behind us, by far our greatest crisis, the question remained of what to do next? What sort of nation did we want to be? Because of our geography, and the relative weakness our neighbors, both colonial and indigenous, we found ourselves in the unique position to articulate to ourselves, free from coercion, and based on our own ideals enshrined in the Declaration, a moral and ethical path through this ever shrinking world rather than one dictated to by circumstance like so many other great empires before. Rome did not become the killing machine it was because it wanted to, it did so because it had to. Rome was not great in its beginning and occupied the least desirable and least defensible part of Italy. It was only through, as Gibbon would write in his magisterial work, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, "ancient renown and disciplined valor" that a rag-tag group of rejects made their little patch of Italy the seat of the mistress of the world. Would America do the same with its newly restored, hard won nation? Would we follow the path of other nations and rampage through the Third World in attempt to beat out their neighbors in numbers of colonies and square footage nabbed? Or would we take a higher road and insist that ourselves, above all, adhere to the high ideals we set for ourselves in the founding document.

Whatever your feelings or criticisms are of the conquest ethic of the past, it was no doubt part of US history as it was for every nation on this planet big and small. Tribes displaced, either through force of arms or migration, other tribes and either annihilated, subjugated, or assimilated them. We did the same with the native tribes of this continent over a protracted period which was influenced by chance, ignorance, and at times, malicious policy. As tragic as parts of our history were, we cannot go back in time and insist on our wrongheaded or misguided forebears that they show mercy and guide themselves by their Christian ethic rather than avaricious greed. However, what we can do, generation by generation, and by the eternal dialectic of history where one generation rescues their parents from their mistakes by rejuvenates the stagnating culture they bequeathed us, is to look back at history and guide ourselves by a philosophy that uses reason to take into account evidence that has accumulated since; rather than assuming we can do the same thing over again and change the results simply because we're here now and must be the most just and able generation since we happen to reside at the terminus of history which, as our current crop of Leftists love to remind us, as a right and a wrong side.

I think this is what is going on in the debate between Ron Paul and John McCain. Both men are guided by principles, which are heavily influenced by a keen sense of justice,

but, the former's sense of what that means is much more influenced by the Declaration than that of the latter which is an invasive Progressive view of the question of should we intervene in the affairs of other nations, big or small. Ron Paul, being a Libertarian, is influenced by the Non-Aggression principle which states that an individual, or group of individuals, have no right to initiate force on another party unless in self defense, or in the defense of others that are in danger. Let me be clear, it's not pacifist but a building block of a civil society where violence is seen as an absolute last resort when all argument fails. Ron Paul says as much when he talks about diplomacy. He had no problem with World War 2 because we were attacked and then, subsequently, declared war on by Germany. McCain counters this by claiming that our lack of involvement in European affairs prior to Germany invading Poland was the main cause of the war. There's truth in this but not in the way I think McCain means. I think he's harkening back to the lack of ratification of Wilson's Fourteen points which essentially ducked the US out of any sort of post-war settlement in Europe which was subsequently usurped by the immensely problematic Treaty of Versailles which not only humiliated Germany by stripping her of territory, colonies, and funds in the form of reparations; but also carved the martial heart out of a land defined by its militarism by limiting its army to 200,000 men, outlawing its air force, and relegating its navy to a tonnage unsuited for military vessels. Essentially, it starved, broke, and castrated Germany which made it much easier for the millions of unemployed soldiers to grow bitter at a Government (Weimar) that had "stabbed Germany in the back," and to join anti-government parties that ran the gamut from Moscow funded Communist groups to the National Socialist German Workers Party (Nazis).

What would have been required is a direct occupation of Germany after the First World War. We, the US, would have had to put a gun to Germany's collective head and forced her to be what Wilson desired: a democracy influenced by self-determination rather than by the old Prussian Junker aristocracy. This is the big question that comes up with all intervention by the US, especially on issues such as Iraq. It is not possible to run around the world with a "democracy" spray gun that washes away governments, either benevolent or malevolent, and then magically replaces them with 1776 patriots who are suddenly going to create a constitutional republic where no history of such a thing has ever been present in the tribal, much less national, consciousness of the people we're claiming to liberate. We only have one option in situations such as that and it's one Ron Paul clearly abhors: colonialism. You invade, knock down their government, then occupy it with troops and force the people to adapt to "freedom." Thousand year old orientations in reality and deep tribal rivalries don't just go away simply because the British decide to call a certain geographic area "Iraq," "Syria," or "Palestine." Same thing with Germany which did not have a history of democracy; only military oligarchy that was imposed by the hegemony of the Prussian state that ended up welding together the rather hodgepodge nation the allies encountered in the

trenches of World War 1.

