

Kristian Vítů

BAKALÁŘSKÁ PRÁCE

UNIVERSITA KARLOVA V PRAZE
Fakulta humanitních studií
2008

UNIVERSITA KARLOVA V PRAZE

Fakulta humanitních studií

BAKALÁŘSKÁ PRÁCE

Název práce

**The American Empire and its Criticism
in the Twentieth Century**

Vedoucí práce

**Dr. James F. Pontuso
Charles Patterson Professor
Hampden-Sydney College, USA**

Vypracoval

**Kristian Vítů
Praha 2008**

Prohlašuji, že jsem práci vypracoval samostatně s použitím uvedené literatury a souhlasím s jejím eventuálním zveřejněním v tištěné nebo elektronické podobě.

V Praze dne 24. 4. 2008

Kristian Vítů

CONTENTS

Introduction	4
<i>1 American Imperialism and Hegemony</i>	7
<i>2 Hamiltonian politics of the Empire</i>	26
<i>3 The age of Empire</i>	44
Conclusion	60
Notes	62
Selected Bibliography	69

INTRODUCTION

Whenever I hear of or read about the ignorance, superficiality, and hegemony of Americans, I recall one of Alexis de Tocqueville's remarks about the French Revolution: "They seem to love freedom, but one finds they only hated the master."ⁱ I am thinking of the very recent wave of Anti-Americanism in the context of American intervention to Iraq. Observing demonstration in Prague in January 2007 against the "hegemony" of the United States, I realized how universal Tocqueville words are. In the Prague streets on that day one found communists together with anarchists, ecologists and many others.

Americans, on the other hand, are not preoccupied with ridiculing Europe or other countries. The lack of "Anti-Europeanism" in America, I believe, shows the success of liberal democracy and superiority of the American political regime. There is no other country that offers a greater scope of opportunity, diversity of opinion or more challenging conditions than the United States. The goal and great hope of the founders of the United States was a democratic society consisting of free, self-governed and responsible citizens. Among the founders, Alexander Hamilton, aware of the fate of the Athenian democracy, said that Americans could "decide the important question, whether societies of man are really capable or not, of establishing good government from reflection and choice, or whether they are forever destined to depend, for their political constitution, on accident and force."ⁱⁱ In other words, America enjoyed the opportunity to prove whether democracy could work as a stable political system. A functional democracy does not require that every citizen has to decide complicated political questions. It does assume, however, a love of freedom and a willingness to assume responsibility for one's own life. An efficient democracy presupposes self-governed and responsible citizens. The enthusiasm for individualism and love of freedom were passions that Tocqueville had not witnessed in the French Revolution.

Americans seem to know that freedom is not a gift and that it demands the willingness fight for it. After World War II, this necessity was recognized by all democratic countries of the western world. The idea of NATO (opposed by European and American leftists) came from the same reasoning. Liberal democracy, with its advantages and weaknesses, is not simple or secure. To protect individual freedom may sometimes require that a nation act alone, for which European have neither courage nor means. The fear of "Americanization" leads some intellectuals to belief that ordinary people for some reasons cannot have responsibility for the fate of the society or their own lives. Anti-Americanism, therefore, goes beyond the hate of America. It stands, often without knowing it, against principles of liberal democracy itself, even when Anti-Americanism is embraced by American intellectuals.

Modern or 20th century's Anti-Americanism and de facto the criticism of liberal democracy has its origin in Martin Heidegger's philosophy. Heidegger was focused on the faults of modernity of which America is the most powerful model. Heidegger's philosophy had great influence on the post-war French left. The French leftists modified his ideas on socialism, and Marxism and used them in their intellectual effort to distinguish themselves from the bourgeoisie. The leader of the left in the post-war France was Jean-Paul Sartre. Without the philosophical depth of Heidegger, Sartre adopted Heidegger's thoughts. Sartre was not precisely political thinker, but his "existential resistance" toward

society generally, the railing against the bourgeoisie, his political pilgrimages to the Soviet Union, his political writings, and his great influence on the French society show his political bias and its impact on contemporary political thought.

