

**T.R.
POLICE ACADEMY
INSTITUTE OF SECURITY SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY**

**DONALD TRUMP’S JACKSONIAN FOREIGN POLICY
AND THE FAR-RIGHT TERRORISM**

**MASTER’S THESIS
Ahmet Can YALÇIN**

Supervisor

Assist. Prof. Dr. Selim ÖZTÜRK

ANKARA-2020

**T.R.
POLICE ACADEMY
INSTITUTE OF SECURITY SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY**

**DONALD TRUMP’S JACKSONIAN FOREIGN POLICY
AND THE FAR-RIGHT TERRORISM**

**MASTER’S THESIS
Ahmet Can YALÇIN**

Supervisor

Assist. Prof. Dr. Selim ÖZTÜRK

ANKARA-2020

ABSTRACT
Police Academy
Institute of Security Sciences
Department of International Security
Donald Trump’s Jacksonian Foreign Policy and the Far-Right Terrorism
Ahmet Can YALÇIN
Master’s Thesis
Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Selim ÖZTÜRK
2020 – 132 Pages

This thesis examines Donald Trump’s foreign policy by plumbing the depths of four US foreign policy traditions. It therefore goes to great lengths to expound upon the school of Jacksonian tradition, the dictates of which thoroughly correspond to the Trump administration’s political decisions. According to the explanation provided in this thesis, Jacksonian school of thought can serve as a bellwether for the direction of American foreign policy under the Trump administration. The fact that domestic politics have huge impact on foreign policy decisions is another phenomenon that is touched upon in this thesis. It scrupulously addresses the intricate relationship between foreign policy and domestic politics by explaining the logic sitting behind President Trump’s Jacksonian approach to foreign affairs. This thesis also argues that the Trump administration’s Jacksonian methods to develop foreign and domestic policy cause great concern amongst the opponents of this administration. And the opponent’s concerns pave the way for poor impressions which equate the Trump administration with the far-right ideology since the Jacksonian tradition is not very well comprehended by many in the United States and abroad.

Key Words: Donald Trump, Andrew Jackson, American Foreign Policy Traditions, American Political Culture, Jacksonian, Silent Majority, Nationalism, Far-Right Terrorism.

ÖZET
T.C.
Polis Akademisi
Güvenlik Bilimleri Enstitüsü
Uluslararası Güvenlik Anabilim Dalı
Donald Trump’ın Jacksoncu Dış Politikası ve Aşırı Sağ Terörizm
Hazırlayan: Ahmet Can YALÇIN
Yüksek Lisans Tezi
Tez Danışmanı: Assist. Prof. Dr. Selim ÖZTÜRK
2020-132 Sayfa

Bu tez, dört Amerikan dış politika geleneğini göz önüne alarak Donald Trump’ın dış politika anlayışını incelemektedir. Bu nedenle, prensipleri Trump yönetiminin siyasi kararlarına tekabül eden Jackson geleneği ekolünü açıklamak için çok kapsamlı bir yaklaşım ile açıklamaktadır. Tezde yer verilen açıklama doğrultusunda bu geleneğin anlaşılması Trump yönetiminde olan Amerikan dış politikasının nasıl bir tutumu benimseyeceğini anlamaya yardımcı olmaktadır. Bu tezin açıklamaya çalıştığı hususlardan birisi de iç politika kararlarının dış politika üzerindeki büyük etkisidir. Bu tez iç politika ve dış politika arasındaki karmaşık ilişkiyi Başkan Trump’ın Jackson geleneğine dayanarak verdiği dış politika kararlarının arkasında yatan mantık ile bağdaştırmakta ve bu durumu detaylı bir şekilde ele almaktadır. Bu tezde ayrıca Trump yönetiminin dış politika ve iç politika kararlarını ele alırken Jackson geleneğine göre hareket etmesi ve bunun neticesinde ortaya çıkan muhalefetin endişeleri de tartışılmaktadır. Buna ek olarak, muhalefetin söz konusu endişeleri, Jackson geleneğinin Amerika’da ve yurt dışında iyi bir şekilde kavranmaması nedeniyle Trump yönetimini aşırı sağ ideolojiyle eş gören izlenimlere zemin hazırlamaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Donald Trump, Andrew Jackson, Amerikan Dış Politika Gelenekleri, Amerikan Siyaset Kültürü, Jacksonculuk, Suskun Çoğunluk, Milliyetçilik, Aşırı Sağ Terörizm.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AI: Artificial Intelligence

AIPAC: American Israel Public Affairs Committee

BLM: Black Lives Matter Organization

CENTCOM: United States Central Command

D.C.: District of Columbia

EU: European Union

FED: Federal Reserve Board

GDP: Gross Domestic Product

IAEA: International Atomic Energy Agency

IMF: International Monetary Fund

ISIS: Islamic State of Iraq and Syria

JCPOA: Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action

MENA: Middle East and North Africa

NAFTA: North American Free Trade Agreement

NATO: North Atlantic Treaty Organization

NGO: Non-Governmental Organization

PKK: Kurdistan Workers Party

PYD: Democratic Union Party

TPP: Trans-Pacific Partnership

UN: United Nations

US: United States

USA: United States of America

USMCA: United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement

USSR: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

WASP: White Anglo-Saxon Protestant

WHO: World Health Organization

WTO: World Trade Organization



DONALD TRUMP’S JACKSONIAN FOREIGN POLICY AND THE FAR-RIGHT TERRORISM

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPROVAL PAGE	Error! Bookmark not defined.
COPYRIGHT DECLARATION	II
ABSTRACT	III
ÖZET.....	IV
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	VI
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	VII
INTRODUCTION.....	1

CHAPTER ONE

THE FORMATION OF JACKSONIAN TRADITION IN AMERICAN POLITICAL HISTORY

1.1. FRONTIERSMAN EXPERIENCE AS THE FOUNDATION OF JACKSONIAN TRADITION.....	11
1.2. THE WAR OF 1812 AND THE RISE OF A POPULAR WAR HERO....	19
1.3. THE ENTRENCHMENT OF JACKSONIAN TRADITION IN THE AMERICAN POLITICAL SYSTEM.....	28
1.4. THE TARIFF AND NULLIFICATION CRISIS	36
1.5. THE BANK WAR.....	38
1.6. THE INDIAN REMOVAL	40

CHAPTER TWO
THE JACKSONIAN TRADITION AND AMERICAN FOREIGN
POLICY

2.1. AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY TRADITIONS	44
2.2. JACKSONIAN POLITICS AND THE TRUMP ADMINISTRATION....	54

CHAPTER THREE
THE COMPETITION AMONGST THE AMERICAN FOREIGN
POLICY TRADITIONS WITHIN THE POST-COLD WAR ERA

3.1. AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY TRADITIONS AND DONALD TRUMP’S PICK	63
3.2. OBAMA’S HAMILTONIAN AND WILSONIAN FOREIGN POLICY..	72
3.3. DONALD TRUMP’S JACKSONIAN FOREIGN POLICY	85
3.4. NATIONALISM AND TRUMP	92
3.5. THE JACKSONIAN TRADITION FROM RICHARD NIXON TO DONALD TRUMP	99
3.6. THE FAR-RIGHT TERROR ATTACKS AND THE SMEAR CAMPAIGN AGAINST JACKSONIANS	107
CONCLUSION.....	112
REFERENCES.....	121
CV	132

INTRODUCTION

It is widely known that the election of Donald Trump in 2016 presidential election was not expected by many people across the world. The number of people who were befuddled by his election included those studying American foreign policy. His election created uncertainty for the outlook of the international system and the place of the United States of America within that order. One of the cardinal reasons of that uncertainty was that most of the pundits were not able to make of President Trump's intentions and his foreign policy with regards to the American led liberal international order and its maintenance. Meanwhile, populist nationalist views in American politics were rapidly spreading at institutional levels, thereby subtly influencing the foreign policy decisions that were deemed as irrevocable. And most of the experts on US foreign policy set forth that the ambiguity in American politics was the result of Donald Trump's populist decisions.

Despite the fact that President Trump's populist approach to foreign and domestic politics created the uncertainty to some extent, his policies were not the taproot of the ambiguity Americans had been experiencing in the past decades. Donald Trump is embodiment of a rough patch Americans have been going through since the US foreign policy establishment endorsed liberal ideas and values as its pole star in the international order in which the US was the sole super power for a while after the end of the Cold War.

With the election of Donald Trump, the foreign policy of the United States has incrementally abandoned its three decades long liberal hegemonic position in foreign affairs, where realism has started to trump liberalism, instead. And this substantial change has also reflected upon the domestic politics. The opponents of the Trump administration have equated Trump supporters with the far-right groups due to their deep commitment to the President's populist and nationalist policies. Furthermore, the fact that the elites are scorned and disliked by Trump and his supporters demonstrates that American foreign policy has now become a chess board on which nationalist and liberal policymakers have been grappling with each other to influence the political decisions and their outcomes.

However, the values and ideas Trump represented for the Americans who had voted for him is one of the focal points of this thesis, which plumbs the depths of US foreign policy traditions, which have been set out by Walter Russell Mead, to discover Donald Trump's foreign policy and its striking similarities with the Jacksonian school of thought amongst the four traditions. Due to the fact that US foreign policy traditions usually are factored out while striving to make of the Trump administration's policies, it is necessary to view American foreign policy through lenses of Jacksonianism with the aim of understanding the roots of American populist nationalism and its impact upon the policymaking process, whereby the Trump administration reckons with his followers' (Jacksonians) vantage points. Besides, this thesis zeros in on the perspectives of the Trump opponents who disparage Jacksonians as the far-right supporters since the Trump administration has considerably deviated from Hamiltonian and Wilsonian foreign policy traditions while making decisions regarding external and internal affairs.

Furthermore, the thesis seeks to expound upon Jacksonian tradition in detail by poring over academic works written on Andrew Jackson and US foreign policy to fill the gap in the academic literature. The fact that there is not any substantial work on US foreign policy traditions and Donald Trump is one of the primary concerns of this thesis which seeks to fill that gap in the literature by dovetailing American culture and foreign policy into a single research. By doing that, this thesis aims to provide a multidisciplinary and comprehensive approach in interpreting Donald Trump's foreign policy comparing to the works which are to be dissected in the following literature review.

As Mead (2009) argues that "the competition to influence US foreign policy amongst these four traditions have existed since the eighteenth century and the US foreign policy-making process will be formed in tandem with that competition" (p. xvii). And this point makes this thesis has a paramount importance in approaching the concept of US foreign policy under the leadership of Donald Trump from a different perspective. Owing to the fact that other significant works on US foreign policy have brushed aside to touch upon the four US foreign policy traditions while explaining the events in detail, they mostly focus on theoretical interpretations, thereby failing to take domestic politics into consideration in their attempts to

explain US foreign policy. For instance, Mearsheimer (2018) opines that “the American foreign policy establishment must reckon with balance-of-power in policymaking process” (p. 1). On the other hand, Walt (2018) argues that “US foreign policy must be developed by a new elite group of people who formulate a strategy of restraint rather than the current elites who have been following a strategy of US dominance in the international system” (p. xii).

Despite the fact that Joseph S. Nye, Jr. touches upon American foreign policy traditions in his prominent work, *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics* (2004), he fails to address the significance of the Jacksonian tradition in the formation of American foreign policy along with domestic politics. He argues that “the follower of this tradition dispenses with soft power” when it comes to politics (2004, p. 140). However, Nye’s approach to the Jacksonian tradition from “soft power” concept does not ring hollow since he accentuates the tough-mindedness of Jacksonian head of the Department of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld, during the Iraq War in 2003. But this finding is not enough to elucidate the profound impact of the Jacksonian tradition on American foreign policy, thereby depriving readers of grasping comprehensive examination of Trump’s foreign policy.

On the other hand, Samuel P. Huntington’s *Who are We?: America’s Great Debate* (2004) offers highly detailed explanation for the motivations and concerns of many Americans, majority of them are Jacksonians who are subtly mentioned without being bluntly equated with the Jacksonian tradition in the book, with regard to security of their country and culture. He believes that “Americans should recommit themselves to the Anglo-Saxon culture, traditions, and values” in order to further and secure the interests of the United States in the perilous times (2004, p. xviii). Huntington’s concerns for the future of American nation and his country’s place within the international system correspond to the issues which have been besetting the Jacksonian community hitherto. This striking similarity with the concerns of Huntington and the Jacksonian community makes this work considerably important to get a picture of the motivations of fervent supporters of Donald Trump. The perspective set forth by Huntington, however, is a cultural one that dispenses with international relations and security dimension to a considerable extent, thereby only addressing to Donald Trump’s Jacksonian approach to domestic politics. For

that reason, his work can be regarded as one of the cornerstones for discovering the vantage points of Donald Trump's Jacksonian supporters but it does not suffice to explain when historical, international relations and security dimensions are taken into consideration to clarify Donald Trump's Jacksonian foreign policy.

Last but not the least, the work of J.M. Opal, which is *Avenging the People: Andrew Jackson, the Rule of Law, and the American Nation* (2017), strives to shed a light upon the experiences of Andrew Jackson and how those experiences shaped his mindset which would later pave the way for his legacy. However, the work, albeit very substantial one to unpack the logic sitting behind President Jackson, does not help the researcher unravel the notions of the Jacksonian tradition in detail to make sense of the tradition itself. The work thus reflects a certain time period in American history where the formation of the Jacksonian tradition is factored out. Given that, the work does help the researcher get a historical point of view while analyzing and decoding the Jacksonian tradition in conjunction with the events that shaped Andrew Jackson's approach to politics. Nonetheless, the work is neither enough to get to the bottom of the Jacksonian tradition nor Donald Trump's foreign policy.

At last, Lynn Hudson Parson's *The Birth of Modern Politics: Andrew Jackson, John Quincy Adams, and the Election of 1828* (2009) revolves around the political competition between two presidents by scrutinizing their lives with the intention of understanding roots of current American political and election system. Due to the fact that Andrew Jackson was elected as the President of the United States in the election of 1828, the perspective offered by this work greatly matters for exploring the formation and entrenchment of the Jacksonian tradition in American politics. Despite the fact that the work focuses on a certain period of time in American history, it concisely and precisely expounds upon the backdrop of the events which led to the current two-party system in the United States by underscoring the presidency of Andrew Jackson. Therefore, the work is indispensable for those seeking to discover the Jacksonian tradition. But it fails to dovetail the backdrop of events with today's political situation since it analyzes those events from historical points of view.

The works mentioned above constitute the *sine qua non* literature for exploring the Jacksonian tradition in tandem with American domestic politics and foreign policy. Nevertheless, these prominent works are not enough to make of Donald Trump's Jacksonian foreign policy due to two reasons. First of all, they, except the works of Mead and Nye, do not reckon with US foreign policy traditions. The second is that those that reckon with the traditions fail to employ interdisciplinary approach to explain their main points unlike this thesis.

This thesis, however, expounds upon Donald Trump's foreign policy by utilizing US foreign policy traditions while taking the cultural and historical elements, which are the two key components of domestic politics, into account as determining factors in American foreign policy since other works on US foreign policy have mostly factored out the dimension of domestic politics. Therefore, this research does not interpret American foreign policy thus and so when it is compared to previous theoretical researches on US foreign policy. It rather discusses Donald Trump's Jacksonian foreign policy in regard to four philosophical schools of thought, which are explained in a comparative analysis in this research, and it is not hidebound by the theoretical interpretations of American foreign policy which have been churned out by plenty of scholars thus far.

Furthermore, this research takes international relations and security dimensions into consideration while explaining Donald Trump's Jacksonian foreign policy unlike previous researches, the existence of which have created a gap in the literature to be filled by this study. And this gap has come to define the purpose of this thesis, which is to explore and then explain Donald Trump's foreign policy by employing interdisciplinary approaches to get a picture of the Jacksonian tradition and its intricate relationship with the policies of the Trump administration. While doing that, this research also aims to show striking influence of domestic politics on foreign policy decisions concerning the relationship between the Trump administration and its Jacksonian supporters.

Bearing in mind that the United States of America has the largest economy while supporting it with the most advanced armed forces in the world makes it critically important to understand its foreign policy for other nations' policymakers

and for those who study US foreign policy. But the schools of thought that are utilized in this thesis to fathom US foreign policy makes this thesis substantial analysis by dwelling on the tradition Donald Trump has ferociously and glaringly endorsed. Plus, it sheds a light upon the American foreign policy after the Cold War by analyzing that time period in tandem with US foreign policy traditions. Additionally, the fact that foreign policy mirrors the domestic policy requires this research to explain Jacksonian tradition in a historical context to comprehend the pillars of this tradition and what kind of role they played in the formation of this tradition, thereby influencing Donald Trump's foreign policy and his supporters' political decisions. With that in mind, what makes this thesis significant can be encapsulated within a few but cardinal comments. First of all, this study offers an interdisciplinary approach by conflating American history, culture, foreign policy and its traditions with the intention of explaining the Jacksonian tradition in a comprehensive way. The second is that it takes international relations and security dimensions into consideration while clarifying Donald Trump's Jacksonian foreign policy. And the third reason why this study greatly matters is that it does not factor out the dimension of domestic politics as a phenomenon while analyzing American foreign policy unlike most of the academic works.

Methodologically, the thesis employs qualitative approaches to discover and scrutinize Donald Trump's Jacksonian foreign policy and why the President and his Jacksonian supporters are labeled as the far-right extremists. Thus, the research focuses on data collection by utilizing academic papers, newspaper articles, policy documents, and speeches of the leaders. By the same token, the thesis applies discourse analysis methods in order to drill down the symbols and references used in the speeches of Donald Trump with the aim of decoding those references and symbols, thereby clarifying Trump's personal and political relationship with the Jacksonian tradition.

In Chapter I, this thesis aims to give brief introduction to the research itself by offering its literature review, methodology, and all of its chapters' contents. Also, it strives to explain the purpose of this thesis, which is to explain Donald Trump's foreign policy from an interdisciplinary approach by utilizing the Jacksonian foreign policy tradition as a lens. Furthermore, it discusses significant works on US foreign

policy, Andrew Jackson and American culture in order to demonstrate their findings that are both seen as rewarding and unrewarding in the process, whereby this research was gingerly conducted.

In Chapter 2, the study revolves around a preface about American foreign policy traditions and the significance of the prominent leaders' legacies for the states and their destiny. This chapter also aims to underscore the importance of relationship between these traditions and the paramount figures whose names have left substantial impact on their nations, thereby carrying either famous or notorious connotations in the minds of the future generations of their countries. It compares Germany and the United States to a considerable degree to show how the legacies left by the past paramount figures have impacted these two nations. Furthermore, this chapter evinces the choice of President Trump among the four US foreign policy traditions with respect to his administration foreign policy decisions. And his pick denotes the legacy he has readily embraced.

In Chapter 3, the study closely seeks to explain the formation of the Jacksonian tradition by dissecting landmark events in the life of Andrew Jackson, whose experiences and actions laid the groundwork for this tradition. The thesis in this chapter also revolves around and delves into six pillars of the Jacksonian tradition as the bedrock thereof. It therefore regards these six incidents in the fulcrum of the Jacksonian tradition, which has not only come to dominate the decision-making process in the Trump administration but also it has come to carve out a niche in American culture and politics. The logic behind the analysis of six pillars of the Jacksonian tradition is to inform the readers who are unversed in the nuances of this school of thought. The fact that this tradition is the brainchild of President Jackson and his followers is precisely reckoned with in this chapter with the intention of discovering the striking similarities of President Trump and his followers.

In Chapter 4, the thesis strives to come to grips with the Jacksonian tradition from foreign policy perspective. For this reason, this chapter accentuates Jacksonianism as the most significant school of thought in American foreign policy under the Trump administration. In addition to that, this chapter subsumes the most comprehensive comparison of the Jacksonian tradition with Hamiltonian, Wilsonian,

and Jeffersonian traditions in order to demonstrate their distinct approaches to American foreign policy.

In Chapter 5, the thesis aims to clarify the conflict, which is to influence foreign policy decisions, amongst the four American foreign policy traditions after the end of the Cold War. For that reason, there is a short introduction of US foreign policy after 1991 before this chapter zeroes in on President Trump's predecessor's foreign policy with an emphasis on the school of thoughts which dominated his epoch. By doing that, the study seeks to juxtapose Obama's foreign policy to Trump's foreign policy through the lenses of American foreign policy traditions, thereby going through Donald Trump's Jacksonian foreign policy with a fine-tooth comb. And nationalism as a driving force behind Trump's foreign policy is explained in conjunction with the Jacksonian tradition in the chapter. Moreover, this chapter touches upon the growing power of the Jacksonian community from the era of President Nixon to President Trump in a detailed way. Though this increasing power is feared and denounced by the elites who have always wished to change the course of American politics according to their own agendas, the Jacksonian community usually has been able to find its way to express its thoughts and concerns in their very own ways. And as a result of the fierce opposition and tough rhetoric of Jacksonians to the policies of elites, they have been tried to be brushed aside by the followers of other schools of thought in the government and then besmirched as the far-right terrorists and extremists. And this phenomenon is thoroughly elucidated in this chapter.

In Chapter 6, this thesis offers its conclusion in which the findings of Donald Trump's Jacksonian foreign policy are assessed. And it is concluded that Donald Trump's foreign policy is a Jacksonian through and through. Hence, this chapter plays a crucial role in defining and making of the Trump administration foreign policy in tandem with international security and 2020 elections in the United States. Furthermore, this chapter evaluates the whole process, whereby this thesis was conducted with the purpose of reminding the readers that this research is an interdisciplinary approach to investigate American foreign policy under the Trump administration.

Eventually, this thesis can be boiled down to four main points, which are sought to be clarified throughout the research. In the first place, it seeks to shed a light on Donald Trump's foreign policy from an interdisciplinary approach within which one of the four US foreign policy traditions, which is Jacksonianism, along with theoretical, cultural, and historical methods are employed. Secondly, it meticulously takes domestic politics into account while interpreting US foreign policy since domestic politics is considered as a cardinal factor in the decision-making process with respect to foreign policy under the Trump administration. Last but not the least, this thesis also strives to clarify why the term of "far-right" is used as a smear campaign against Jacksonians who support Donald Trump at all costs. And it conclusively sets forth that explaining the Trump administration's Jacksonian policies is essential to make of future Jacksonian leaders' policies and mindset in the United States of America.

CHAPTER ONE

THE FORMATION OF JACKSONIAN TRADITION IN AMERICAN POLITICAL HISTORY

Andrew Jackson is one of the well-known but also downplayed presidents of the United States of America. He is on the twenty-dollar bill and remembered with his sturdy, undaunted, and unbridled personality. “His very name evoked a set of feelings and stories that marked Americans in some essential way[s]” in which a lot of people internalized his characteristics while the rest refuted, belittled, and condemned his legacy and contributions to his homeland (Opal, 2017, p. 2). Not only is he one of the most controversial presidents in the US history but he is also one of the most celebrated and respected presidents for some Americans who have been following the set of values and ideas having been put forth by him in this century.

The values, ideas, and inspiration Andrew Jackson had left behind when he passed away on June 8, 1845 have been taken and internalized by a plenty of Americans who consider that the seventh president of the US “was a proper nationalist” (p. 2). The populist nationalism of his legacy serves as a tool with which it brings the middle-class and working-class Americans together, who are predominantly white Americans as it did in the 1820s, to set forth their opinions on politics and economy of the US. They come together to ward off the threats to their financial, cultural, and individual liberties on the basis of Andrew Jackson’s nationalism. By the same token, he boldly serves as a minister that can take care of the problems of those classes, whose voices have not been heard in the White House for a long time in a figurative sense. Nonetheless, he has been able to become the voice of the unheard and forgotten people of the American nation thanks to his tradition that was left as a legacy and “gift” to the American people, though he has been dead for the last one hundred and seventy-five years.

At the beginning, in order to understand Andrew Jackson’s tradition, it is necessary to come to grips with him and his early life as a frontiersman, thereby getting a picture of the Jacksonian tradition and his followers, the Jacksonians.

Owing to the fact that the frontier life straightened him out throughout his life, he built his legacy on that life style where he was always on the alert. By the same token, discovering Andrew Jackson's ideas, values, and his characteristics helps to conduct the research in order to interpret Donald Trump, his "America First" foreign policy, and his supporters whom this research deems as the "Jacksonians". Also, this succinctly demonstrates that the legacy of Andrew Jackson and his frontiersmen still continues to live on amongst many Americans who are determined to acknowledge and reflect the situation in which the United States is headed to. This acknowledgement is the election of Donald Trump who is the current successor of Jacksonian tradition in US where he has conspicuously revitalized and optimized the Jacksonian sentiments in tandem with his America First foreign policy approach. In short, he has been able to reconsolidate Jacksonians into his America First policy with great success as Ronald Reagan and Richard Nixon brought off in the twentieth century.

In other words, the main pillars of Jacksonian tradition, which are assessed in the following pages, are essential to get a picture of the tradition itself in tandem with Andrew Jackson and his twenty-first century successor, Donald Trump. Plus, these pillars can be seen as the straw that broke the camel's back in the era of Andrew Jackson since the formation of his populist tradition at some point in the future would rock the American political system to its foundations. For that reason, it is necessary to acknowledge that these pillars are intricately connected to each other in the formation of Jacksonian tradition which has had a substantial impact in the decisions and lives of the contemporary Jacksonians.

1.1. FRONTIERSMAN EXPERIENCE AS THE FOUNDATION OF JACKSONIAN TRADITION

Andrew Jackson was born in Waxhaws in South Carolina in 1767 to Scotch- Irish parents. At that time, "it was not clear where one Carolina began and the other ended, where white settlements gave way to native grounds" (Opal, 2017, p.16). He came from immigrant parents who were "Scottish Presbyterians [who] had escaped Anglican authorities by crossing the Irish Sea and settling in Ulster, where they

secured longer leases, better wages, and the occasional protection of British authorities against the displaced natives” (p. 17). The Protestant sect to which his parents belonged is known to have clashed with Anglican teachings to some extent which forced many Presbyterians to migrate. The main reason, however, was that “the descendants of the Presbyterian Scots who had been sent to Ireland between 1608 and 1650 to bolster English control of its catholic population” were seen as social pariahs and denied many rights (Henretta, Brody & Dumenil, 2002, p. 107). “In Ireland the Scots faced discrimination and economic regulation” and this constituted their push factor for migration (p. 107).

His parents “joined the roughly fifty-five thousand Protestant Irish who came to North American between the Seven Years’ Wars and the Revolution. They expected more than better rents on the far side of the Atlantic.” (Opal, 2017, p. 17). And they were looking for lands where they could do farming, trade, and have a safe haven for themselves to live up to their religious teachings. “The Carolinas emerged as major destinations as Pennsylvania and Virginia grew more expensive and royal governors of Scottish origin tried to populate the deep southern colonies” (p. 17). They strove to ensconce themselves in their new homes by preserving the ideas and values they brought with them to the new world where “the Scots-Irish were determined to keep their culture. They held to their Presbyterian faith and promoted marriage within the church” (Henretta, Brody & Dumenil, 2002, p. 107).

The new settlers gradually populated the lands they were given by the colonial authorities, who “were...eager to recruit white families” (Opal, 2017, p. 17). “Scots-Irish Presbyterians who migrated to frontier settlements west of the Susquehanna River challenged the pacifism of the Quaker-dominated assembly by demanding a more aggressive Indian policy” (Henretta, Brody & Dumenil, 2002, p. 108). The Paxton Boys incident in which “[the] Scots-Irish farmers ... massacred twenty members of the Conestoga tribe” happened and this brought two different groups to confrontation in 1763 in Lancaster, Pennsylvania. (p. 123). The situation in the Carolinas was no different from Pennsylvania but there were not Quakers or any other groups to oppose them at least. “By the 1760s, after a brutal war between the Carolinas and the region’s dominant nation, the Cherokee, the Waxhaws were well settled with north Irish Presbyterians” and this war led Andrew Jackson’s parents to

settle in Waxhaws where he was born in 1767 (Opal, 2017, p. 15). This new and untouched territory was a blessing for the parents of Andrew Jackson who thought that “North America’s cheap lands and high wages outweighed its exotic perils” (p. 18).

Although the violence was widespread amongst the frontiersmen, it was mostly the result of the religious understanding of Ulster Presbyterians who did not underscore the importance of the tolerance in the society they were living comparing to other different Christian sects having prevailed in the colonies at that time. “What set Ulster Presbyterians from [the rest] ...was less a propensity for anti-native violence than their century-old story about that violence” (p. 21). Their attitude nevertheless was in conjunction with the dominant Puritan mind-set of its era where the Native Americans, Indians, were regarded as uncivilized and rascals. “In this respect they had much in common with earlier settlers of New England” where the Native Americans were seen as barbaric and savages (p. 21).

John Winthrop, one of the most prominent Puritans, gave a speech on April 8, 1630 on a ship named *Arabella*. The name of the speech was “A Model of Christian Charity” in which he distinctively used the term “city upon a hill” from the Bible to define America. He said that

For wee must consider that wee shall be as a citty upon a hill. The eies of all people are uppon us. Soe that if wee shall deale falsely with our God in this worke wee haue undertaken, and soe cause him to withdrawe his present help from us, wee shall be made a story and a by-word through the world. Wee shall open the mouthes of enemies to speakeevill of the wayes of God, and all professors for God's sake. Wee shall shame the faces of many of God's worthy servants, and causetheire prayers to be turned into curses upon us till wee be consumed out of the good land whither wee are a goeing. (1630, p. 9)

It can be deduced from his speech that the Puritans considered themselves as the chosen people like the Israelis and they also thought that they could build a society that could be better than the other societies and communities living in the old world. And this approach was shared by Ulster Presbyterians as well, who converged with the Puritans on many issues such as the Native Americans and “City Upon a Hill”. The Puritans saw the native tribes as “[t]he enemies of their New Israel” and “had to be slain, as God willed” (Opal, 2017, p.21). Furthermore, in [*sic*] the Calvinist tradition of both New England Puritans and Ulster Presbyterians, bloodshed also signified God’s anger with the chosen people with whom he had special

covenant” (p. 21). Their attitudes towards the Native Americans were similar both in sermons and practices of them.

Andrew Jackson was heavily influenced by his parents’ religious culture and Scots-Irish background which shaped his way of seeing and interpreting the events. He lost his father at an early age and had to help his mother and brothers to maintain the living. He was just eight years old when the Revolutionary War erupted between the thirteen colonies and the British Empire. “In late 1779, his oldest brother, Hugh, rode off with a North Carolina unit to defend Georgia; he returned deathly ill and died a few months later” (p. 41). Because of the fact that his oldest brother passed away, Andrew Jackson had to experience and swallow the grim realities of a war. It was this war where he went through military education. The watershed moment, however, in his life was caused by a British officer, whose soldiers caught him and his brother while there were fleeing away from them. “When an officer told Andrew to clean his boots, the nervy boy refused, and the man struck with his sword, leaving a deep gash in Jackson’s skull” (p. 42). Not only did this incident ignite ire towards the British until his death in 1845, thereby defined his attitudes towards them and their allies in America, but also it left a mark, which traumatized him with the death of his loved ones, on his character and ideas which were to define his tradition in the future.

