

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](#) ►

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](#)



Re: Party Spectrum

by [Carly Minow](#) - Saturday, April 21, 2018, 1:42 PM

It seems that thoughts and beliefs on isolationism-internationalism fall on a spectrum and not a strict party belief. In the Republican Party, members who follow a sort of extreme-isolationist ideology, like Ron Paul, seem to mimic the Irreconcilables. Paul's reasoning seems to be one based off of authority, death, and economy. He cites that we have no constitutional authority to meddle in other country's affairs, that in our efforts to spread good we kill as a side effect, and that our presence in other nations takes a toll on our expenses. (video 0:38-0:52 and 5:10-5:52) Fmr. Amb. Alan Keyes is similar to Sen. Henry Cabot Lodge, as he promotes a more Reservationist approach to foreign policy. Sen. Lodge was not anti-foreign involvement; "He saw an active foreign policy as crucial to forming America's national character." (Fleming, History News Network Article) In his stance on Darfur and international involvement, he states that America is "a nation of nations, a people of many peoples. If somebody's being hurt somewhere in the world, somebody in America grieves for them." He further expresses his Reservationist view by stating that we need not send troops, but rather "reinforce the sense of local, regional responsibility." (Keyes video 0:48-1:14) Sen. John McCain appears to be the most Internationalist of them all, stating that he wants military presence and fighting in Iraq. (McCain 0:38-0:45) He also argues that isolationism, like Paul's, is the catalyst for evil leaders gaining power. (McCain video 0:12-0:33) With the many different views and opinions stated, the Republican Party has created its own spectrum on foreign policy.

Sum of ratings: [3 \(1\)](#)

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



Re: My Opinions

by [Carly Minow](#) - Tuesday, April 24, 2018, 4:18 PM

To further my initial post, my personal viewpoint is one that does not follow any of the presented labels. I feel that we owe our allies protection from harm, aid in times of need, and support in government and legislation when fitting. For example, I identified with Keyes' quote in the above post. Our country's motto is *E pluribus unum*, or "out of many, one". America, being home to all different nationalities, has a unique culture shaped by millions of life experiences, and it is only fitting that we grieve for our hurt friends and masses. However, I do not entirely agree with extremes like acting as the world police. Becoming involved in wars we have no place in, or sometimes even starting them by aiding one side or toppling a government (ex. the Vietnam and Iraq wars), has not proven to be an effective nor reliable military strategy. I do not agree with McCain's willingness to fight (see above post), in my opinion, an unnecessary war. In the end, I'd say that I am a sort of "Restricted Internationalist" who approves of assisting our allies, but not becoming

restricted internationalist who approves of assisting our allies, but not becoming too involved in other countries' affairs.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1

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



Arguments and My Position on the Internationalist/Isolationist Spectrum

by [Carley Kramer](#) - Sunday, April 22, 2018, 1:26 PM

I initially didn't have a solid idea of where I stood on the internationalist/isolationist spectrum but after reading the forum materials, I feel that I am probably more aligned with non-intervention, which is closer to the isolationist side of the spectrum. The arguments that are presented for intervention and internationalism are morally compelling, such as protecting human rights, preventing genocide, and spreading democracy, but I was surprised by how much I agreed with some of the statements made by non-interventionist Ron Paul. His arguments definitely made me rethink the issue of intervention the most out of the materials presented. This short argument tied many of his points that I found intriguing together: "[McCain] doesn't understand the difference between non-intervention and isolationism. I'm not an isolationist, I want to trade with people, talk with people, travel, but I don't want to send our troops overseas using force to tell them how to live. We would object to it here, and they're going to object to us over there." (1:30 McCain Isolationist video) This quote includes the ideas that the U.S. shouldn't use military force to tell other countries what kind of nation or people they should be, that we can still utilize diplomacy, and that many of our interventionist policies today would be considered inhumane or uncalled for if they were to happen to us. These ideas are what most affected my position. I'm not an Isolationist, but Internationalist policies are usually problematic even if they have good intentions.

Historically, I think that Paul may have some similarities with the Irreconcilables (even though he himself said he is not an isolationist), because of this statement from the Irreconcilable viewpoint: "Yet, at the close of the war, many of those same countries that we are now told will liberate nations and bring democracy to the people of the world seized every foot of territory that was held by helpless people anywhere." (Forum 2 materials) I thought that this sounded similar to what Rand Paul had to say about the unintended consequences of international intervention when asked if America had the responsibility to spread democracy and help others: "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, and to spread our goodness overseas it usually requires force. We're spreading our goodness in Iraq, we can't do that without dropping bombs on them and killing a lot of people." (0:33 Ron Paul ABC interview) The two are definitely not identical, I just thought those were similar ideas.