Unlike Heidegger, Sartre – and many others such as Simone de Beauvoir, Herbert Marcuse, George Bernard Shaw, and Bertrand Russell – believed that salvation for Europe from American influence lay in a radical socialism. Sartre adopted and evolved in his own style, embracing particularly Heidegger’s moral relativism, questioning of the universal thinking and the confidence of gradual trivialization of the modern world. With Sartre, I believe, criticism of America became the theme of the entire intellectual left in Europe. Sartre’s generation was significant for its admiration of the Soviet Union and other totalitarian regimes, the propagation of socialism and the hatred of the United States. The entire French population gradually became aware of the “threat” of Americanization. If Heidegger created Anti-Americanism, Sartre popularized it. Sartre shaped modern liberalism. Particularly during the sixties French intellectuals began to enjoy great popularity at American universities. Polish exiled poet Czesław Miłosz said about the situation at American universities, “To a large extent, the atmosphere at American universities is also shaped by people who were revolutionaries in 1968. Now they have become professors, but they haven’t made much progress in the meantime... Together with the influx from France, they make for very specific atmosphere... These days, you have to be ‘politically correct,’ which means you have to be on the side of the blacks, against racism, for everything that’s progressive.”ⁱⁱⁱ The moral relativism arose from that popularity made it impossible to create a valid and consistent opposition. American belief in the rightness of liberal democracy could be sometimes superficial, but was certainly defensible. The New Left counterbalanced its intellectual weaknesses by collectiveness, vanity and eagerness.

In particular Anti-Americanism of Noam Chomsky impressed and inspired by European leftists presents the view that American society, politics, and its leaders are corrupt and that the American political regime is worse than any other. He and his followers considered themselves to be dissidents who face opposition from the “establishment” comparable to dissidents of totalitarian regimes.

This text primarily intends to present arguments of the leading intellectuals who formed and popularized the Anti-Americanism of the last century and whose arguments are constantly repeated by those who see the threat from America. Since modern Anti-Americanism criticizes principles that are pillars of liberal democracy, I contrast it with the ideas of Alexander Hamilton whose political thought and practical politics helped to shape the future of American democracy. The main intention of this paper is to show the unique character of American democracy, the sharp contrast between Hamilton’s views of American democracy and the views of Heidegger, Sartre, and Chomsky.

I would most especially like to thank James F. Pontuso under his patient guidance I had opportunity to write this paper and understand the origins of American democracy. Special thanks to Walter M. Bortz, President of Hampden-Sydney College for his generosity in offering me a scholarship. I also wish to thank Victor Cabas for help with editing. Last but not least, my appreciation goes to my parents for their support and trust.

I

AMERICAN IMPERIALISM AND HEGEMONY

I thought that I had escaped the Evil Empire, but it turns out that I am living in it. Although I grew up thinking that liberty and equality were the ideals of American democracy, according to some of the leading intellectuals in the twentieth century, America's principles are only rhetorical slogans that disguise the brutal oppression of other nations and vulgarization of the global society. According to its critics, America, the greatest democratic society in the world, began after World War II to control world events not only by military actions, but also economically, and unfortunately for the whole world, including the United States itself, also culturally. I shall present the arguments of the most influential intellectuals who were interested in the phenomenon of Americanism. The Iraq war in particular has undermined faith in America's good intentions, the integrity of its political institutions and the suitability of its cultural practices. The most profound Anti-American thinker is the great German philosopher of the last century, Martin Heidegger, whose major philosophical work pondered the relationship of "modern man" to Being, which is the source of all meaning. Heidegger insisted that the Western world has misunderstood the meaning of Being, a misjudgment that created the crisis and catastrophe of today's world. America, according to Heidegger, embodied this mistake or evil the most definitively. However, to fully understand Heidegger's criticism, it is first necessary to discuss later criticisms that were influenced and based on Heidegger's philosophy. Therefore, I begin with the most popular, if less profound criticism presented by Noam Chomsky. Later, I will discuss the post-war criticism of Jean-Paul Sartre and Simone de Beauvoir.