All the things Andrew Jackson went through at his early ages goosed up his sentiments towards the British and native tribes and shaped his character, but they all made him stronger and ruthless to be a frontiersman and westerner. He was interested in the law to bring justice and take revenge from those who committed crimes against the common folks. They “tried to escape the law as they had known it by heading west and even forming their own states” but “Andrew Jackson tied his fortunes to a new version of that law, and thus to a new kind of nation” (p. 48). In this nation, he believed that a new civilization based on the promises which were to be honored by the common folks would prevail with ease. And he worked hard to reach this goal by being pragmatic, adamant, and lion-hearted.

He simply wanted to be a man of means and correctly saw as his fast track. His sharp memory and neat writing would enable him to name cases, cite precedents... As important, he was comfortable around elite men, having spent time with Presbyterian clerics, Charleston swells, and professional soldiers to know when and

how to talk and listen, eat and drink, boast and defer. He also saw no reason why contracts should not be honored. (p. 52)

He never hesitated to seize any opportunity to progress himself towards his goal. Besides, he was very careful and well-mannered around the polite and elite people so that he could curb any of his actions that could be considered as a breach of decorum amongst them. The way he behaved was affected by the teachings and personality of his mother who “worked in mysterious ways, compelling him to see life as perpetual struggle and to distrust the self-assured gentlemen whose esteem he craved” (p. 53). In order to widen his circle, he was believed to have taken part in a group, which is known as “the Freemasons” (p. 53). It was “a secret fraternity with deep Irish roots that flourished in postrevolutionary America” (p. 53).

However, the most significant moments, which altered his decision-making process, were the result of a frontiersman experiences which made him Herculean. Being a westerner and frontiersman defined who Andrew Jackson was and how he came to be appreciated. “His temperament and character were suited to the rough-and-tumble southern frontier society in which he lived” (Parsons, 2009, p. 18). For that reason, he climbed up the ladder without difficulty amongst the common folks who shared the same culture and environment with him. In late-eighteenth-century living in the American frontier was difficulty and even considered by some easterners as foolhardy enough due to the danger posed by the Native Americans, yet people were determined to extend their settlements towards the west and south. Their decision was championed by Andrew Jackson who built a plantation in Nashville, Tennessee. It was called the Hermitage where he and his wife, Rachael Jackson, merrily occupied till their last days. “His solace through war, politics, Indian fighting, financial chaos, and the vicissitudes of life in what was then frontier America, Rachel gave him what no one else ever had” (Meacham, 2008, p. 5). Though they did not have any child carrying their blood, “in [*sic*] her arms and in their home he found a steady sense of family, a sustain•ing universe, a place of peace in a world of war” (p. 5).

What disrupted and variegated his peace and harmony at the Hermitage was frontier violence which was common in Jackson’s era. It “swept away plans for greater equality, diminishing *saluspopuli* to a frantic logic of kill or be killed” (Opal,

2017, p. 63). The Native Americans were one of the main reasons of it since the settlers ceaselessly strove to expand their territories. Besides, growing number of European immigrants to America pushed further settlements to the west where most of the lands had been occupied by the Native Americans for centuries. By the same token, the fact that some of these new settlements turned into slave-holding states, many frontiersmen found it reasonable to do farm there owing to cheap slave labor and profits coming from cotton, rice, tobacco, and fur trade.

The Native Americans were one of the main obstacles for the westward expansion along with the British, Spanish, and French Empires. Their existence was never winnowed out since the white settlers and the native tribes often times did trade with each other and they all exchanged the significant know-how of farming in the frontier lands, which helped the white settlers to grow their products. Nevertheless, these exchanges were not enough to mitigate the striking difference between them. Majority of the settlers supported high-handed solutions to the Native American problem which attacked their villages and farms. These attacks constituted the leading violence in the frontier life within which Andrew Jackson's views were able to cut across established norms of America, which were substantiated by the Northerners. "As with most frontiersmen, indeed, as with most white Americans, Jackson had little or no patience with the Indian's claims to their ancestral lands" (Parsons, 2009, p. 5). Furthermore, he religiously expressed his views on them. He regarded them as "primitive children, violent savages whose word was unreliable and whose capacity for barbarous torture and cruelty knew no bounds" (p. 5).

Andrew Jackson was carrying the characteristics of American frontier culture in which he was very pragmatic, individualistic, progressive, and resilient. He was not in opposition to trade with the tribes from whom the white settlers could learn skills to survive in the dangerous frontier. He, however, "emerge[d] as one of the leaders in the cause of rapid Indian removal" in the late eighteenth-century (p. 10). "It was a position from which he ... never waver[ed] and ... did [sic] no harm to his standing among the people of Tennessee and the southwestern frontier" (p. 10). Whenever he had a chance to clamp down on the Native Americans, he did not vacillate between them and the white folks whom he dearly respected, loved, and protected against the dangers in the frontier settlements. In order to defend them

against the threats emanated from the external borders of Tennessee, he even considered to wage a war against the Spanish Empire that “controlled the city of New Orleans, vital to the passage of American wheat, corn, lumber, and other raw material down the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers” (p. 10) The fact that New Orleans was in the Louisiana Territory meant Andrew Jackson was to wage a war against an empire, “liberal Indian policies [of which] made the Louisiana Territory a potential haven for hostile tribes beyond the reach of the Americans” (p .10). But he did not want any direct action which could do harm on Tennessee and his folks but used it as a trump card to get support from the federal government. By doing that, he aimed to convince the federal government to support for his ambitions which were to seek retribution from the Native Americans and the Spaniards, who hampered the expansion of the frontiersmen and their way of life.

Andrew Jackson was driven by his instincts, which occasionally gnawed away at him, rather than pure logic. The instincts constituted the bedrock of his motives in the frontier lands. First of them was the revenge that he sought for on many occasions since he regarded honor at the top of his characteristics that could not be violated. He “obsessed over what distant strangers might say about him. This made him exceptionally sensitive...” (Opal, 2017, p. 73). He employed various approaches when he was confronted and humiliated by the other people, who were only a few white folks to dare to anger him, to prove them he could maintain his integrity and honor. The most famous and well-known with Jackson himself was dueling with his confronters. When he was twenty-one-year old in 1788, “he challenged an older, more established attorney, Waightstill Avery, to a duel after Avery mocked him in court” (p. 73). He believed that he was not seen as an honorable man by Avery. Thus, he thought the duel as the only way to seek revenge to preserve his honor against the insults made by Avery. When the duel happened, “the two duelers intentionally shot at somewhere else not to maim each other” (p. 73). Nevertheless, Andrew Jackson proved other people including Avery that he was ready to die and kill for his honor and integrity irrespective of the consequences thereof. This marked not only his most well-known features amongst the common folk, but also it signified that he was ready to take revenge when he felt that he needed to.

During his years in Nashville, Tennessee in the late eighteen-century, he hit upon the idea that he had to protect himself and the people around him against the frontier violence since the Federal government did not guarantee their protection until the date Tennessee became an official state of the United States on June 1, 1796. What he went through in these years were both symbolic and significant for his future positions and the people with whom he was to meet. The experiences “alienated [sic] him from Federalist models of civil order and taught [sic] him to narrate vengeance as legal, just, and even holy, if not exactly American” (p. 78). In sum, he learnt to take the sweet with the bitter because of the fact that life showed its grim side on several occasions.

In the following years, Andrew Jackson showed his skills in law to take advantage his interests regarding with revenge, ordinance, and justice. He “knew how to parse the legal and religious arguments for collective punishment” which was utilized and abused by him (p. 98). His second duel with a man named Charles Dickinson, who had vilified the wife of Jackson and later apologized, was an essential instance in which the character of Andrew Jackson can be picked up upon with ease. Dickinson and Jackson met “across the Tennessee border in Kentucky, on May 30, 1806” (Parsons, 2009, p. 19). Charles Dickinson was shot and killed by Jackson, who was also badly wounded, in the duel which gave him a bad reputation for quite some time. After Dickinson passed away, “[a] number of [his] friends proposed to run a memorial for their fallen comrade in one of the local papers, but when they learned that Jackson was particularly interested in learning their names, they hastily begged off” (p. 20). This attitude of Jackson was a clear intimidation which he employed many times in his military and political career.

Eventually, the frontier mentality, which was the backbone of the Jacksonian tradition, had a huge impact on the decisions Andrew Jackson made. He conceded that the security of his loved ones could only be maintained by taking the control of power to subdue nature. The frontiersman experience taught Jackson the grim reality of life, which is the survival of the fittest. Jackson’s duels and manipulation of law for the interests of himself and the common white folks in order to defend his honor laid the groundwork for his tradition. Besides, his vindictive attitude was endorsed by many of his followers that did not hesitate to bring the justice by themselves to

the people whom they deemed deserved it. His willingness to protect his people at all costs generated a conservative culture that can be substantiated in his tradition as well. This protective culture has come to acknowledge the significance of the Second Amendment for the sake of common white folks' security and well-being hitherto. His experience and actions simply epitomize a proverb—evil triumphs when good men do nothing.

1.2. THE WAR OF 1812 AND THE RISE OF A POPULAR WAR HERO

Andrew Jackson never balked at showing his support for self-defense against the hurdles the frontiersmen and the United States had to overcome. In the early nineteenth-century, there were simmering problems between the United States and British Empire, which became obvious when “The British Navy ... searched American ships for British deserters and impressed (or forced) them back into service [and] ... many of [them] were American citizens” (Henretta, Brody & Dumenil, 2002, p. 234).

Under international law a nation's waters extended three miles out to sea because this was the maximum range of shore batteries. Whether through neglect or design, British warships often operated within American waters. The seizure of enemy ships and the impressment of seamen within the three-mile limit was a violation of the young republic's sovereignty that Americans found particularly objectionable. (Hickey, 2012, p. 12)

Some Americans cried foul when they learnt these incidents which showed the weakness of the US Navy and new republic against its nemesis, the British Empire. The incident which rendered the concerns of those Americans happened on June 22, 1807. “The [*sic*] British warship *Leopard* fired point-blank on the American frigate *Chesapeake* after the American captain refused a demand to search the vessel for alleged deserters” (Parsons, 2009, p. 22). Andrew Jackson was no exception amongst the Americans who sought revenge after the incident, at which he directed his ire to avenge the Americans against the British Empire and its American—the Federalists—and Indian allies with whom the British had been misleading to help. “The [*sic*] British supplied their needs to retain loyalty in case of war with the United States” (Hickey, 2012, p. 22). This calamity for the US was one of the leading factors to the War of 1812 because “the [*sic*] *Chesapeake* affair stirred public outrage throughout the United States” (p. 16). The affair was seen as the violation of the

sovereignty of the United States and it “continued to fester, contributing the rising anti-British feeling in America” (p. 16).

On November 7, 1811, the governor of Indiana Territory, William Harrison Henry, launched an attack, known as the Battle of Tippecanoe, to disperse a religious movement which turned into military one to obstruct the white settlers. It was a movement founded by “a Shawnee spiritual leader, Tenskwatawa (better known as the Prophet)” in 1805 (p. 22). Later, his brother who altered the movement into a military one, Tecumseh strove to organize his confederacy comprised of Native Americans to ward off further expansion of the white people. By the same token, the two brothers “forg[ed] closer bonds with the British” and they “established a camp at Prophetstown on the Wabash River just below the mouth of the Tippecanoe River in present-day Indiana and from there spread their message of resistance throughout the West” (p. 23). “Tecumseh was seen as the bulwark for the defense of Canada against the Americans by the British officials” who surmised that Tecumseh could help them to force the United States to yield to the demands of the British Empire (Conlin, 2010, p. 212). The war was won by William Harrison Henry with the help of one thousand regular soldiers, two hundred of which were killed during the battle but it “did little to deter the Indian depredations on the frontier, and the whole region remained unsafe” (Hickey, 2012, p. 24). The battle corroborated the claims of a lot of Americans who had assumed that the British were backing the Indians to incite violence when it was necessary for a war against the Americans. Besides, “the [sic] Indian war drove many natives in the region into the British camp”, where the native tribes and their leaders sought refuge from the Americans’ ire directed at both the British and their native allies since “the [sic] Indians were armed with British weapons, and this only served to reinforce the notion that the British were behind the depredations (p. 25).

After these significant incidents, the politicians in the United States were bickering over the war against the British Empire. On the one hand, The Federalists, dominantly supported by the New Englanders who extensively traded with the British, opposed the war with fear of losing their trade opportunities and networks. On the other, “the Republicans hoped to destroy British influence over American Indians and thus put an end to the nation’s recurring Indian wars” (p. 25). The views

of the Republicans regarding the war totally complied with the approach and attitude of Andrew Jackson who could not agree less than that. Furthermore,

Republicans also saw war as a way of vindicating American independence. As heirs of the American Revolution, the Republicans were steeped in Anglophobia. Extremely sensitive to British slights—as one would expect from citizens of a new nation—they saw British encroachments as part of a larger plot to keep the United States in a kind of quasi-colonial subjugation. (p. 25)

The hawkish attitude of the Republicans stimulated the lurking anti-British sentiments amongst the common folks including Jackson who expressed his support for war in a full-throated way. The numbers of those supporting war gradually increased and forced the government to take it into consideration.

Due to the fact that “the [*sic*] British did not just threaten American national security at sea. British agents supplied Indians in the Northwest and Southwest Territories against advancing American settlers, traders, and officials, even though these lands were technically within the United States” (Nester, 2013, p. 30). Andrew Jackson saw an opportunity to drum up support for the upcoming war both in his state, Tennessee, and in the capitol city. Since he “demand[ed] that the United States square off with Britain” long before, he was seen one of the defenders of his state and people (p. 29). Furthermore, “for [*sic*] Jackson, war for vengeance, honor, and character filled an existential void for the entire nation” and he later became the symbol of that void with his victories against the Native Americans and the British troops (p. 29). His determination and boldness drove people to respect him and soaked up his ideology, which was the cornerstone of his tradition. The War of 1812 was a watershed moment for Andrew Jackson and his Jacksonian tradition, which has become part of the American culture since then.

The incidents such as the *Chesapeake* affair and the Battle of Tippecanoe intensified the economic, political, and social problems which the United States had been going through due to the Napoleonic Wars in Europe for a long time. The political situation was radically shaken by foolhardy decisions made by the two different approaches to the American foreign policy at that time. These two were Jeffersonian and Hamiltonian approaches which came up with different policies to deal with the British Empire. “Jeffersonians believed in a weak central government, states’ rights, an agrarian-based economy, minimal international trade, and use of

only militia and gunboats for defense” (p. 31). However, their approach failed to prevent the war by not being able to safeguard American sovereignty and economic interests. For that reason, the Hamiltonians “advocated a muscular, problem-solving government that worked with the private sector to develop the nation’s infrastructure, industries, innovations, trade, finance, and schools. The result would be a dynamic, prosperous, diversified economy that would eventually surpass Britain and all other countries” (p. 31).

These two approaches’ failure to consolidate American power was neither condoned nor forgotten by the American people who had taken the approaches of the two significant American founding fathers at face value. They wised up to another approach which had been kicking around for some time. It was the Jacksonian tradition having begun to emerge in the western frontier before it was internalized by many white Americans. Walter Russell Mead (1999) opines that “the [sic] United States over its history has consistently summoned the will and the means to compel its enemies to yield its demands” (p. 6). For that reason, the new approach to which the American people turned was the Jacksonian tradition. William Nester (2013) sets forth that

Jacksonism’s attitudes and assertions existed long before it became a movement with a label. Indeed, Jacksonism’s core attitudes are as old as America. The slogans “might makes right,” “shoot first and don’t ask questions later,” and “my nation, right or wrong,” to cite some of the more prominent, appeal to those who are ignorant, angry, and fearful facing challenges to the nation that are rooted in the real world’s complexities, laws, paradoxes, and outright contradictions. (p. 32)

By the time the war approached, the ideas of Jacksonian approach had already worked its way through the minds and hearts of the majority of the Americans who are known as the War Hawks. They were “swelling [sic] numbers of congressmen, newspaper editors, and other influential Americans ... who were committed to settling the issue with force” (p. 32). By the same token, “they [sic] insisted that the United States could defeat the British Empire by swiftly conquering Canada” and they also believed that “they could either wield Canada as a bargaining chip in negotiations for British concessions or simply attach the vast territory and its natural resources to the United States” (p. 32). The policies that wanted to be employed by the Jacksonians insidiously reflected their way of understanding the world around them. They thought that “greed reinforced and reflected creed” (p. 32). Their greed

could be clearly picked up on amongst the white settlers in the frontier lands where they had to experience the violence and hurdles brought about by the British and their native allies. According to Mead (1999),

Through the long sweep of American history, there have been many occasions when public opinion, or at least an important part of it, got ahead of politicians in demanding war. Many of the Indian wars were caused less by Indian aggression than by movements of frontier populations willing to provoke and fight wars with Indian tribes that were nominally under Washington's protection-and contrary both to the policy and the wishes of the national government. The War of 1812 came about largely because of a popular movement in the South and Midwest. (p. 6)

The fact that the British Empire wanted to manipulate the Native Americans to incite violence in the frontier settlements could not be downplayed but the Jacksonians' attitude to seek for more violence and even war demonstrated their revengeful side. The underlying reason of their support for war was to "to seize ancestral lands from the Indians to take Canada from Britain, and to pry Florida from Spain" in order to come into possession of those "lands by force rather than diplomacy [for] land agents, farmers, and merchants" (Nester, 2013, p. 32).

The ideas of the Jacksonians were championed by many who regarded the policies of Jeffersonians and Hamiltonians as obsolete and ineffective for the future of frontiersmen and the United States. They considered that these two approaches were not in adept at dealing with the British that wreaked havoc on their society, honor, trade, and country. In order to get rid of these policies and people that took a heavy toll on the white folks and their country, "Jacksonians dominated [Thomas] Jefferson's Republican Party, which held 75 per-cent of the House seats and 82 percent of the Senate seats" (p. 32). They hastily ratified the proposal which suggested declare war against the British Empire by giving no chance the President James Madison to veto it. The President had to announce that he signed the proposal of the war against the British Empire on June 18, 1812.

The war, however, did not evolve into overwhelming victories for the Americans in the way Jacksonians and War Hawks predicted. It upset the balance in the politics by distracting Americans from the complications caused by the war itself. In addition, they could not even take the control of Canada since the "first invasion resulted in a hasty American retreat back to Detroit" (Henretta, Brody & Dumenil, 2002, p. 236). They also failed to hold "York (present-day Toronto)" for a

considerable of time under their control (p. 236). The main reason of these defeats and disappointments were nothing but political disputes.

New Englanders opposed the war and prohibited their militias from fighting outside their states. Boston merchants and banks declined to lend money to the federal government, making the war difficult to finance. In Congress Daniel Webster, a dynamic representative from New Hampshire, led Federalist opposition to higher taxes and tariffs and to the national conscription of state militiamen. (p. 236)

The division forced Americans to pay high costs during the war. They had only a few victories by 1813 and had significant casualties comparing to the British losses. But the Americans won only a few battles. They were the Battle of the Thames, at which William Harrison Henry, the governor of the Indiana territory, defeated the Native American and British troops by “killing Tecumseh [that was] a general in the British army” in 1813, and a substantial defeat of the British vessels on Lake Erie (p. 236). In spite of these victories, the British troops advanced and further complicated the matters in American politics and economics. “The most humiliating defeat of all came in August 1814, when a British expedition routed a more numerous American army at the Battle of Bladensburg and then marched on to sack an undefended Washington City” (Nester, 2013, p. 33). The British scorched the official buildings and humiliated the new republic one more time. They also “chased President Madison and his wife to the safety of Virginia” where he could seek refuge from the British invasion to zero in on the war Americans were losing (Parsons, 2009, p. 32).

Nevertheless, the good news came from the Southwest where “rugged slave[-]owning Andrew Jackson led an army of militiamen from Tennessee to victory over the British-supported Creek Indians in the Battle of Horseshoe Bend, forcing the Indians to cede 23 million acres of land” in 1814 (Henretta, Brody & Dumenil, 2002, p. 237). After he triumphed over the Creek Indians, he was seen as a national hero, who “[had been] bedridden and stricken by pain when word [had] arrived of the Fort Mims massacre” at that time (Nester, 2013, p. 36). The deal signed after the Creek War, The Fort Jackson, was one of the fundamental treaties which defined the relationship between the Native Americans and the white settlers. The treaty was the harbinger of “the beginning of the end not only for the Creek nation but for all Indians throughout the south and southwest” (Remini, 1977, p. 231). Moreover, Jackson got the Indians over a barrel by implementing his terms, which were aimed

at securing the white men's interests, in the treaty and he did not leave them any loopholes to be circumvented. Thanks to him, "millions [sic] of acres of choice land had been ripped out of the Indian domain and placed under the auction hammer of the land speculators. And the Indians must remove to get of the harm's way—for their own good" (p. 231). With these changes in the frontier, the white settlers gained a leverage which could not be brushed aside for their expansion towards the west and the southwest of the United States. He had already discovered how to conflate his personal and state's interests by utilizing law for the honor and victory, which undergirded the reprisal sentiments amongst the white folks, in the frontier life. It was a "pattern of land removal and seizure" that legally justified the westward expansion on the behalf of the frontiersmen (p. 231). Besides, what was accomplished by this sturdy frontiersman gingerly has to be reckoned with since he has been one of the controversial and disliked presidents of the United States of America.

Within the twenty-five years the entire family of red men, Creeks, Cherokees, Chickasaws, Choctaws, and Seminoles, were swept from the south and either buried under the ground or banished to the remote western country beyond the Mississippi River. And from start to finish the man most responsible for this expansion of the American empire was Andrew Jackson. (pp. 231- 232)

Upon the news that the British troops, which were roughly 8000, under the control of General Sir Edward Pakenham were going to launch an attack on New Orleans to capture it, thereby blocking the American traders' shipments in the western frontier from reaching to Atlantic Ocean, Andrew Jackson tenaciously gathered his militiamen from Tennessee and later he was on his way to New Orleans, where "morale was low, supplies were short, and the defense force consisted of only seven hundred men" (Parsons, 2009, p. 33). In addition to that, "it [sic] had been only eleven years since this heady mixture of twenty thousand French-speaking, Spanish-speaking, German-speaking, and English-speaking residents, not to mention a contingent of both slave and free African Americans, had become part of the United States" (p. 33). Andrew Jackson, however, was not a person to give up easily and he was ready to sacrifice everything to draw himself up to his full height and this is one of the reasons why he was referred as "Old Hickory" by his militiamen and supporters. "Military necessity forced Jackson to set aside his harsh prejudices

briefly and command the most culturally, linguistically, and racially mixed army in American history” in order to defeat the British (Nester, 2013, p. 46).

As a commander of the Southern militiamen, “he cobbled together an army of 2,000 Kentucky and Tennessee riflemen, New Orleans merchants, two battalions of free blacks, some Choctaw Indians, and artillerymen in the employ of a pirate-businessman, Jean Lafitte” (Conlin, 2010, p. 214). Although he was inflexible and determined to clash with the British troops that outnumbered the militiamen, he did not put anything at risk by taking advantage of geography of New Orleans to ward off the British attack. “Jackson’s men threw up earthworks 5 miles south of New Orleans, the Mississippi River on their right, swamp on the left. Jackson created a wide-open battlefield with his own army well protected” (pp. 214- 215). His strategic thinking helped him and his militiamen to defeat the British troops without much effort.

[General Sir Edward] Packenham should have paid closer attention to the battlefield Jackson had designed. But, like so many British generals, he disdained American soldiers too reflexively to take notice of how unfavorable his situation was. He sent his army through a morning mist in a straightforward frontal assault. Lafitte’s cannoneers raked the British with grapeshot. (p. 215)

The bull-headed and lion-hearted features of Andrew Jackson helped him get an upbeat victory over the British forces that constantly belittled the American militiamen and their way of waging wars. But the American forces led by Jackson changed the course of history on January 8, 1815. The British attack was staved off and General Sir Edward Packenham was dead along with his more than two thousand men, who were either dead or fatally wounded, while the American casualties were only thirteen dead and fifty-eight injured. This victory served as a bellwether for the future successes of Andrew Jackson who had “remained controversial in mid-Tennessee and obscure everywhere else, a tarnished westerner whose extreme views did not align with any popular movement or national party” before the war (Opal, 2017, p. 138).

The Americans were able to reclaim their damaged reputation by the British thanks to the victory at the Battle of New Orleans. Besides, Andrew Jackson was able to avenge himself against the British for what they had done to him, his family, people, and country. He had been biding his time when the War of 1812 broke out.

And he emerged as a national hero who brought the British, the arch enemy of the new republic, to its knees. Nevertheless, the British and Americans, who were represented by John Quincy Adams, had signed a peace agreement, the Treaty of Ghent, on Christmas Eve 1814 before the American militiamen and the British troops clashed. Although the treaty purported that the Americans could retain its borders as they had been before the War of 1812, the die was cast.

Nonetheless, Americans saluted the news with joy and thrill. “The story of Jackson’s victory over the British at New Orleans would become one of the great tales of the American saga. Americans were vicariously purged of shame and frustration” (Parsons, 2010, p. 35). Furthermore, “the outcome [of the battle] reaffirmed the young nation’s self-belief, restoring a sense of national prowess and destiny” (p. 35). Andrew Jackson was seen as a symbol of national defender, avenger, and a hero who “beat back the uniformed invaders from the sea and saved endangered female virtue”, which the Americans thought that the British were going to violate frantically (p. 35). John Quincy Adams, who was to be the opponent of Andrew Jackson in the presidential elections of 1824 and 1828 and would also stand behind Andrew Jackson when he invaded Florida by overlooking the orders of the President James Monroe in 1815, also was appreciated and seen as one the diplomatic contributors to the victory due to his success in finding a solution to the borderline issues by the Americans. In addition to that, the significance of the battle transcended the boundaries of the new republic in which the civilization versus the savages were reinvigorated with a new understanding. It was “America versus Europe, the West versus the East, the Forest versus the City, Virtuous Innocence versus Sophisticated Depravity” (p. 36). This new understanding conspicuously demonstrated the American frontier mentality, which was vigorously embodied by Andrew Jackson and Jacksonians.

For the Jacksonians of 1819, the American people were part of an epic drama, not a historical process. Because their households were in constant danger, they lived in emergency rather than ordinary time, and could transcend the law they meant to impose. The nation was more like a frontier home than a secure society ... Vengeance was a male duty, not a youthful sin. Especially on behalf of distant Americans rather than family or friends, it was indeed a civic duty, a bloody remaking of the liberty that framers had once invoked. Instead of worrying about how civilized they appeared to polite and commercial nations, the general’s followers argued, Americans should focus on instilling fear in savage ones. They

had to convince their most depraved foes that anyone who harmed an American, anywhere would suffer instant death. (Opal, 2017, p. 169)

At the end of the Battle of New Orleans, Andrew Jackson became a national hero. As a victorious general, he was celebrated and welcomed by the common white folks, whom he dearly loved and respected, wherever he visited. The Americans took solace in his victory in the War of 1812 and regarded him as a national symbol that stood against the British aggression and Native American barbarism. Moreover, he exemplified a strong and popular national character that could unite Americans for a common cause whenever the United States faced a crisis. In other words, Jackson was able to demonstrate his potential which could also unleash the new nation's potential as well. And he simply proved that he could do anything for payback for which Americans had been yearning with respect to the British Empire and the Native Americans in the western frontier.

1.3. THE ENTRENCHMENT OF JACKSONIAN TRADITION IN THE AMERICAN POLITICAL SYSTEM

The election held in 1824 was important for the future of the American politics and the maintenance of democracy. The fact that Andrew Jackson ran for the first time and that the popular vote was part of the election were new and exciting for this new nation and its eligible citizens—white men who were not allowed to cast a vote for the president rather than electing decision makers representing them until the election of 1824. The opportunity to vote for their president raised the dickens with the Northerners and the Southerners (including frontiersmen) since these white men were no longer subjected to vote for the elites who had disregarded the needs and issues of the frontiersmen by focusing on the trade in New England and dissipating anti-slavery ideas. Furthermore, the election of 1824 “remains the only election thus far to be resolved by the House of Representatives in accordance with the Constitution's Twelfth Amendment” (Parsons, 2010, p. 69). It means that “the [sic] House awarded the presidency to John Quincy Adams and denied it to Andrew Jackson, bringing about a permanent rupture between the two men”, who were seen as the heroes of the Battle of New Orleans (p. 69).

The era of 1824 was equated with the rise of popular politics in the United States, where the politics had been controlled by “wealthy notables” that were “northern landlords, slaveowning planters, and seaport merchants” thus far (Henretta, Brody & Dumenil, 2002, p. 310). With the rise of popular politics, the settlers in the west wanted their voices be heard in the capitol and did not want to see a man agreeing upon the ideas and policies of the Federalist Party, which was the voice of the elites in the eyes of the frontiersmen.

The election of 1824 comprised of five significant figures by trying to one-up each other with subterfuges and political maneuvers. Those figures were Andrew Jackson, John Quincy Adams—the son of the second president of the United States—John C. Calhoun, William H. Crawford, and Henry Clay. They all were well-known public figures with deep-seated ambitions in the politics except Andrew Jackson who did not like the politics and regarded it as petty affairs. Nonetheless, he was encouraged and convinced to run for the 1824 elections for the presidency of the United States of America. He was later nominated by the assembly in Tennessee. His nomination upset the balance in the American politics since “President Monroe’s cabinet members now saw [him] as a threat” (Opal, 2017, p. 164).

Amongst those five candidates, some had deep-seated ambitions and background in the politics. To exemplify, John Quincy Adams, whose father was John Adams, served as the Secretary of the State under the Monroe Administration between 1817 and 1825. John C. Calhoun was the Secretary of War, whilst William H. Crawford was the Secretary of Treasury at that time. By the same token, Henry Clay was no less experienced than the rest. He was the fervent speaker of the House of Representatives from Kentucky. But Andrew Jackson was not part of that people who paid court to other politicians in order to consolidate their power amongst the elites. What was achieved by those candidates was that

They introduced democracy to national politics by seeking support among ordinary voters. Thanks to democratic reforms, eighteen of the twenty-four states used popular elections (rather than a vote of the state legislature) to choose members of the electoral college. Thus, in three-quarters of the states the contest for the presidency depended directly on the votes of ordinary men. (Henretta, Brody & Dumenil, 2002, p. 312)

Jackson was the man of the people whose voices had been unheard in the capital for a long time since the frontiersmen and their problems left unresolved,

however. “His candidacy appealed to all those who were suspicious of the closed nature of the congressional caucus”, thereby making him one of the appreciated and celebrated candidates for the presidency amongst the all nominees (Parsons, 2010, p. 79). He became one of the most famous and idolized Americans at that time. Whatever state he visited, almost all of the people riveted their attention on him with respect and admire due to his victories during the War of 1812. Nationalistic sentiments amply oozed from him and the people, who rigorously cheered for him, began to gravitate towards him and his tradition which was enough for the unwavering support of Jacksonians.

