

Question A

The principles of foreign policy, that Alexander Hamilton incorporated into George Washington's Farewell Address, centered about the second great patriotic tradition of unilateralism, meant to preserve the first one dubbed, 'liberty'. One of the main tenets presented in the Farewell Address was that while America's foreign policy is necessary, biases towards certain countries over others is entirely poisonous to the preservation of independence. Also, while relations with foreign nations should be encouraged in light of policy undertakings, political ties should not, save for extraneous, hopefully temporary circumstances (i.e., emergencies). A third premise set forth in Washington's Farewell Address was that the United States should always be prepared for defense, as enemies and allies can be interchanged within the blink of one's eye. Lastly, the fourth and strongest principle set forth in the Address was that, by adhering strongly to the first three, power would be awarded, God's gift in the balance of Providence, in the land embodied by prudent and faithful citizens and leaders.

Often times, the global views of parents have as much, if not more, to do with the legacies of children's perceptions of the world as do the influences of other environmental influences. As much as this country's founding fathers wanted their novel Republic, consisting of 13 states, to be original in ideology, mother Britain remained psychically connected. Some of the unilateralism-based beliefs in Washington's address reflected the latter. A mere 73 years prior to Washington's Address, the Whig Prime Minister, Walpole, opined the common British sentiment in his statement, "My politics are to keep free from all engagements as long as we possibly can." Forty-one years before the Farewell Address, the British House of Lords were beckoned to acknowledge and submit to God's Divine purpose in separating one continent from another. Intrinsic to this role was to engage in separatism, within one's political system.

Britain's policy of making the best of its insular nature, ensuring the checks and balances of power on the 'Continent' (i.e., avoiding ground-based wars and strengthening its navy) and taking charge of world-trade, certainly influenced Americans. The collective lexicon of Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Paine, and John Adams revealed, in no small measure, the highly instrumental manner with which British ideology shaped young America's.

However, certain aspects of early American history helped chisel some of the pre-sculpted philosophies intrinsic to the Washington Farewell Address, as well. Before the American Revolution, the God-fearing, Bible-toting colonists enjoyed a comfortable, symbiotic relationship with Great Britain. Their puritanical connection with God was always showcased from the start of their settlements. Moreover, by remaining humble servants of the Lord and perceiving everyone as equal (later opined as 'maintaining neutrality to foreign nations' within the contexts of Washington's Farewell Address), the colonists not only believed that Providence would be theirs, but that they would be placed on a pedestal by other countries. The latter is painstakingly obvious in John Winthrop's 1630 address, "The Lord make it like that of New England, for we must consider that we shall be as a City Upon A Hill, the eyes of all people are upon us." This 'role-model' position, looked upon favorably by He who is Divine, and intrinsic to a nation perceived as a global leader, was much coveted. Furthermore, this philosophy was later paraphrased in Washington's Farewell Address as, "It will be worthy of free, enlightened, and at no distant period a great nation to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence."

In the earliest days during their intimate association with Britain, the colonists were allowed the amenities of growth, protected from the French, north of them. After having been faithful and loyal to their mother country, however, the colonists were betrayed and

psychologically scarred, thanks to unfair regulations, restrictions, and increased taxes that were suddenly imposed upon them. With time, the hypocrisy of England became more lucid, and monarchies became synonymous with oppression and the 'Old World'. The colonists had tasted enough of freedom to be unwilling to give up the latter. They perceived themselves as exceptional and destined for favor by God. By having already accomplished successes in self-government, as related to a spectrum that spanned from commerce to land-expansion, the colonists' confidence grew, as well. There was no turning back.

Unfortunately, the betrayal that emanates from one's parents (supposed 'allies') sometimes propagates the deeply ingrained sense of distrust a child may feel for his lineage from that point, onward. This distrust towards any entity but the self was later clearly rehashed in the segment of the Farewell Address that stated, "There can be no greater error than to expect or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard."

Recounting another analogy that embraces the psychological impact of abusive parent-child relationships seems pertinent within the realm of this discussion. A child who has been continually betrayed and oppressed when young hones his sense of obstacle-recognition, once older. However, sometimes this sense can be so acute and sensitive, that future offenses are perceived where none are intended. In this case, even though the early colonists needed the French and European allies in acquiring the essence of independence from Britain, the sense of trust that had already been violated from the motherland did much to taint American's perceptions of other lands. An example of the latter is revealed in John Adam's 1775 journal entry surrounding our connection with France. His sentiments disclosed the perceived need for maintaining cautious negotiations with France and "not to enter into any Alliance with her,

which should entangle us in any future wars in Europe." It remains so clear as to be farcical how much the opinions of John Adams such as, "We ought to lay it down as a first principle and a Maxim never to be forgotten, to maintain an entire Neutrality in all future European Wars" influenced Washington's own.

For the colonists and their territory, 'bigger' was intrinsically considered better and associated with greater prosperity and independence; in their collective mind, then, although the unknown was riddled with caprice, the need for expansion was necessary. First, however, was the need to acquire more of a balance of power with that of Britain. By the late 1780's, without the help of allies and foreign aid, the latter may not have occurred. By the time Lord Cornwallis relinquished his position at Yorktown in 1781, the 'manifest destiny' seeds were planted. The 1783 Treaty of Paris set forth the guidelines, stipulations, and boundaries of peace, and was a cornerstone for America's purposes of autonomy and true democracy. Keeping in mind that unilateralism was still considered the ideal towards which every free nation should strive, in his final speech as president, Washington downplayed America's alliance with the French as trivial and 'short-term'. He circumvented the pivotal role of this alliance by saying "Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishment on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies."

Ultimately, the principles set forth in Washington's Farewell Address were so well-purposed, as to apply equally well to past, present, and future American stakes. By encouraging neutrality in the foreign arena, (e.g., not engaging in international war), Washington was actually sly in attempting to buy much needed time to raise a strong enough militia and economy. Thus, with time, other nations might be more dependent on America than would remain the converse. Also, neutrality encouraged a safer form of self-focus, that embraced national, rather than

international affairs. Washington was also concerned that alliances with foreign countries would encourage political factions within a still too nubile and impressionable country. America was still bristling with the restlessness and youthful spirit of a novel government. Infancy is one of the most vulnerable stages of existence, whether for humans or governments; Washington was cognizant of the latter. Lastly, Washington was committed as a leader to being protective of the uncharted territories of America. He understood that engaging in wars/disputes with other countries would encourage the use of American soils as actual battlegrounds. As relates to the latter, Washington was visionary enough to have foreseen the necessity of retaining the fertility and promise of North America, for its expectedly imminent expansion to have been successful. Though he may have been hated for his staunch convictions surrounding the virtues of 'neutrality', Washington's address was so influential, that the later expansion and success of America as a superpower was perceived as the destiny of a God-favored people, rather than the partial result of luck, circumstance, and demographics.