Sum of ratings: 3 (1) [Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Arguments and My Position on the Internationalist/Isolationist Spectrum**by [Carly Minow](#) - Tuesday, April 24, 2018, 4:44 PM

I enjoyed reading your post, but would you consider the idea that Isolationism has no correlation to foreign policy? Trade is a vital part of our economy as well as the global economy. We import and export materials to and from other nations. To achieve this, we need to have a rapport with fellow leaders and foreign policy allowing all involved countries the ability to ship and receive necessary items. Even North Korea, the so-called "hermit country", participates in international trade. Therefore, I disagree with the Paul quote cited above. To be isolationist does not mean to cut oneself off from the world; you can still be isolationist and have foreign presence. Paul's argument that he is not isolationist because he wants trade contradicts the definition of isolationism.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1) [Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Arguments and My Position on the Internationalist/Isolationist Spectrum**by [Kevin Gable](#) - Wednesday, April 25, 2018, 10:48 PM

I also found some real sense in some of what Ron Paul was saying. But when I was considering the spectrum I found two things pretty interesting that I may think are also relevant to what you are saying about Paul as a non-interventionist. At 5:17 minutes into his ABC interview Ron Paul was asked if he would pull our troops out of every country and bring them home. "There would be several reasons. 1, under the constitution we don't have the authority to just put troops in foreign countries, Willie Nillie, and we're not at war." He goes on to say, "We can't afford it anymore. We're going broke. We're on the verge of doing what all great empires have done in the past, spread themselves too far around the world." This is very compelling and makes a good irreconcilable view point. But then shortly after that when asked about the "what if" scenario of a nuclear weapon in Iraq he made another good argument sharing his Cuban Missile Crises experience by showing the difference in action. There was no invasion to solve that crisis. (I wonder if it is fair to compare these threats though as Russia at that time didn't just have one nuke but an entire armament?) So when criticizing the actions in Iraq and the failure to find nukes he said, "It's the lack of diplomacy that is the greatest threat, not the weapons themselves." This seems more of a reservationist stance. He's talking about relying more heavily on diplomatic policy rather than militaristic policy. These

spectrums have been tricky for me because both of those arguments are really good. But when McCain mentioned how Hitler came to power and that isolationism can contribute to those historical times I thought about the two times I went to South Korea. It was an amazing country and culture. What McCain made stick out in my mind was how I had learned, while working with the Army as a contractor, that in the event of war in that region there is so many conventional artillery rounds pointed at each other that the life expectancy for the portions at the DMZ and surrounding area is seconds, not even minutes. Now I'm not an expert and nor can I predict the future but I can't help but wonder what would happen if we just packed up and left?

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

2

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



Re: Arguments and My Position on the Internationalist/Isolationist Spectrum

by [Carley Kramer](#) - Thursday, April 26, 2018, 1:22 PM

That quote about constitutional authority, "Under the constitution, we don't have the authority to just put troops in foreign countries willy-nilly when we're not at war. Where does this authority come from?" (5:20 Ron Paul ABC Interview) was something I also found interesting. The issue of the role of the US in the world gets so complicated when discussing if we should or should not intervene and what issues merit intervention, that the consideration of whether or not our federal government actually has the power to do so seems to get lost in the argument. Where does the authority come from? What are the implications of that authority? Do we want the federal government to have this authority that is so far beyond any power given to it in the constitution? These are questions I hadn't initially considered about this topic because today it seems obvious that the federal government has seemingly unlimited authority, not only in the U.S., but abroad as well. I appreciated how Ron Paul's argument made me take a step back and look at federal authority in this sense. His call for diplomacy over militarism was also interesting, and does seem to be closer to Reservationist.

McCain mentioning Hitler and isolationism makes this issue even more difficult than it already is. The discussion of intervention in relation to genocide is challenging, because of course we want to or arguably should intervene when there is a genocide happening. History does not provide a lot of hope that genocide can be resolved through diplomatic intervention alone, and with militaristic humanitarian intervention, there are those unforeseen consequences that Paul talked about. The issue of genocide is what Paul was responding to when he said "You can't use force of arms to invade other countries to make them better people." (3:00 Ron Paul ABC interview) This is where I'm not exactly aligned with Paul, because while I agree with his statement, I find it hard to

accept that the only other answer is to let genocide occur without consequence. So do we leave it to other nations in the area to deal with as well as they can, or do we allow our government to overstep its constitutional powers in order to save lives? What if other nations can't resolve the issue, or are taken over? What happens once intervention has ended a genocide - do we occupy the area and help rebuild or structure a new government, or leave the mess for others to clean up? I just can't find an easy answer to these questions. Bringing up Hitler and genocide in any argument evokes such a powerful, emotional response that it's kind of difficult to respond to, and it does throw a wrench in a non-interventionist argument. I think that there is probably a middle ground between being the world police/sacrificing the sovereignty of other nations and just accepting genocide/human rights atrocities, but deciding where to draw that line is really tough.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3

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


Re: Arguments and My Position on the Internationalist/Isolationist Spectrum

by [Carly Minow](#) - Thursday, April 26, 2018, 5:09 PM

I like your points on how genocide does effect isolationist policy. However, you raise many questions, some of which are complex and hard to answer. A complicated and ever changing topic like genocide can only be dealt with on a case by case basis. For example, the recent Rohingya ethnic cleansing and genocide has received worldwide condemnation, but little action. The United States has not taken up arms against Myanmar, even though diplomatic efforts failed. We seem to be reservationists on that one genocide, taking a stance somewhere between Keyes and Paul. America, and other powerful countries, want the unfair slaughter of the Rohingya to end but the cost of war is too high to achieve it.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