Andrew Jackson did not need to go to great lengths to find support in the public because “his [sic] reputation as a man of civic virtue and plain solid republican utility attracted many voters, and his rise from common origins fit the tenor of the new democratic age” (Henretta, Brody & Dumenil, 2002, p. 312). His character and life style as a frontier, westerner, slaveholder, patriot, lawyer, general, and cotton planter defined his voters as well due to the changes in the 1824 election system. “Voters, many of them newly enfranchised and with new opportunities to influence the selection of a president, had to be approached in a manner different from that of the earlier generation” (Parsons, 2010, p. 90). For that reason, the elites of the north could not garner enough support amongst the frontiersmen and slave holders in the south and southwest who strongly and enthusiastically supported Jackson.

The campaign literature in 1824 reflects this. The emerging egalitarian rhetoric of second-generation American republicanism suggests that voters were more comfortable with candidates who were closer to them in education and experience. No one in the earlier generation claimed that [George] Washington, [Thomas] Jefferson, [John] Adams, or [James] Madison was an ordinary American. (p. 91)

The vast majority of the population toyed with the idea of seeing a tough leader who could understand and listen to them. A leader who was potent, charismatic, fearless, and revanchist at that time to protect them and the country at all costs, when the writing was on the wall. Hence, they voted for the only candidate having all those features, who was Andrew Jackson, while the rest of the candidates represented an unforeseeable future for citizens and the United States. Meanwhile, John Henry Eaton, sidekick of Andrew Jackson, released letters, which were called the Wyoming Letters, to the public by concealing his name. The fact that the letters

were written and published by his companion was unbeknownst to Jackson, who later was surprised and dumbfounded.

The Wyoming letters and their offshoots showed considerable amnesia as well as nostalgia. To portray the bewigged Framers of the Constitution as closet democrats envisioning common folk choosing a president (while at the same time creating the Electoral College) required imagination, at the very least. To present Jackson as a second [George] Washington, given that he was one of the few congressmen to oppose the resolution thanks for the Great Man's services in 1797, was also a bit of stretch. Not surprisingly, Wyoming made no mention of Jackson's congressional career. He had instead put his finger on a growing perception that somehow the will of the American people was being shoved aside by the intrigues and manipulations of a few. (Parsons, 2010, p. 94)

The letters prove that Jacksonians wanted to alter the perceptions of the public by pointing to the Northerner politicians who were figuratively and literally far cry from the rest of the United States in the way they approached to politics. Besides, the letters illustrated the chasm between the elites and common white folks, who were suspicious of the former, so that the Jacksonian community could take advantage of it. Eventually, they were able to convince a plenty of people to vote for their Jacksonian cause. Although Jackson's votes were higher than the rest, he was not elected as the president of the United States owing to the fact that none of the candidates had the majority of the electoral vote. Instead, the House of Representatives had to pick one of them and their choice was John Quincy Adams. He curried favor with Henry Clay, who later became the secretary of the state under Adams' administration, during the presidential race so that Clay could back him politically. He "used his powers to thwart Jackson's election. By the time the House met in February in 1825, Clay had assembled a coalition of congressmen from New England and Ohio Valley that voted Adams into presidency" (Henretta, Brody & Dumenil, 2002, p. 313). It was effortless to find and persuade the congressmen who could not dismiss the idea of Jackson, who was a westerner, rude, loose cannon, and slave-owner, as the president of the United States.

Table 1. Popular Votes of Presidential Candidates

Presidential Candidate	Popular Vote	Electoral College
Andrew Jackson	152,901	99
John Quincy Adams	114,023	84
William H. Crawford	46,979	41
Henry Clay	47,217	37

In the end, Jackson went back to the Hermitage and stayed there. The outcome of the election justified the distrust of Jacksonians regarding the politics and elites from the Northern states who had steered the wheel for a long time in the decision-making process, whereby they always prioritized their interests over the needs of the common folk and the country. This augmented the South and North divide in the country where the North had a say on every issue now. Andrew Jackson and his supporters, however, did not give up hitting out at the president and his cabinet members due to their secret arrangements during the presidential race of 1824. Owing to the fact that Henry Clay was appointed as the secretary of state, the “corrupt bargain” was deplored and criticized by Jacksonians who accused Adams for factoring out the popular vote. And this meant that the Adams administration was glossing over the demands and ideas of the majority who voted for Andrew Jackson.

Nonetheless, Andrew Jackson and Jacksonians gained a lot of experience for the election of 1828. Not only did they realize that they could win the presidential race, but they also could fall into line with the majority of white men in the country, who saw Jackson as their shepherd like Jesus Christ to lead them like sheep to a safe haven. In addition to that, Andrew Jackson’s reductionist approach, which had been part of him since his time in the Carolinas, was seen as a way of discerning friends from foes by implementing a military mind-set to American politics by Jacksonians. He did not go to great lengths to ruminate over the details in which black and white were enough to get by for him.

The vast majority of Jacksonians were determined to win this campaign unlike the one in 1824. They were very-well organized to defeat their opponents at all levels. Andrew Jackson was no different than his supporters in commitment to the race which he lost four years ago. Despite the fact that he was the choice of the people in 1824, he did not take the support of the people for granted and buckled down to working hard to make sure that he had the endorsement of the voters once again. He was also aware of the importance of his character and image in the race. That is why he thought that he needed another party with which he could be affiliated rather than the Republican (The Democratic-Republican Party) or the Federalist,

which had been founded by Alexander Hamilton in 1789. In addition to that, The National Republican Party was famous with its fierce opposition to Andrew Jackson. At the end, Old Hickory and Jacksonians came up with the Democratic Party to run for the presidency and represent the will of the people.

The 1828 race was a closely contested election in which John Quincy Adams, the president of the US at that time, and Andrew Jackson represented two disparate ways of American culture and politics. On the one hand, John Quincy Adams represented an elitist way of life and sought a similar path for the US as well by disregarding the views of most Americans. On the other hand, Andrew Jackson represented a frontiersman way of life in which common white men and their needs and interests were to be secured and sustained gingerly. He stood for the common folks who felt not appreciated and disparaged by the elites. The population was not looking for a stuck-up whose breach of decorum was different from theirs. Hence, Andrew Jackson was the one they could vote for to be governed with respect and dignity. Furthermore, he “had a unique appeal in the postwar, post-panic, and even post-party 1820s” unlike Adams and his partners (Opal, 2017, p. 191).

John Quincy Adams justified the claims of Jacksonians that he was an elitist in an event, which was held in December 1827, to remember the ones having defended Baltimore against the British during the War of 1812. He gave a speech in which he used French words which confounded the ordinary people in the audience. “Realizing that he had puzzled the group, Adams hastily explained that the allusion was taken from French writer Voltaire’s *Le Blanc et Le Noir*, in which *Blanc* (white) stood for the good Americans, *Noir* (black) for the evil British invaders” (Parsons, 2010, p. 167). But his explanation was even an unconscious acknowledgement that he was not from the common folks unlike Jackson whose language reflected the frontier culture and the hard times he had to go through as most of the Americans did. The election was fundamentally between the representatives of two significant concepts for American democracy, which was “democracy” and “aristocracy” (Wagner, 2007, p. 41). On the one hand Andrew Jackson symbolized the democracy for the common white folks across the United States. On the other hand, John Quincy Adams embedded aristocracy for specific people mostly living in the industrialized northern states.

With an emphasis on individualism and national honor Jackson challenged Adams in the election of 1828. But the significance of the election in the political history of the US was behind Andrew Jackson's landslide victory. "Before 1828 voters took more interest in state and local elections than they did in the presidency. Afterwards the pattern was reversed" (p. 184). The white men realized that they could vote for the person by whom they wanted themselves to be governed. Besides, this further amplified the party politics and made people conscious of the political debates and issues around them. In short, the election of 1828 laid the groundwork for the party politics in the US. And Andrew Jackson was behind this substantial change with his group, which was the Democratic Party. "The Democrats would dominate presidential politics for the next thirty years, during which they would win six out of eight presidential elections" (p. 187).

What is more, the slavery issue would divide the Democratic Party in the future. The Southern Democrats (Yellow Dog Democrats) would champion slavery in the annexed lands after the Mexican-American War and in the new acquired territories, while the Northern Democrats would oppose the expansion of the slavery in the new territories joining the Union. Their division would lead to titanic changes in US history, in which the Civil War would break out in 1861 and last four years until 1865. Furthermore, the Democratic Party in the South would be seen as the bulwark of the white men and women's authority over the people who would not have right to vote such as African Americans and other minorities in the Southern States, where Jacksonians dominantly resided, until the mid-twentieth century.

Andrew Jackson served between 1829 and 1837 as the first populist president of the United States. He ushered a new era in which the party politics were deeply entrenched in the American political culture. He became the mouth of the majority of Americans whose voices had been unheard for years. The Jacksonians stood beside him and supported his decisions, which would let them hold sway over the new republic for the next decade, in order to spread democracy and strengthen the will of the common folks rather than the elites. Beyond that, Jacksonians began to emerge as the bedrock of the president's policies which were aimed to increase and ameliorate the life standards thereof. John Yoo (2008) sets forth that

Upon winning the election of 1828, Jackson embarked on a transformation of the political system and the Presidency. He sought to advance the cause of democracy, and made an expanded executive power his tool in that great project. To Jackson, democracy meant that the will of the majority should prevail, regardless of existing governmental and social arrangements. (p. 102).

Moreover, Andrew Jackson surrounded himself with the people having the same vision as he had for the United States of America to incrementally intensify the transformation under his leadership. But the most of the people around him were not part of the official cabinet that had the approval of Congress. And later his unofficial cabinet came to be called as Kitchen Cabinet, the advices of which were to be reckoned with by Jackson. The members of the cabinet significantly mattered since Jackson relied upon their thoughts and views before coming up with decisions.

Its most influential members were Francis Preston Blair of Kentucky, who edited the *Washington Globe*; Amos Kendall, also from Kentucky, who helped Jackson write his public papers; Roger B. Taney of Maryland, who became attorney general and then chief justice of the United States; and the most influential, Secretary of State Martin Van Buren. (Henretta, Brody & Dumenil, 2002, p. 317)

Those members played very significant role while implementing the Jacksonian policies and their connections opened the doors for President Jackson to solidify his political power to win the hearts and minds of the ordinary white men along with the southern slave holders who disliked the idea of abolition of the slavery supported by the Northerners. Additionally, the president “used patronage to create a loyal and disciplined national party”, which could assist him thoroughly for his future political ventures (p. 317). He also utilized the influence he had in order to drum up support in different institutions within which he needed their assistance to legalize the bills for the phenomenal change. To substantiate the change while “using [sic] the spoils system”, he “dispensed government jobs to aid his friends and win support for his legislative program” (p. 317).

Andrew Jackson was decisive and adamant to bring an extraordinary change to the political and cultural codes of the American system with his military-minded approaches rather than political oriented way of thinking. Therefore, he ordered the native people of the southwest to go further west so that the white settlers could take their lands for farming and dwelling on. He showed that he did not leave his vengeance behind the election times where it was controversial topic with the removal of the tribes. In the early 1820s during the election of 1824, “senators had bickered over the ways of protecting the American frontier and wound up

abandoning the idea of revenge” (Opal, 2017, p. 195). Besides, he suggested that the power wielded by the national government be reduced and confined to a degree to which the states could rule themselves better and effectively. In other words,

He advanced a new vision of the President as the direct representative of the people. Jackson put theory into practice with the vigorous exercise of his executive powers—interpreting the Constitution and enforcing the law independently, wielding the veto power for policy as well as constitutional reasons, and re-establishing control over the executive branch. (Yoo, 2008, p. 105)

Eventually, he opened the doors for the white Americans to rule themselves and follow the path they wished to seek for their fortunes without much interference from the Federal and state governments so that they could enjoy their liberty and freedom. His legacy underscored the importance of individualism and to live a life which is full of hope and opportunity. The idea of sovereignty was permanently introduced to the Americans who sternly heeded and absorbed the legacy of Jackson. In addition to that, common white folks were eager to preserve and protect what they inherited from Jackson by avenging themselves against any adversary if necessary.

By the same token, Jackson’s path to the Oval Office has entrenched itself in American political culture by introducing the two-party system, which is today dominated by the Republican and the Democratic Party, which was founded by Jackson and his followers. His support for the spoils system has also become part of the American politics.

1.4. THE TARIFF AND NULLIFICATION CRISIS

The crisis of tariff and nullification was important because the tariff Andrew Jackson implemented in his first term contributed to his landslide victory, thereby earning a lot of votes from the Americans who supported the tariffs. Nevertheless, his winning led to a serious problem, in which Jackson wielded his power to defend and protect the Union. The stability and compromise in the Union became significant to sustain the harmony in the United States where Jackson championed the rights of the states over the Federal government, but this crisis made him realize that protecting the Union was the most vital action as a president of the people, who had founded the country as a result of a revolution which cost a lot of blood and lives.

The national tariffs, which were aimed to cut the trade with other nations, were fiercely resisted by the southern planters whose advices to the Federal government went unheeded. The harshest opposition came from Andrew Jackson's homeland, South Carolina, in which the planters felt that they needed protection from the slaves in case of any racial tension. The incidents brought about by Nat Turner would sear into the memories of the slave owners who feared that some kind of uprising could happen at any time. Due to the fact that "South Carolina was the only state with African American majority—56 percent of the population in 1830—which made it more like Jamaica or Barbados than the rest of the South", the residents of it did not want to accept the national tariffs (Henretta, Brody & Dumenil, 2002, p. 319). Furthermore, South Carolinians along with the other Southerners realized that their complaints were not taken into considerations. Their economic and personal securities were left aside by the Federal government. Aside from that, "the [sic] tariff hit the South's economic interests hard; planters had to export raw material, primarily cotton, into the competitive world market, but had to purchase finished products in the home market where tariffs kept prices high" (Yoo, 2008, p. 141).

The dispute did not end well for the southern cotton farmers who "believed that their crop was paying the country's bills and underwriting industrial development in the North" (Conlin, 2010, p. 267). Some of them also thought that "the Constitution prohibited taxation for purposes other than raising revenue and that one part of the nation—the North—could not benefit from taxes at the expense of another" (Yoo, 2008, p. 141). The fact that the southern cotton growers could not agree with the tariff was obvious in 1832 in the Congress, where their demands were officially downgraded and the tariffs were not reduced accordingly. Following the decision of the Congress, they girded themselves for the worst and "in [sic] November leading South Carolinians called a state convention, which boldly adopted an Ordinance of Nullification" (Henretta, Brody & Dumenil, 2002, p. 320). They surmised that "the [sic] Ordinance declared the tariffs of 1828 and 1832 null and void, forbade the collection of those duties in the state after February 1, 1833, and threatened secession if the federal government tried to collect them" (p. 320).

Andrew Jackson was, however, determined to prevent South Carolina from leaving the Union and reason out a way in which the state and Federal governments

could compromise. “At [his] request, Congress passed a Force Bill early in 1833 authorizing him to use the army and navy to compel obedience” (p. 320). After this bill, South Carolinians veered away from their decision, which was not endorsed by any state in the South, and agreed upon the terms set by the Federal government on the tariffs. And the crisis underscored that Jackson was adamant and decisive to implement his policies by any means of necessary. For that reason, he also clearly showed the people around him including his opponents that they had to comply with him one way or another in order to satisfy the needs of the common Americans, of whom majority were comprised Jacksonians.

This crisis has been the cornerstone of Jacksonian tradition since it showed the significance of the Union that had to be defended no matter what. And it has assured that Jacksonians must do whatever necessary when the United States faces an existential crisis, whether it is internal or external. Besides, the tariff crisis showed the importance of federal government for the Northerners while the Southerners realized that they could not oppose the federal government as long as they remained within it.

1.5. THE BANK WAR

It was a war about the Second Bank of the United States which was disliked by many ordinary and rich Americans due to its monetary policies. The Second Bank was supposed to be the backbone of the American economy with its objective of balancing the dollar. It operated under the authority of Nicholas Biddle who was the president of the bank and was later hoodwinked by Henry Clay and Daniel Webster to solicit for “an early recharter of the Bank” (Henretta, Brody & Dumenil, 2002, p. 321). Though Biddle did not like the idea of the government intervening in the Bank’s operations, he made a deal with two politicians who had clandestine plans to remove Jackson from the power. Clay and Webster wanted to make Jackson lose the election of 1832 with a scandal involving the Second Bank of the US. By the same token, the president of the Bank seized every opportunity to solidify the power of the Bank and himself. “He made sure his influence was felt by paying newspaper editors and legislators to defend the Bank” (Yoo, 2008, pp. 122-123).

Nevertheless, the attempts of Clay and Webster to nip the election of Jackson in the bud were failed by Jackson who discerned their cunning plan to split the Democrat Party into two political factions, thereby causing confusion and complexities during the election time. Besides, he had had a distaste of the Bank for a long time. He did not see it as the Bank having been in the benefit of the country or common people. “As with the Federal Reserve Bank today, the Second Bank’s control over the supply of money allowed it to influence, if not control, the nation’s lending activities, interest rates, and economic growth” and this made his blood boil with the possibility of being manipulated by foreign nations in a time of war or calamity (p. 121). Also, he had realized the activities of the Bank mostly benefited the rich whose gains were surreptitiously tied to the profits of the Bank. As a consequence of it, “Jackson decided to rein in, and then destroy, the Second Bank. He viewed it as an institution that benefited a small financial elite. Corruption and outright embezzlement plagued its earlier years” (p. 121).

The bill asking for of the recharter of the Bank expected than four years earlier was nixed by the president Jackson who he threw salt on his opponents’ game. In addition to that, he stressed the significance of the Constitution in his explanation in which why he vetoed the bill.

Jackson’s veto of the Bank presented a striking declaration of independence from the other branches of government. He gave no deference to the views of Congress, the Supreme Court, or even past Presidents on the constitutionality of the Bank. Jackson believed that as President, he had a duty to decide for himself what the Constitution meant and to use the powers of the Presidency to advance that vision. Jackson’s was not a passive vision of the Presidency, nor was it limited to self-defense of the office. He did not limit his powers solely to protecting the Presidency from the encroachments of the other branches. As with the Bank, Jackson believed that the President should use his power affirmatively to prevent the other branches from violating his view of the Constitution, even if their policy did not infringe on executive branch prerogatives. (p. 127)

The Old Hickory showed everybody that he represented the majority of Americans with his decision on the Second Bank of the United States, which helped him to win the election of 1832. Aside from that, the “most fervent supporters [of Jackson] were farmers and workers whose lives had been disrupted by price fluctuations or falling wages” since the Bank “had maintained monetary stability and restrained expansion-minded banks in the western states, forcing some to close” (Henretta, Brody & Dumenil, 2002, pp. 321-322). Moreover, he thought that he

could make the lives of ordinary white Americans better and prosperous with the power he wielded “by reducing rather than expanding the role of government in society” with ease (Yoo, 2008, p. 126). “Deregulation, however, would not benefit big business. Instead, Jackson believed that government regulation entrenched the rich in power; getting the government out of the way would allow individual talents and merit to come to the fore” (p. 126). He, therefore, regarded his action as legitimate since the common white men could equally benefit from that. To illustrate, “state [*sic*] bakers welcomed the demise of the Second Bank, and thousands of middle-class Americans—lawyers, clerks, shopkeepers, artisans—cheered his attacks on privileged corporations. They wanted equal opportunity to rise in the world” where the elites had significant influence (Henretta, Brody & Dumenil, 2002, p. 322).

The Bank War has come to reassert the Jacksonian community’s mistrust with regard to the elites, who are known to have significant financial, political, and cultural power in the United States. The fact that Andrew Jackson was able to foil a plot organized by some corrupt elites to prevent him from taking the power remains a clear example for Jacksonians who do not have any sympathy for the elites that promote the policies Jacksonians frown on. Last but not the least, the result of the Bank War demonstrated that President Jackson was to follow the Constitution as it was written without interpreting it.

1.6. THE INDIAN REMOVAL

The views of Andrew Jackson towards the African Americans and Native Americans reflected its era in which they were seen as savages, inferior, and uncivilized. By the time Jackson got elected in 1828, he had shared his point of views regarding the native tribes on many occasions. For instance, before the Creek War broke out in 1813, he “had made clear his chilling vision for the Indian tribes, writing that Indians were barbarians and banditti” (Rose, 2015, p. 105). He considered them as inferior to the white men who were civilized and destined to rule over them. And the actions taken by Jackson proved it but it was also interesting that he had adopted a Native American boy during the Creek War, which contradicted his views.

Nevertheless, Andrew Jackson was determined to finish what he started while he was leading the state militia before being elected as the president. It was to avenge themselves against the Native Americans who murdered and tortured white settlers by obstructing their expansion, thereby blocking the enlargement of the United States towards the west and south. He wanted common folks live and cherish in a peaceful and prosperous country, where they felt secure against all the frontier violence and European power struggle. Hence, he also saw the Native Americans as a security issue with which diligently had to be dealt. The President Jackson wanted to straighten the native issue out with high-handed approaches which he was not able to terminate a decade ago. He believed that the new republic had “to solidify its own sovereignty and security by undermining Indians’ independence and isolating them from potential European allies. Once Indians were left without British or other European support, the United States would be able to exert firmer control over them” (p. 105).

In order to secure and protect the United States and Americans, Jackson wanted to remove the Native American tribes from their ancestral lands for further expansion and peaceful environment for the white settlers. He wholeheartedly believed that “his policies actually served their best interests. The Indians were savages bound for extinction. By taking their ancestral land and sending them westward, he saved them from being immediately overrun and either wiped out or assimilated by white settlers” (Nester, 2013, p. 148). His resolution was not opposed unlike his previous policies. Most of the Americans agreed with Jackson and perceived the native tribes as a security issue which could prevent them from being able to reach the abundant resources of the western lands and they endorsed the decision of their removal from those lands. Furthermore, the general attitude amongst the Americans was no different from the government officials.

They [all] did not believe it necessary to assess the degree of civilization of any particular community of Indians but presumed that every polity made up of people who were racially classified as Indian lacked civilization, regardless of the group’s actual cultural practices. Presumed to be uncivilized people, Indian polities necessarily lacked sovereignty in Americans’ eyes. In practice, that was also how European imperialist ventures worked in the late nineteenth century: nonwhite people were categorically presumed to be “uncivilized” and to lack sovereignty, thus warranting their exclusion from the protections of international law. (Rose, 2015, p. 122)

The Indian Removal Act was signed by President Jackson in 1830 by officially declaring that the Native Americans living in the eastern side of the Mississippi River should move to the western side. Those who repudiated the Act would be removed by force. Most of the native leaders and US government officials were bribed to realize the removal, which “many [sic] eastern whites, including those sympathetic to the Native American peoples, also favored” (Henretta, Brody & Dumenil, 2002, p. 323). The Act ordered the tribes of the Old Southwest, in which “the so-called Five Civilized Tribes; the Cherokees and Creeks in Georgia, Tennessee, and Alabama; the Chickasaws and Choctaws in Mississippi and Alabama; and the Seminoles in Florida” were living, to leave their ancestral lands (p. 323).

This decision paved the way for an incident which seared into the memories of the most Americans. It is known as the Trail of Tears. “During the summer [in 1838], Martin Van Buren, who had succeeded Jackson as president, ordered General Winfield Scott to enforce the treaty” signed by the Cherokees and the US government (p. 325). The Cherokees like most of the native tribes did not want to abandon their ancestral lands for a designated new Indian Territory and chose to resist the decision of the US government, but “Scott’s army rounded up about 14,000 Cherokees and forcibly marched them 1,200 miles” (pp. 325-326). This forcible replacement caused the Cherokees to lose four hundred and twenty-four people on the way (Nester, 2013, p.153). In total, approximately 4000 Native Americans passed away during this painful and overwhelming journey.

The removal of Native Americans was an attempt to safeguard the values and ideas that Jacksonians would inherit from President Jackson. Their tradition strongly approves of any kind of actions to protect the well beings of Jacksonians against the enemies and alien cultures. For that reason, the Jacksonian tradition is ruthless when it comes to their security and strives to eliminate any threat to them at all costs.

CHAPTER TWO

THE JACKSONIAN TRADITION AND AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

The foreign policy of the United States has been tried to be conceptualized by many scholars and decision-makers across the globe, yet many have failed to expound upon the approaches taken by the American administrations except Walter Russell Mead, who trumped up four US foreign policy schools of thought: Hamiltonian, Jeffersonian, Jacksonian, and Wilsonian. Although the theories of international relations have been utilized to make of and analyze US foreign policy, many of those have fallen short. Mead (1996) unequivocally explains the reason why these schools of thought matter for American studies in every field thereof.

Viewing American foreign policy through this particular historical lens—rather than thought that of such abstract conventional categories as isolationist, internationalist, idealist, or realist—promises to yield richer results for analysis and policy-makers alike. (p. 90)

These US foreign policy traditions encapsulate the approaches of many presidents with diverse backgrounds and of their administrations in tandem with the international affairs. They help those studying US foreign policy understand and conceptualize it with ease. Furthermore, these schools of thought are the reflections of paramount American political figures having left a legacy which still continues to linger on in American political culture as of today. These figures are Alexander Hamilton, Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, and Woodrow Wilson.

The fact that those figures are still known by plenty of ordinary Americans and the decision-makers evinces that their legacy and heritage help the United States prove itself as a nation of cumulative experiences, which are kept in the mind of officials to improve and modify foreign and domestic policies for the expanding and changing interests of US. Grasping these schools of thought paves the way for a comprehensive knowledge of various cliques in the American society and political culture within which each faction has had significant power to influence the decision-making process up till now.

2.1. AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY TRADITIONS

First of these schools of thought is Hamiltonian tradition that derives its name from one of the Founding Fathers and the first Secretary of the Treasury, Alexander Hamilton. Mead clearly defines that “the Hamiltonian vision has been the most consistently influential of the four schools with respect to the conduct of American foreign policy” (p. 90). For that reason, this approach requires serious attention with the purpose of dissecting Trump’s foreign policy and which tradition he has surmised his policies fit properly as well. “As the early Hamiltonians worked out their ideas concerning American foreign policy, they found themselves—naturally and inevitably under the circumstances—looking to Britain as a model. But they went beyond their model” (p. 92).

The British Empire played significant role in the construction of Hamiltonian tradition in which British decision-making process laid the groundwork for the Hamiltonians’ view on American foreign policy. It is palpable that there has not been any nation which “has dominated American foreign policy thinking as Britain has done; the national preoccupation with the Soviet Union during the Cold War was neither as intense or as focused as the national concern with Great Britain during most of [American] history” (Mead, 2002/2009, p. 115). Hamiltonians basically dovetailed British foreign policy ideas with the American national interests, thereby establishing an Anglo-American tradition that has heretofore dominated US foreign policy establishment. Therefore, Hamiltonian thought mirrors the mentality of British politicians on many issues and they are also similar to their European companions in many ways such as their attitudes, perspectives, education styles, and cultural taste. Mead writes that

Speaking very broadly, as a group they often either come from or work for the class of people in the United States who most resemble the upper classes of European society; they have read the same books as their European counterparts, studied the same subject at school, heard (if musically inclined) the same operas, and hold similar opinions on many subjects... Unwary European diplomats in the company of Hamiltonian thinkers like Henry Cabot Lodge Sr. or the elder George Bush may think that they are dealing with men who inhabit the same intellectual universe they do: Hamiltonians speak the language of Continental realism. (p. 100)

In their foreign policy approach, the Hamiltonians are driven by the national interest, which is something they are capable of doing anything to advance and secure. They believe that free trade can bring about a wealthy country in which

national interests could be safeguarded with ease by creating a peaceful environment. According to Hamiltonian understanding, American national interests could be defined in terms of commerce and trade which would share its benefits to the other nations that live up to Hamiltonian rules and principles. They consider that economy constitutes the most essential factor in the strength of America's place in the world, where US foreign policy must correspond to that with cooperation and agreements that further advance American interests by any means necessary.

Thus, it is striking that “freedom [*sic*] of the seas...remains the single point on which American interests are most likely to come into conflict with those of other powers” (Mead, 1996, p. 94). And this phenomenon can be seen in the two world wars in which Americans decisively fought. When the German Empire and the Nazi Germany posed a serious threat to American trade with the European nations in the Atlantic Ocean, US had to be part of the wars from which it had tried to shy away. Besides, the attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941 by the Japanese Empire was a cardinal threat to American trade and national interests in the Asia-Pacific region. Last but not the least, the current problems in the South China Sea is likely to drive Hamiltonians to strenuously protect and defend their country's interests in the same region where the incident having caused US to declare war against the Axis Powers occurred seventy-nine years ago.

The second and one of the most famous schools of thought is the Wilsonian tradition. It is named for a tribute to the twenty-eight president of the United States, Woodrow Wilson who wanted to spread his principles after the World War I to the nations of Europe with the intention of maintaining an international order and peace in conjunction with American interests. Despite the fact that President Wilson was not first of his kind in believing that disseminating American values and norms across the globe, this school of thought is known with his name. Wilsonians essentially deem that “the United States has both a moral and a practical duty to spread its values through the world” wherein “American interests require that other countries accept basic American values and conduct their foreign and domestic affairs accordingly” (Mead, 2002/2009, pp. 87 & 88).

The Wilsonian tradition purports that the United States stands as the best example of how a democratic state should act in the international system and that is why the others must be modified to look like the US by internalizing American culture and values. Wilsonians believe that American culture and values must be regarded as the state ideology and spreading them all over the world must be prioritized in foreign policy making process in order to advance the interests of US in all areas without any difficulty.

Democracy and human rights are their two significant ideas, which have been equated with American values in their mind, to spread and to be appreciated in the world. The Wilsonian tradition claims that “nondemocratic regimes must accept democracy through either peaceful or violent ways to maintain a peaceful and democratic international system” so that the US can smoothly work with these democratic countries on many issues (p. 173). For this reason, Wilsonians always prioritize these liberal values that comply with American interests and culture in their foreign and domestic policies. Hence, the Wilsonian tradition highly values the missionaries who go to overseas to live and spread Christianity along with American culture and values. However, the foreign policy with regards to nondemocratic countries has been the crux of their dispute with other schools of thought and will likely to remain so.

From the end of the Cold War to the end of the Clinton administration, Wilsonianism battled with Hamiltonianism to be the dominant force in American foreign policy. Much of the contemporary fighting over foreign policy—as, for example, with respect to China—reflects a conflict between the Hamiltonian quest to build a global commercial order and the Wilsonian view that that order must also be based on principles of democratic government and the protection of human rights. (Mead, 2002/2009, p. 139)

Moreover, they do not hesitate to wage wars for spreading and safeguarding American or liberal values if necessary. The Iraq War in 2003 demonstrates their steadfast commitment to their philosophy. Their involvements in the Color Revolutions in the post-Soviet countries in the early 2000’s and the Arab Spring in the early 2010’s is the well-known instances within which Wilsonians forthrightly brought their influence in US foreign policy establishment to the fore to spread democracy and human rights in the backward and nondemocratic countries in their vantage points. The Houses of Representatives and Congress also passed a “bill that is aimed to impose sanctions on Chinese authorities due to their treatment of Uighur

Muslims” (Reuters, 2020). And this bill, which is known as the Uyghur Human Rights Policy Act of 2020, substantiates the sway of Wilsonians and their tradition, which has been deeply entrenched in the American institutions.