Ron Paul understands from his reading of history that getting into the “colonialism/imperialism” game is corrosive to the moral ethic of a nation. It is utterly impossible to be the “nice guys” in that situation because no matter what the foreigner is the aggressor. Whatever petty rivalries or civil wars existed prior to the arrival of a third party are put aside temporarily to eject the interloper. We saw this in spades in the bad years of Iraq during 2006 before the surge when Sunnis and Shia banded together to get the US to pull out of the region, which we almost did prior to the arrival of General David Patreus who utterly reversed the situation by building the confidence in the local population to get them to switch sides and assist the Americans against Iranian encroachment into Iraq. Also, the interventionist can never be sure which side he’s on, as noted with Obama’s picking “the good Arabs” to “fight the bad Arabs” in Syria when in fact we were arming ISIS to take on Assad, hence the whole ISIL/ISIS naming conundrum Obama was throwing around to hide the fact that Secretary of State Clinton was running guns to these maniacs out of the Benghazi embassy. It’s understandable what Obama was trying to do but I think it’s much more logical to let the region correct itself as Ron Paul insisted. If Iran is enriching uranium you can be damn sure the Israelis will do something about it as they did when Saddam Hussein back in the 80’s claimed he was close to bringing nuclear weapons online and that the first target would be Tel-Aviv. Action was swift via a daring airstrike conducted by the IAF which successfully destroyed the Osirak reactor and knocked Iraq out of the nuclear game for good. The point here is that the Israelis, not the Americans, were in a better position to make that call than we ever could be since they are right next door to the threat whereas our position would always be, due to lack of proximity and intimate cultural knowledge, purely abstract and intellectual.

Sum of ratings: 3 (1)

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



21st Century Liberal Internationalist

by [Hayley Allen](#) - Sunday, April 22, 2018, 8:35 AM

After reading and listening to the materials for forum 2, I lean most closely towards a “21st century liberal internationalist” as defined by the historian in the Bush/Wilsonian video. The historian describes Wilson’s “self-determination” theory in modern day terms as, “Today what it means is that people should be able to choose their own governments. I’d flip that formulation as to say the legitimacy of governments rests on their ability to provide for their people, in many different forms. But they have to provide the basic services that satisfy the basic wants of their people. And if at some point, their failure to provide for their people becomes so great as to really amount to an attack on those people; a gross failure to protect. Then there is an international responsibility to act” (3:12-3:45). I believe people have the right to decide what form of government best suits their country, which hopefully leans towards

to decide what form of government best suits their country, which hopefully leads towards democracy but if not then it is not the decision of the U.S. to say that is the wrong way to govern a country. There is great difficulty with involving yourself in another country's politics/conflict that can lead to more instability, war, corruption, and animosity towards the United States. Many of the situations that U.S. has stepped in to over-power dictatorships or instill revolts/instability the outcomes have been far from successful.

Another factor why I believe in liberal internationalist is historical context. This is crucial to understanding how a country functions from things like colonial roots to ethnic diversity, every country has a complex history. With different pasts come different solutions for progress and growth, the United States is no different. Supporting countries that show potential for democracy or minimal corruption can lead to stronger diplomatic ties however forcing that change on a country that is not ready or not fully supportive of the change leads to complications and violence.

I have personal experience both in my bachelor degree in International studies as well as having studied abroad in a country that's government was both completely dependent on United States foreign aid money as well as a struggling democracy. Madagascar, where I lived and studied for four months is a good example of my original stance on liberal internationalist and relations with the U.S. They were once French colonial territory and after becoming a sovereign country have experienced three major coups (a sudden, violent, and illegal seizure of power from a government) that have left them completely unstable up to today. Their government is riddled with corruption at all levels and their economy is 90% informal, meaning there are no taxes or regulation on any of it. The U.S. did play a role in supporting their government funds until the coup in 2008 where the U.S. cut all funding from their 'false' new government. By looking at their historical context showing a new democracy (1960's), the U.S. was unable to see the corruption or instability and continued to create dependency on their foreign aid. Since the coup the country has been on a downward spiral and now ranks as one of the poorest countries in the world with about 80% of the population living in poverty. I definitely don't blame the U.S. for cutting the funds but the dependence they created as a 'foreign policy' left Madagascar unable to survive without the money, rather than giving the tools and local capacity to create their own economy or more stable government.