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


Re: Arguments and My Position on the Internationalist/Isolationist Spectrum

by [Carley Kramer](#) - Friday, April 27, 2018, 6:59 PM

Yes, the current Rohingya genocide is an excellent example of diplomatic intervention not being enough. There were several sections of our forum

materials where historians and politicians discussed genocide, and the points they made varied widely. Ron Paul seemed to have the idea that the US government shouldn't intervene for humanitarian or moral reasons, but rather that individuals within the US had that responsibility. He expressed that idea in several places: "There's no constitutional authority, there's no moral authority. There's plenty of moral authority and responsibility for individuals to participate ..." (0:05 Alan Keyes on Darfur) "It's okay for us to have a responsibility personally to help other people, if we didn't have an income tax we would have more money and you could help as many people as you wanted." (0:23 ABC Ron Paul interview) This is not an idea I really agree with, as I think we should keep an income tax and that this idea leaves out anyone other than the richest Americans. Alan Keyes, on the other hand, said that the US does have a responsibility to help in situations like Darfur and advocated for less militaristic intervention, more diplomacy, and support for the affected region, saying: "I think a lot of the suggestions made here in terms of how we get involved are good ones, we don't have to send troops, but we need to support and reinforce the sense of local, regional responsibility for both humanitarian and military order in that region." (1:02 Alan Keyes on Darfur) Lastly, there was a section on this in the Wilson and Bush video: "There is a legitimate line between cases of severe human rights violations of genocidal proportions. We can say in those cases, the international community can decide to intervene without licensing any government, whether the US government or the Russian government or any other, to simply go in and invade countries at will." (5:34 Comparing Wilson and Bush video)

What I thought was interesting about this is that despite their differing viewpoints, none of these historians or politicians are arguing for single governments to have the sole responsibility of, and decision making power in, intervention in cases of genocide. Paul thinks it should be an individual responsibility, Keyes thinks we should empower the regional nations to deal with such crises, and the last speaker thinks it should be an international responsibility in order to keep more powerful nations in check and ensure that the intervention remains humanitarian rather than political. This idea that outside nations shouldn't act alone in humanitarian intervention is one I can get behind. However, they're not fully satisfying answers, as wealthy Americans have yet to resolve the issue of genocide, and we have seen organizations such as the United Nations repeatedly fail to prevent genocide in situations such as their infamous handling of the Rwandan genocide, and now again in Myanmar.

Sum of ratings:3 (1) 3

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Arguments and My Position on the Internationalist/Isolationist Spectrum**by [Carley Kramer](#) - Friday, April 27, 2018, 7:28 PM

I noticed I accidentally wrote Rand Paul instead of Ron Paul in the second paragraph - sorry for any confusion.

Sum of ratings:0 (1) 0

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: The Role of the U.S. in the World, Internationalism/Isolationist Spectrum, The 2016 candidates, and the Post WWI relevance**by [Kevin Gable](#) - Sunday, April 22, 2018, 2:37 PM

My apologies for answering these 3 together But they really seemed related to me.

My position on this spectrum like most depends on the issue at hand. When Henry Cabot Lodge brought up his objection to the US joining of the League of Nations I have to admit I agreed why he objected. "After the war, Wilson's concept of a League of Nations that would obligate the United States to fight future wars without the consent of Congress violated Lodge's belief that the use of force should spring from the united will of the American people." (from the History news article on Lodge) This makes sense to me so in this sense I find myself more on the Isolationanist side of the spectrum. But then later when John McCain talks about US isolationism being a contributing factor to the rise of Hitler into power propelling WWII(:08in to the debate video) I agree with him as well finding myself on the other side as an internationalist. With our failure to follow through on promises made at that time complicated the world stage greatly. And this is what keeps me a bit confused and searching for more knowledge. In just this example you have too far on both spectrums. The way the League of nations would have operated would have violated the very freedom of the American people however refusing to act made the situation worse. And for this very reason here I can't unilaterally agree with either canidate. Rather I desire, even though that is the very example of "idealistic", to pick and chose pieces of them to make a larger collective of balance. This above example I believe demonstrates my cuurent position on the first 3 questions. I believe we need a balance of action in international affairs with a great focus on what's at stake here at home. And that balance is historically not easy.

Sum of ratings:3 (1) 3

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



Re: The Role of the U.S. in the World, Internationalism/Isolationist Spectrum, The 2016 candidates, and the Post WWI relevance

by [Jason Yeager](#) - Friday, April 27, 2018, 4:42 PM

That McCain quote was also interesting to me. I would not classify myself as a McCain supporter, but I do believe that he brings a unique perspective to the argument, considering the six years he spent as a POW in Vietnam and how much physical and mental torture he endured at the hands of his host.

My issue with his quote lies in his assertion that isolationism is what caused World War II. This seemed to me to be a bit of an extreme stretch. I've always understood that the Great Depression was probably the main reason that led to the Nazis seizing power in Germany. As is noted in our textbook, "The road to the Second World War began at least a decade before U.S. entry in 1941. In Japan, Italy, and Germany, economic stagnation created political conditions that nurtured ultranationalist movements bent on territorial expansion. Elsewhere in Europe and in the United States, economic problems led governments to concentrate on domestic recovery and avoid foreign entanglements." (pg. 852, *Liberty, Equality, Power*) So the U.S., along with most other countries around the world, were practicing isolationism at the time, but only out of desperate need to take care of their own citizens.

His quote did make me wonder--what would Europe and the rest of the world look like if we had only focused on the Pacific theater and retaliation against Japan's aggression, and never entered the fray in Europe? This seems to be the direction Ron Paul would have desired. Should we have just let Russia and the Nazis duke it out for control of the continent? And if the Nazis had won, would it have been in our best interest to close ourselves off and wait for them to attack us? I think the world would be a far different place today if we had followed Ron Paul's isolationist vision.