The third school of thought is the Jeffersonianism. It is called after the first Secretary of the State and third president of the United States, Thomas Jefferson. This tradition regards democracy as a gift that should not be seen as an everlasting blessing. Jeffersonians believe that the propensity to break the laws and to become a greedy person is the presumable threats to democracy, which is something to be safeguarded at all costs at home rather than abroad. The Jeffersonian emphasis on democracy comes from their unwavering belief of the Revolutionary War which paved the way for their liberty.

Along with the Jacksonian school of thought, Jeffersonians are “from idiosyncratic elements of American (or Anglo-American) culture, remain less well known, less well liked, and much less well understood” (Mead, 2002/2009, pp. 174 & 175). The mutual interest of these two traditions is that “the object of [American] foreign policy should be to defend ... [America] values at home rather than to extend them abroad” (p. 175). Therefore, the Jeffersonians do not seek adventures abroad that could entrap US in the quicksand of foreign lands. They mostly strive to maintain American security in the international affairs by coming up with grand strategies to defend and protect their country. Two of the most famous Jeffersonians are “John Quincy Adams and George Kennan”, whose strategic visions helped US foreign policy adapt to the realities of its epoch (p. 87). John Quincy Adams crafted the Monroe Doctrine, in which the European powers were aimed to be kept out of the new world. On the other hand, George Kennan came up with the striking strategy of the Cold War—the containment—to prevent the Soviet Union’s growing influence from affecting the rest of the democratic countries around the world. In addition to that, this school does not aim to alter the international system unlike the previous two schools of thought; Hamiltonianism and Wilsonianism. Jeffersonians have come to balk at the idea of the American hegemony because of its responsibilities and ramifications for American democracy. They reckon that the resources and time spent to maintain US hegemony might cost the corruption of democracy at

home, whilst the other nations do not candidly support a hegemonic power that dictates certain values and norms upon their deep-rooted traditions.

Furthermore, Jeffersonians strive to minimize the risk of war when they want to advance US interests by strategically calculating every detail in their moves. But they think that if they “speak [*sic*] softly, and carry the smallest possible stick”, they can achieve their foreign policy goals without much difficulty (p. 192). For that reason, their foreign policy is scrupulously developed to circumvent any possible and unnecessary wars that could cause US to spend its resources and time for nothing such as the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. Due to the fact that their approach to foreign policy is strategic and meticulous unlike the other schools of thought, the Jeffersonian tradition habituates American foreign policy to a grand strategy which gives many decision-makers and leaders the ability to see the bigger picture (geopolitics), thereby factoring out the petty affairs which could filibuster the decision-making process.

In a nutshell, the Jeffersonian school of thought is very circumspect with regards to foreign policy, in which Jeffersonians always sound the alarm about the dangers and security threats which can damage US interests. This school comes up with a grand strategy which helps US overcome the era’s hurly-burly all the time. Maintaining and safeguarding democracy at home is their priority. Jeffersonians believe that the pitfalls limiting the freedom of the individuals must be got rid of for the sake of democracy and liberty of the populace. Unlike the former schools of thought, Hamiltonian and Wilsonian traditions, the Jeffersonianism proposes American point of view to the international affairs and domestic policies along with the Jacksonian tradition, which is the last but most essential school of thought to come to grips with US foreign and domestic policy in this century.

The Jacksonian school of thought is the less known and appreciated US foreign policy tradition amongst people who strive to savvy American foreign policy along with its domestic policy. It is named after Andrew Jackson who was the seventh president of the United States. He ushered a new era in American politics and culture with his mind-set and approach because of the challenges he faced in his life time. There are distinct features which differentiate him from the rest of the

representatives of the schools of thought. He was not a politician unlike the others and had not even held any significant position in the administrations of the presidents until his presidency in 1828. He was a formidable general and personality who reflected frontier culture and westerner mentality to his marrows. What he experienced in his life time at all levels has remained in American culture heretofore. Neither world wars nor globalization has managed to obfuscate and jettison his ideas and tradition from the layers of American society, wherein the common white folks have proudly carried the torch having been given to them by the former generation of Jacksonians.

The prominent Jacksonians who “have managed to tap into the power of the populist energy that Old Hickory rode in to the White House” are Richard Nixon, Ronald Reagan, Donald J. Trump, Pat Buchanan, Steve Bannon, John McCain, George Wallace, Jesse Ventura, Ross Perot, Douglass McArthur, and George S. Patton Jr. (p. 230). These people are the prominent leaders with whom Jacksonians agreed on many issues regarding the order they wanted to create in their homeland. Besides, they have a tendency to stand behind their leaders no matter what happens unless those leaders stop caring about Jacksonians and their problems irrespective of the leaders’ age and private life. The reason of their unwavering support comes from the campaign Andrew Jackson mounted during his presidency. He paved the way for a white male suffrage, which later led the common white folks to discover their power in American politics.

Despite the fact that Andrew Jackson founded the Democratic Party, most of Jacksonians “altered their alliance to the Republican Party under Richard Nixon” in the late 1960’s due to the policies implemented by President Lyndon B. Johnson (p. 224). His policies were about “racial and economic liberalism” such as “the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965” along with “Medicare, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and the War on Poverty” in the South (Black, 2004, p. 1010). Those policies altered the balance of power in the states which used to be part of the Confederacy by giving African Americans and other minority groups to vote. As a result of these policies, Southern democrats, white people who had united under the Democratic Party since the late 1830’s with the leadership of Andrew Jackson, started losing faith in their own party because

African Americans were able to vote, thereby weakening the control of white people in the state and legislative affairs. By the same token, Northern Democrats (liberal white people) focused on African Americans and other minority groups rather than white people to garner vote as a means to advance their political interests. And this significant change has substantially affected American politics at domestic and foreign policy levels ever since the white men suffrage started by pushing Jacksonians to associate themselves with the Republican Party since the Presidency of Richard Nixon.

It is a fact that “culture [sic] educates ... [people] about ... [their] generational debts and obligations. At its best, it is a tangible inheritance of the past, one that each of ... [Jacksonians] is obligated to regard with the responsibilities of trusteeship” (Deneen, 2018, p. 77). For that reason, only by unraveling Andrew Jackson’s cultural codes can one come to grips with the Jacksonian tradition and how it has come to manifest itself in American culture and foreign policy for centuries.

The legacy left by Andrew Jackson not only affected the people of his era, but also it has been one of the cornerstones of American culture that can be observed at many levels of American society today. His heritage and experience culminated in the Jacksonian tradition which is the last and the most effective school of thought amongst four main US foreign policy traditions. The fact that it has been one hundred and seventy-five years since Jackson’s death does not mean that his legacy, the Jacksonian tradition, came to naught. It actually has become so much pervasive again in the discourse of the American politics in the last few years. It has always been in the somewhere in American soil and American culture while being at the common white folks’ disposal whenever it is needed. The rise of populist politics with the election of Donald Trump substantiates that claim. Jackson’s rough-and-tumble character has been insidiously reflected amongst many Americans—contemporary Jacksonians—and in many US institutions. The populism emboldened by Trump and his supporters are the twenty-first century Jacksonians who strenuously reflect the tradition of Andrew Jackson.

A tradition shaped by frontier violence, honor, vengeance, self-defense, wars, politics, and nationalism are the bedrock of the Jacksonian characteristics, in which

the perception of numerous Americans is constructed and shaped accordingly. Mead (1999) opines that “Every political party since his presidency has drawn on the symbolism, the institutions and the instruments of power that Jackson pioneered” (p. 7). The foundations of the two-party system in American political culture were laid by him and his followers. For this reason, the Jacksonian tradition is highly required to be examined to shed a light upon the foreign and domestic political discussions and security issues that have beset the United States in the last few years due to the revival of the great power politics, nationalist and populist movements in most of the countries across in the world.

Furthermore, it is essential to get a picture of the features of Jacksonian tradition in tandem with the foreign policy of the United States to make sense of Donald Trump’s “America First” approach. Because of the fact that the Jacksonian tradition is one of the four schools of thought in American foreign policy along with Hamiltonian, Jeffersonian, and Wilsonian traditions, it distinctly diverges from the rest with some of its precise and clear-cut notions such as honor and vengeance. But examining these two notions are not enough to make of the Jacksonian tradition which hinges upon American culture and values as the rest of the schools of thought do to some extent as well. That is why clarifying the notions of Jacksonian tradition are precisely needed to come to grips with that. It “represents distinct intellectual approach... to American foreign policy that emerge[s] out of distinct cultural, social, and economic elements in American society” (Mead, 2002/2009, p. 176). It is also necessary to be aware of the fact that the Jacksonian school has “evolved over the generations while constantly seeking ways of expressing and advancing identifiable interests and concerns” in American politics (p. 176). Besides that, the followers of this tradition consider “foreign policy ... as an instrument of domestic policy; they favor particular foreign policy ideas because they believe that certain approaches ... will best advance the kind of domestic policies and order they wish to promote” (p. 176).

The tradition of Andrew Jackson was mentioned and evaluated by Walter Russell Mead who defined the Jacksonian tradition in great detail in his work named “The Jacksonian Tradition and American Foreign Policy” in 1999. He defines the features of Jacksonian tradition and Jacksonians, who are the root of the tradition.

According to Mead (1999), “Jacksonians with their impact on the political system and decisions would be the cornerstone of the American public and private life in this century” (p. 9). He anticipated their impact in 1999 and it is obvious that he was right back then. He defined Jacksonians as “suspicious of untrammelled federal power, skeptical about the prospects for domestic and foreign do-gooding (welfare at home, foreign aid abroad), opposed to federal taxes but obstinately fond of federal programs seen as primarily helping the middle class” (p. 8). They mostly constitute the middle class and working-class Americans who are dominantly white people sharing a European background. And they believe that the policies of the commander-in-chief must answer to the demands and needs of themselves since they think they are the major component of American culture and democracy. Mead also sets forth that

Jacksonian America is a folk community with a strong sense of common values and common destiny; though periodically led by intellectually brilliant men like—Andrew Jackson himself—it is neither an ideology nor a self-conscious movement with a clear historical direction or political table of organization. Nevertheless, Jacksonian America has produced—and looks set to continue to produce—one political leader and movement after another, and it is likely to continue to enjoy major influence over both foreign and domestic policy in the United States for the foreseeable future. (p. 9)

As of today, the argument of Mead seems that it was based on the facts which helped him to predict the foreseeable American future. The common folk community, Jacksonians, have produced another political leader, Donald J. Trump, to whom they can devote themselves, thereby holding sway over the American foreign and domestic politics along with national security issues since 2016. Besides, Jacksonians have strikingly demonstrated that they are ready to throw their weight behind the President Trump, who can understand them and has opposed the globalists agendas of Hamiltonian and Wilsonian policy-makers, who are also known as the elites, the international trade agreements and political decisions which have destroyed the well-being of common people of the United States.

What makes the Jacksonian tradition unique and disparate from the other schools of thought in American politics deserves a close examination in order to get a picture of it with clear-cut explanation. Hence, comparing the Jacksonian tradition with others distinguishes its essential characteristics. Wilsonian approach stands for international norms with which the nations have to comply to live in peace and

harmony while Hamiltonians propose a global perspective in which world is ruled by international organizations to maintain and enhance international trade and peace. Wilsonian and Hamiltonian approaches might correspond to the demands of each other to a significant extent. However, Jacksonian and Jeffersonian approaches proffer something different from the first two schools of thought that converge at some point. They are not influenced by the Continental European way of thinking unlike the previous ones. Rather, they demonstrate unique American cultural codes. On the one hand, Jeffersonians regard the spread of democracy, upon which their arguments are hinged, as the bulwark of American security and prosperity at home rather than abroad. On the other hand, Jacksonians consider democracy as a significant right to safeguard and represent the interests of common people without indulging in spreading it abroad as well. As Clarke and Ricketts (2017) simply put it, “a [*sic*] fundamental distinction amongst the four traditions is between those who seek to perfect and protect the virtues of the Republic (Jeffersonian and Jacksonian) and those who seek to remake the world in its image (Hamiltonian and Wilsonian)” (p. 17).

The ways in which Jacksonians and Jeffersonians choose to walk are similar but not all the same. They both disregard and distrust the elites with whom they do not desire to be associated. They highly value the will of the people who are the head of the country and of its institutions because they elect a president that is supposed to respect and reckon with the will of the citizens. Plus, “they [*sic*] generally prefer a loose federal structure with as much power as possible retained by states and local governments” (Mead, 1999, p. 8). However, the stark disagreement can be discerned when it comes to their positions on civil liberties. Mead clarifies that

Both [*sic*] Jeffersonians and Jacksonians are civil libertarians, passionately attached to the Constitution and especially to the Bill of Rights, and deeply concerned to preserve the liberties of ordinary Americans. But while the Jeffersonians are most profoundly devoted to the First Amendment, protecting the freedom of speech and prohibiting a federal establishment of religion, Jacksonians see the Second Amendment, the right to bear arms, as the citadel of liberty. Jeffersonians join the American Civil Liberties Union; Jacksonians join the National Rifle Association. In doing so, both are convinced that they are standing at the barricades of freedom. (p. 8)

2.2. JACKSONIAN POLITICS AND THE TRUMP ADMINISTRATION

The mindset of Jacksonians is not easy to grasp from outside of the United States, where some Americans even have difficulties to make of their arguments and views, since they think through cultural values and codes that can be only decoded and picked up upon by plumbing the depths of their tradition. They strongly cherish and admire individualism, honor, religion (Protestantism), military strength, victory, freedom, nationalism, and instinct. Their recalcitrance gnaws away at the other schools of thought because Jacksonians are considered “as the most obstructionist” amongst them by neither “supporting [sic] Wilsonian initiatives for a better world [nor] understanding [sic] Jeffersonian calls for patient diplomacy in difficult situations, [n]or accepting [sic] Hamiltonian trade strategies” (p. 9). Moreover, people from different countries look askance to the leaders who represent the Jacksonian tradition with pride. This clearly illustrates the current international affairs in which Donald J. Trump is seen and thought of by the foreign governments and some Americans, who have deplored Jacksonians for years. Though some Americans and Jacksonians do not appreciate each other, they have managed to live side by side for decades but “the Jacksonian community was one from which many Americans were excluded: Indians, Mexicans, Asians, African Americans, [Muslims], obvious sexual deviants and recent immigrants of non-Protestant heritage” (p. 14).

One of the main reasons why Jacksonians are condemned is that their stubborn attitude to the idea of multiculturalism which they see as a perilous ideology for the United States and the common white folks. Although the idea that different cultures would come together and cherish has been one of the main US foreign and domestic policy objectives at the helm of Hamiltonian and Wilsonian traditions, Jacksonians staunchly believe that those who want to be part of their land are definitely supposed to comply with their rules and values rather than bringing something alien to them and their culture. Their populist approach undoubtedly explains their protective behavior, which is called as “Jacksonian populism” mirroring the mentality of Jacksonians (p. 9). Besides, Mead starkly explains that “historically [sic], American populism has been based less on the ideas of the Enlightenment than on the community values and sense of identity among the British

colonizers who first settled this country” (p. 9). For this reason, Jacksonian populism and tradition hark back to the colonial times where, the Scots-Irish people, of whom Andrew Jackson’s parents were part, started to migrate to the new world. They established their settlements in the “regions of the Carolinas and Virginia, and who went on to settle much of the Old West—West Virginia, Kentucky, parts of Indiana and Illinois—and the southern and south central states of Tennessee, Missouri, Alabama, Mississippi and Texas” (p. 9). Their lives and experiences were shaped by the conflicts in these regions such as the Revolutionary War, frontier violence, the Civil War, and the disputes with the Native Americans. And the Jacksonian tradition is today respected and practiced by many white folks across the United States with assiduousness.

What Jacksonians went through in their settlements altered their world views and tradition. The incidents they experienced seared into their memories and gave them a sense of preoccupation with which they have always reckoned thus far by sharing those memories through the Jacksonian tradition to each generation. As of today, it is evident that the Jacksonians reflect frontier culture and deeply embedded core American values such as individualism, honor, pragmatism, right to bear arms, and avenging themselves against those who entail a risk to their socio-economic and cultural well-beings. Their tradition has also been manifested and employed in today’s American foreign policy since the election Donald J. Trump who has striking similarities with Andrew Jackson in his manners and methods.

By the same token, Trump administration’s Jacksonian foreign policy can be considered as damning evidence arising from his predecessor’s choice of US foreign policy tradition(s). The Obama administration was religious about implementing Hamiltonian and Wilsonian schools of thought together in their domestic and foreign policies, thereby raising the dickens with the Jacksonians time and time again. And this dispute deepened the concerns of Jacksonians with respect to their culture and liberty. Jacksonian opposition to the Hamiltonian and the Wilsonian schools of thought in foreign and domestic policies has shown itself many times ever since the collapse of the Soviet Union. And the Jeffersonian tradition has been on the same page with Jacksonians in its opposition to other schools of thought. For instance, Mead (2002/2009) says that

despite [sic] their relegation to the opposition in the George H. Bush and Clinton administrations, the two schools remained deeply rooted in American opinion and were able to force Hamiltonian and Wilsonian globalists to retreat from their most expansive, intoxicating visions of a “new world order”. [Plus], the [sic] election of 2000 saw George W. Bush adopt key themes from Jeffersonian and Jacksonian ideas, speaking in the campaign of the need for the United States to lower its profile, walk more “humbly”, and to move back to a narrower and more restricted view of the national interest. (p. 176)

The reason why Jacksonians opposed the new world order was due to their characteristics which did not go hand in hand with the globalist approaches after the end of the Cold War. Their thoughts on how to develop foreign and domestic policies were excluded from the policy-making process, whereby spreading democracy and human rights and enhancing the global free trade have heretofore dominated. Jacksonian cultures and values were considered as part of a fuddy-duddy tradition in the eyes of the elites, who strongly advocated Hamiltonian and Wilsonian foreign and domestic policies to secure and advance their own interests.

Jacksonians advocate a foreign policy which is at odds with the globalist traditions. Therefore, it is very substantial to explore the Jacksonian tradition which mirrors the values and ideas of Jacksonians in domestic policy. According to Jacksonian school of thought, “the prime goal of the American people is not the commercial and industrial policy sought by Hamiltonians, nor the administrative excellence in support of moral values that Wilsonians seek, nor Jeffersonian liberty” (Mead, 1999, p. 15). While Hamiltonian and Wilsonian schools of thought propagate liberal ideas and values, Jacksonians along with Jeffersonians constitute “the most sophisticated of all approaches to foreign affairs: realism” (p. 17). Jacksonians strive to see the global affairs from a gloomy perspective, thereby mistrusting the international institutions and liberal ideas.

Jacksonians think that the resources of US must be utilized for their own interests rather than those foreigners living abroad. Spreading democracy and human rights should not be the priority of US foreign policy while American citizens have a lot of problems at home. They also believe that the common white folks are the bedrock of American society and they must have a say in the foreign policy making to interfere with the decisions which could damage their lives such as free trade agreements, immigration, and waging wars for liberal values and petty affairs. Additionally, “Jacksonians approach foreign policy in a very different spirit—one in

which honor, concern for reputation, and faith in military institutions play a much greater role” than the rest of the traditions. (p. 17). For that reason, they mostly care about the incidents and events taking place in the world which could only threaten their material interests. To illustrate, “the [sic] [First] Gulf War was a popular war in Jacksonian circles because the defense of the nation’s oil supply struck a chord with Jacksonian opinion” (p. 18).

By the same token, the Jacksonian tradition represents the grim realities which have been tried to be removed from consideration and erased in American society and culture by the elites who have thought that liberal values and ideas could replace the Jacksonian culture and tradition. The realistic principles of Jacksonians are radically reflected in their foreign policy approach as well. They see the foreign affairs through the lenses of nationalism, with which they equate supporting the US military. Nevertheless, they do not champion military because they develop a strategic policy to safeguard and advance American interests by using it as a tool to advance their material interests. Rather, it is an “emotion, like love of one’s family” (pp. 17 & 18). In their eyes, “the [sic] nation is the extension of the family. Members of the American folk are bound together by history, culture and a common morality” (p. 18). And they are ready to defend and extend this bound by striving to alter the domestic and foreign policies of US, even if the elites, whom Jacksonians dislike, do whatever they can to ward off their actions. Their attitude towards the US military and its institutions substantiates that Jacksonians are triggered by sentiments rather than ideas since they are unconsciously populist Americans who believe that “international and national challenges might be byzantine, yet the way they are addressed must be straightforward” (p. 16). This kind of approach is embedded in President Trump’s Jacksonian style in which he does not pay much attention to being politically correct. It is also obvious that he does not shy away from expressing his views point blank and that he swims against the tide when necessary. He tweeted that “the [sic] United States will be powerfully supporting those industries, like Airlines and others, that are particularly affected by the Chinese Virus. We will be stronger than ever before!” (2020). Upon the Covid-19 pandemic, President Trump did not hesitate to share his views on China, with which many people agreed but could not

speak for fear of being not politically correct and bringing about a diplomatic spat with China.

In other words, the Jacksonian school of thought regards democracy and liberty as the two significant elements for safeguarding their culture and values. They are nationalist and populist in approaches to foreign and domestic policies. The spreading of democracy and human rights abroad are neither their concern nor priority in foreign policy. Nor do they care about international affairs as long as any major conflict does not directly affect their material interests. Besides, they are not fond of the elites and their influence on US foreign and domestic policy. They are also suspicious of the federal government since it can use its power to limit the liberty of Jacksonians for the sake of Hamiltonian or Wilsonian ideas. Moreover, the US military is seen as if it was part of their family since military culture is deeply entrenched in their tradition.

Jacksonians are the calamity howlers for reminding the policy-makers about the grim realities of the international affairs. Their realist approach is premised upon one of the Jacksonian tradition's cultural codes, which is frontier culture. It has taught Jacksonians the thorny sides of life, in which Jacksonians living in the frontier were all alone against the native tribes in the wilderness. But they successfully completed their mission against the uncivilized and unknown in nature by conquering it. Given this, their opposition to any policy or incident indicates a straw in the wind for American future. Mead also boils the Jacksonian school of thought down:

Those who like to cast American foreign policy as an unhealthy mix of ignorance, isolationism and trigger-happy cowboy diplomacy are often thinking about the Jacksonian populist tradition. That tradition is stronger among the mass of ordinary people than it is among the elite. It is more strongly entrenched in the heartland than on either of the two coasts. It has been historically associated with white Protestant males of the lower and middle classes—today the least fashionable element in American political mix...[The] ideas and policy proposals that resonate with Jacksonian core values and instincts enjoy wide support and can usually find influential supporters in the policy process. (1999, p. 17)

Donald Trump is the personification of a Jacksonian leader with his policies and style. The campaign of Donald Trump in 2015 with his Jacksonian rhetoric and style was cherished amongst Jacksonians who had been waiting a leader to restore the damage done by the Obama administration. He tapped into the populist

sentiments of Jacksonians in 2016 presidential race and his strategy helped him to win the election. For that reason, he gingerly listens to them and further takes their views into consideration in the policy-making process.

However, he has faced many challenges inside and outside of the United States due to the previous policy makers and their adamant attitude to implement Hamiltonian and Wilsonian policies. Instead of wishing away the globalist policies, which have substantially carved out a niche in US foreign and domestic policy since the collapse of the Soviet Union, President Trump and his administration have worn their hearts on their sleeves and begun to dismantle the policies which have caused Jacksonians to suffer economically and culturally in the past years due to international free trade agreements and open border policies. These policies have caused many industrial jobs to move to overseas and brought many illegal immigrants from the Latin American and other countries. The fact that Jacksonians noticed that they were losing their jobs was a watershed moment for them and American politics. Aside from that, the increasing number of illegal immigrants has begun to take their remaining jobs since they have been paid for their work less than the average American citizen paid in an hour. Besides that, these illegal immigrants, whose numbers have significantly risen in the past decades, have brought their culture and religion which go against the Jacksonian tradition. As a result of these developments, Jacksonians felt that they were in a dire situation in which they had to protect and secure their well-beings and tradition against the globalist policies of Hamiltonian and Wilsonian schools and the illegal immigrants.

Ever since Donald Trump was elected on November 8, 2016 the United States has entered a new period where the Jacksonian school of thought has trumped other foreign policy traditions at many levels. As a result, American foreign and domestic policies have been deeply affected by this shift in the power. And this transformation has been top-of-the-mind concern for many who live inside and outside of the United States of America, where the Jacksonian tradition is to remain as the bedrock of American society and culture whenever the society faces an existential crisis such as the world wars, plagues, violent protests, or economic downturns. Jacksonians have bluntly demonstrated that they regard the globalist policies of the elites as a cardinal sin and that can only be nixed by a leader who has

embedded their tradition, in which vengeance, honor, individualism, and nationalism prevail and cherish together.

Donald Trump and his administration have proven that they are explicitly mandated by core Jacksonian values such as an instinct rather than a particular ideology. President Trump has become the protector of American farmers, workers, and mining industry with his economic policies. Trump administration introduced a set of tariffs to protect American farmers and workers as Andrew Jackson did. President Jackson was the representative of the common white folks during his era, President Trump has also moved toward that direction by securing and improving the well-being of Jacksonians as a popular leader. He has drawn oneself up to his full height and altered foreign and domestic policies of the United States in a Jacksonian way in which the working and middle-class Americans can take advantage of the benefits rather than the elites.

CHAPTER THREE

THE COMPETITION AMONGST THE AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY TRADITIONS WITHIN THE POST-COLD WAR ERA

There are important people in each nation's history with regard to their contributions to their society, history, and culture. Those who left something have been either celebrated or criticized or even loathed by the future generations of their countrymen for the legacy that had brought about substantial changes in the past. It is these changes—good or bad—in the course of events carve out a niche within the societies, thereby forcing a plenty of its citizens to foreswear certain views and vice versa. Because those people often times bring values and actions which are considered repugnant by certain citizens who cannot fathom whether those people are ahead of the curve or not. This suspicion has always germinated in the minds of ordinary people to whom the contributors are attracted, thereby morphing themselves into controversial personalities due to their practices having altered the status quo.

The changes which transformed the status quo are the bedrock of the people whose legacies have strongly influenced their nation and the culture thereof. For that reason, the fault lines which had been broken were the main reasons of a plenty of incidents and events. Those fault lines, however, were downplayed and condoned by many people who thought that modern people would erase the tectonic lines of the past. To illustrate, Germany is a good example since the country is thought to be displaying liberal values at its core by contradicting its past and its important and controversial figure Adolf Hitler, who officially set forth that the Germans were superior from the other ethnicities. His ideas were not unique to him. They hark back to the German Empire, where people were initially introduced. Jean-Yves Camus and Nicolas Lebourg (2017) put forth that

The medieval Reich, with its feudal principalities and trade guilds, represented an ideal Germany in which society as a whole was supposedly organized into a harmonious hierarchical order. Pan- Germanism founded its legitimacy on the idea of uniting in the second Reich (1871–1918) all German speakers, who would lend their full strength to Germany in the face of the Western nations. (pp. 16-17)

Due to the fact that German nation sowed the wind in the 19th century, they had to reap the whirlwind thereafter. The reason was the tectonic lines which were broken at that time by certain people, whose ideas paved the way for the rise of Adolf Hitler. Nonetheless, he was not an exception by altering the status quo in order to implement his set of ideas and goals. He was followed by most of the German people but later he became not only a controversial historical figure but also a hated one owing to his emphasis on nationalism, which was extremely radical and repugnant. Once the dust settled in 1945, the German people went through a rough patch and it was believed that the ideas of Adolf Hitler, particularly nationalism, was long gone, yet, it was not the case.

By the time the Cold War was over, Francis Fukuyama (1992) opined that “the legitimacy of liberal democracy as a system of government had emerged throughout the world over the past few years, as it conquered rival ideologies like hereditary monarchy, fascism, and most recently communism” (p. xi). He even further elaborated his thought on the trajectory of the international system after the end of the Cold War.

Nationalism is currently on the rise in regions like Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union where peoples have long been denied their national identities, and yet within the world's oldest and most secure nationalities, nationalism is undergoing a process of change. The demand for national recognition in Western Europe has been domesticated and made compatible with universal recognition, much like religion three or four centuries before. (p.xviii)

However, he was wrong because he deemed the power of nationalism as weak and fleeting. This is particularly conspicuous that he is wrong in the 21st century by poring over the newspapers in Germany, where “German newsstands currently carry the largest number of nationalist titles, which both cast into relief and construct the spread of nationalist sentiments” (Camus & Lebourg, 2017, p. 185).

The case of Germany is just one example among many which needs to be paid attention. The country's controversial personality, Adolf Hitler, has influenced a significant number of people in today's Germany and in many countries as well since his death in 1945. The latest terror attack conducted by a far-right supporter, whose sole motivation was hatred towards the minorities, in Hanau, Germany shows that the ideas sowed in the 19th and 20th centuries are still alive among some of the

German citizens who strenuously uphold nationalism which should have been “tamed” long before (Hucal, 2020).

Having touched upon the legacy of a controversial person from Europe with global influence, it is very essential to plumb the depths of those people whose legacies surreptitiously continue to live on in order to get a picture of nationalism which is the bedrock of foreign or domestic policy traditions in all around the world. Besides, each generation learns from the previous ones to reconcile their ideologies with the experiences of people, whose legacies have brought about certain traditions in the culture of their society. This tradition can be subsumed by certain disciplines such as economics, sociology, psychology, history, anthropology, and so on with the aim of measuring and grasping it, yet the very best of it can be made by observation and comparison.

For that reason, the current trends in the United States of America with regards to the 2016 presidential elections, the rise of populist and nationalist sentiments, and the increase in the violent protests necessitate a research which sheds a light on them in American culture and foreign policy traditions. This research, unlike many, does not solely zero in on Donald Trump as the motivator or cause in these shifts and protests in the US. It rather zeroes in on one of the four essential US foreign policy traditions to make sense of Donald Trump’s political decisions with respect to foreign affairs and its intricate relationship with the incidents US has been going through in the last four years. These schools of thought are “Hamiltonians, Jeffersonians, Transcendentalists [Wilsonians], and Jacksonians.” (Mead, 1996, p. 89)

3.1. AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY TRADITIONS AND DONALD TRUMP’S PICK

The fact that Donald Trump is the one who has often times pontificated on the values upheld by the American people, which are predominantly related to American hegemony, has put him in the forefront of the controversies and discussions at all levels of the society and the state. Even his predecessor publicly called him “unfit”

for the office in the summer of the election campaign (Stanley-Becker & Sullivan, 2016).

What was glossed over, however, was the flag Donald Trump was carrying in the presidential race, within which there existed a rough-and-tumble clash between Hilary Clinton and him. That clash was indeed the tip of the iceberg and the fiercest clashes were amongst US foreign policy traditions, which have been striving to realize their own agendas in the policy-making process since the Declaration of Independence in 1776. Clinton, former Secretary of the State between 2009-2013 under Obama administration, firmly expressed and championed the continuation of the liberal world order led by the United States and its allies, whilst Donald Trump gave voice to his thoughts in a full-throated way in which the American people were being brushed aside in that system, which caused them to be in dire straits comparing to the people of other nations.