I wish to show that Heidegger's philosophy was the basis for Sartre's Anti-Americanism, and in fact for most of the serious criticism of America. Even though many other leftist intellectuals were concerned by the phenomenon of Anti-Americanism – Bertrand Russell, and Herbert Marcuse for instance – Sartre's railing against the bourgeoisie and his influence on the European Left made him in

Herbert Marcuse's words "the conscience of the world." Although Chomsky's writing doesn't offer complexity of Heidegger's or Sartre's philosophies, he enjoys great popularity: the magazines *Foreign Policy* and *Prospect* have pronounced Chomsky "the world's top public intellectual."

As I suggest above, the antipathy toward the USA has unified intellectuals of every political spectrum. Therefore for clarity, I have divided this criticism according to the political orientation of its proponents on the Left and Right. Whereas Chomsky and Sartre focus exclusively on America and even express hope that the USSR would counter the influence of the United States, Heidegger examines the modern world that was for him represented by America and the USSR, seeing the only difference between them as the degree to which each was responsible for the cultural devastation of Europe.

Leftists

Today, American postmodern criticism is a transatlantic phenomenon. The most well-known critic of America on the current scene, Noam Chomsky, "one of America's foremost political intellectuals and dissidents,"^{iv} wields great influence on postmodernism in Europe and on European postmodern philosophy and vice versa. His criticism focuses particularly on the crimes of American foreign policy, on the power of the mass media, and on the American government. To put it differently, Chomsky believes that America's elite using commerce, a strong executive power, and the media, seeks to dominate the world. Chomsky feels a moral and intellectual responsibility to question the foreign and domestic policy of the US government. He views the hegemony of US foreign policy and American imperialism since the Vietnam War as the beginning of an aggressive American expansion. The brutality and hegemonic interests of the US government, the CIA and the U.S. Army during the Vietnam War led him to expose the flaws of the power-hungry leaders of American society. Although he sees American participation in World War II was legitimate, it was an opportunity for the United States to "spread dependence and subordination," to achieve global dominance. According to Chomsky, the aggression of American foreign policy during the Cold War went far beyond the Soviet oppression:

I recall remarks by a Fatherland Front leaders on a remote village in Vietnam, Palestinian organizers, etc., describing the USSR as the hope for the oppressed and the US government as the brutal oppressor of the human race...It's also unnecessary to point out to the half a dozen or so sane people who remain that in comparison to the conditions imposed by US tyranny and violence, East Europe under Russian rule was practically a paradise.^v

Importantly, Chomsky does not condemn American society as whole. He argues that the economic interests in foreign countries are not the concern of ordinary Americans; rather the economic domination is the concern of American elite. Intelligence services and a corrupt media gave the elite the means to hide illegal operations whose only purpose is to strengthen the imperial position of America. After the Cold War, the United States had to create new enemies. The activity in the Middle

East together with so-called defensive-missile system in Europe, Chomsky calls “the Cold War II” and the continuation of American exploitation and hegemony.^{vi}

Chomsky’s sees the interconnection between the mass media and the modern “aristocracy” of American society. He analyzed this conspiracy of the mass media in one of his books on the hegemony of American elite, *Manufacturing Consent*. Here he proclaimed that the mass media in the United States are under the control of and “arise from the preselection of right-thinking people (millionaires) due to free market economy.”^{vii} Although the military interventions in Latin America were presented by the media and by politicians as necessary to the war against communism, these interventions actually inflicted terror on innocent civilians. Especially in Nicaragua, the American government went too far. “The United States,” Chomsky reminds us, “happens to be the only state in the world that has been condemned by the World Court for international terrorism, would have been condemned by the Security Council, except that it vetoed the resolution. The Court referred to the US terrorist war against Nicaragua, the court ordered the United States to desist and pay reparation.... This is massive terrorism.”^{viii} Nevertheless, nothing has changed since the eighties: Ziaudin Sardar and Merryl Wyn Davies – the direct intellectual descendants of Noam Chomsky – argue in *Why Do People Hate America?* that the same media bias exists today as during the Vietnam Era: “the news division of the media cartel appears to work against the public interest – and for their parent companies, their advisers and the Bush Administration.”^{ix} In other words, Chomsky argues that American media failed in its main function: it does not offer “the diversity of opinion” that should be the role of the media in democracy. Instead of providing objectivity, the media is the tool of the American elite.