Sum of ratings: [3 \(1\)](#)

3

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



Re: The Role of the U.S. in the World, Paul and Lodge Similarities

by [Kevin Gable](#) - Sunday, April 22, 2018, 2:39 PM

I do see some similarities between Lodge and Paul. What I see is that Lodge very much wanted the will and freedom of the American people heavily considered in any treaty or agreement involving foreign affairs. He did in fact want a sense of foreign involvement that could flourish through trade and relations. Likewise if force was truly necessary then He wanted it by the will of the people. (article on Lodge) Paul also gets into the dangers and difficulties of unilaterally spreading American interests and affairs overseas. "It doesn't work. There's too many unintended consequences." (:39

into his interview) How beautifully said that is. How accurate do you all think that is? But what I really took to heart was when he said, "You can't use force of arms to invade other countries to help make them better people. Our job is to make ourselves better people." (3:00 into his interview). He also talked about how He supported actions in WWII. He believed we needed a foreign presence.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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



Re: The Role of the U.S. in the World, Paul and Lodge Similarities

by [Kayla von Stein](#) - Friday, April 27, 2018, 4:00 PM

I could see the similar in putting the American people first, but I don't think Lodge would agree at all about Paul's adversity to standing up for when things reach a certain level of inhumanity. The interviewer brings up genocide and Paul's response is that we can only have an opinion, but we can't intervene (1/2 way through the Paul interview). Lodge was against neutrality in what he thought was "evil" (Lodge Article). He wanted us to be on the "good" side and I think in terms of genocide, fighting against it would be just that.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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



Intervention vs non intervention

by [Meri Pedelini](#) - Sunday, April 22, 2018, 4:01 PM

I am very conflicted with this spectrum because I can see where both of the candidates are coming from, To an extent I believe Pope's message of not forcing a way of life on another peoples but on the other hand I feel to agree more with Keys. in the video at :55 seconds he says that we are in touch with every single nation on earth and that if someone is being hurt than someone somewhere in our country is grieving for them. America would have never come about if we had not had help from other nations. In the Revolutionary War. Therefore when it comes down to it I think that it is our duty to help in anyway we can to prevent evil things from happening, "If you are neutral in situations of injustice, you have chosen the side of the oppressor. If an elephant has its foot on the tail of a mouse and you say that you are neutral, the mouse will not appreciate your neutrality." – South American Leader Desmond Tutu

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



Re: Intervention vs non intervention



by [Meri Pedelini](#) - Tuesday, April 24, 2018, 8:36 AM

Obviously I meant Paul* Ron Paul, not Ron Pope! Oops

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

0

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



Re: intervention vs. non-intervention

by [Sienna Grosse](#) - Sunday, April 22, 2018, 4:42 PM

After watching the video clips I feel like I was able to more carefully consider my position. While I don't fully agree with what Ron Paul had to say, I also don't completely agree with what Biden had to say. I guess I find myself somewhere in between, but also with some completely different ideas. I agree with the Ron Paul rhetoric about using force not working as he stated in the ABC news interview, but I don't agree that we should stand by if a genocide is happening. We have a pretty big influence on the rest of the world and I don't think it's fair to not help out a place that's more vulnerable. However, I didn't find myself agreeing with what Biden said about the United States' mission needing to be about 'winning' when talking about the Iraq war in the republican debate video clip.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

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



Re: intervention vs. non-intervention

by [Meri Pedelini](#) - Thursday, April 26, 2018, 8:05 PM

I agree with your post, I did like Biden's ideas but within his debate I felt like he was using trigger words to gear up a reaction from the audience. By pulling the "Hitler Card" (forum video 0:48) obviously Paul is going to look like the bad guy, I felt like it was a cheap shot. But I do agree that some times war is unavoidable and to stand by is to contribute to the harm being done (like the Darfur genocide) and if other countries are breaking rules (the "alleged" Syria chemical attacks) then we should be able to step in and make sure people's rights and rules are being upheld to the standards we set.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

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



Should the U.S. be the world police?

by [Jason Yeager](#) - Sunday, April 22, 2018, 6:29 PM

I am so on the fence on this issue, and I struggle with both views.

As an Air Force brat who has lived abroad (I lived in Germany for two years), I have

lived the internationalist side. Thankfully, I lived off-base in a tiny village about an hour from any American installations, so I got to experience the German culture. I experienced the sensation of being "occupied" by a foreign force that most (all) of my German friends felt. There is heavy resentment amongst the German people for being forced to live alongside a very large contingent of Americans. Not that they dislike Americans; most Germans I know actually love America and all that we stand for. The fact that they do not have a choice as to whether or not they want U.S. military installations in their country is where the resentment lies.

If we are to be the world police, then I see the benefit of having military installations around the world. Bringing wounded soldiers from Iraq to the U.S. regional medical center in Landstuhl, Germany, for example, is far more convenient than flying them halfway around the world back to the States. That is the limited internationalist in me speaking, which is the view that I've carried most of my life.

But as I have aged, and as the world has gotten smaller, I see myself leaning more towards the mild reservationist view. I have asked myself many rhetorical questions about this issue; the main one being "Who are we to force our views of morality, religion, and democracy on the rest of the world?" Most Americans probably feel that we are a good and righteous people, but does that give us the right? As Ron Paul states in his interview, "We're spreading our goodness in Iraq. We can't do that without dropping bombs on them and killing a lot of people." (:46, Ron Paul video clip) How "good" does the rest of the world see us as if we have to share our goodness through violence?