Their disagreement could also be interpreted in their approach to US foreign policy. Clinton and Obama approached to foreign and domestic policies through the perspectives Hamiltonian and Wilsonian schools of thought while Trump embodied a set of ideas and values, which reflected the core values of the Jacksonian tradition, within which he did not trust the elites and their decisions, thereby regarded international institutions as unreliable and controversial. Those ideas and values also were not in a situation to comply with porous borders dictated by the process of globalization and hardcore liberals which brought too many illegal immigrants having had disparate cultures, appearances, and faiths.

Last but not the least, Trump harshly criticized the economic policies implemented by former administrations, which prioritized global trade rather than the middle-class and working-class Americans at all. He said in a presidential speech in Monessen, Pennsylvania that “globalization [*sic*] has made the financial elite who donate to politicians very wealthy. But it has left millions of our workers with nothing but poverty and heartache” (Trump, “Declaring America’s Economic Independence”, 2016). By the same token, he forthrightly accused his opponent and China. He stated that “then [*sic*], as Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton stood by idly while China cheated on its currency, added another trillion dollars to our trade

deficits, and stole hundreds of billions of dollars in our intellectual property” (Trump, 2016). That is the reason why he was so determined to puzzle out the trade deficit with China by clamping down on the trade deals made by the US and China.

The set of ideas and values embodied by Donald Trump harks back to the 18th and 19th centuries. They were introduced to the American people and culture by the seventh president of the United States, Andrew Jackson. With his sturdy character, he came up with these set of ideas and values which are today known as the Jacksonian tradition. Its role in American culture has been subtle but substantial for decades. Therefore, Andrew Jackson’s legacy and tradition are worth to be fleshed out to come to grips with the current tectonic lines in the US. Historian Lynn Hudson Parson suggests that “he [sic] was a slaveholder, but so were Washington and Jefferson.” (2009, p. 2). Besides, he makes a striking point at which his similarity with Donald Trump in that way can be clearly discerned. “He was hated when in office, but so were Lincoln and the Roosevelts. He plays a prominent part in [American] history not so much what he achieved as for what he came to represent” (p. 2). And discovering him elucidates us to fathom what he represents for the United States of America in twenty-first century.

It is widely known that the United States of America was considered as the sole super power of the world at the end of the Cold War and this approximately lasted more than two decades. This time period in which the US stood alone at the top of the international order with mighty power projection all around the world was an era of American hegemony. The US had enormous resources to consolidate its economic and military power without any difficulty and objection raised by any other country in the world. On the one hand, the four significant foreign policy traditions of the United States found a niche for themselves within the foreign policy establishment except Jacksonian and Jeffersonian approaches. On the other hand, the post-Cold War foreign policy makers sternly preferred to employ Hamiltonian and Wilsonian approaches. Furthermore, some of the Americans and foreigners thought that the leadership of the US would bring an endless peace and freedom to all nations in the international system where there had never been an authority to adjudicate the disputes and problems amongst states. And the US could be that authority that was able to ask the questions and make important decisions accordingly. The moment and

opportunity US had seized at the end of the Cold War was considered by Francis Fukuyama as “the end point of mankind's ideological evolution and the universalization of Western liberal democracy as the final form of human government” (1989, p. 4). Besides, the fact that the United States was left alone without an enemy having posed a significant threat to its national security in the international system caused American foreign policy establishment to be stuck in limbo. They realized that the US was very powerful to pursue whatever foreign policy it desired to employ with respect to the hegemonic status of their country in the world affairs. Mead writes that

The United States not only won the Cold War, it diffused its language, culture, and products worldwide—the American dollar became the international medium of finance; the American language became the lingua franca of world business; American popular culture and American consumer products dominated world media and world markets. The United States is not only the sole global power, its values inform a global consensus, and it dominates to unprecedented degree the formation of the first truly global civilization our planet has known (2002/2009, p. 10)

Given the expectations of Fukuyama, many believed that the world entered into another phase which had never been seen by mankind hitherto. The United States of America could fulfill its God given mission to lead all the nations in the world to the direction of peace, prosperity, freedom, liberty, and equality by being as a role model for them. With the concept of “a city upon a hill” the US was ready to be beacon of hope for the rest of the world to alter the international system in a way that every state could benefit unless they swim against the tide. The system was planned to look like a liberal world order in which fascism, communism, nationalism and religious extremism would disappear and all of the people in the world along with the states they were living in would endorse liberal ideas and values with ease. American culture and values would be upheld by everybody as well.

The President George H. W. Bush, who was in the White House when the Cold War ended, initiated a policy which could consolidate American hegemony across the world by spreading democracy and human rights in the early 1990's. His administration strongly believed that the United States was going to create a world order in which international affairs would be conducted by the rules established by US led institutions. Moreover, President Bush encapsulated his vision for this new world his administration was striving to build while addressing the United Nations General Assembly. He said that

We have a vision of a new partnership of nations that transcends the Cold War: a partnership based on consultation, cooperation, and collective action, especially through international and regional organizations; a partnership united by principle and the rule of law and supported by an equitable sharing of both cost and commitment; a partnership whose goals are to increase democracy, increase prosperity, increase the peace, and reduce arms. (1990)

In addition to that, former Secretary of State under the Nixon and Ford administrations, Henry Kissinger, (1994) writes that “for [*sic*] the third time in this century, America ... proclaimed its intention to build a new world order by applying its domestic values to the world at large. And, for the third time, America seemed to tower over the international stage” (p. 805). This new world order where the United States was to lead the rest of the nations for a better world also reflected the Wilsonian school of thought in its approach to international relations. As a prerequisite, the Wilsonian tradition has always wanted to carve out a global system based on rules and principles with which each nation would be required to comply. These rules and principles Wilsonians wish to propagate are American values and ideas, which have been equated with liberal ideas and values as well. Wilsonians seized the moment since there was not any major power to hinder their policies in the international system. Mead (1991) believes that

the end of the Cold War and the triumph in the Gulf [War] gave the United States the best opportunity since 1945 to remake the world in its image, and to establish the peaceful and prosperous international order that it had sought since Woodrow Wilson proclaimed his Fourteen Points. (p. 377)

The expectations and reality did not correspond to each other, however. Liberal ideas and values have not yet been endorsed by many states and people around the world as not predicted by many scholars and pundits who preferred to live in the delusion of liberalism. The way US and world realized that liberal values and ideas fell short was in the twenty-first century, within which liberal intellectuals around the globe thought that they had left behind the crisis-ridden twentieth century. The terror attacks of September 11, 2001 have devastatingly altered the liberal world order by sending complicated and contrasting messages to each individual throughout the world, whose lives have been significantly affected by the consequences of those terror attacks due to intensifying of globalization and interdependence amongst the states and people. George W. Bush, who was the president at that time, was seen as the impersonation of the changes brought about by the realization of vices in liberal world order. Samuel Huntington, whose ideas have

played substantial role in the post-Cold War era regarding the intellectual discussions about international relations, believes that the terror attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon “dramatically symbolized the end of the twentieth century of ideology and ideological conflict, and the beginning of a new era in which people define themselves primarily in terms of culture and religion” (2004, p. 344).

The changes brought about by 9/11 attacks have cast a shadow over foreign and domestic policies of the states around the globe in tandem with the national security policies of the United States of America. The terror attacks provided the US with an enemy, which was radical and extremist Muslims in the eyes of the Americans, to solidify the power of the national government, whilst the core ideas and values of liberalism, which were also the cornerstone of the US foreign policy, were condoned to justify the national security policies of the government. The War on Terror policies and the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq chipped away at the liberal values and ideas while consolidating American military and economic power in the Middle East by bringing “democracy” and “human rights” into the countries where liberalism had never been embraced by their populace. As a result, those states began to be seen as aliens and threats to the American hegemony. George W. Bush, who deeply embraced Hamiltonian and Wilsonian traditions in his foreign policy, mentioned “axis of evil” in his State of the Union Address in 2002 with the aim of conjuring up the struggle Americans gave during the WWII against the Nazis, Italians, and Japanese. He (2002) stated that

states [*sic*] like these, and their terrorist allies, constitute an axis of evil, arming to threaten the peace of the world. By seeking weapons of mass destruction, these regimes pose a grave and growing danger. They could provide these arms to terrorists, giving them the means to match their hatred. They could attack our allies or attempt to blackmail the United States. In any of these cases, the price of indifference would be catastrophic.

President Bush truly believed that he could fend off any kind of threat emanating from the axis of evil countries such as Iraq, Iran, Afghanistan, Syria, Libya, Cuba, and North Korea. The unwavering belief of George W. Bush came from the widespread idea that American identity, which has been equated with liberal ideas and values for years, could turn those states into democratic and liberal ones. Though he strove to utilize Jacksonian school to a considerable extent because he needed Jacksonians to assist his unilateral actions and heavy-handed approaches to

people from the axis of evil countries, he was religiously committed to Hamiltonian and Wilsonian schools of thought. Samuel Huntington (2004) opines that “if [sic] American identity is defined by a set of universal principles of liberty and democracy, then presumably the promotion of those principles in other countries should be the primary goal of American foreign policy” (p. 10). The fact that American foreign policy has held those principles as the reflection of American identity has had a huge impact on the foreign policy establishment and its elites, who have hunkered down to realize those policies in the field.

Moreover, the horrific events of 9/11 and the War on Terror engendered uncertainty and skepticism towards the foreign policy of the US amongst the allies and others due to American unilateral action. Although American decision-makers believed that they put the security of their country first, their hard-nosed approach to do social engineering in order to prevent radical and extremist groups from taking the control of those countries and certain regions such as the Middle East and North Africa caused many foreign leaders to become muddleheaded. The Iraq War in 2003 was not seen as a necessary evil to clamp down on illiberal countries amongst some of the NATO members led by France and Germany. They had backed the US decision to seek and destroy the Al-Qaeda members and Osama Bin Laden in Afghanistan in 2001, though. Their hesitation and mistrust were result of “American unilateral action to declare war on Iraq on March 19, 2003 by repudiating the core principles and pillars of the United Nations at the Security Council” (Kumar, 2014, p. 123).

Nevertheless, the most striking opposition came from the Russian Federation that had supported the invasion of Afghanistan by US like Germany, France, and China had done. The President of Russia, who was Vladimir Vladimirovich Putin, urged his American counterpart to be aware of the “grave consequences” of the war (LaFraniere, 2003). The reason why Russian politicians and administration were vexed by the liberal agenda of American foreign policy, which was belied by heedless and minor security threats to justify the occupation and unilateral actions taken by the Americans, was the strong desire to have good relationship with the United States so that the Russian foreign and security policies would not have to be developed in a way in which great power politics were designed and mandated.

However, the plans of the Russian Federation were disrupted. Thomas Ambrosio writes that “these [sic] hopes were quickly dashed as a result of the row over the Bush administration’s planned invasion of Iraq. The dispute over Iraq was bitter and divisive, and seriously tested the Russo – American relationship” (2005, p. 1190). The tested relationship was the harbinger of the conflicts and disputes between two great powers in the coming years. And this was something the Kremlin had long anticipated unlike the White House.

Additionally, the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq turned into a quagmire for the US military. Their liberal policies were met with fire and fury by most of the native population of these countries who lost their loved ones, properties, peace, stability, and hope under the US invasion. The response of the American forces to the rebels and terrorists who complicated the US policies was ham-handed and this kind of approach brought the core of liberal values and ideas—the human rights—to the fore. The butterfingering and cruel treatment of the prisoners at Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq by the American soldiers demonstrated that the US did not practice what it was preaching for years. Puar (2004) opines that “the [sic] actions of the U.S. military in Saddam's former torture chambers certainly narrows the gap between us [Americans] and them-between the patriot and the terrorist-as the actions involve the exact same site, the same population, and nearly sequential time periods” (p. 523).

Democracy, at least in terms of American political culture, has never come to exist in illiberal countries where the United States wanted to spread liberal values and ideas with heavy-handed force. Yet the US did not cease to be the sole power in the world system by the end of the 2008 in which the majority of world economies suffered from a global financial crisis. Moreover, the war between Georgia and Russian Federation demonstrated the fundamental changes in Russian security and foreign policies as a response to American policies in the region, where Russians saw as their sphere of influence. Georgia bordering Russian Federation in the Caucasus area strove to adhere to the liberal policies of US by signaling its transformation as a democratic and liberal country. Because of the fact that Georgians thought that they would be better off with American led world order after decades of Soviet Union governance, many citizens organized Rose Revolution in 2003. This revolution changed the power politics in Georgia by bringing a pro-Western leader into power.

As a consequence of the change, politics were shaped and developed accordingly and this transformation “flamed up the simmering conflict between Georgian people and people living in South Ossetia” (Welt, 2010, p. 69). What the American policy-makers did not take into consideration was that Russian security and foreign policies were hidebound by geopolitics. By the time the Russian politicians and leaders had meticulously underscored their mind-set on many occasions, it was clear in 2008 that their words and political portents had been taken at face value.

In 2007 at the Munich Security Conference, the President of Russian Federation, Vladimir Putin, clearly and forthrightly had expressed his country’s attitude to the liberal policies of the United States of America around the globe when the war, which lasted five consecutive days, erupted between Russia and Georgia on August 7, 2008. He had said that

The unipolar world that had been proposed after the Cold War did not take place... It is world in which there is one master, one sovereign. And at the end of the day this is pernicious not only for all those within this system, but also for the sovereign itself because it destroys itself from within. And this certainly has nothing in common with democracy. Because, as you know, democracy is the power of the majority in light of the interests and opinions of the minority. Incidentally, Russia – we – are constantly being taught about democracy. But for some reason those who teach us do not want to learn themselves. I consider that the unipolar model is not only unacceptable but also impossible in today’s world. And this is not only because if there was individual leadership in today’s – and precisely in today’s – world, then the military, political and economic resources would not suffice. What is even more important is that the model itself is flawed because at its basis there is and can be no moral foundations for modern civilization [*sic*]... Unilateral and frequently illegitimate actions have not resolved any problems. Moreover, they have caused new human tragedies and created new centers [*sic*] of tension. Judge for yourselves: wars as well as local and regional conflicts have not diminished... Today we are witnessing an almost uncontained hyper use of force – military force – in international relations, force that is plunging the world into an abyss of permanent conflicts. As a result we do not have sufficient strength to find a comprehensive solution to any one of these conflicts. Finding a political settlement also becomes impossible. (2007)

It is palpable that President Putin had warned the American politicians and decision-makers about the ramifications of the liberal foreign policy employed by them. It is also true that American politicians downplayed and did not heed the warnings of the Russian President. As the winner of the Cold War, American politicians had bethought themselves to rule the world by launching an American epoch in which liberal values and ideas would be endorsed by all the nations across the globe. They behooved themselves to champion the system that they created at all costs.

On the other hand, the presidential election in November in 2008 was significant and historical for American citizens whose support for the wars in the Middle East had gradually decreased in that year. “As the war and the president grew increasingly unpopular, so did the Republican Party” (Jacobson, 2010, p. 208). As a result of it, the voters elected a Democrat President, who was Barack Hussein Obama and he later became the first African American President of the United States. His election stood for the concept of the American Dream that anybody could achieve whatever they want irrespective of their religion, race, gender, and economic background as long as they worked hard. He was the embodiment of the liberal values and ideas which jibed with American culture and values after hard times.

The election of Barack Obama was seen as a way in which US foreign policy would change towards the Muslim majority countries and Russian Federation, which have been severely affected and hurt by the policies of previous administration. The War on Terror and its legacy in the Middle East were obvious to have been downplayed both at home and abroad for the US. As an African American, whose father was a Muslim from Kenya, Obama was presented as the water under the bridge in order to bridge the gap between the Middle Eastern and other countries, including NATO allies, due to the damage upon which was inflicted by the policies of the previous administration in the War on Terror period.

3.2. OBAMA’S HAMILTONIAN AND WILSONIAN FOREIGN POLICY

Because of the fact that Barack Obama was elected as the first African American President of the United States, there were many expectations from him about addressing the racial and socioeconomic issues in his country, where the global financial crisis in 2008 took a heavy toll on many of the Americans. Besides, the wars in the Middle East were not strongly supported anymore by the majority of American people who demanded that the money for the wars be spent for infrastructure, health care, education, and veterans at home. The numbers of American soldiers who lost their lives in the wars in distant places triggered sentiments amongst almost all Americans, who wanted their country get out of those miserable countries and places since neither democracy nor human rights were

enough to justify the deaths of American troops abroad. And Obama tapped into these sentiments by indicating that “he was to bring the American troops from Iraq to home” (Packer, 2008). Gary C. Jacobson (2010) says that

Barack Obama, a young African American Democrat unknown to most Americans at his campaign’s outset, occupied the White House, and Democrats controlled the House and Senate by margins as wide as before the Republican revolution of 1994. The war was not the only reason for this remarkable reversal of party fortunes; the economy’s downward slide during 2008 and then plunge off the cliff in September contributed to it, as did other Bush administration failures, such as the response to Hurricane Katrina. But the economic crisis was so devastating because it compounded damage that the war had already inflicted on the president and his party. (p. 207)

Obama was able to win the race with his smart move yet, he did not know what exactly he was going to inherit from the previous administration with regards to the policies on the foreign affairs and domestic problems. Besides, the economic and social matters had already beset the state of the Union for a while when he was elected. But he was seen as the person who could easily overcome all those problems that were troubling the nation.

It is essential to be familiar with the foreign policy traditions of Hamiltonian and Wilsonian approaches to make sense of US foreign policy after the end of the Cold War, the implementation of which has been seen firmly crucial to ensuring the security of US by the foreign policy establishment. And the Obama administration was no exception in the implementation of these foreign policy traditions comparing to his predecessors after the end of the Cold War. Their approaches can be encapsulated in a way in which “Hamiltonians are conditional multilateralists, favoring multilateral cooperation and institutions when and only when this approach serves US interests better than unilateral approaches” (Mead, 1996, p. 90). On the other hand, Wilsonians “are unconditional multilateralists who believe that the growth of these institutions and cooperative diplomatic methods is itself a vital American interest” (p. 90).

Obama adhered to these two traditions to serve to the interests of US both at home and abroad by endorsing and embodying “liberal hegemony”, where “a state aims to turn as many countries as possible into liberal democracies like itself while also promoting an open international economy and building international institutions” (Mearsheimer, 2018, p. 1). Moreover, Stephen Walt further expounds

upon why the U.S. policy works “see the preservation of U.S. primacy and the expansion of a predominantly liberal world order as essential for U.S. security and prosperity” (Walt, 2018, p. 14). According to this policy, the American foreign policy works consider liberal hegemony as a foreign policy goal to preserve and protect the core interests of US all around the world, thereby developing the national security policies of the United States in tandem with Hamiltonian and Wilsonian schools of thought.

Furthermore, it can be understood that liberal hegemony has been deeply entrenched in American institutions particularly the Department of State, the Department of Defense, and the White House along with many think-tanks based in capitol. These institutions disseminate the discourse of liberal hegemony, in which “the concept of inalienable or natural rights” constitutes bedrock of their points of views (Mearsheimer, 2018, p.2). The US policymakers have been bent on realizing their policies at all costs since the end of the Cold War and their sidekick to bring about the changes on their agenda has been the military might of the United States thus far.

As a result of this policy, Mearsheimer sets forth that “American foreign policy establishment considers the hard power as a must to dissipate the liberal norms that they see as crucial for the National Security of the US” (p. 147). He further elaborates that American decision makers “believe they have the right, the responsibility, and the know-how to use military force to achieve their goal” (p. 144). Due to the fact that the political establishment in Washington D.C., the Belt Way, heavily relies on the military power as way to “communicate” with the other nations and publics to demonstrate US foreign policy, the military-mind strenuously trumps the diplomatic approach almost at all levels of policy making process, whereby the “U.S. military power” has been thought “as an invaluable tool for advancing an ambitious global agenda” (Walt, 2018, p. 58). For that reason, the heavy reliance on the military brings about the concept of security which is the cardinal justification of the militarization of the foreign policy of the United States of America, whose “militaristic foreign policy invariably fosters a powerful national security state” (Mearsheimer, 2018, p. 144).

The Obama administration came up with a liberal foreign policy in the Middle East in order to alter the perception of a lot of Muslim people across the world who considered that the United States was the enemy of Islam and their ways of life. He considered that “reducing the United States’ massive military and political investment in the Middle East was vital national security interest” for the US (Lynch, 2015, p.18). He also believed that “American partners in the region must be obliged to face up to the challenges which are deemed as threats to their own national security by themselves” (p. 18). By developing these policies, President Obama thought that he could slowly alleviate anti-American sentiments amongst the Middle Eastern and Islamic countries in the world, thereby enhancing the cooperation between those countries and the United States to realize his foreign policy goals, which were spreading democracy and human rights in order to make those countries internalize liberal and Western style democratic systems. Additionally, he was determined to turn to page and bring about a rapprochement between the United States and the Russian Federation, while “elicit[ing] [sic] Chinese cooperation on regional and global issues” (Indyk, Lieberthal& O’Hanlon, 2012, p. 29).

Despite the fact that Obama wanted to break the ice between US and the Muslim world, he refused to change tack and employ either Jeffersonian or Jacksonian approach. He was uncompromising in his foreign policy direction at which world system was thought to be led by American hegemony and the rest of the countries were assumed that they would willingly adjust their policies accordingly. He underscored his unwavering support for US foreign policy tradition, which was the combination of Hamiltonian and Wilsonian approaches, in his Nobel Peace Prize lecture in Oslo, Norway in 2009. In that speech he hinted the future policies that he was going to develop for his country’s national security interests. He said that

In the wake of such destruction, and with the advent of the nuclear age, it became clear to victor and vanquished alike that the world needed institutions to prevent another world war. And so, a quarter century after the United States Senate rejected the League of Nations – an idea for which Woodrow Wilson received this prize – America led the world in constructing an architecture to keep the peace: a Marshall Plan and a United Nations, mechanisms to govern the waging of war, treaties to protect human rights, prevent genocide, restrict the most dangerous weapons. In many ways, these efforts succeeded. Yes, terrible wars have been fought, and atrocities committed. But there has been no Third World War. The Cold War ended with jubilant crowds dismantling a wall. Commerce has stitched much of the world together. Billions have been lifted from poverty. The ideals of liberty and self-determination, equality and the rule of law have haltingly advanced. We are the

heirs of the fortitude and foresight of generations past, and it is a legacy for which my own country is rightfully proud. (2009)

President Obama readily endorsed the spread of democracy and human rights with the intention of creating liberal democratic states in order to foster free trade in the international system where the US was the pioneer of this sea change process. His foreign policy approach complied with his predecessors' foreign policies to a considerable extent due to his endorsement of liberal foreign policy of the US foreign policy establishment. He did not swim against the tide by throwing salt on the foreign policy establishment's game with regards to relationship with Russia and China.

Obama's endorsement of liberal hegemony raised the dickens with the other major powers in the international system in which the rise of China and the resurrection of Russian power insidiously hedged against American policies. Owing to the fact that Russian and Chinese policy wonks saw the United States as a security threat to their national security interests, they were "indifferent to Obama's personal charms" unlike the states that benefited from the liberal hegemony (Dueck, 2015, p. 66). "They were [*sic*] interested in whether he conceded [*sic*] to their interests and priorities, not in his personal background as such, or in any vision he might have [*had*] for a more liberal international order" (p. 66).

Initially, his policy of a fresh start with Russia was hamstrung by American policies in Europe due to his administration's support for the enlargement of the European Union (EU) and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) towards the borders of the Russian Federation. Although US and Russia were able to work together at Obama's initiative with his Secretary of State, who was Hillary Clinton in his first term, for a while, the two powers could not agree upon the idea that most of the illiberal countries, particularly Russian neighbors, were going to transform themselves into a Western style democracy with their memberships to international organizations such as the World Trade Organization (WTO), International Monetary Fund (IMF), the EU, and NATO. By the time "both [*sic*] US President Barack Obama and then Russian President Dmitry Medvedev [*had*] agreed to moves that they considered in the national interest of their respective countries", the

Ukrainian crisis was looming over the horizon (McFaul, Sestanovich & Mearsheimer, 2014, p. 167).

With the intentions of turning Ukraine into a Western style democratic country American policy works aimed to expand and strengthen international institutions and free trade, thereby sustaining American hegemony and international security as they did with Georgia in 2008. But they downplayed the policies that were going to be developed by the Russian Federation and its Prime Minister, who was Vladimir Putin between 2008 and 2012. The Maidan Revolution which occurred in February 2014 worsened the relations between two countries.

The Russian foreign and security policies were developed in tandem with geopolitics rather than liberal values and ideas in order to fend off the Ukrainian crisis, which could seriously damage the Russian interests in the region. John J. Mearsheimer (2014) sets forth that “the United States and its European allies share most of the responsibility for the crisis” (p. 1). He further explains that

The taproot of the trouble is NATO enlargement, the central element of a larger strategy to move Ukraine out of Russia’s orbit and integrate it into the West. At the same time, the EU’s expansion eastward and the West’s backing of the pro-democracy movement in Ukraine—beginning with the Orange Revolution in 2004—were critical elements, too. Since the mid-1990s, Russian leaders have adamantly opposed NATO enlargement and in recent years, they have made it clear that they would not stand by while their strategically important neighbor turned into a Western bastion. (p. 1)

The Ukrainian crisis, which later led to the annexation of Crimea by Russia in March 2014, became the incident which defined the US – Russian relations in Obama’s second term, in which he went to great lengths to spread liberal values and ideas across the world. As a consequence of the crisis, US asked its allies to sanction Russia in order to punish it for the actions taken owing to geopolitics rather than liberal policies. The sanctions implemented by the EU members created a security crisis in the middle of Europe with the actions taken by NATO, the enlargement of which triggered the Russian backlash in Europe. Jeffry D. Sachs opines that the policies and actions “might look defensive to NATO surely looks offensive to Russia, especially as NATO continues to deploy new weapons systems that Russia finds threatening, to engage in new overseas missions such as the NATO-led overthrow of Libya’s Moammar Khadafy in 2011” (2018, p. 74).

The most significant decision made in the Obama administration was about the rise of China and its probable security threats for the future of American liberal hegemony, however. The fact that the US was wasting most of its energy and resources for the countries in the Middle East in order to spread democracy and human rights caused American policy wonks to factor out and belittle China and its unprecedented rise in the international system to a significant extent. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton stated that the Americans'

Most [sic] potent asset as a nation is the power of our values — in particular, our steadfast support for democracy and human rights. This speaks to our deepest national character and is at the heart of our foreign policy, including our strategic turn to the Asia-Pacific region. (2011)

Furthermore, the United States with its security allies—Japan and South Korea—wanted to consolidate its grip in the region by enhancing strategic relations. The Obama Administration aimed to marshal several countries in the region such as Australia, India, Taiwan, Philippines, and Indonesia to curb the malign influence of China. Most of the American policies were encapsulated by Hillary Clinton in her feature, in which she supported engagement with China in the teeth of all the aggressive actions taken by Chinese military establishment. She put forth that

From opening new markets for American businesses to curbing nuclear proliferation to keeping the sea lanes free for commerce and navigation, our work abroad holds the key to our prosperity and security at home... Harnessing Asia's growth and dynamism is central to American economic and strategic interests and a key priority for President Obama. Open markets in Asia provide the United States with unprecedented opportunities for investment, trade, and access to cutting-edge technology. Our economic recovery at home will depend on exports and the ability of American firms to tap into the vast and growing consumer base of Asia. Strategically, maintaining peace and security across the Asia-Pacific is increasingly crucial to global progress, whether through defending freedom of navigation in the South China Sea, countering the proliferation efforts of North Korea, or ensuring transparency in the military activities of the region's key players... By virtue of our unique geography, the United States is both an Atlantic and a Pacific power. We are proud of our European partnerships and all that they deliver. Our challenge now is to build a web of partnerships and institutions across the Pacific that is as durable and as consistent with American interests and values as the web we have built across the Atlantic. That is the touchstone of our efforts in all these areas... The fact is that a thriving America is good for China and a thriving China is good for America. We both have much more to gain from cooperation than from conflict. (2011)

Aside from that President Obama announced his administration policy—pivot to Asia—towards the rise of China and the growing economic potential of Asian economies in a speech to the Australian Parliament on November 17, 2011. He remarked that “after [sic] a decade in which we fought two wars that cost us dearly,

in blood and treasure, the United States is turning our attention to the vast potential of the Asia Pacific region” where China would be a top-of-mind priority for the American foreign policy and national security establishment (Obama, 2011). Jentleson (2014) purports that

The subtext is that other regions—Europe since the end of the Cold War, the Middle East with the end of the Iraq and Afghanistan wars—have become less strategically important, while the rise of China as a major power and impressive regional economic growth rates have made Asia more strategically important. (419)

Rather than disregarding or wishing away the potential threats posed by China, the US foreign policy makers under the Obama administration decided to be at sword’s point in the Asia-Pacific region, where the superpower of the world, whose power had been on the wane for the last few years, acquiesced in redirecting its military forces and political influence. But the policies of the Obama administration came to naught since American policy makers were able to make little headway against the rising power of China at economic, military, and political levels. The underlying reason of the failure was “a hybrid strategy that included [*sic*] elements of engagement, integration, and accommodation on the one hand, and implicit containment, balancing, or deterrence on the other” (Dueck, 2015, p. 72). The lack of assertive and aggressive policies expedited China’s rise and helped the Chinese authorities to conceal the growth of their country’s economic and military power by masquerading as a peaceful and pacifist state.

In addition to that, the lack of precise strategy either to prevent or steer the rise of China was obfuscated by the uprisings—known as the Arab Spring—in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region in the early 2010s. The Obama administration was cautious to not get involved militarily to the MENA region where the previous wars US had waged already seared into the memories of the American people and entrenched into its culture. Nevertheless, the uprising in Syria became unraveled unlike the revolts in Egypt and Tunisia due to the involvement of the Russian Federation to defend Syria’s integrity and its President Bashar Al Assad with heavy-handed force.

The Obama administration was determined to bring worrisome challenges to the fore in order to eliminate the threats which could rock the boat for American hegemony in the global arena. With the intention of curbing the economic influence

of China, his administration proposed the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) which was a free trade agreement. This partnership subsumed various nations in the Asia-Pacific region such as the US, Australia, Canada, Japan, Mexico, Brunei, Chile, Malaysia, New Zealand, Singapore, Peru, and Vietnam. The TPP was aimed at strengthening the economic and trade relations amongst these various nations, thereby cutting back the growth of Chinese influence and economy. Because of the fact that the Obama administration was in accordance with Hamiltonian and Wilsonian traditions, they regarded new international institutions and free trade agreements to hinder the rise of China. Therefore, the agreement was believed that it was going to “add billions to the US economy and solidify Washington’s political, financial, and military commitment to the Pacific for decades to come” (Gordon, 2012, p. 17). Despite the fact that the TPP was estimated that it was going to cause some of the jobs of the middle and working class of Americans to move to other countries where the wages were low comparing to the wages in US, the Obama administration did not throw the baby out with bath water and saw the agreement as a significant step to contain and engage in China at same time.