I struggle to justify what the United States does as fighting for democracy or even as humanitarian relief because it usually involves the military and most times does not work with the actual government of the country. Acknowledgement of local knowledge and experience, rather than telling them what is right or wrong can lead to more successful, diverse and stable forms of government. Through diplomacy and communication, the U.S. can improve their foreign policy to be less intrusive and provide aid to best help the countries that do need international intervention or support.

Sum of ratings:3 (1) 3

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


Re: What is America's position on foreign affairs?

 by [Daniel Zavala](#) - Sunday, April 22, 2018, 3:41 PM

I would have to say that I don't find myself agreeing with any of the four candidates much at all. The only thing that I could really find myself agreeing with is Trump's sentiment that other countries should pull more of their own weight in terms of their military spending (Four foreign policies.pdf). More importantly, this conversation is important because it highlights the same problem our nation has been facing both at the end of World War One and for most of our history. That issue being that we have never been entirely clear on what we kind of entity we want to be when it comes to dealing with foreign powers.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1

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

Re: What is America's position on foreign affairs?

 by [Daniel Zavala](#) - Thursday, April 26, 2018, 5:58 PM

To add on to my earlier statement, I would have to say that I find myself agreeing with mild reservationist ideas for the most part. While I can certainly see the value of an organization like the League of Nations, I can't say that I would be supportive of it for two reasons. The first reason part of being a member of the League of Nations would require handing off a portion of our own autonomy to foreign powers. The second reason is because that in the grand scheme of things, the League was ineffectual at stopping anything. Despite vowing to stop wars from occurring, they could not stop Japan from invading China, the USSR from invading Finland, or Germany from invading any number of the countries they were allowed to occupy.

From a more modern perspective, I identify with Ron Paul the most. America is currently so deeply entrenched in the affairs of the rest of the world that it is unlikely we will ever be able to completely ignore something as serious as war in other nations. But as Ron Paul said, we should learn to stay out of fights that are not our business (Ron Paul video).

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1

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

Internationalism Vs. Isolationism

 by [Justin Douglass](#) - Sunday, April 22, 2018, 6:53 PM

The ongoing discussion on if The United States should help abroad, or feel like they have a core responsibility to help other nations like they help they own, has been a topic of heated discussions for centuries. I'm a young man who hasn't been exposed

topic of heated discussions for someone like a young man who hasn't been exposed much to politics, so I'm very open to change and other opinions. With that said, I believe The United States should be somewhere in the middle of the "Internationalism Vs. Isolationism" debate. I identify with Ron Paul the most out of everyone that was speaking on the topic. His interview where we was giving examples on when America should step in and be apart of another country's business touched on many of my points (Ron Paul interview, Approx. 5:16). Professor Joe Escobar touched on this topic briefly earlier in the term, and I believe he said something like, "Shouldn't we focus on what's going on in our own country first?" (Escobar, Class Lecture). We, as a society, cannot function under the impression that we and a small few are the world's police; it's that kind of mentality that causes much tension around the world and that's why some countries may not like The United States. However, I also don't believe we should purely focus on us. The United States are in a position where they can usually help and assist those who ask for it, and I believe that's how we should act: unless there's a large war with many dying and our allies need help, The United States should typically focus on itself first, others second.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



Re: Internationalism Vs. Isolationism

by [Hayley Allen](#) - Tuesday, April 24, 2018, 12:48 PM

I agree with you as I also could identify a lot with what Ron Paul argues in his interview . He discusses that we can have a moral or personal responsibility to want to spread the goodness of democracy however he says, "It does not work, it has too many unintended consequences. To spread our goodness overseas, it usually requires force" and that "we should only do those things under the prescribed conditions of the constitution" (Ron Paul .30-1.10). This would obviously lean towards the non-interventionist aspect although he does not stand completely in the isolationist side of the spectrum as he says diplomatic resolutions and compromises can resolve conflicts more efficiently than violence.