I disagree with Ron Paul's opinion that we should basically never get involved in foreign affairs unless we are attacked. As a mighty and resourceful nation, I feel that in times of natural disaster, or when there are occurrences of blatant atrocities against humanity, we are obligated to step in and help. Syria would be a good example, as would our involvement in Kosovo (which Ron Paul disagrees with), where people were doing really awful things to each other. The problem I have with this is that we seem to pick-and-choose where we are going to apply our vast resources, based on the benefit to us.

I saw an estimate on Wikipedia that the cost in human lives of the Kosovo conflict was 13,547. (Wikipedia) That seems like a lot, until it is compared with Africa. There are numerous, seemingly never-ending conflicts on that continent, and the number of deaths is astronomical. I've seen estimates that in the Democratic Republic of Congo alone, there have been over 6 million deaths due to conflict. During the height of their civil war (1998-2003), which was happening at around the same time as the Kosovo conflict, upwards of 45,000 people--over half of which were small children--were being killed every month! (The Guardian) And what did the United States do to stop this

horror? Absolutely nothing.

I hate to ask another rhetorical question in a post filled with them, but.....Where are the police when you need them? Apparently, unless your skin is the right color and your country has the right resources, they are nowhere to be found.

Sum of ratings:3 (1) 3

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



Re: Should the U.S. be the world police?

by [Nestor Aviles Perez](#) - Tuesday, April 24, 2018, 10:50 PM

I agree with you that no matter what it is our duty to help others in time of need regardless of their nationality. When natural disasters strike other countries and they are in need of help to rebuild or to get back on their feet it is everybody's job as humans and neighbors on this planet to help each other. At the end of the day, we are all sharing the same home. I also have to agree with your last rhetorical question because there is currently an economic crisis in Venezuela. Nobody seems to be going to help them and I have not heard them be mentioned by politicians in the US. People are starving and getting assaulted and killed in their streets. Kids are fleeing their country without their parents in hope of making it somewhere safer. You would think that since they export a lot of oil and the US is obsessed with oil that the US would have tried to help in some way but that is not heard of. They apparently have the right resource and something that the US wants in oil but still their country is not being helped.

Sum of ratings:2 (1) 2

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



Re: Should the U.S. be the world police?

by [Jason Yeager](#) - Thursday, April 26, 2018, 5:53 PM

I'm not sure what to think about Latin America, much of which is a violent mess. Maybe we don't get involved in Venezuela because American oil companies already have operations there. I wonder if the illegal drug trade has anything to do with it. Venezuela is one of the main arteries into the U.S. for drugs from Columbia. (Wikipedia) And even though the U.S. professes to want to stop it,

the illegal drug trade is BIG business. Follow the money.

I would like to think....well, maybe "like" is not the right word.... that much of our intervention, or lack thereof, in Latin America--Central America in particular--is being driven by Trump and what appears to be his disdain of Latino people. Obviously, I don't know what is in Trump's heart, but I can't think of a more segregationist and isolationist move than the building of his "wall." (Berlin, anyone?!)

But Obama had his issues with Latino foreign policy as well. I came across an article in the New York Times related to the validity of the electoral process in Honduras. It appears as though President Juan Orlando Hernandez manipulated the court and electoral systems to illegally run for re-election, and then manipulated the vote count to ensure his victory. Since his election in 2013, he has been steadily consolidating power and turning a democracy into a dictatorship. The public outcry and protests have been huge. But as we have a military interest there--our military operates out of the Soto Cano Air Base in the "wars" on drugs and immigration--both U.S. Presidents have turned a blind eye towards the antics of power-hungry Hernandez. ("U.S. at a Crossroad as it Confronts Turmoil in Honduras", *New York Times*, Dec. 2013)

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

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



Re: Should the U.S. be the world police?

by [Jason Yeager](#) - Friday, April 27, 2018, 3:16 PM

Sorry - the date of the NYT article is 2017, not 2013.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

0

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



Trump's rare view on foreign policy

by [Nestor Aviles Perez](#) - Sunday, April 22, 2018, 11:31 PM

Although I don't identify with any particular candidate and their view on foreign policy because I am a Jehovah's Witness and want to stay neutral on political topics, I thought that Donald Trump's view was different. I have not heard on any other politician that their views on foreign policy revolved around money and not keeping

good relations and helping others. I think the Charles Krauthammer, the author of the article, would agree with me. He compared every other candidates view on foreign policy to that of a recent politician. However, he compared Trump to King Philip II of Spain. Has their really not been another politician in recent years that had the same view on foreign policy as Trump?

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Trump's rare view on foreign policy

by [Kayla von Stein](#) - Thursday, April 26, 2018, 6:54 PM

I was thinking it was strange as well that Charles Krauthammer couldn't find ANY other examples. Admittedly, my interpretation of that article was that he was a bit pessimistic and sarcastic on basically all of the politicians he discussed. His last snibbit on Bernie Sanders: "Don't be surprised if President Sanders hands Guantanamo Bay over to the Castros, although Alaska looks relatively safe for now," and his last sentence, "Don't say you weren't warned," (The Four Foreign Policies). With those examples and the article as a whole gave a very solemn look at the choices the American people had in front of them.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Lodge and friends