One of the most striking foreign policy and national security issues of Obama’s presidency was the Islamic Republic of Iran and its uncompromising stance with regards to reducing the uranium enrichment. The White House sternly evinced that Iran having nuclear capability to tip the balance of power in the region would not be allowed. “The Obama administration took an all-options-on-the-table position, implying that military strikes could [even] be resorted to” (Jentleson, 2014, p. 482). During the presidential election campaigns in 2012 President Obama candidly expressed the policies with which he was to reckon and for which he was going to clamor if he was re-elected while addressing to American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC). He stated that

A nuclear-armed Iran is completely counter to Israel’s security interests. But it is also counter to the national security interests of the United States. Indeed, the entire world has an interest in preventing Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon. A nuclear-armed Iran would thoroughly undermine the non-proliferation regime that we’ve done so much to build. There are risks that an Iranian nuclear weapon could fall into the hands of a terrorist organization. It is almost certain that others in the region would feel compelled to get their own nuclear weapon, triggering an arms race in one of the world’s most volatile regions. It would embolden a regime that has brutalized its own people, and it would embolden Iran’s proxies, who have carried out terrorist attacks from the Levant to southwest Asia. And that is why, four years

ago, I made a commitment to the American people, and said that we would use all elements of American power to pressure Iran and prevent it from acquiring a nuclear weapon. And that is what we have done. (2012)

What is more, Obama made a deal with Iran with respect to developing a nuclear plan which could pave the way for acquiring nuclear weapons by the Islamic Republic of Iran, thereby disrupting the balance of power in the Middle East and posing cardinal threat to American troops stationed in the region. The deal, which is known as Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), was signed between Iran and the US along with five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council and Germany and the European Union on July 14, 2015 in Vienna. The importance of the deal was that Iran was going to reduce its uranium capabilities, which were to be controlled by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), while the US and its allies were gradually going to lift the sanctions on Iran in return. However, it was later revealed that the Obama administration did not divulge the details of the agreement that was signed with Iran to the public and the Congress. “He had sent billions of US dollars and millions of foreign currencies to Iran by planes” without informing the necessary institutions (Thiessen, 2018).

The disclosure of this information brought about the Congress to rail against, especially the Republican senators who had opposed the agreement with Iran since the beginning, to the deal signed by the Obama administration and majority of them advocated a military operation to eliminate the nuclear facilities of Iran. They along with some Democrats strongly disagreed with the administration since they considered the Iranian leadership as untrustworthy and a threat to the stability of the region and the critical ally of the US, Israel.

By the same token, the Obama administration zealously strove to tackle another essential foreign policy issue by spearheading its solution globally. It was the Paris Climate Agreement which was signed on April 22, 2016. The agreement was aimed to revolve all the nations around the finding solutions to address global warming under all circumstances. “The Paris agreement was thought to usher a new era in which an entirely new pattern would emerge and then marshal all the nations together in order to resolutely grapple with climate change” (Bodansky, 2016, p. 290). Reducing the carbon dioxide to much lower levels was seen as a yardstick for

most of the signatories. Therefore, the states having signed the agreement were expected to comply with the terms of the agreement thus and so.

Last but not the least, the Obama administration had to confront with the reality of geopolitics in his foreign policy decisions in which liberal values and ideas defined most of his advisors' and his understanding. The Syria policy of the Obama administration proved itself as unsuccessful as his policy towards Ukraine and Libya. The fact that his administration's adamant manner not to acknowledge the policies mandated by geopolitics was the main reason of the failure and the great power competition was also glossed over to a considerable extent. Thus, the hesitation and indecisive manner of the Obama administration raised the stakes in the troublesome country where Russia undoubtedly mistrusted the intentions of US and was ready to defend its national security interests no matter what it took. It was believed that "the situation in Syria was different from the one in Libya and it did not require the same action due to the difference thereof" but the results of the foreign policy of Washington proved otherwise (Buckley, 2012, p. 82).

The scope through which the Obama administration viewed the foreign affairs were dictated by liberal ideas and values rather than the realities of vexing global issues, which gingerly needed to be zeroed in on to formulate a policy. The endorsement of a liberal foreign policy by Hamiltonian and Wilsonian schools of thought behooved US foreign policy and national security establishment to consider nationalism, particularly the nationalist sentiments in foreign countries, as an obstacle for disseminating democracy and human rights, which have been thought as the cornerstone of American interests to be safeguarded and championed all around the world for the time being. This approach has borne fruits for the foreign policy elites, whose stance have been in conjunction with liberal democratic norms and principles, on a range of global issues, yet they have not been able to come to grips with geopolitics and nationalism due to liberal fallacies that bedevil their perception.

The fact that they have factored out these two patterns has been nothing but conspicuous in the past decade. Syria, Ukraine, and the Asia-Pacific regions have become the focal points of liberal foreign policies' abject failures, whereas those states (Russia and China) that acclimatize their foreign and security policies in

tandem with geopolitics—along with nationalism—have further advanced their material interests comparing to US. Francis Fukuyama (1992) simply puts it

The state in a liberal democracy is by definition weak: preservation of a sphere of individual rights means a sharp delimitation of its power. Authoritarian regimes on the Right and Left, by contrast, have sought to use the power of the state to encroach on the private sphere and to control it for various purposes—whether to build military strength, to promote an egalitarian social order, or to bring about rapid economic growth. What was lost in the realm of individual liberty was to be regained at the level of national purpose. (p. 15)

The civil war in Syria, which started in 2011, attracted major powers like US and Russia along with regional (minor) powers such as Turkey, Iran, and Saudi Arabia. These powers have tried to safeguard and advance their national security interests since then. Nonetheless, the Obama administration was not aware of the realities of the situation in the region where Russian military involvement had been disregarded by the foreign policy establishment. The Russian state, then the Soviet Union, has had a naval base in Tartus since 1971. The Oval Office was surprised to see direct Russian engagement to the Syrian civil war in September, 2015 with intense carpet bombing for the purpose of protecting the Assad Regime and destroying various groups that were seen as terrorist organizations and that could pose a serious threat to them in the future.

The ineptness of grasping geopolitics in the Obama administration has left grave damages to the international system, in which the states have been required to prioritize security over short term interests recently owing to the perceptions created by liberal ideas and values. Hamiltonian and Wilsonian schools hindered the Obama administration strategic vision by obfuscating essential US interests for the sake of liberal and intangible policies, which was not going to find a substantial niche while the international system was tilting towards the era of great power politics. The United States in this changing system did not balk at the idea of cooperation with a sordid organization in the Syrian civil war, which is known as the People's Protection Units (YPG), having ties with the Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK) that has been the long time enemy of Turkey since the late 1970s. Despite the fact that the PKK has been designated as a Foreign Terrorist Organization (FTO) since 1997 by the State Department, the policy makers in Washington were adamant in their commitment to cooperate with this terrorist organization, thereby crossed the Rubicon with respect to Turkey, which has been a NATO ally of US since 1952.

In other words, the foreign policy developed and employed by the Obama administration was out of touch with the realities of the regions where the United States had long term strategic interests such as the Middle East, Europe, and the Asia-Pacific. Obama's foreign policy understanding was similar to the vantage point of one of the previous presidents, Bill Clinton, who stated that "in a world where freedom, not tyranny, is on the march, the cynical calculus of pure power politics simply does not compute. It is ill-suited to a new era in which ideas and information are broadcast around the globe before ambassadors can read their cable" (1992).

The belief that power politics had been left behind behooved the Obama administration to downplay geopolitics and its dictates to a great extent, thereby ringing down the curtain on American hegemony in the international system. The liberal policies developed by the administration gnawed away at other major powers like China and Russia since these powers' security interests did not jibe with US foreign policy initiatives. Their mistrust of the intentions of US in global affairs hastened the arrival of power politics, which was seen as a reaction to developments in their regions and in the world as well. Mearsheimer (2001) writes that

The optimists' claim that security competition and war among the great powers has been burned out of the system is wrong. In fact, all of the major states around the globe still care deeply about the balance of power and are destined to compete for power among themselves for the foreseeable future. (361)

Because of the fact that security competition amongst the great powers was seen as a fuddy-duddy business by the Obama administration and the foreign policy establishment in Washington D.C., the geopolitical shifts were dissected without in-depth analysis. For that reason, US military and foreign policy establishments were sluggish to change tack and straighten out their deep-seated policies towards the major competitors. As a result of this delay, US decision makers were not able to come to grips with geopolitics and to curb the growing influence of China. In addition to that, Russian involvement in Syrian civil war and Ukrainian crisis caused American foreign policies to fail and then adapt to the realities of the situation in the regions. This clearly demonstrated that the US foreign policy elite scratched the surface of geopolitics and the realities of the international world order. Although these failures were palpable amongst the foreign policy makers, of whom were comprised Hamiltonians and Wilsonians, they chalked their flaws up to the other

countries and their leaders. However, the taproot of failure was dispensing with Jeffersonianism and Jacksonianism from the decision-making process by the two former schools that can go hand in hand concerning internal and external affairs simultaneously.

Nevertheless, the adamant approach of the foreign policy establishment, where Hamiltonian and Wilsonian decision-makers have been able to agree upon most of the decisions, in the Obama administration soldiered on until the new elected president, Donald J. Trump, took his seat in the Oval Office in 2017. He was to bring about radical changes in US foreign policy by enthusiastically employing one of the four US traditions, the forgotten one, to boost his country's power and position in the security competition amongst the great powers.

3.3. DONALD TRUMP'S JACKSONIAN FOREIGN POLICY

Plenty of pundits have attempted to conduct researches to comprehend why "Trump's foreign policy does not yet have a widely accepted name" (Anton, 2019). Because he has not officially announced the way he conducts his foreign policy thus far, yet it would be absurd, if he pronounced. Despite the fact that the writing is on the wall, majority of the scholars and politicians across the world have not come to discover his foreign policy tradition, yet. Many still try to come up with a certain definition by discussing previous concepts, majority of which have been disliked by the president himself.

so [*sic*] the fact that Trump is not a neoconservative or a paleoconservative, neither a traditional realist nor a liberal internationalist, has caused endless confusion. The same goes for the fact that he has no inborn inclination to isolationism or interventionism, and he is not simply a dove or a hawk. His foreign policy doesn't easily fit into any of these categories, though it draws from all of them. (Anton, 2019)

Nonetheless, anertswile tradition for the president's foreign policy has existed for years in American political culture, albeit without being put into words. And the Jacksonian foreign policy tradition fills the vacuum, in which many concepts and ideas have been used to fill up till now. As soon as Donald Trump stepped into the White House, he paid a visit to Tennessee, where the seventh President of the United States, Andrew Jackson, was laid to rest. Furthermore, he put "Andrew

Jackson's portrait on the wall in the Oval Office" (Glasser, 2018). President Trump, who was elected on November 8, 2016, represents the ideas and values of Jacksonians rather than liberal policies of the foreign policy elites who have compounded Hamiltonian with Wilsonian US foreign policy traditions to realize their agendas at domestic and foreign policy levels. The elites come to represent a bunch of very powerful people in the United States where they have tremendous and insidious influence in the media, politics, business, trade, education, and so on. According to Donald Trump and his Jacksonian supporters,

The elites are largely globalists who despise American nationalism and the border stringency that comes with it. They favor free trade, multilateral arrangements and institutions, and a definition of America that is reduced largely to its governmental creed, which they view as universal and applicable to all peoples everywhere. Hence their activist foreign-policy views. (Merry, 2018)

Owing to the fact that the elites with their mixture of Hamiltonian and Wilsonian foreign policy approaches have significantly influenced the decisions of the US institutions and some international organizations such as the United Nations (UN), the World Trade Organization (WTO), and the Federal Reserve Board (FED), they have been able to employ any policy they have wished, whether it is foreign or domestic politics has not mattered for them, for the aim of constructing a world system in which each state would obey and live up to the set of norms and ideas mandated by that system, thereby subtly safeguarding and advancing their interests. In the minds of the elites, US military has been the most effective tool to realize their agendas on which the spread of democracy and human rights have been their prominent objective heretofore.

By the same token, the elites do not want to alter the international system in which the United States has served as headquarter by embodying and defending liberal values and ideas at home and abroad for decades. According to their world order, the citizens in each country, especially the Americans, are required to be open minded to their policies that demand radical changes in the lives of many ordinary Americans and other citizens in the world as well. The fact that US and its citizens is seen as the beacon of hope for the rest of the world is a deep-rooted view amongst the elites, whose liberal policies strive to engineer the American society from within accordingly. "Claiming to liberate the individual from embedded cultures, traditions, places, and relationships, liberalism has homogenized the world in its image—

ironically, often fueled by claims of “multiculturalism” or, today, “diversity” (Deneen, 2018, p. 17 & 18). As a result of liberal approach to the core American values, the elites have significantly hoodwinked many American citizens into believing that their country should be a multicultural society with numerous ethnicities and cultures.

Hence, the elites have come to find nationalism as a worrisome and senseless idea that could prevent their global policies from being realized across the world. Nationalism has been tried to be winnowed out. Yet the idea of a nation with a dominant ethnic people and culture has thus so far survived and trumped the agenda of the elites on many occasions in various countries and instances. For that reason, the elites promote multiculturalism, immigration, and globalization with ethnic consciousness and economic policies all around the world with the intention of denationalizing people and states, thereby alleviating the minorities’ patriotic sentiments. And it can also be deduced that the liberal policies of the elites have been successful in many countries by looking at the demands of the minorities and different ethnic groups.

The United States and its citizens are one of the most significant nations in the world when it comes to the plans of the elites, the major policies of which are multiculturalism, immigration, and globalization. American institutions and policies have been considerably influenced by the elites who have been at the helm of most of the international institutions and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) advocating liberal virtues and concepts to pave the way for a multicultural nation without borders. Besides, the US is known as “the first nation founded by the explicit embrace of liberal philosophy, whose citizenry is shaped almost entirely by its commitments and vision” (Deneen, 2018, p. 5). Hamiltonian and Wilsonian traditions claim that these kinds of ideas are necessary to strengthen international institutions and trade to safeguard the global order. For that reason, Americans have come to be defined by concepts such as “melting pot” and “salad bowl” to decrease nationalist sentiments based on ethnicity. White people with Anglo-Saxon background would have to see their fellow Americans such as African Americans, Native Americans, and Eastern and Southern European Americans, Hispanic

Americans, Jewish Americans, Catholic Americans, and Muslim Americans as citizens united for a common purpose.

However, majority of the white people with European background, irrespective of Anglo-Saxon heritage, constitute the group known as Jacksonians who impersonate the values and ideas of the seventh president of the United States, who was Andrew Jackson. The foreign policy tradition of Jacksonian approach carries his name to imply the policies he developed along with his characteristics and culture. The Jacksonian tradition has returned to haunt the American politics since the election of President Trump in twenty-first century, albeit with its ramifications. Moreover, the values and ideas of this tradition have been celebrated and appreciated by the supporters of the president. Although it is one of the four US foreign policy traditions along with Hamiltonian, Jeffersonian, and Wilsonian traditions, it has been seen as the most disliked and underestimated approach by many Americans and foreign people in the world. Joseph S. Nye (2004) opines that

Each approach has its virtues and faults. The Hamiltonians are prudent, but their realism lacks a moral appeal to many at home and abroad. The Jacksonians are robust and tough, but lack staying power and allies. Both the Hamiltonians and Jacksonians fail to accord adequate importance to soft power. The Jeffersonians, on the other hand, have plenty of soft power, but not enough hard power. [Moreover], [the] Wilsonians seek to transform the international situation. (p. 140)

These main American foreign policy traditions are not enough to define, understand, and analyze the way American decision-makers come to their conclusions, yet they help those study US foreign policy to evaluate and examine past decisions which might be cardinal to grasp today's American foreign policy. Besides, these traditions are not employed with a clear-cut ways and processes, whereby each of the traditions mingle with each other to correspond to the realities of its epoch, at least the realities of the American interests rather than the interests of other states. For that reason, coming to grips with these traditions, especially the Jacksonian tradition, paves the way for historical and critical discovery and making sense of American politics at home and abroad after the election of Donald Trump, whose victory gave the shock of the elites' life.

Furthermore, because of the fact that "all [*sic*] four schools of thought see foreign policy as an extension of domestic policy; all four have developed distinct approaches to American foreign policy that complement their domestic agendas"

(Mead, 1996, p. 89). Furthermore, Walt (2020) suggests that “what leaders choose to do at home will matter more in the long run than what they choose to do abroad”. Hence, it is essential to be aware of the fact that Donald Trump’s foreign policy mirrors the domestic policy he has zealously embraced. The thoughts, ideas, and values of Jacksonians who voted for him in 2016 lay the groundwork for his domestic policy, thereby affecting his administration’s foreign policy decisions. The Jacksonian tradition “reflect[s] deep seated regional, economic, social, and class interests; they embody visions for domestic as well as foreign policy; it [sic] express[es] moral and political values as well as socioeconomic and political interests” (Mead, 2002/2009, p. 87).

Jacksonians, who are comprised of white middle class and working-class Americans, are the ones who have been gravely affected by the policies of the elites in the recent years. The changes triggered by globalization at economic and cultural levels have wreaked havoc upon their lives by systematically changing cultural codes and job opportunities around them. These changes have posed a serious security threat for them who disagree with the elites on many issues such as immigration, economic globalization, open borders, gun control, multiculturalism, and US foreign policy that seeks to spread democracy and human rights outside while US citizens suffer due to lack of investment at home.

Jacksonians are known with their heavy-handed approaches to achieve their foreign and domestic policy goals and Donald Trump has been no exception in that sense. He proudly stands for the Jacksonian foreign policy tradition in which security of the Americans and the economic growth of the United States are the focal points. Therefore, he is ruthless and protective when it comes to the neglected Americans (Jacksonians), whose demands and vantage points have been brushed aside by the previous administration(s). The fact that most of Jacksonians are either working-class or middle-class Americans is a striking force for the President Trump who became president thanks to their unwavering support in 2016. It must be borne in mind that “most of the farmers largely voted for Trump” (Evich, 2016). For that reason, Trump administration has aimed at improving the life standards of the Jacksonian farmers by employing Jacksonian foreign policy in order to secure Americans’ interests rather than the interests of the elites who benefit from global economic policies

unlike the American farmers. In his visit to Nashville, Tennessee as a president, Trump (2018) remarked that

It was a pivotal moment in the War of 1812. At the time, the British Army seemed totally unstoppable. They had just beaten Napoleon in Europe, and set fire to the United States Capitol. But that did not stop a man named General Andrew Jackson of Tennessee. Did you ever hear of Andrew Jackson of Tennessee? He was a great general and a great President, and his ragtag militia of patriots who were ready to fight to defend American independence...The Americans held their ground. Independence was secured. Andrew Jackson's name was etched into history. And those patriot farmers proved once again that, in the words of Andrew Jackson, farmers are the "basis of society, and true friends of liberty." Great story. Love that story. Have great respect for Andrew Jackson. Today, the Battle of New Orleans lives on in the American soul, and it lives on in each and every one of you. Our task is to preserve the freedom that American soldiers have fought for and died for in every generation. Our task is to uphold the values and principles that define who we are as a nation and as a people. Our task is to love, cherish, and protect the flag and the Constitution of the United States. If we do these things, if we reawaken the confidence that inspired Jackson's victory — our country is getting its confidence back again — the character that stormed the beaches of Normandy, and the courage that sent pilgrims across the ocean and astronauts to the moon, then there is nothing we can't do.

President Trump clearly demonstrated that he endorsed the Jacksonian school of thought by extolling the seventh president of the US, Andrew Jackson, by underscoring the significance of the American farmers for both himself and Andrew Jackson's victory at the Battle of New Orleans. He simply vouched for a bright future for US and Jacksonians, who had started losing their jobs, cultures, and identities along with their shrinking numbers since the end of 2008. Plus, he was eager to reinvigorate American power and "exceptional" position in the international system where US power had been on the wane for a while and it was because of the previous administrations that lukewarmly employed Hamiltonian and Wilsonian schools of thought in foreign policy. President Trump (2017) tweeted that "the [*sic*] first 90 days of my presidency has exposed the total failure of the last eight years of foreign policy."

Donald Trump's approach to foreign policy is not easy to be made of by many. Nor is his approach to domestic politics. But, the underlying reason of this befuddlement is lack of appreciation of US foreign policy traditions, particularly the Jacksonian tradition which has been forgotten and neglected like the Jacksonian community has been treated with contempt. "The Jacksonian school represents a deeply embedded, widely spread populist and popular culture of honor, independence, courage, and military pride among the American people" (Mead,

2002/2009, p. 88). In order to keep it up with this school, one needs to see who these people are, to hear what they say, and to speak with them to appreciate them. The foreign and domestic policies of the Obama administration did the otherwise by having chosen see no evil, hear no evil, speak no evil attitude toward Jacksonians. Because of the policies of the Obama administration, they revolved around a leader who saw, heard, and understood them and did not go against their values and ideas in 2016 presidential elections, in which Donald Trump was elected at the ballot box owing to the electoral-college system.

Given the unwavering support of Jacksonians for Donald Trump, he developed his foreign policy in line with the Jacksonian tradition to preserve American dominance at economic and military levels in the international system. As one of the previous Jacksonian presidents Richard Nixon, initiated a Sino-American rapprochement to prevent communist China from being a partner of the USSR against the United States, Trump has also made a Jacksonian move in his foreign policy. He has clamped down on China by raising the tariffs for Chinese goods to hinder the rise of China. Meanwhile, he has striven to break the ice between the US and Russia to prevent Russia from being an ally of China in the emerging great-power competition within which American dominance in the Asia-Pacific region is at stake.

In addition to that, President Trump has chosen to seem like an unpredictable decision-maker in the foreign affairs in order to bamboozle and intimidate the counterparts of the rival nations of the United States. He resorts to harsh Jacksonian rhetoric to address the issues which are deemed critical for the American national security while also implying that his administration is ready to initiate talks for the nations complying with the requirements of his administration. Besides, Trump never hesitates to let it be known that he is willing to use America's military might to reach his desired foreign policy outcome. And his approach is strikingly similar to President Nixon's "madman theory" which is known as "coercive diplomacy" (Sagan & Suri, 2003, p. 150).

3.4. NATIONALISM AND TRUMP

It is evident that Donald Trump is one of the political leaders who put his country and people first rather than foreign people and countries comparing to his predecessors who mostly took global perspectives into consideration in decision-making process. He wore his heart on his sleeve on many occasions with regards to his views which prioritized Americans at all costs. Donald Trump, who was running for the presidency at that time, gave a speech at the Republican National Convention in 2016 and he thoroughly defined his strategy towards the decision-making process, by which Jacksonian views had been removed from consideration in the past administrations. He declared that

The most important difference between our plan and that of our opponents, is that our plan will put America First. Americanism, not globalism, will be our credo. As long as we are led by politicians who will not put America First, then we can be assured that other nations will not treat America with respect. This will all change in 2017. The American People will come first once again. My plan will begin with safety at home – which means safe neighborhoods, secure borders, and protection from terrorism. There can be no prosperity without law and order. On the economy, I will outline reforms to add millions of new jobs and trillions in new wealth that can be used to rebuild America. (2016)

In order to realize his political agenda Donald Trump has made substantial headway against Hamiltonian and Wilsonian schools of thought in policy-making process with his “America First” approach. He was determined to protect and improve the well-beings of Jacksonians, the middle and working-class Americans, across the United States. And he also regarded most of the agreements signed by the previous administration as one of the reasons why his supporters and America failed, lost their respect and honor. For that reason, the trade agreements were re-evaluated by the Trump administration to secure and advance the material interests of the American people.

After Donald Trump became the sitting president, one of the re-evaluated trade deals, which was Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) spearheaded by the Obama administration, was abrogated. Besides that, he pushed for further negotiations over North America Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) amongst US, Canada, and Mexico. Nonetheless, the most striking reassessment has been the one with China. Due to the fact that China has had US dollars that can rock the boat with regards to US economy, US trade deficit with China has been a huge concern for many US

politicians including the Trump administration. Therefore, President Trump decided to raise the dicens with the second biggest economy of the world by raising the tariffs for the products coming from China, where most of the businesses moved their factories from US to China owing to cheap labor. With this move, he started a trade war between USA and China. He also stated that

When a country (USA) is losing many billions of dollars on trade with virtually every country it does business with, trade wars are good, and easy to win. Example, when we are down \$100 billion with a certain country and they get cute, don't trade anymore-we win big. It's easy! (2018)

By the same token, President Trump believed that the free trade agreement with the EU be reassessed as well. His administration hit upon the idea that they could “use the auto tariffs to punish European countries that tax American digital firms” (Johnson, 2020). The Trump administration has simply considered that all the trade agreements hurting Americans must be renegotiated and that American farmers and workers must be protected against the foreign countries where labor is cheaper than American labor. Although his actions have gone against the economic globalization championed by the previous administrations, President Trump has expressed his willingness to negotiate each deal for the material interests of Americans and for the respect and honor of his country. And his focus on the material interests, honor code and respect for his country evince that he precisely understands what Jacksonians have been looking for in free trade agreements so far—which is American nationalism.

Not only free trade agreements but also international institutions have been affected by Trump's Jacksonian policy-making process, whereby the function of these institutions and American interests are dissected and evaluated whether they correspond to each other. If any of the international institutions and its policies work at cross-purposes with the Jacksonian tradition, they are rendered fuddy-duddy until it proves itself worthy for Jacksonians and the Trump administration. For instance, NATO has been questioned by President Trump many times during his election campaign and his presidency. Despite the fact that NATO members are required to pay their fair share, which is two percentage of their GDP, Trump has discerned that most of the members have fallen short of paying it. He stated that “NATO is

obsolete” during a rally in Racine, Wisconsin (Parker, 2016). His remark was the reflection of Jacksonians who have always mistrusted international organizations.

By the same token, the World Trade Organization (WTO) was also a top-of-the-mind concern in Trump administration. The WTO has been seen as an international organization which stipulates a set of conditions to be obeyed in free trade agreements. But the Trump administration strongly believes that countries such as China and other rich nations do not take those rules into considerations by taking advantage of the organization while putting US at harm’s way. President Trump shared his views regarding the WTO and other countries on social media. He said that

The WTO is BROKEN when the world’s RICHEST countries claim to be developing countries to avoid WTO rules and get special treatment. NO more!!! Today I directed the U.S. Trade Representative to take action so that countries stop CHEATING the system at the expense of the USA! (2019)

As a result of the Trump administration’s policies, US representatives have been restlessly working to wield their influence in the WTO in accordance with their protectionist trade policies which prioritize American farmers and working-class citizens rather than the elites and foreign countries. In this instance, the Trump administration is determined to comply with the Jacksonian tradition to force the WTO to whip China with the purpose of harnessing the rising economy of it and diminishing the trade deficit between these two great powers.

By the same token, the Trump administration went through the roof when they figured out that the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank advocated policies that could work at cross-purposes with Trump’s Jacksonian foreign policy in which America First approach dictates that globalist methods are jettisoned. Besides that, the World Health Organization (WHO) was castigated by the Trump administration due to its belated warnings regarding the Covid-19 pandemic having erupted from Wuhan, China. President Trump was uncompromising in his decision to cut funding to the WHO. He clarified his administration’s position towards the WTO and the WHO. He articulated that

China’s pattern of misconduct is well known. For decades, they have ripped off the United States like no one has ever done before. Hundreds of billions of dollars a year were lost dealing with China, especially over the years during the prior administration. China raided our factories, offshored our jobs, gutted our industries, stole our intellectual property, and violated their commitments under the World

Trade Organization. To make matters worse, they are considered a developing nation getting all sorts of benefits that others, including the United States, are not entitled to... Chinese officials ignored their reporting obligations to the World Health Organization and pressured the World Health Organization to mislead the world when the virus was first discovered by Chinese authorities... China has total control over the World Health Organization, despite only paying \$40 million per year compared to what the United States has been paying, which is approximately \$450 million a year. We have detailed the reforms that it must make and engage with them directly, but they have refused to act. Because they have failed to make the requested and greatly needed reforms, we will be today terminating our relationship with the World Health Organization and redirecting those funds to other worldwide and deserving, urgent, global public health needs. (2020)

Furthermore, the EU and the Federal Reserve Board (FED) have also been berated by the Trump administration in many cases. The EU has been regarded as the institution which puts tariffs to American products while demanding the decrease of tariffs for European products in return. For that reason, a new free trade agreement with the EU has been on the agenda of the Trump administration that purports that the trade deficit with the EU must be lowered so that US can also benefit from the economic relationship. President Trump, on his social media account, stated that

The European Union is coming to Washington tomorrow to negotiate a deal on Trade. I have an idea for them. Both the U.S. and the E.U. drop all Tariffs, Barriers and Subsidies! That would finally be called Free Market and Fair Trade! Hope they do it, we are ready - but they won't! (2018)

The Federal Reserve Bank was criticized by the President on many occasions because of their monetary policies which hamper the material interests of Jacksonians. The FED is, however, independent from any state interference and this makes this situation more complicated for the Trump administration. According to them, the FED has to comply with their administration's protectionist economic policies to compete with the rest of the countries. Owing to the fact that the Trump administration is hard-pressed to manipulate the FED with ease, the President Trump generally shares his discontent with the institution. He tweeted that "the [*sic*] Federal Reserve must FINALLY lower the Fed Rate to something comparable to their competitor Central Banks. Jay Powell and group are putting us at a decided economic & physiological disadvantage. Should never have been this way. Also, STIMULATE!" (2020).

Given the Trump administration mistrust of international organizations, it is not perplexing to make sense of their suspicion of international agreements signed by the previous administration. As the most widely known examples indicate, which are

the decertification of the JCPOA and the Paris Climate Act, the Trump administration is solely driven by the material interests and does not mull the ramifications over because those agreements foisted undesired constraints upon American businesses and interests. The Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) was signed with the intention of preventing Iranians from enriching uranium, thereby cutting the amount of uranium to build a nuclear weapon. Nonetheless, the Trump administration decided to repudiate the agreement in 2017. Plus, the Paris Climate Accords, which was aimed to cut the carbon dioxide emission to a certain level, was disavowed as well.

Another nationalist approach in the Trump administration's Jacksonian foreign policy is his endorsement and appreciation of the US military. President Trump deemed that American military power and combat-readiness lagged behind its foreign competitors due to the negligence of the Obama administration. Hence, the Trump administration strove to restore American military might to best America's foes at all levels. Not only did Trump believe that this reconstruction could goose up and safeguard American sovereignty but he also believed that he could get on well with Jacksonians by augmenting the most respected and liked the US institution—the Pentagon—by them. The Trump administration buckled down to amplify the budget for the Department of Defense in order to project US military power across the world.

By the same token, the Trump administration considered that they could prove the military might of US by defeating Daesh (ISIS) in Syria and Iraq and supporting military innovations and projects in many fields such as artificial intelligence (AI) and supersonic missiles. They also were determined to root out US enemies and terrorist organizations in the Middle East region where Daesh leader Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi and Iranian General Qassem Soleimani were killed by the US airstrikes. These military achievements by the Trump administration were celebrated by Jacksonians who support a total victory over their enemies. Besides, Trump's harsh rhetoric with respect to Daesh and its leader demonstrates his Jacksonian approach. Trump remarked that "he [sic] was a sick and depraved man, and now he's gone. Baghdadi was vicious and violent, and he died in a vicious and violent way, as

a coward, running and crying” (2019). What he said upon the news of Baghdadi’s death corroborates his Jacksonian mind-set and endorsement thereof.