He continues to say that there is no moral justification for starting a war and that only in defense is it okay to join a war in examples of WWII, in contrast to Vietnam War where the U.S. was very invested in other countries politics as it was the Cold War. I understand that there are complications to any decision made and the outcomes cannot always be predicted. I do however believe by staying closer towards non-intervention, less militaristic foreign policy as Ron Paul explains or even Wilson's self-determination theory of countries deciding their own governments that he included in his 14 points in the post WWI discussions (Escobar Lecture), then other countries conflicts may resolve themselves rather than growing into wars and hostility towards the United States as with the example of the Middle

East.

I can't completely agree that we should ignore the problems of the world and only focus on our own problems because as a capitalist country we depend on the world for our economy and business. That's why we cannot sit back and allow total chaos, that being said, diplomacy and agreements should be the center of our foreign policy before military invasion or occupation.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3

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



Re: Internationalism Vs. Isolationism

by [Jacob Spriggs](#) - Friday, April 27, 2018, 1:54 AM

I think I'm with you on this topic in the sense that I stand somewhere in the middle of the internationalism vs. isolationism spectrum. I have one foot in the internationalism side of the spectrum because we depend on almost every other nation as a capitalist nation and we need to make sure the ties we have with other countries remain tight by assisting them when they are in need. My other foot is on the side of isolationism because I believe our country has many problems of our own we need to take care such as the ever increasing national debt. Right now is an ideal time in my opinion to withdraw our attention from the problems of other countries and refocus on making our country better, because we aren't involved in any foreign disputes in a major way other than Syria, which I believe is the only part of the world that does need our help at the moment. I believe our nation could benefit from some isolation, but we shouldn't completely turn our back to those who need our help.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

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



My position on the internationalists, reservationist, irreconcilables

by [Mj Capelle](#) - Sunday, April 22, 2018, 11:42 PM

in the videos it discusses about America's involvement with other countries. During the interview with Ron Paul they both analyze the problems on America and their military. Ron Paul wants the troops to depart from Iraq and not want them to be "world policemen." It also, cost too much money to keep sending troops to other countries and support them as Ron Paul states. On the other hand, in other two short videos they both talk about how having a relationship with numerous countries is very beneficial towards America and those who are in need of help. Alan Keyes explains how we need to lend more help to other nations and not turn our backs against them because the United States is a country that is all about providing and aiding others

countries. Overall, I lean more towards internationalist rather than isolationist because it gathers different countries from around the world and brings us closer. By doing this we can resolve each others problems and talk about them (United Nations).

Sum of ratings: 1 (1) 1

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



To intervene or not....

by [Vanessa Heilmann](#) - Sunday, April 22, 2018, 11:54 PM

Intervention or non intervention. This is a very complicated stand to take one way or the other. John Paul's extreme view that there is never "a moral justification to start war" and that "it's not our business" (Ron Paul video clip) seems to separate us as a nation and cowardly allows us to sit in the corner until it's over. McCains comparison of WWII and allowing "Hitler to come to power with that kind of attitude" (John McCain video clip) is a heavy analogy. I would have to agree more with Alan Keyes, where "We don't have to send troops, but we need to support and reinforce the sense of regional responsibilities. Both humanitarian and military." (Alan Keyes video clip) Of course every situation is different and in my mind is cause for different action taken. We are as he says "a nation of nations" and should be there to support our allies however we can without posing a threat to our homeland. Of course there can be consequences to every action as well.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1) 1

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



Re: To intervene or not....

by [Hayley Allen](#) - Wednesday, April 25, 2018, 12:26 PM

The way I saw what Ron Paul was saying about "there is never a moral justification to start war" is that instigating violence on another country has no justification except for the spread of military/political power of one nation over another. He explains after that quote that if we are attacked in the case of Pearl Harbor then it is our duty to retaliate or defend. Also I can sort of understand where McCain gets the point about ignoring border disputes which Paul had been saying is "not our business". That if there are extreme leaders such as Hitler who are invading into other nations with no consequences then it should not be ignored to the extent that happened in WWII. I have been agreeing with most of Ron Paul's statements regarding non-intervention which as he discusses in his 7.5 min interview clip, many of the times the U.S. has been involved in conflicts they have just escalated the violence and severity of the issue.