by [Meri Pedelini](#) - Tuesday, April 24, 2018, 9:05 PM

I can see similarities between Lodge and the 2008 republican candidates, for one, Lodge believes in trading and working with other countries just like Paul says he does as well. "He backed the creation of the Panama Canal and Roosevelt's role as a mediator in the Russian-Japanese War. He was equally enthusiastic about insisting on an "Open Door" policy in China." But he does not believe in going to war without the approval of US Congress. "Wilson's concept of a League of Nations that would obligate the United States to fight future wars without the consent of Congress violated Lodge's belief that the use of force should spring from the united will of the American people"(Forum materials) Just like Paul does not believe in having the troops in Iraq or anywhere else. But he also splits off and believes that if there is a war between "good and evil" that we have the duty to fight. Like the Civil War or WW1. And that's where he differs from Paul and is more like McCain or Keyes. Paul claims not to be an isolationist but does not believe in exercising military power to force our idea of what society

should be. “To go around and spread our democracy and goodness, it doesn’t work—too many unintended consequences” (interview :44) Too many unintended consequences, like what would happen if we entered a war against the US people’s will because of the League of Nations?

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



1918 - 2018

by [Meri Pedelini](#) - Tuesday, April 24, 2018, 9:05 PM

Wilson stayed neutral in World War 1 for three years until 1917 after American finally joined the war after the Russian revolution (textbook ch 23). In WW2 we tried to stay out of the war until Pearl Harbor, how do we determine when the line has finally been crossed and we should enter the war? In this day and age, I think it has become harder to defend a strong irreconcilable’s stance than back in 1918 because we are so connected and how easily we can see what is going on in the world and how it all connects to us in our country. Its more difficult to isolate yourself from reality when reality and news is flying in so rapidly, instead of waiting for the newspaper once every 24 hrs if that!

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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



Re: 1918 - 2018

by [Mirissa Hicks](#) - Wednesday, April 25, 2018, 8:16 PM

I have the similar opinion after watching all of these videos and learning/ witnessing major events in America. It’s hard to side with Ron Paul’s belief of isolation and not becoming involved when you’re allied with other countries. I don’t think America should be involved in EVERYTHING that happens and try to be a world hero but isolating ourselves isn’t the answer, in fact I see it as making us a target. I like when Keyes states “we need to support and reinforce the local and regional responsibilities for humanitarian and military order” (Alan Keyes on Darfur 1:00) That makes me think that we don’t always need war but to make peace to avoid war isn’t being a secluded country it’s making alliances and building relations with other countries to keep us out of messy situations that potential end up in war. Yes, there comes issues with being friendly with every country as seen in both WWI and WWII but I don’t believe Ron Paul’s vision would have been the effective approach for our country especially since we rely on other countries for multiple imports and support and Ron Paul stating, “it not

our business” (Ron Paul interview 2:48) isn’t a reality when we are supposed to be in alliance with other countries. I think today that is why America is one of the top countries is because we have strong alliances and cooperation’s with other countries because we do help out when needed and were not just minding our own business.

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

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



Ron Paul: The Antithesis of Henry Cabot Lodge

by [Kayla von Stein](#) - Tuesday, April 24, 2018, 11:42 PM

Henry Cabot Lodge believed in “using force to uphold justice and peace,” while I would say that John McCain and Alan Keyes probably also believes that, I know that Ron Paul did not. Ron Paul would categorize Lodge’s thinking as being the “world’s policemen,” which he says has brought on many unintended consequences (0:10-0:40 of the Ron Paul interview). Whereas Lodge was very black and white on issues of right and wrong (6th paragraph in the Lodge article), Paul’s opinion is that regardless of how bad the problems are in those countries, that we should not intervene. This includes genocide; and our involvement is only justified if we are in defense, such as the attack on Pearl Harbor (1:15 and 2:50 in the Ron Paul interview).

I would think that Henry Cabot Lodge would have some choice words about Ron Paul’s views considering he thought Wilson’s neutralism was completely blasphemous (6th Paragraph in Lodge Article). If he thought not being completely on the “right side,” I can’t imagine his thoughts on being on the sidelines. McCain on the other hand, is on the same team as Lodge in that inaction or neutrality can have consequences. These consequences, he says in response to Ron Paul’s non-interventionism, are what caused World War II (0:10 in McCain video). He even conflates non-intervention as isolationism. He then proceeds to say that with America’s inaction, that we allowed Hitler to do the terrible things that he did. Based on Lodge’s feelings towards the “wrong” side of WWI (AKA Germany), he would more than likely agree with McCain.

Keyes is along the same lines as McCain and Lodge as well. He believes that the United States has a responsibility and that we cannot turn our backs on our allied countries (Dafur video). What might differ is that he doesn’t believe that we have to send our troops, but that we have to uphold our responsibility and order in all areas because we are in touch with every aspect of the world.

Sum of ratings: **3 (1)**

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


Re: Ron Paul: The Antithesis of Henry Cabot Lodge

 by [Carly Minow](#) - Wednesday, April 25, 2018, 4:19 PM

I respectfully counter your statement that McCain, Lodge, and Keyes are all similar in their opinions and thoughts. McCain, in an article he wrote for [foreignpolicy.com](#), labels himself as internationalist. "I am a proud internationalist, but I recognize that an internationalist foreign policy is a tough sell in America today, especially among Republicans." Lodge was a proponent of foreign policy, but that of which benefited the American people, our sovereignty as a nation, and the spread of American idealism (examined in paragraphs 5, 8, and 9 of the Lodge Article). In my opinion, Keyes and Lodge are the most alike out of the three Republican examples. His views on Darfur, and his wanting to promote regional government, not American military presence (Keyes video 0:48-1:14), fall in line with Lodge's sovereignty and reservationist ideas.