What is more, the Jacksonian school purports that American lives matter and none of the American soldiers can be sacrificed for misbegotten plans of the decision-makers and their political agendas all around the globe. However, if war begins owing to corrupt politicians, they fight brutally till they destroy their enemies and they do not dread to wage an all-and-out war against anyone threatening their well-beings and country. They do not oscillate between surrendering or winning the war. They just fight to die by burning their bridges. Despite the fact that Jacksonians are ruthless paladins when it comes to war, they set forth that the US military should not be involved in most of the conflicts unless the material interests of Americans are at stake. Therefore, they question the US military presence and involvements in many foreign lands.

Donald Trump shares Jacksonians’ views with regards to the US military involvement and presence in foreign places, where American taxes are mostly used for not the material interests of Jacksonians but for the safety of foreign people and lands. And the wasting of tax payers’ money for foreign people is widely disapproved by Jacksonians who believe that fighting other people’s wars militate against the well-being and security of the United States and American citizens. That is why the Trump administration has insisted on their NATO allies to pay their fair share to support their militaries against the threat of international terrorism and the Russian Federation.

Furthermore, President Trump has never hesitated to demonstrate his Jacksonian approach to armed forces in many cases by supporting the US military institutions and members at all costs by increasing the budget of the Pentagon and ameliorating the situation of the veterans at home. But there is one thing he has done to prove his Jacksonian way of doing things with respect to the US military is his decision to question and getting rid of the [sic] “endless wars, where ... [American] military functions as a policing operation to the benefit of people who don’t even like the USA” (Trump, 2019). He decided to withdraw the US military personal from the north of Syria, where Turkey was conducting a military operation with the aim of

rooting out the PYD having strong ties to the PKK, which is “a terrorist organization not only in the eyes of the Turkish government but in the eyes of the US government as well”, and backed by the United States Central Command (CENTCOM) to advance US military interests in the region in the fight against the Daesh (Turkish Heritage Organization, 2016, 03:15-05:21).

By the same token, the Trump administration stroke a peace deal with the Taliban in Afghanistan in February, 2020. This deal contains “four main provisions”, one of which is the “withdrawal of US troops” from Afghanistan (Armed Conflict Location & Event Data Project, p. 1, 2020). Besides, Trump decided to withdraw US forces from Germany, where US has nuclear weapons. His decision “stunned officials in both countries—including many in his own administration” (Mead, 2020). The reason why many officials were dumbfounded by his abrupt decision was his Jacksonian approach towards foreign policy and the US military personal.

The purpose of the Trump administration in their decisions to tackle international organizations, free trade agreements, and the US military decisions is that Jacksonian point of view, which was dismissed as an old-fashioned approach and not taken into consideration in the past administrations, now must be part of American foreign policy and decision-making process. And international organizations along with other countries must bear in mind Jacksonian vantage point before reaching a middle ground with the Trump administration. The fact that the Jacksonian school of thought is not appreciated by most of the foreign countries and almost all of the international organizations has not been a serious concern for the Trump administration.

Nevertheless, the Trump administration is decisive to follow the philosophy of Jacksonian school while expecting rest of the states to acclimatize themselves to this reality by ironing out their differences. President Trump, who acts as a populist leader in decision-making process, also shows his determination to end the wars which have turned into a quagmire for the US military in the past years. His decisions and actions represent another aspect of his Jacksonian understanding of foreign and military affairs and further indicate that he precisely reckons with Jacksonians’ perspectives and sentiments before he arrives to any conclusion in his

foreign policy decisions along with his administration's decisions in domestic politics. And the most essential Jacksonian sentiment has been heretofore nationalism that can be discerned at all levels of political decisions made by the Trump administration.

Moreover, nationalism helps the Trump administration accentuate the significance of American sovereignty by putting America first in the policy-making process, by which foreign countries are expected to respect American power across the world once again. Besides, the Trump administration strives to consolidate American sovereignty and identity both at home and abroad by touching a chord with Jacksonians, whose support for the administration is very critical. In order to realize his Jacksonian foreign policy Trump needs to remain an august president in the eyes of Jacksonians who are ready to go to great lengths to protect their identities, cultures, well-beings, and their country against the massive immigration coming from the Latin American countries.

Eventually, Donald Trump's foreign policy approach has laid the reality out that Hamiltonian and Wilsonian politicians have glossed over for years. That reality is the fact that the international order established by Hamiltonians and Wilsonians is a gloomy system, of which current set of values do not correspond to the values of the American common folk anymore. And this has been the top-of-mind concern for Jacksonians who have come to see the international system from a gloomy perspective which enables them to see the system from a realist perspective, thereby allowing Trump to see it from the same vantage point. Last but not least, President Trump's foreign policy has demonstrated that America is not an idea to which other nations look up in order to look the same. Rather, America is a country that has to be reckoned with, respected, and honored on the global stage with its mighty economic and military power, instead.

3.5. THE JACKSONIAN TRADITION FROM RICHARD NIXON TO DONALD TRUMP

The resistance of Jacksonians to Hamiltonian and Wilsonian policies harks back to the era of the Nixon administration. President Nixon was the first president who

came up with a strategy in order to drum up support amongst the Southern voters who comprised of majority of Jacksonians in the late 1960s. And he won a landslide victory thanks to the help of Jacksonians, whom he referred as “the silent majority” (Shribman, 2019). With his “Southern Strategy”, Nixon was able to address the deep-seated security issues of Jacksonians living in the South where “race and ethnicity overshadow economic class” (Brown, 2004, p. 192).

The silent majority speech of Nixon touched a chord with Jacksonians who put “patriotism, race, and class” first rather than global issues (Laderman, 2019, p. 95). They did not want their country to wage a war in Vietnam while they had plenty of problems to be solved at home. Meanwhile, the United States was losing ground against the Soviet Union with regard to arms race and Hamiltonian and Wilsonian decision-makers failed to address these domestic and foreign policy issues upfront. Thus, Nixon made Jacksonians aware that they were the silent majority since they “had in fact been silenced” by the politicians who were mostly WASPish—White Anglo-Saxon Protestant—and adamant to see the events from the perspectives of Hamilton and Wilson philosophies (p. 96). Additionally, what makes Jacksonians differ from WASPs is that they are the common folks of whom are comprised millions of working-class and middle-class Americans whereas WASPs are comprised of wealthy white Americans with British background and are mostly referred as the elites of the United States. And their numbers have significantly decreased in the last years. However, they have hitherto come to belittle Jacksonians since majority of them have come to endorse and champion Hamiltonian and Wilsonian schools of thought in foreign and domestic policy by disseminating liberal values which make Jacksonians go through the roof.

The Nixon administration was going through a rough patch in foreign policy because of the balance of power in the international system within which American dominance was withering on the vine, thereby tilting the balance for the favor of the USSR in the security competition. And any kind of poor decision concerning the intentions of the other side would be deemed as irrevocable for the future of the United States. The administration thus admitted that “the United States had fallen behind its dominant position in the arms race” and the policies and agreements to curb the arms race were not endorsed as it had been expected by the USSR (Dallek,

2007, p. 136). Hence, the US government under President Nixon was girding itself for the worst. Additionally, the Bretton Woods system was going downhill in the early 1970s by altering the exchangeability of US dollar and gold.

Given the situation of the Nixon administration and Jacksonians in the late 60s and early 70s, it is easy to pick up on striking similarities with the Trump administration and Jacksonians in the 21st century. As explained by Cha and Seo (2018),

both the Nixon and Trump administrations started to serve their country during transitional periods of relative decline in U.S. power and growing political contestation. While Nixon and Henry Kissinger came to govern as the original postwar international order was crumbling, Trump was similarly elected at a time when the post-Cold War order was coming undone. (81)

The fact that the foreign policy establishment of the United States has been exorbitantly dominated by decision-makers who follow Hamiltonian and Wilsonian traditions has left Jacksonians with rancor. The full endorsement of Hamiltonian and Wilsonian schools of thought by the foreign policy establishment on Capitol Hill after the end of the Cold War has made liberal values and ideas, which go against Jacksonian ideas and values, percolated into American public consciousness. Jacksonians' sole purpose of creating and maintaining the order they have heretofore wished to create has been disrupted by liberal policies of the foreign policy establishment since then. Jacksonians by the same token have come to conclusion that their culture is seen as petty and despicable by Hamiltonian and Wilsonian policymakers who vigorously champion liberal values and ideas at the risk of weakening Jacksonian tradition and its influence in American culture and democratic system.

For that reason, Jacksonians have been determined to throw their weight behind President Trump, who is seen as the current and most famous leader of Jacksonians, in order to safeguard their culture, identity, heritage, and future against the liberal policies of the other two schools of thought such as multiculturalism, open borders, and immigration. What is more, due to the fact that the factories Jacksonians used to work were forced to move to overseas and that open borders brought many illegal immigrants from the Latin American countries under the previous administrations having employed Hamiltonian and Wilsonian policies, the bulk of

Jacksonians living primarily in the American heartland and coming from a white and European heritage felt that their well-being was under threat. And they decided to square off under the leadership under the Trump administration. Plus, the waning American power on the international stage has made them worry about for the future of their country and livelihood due to rise of China and resurgent Russia. In other words, the returning of great-power competition has tremendously vexed Jacksonians for fear of losing their well-being and heritage along with their country's economic and military power on the world stage. Given that, the Jacksonian community has come to accentuate the significance of American spiritual security by safeguarding Anglo-American culture and European heritage of Jacksonians amid the growing internal and external threats in the face of great power competition. And Donald Trump is the fulcrum in their struggle to maintain the security of America and their community.

According to Jacksonians, the liberal policies of Hamiltonian and Wilsonian schools of thought posed a grave danger to their white, Protestant, and American identity along with the reputation of America in the eyes of foreign competitors. And this threat has been intensified with the end of the Cold War since the United States became the only great power in the international system. Given that, concepts such as multiculturalism, globalization, ethnic and gender identities were prioritized by the policy makers who believed that they could turn US into a peaceful and multicultural society by addressing and appreciating the differences of the American people simultaneously. By doing that, they desired to demonstrate that other nations also followed the footsteps of the US for the sake of resembling the hegemonic power of the international system. As Samuel P. Huntington (2004) writes that

A massive Hispanic influence raised questions concerning America's linguistic and cultural unity. Corporate executives, professionals, and Information Age technocrats espoused cosmopolitan over national identities. The teaching of national history gave way to the teaching of ethnic and racial histories. The celebration of diversity replaced emphasis on what Americans had in common. The national unity and sense of national identity created by work and war in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and consolidated in the world wars of the twentieth century seemed to be eroding. By 2000, America was, in many respects, less a nation than it had been for a century (pp. 4 & 5)

In relation to the observation of Samuel P. Huntington, Jacksonians seem to have realized the threats posed by Hamiltonian and Wilsonian liberal policies and

their ramifications for the future of the United States and its white and Protestant culture, which has played a significant role in the formation of American identity and democracy, long before than any other US institution. The fact that religion, mainly Protestantism, is seen as innocuous does not mean that there are not various groups, the ideas of which are substantially affected by Jacksonians such as some of the white evangelical Christians. Even though Walter Russell Mead opines that “evangelical theology does not automatically produce Jacksonian or populist foreign policy”, their Jacksonian influence under the Trump administration cannot be downplayed (2006, pp. 42 & 43).

To illustrate, it is necessary to be aware of the fact that “most of the evangelical Christian voters supported Donald Trump in 2016 presidential elections” (Smith, 2016). Furthermore, the studies show that “most of the white evangelicals—nearly seventy percent of them—still throw their weight behind President Trump for the 2020 presidential elections” (Lipka& Smith, 2020). Their unwavering support indicates that at least two thirds of evangelicals are in line with the school of thought President Trump stands for, which is Jacksonianism, and that they share mutual concerns with the president when it comes to the American domestic and foreign policy. Though the evangelicals seem to have blinkered ideology concerning the pitfalls in both internal and external policies, they are not seen as a recalcitrant group by Jacksonians and the Trump administration to advance their interests.

Aside from the religious groups, vast majority of Jacksonians consider that their identity is under attack by the liberal policies of the previous administrations that championed multicultural, ethnic, gender, and religious diversity at the cost of white American identity shaped by Anglo-American culture. The fact that “African Americans, Asian Americans, and Hispanic Americans will constitute the majority of the US population by 2050 by surpassing white Americans’ population” is a grave danger for Jacksonians who have showed their discontent for illegal immigration, multiculturalism, diversity, and interracial marriages for the sake of the United States and its white population that is deemed to be the bedrock of American society (Parker, Morin & Horowitz, 2019).

In other words, not only have Jacksonians acknowledged the dismal reality but also they have helped other schools of thought to come to grips with that phenomenon which has bedeviled their culture, well-being, liberty, religion, identity, and values for a very long time. Their tradition is under attack as it was threatened by the Native Americans and imperial powers such as the British Empire, Spanish Empire, and French empire in the American frontier where first Jacksonians who lived and strove to safeguard those values no matter what. In the late eighteenth century, Jacksonians had a leader who was Andrew Jackson having helped them protect themselves and their well-being against domestic and foreign threats. And in the twenty-first century Jacksonians have faced another existential crisis that has needed to be addressed for their future and well-beings as if they lived in the American frontier. But they did not have a proper leader who was approved by majority of Jacksonians until 2015. Donald Trump has become their leader since then and will continue to address the problems of Jacksonian America in the near future to be reelected in 2020.

Therefore, the Jacksonian foreign policy tradition has begun to dominate American domestic and foreign policy since the United States is getting prepared to demonstrate its power to compete against the great powers such as Russia and China, meanwhile the majority of white population try to remain the dominant group in the current demographic trends. Moreover, this situation bears striking similarities to the time period in which Andrew Jackson became popular and ruled the country tooth and nail. He had to deal with the major powers of his era, US bank(s), and demographic trends to assure the well-being of Jacksonian America. And Donald Trump has likewise been trying to do the same for the last four years in tandem with the teachings of Jacksonian school of thought.

Donald Trump's rhetoric has reflected the insecurities of Jacksonians who have been seriously affected by the liberal policies of Hamiltonian and Wilsonian decision-makers since the beginning of his election campaign in 2015. Jacksonians, therefore, made significant provisions for his campaign and noticed that they were on the verge of a "now or never" moment in their lives to overcome the pitfalls caused by the formulation of liberal policies, which went against the values of Jacksonians, such as globalization, multiculturalism, and bringing democracy and liberty to other

(illiberal) countries. Those policies mushroomed into a serious matter for Jacksonians who have been comprised of white working-class and middle-class Americans.

What is more, some of the members of Jacksonian community have hitherto had negative views with respect to multicultural American society, in which the dominance of Anglo-American culture and Protestantism might be debilitated by the illegal aliens and their peculiar and pervasive culture to Jacksonian values and life styles. For these reasons, Trump's harsh Jacksonian rhetoric on particular matters such as illegal immigration, economic globalization, American nationalism, and international terrorism provoked Jacksonians to take their lives into their own hands owing to their instinctive nature. For instance, Donald Trump, who was running for the Republican Party's nomination at that time, said that

When do we beat Mexico at the border? They're laughing at us, at our stupidity. And now they are beating us economically. They are not our friend, believe me. But they're killing us economically. The U.S. has become a dumping ground for everybody else's problems...When Mexico sends its people, they're not sending their best. They're not sending you...They're sending people that have lots of problems, and they're bringing those problems with us. They're bringing drugs. They're bringing crime. They're rapists. And some, I assume, are good people. (2015)

Trump's blunt remarks with respect to immigrants, especially Mexicans, caused an outcry amongst the Latin American community in the United States, where the Trump administration decided to build a wall between the US and Mexico in order to curb illegal immigrants. The fact that the policies of Hamiltonian and Wilsonian politicians have come to champion immigration and open borders has been strongly disavowed by the Trump administration due to unwavering support of Jacksonians for hindrance of illegal immigration. The Trump administration by the same token introduced a set of travel restrictions for the Muslim majority countries in 2017. It was known as the Muslim ban which prevented the citizens of Syria, Yemen, Somalia, Libya, and Iran from entering into US for three months. This ban was a stark endorsement of Jacksonian politics since Donald Trump had stated that "a total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States until our country's representatives can figure out what is going on" in 2015 while running for the Republican Party's nomination (Taylor, 2015).

The banning of the citizens of those Muslim majority countries from entering into the United States was the damning evidence of the Trump administration's populist (Jacksonian) response to the problems having been engendered by Hamiltonian and Wilsonian policymakers. Along with globalization and endless wars, immigration undergirded by multicultural ideas has been seen as a security threat for Jacksonians who are unyielding to safeguard their liberty by using their constitutional right, which is the Second Amendment.

Jacksonians believe that their culture and well-being are under threat owing to Hamiltonian and Wilsonian policies which have brought millions of immigrants into their doorsteps. Although they were for the first time referred as the "silent majority" by President Nixon in 1969, their reaction to protect their tradition has been quite loud (Shribman, 2019). And they believe that sending those who pose threat to their country, culture, jobs, and well-being to where they come from is extremely important to resolve the illegal immigration issue.

Due to the fact that they have a leader in the Oval Office, they do not feel that they are underrepresented anymore and that their struggle to protect their culture and way of lives can be seen as a sound effort, irrespective of the ways of doing such actions. Thus, small number of Jacksonians has resorted to their rights in the Constitution to demonstrate that they are bent on defending their self-claimed rights by dragooning some people who disparage and vilify Jacksonian values and ideas into respecting them. And their acute reaction to multiculturalism, globalization, and open borders are designated as "far-right terrorism" by the people who do not approve of the Trump administration's Jacksonian policies.

Even though Jacksonians do not advocate harming people that do not share their values and ideas to show their opposition to Hamiltonian and Wilsonian politicians and liberals, there are a bunch of extremist people in the United States who have the means and clear intentions to do harm the others. And the actions of extremist people are used to discredit Jacksonians and the Trump administration. Hence, Jacksonians have refrained from using violence to demonstrate their opposition in most of the cases. However, they have not been able to shy away from being stigmatized as the far-right extremists by the Democratic Party members and

the main stream media since they have obviously showed that they will support President Trump under all circumstances. And the exact reason why Jacksonians champion the cause of President Trump is plainly clarified by Samuel P. Huntington.

The substantial benefits from immigration in terms of economic growth, demographic revitalization, and maintenance of international status and influence may be countered by the costs of higher spending on government services, fewer jobs, lower wages, and reduced benefits for native workers, social polarization, cultural conflict, decline in trust and community, and erosion of traditional concepts of national identity. The immigration issue may produce serious divisions among elite groups, arouse popular opinion against immigrants and immigration, and offer opportunities to nationalist and populist politicians and parties to exploit these sentiments. (2004, p. 183)

Because of the fact that Jacksonians have not come to trust Hamiltonian and Wilsonian politicians—the staunch defenders of American liberal hegemony—in the Democratic and Republican parties in the last decade, they usually prefer showing their opposition by coalescing around a Jacksonian leader, who has been Donald Trump since 2015. And they do not have any sympathy for those advocating liberal hegemony on both sides of the aisle which has heretofore debilitated their well-beings owing to mass migration, economic globalization, and loss of their jobs. This pattern in that community has not changed since the election of Donald Trump. Furthermore, Jacksonians have begun to gravitate towards the Trump administration regardless of the leaks coming from the White House with regard to President Trump’s private life and personal diplomacy, both of which are glossed over by majority of Jacksonians because they have started gaining control in the decision-making process of foreign and domestic policies that caused damage in their lives in the previous administrations.

3.6. THE FAR-RIGHT TERROR ATTACKS AND THE SMEAR CAMPAIGN AGAINST JACKSONIANS

The far-right terrorists’ sporadic attacks on immigrants have significantly surged since the election of President Trump in 2016. According to a research conducted by a think-tank located in the United States, “far-right terrorism has significantly outpaced terrorism from other types of perpetrators, including from far-left networks and individuals inspired by [Daesh] and al-Qaeda” (Center for Strategic & International Studies, Jones, Doxsee& Harrington, 2020). Given that, it is palpable to

infer that the terror attacks were driven by the hatred of immigrant communities that were seen as a serious problem for the radicalized white people with extremist views. And these perpetrators are perceived as if they were related to Jacksonians due to their harsh rhetoric and firm opposition to Hamiltonians and Wilsonians.

The motivations behind the attacks in Charlottesville, Virginia in 2017 and El Paso, Texas in 2019 clearly indicate that the perpetrators shared the some of the concerns of the Jacksonian community. Jacksonians are not radicalized or extremist people that bring destruction as long as their well-beings are not under physical attack unlike the far-right terrorists, however. James Alex Fields Jr., who drove his car through the crowd and killed one demonstrator on August 12, 2017, was there to show his solidarity at “Unite the Right rally with the aim of preventing leftist groups from taking down of Confederate General Robert E. Lee’s statue” (Fieldstadt, 2019). After the incident, President Trump expressed his views in a press conference concerning the attack in Charlottesville when he was answering the questions of the reporters. And he said that

I’ve condemned neo-Nazis. I’ve condemned many different groups. But not all of those people were neo-Nazis, believe me. Not all of those people were white supremacists, by any stretch. Those people were also there because they wanted to protest the taking down of a statue, Robert E. Lee...And you take a look at some of the groups and you see -- and you’d know it if you were honest reporters, which in many cases you’re not, but many of those people were there to protest the taking down of the statue of Robert E. Lee. So this week it’s Robert E. Lee. I noticed that Stonewall Jackson’s coming down. I wonder, is it George Washington next week? And is it Thomas Jefferson the week after? You know, you all -- you really do have to ask yourself, where does it stop? But they were there to protest...You take a look, the night before, they were there to protest the taking down of the statue of Robert E. Lee... George Washington was a slave owner... So, will George Washington now lose his status?... How about Thomas Jefferson?...Are we going to take down the statue? Because he was a major slave owner. Now, are we going to take down his statue? So you know what? It’s fine. You’re changing history. You’re changing culture. And you had people, and I’m not talking about the neo-Nazis and the white nationalists, because they should be condemned totally. But you had many people in that group other than neo-Nazis and white nationalists. OK? And the press has treated them absolutely unfairly. Now, in the other group also, you had some fine people, but you also had troublemakers and you see them come with the black outfits and with the helmets and with the baseball bats...You [sic] had a lot of bad people in the other group... (2017)

In his answers, President Trump accentuated that the reporters were altering history and culture due to covering the incident from subjective perspective and skewed judgment. He lashed out at them for their unscrupulousness since the press zeroed in on few extremist people while there were many radical leftist groups in

other side such as Anti-fascist movement (Antifa). Furthermore, Trump was aware of the fact that these radical groups were driven by anti-Jacksonian sentiments in which they demanded all the statues reflecting Jacksonian culture and heritage be removed by force. And his remarks were recalled and then denounced by his opponents when the protests erupted in 2020 over the death of George Floyd, who was an African American killed by a white police officer in Minneapolis, Minnesota. The protests known as the Black Lives Matter (BLM) erupted as a result of George Floyd's murder by a police officer culminated in violent attempts to erase and remove the culture and history of Jacksonians all over the states. And those attempts were met with fire and fury by Jacksonians who were tenacious to safeguard and maintain their past, law and order in their cities, towns, and states. They illustrated their love of liberty by resorting to Second Amendment by any means necessary.

In addition to the previous attack, there were many attacks conducted by far-right terrorists whose views were not in accordance with Jacksonians across the United States but one was striking than others. It befell in El Paso, Texas on August 3, 2019. The perpetrator, Patrick Crusius, was motivated by ideas which have come to vex all of the Jacksonians as of today. Crusius believed that his home state, Texas, was invaded by Mexicans, whose increasing population all over the states has been seen as a threat to Anglo-American culture and values. "As reported by the El Paso Police Department, Crusius' aim was to shoot Mexicans indiscriminately" (Aguilera, 2020). And it is conspicuous that the motivation of the attack was to "protect" Crusius' home state against the immigrants as if he had been living in American frontier and had been required to defend his home against the Native Americans. Plus, this attack occurred under a populist and nationalist administration that has readily put its John Hancock on the implementation of Jacksonian philosophy in foreign and domestic policy making.

Last but not the least, the far-right terror attacks never stopped Jacksonians showing their distaste for Hamiltonians, Wilsonians, and the elites for fear of being besmirched as far-right supporters or racist people. Furthermore, they have also accused the Democratic Party members and Trump dissidents as the radical left or socialists who glossed over the destruction and turmoil in the cities, where BLM and Antifa protesters "peacefully" demonstrated, thereby encroaching upon the primary

concept of Jacksonians, which is law and order. As a result of it, President Trump aimed to consolidate his Jacksonian supporters in a rally which was held in Oklahoma as the first presidential campaign event on June 20, 2020 after the Covid-19 measures were incrementally eased. Despite the fact that he sounded ebullient in the rally, the riots and lootings which erupted as a result of the BLM protests were continuing throughout the country at that time and his base did not balk at the idea of regarding those violent rioters and looters as the radical left supporters.

Moreover, he expressed that he counted on Jacksonians for the upcoming election on November 3 in order to soldier on preserving and advancing the silent majority's interests. President Trump plainly endorsed Jacksonians once again in his address. He said that "the [sic] forgotten men and women, I campaigned for the forgotten. These are great people. These are substantial people. These are the elite. By the way, you're the elite. They're not the elite. You're the elite" (Canty, 2020). And Trump further added to his remarks that "I stand before you today to declare the silent majority is stronger than ever before. Five months from now, we're going to defeat sleepy Joe Biden... We're going to stop the radical left" (2020).

President Trump's remarks sounded as if his Jacksonian supporters had been getting prepared to ward off a Native American assault, which was a formidable incident for American frontiersmen in the era of Andrew Jackson. And this kind of rhetoric, which is Jacksonian in every respect, is one of the cardinal reasons why the other side of the aisle labels Jacksonians as racist and far-right extremists in the United States. Even though Jacksonians, who are comprised of resented white people, do not balk at the idea of resorting to their Constitutional rights to demonstrate their disapproval of the policies championed by Hamiltonian and Wilsonian policymakers, they have constricted themselves to a rhetoric which plays down political correctness. On the other hand, some Americans that share some of the concerns of Jacksonians in domestic and foreign policy prefer violence to peace and their actions are used as a smear campaign to disparage and demean the Trump administration and Jacksonians at the same time. In other words, President Trump's Jacksonian foreign policy has caused his administration and supporters to be referred as far-right extremists by Hamiltonians and Wilsonians that have tried to discredit

Jacksonians—including Trump—at all levels of society by labeling them as racists, bigots, and extremists.

The first presidential debate on September 30 was, however, another platform on which such allegations linking the Trump administration with the far-right groups were once again uttered by Joe Biden, the Democratic presidential nominee, representing the Hamiltonian and Wilsonian schools of thought. Moreover, President Trump was accused of not condemning those extremist groups by his opponents at the end of the debate due his answer to a question of the moderator, Chris Wallace from the Fox News network, who “asked if he was willing to denounce white supremacists” (Conklin, 2020). Although President Trump answered the question by saying “Sure, I’m willing to do that”, it was implied by former Vice-President Joe Biden that President Trump should denounce one of the far-right groups, which was Proud Boys (2020). As a result of this spat, Trump said that “Proud Boys, stand back and stand by” (2020). But his expression eventuated in outcry among some Americans who believed that Trump supported these far-right groups.

Even though any concrete evidence to prove the relationship between the Trump administration and the far-right groups does not exist, vilifying Donald Trump and his supporters is seen as a strategy to coax some Trump supporters and undecided voters into voting for Biden, instead. According to the logic sitting behind the Jacksonian tradition, Jacksonians do not simply abandon their support for President Trump owing to baseless accusations coming from the Democratic Party members and its supporters. Under these circumstances, only might the undecided voters be convinced to vote for the Democratic presidential nominee with this strategy, however.

CONCLUSION

Owing to the fact that US foreign policy has been a matter of concern for many scholars and decision-makers across the globe, majority of them have failed to come to grips with Donald Trump's foreign policy and its implications for the international system and security. Furthermore, the failure has conspicuously continued even when the attempts to equate the Trump administration and its supporters with the far-right extremist groups are pontificated by many American and foreign politicians. And these failures are seen as the harbinger of deep divisions in American politics, the future implications of which cannot be glossed over for the international security. For that reason, this thesis seeks to fall upon a solution to discover Donald Trump's foreign policy and the reason why his administration along with his supporters are identified as the far-right supporters. And that solution has been the four US foreign policy traditions, in which America foreign policy and culture have mingled with each other while formulating Hamiltonian, Wilsonian, Jeffersonian, and Jacksonian schools of thought that can offer a comprehensive explanation.

In the first place, it is necessary to acknowledge the fact that Donald Trump is a populist and nationalist American president who follows Jacksonian school of thought. The tradition he employs is named after the seventh and first populist president of the United States, who was Andrew Jackson. The bedrock of Jacksonian tradition was formed by the legacy left by President Jackson and his supporters, whose ideas and values have soldiered on till now. And this fact behooves this thesis to explain Andrew Jackson's legacy and crucial moments during the formation of Jacksonian tradition in tandem with Trump administration's foreign policy so that the failure can be redeemed scrupulously.

The election of Donald Trump in 2016 has paved way for a time period where populist and nationalist ideas are candidly appreciated by some of the groups in the United States. And these groups are known as Jacksonians who are mostly white middle-class and working-class Americans. They happen to constitute the majority of the Trump administration's supporters who carried Trump into the Oval Office four

years ago. Their mindset has been shaped by the ideas and values of the Jacksonian tradition which has been cornerstone of Donald Trump's foreign policy approach.

In order to discover Jacksonian tradition this thesis strove to latch onto the foundations of Jacksonian tradition. And it came to conclusion that six major events played great role in the formation of this US foreign policy tradition that has its own interpretation of international security and system. Even though this kind of interpretation is clearly defined by Jacksonians, its core principles can only be discovered by combing through six crucial moments in the life of Andrew Jackson, which are defined as the six principles of the Jacksonian tradition in this thesis.

First of the crucial moments that formed the school of Jacksonian is Andrew Jackson's frontiersman experience within which he learnt the grim reality of life, which is the survival of the fittest. This experience taught him to be responsible for the security of his loved ones and the common white folks who suffered a lot due to the attacks of the Native Americans. These sufferings culminated in an understanding amongst the frontiersmen that underscored the significance of honor and vengeance as way to defend themselves and secure their way of lives against the threats emanating from outside. As a consequence of this encounter with the perils of external world, the Jacksonian community has come to regard outlanders with suspicion since then. At last, Jackson's willingness to protect his people at all costs generated a conservative culture that can be observed in the contemporary Jacksonians' unwavering support for the Second Amendment for the sake of common white folks' security and well-being. Their total commitment to the Amendment complies with the way of thinking of frontiersmen who simply believed that evil triumphed when good men did nothing.