Alan Keyes' statements in the Republican debate may sound appealing but nothing that he said can actually be used to implement policy or action. He says things that

that he said can actually be used to implement policy or action. He says things that stir the emotions of people or voters in this case like when he says, "if someone is being hurt somewhere in the world, someone in America grieves for them" (Alan Keyes, 0:48). That is exactly what Paul is trying explain that individuals can feel that moral responsibility but as an entire country we cannot come to the rescue of every injustice in the World because there are far too many. Keyes continues to say we cannot turn our backs on these people however America has always strategically selected who they help in situations based on how it will help ourselves. There are many times the U.S. has done just that if there is not benefit for themselves like with the genocide in Rwanda where U.S. sent troops to rescue just the American citizens and left the locals to be slaughtered. Nothing the U.S. does is completely selfless, even their programs like Peace Corps or USAID have many strings attached policies for those hosting Nations while they are supposedly to spread the 'goodness' of America.

As someone who has studied the U.S. foreign aid work and has friends/family who have done Peace Corps, there is positive work being done. But I have also seen programs implemented that are not relevant or logistical for what the country needs and are based on what the U.S. thinks they need. With Peace Corps, a lot of the programs are English speaking teachers/classes which I don't know what use someone in rural Ethiopia has with knowing some conversational English phrases, when most of these people don't have access to any form of healthcare or clean water. I believe in foreign aid and support but there is a right way and a wrong way and the U.S. government does not give without expecting some kind of pat on the back or recognition for their good deeds. This is problematic for the development of developing nations as well as for our foreign aid money to be used efficiently and for the most good.

Sum of ratings: **3 (1)** [Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: To intervene or not....

by [Vanessa Heilmann](#) - Friday, April 27, 2018, 9:51 PM

I definitely agree with your statement, "if there are extreme leaders such as Hitler who are invading into other nations with no consequences then it should not be ignored to the extent that happened in WWII." But what I am hearing in Ron Paul's video clip he is saying, "The United States should not be the world's policeman." I think if we can provide support for these countries then we should. You point out he says, "many of the times the U.S. has been involved in conflicts they have just escalated the violence and severity of the issue." How are we supposed to know if no one stepped in would the situation have escalated even more. I feel if we have the resources and the means to help a fellow country then

more. If we have the resources and the means to help a fellow country then yes we should help. Take the incident in Portland on the MAX May 26, 2017 for example. "Two men were killed in a stabbing on a MAX train Friday when they tried to intervene as another man yelled racial slurs at two young women who appeared to be Muslim, including one wearing a hijab." (oregonlive.com) I know this was in our state and it's an extreme comparison, but these men came to help and rescue these 2 young women. The outcome was worse and a tragedy, but those men are heros and did what they could to save those girls. Complete strangers, yet still neighbors in this life. Who knows what could've happened to those two girls if someone didn't step in and save them. So yes the violence was escalated and of course it's terrible that those 2 men died. But how can we as humans just sit back and let happen? When Ron Paul says, "It's not our business. It's a tragedy and we should have a moral statement, but you can't use force of arms to invade other countries to make better people, our job is to make us better people." How are we making better people if you just stand by and watch these countries being attacked? If we can help we should!

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



Henry Cabot Lodge and 2008 Rep. Candidates and views on US Involvement

by [Peyton Tooze](#) - Thursday, April 26, 2018, 5:29 PM

The 2008 republican candidates showed some similarities to Henry Cabot Lodge, but the one I find to be the most similar is Ron Paul. Paul wanted troops out of the middle east and believes that when it comes to border wars or disputes overseas, we should leave those countries to fend for themselves. (Ron Paul interview) Paul doesn't want the US to be obligated to help any country across the world just like Henry Cabot Lodge. Lodge opposed the inclusion of the US in The League of Nations because he didn't want the US to be obligated to join European affairs that will only serve to hurt the US people and the US economy. "Lodge wanted America to side with the Allies and join the victorious powers in a 'League to Enforce Peace,' after the war." (Henry Cabot Lodge article) Alan Keyes believes that the US is "a nation of nations" meaning that we are apart of all areas of the world because we are made up from all areas of the world. His view is opposite of Paul because doesn't want the US to turn their backs on suffering countries. John McCain is on the side of Keyes because he believes Paul's idea of not getting involved overseas is the isolationism that started WWII. (McCain clip)

I found myself on the Reservationist side of the spectrum siding with Henry Cabot Lodge and Ron Paul. The peace aspect is what attracts me onto the mild reservationist side of the spectrum. I think that we shouldn't get involved in civil wars across the globe because it ultimately hurts our country. It's good to spread the positivity of

globe because it ultimately hurts our country. It's good to spread the positivity of democracy but forcing it upon other countries that don't necessarily want or feel that they need to change. If another world power wanted to occupy the US and spread another type of government we wouldn't take it lightly.