Here is the url for the [foreignpolicy.com](#) article McCain wrote

<http://foreignpolicy.com/2013/04/26/how-to-save-the-republican-party/>

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

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

Re: Ron Paul: The Antithesis of Henry Cabot Lodge

 by [Kayla von Stein](#) - Thursday, April 26, 2018, 7:13 PM

After reading the article that you provided, I still hold my ground that McCain is fairly similar to Lodge in a lot of aspects. McCain states in the 10th paragraph "America is not an NGO. Nor does internationalism mean that America can or should serve as the world's policeman. It doesn't mean that our power is limitless. And it doesn't mean the answer to every problem is military intervention. No one believes that," (McCain Foreign Policy Article). The article also goes on to say that America leads and that we cannot retreat (7th paragraph in McCain Foreign Policy Article). To me, that reads as American Idealism because we are believing us to *need* to lead other countries.

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

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

Re: Ron Paul: The Antithesis of Henry Cabot Lodge

 by [Carly Minow](#) - Friday, April 27, 2018, 5:10 PM

I understand where you are coming from. However, McCain is very separate from Lodge. While the thought of the US being the world police or an NGO is illogical, Lodge supported foreign policy with a benefit to our country. He would only support the Treaty of Versailles if Congress and the American people still had the power to declare war or keep neutrality. In paragraph 42 of McCain's article, he writes "We have affirmed that America must stand up for people who share our values because it is right — but also because we have an interest in seizing opportunities to make more friends and fewer enemies, and to shape conditions in the world that allow our citizens to live in peace and freedom at home." While I admit that both Lodge and McCain have American interests in mind, McCain goes a step further. He supports foreign policy as a means of creating relationships and defending allies. This combats idealism because it is not that we "believe" we need to lead other countries. Rather, McCain's internationalism is that we must assist our friends for the sake of both of our causes.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

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


Lodge, Paul, McCain, America

by [Mirissa Hicks](#) - Wednesday, April 25, 2018, 7:04 PM

Henry Cabot Lodge seems to have a middle ground on his views on America's involvement in war. Reading the article, I don't see how Lodge was "demonized as the prototype of the isolationist" (Henry Cabot Lodge article) when comparing the videos on Ron Paul and his beliefs "that the United States should not be the world police men" (Ron Paul interview 0:09). From looking at both politicians it seems like Paul doesn't seem like anything is justified for using armed force nor does he think we should be involved in any other countries problems. Which is not the same logic Lodge had, it seems like Lodge didn't want to go to war just because, but I like the way the article put it as "that the use of force must always be on behalf of justice and freedom." (Henry Cabot Lodge article)

I can say that I completely agree when John McCain says to Paul "that kind of isolationism is what led to WWII, we allowed Hitler to come to power with that kind of isolationism" (John McCain on isolationism 0:12). I think we have learned from our mistakes especially during WWII that ignoring a country that has a powerful leader with bad intentions isn't just going to go away, or they're just going to give up because we don't pay attention to them. If Paul was elected President I feel like we would have been a secluded country and it may have had a negative impact on our country. He talks in his interview that "he voted to only go for those responsible" (Ron Paul

interview 1:26) referring to 9/11 and then coming right back home. But that doesn't seem like a reality for America, since back in 2001 Saddam Hussein had such a big following that chances are someone else most likely would have rose to power after his capture, but for America I feel like we have learned from isolating ourselves in the past that taking the extra protocol to make sure we can have peace with Iraq was a steep in the right direction to avoid bigger problems that may have lead on down the road.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



Re: Lodge, Paul, McCain, America

by [Kayla von Stein](#) - Thursday, April 26, 2018, 7:22 PM

I couldn't really understand how Lodge could be seen as a "villain" either. Considering he was for the League of Nations, but was against Article X, which would prevent congress from vetoing war (pg. 766 of the textbook).

I think calling Lodge an isolationist would be a stretch especially in comparison to Ron Paul.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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



Diplomacy Rather than Intervention

by [Decker Robinson](#) - Wednesday, April 25, 2018, 9:25 PM

The cases for both Isolationists and Internationalists in the articles and clips brought up very good points. Points that are frankly hard to disagree with. Ron Paul believes that rather than intervene in other countries problems with troops, we should be able to use productive diplomacy to solve the issue. Paul believes that sending troops and providing aid for countries is only losing money just so we can feel good. In the John McCain on isolationism clip, Paul says "I don't want to send our troops overseas using force to tell them how to live. We would object to it here and they will object to it over there" (1:42). I believe this is a very interesting quote by Paul because it puts the audience in the shoes of the countries that have our troops intervening in their problems. Although I know I don't speak for everybody; but, I think we wouldn't be too happy if we had troops from a foreign country on our land. The internationalist point of view is best summed up by Alan Keyes. Keyes says that America cannot turn it's back on its "universal mission" of being the support of all of countries in need. Keyes's point pulls at the emotional aspect of the listener; how can we not help when we are the one they look up to and we have all the resources to do so? These articles and clips all made points that I made me think about where I stand on the spectrum because before I would be a limited internationalist; but, I think taking all the points into consideration I

would say that the isolationist points did stick with me a little more. I would probably say that I am still a limited internationalist.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1) 2