The second event was the War of 1812 and the rise of Andrew Jackson as a popular war hero into the American public's consciousness. The War of 1812 was, at first, a devastating war for the new republic but the Battle of New Orleans was a whole other story which showed the potential power of the Americans to the major powers of its era. Under the leadership of General Andrew Jackson, the American militiamen were able to fend off British assaults with a huge success. As a victorious general, he was celebrated and welcomed by the common white people, whom he

dearly loved and respected, wherever he visited. The Americans took solace in his victory in the War of 1812 and regarded him as a national symbol that stood against the British aggression and Native American barbarism. Moreover, he exemplified a strong and popular national character that could unite Americans for a common cause whenever the United States faced a crisis. As a result of this victory, the American people started nourishing an idea of having a leader who had bandwidth to deal with security of their country along with their well-being. And that meant a populist leader for the sake of the United States of America.

The third pillar of Jacksonian tradition in this thesis is entrenchment of Jacksonian tradition in the American political system. Because of the fact that Andrew Jackson was the one who introduced two-party system to US democracy, and that he garnered most of the popular vote, which was exercised in the American elections for the first time in the election of 1824, he laid the foundations of today's American political culture. Furthermore, he and his supporters established the Democratic Party since he thought that the political parties at that time did not correspond to the needs of the common folks and the United States. Having won the presidential elections in 1828 and 1832, he endorsed spoils system that allowed him to consolidate his supporters in the administration and to strengthen his power, thereby superimposing his values and ideas onto those seeking to get hooked on the government.

The next events that helped Jacksonian culture modify into a tradition befell while Andrew Jackson was in the White House. After Jackson was elected, he was keen on keeping his promises to the common white folks. And one of the promises was to deal with the tariffs which were aimed to be cut at national level to lower the trade deficit with the foreign powers. However, fierce opposition coming from the Southern plantation owners left the administration in limbo for a while. Particularly the objection of Jackson's home state, South Carolina, intensified the president's firm decision to clamp down on the states that did not want to obey the resolutions of the federal government. The disagreement between South Carolina and the federal government mushroomed into the nullification crisis where South Carolinian politicians demanded that their state leave the Union with the purpose of trading with foreign nations freely. But their intention to leave the Union was nipped in the bud

by President Jackson's quick decision to send the US troops to South Carolina to implement the resolutions of the federal government. This crisis has been the cornerstone of Jacksonian tradition since it showed the significance of the Union that had to be defended no matter what. And it has assured that Jacksonians must do whatever necessary when the United States faces an existential crisis, whether it is internal or external. Besides, the tariff crisis showed the importance of federal government for the Northerners while the Southerners realized that they could not oppose the federal government as long as they remained within it.

The fifth one is known as the Bank War in the American history. Upon the election of President Jackson in 1828, his opponents plotted against him to prevent him from running in 1832 elections and they considered the Second Bank of the United States as a promising tool with which they would upset the confidence of the American people to the President. Thus, they accosted to the head of the Second Bank of the US, Nicholas Biddle. Those who were against the President's policies strove to bamboozle the head of the bank so that the Bank could interfere in politics, thereby diminishing the support for Andrew Jackson within the Democratic Party. Their surreptitious endeavors to disrupt the balance of American politics were, however, picked up upon by the President who had had skepticism towards the Second Bank of the US when he was elected in 1828. He surmised that the Bank's activities were neither in favor of the United States nor the common white folks and that it rather served the interests of the elites. For that reason, he decided to put an end to the function of the Second Bank of the US by employing his presidential powers. The Bank War has come to constitute the mistrust of the elites who are known to have significant financial power in Jacksonian tradition. The fact that Andrew Jackson was able to foil a plot organized by the corrupt elites to prevent him from taking the power remains a clear example for Jacksonians who do not have any sympathy for the elites that promote the policies Jacksonians frown on. Last but not the least, the result of the Bank War demonstrated that President Jackson was to follow the Constitution as it was written without interpreting it according to the interests of a particular group.

The last landmark event in the formation of Jacksonian tradition is known as the Indian removal. It was the culmination of many brutal incidents which were

experienced by the frontiersmen. That experience justified the era's views regarding the backwardness of the Native Americans and other colored people in the eyes of the white Americans. The fact that the Native Americans were seen as uncivilized and barbaric was another factor that pushed the President and even his opponents to come up with a plan to relocate the Native Americans to a remote place where white men and Indians would not encounter. Besides, Andrew Jackson had been holding a grudge against the Native Americans due to their inhuman treatment of the frontiersmen when he took a decision to move them from their ancestral homeland. By this decision, he aimed to secure and protect the United States and American frontiersmen, thereby allowing white settlers to expand towards the west of the US. In a nutshell, the removal of Native Americans was an attempt to safeguard the values and ideas that Jacksonians would inherit from President Jackson by providing security for their well-beings and material interests. Their tradition strongly approves of any kind of actions to protect the well beings of Jacksonians against the enemies. For that reason, Jacksonian tradition is ruthless when it comes to their security and strives to eliminate any threat to them at all costs.

According to this thesis, these events constituted the bedrock of Jacksonian tradition which has come to define the foundations of Trump's foreign policy hitherto. The Jacksonian school of thought is the reflection of the order Jacksonians wish to create. This order is populist and nationalist at its core and it rigorously underscores the importance of revenge and honor in its society and country. Moreover, this tradition harks back to Scottish-Irish immigrants who mostly settled down in the Carolinas and other colonies where they tried to survive against nature and the attacks of Indians. For that reason, this tradition subsumes the elements of the American frontier experience and the War of Independence and it always acknowledges the grim realities of life by believing the survival of the fittest.

It is also significant to be aware of the fact that Jacksonian tradition is less inclusive than the other traditions, which are Hamiltonianism, Wilsonianism, and Jeffersonianism. Owing to the fact that Jacksonians are comprised of white middle-class and working-class Americans, they prefer maintaining their Anglo-American culture and European background rather than letting alien cultures and people corrupt their heritage. Not only do they seek to preserve their past but also they want to

ensure a promising future for themselves by securing their present. They therefore balk at the idea of multiculturalism, open borders, economic globalization, and the policies developed by the foreign policy elite in the government institutions who have strenuously endorsed Hamiltonian and Wilsonian traditions in the decision-making process of foreign and domestic policy. By opposing the policies of Hamiltonian and Wilsonian policies, which stand for liberal ideas and values, Jacksonians demonstrate their will to protect the power and influence they have in the American society and politics.

The thesis meticulously explains how Donald Trump's foreign policy greatly benefits from Jacksonians' will to protect their culture and well-being. It is conspicuous in this thesis that his administration accentuates and promotes the approach of "America First" as a way to protect the United States against the rival states. By the same token, this approach also aims to ameliorate the policies of Hamiltonian and Wilsonian politicians, who have embraced a global role for the United States, that have taken quite a toll upon the Jacksonian community since the end of the Cold War. Hence, America First approach is delicately taken to combine the interests of the Jacksonian community with the foreign policy of the Trump administration so that Jacksonians can support the foreign policy decisions willy-nilly.

In order to realize America First approach Donald Trump employs Jacksonian tradition at full strength. He clamps down on China due to its growing economic and military power, both of which pose serious security threats for the United States and for the promising future for which the Jacksonian community has been seeking. Plus, he utilizes the strategies used by the previous Jacksonian American presidents such as Richard Nixon and Ronald Reagan. He tries to look as if he was an unpredictable man as President Nixon did in 1969 with the intention of forcing the Soviet Union and the North Vietnamese to sign a peace agreement in Paris to end the conflict in Vietnam. In addition to that, his slogan "Make America Great Again" belongs to the presidential campaign of President Reagan—another Jacksonian leader—who used the slogan to drum up support from the Jacksonian community. The Trump administration's foreign policy also zeros in on the free trade agreements signed by previous administrations which were dominated by Hamiltonian and Wilsonian

politicians. TPP, NAFTA, and many bilateral trade agreements have been either rescinded or revised in tandem with the interests of common folks of America to bring the jobs back, which were sent to overseas due to economic globalization, to their home states.

This thesis also strives to explain the reason why the Trump administration has efficaciously conducted successful diplomacy with Russia, China, North Korea, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and the United Arab Emirates by analyzing Jacksonian tradition. The logic sitting behind that diplomacy is predicated upon the reluctance of Jacksonians to spread democracy and liberalism abroad. Despite the fact that this approach of Jacksonian tradition is not appreciated by most of the treaty or non-treaty allies of the US, the Trump administration is determined to maintain that approach as long as American interests are secured and advanced. The Jacksonian school of thought cares about maintaining and advancing democracy at home rather than abroad unlike Hamiltonian and Wilsonian schools. This philosophy complies with other states as long as they do not pose a security risk to their country and material interests. Thus, they do not advocate going abroad to fight endless wars in remote places where dying for fleeting ideas such as democracy and human rights does not advance their interests. And they strive to be very careful not to squander their time and resources on the interests of the elites who eagerly promote dissemination of liberal values and ideas. However, when an incident raises the stakes concerning the security of the United States, the Jacksonian community will be at the forefront to defend American interests without hesitation.

Last but not the least, this thesis strove to dissect the situation in which the American hegemony has been waning in the last decade by reckoning with Donald Trump's Jacksonian foreign policy's likely reaction. Jacksonians' opposition to Hamiltonian and Wilsonian foreign and domestic policies remind the American policymakers that the United States has entered in a new era where the great power competition must be prioritized rather than spreading liberal values and ideas around the globe. Moreover, their opposition can be seen as the reminder of the grim realities of the world to American public that has accustomed to the sheer (global) dominance of their country in the international system since the end of the Cold War. As a consequence of this opposition, Donald Trump's foreign policy has

acknowledged the situation and begun to see the international order from a realist perspective by goosing up American military and economic might to counter Chinese influence at national and international levels. Plus, as his Jacksonian foreign policy dictates a realistic approach to international relations, President Trump has sought to turn the page and have good relations with the Russian Federation. Even though his attempts to realize the political rapprochement between Russia and the US have been hamstrung by Hamiltonian and Wilsonian politicians in the US institutions, the conduction of Jacksonian foreign policy has evidently showed the benign intentions of the Trump administration.

Eventually, this thesis has tried to elucidate the reflection of Jacksonians at domestic level since domestic politics have had huge impact on the process of decision-making with regards to foreign policy. Due to the fact that Donald Trump is considered as the savior of populist and nationalist Jacksonian community, his policies have to correspond to the demands and needs of this community. The fact that Jacksonians are not known as an inclusive community drives them to strongly oppose the policies that champion open borders and illegal immigration. For that reason, the Trump administration responds to their demands by building a wall between American and Mexican border to prevent illegal immigrants from crossing the border illegally. Additionally, new visa restrictions on certain countries, most of which are Muslim majority, have been imposed. Given that, the Trump administration and the Jacksonian community have been accused of being as the advocates of the far-right ideology due to their motivations to curb illegal immigration, thereby lowering the crime rates in major American cities.

This thesis has set forth that the significance of the Jacksonian community and their tradition by exploring Donald Trump's foreign policy. It is necessary to come to grips with US foreign policy traditions to make of American politics and culture since these traditions have emerged from the cultural interactions of various American ideas and historical events. By the same token, the implications of Donald Trump's Jacksonian foreign policy have been quite significant concerning the international security, particularly in the Asia-Pacific region, Europe and the Middle East and North Africa region. The disputes at South China Sea with China and NATO allies' strong opposition to Russian revanchism in Eastern Europe have been

seriously affected. The simmering problems of the Middle East have forced the Trump administration to come up with strategies which are seen as unusual. The political and military moves of this administration to advance the material interests of Jacksonians and the United States have already left its mark in the region.

Based on the information gained at the end of this thesis, the voting patterns of the Jacksonian community will play a pivotal role in the 2020 elections. For that reason, the ceaseless discussion to shape American foreign policy amongst the four US foreign policy traditions will soldier on. Unless the current leader of Hamiltonian and Wilsonian traditions, Joe Biden, is elected, Jacksonian tradition will have been deeply entrenched in American politics along with international relations in the near future. Though the fierce opposition of Hamiltonian and Wilsonian politicians to Trump's Jacksonian foreign policy is regarded as an interfering busybody, the Jacksonian community seems to have carved out a niche for themselves in the American politics which will be remembered even if President Trump is not reelected.

REFERENCES

- Aguilera, J. (2020). "One Year after Mass Shooting, El Paso Residents Grapple with White Supremacy: It was here the Whole Time." *Time*, 03 August 2020, <https://time.com/5874088/el-paso-shooting-racism/> (Accessed: 04 August 2020).
- Ambrosio, T. (2005). "The Russo-American Dispute over the Invasion of Iraq: International Status and the Role of Positional Goods" *Europe-AsiaStudies*, 57(8), 1189-1210.
- Anton, M. (2019). "The Trump Doctrine", *Foreign Policy*, 20 April 2019, <https://foreignpolicy.com/2019/04/20/the-trump-doctrine-big-think-america-first-nationalism/> (Accessed: 05 August 2020)
- Armed Conflict Location & Event Data Project. (2020). (Rep.). Armed Conflict Location & Event Data Project. doi:10.2307/resrep24697
- Black, M. (2004). The Transformation of the Southern Democratic Party. *The Journal of Politics*, 66(4), 1001-1017. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2508.2004.00287.x
- Brown, F. (2004). Nixon's "Southern Strategy" and Forces against Brown. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 73(3), 191-208. doi:10.2307/4129605
- Buckley, C. (2012). Learning from Libya, Acting in Syria. *Journal of Strategic Security*, 5(2), 81-104. Retrieved June 2, 2020, from www.jstor.org/stable/26463961
- Bush, G. H. (1990, October 1). *Address to the United Nations General Assembly by President George H.W. Bush*. Address presented at The United Nations General Assembly in USA, New York. Retrieved June 22, 2020, from <https://2009-2017.state.gov/p/io/potusunga/207268.htm>
- Bush, G. W. (2002, January). *State of the Union Address*. *State of the Union Address*. Washington D.C. Retrieved from <https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2002/01/20020129-11.html>

- Camus, J.-Y., & Lebourg, N. (2017). *Far-right Politics in Europe*. (J. M. Todd, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Canty, J. (2020, June 20). Donald Trump. Retrieved August 6, 2020, from <https://factba.se/transcript/donald-trump-speech-kag-rally-tulsa-oklahoma-june-20-2020>
- Center for Strategic & International Studies, Jones, S. G., Doxsee, S., & Harrington, N. (2020, June). *The Escalating Terrorism Problem in the United States*. Center for Strategic & International Studies. Retrieved from https://csis-website-prod.s3.amazonaws.com/s3fspublic/publication/200612_Jones_DomesticTerrorism_v6.pdf
- Cha, T., & Seo, J. (2018). Trump by Nixon: Maverick Presidents in the Years of U.S. Relative Decline. *Korean Journal of Defense Analysis*, 30(01), 79–96. Retrieved from [http://politics.khu.ac.kr/home/khpolitics/www/img/prof/2018Trump by Nixon.pdf](http://politics.khu.ac.kr/home/khpolitics/www/img/prof/2018Trump%20by%20Nixon.pdf)
- Clarke, M., & Ricketts, A. (2017). Understanding the Return of the Jacksonian Tradition. *Orbis*, 61(1), 13–26. doi: 10.1016/j.orbis.2016.12.006
- Clinton, H. (2011, October 11). America's Pacific Century. Retrieved May 30, 2020, from <https://foreignpolicy.com/2011/10/11/americas-pacific-century/>
- Conklin, A. (2020, September 30). Trump's Proud Boys comment at debate sparks pushback, outrage; Tim Scott asks him to clarify. Retrieved October 3, 2020, from <https://www.foxnews.com/politics/reaction-trump-proud-boys-comment-presidential-debate>
- Conlin, J. R. (2010). *The American Past: A Survey of American History*. Boston, MA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
- Dallek, R. (2007). *Nixon and Kissinger: Partners in Power* (1st ed.). New York, NY: HarperCollins.
- Daniel Bodansky. (2016). The Paris Climate Change Agreement: A New Hope? *The American Journal of International Law*, 110(2), 288-319. doi:10.5305/amerjintelaw.110.2.0288

Deneen, P. J. (2018). *Why Liberalism Failed*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Donald J. Trump . (2020, May 30). *Remarks by President Trump on Actions Against China* [Press release]. Retrieved June 27, 2020, from <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-actions-china/>

Donald J. Trump. (2019, October 27). *Remarks by President Trump on the Death of ISIS Leader Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi* [Press release]. Retrieved June 27, 2020, from <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-death-isis-leader-abu-bakr-al-baghdadi/>

Dueck, C. (2015). *The Obama Doctrine: American Grand Strategy Today*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Evich, H. B. (2016, November 13). Revenge of the rural voter. *Politico*. Retrieved from <https://www.politico.com/story/2016/11/hillary-clinton-rural-voters-trump-231266>

Fieldstadt, E. (2019, June 28). James Alex Fields, driver in deadly car attack at Charlottesville rally, sentenced to life in prison. Retrieved August 4, 2020, from <https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/james-alex-fields-driver-deadly-car-attack-charlottesville-rally-sentenced-n1024436>

Fukuyama, F. (1989). The End of History? *The National Interest*, (16), 3-18. Retrieved May 18, 2020, from www.jstor.org/stable/24027184

Fukuyama, F. (1992). *The End of History and The Last Man*. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Glasser, S. B. (2018, January 22). The Man Who Put Andrew Jackson in Trump's Oval Office. *POLITICO Magazine*. Retrieved from <https://www.politico.com>

Gordon, B. (2012). Trading Up in Asia: Why the United States Needs the Trans-Pacific Partnership. *Foreign Affairs*, 91(4), 17-22. Retrieved June 1, 2020, from www.jstor.org/stable/23218036

- Henretta, J. A., Brody, D., & Dumenil, L. (2002). *America: A Concise History* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martins.
- Hickey, D. R. (2012). *The War of 1812: A Forgotten Conflict*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Hucal, S. (2020, February 27). Racially motivated terror attack in Hanau puts Germany's right wing extremism into focus. Retrieved April 6, 2020, from <https://abcnews.go.com/US/racially-motivated-terror-attack-hanau-puts-germanys-wing/story?id=69128298>
- Indyk, M., Lieberthal, K., & O'Hanlon, M. (2012). Scoring Obama's Foreign Policy: A Progressive Pragmatist Tries to Bend History. *Foreign Affairs*, 91(3), 29-43. Retrieved May 29, 2020, from www.jstor.org/stable/23217964
- JACOBSON, G. (2010). George W. Bush, the Iraq War, and the Election of Barack Obama. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 40(2), 207-224. Retrieved May 29, 2020, from www.jstor.org/stable/23044817
- Jentleson, B. W. (2014). *American Foreign Policy: The Dynamics of Choice in the 21st Century* (5th ed.). New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Johnson, K. (2020, January 23). Europe Is the New Front in Trump's Trade War. *Foreign Policy*. Retrieved June 22, 2020, from <https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/01/23/europe-new-front-trump-trade-war-davos-wef/>
- Kissinger, H. (1994). *Diplomacy*. London, UK: Simon & Schuster.
- Kumar, R. (2014). Iraq War 2003 and the Issue of Pre-emptive and Preventive Self-defence: Implications for the United Nations. *India Quarterly*, 70(2), 123-137. Retrieved May 19, 2020, from www.jstor.org/stable/45072829
- Laderman, S. (2020). The "Silent Majority" Speech (Critical Moments in American History) (1st ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- LaFraniere, S. (2003, March 18). Russia's Putin Calls Iraq War A 'Mistake'. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/politics/2003/03/18/russias-putin-calls-iraq-war-a-mistake/7fff0ba1-bfda-4970-a1a9-f7c7afd6aaa2/>

Lipka, M., & Smith, G. A. (2020, July 1). White evangelical approval of Trump slips, but eight-in-ten say they would vote for him. Retrieved July 18, 2020, from <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2020/07/01/white-evangelical-approval-of-trump-slips-but-eight-in-ten-say-they-would-vote-for-him/>

Lynch, M. (2015). Obama and the Middle East: Right sizing the U.S. Role. *Foreign Affairs*, 94(5), 18-27. Retrieved May 29, 2020, from www.jstor.org/stable/24483734

Meacham, J. (2008). *American Lion: Andrew Jackson in the White House*. New York, NY: Random House Trade Paperbacks.

Mead, W. (1991). The Bush Administration and the New World Order. *World Policy Journal*, 8(3), 375-420. Retrieved June 22, 2020, from www.jstor.org/stable/40209215

Mead, W. (1999). The Jacksonian Tradition: And American Foreign Policy. *The National Interest*, (58), 5-29. Retrieved April 21, 2020, from www.jstor.org/stable/42897216

Mead, W. R. (1996). Hamilton's Way. *World Policy Journal*, 13(3), 89–106.

Mead, W. R. (2001). *Special Providence: American Foreign Policy and How It Changed the World* (Reprinted, 2009 ed.). New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf.

Mead, W. R. (2020, June 10). The Thinking Behind Trump's Troop Cut in Germany. *WSJ*. Retrieved from <https://www.wsj.com>

Mead, Walter Russell. "God's Country?" *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 85, no. 5, 2006, pp. 24–43. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/20032068. Accessed 18 July 2020.

Mearsheimer, J. (2014). Why the Ukraine Crisis Is the West's Fault: The Liberal Delusions That Provoked Putin. *Foreign Affairs*, 93(5), 77-89. Retrieved May 30, 2020, from www.jstor.org/stable/24483306

Mearsheimer, J. J. (2001). *Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. New York, NY: WW Norton & Co.

- Mearsheimer, J. J. (2018). *The Great Delusion: Liberal Dreams and International Realities* (Henry L. Stimson Lectures) (1st ed.). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Merry, R. (2018, December 23). 2019: Donald Trump vs. the Elites? Retrieved June 6, 2020, from <https://nationalinterest.org/feature/2019-donald-trump-vs-elites-39592>
- Nester, W. R. (2013). *The Age of Jackson and the Art of American Power, 1815-1848*. Washington, D.C.: Potomac Books.
- Nye, J. S. (2004). *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*. New York, NY: Public Affairs.
- Obama, B. H. (2009, December). *Nobel Lecture*. Nobel Lecture. Oslo. Retrieved from <https://www.nobelprize.org/prizes/peace/2009/obama/26183-nobel-lecture-2009/>
- Obama, B. H. (2011, November). *Remarks By President Obama to the Australian Parliament*. Remarks By President Obama to the Australian Parliament. Canberra. Retrieved from <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2011/11/17/remarks-president-obama-australian-parliament>
- Obama, B. H. (2012, March). Washington, D.C. Retrieved from <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2012/03/04/remarks-president-aipac-policy-conference-0>
- Opal, J. M. (2017). *Avenging the People: Andrew Jackson, The Rule of Law, and the American Nation*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Packer, G. (2008, June 30). Obama's Iraq Problem. *The New Yorker*. Retrieved from <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2008/07/07/obamas-iraq-problem>
- Parker, A. (2016, April 02). Donald Trump Says NATO is 'Obsolete,' UN is 'Political Game'. Retrieved June 22, 2020, from <https://www.nytimes.com/politics/first-draft/2016/04/02/donald-trump-tells-crowd-hed-be-fine-if-nato-broke-up/>

- Parker, K., Morin, R., & Horowitz, J. M. (2019, March 21). 3. Views of demographic changes. Retrieved July 20, 2020, from <https://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2019/03/21/views-of-demographic-changes-in-america/>
- Parsons, L. H. (2009). *The Birth of Modern Politics: Andrew Jackson, John Quincy Adams, and the Election of 1828*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Puar, J. (2004). Abu Ghraib: Arguing against Exceptionalism. *Feminist Studies*, 30(2), 522-534. doi:10.2307/20458978
- Putin, V. V. (2007, February). *Munich Security Conference. Munich Security Conference*. Munich. Retrieved from <http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/transcripts/24034>
- Remini, R. V. (1977). *Andrew Jackson and the Course of American Empire, 1767-1821*, Vol. 1. New York, NY: Harper & Row, Publishers.
- Rosen, D. A. (2015). *Border Law: the First Seminole War and American Nationhood*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sachs, J. D. (2018). *A New Foreign Policy: Beyond American Exceptionalism*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Sagan, S., & Suri, J. (2003). The Madman Nuclear Alert: Secrecy, Signaling, and Safety in October 1969. *International Security*, 27(4), 150-183. Retrieved August 28, 2020, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4137607>
- Shribman, D. (2019, October 31). Opinion: Nixon's "Silent Majority" speech, 50 years later. Retrieved 2020-07-25, from <https://eu.detroitnews.com/story/opinion/2019/10/31/opinion-nixons-silent-majority-speech-50-years-later/2500985001/>
- Smith, G. A. (2016, September 23). Many evangelicals favor Trump because he is not Clinton. Retrieved July 18, 2020, from <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/09/23/many-evangelicals-favor-trump-because-he-is-not-clinton/>
- Stanley-Becker, I., & Sullivan, S. (2016, August 2). Obama: Trump is 'unfit to serve as president'. Retrieved April 6, 2020, from

https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/amid-continuing-fallout-from-khan-controversy-a-gop-congressman-declares-his-support-for-clinton/2016/08/02/a756b792-58b3-11e6-9aee-8075993d73a2_story.html

Taylor, J. (2015, December 7). NPR Choicepage. Retrieved July 25, 2020, from <https://choice.npr.org/index.html?origin=https://www.npr.org/2015/12/07/458836388/trump-calls-for-total-and-complete-shutdown-of-muslims-entering-u-s>

The 1992 Campaign; Excerpts From Speech By Clinton on U.S. Role. (1992, October 2). *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/1992/10/02/us/the-1992-campaign-excerpts-from-speech-by-clinton-on-us-role.html>

Thiessen, M. A. (2018, June 8). Obama took lying to new heights with the Iran deal. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/obama-took-lying-to-new-heights-with-the-iran-deal/2018/06/07/b75f72d2-6a7c-11e8-9e38-24e693b38637_story.html

Trump plans to sign bill pressuring China over Uighur Muslim crackdown: source. (2020, June 8). Retrieved June 14, 2020, from <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-trump-uighurs/trump-plans-to-sign-bill-pressuring-china-over-uighur-muslim-crackdown-source-idUSKBN23F27C>

Trump, D. J. (2015, June 16). Full text: Donald Trump announces a presidential bid. Retrieved July 23, 2020, from https://www.washingtonpost.com/gdpr-consent/?next_url=https%3a%2f%2fwww.washingtonpost.com%2fnews%2fpost-politics%2fwp%2f2015%2f06%2f16%2ffull-text-donald-trump-announces-a-presidential-bid%2f

Trump, D. J. (2016, July 21). *Full text: Donald Trump 2016 RNC draft speech transcript*. Speech presented at The Republican National Convention in Ohio, Cleveland. Retrieved June 22, 2020, from <https://www.politico.com/story/2016/07/full-transcript-donald-trump-nomination-acceptance-speech-at-rnc-225974>

Trump, D. J. (2016, June). *Declaring America's Economic Independence* .*Declaring America's Economic Independence*. Monessen. Retrieved from <https://www.politico.com/story/2016/06/full-transcript-trump-job-plan-speech-224891>

Trump, D. J. (2017, August 16). Read the complete transcript of President Trump's remarks at Trump Tower on Charlottesville. Retrieved August 4, 2020, from <https://www.latimes.com/politics/la-na-pol-trump-charlottesville-transcript-20170815-story.html>

Trump, D. J. (2018, January). Nashville. Retrieved from <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-american-farm-bureau-annual-convention-nashville-tn/>

Trump, J. D. [realDonaldTrump] (2017, April 17). The first 90 days of my presidency has exposed the total failure of the last eight years of foreign policy. So true. @foxandfriends. [Tweet] Retrieved from <https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/853942936337350656>

Trump, J. D. [realDonaldTrump] (2018, July 25). The European Union is coming to Washington tomorrow to negotiate a deal on Trade. I have an idea for them. Both the U.S. and the E.U. drop all Tariffs, Barriers and Subsidies! That would finally be called Free Market and Fair Trade! Hope they do it, we are ready - but they won't! [Tweet] Retrieved from <https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/1021909900941815809>

Trump, J. D. [realDonaldTrump] (2018, March 2). When a country (USA) is losing many billions of dollars on trade with virtually every country it does business with, trade wars are good, and easy to win. Example, when we are down \$100 billion with a certain country and they get cute, don't trade anymore-we win big. It's easy! [Tweet] Retrieved from <https://twitter.com/realdonaldtrump/status/969525362580484098?lang=en>

Trump, J. D. [realDonaldTrump] (2019, July 26). The WTO is BROKEN when the world's RICHEST countries claim to be developing countries to avoid WTO rules and get special treatment. NO more!!! Today I directed the U.S. Trade Representative to take action so that countries stop CHEATING the system at

the expense of the USA! [Tweet] Retrieved from <https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/1154821023197474817>

Trump, J. D. [realDonaldTrump] (2019, October 7). I was elected on getting out of these ridiculous endless wars, where our great Military functions as a policing operation to the benefit of people who don't even like the USA. The two most unhappy countries at this move are Russia & China, because they love seeing us bogged..... [Tweet] Retrieved from <https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/1181227885841002496>

Trump, J. D. [realDonaldTrump] (2020, March 13). The Federal Reserve must FINALLY lower the Fed Rate to something comparable to their competitor Central Banks. Jay Powell and group are putting us at a decided economic & physiological disadvantage. Should never have been this way. Also, STIMULATE! [Tweet] Retrieved from <https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/1238460927328075778>

Trump, J. D. [realDonaldTrump] (2020, March 17). The United States will be powerfully supporting those industries, like Airlines and others, that are particularly affected by the Chinese Virus. We will be stronger than ever before! [Tweet] Retrieved from <https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/1239685852093169664>

Turkish Heritage Organization . (2016, May 5). *U.S. Senator Graham Criticizes U.S. Military Strategy in Syria* [Video file]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=w-g8RVtYBM4>

Wagner, H. L. (2007). *History of the Democratic Party*. New York, NY: Chelsea House.

Walt, S. M. (2018). *The Hell of Good Intentions: America's Foreign Policy Elite and the Decline of U.S. Primacy*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

McFaul, M., Sestanovich, S., & Mearsheimer, J. (2014). Faulty Powers: Who Started the Ukraine Crisis? *Foreign Affairs*, 93(6), 167-178. Retrieved May 30, 2020, from www.jstor.org/stable/24483933

- Walt, S. M. (2020, August 24). For Great Powers, It's Domestic Policy, Not Foreign Policy, That Matters Most. *Foreign Policy*. Retrieved from <https://foreignpolicy.com>
- Welt, C. (2010). The Thawing of a Frozen Conflict: The Internal Security Dilemma and the 2004 Prelude to the Russo-Georgian War. *Europe-AsiaStudies*, 62(1), 63-97. Retrieved May 21, 2020, from www.jstor.org/stable/27752420
- Winthrop, J. (1630, April). Retrieved from [https://liberalarts.utexas.edu/coretexts/_files/resources/texts/1630 Model of Christian Charity.pdf](https://liberalarts.utexas.edu/coretexts/_files/resources/texts/1630%20Model%20of%20Christian%20Charity.pdf)
- Yoo, J. C. (2008). Andrew Jackson and Presidential Power. *Charleston Law Review*, 2, 101–150. Retrieved from <https://www.law.upenn.edu/live/files/1585-yooandrew-jackson-and-presidential-power>