Sum of ratings: 3 (1)

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



Comparing Keyes and McCain to Henry Cabot Lodge

by [Jacob Spriggs](#) - Friday, April 27, 2018, 12:55 AM

After reading the article about Henry Cabot Lodge and watching the videos of former presidential candidates Alan Keyes and John McCain debating foreign policy with Ron Paul during the Republican Primaries, I now see the similarities Keyes and McCain have with Lodge. Each of these men are strong internationalists, but only believe that military action in other countries must be justified. The article about Lodge says, "For Lodge the worst foreign policy sin was inaction and neutrality", which I believe Keyes and McCain would have agreed with. Alan Keyes said in the video "We are a nation of nations, a people of peoples" and these words go hand in hand with what Lodge believed. John McCain believes that World War II could have ended much sooner if the U.S. hadn't allowed Hitler to rise to power in Germany, which is the same ideology Lodge had during World War I, as it says in the article, he believed the allies were fighting for "'the right' and Germany was not only wrong but evil." If Henry Cabot Lodge were alive today, I believe he would agree with the internationalist beliefs of Keyes and McCain.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



Change of view

by [Mj Capelle](#) - Friday, April 27, 2018, 2:55 PM

Ultimately I found myself leaning towards the idea of US being heavily involved with other countries (internationalism), but after reading a few of my peers point of view on isolationism I had a change of heart. After carefully re-watching the videos and doing further research on isolationism I believe that the US should become independent to an extent. It has been shown in recent years that US has been involved in too much affairs that we tend to forget about our own country. There is nothing wrong with providing for other countries but we also need to provide for ourselves before others. In the video comparing George Bush to Wilson states that the only time we should interact with other countries is when there is a "severe case of human rights violation" that is when we (US or other nations) can do help that country(ies) without "licensing any

government." Who are we to go into other countries and get our selves involved?

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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



The US "helping"

by [Sierra Carrier](#) - Friday, April 27, 2018, 5:04 PM

I found what Alan Keyes said about helping other countries to be extremely true. We want to be this country that helps other people and other places but we end up being in the middle of some war from it. The United States is such a powerhouse and can be targeted or blamed so quickly. Even though all we are doing may be sending food or clothing over, it will all eventually be shoveled over to their military for usage there.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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



Re: The US "helping"

by [Jordan Lopez](#) - Friday, April 27, 2018, 10:45 PM

I think the underlining issuse isn't aways the interveneing issue but what we do when we are overseas in foreign affairs. Tony smith states " once you open the door to the violation of another countries sovereignty in cases of extreme human rights violations there is no way to stop" (5:15) in the Bush comparison to Wilson video. They mention how not only do we try to help but we try to curve there way of living by influencing our Political Ideology and way of live. Ron Paul says in his interview that " Where does the authority come from, not the Constitution". If you neighbor came over to give you a helping hand with your dishes for example due to a temporary disability and all of a sudden she rearranges your whole kitchen layout because they think there format ideas is better for you, would you be happy?. most people would not and maybe not the best example but its a more relatable example since most American never dealt with foreign policies and conflicts personallly. Ron Paul also says we need to bring our troops home and focus on us. We need improvements as well from homelessness to starvation to eduacation.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



Henry Cabot Lodge vs 2016's Republican Candidates

by [Patrick Darby](#) - Friday, April 27, 2018, 8:27 PM

Although Lodge and the 2016 republican candidates differed in several ways, there are some striking similarities in the political role they played during their respective time periods. Each of them shaped their political ideals on the idea of protecting America's

strength and reputation. Both were advocates of strong militaries, and maintaining a naval presence. You can also see similarities between Trump's treatment of the Paris Agreement, and seeing pulling out as not letting any other nation dictate America's actions, in a similar way that Lodge was against the League of Nations having power of America. Further, Lodge's role as an outspoken voice against the president, (hnn.org article), reminds of the way Trump was outspoken against Obama during both of his terms.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Should the U.S always intervene?