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



Trying to Find Middle Ground

by [Rachel Gragg](#) - Thursday, April 26, 2018, 5:23 PM

I had never really had to think much about whether I was an isolationist or an internationalist before this forum. I didn't have many opinions because I didn't know much, but now, because of this forum, I feel as though I have gotten more educated and can form my own opinion on the topic. I feel like both sides and all of the politicians and historians in the examples have good points and argue well for their case. I think at the beginning, I was leaning more towards Ron Paul's ideas. That this country has enough problems of its own and enough things to fix within that we shouldn't be going out and getting involved in wars, but instead we should just stay out of it and work on ourselves. That invading countries and using force to try to convince them to change their ways is wrong and we should just let other countries fight their own battles and we should mind our own business. However, as I listened to the other people, that did seem to become a little bit of an extreme idea and that it can't end well. When Bush said that that idea of isolationism is what started World War II because America let Hitler get into power, that changed my perspective a little bit. It made me start to consider the stance that America is a strong and powerful nation and we should use that power to try and help other nations and we should not just turn a blind eye when conflict arises in other nations.

So where is a happy medium to this? Because I definitely don't think it's right to have more than 450,000 soldiers deployed overseas, all in various places around the world ([businessinsider.com](#)), however, I don't think we shouldn't be involved in the world altogether. At the beginning of World War I, our textbook authors told us that, "Woodrow Wilson told Americans that this was a European War; neither side was threatening a vital American interest" (Liberty, Equality, Power pg 748). I agree with this to a certain extent. If the US isn't being threatened, why should we intervene? But at the same time, I understand that allies are valuable, and helping other countries when we are as powerful as we are could be considered a duty. I think the politician I agree with most is Alan Keyes. He said, "we don't have to send troops, but we have to show regional responsibility for humanitarian and military order" (Alan Keyes Video). We have to hold some responsibility and we cannot just turn our backs on everything happening in the world, but we don't have to always send troops to try and change their ways especially when they have not attacked us. What do you guys think? Does Alan Keyes pose a reasonable middle ground on the issue?

Sum of ratings:2 (1) [Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**League of Nations shows Internationalism**by [Rachel Gragg](#) - Friday, April 27, 2018, 2:46 PM

I think this discussion relates a lot to before and after WWI and the League of Nations. As learned in class and from our textbook, the United States didn't decide to join WWI until the final year because the U.S. itself was not being personally attacked. Even when the U.S. joined the war there were still no actual attacks on the country, just propaganda put out by people of the nation in order to encourage soldiers to go to war by saying the Central Powers were going to attack the country. Then, following the war, Woodrow Wilson wanted to create the League of Nations. The LN, as learned in class, was essentially a group of nations trying to keep peace. Wilson was trying to be in contact and assuring peace with other nations and therefore it was a way of not being isolated.

The man in the video about Wilson vs. Bush said that, "The U.S. can serve its own interests in building institutions and making common cause with democracies" (Comparing Wilson and Bush Video). I think that what he meant by this is that it is in the United States' best interest to make alliances and be in contact and proximity with other countries and that that can be used to the country's advantage. It is also a way of making sure peace can last and that wars will be avoided. As learned in class, Americans did not want to join the League of Nations because of the Germans hatred of the Treaty of Versailles, but it was Wilson showing his efforts to be an internationalist because of the involvement with other countries. The correlation between the League of Nations and the topic of isolationism vs. internationalism is definitely strong. What do you guys think the man in the video meant when he said this?

Sum of ratings:2 (1) [Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Foreign Policy Today vs. Post WW1**by [Decker Robinson](#) - Friday, April 27, 2018, 4:01 PM

I would say that Hillary Clinton's foreign policy most resonates with my views. I think the best way to sum up her views based on the article is that America will provide its helping hand if it HAS to. I too think like that because I believe that the U.S. is the pinnacle and that it should be a safe haven; with that being said, we do need to think of ourselves first and only be the helping hand if absolutely needed. I believe all of this

ourselves first and only be the helping hand if absolutely needed. I believe all of this discussion relates to the aftermath of WW1 and the Treaty of Versailles because like today we found ourselves divided on foreign policy and whether or not we should exercise our power to help other countries. For instance, today we find ourselves divided on whether we should send troops into Syria. Unilateralist Ted Cruz would most likely say that we should all force necessary to help the Syrian people. Wilson after WW1 wanted the U.S. to be in the League of Nations because he believed that with all the power the U.S. had, we simply could not only think of ourselves.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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



Main difference between 1918 and 2017

by [Kyle Shrope](#) - Friday, April 27, 2018, 6:33 PM

I would say that the main difference between 1918 and 2017 would be technology. Technology has heavily advanced overtime. People today have devices that connect them to any country in the world and they are able to see what goes on their. In 1918 it was easier for politicians to persuade the people, because not everyone had knowledge of what was happening around the world. Politics today have more pressure from citizens on issues going on around the world, because people today can access that information more easily. Technology has increased the connection of the world today.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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



Case Against Non-intervention and position on spectrum

by [Kyle Shrope](#) - Friday, April 27, 2018, 6:49 PM

In the clip where John McCain is arguing with Ron Paul he states "that kind of Isolationism is what caused WW2"(0:12-0:14). I agree with this statement. The United States holds more power than many countries in this world. Before World War 2 started no country kept Hitler in check, which allowed him to build up his forces to be the strongest in the world. If the US choses to be an Isolationist country then more leaders with evil intentions would rise to power. After reading all the articles and watching the videos I still stand as a limited internationalist. I believe that the US holds a strong and important influence on the world. Without US influence the world would be a different place.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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

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

 [Moodle Docs for this page](#)

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

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