by [Jordan Lopez](#) - Friday, April 27, 2018, 9:48 PM

To be a extreme isolationist or an extreme internationalist is pretty much an all or nothing concept. I would defiantly place myself in the middle of all this because I find myself agreeing with Ron Paul and Alan Keyes. This forum on the role of the U.S with other countries gave me a new perspective and I find it a perfect example and at the right timing for the issues happening overseas in today's age. Ron Paul says some things that I actually have said in discussion on foreign conflict. In the video of his interview he says "spreading democracy overseas usually requires force" (0:45). I find myself agreeing with that and he later on states, "The lack of diplomacy is the biggest threat, not the weapons themselves". which in the video he gives an example when asked a question about intervening in a country that's increasing its power with nuclear weapons and is on the side of evil so to speak. He brings up how we communicated with Russia in a time of conflict without using military force. When Alan Keyes is debating with Ron Paul in the video about Darfur he says "I don't think we can turn our backs" when referring to the isolationist standpoint of Ron Paul. I also find myself agreeing with this as well. To sum up my point of view I believe that we need to revise our interactions with other nations as Ron Paul talks about how we are spreading ourselves too far and that we can't afford it. This may be out of character for this forum, however reading this material automatically had me remembering a quote in the movie Avengers 2 where a character named Vision responds to a question about an issue where innocent people died overseas when trying to resolve a foreign affair. The response was, "I'm saying there may be a causality. Our very strength invites challenge, challenge incites conflict and conflict breeds catastrophe".

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



2016 positional view

by [Jordan Lopez](#) - Friday, April 27, 2018, 10:30 PM

Elections are a conversations that reaches many household table discussions. However this recent election probably reached further into the homes in the United States because of Trump running for President and the reach due to social media. I find myself ageing more with Bernie Sanders Pacifist viewpoint because the fact that we are intelligent species when in comparison to others yet we are the only one with massive world wars. I dont remeber our teacher discussing in either 201,202, nor 203 any all out wars between different dog breeds or any other species for that manner. A lot of this happens to derive from our complex emotions and many other factors. Now would I have voted for Bernie? I actually dont know, I didnt participate in the election since I haven't obtained enough knowlege on Goverment and Politics, however, Im not a fan of imperialism and do find wars and violence unjustifiable. Ted cruz on the other hand has a unilateralist viewpoint which I find dangerous. The four foreign policies states that he "Pledges to tear up the Iran deal, cement the U.S.-Israel alliance and carpet bomb the Islamic state". The words "tear up" and "carpet bomb" is enough to convince me that there is more of a chance for other foreign conflicts. Ron Paul says in his interview " If China was here trying to protect their oil, there would be some shooting" (4:24). Hiliary Clinton as a internationalist is more tradiational, however she wants to be involved and not always with peace. The four foreign policies page states " keeping troops in Iraq beyond 2011 and early arming of Syrian rebels". Again, conflictional intervention relating to war like solutions. Lastly, Trump and his mercantilist approach. To see that the article has mentioned how Trump Isnt really on the spectrum since his ideology is more money based then Political. The page says "if Japan and South Korea don't pony up more money for our troops stationed there, we go home". To put this in a different perspective, if you asked me for a ride to Portland and stated you would give me 10 bucks to do so and mid way during the ride you said that you only had and could afford 5 bucks and I pulled over and had you get out, would you be thrilled? Probably not. Im not saying just throw away money and resources but that ideology can create tention and that tention can progress towards conflict. So overall I do lean toward Bernie Sanders, however every situation is different so maybe we can draw an idea from any point of the foreign policy spectrum.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



What should we do?

by [Marissa Luther](#) - Friday, April 27, 2018, 10:59 PM

Being only 19, navigating through my opinions on foreign policies is difficult. I wasn't aware enough of the world around me when any of the United State's actions were affecting the world up until recently. Looking at my options, I would call myself a Strong Reservationist. When thinking of how I want my country to intervene, I would like to think that the I IN- the equivalent of the League of Nations- would make informed

think that the UN – the equivalent of the League of Nations – would make informed decisions based in our best interests. However, I have some of the same reservations of Congress in 1919 when they decided not to sign the Treaty of Versailles (Tuesday/Thursday Lecture). I don't want the US to be pushed into wars that could deplete resources, and worse, lives.

Watching the Ron Paul interview, I agreed with some of his points on isolationism as well. About 1 minute in, he mentioned that it isn't our duty to spread our "goodness:" (democracy), but to defend ourselves if attacked. Many people get worked up about what other countries are doing, and want to bomb them, but I think it is better to wait and see (if we are safe enough to do so) so we don't make the wrong decision. This ties back into the UN or League of Nations voting to unleash violence or not.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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

◀ [The Role of the U.S. in the World](#)

[Taxation](#) ▶

 [Moodle Docs for this page](#)

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

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