But what are the goals of America’s elite? Chomsky answers that the goal of US foreign policy is economic control of the world and that the goal has not changed since the Vietnam War: “Iraq simply offers the great opportunity,” Chomsky maintains, “to establish the first secure military bases in a dependent client state at the heart of the world’s major energy reserves.”^x For Chomsky war in Iraq is only a new excuse for US elites to enforce imperialism. After World War II, the United States of America had gained control over the world economy (especially over raw material markets) and therefore also a political predominance over Western Europe and some parts of Asia and Japan. Chomsky sees the Iraq invasion as important for the very same reason: because of the “threat that Europe and Asia might move towards greater independence, and worse, might be united... A firm hand on the spigot reduces these dangers.”^{xi} Chomsky argues, “the (Iraq) invasion was likely to increase the threat of terror.” Other examples of the same exploitation are American pharmaceutical syndicates that control the world markets and exploit particularly those nations (Canada and Australia) which have established a free health care system. “In reality,” Chomsky writes, “a national health care system would probably reduce expenses considerably, avoiding the heavy costs of bureaucracy, supervision, paperwork and so on, some of the factors that render the US privatized system the most inefficient in the industrial world.”^{xii} American foreign policy, therefore, is far from promoting the defense of human rights and the common good and it is evident that the US government creates conditions that favor the leading elite.

Who are the American elite? According to Chomsky, the elite are power-hungry capitalists, mostly members of the Republican Party. American democracy itself, the United States constitutional

democracy tended from its origin to protect the elite. Chomsky is convinced main function of *the Constitution of the United States*, drafted by James Madison and to the very extend popularized by Alexander Hamilton, was to protect the elite against the majority. For the purpose of this paper it is worthwhile to cite full passages of Chomsky's argument from his book *Hegemony and Survival* and from other articles concern with the framers of the Constitution:

First of all, they were pretty much pre-capitalist. They were kind of on the verge of development of capitalism. Madison, who was the main framer of Constitution, was opposed to democracy... He felt that power should be in the hands of the wealth of the nation – the set of men who have sympathy for property owners and their rights – not general population, which can be fragmented and marginalized somehow ... So his illusion was that the wealth of the nation would work for the public good, and therefore it's okay to give [the aristocracy] the power ... Adam Smith, before him, would never have accepted that illusion. Smith described the merchants and manufacturers of England as dangerous people whose commitment was to delude and deceive the public for their own interest...

James Madison ... makes it very clear that the new constitutional system must be designed so as to insure that the government will, in his words “protect the minority of the opulent against majority” and bar the way to anything like agrarian reform.

Chomsky continues about Hamilton and George W. Bush:

Actually, no predecessor has ever had such fantastic ambition, but in smaller domains it has been tried, and it's never been easy. One of the dilemmas is, how do you control the domestic population, what Alexander Hamilton called the Great Beast.^{xiii}

The elite became more dangerous after the Soviet Union collapsed, when the United States stood alone as a world superpower. Zbigniew Brzezinski, echoing Chomsky's criticisms, writes, “The American president simply began to act as the global leader without any international blessing.”^{xiv} “It is not surprising,” Chomsky adds, “that as the population becomes more civilized, power systems become more extreme in their efforts to control the great beast.”^{xv} To summarize, Chomsky is convinced that the Constitution gave the federal government too much power. He is particularly disappointed by a strong executive that allows the president to conduct foreign policy and thereby to strengthen the positions of the elite. Chomsky believes that American exploitation started under the presidency of Theodore Roosevelt who “stole part of Colombia for a canal that was of great importance for U.S. economic and strategic interests.”^{xvi} George W. Bush is the third president since the United States became a sole world power and the president became the most powerful man on the earth: “There is little doubt,” Chomsky says, “that this administration is at an extreme in seeking to establish a powerful state executive, free from interference by Congress or public awareness of its actions.”^{xvii}

Chomsky sees the only remedy to the powerful federal government in the creation of a real opposition in the American politics. Chomsky explains that the problem with the opposition is its

disintegration: “the total absence of socialist or laborite mass party as an organized competitor in the electoral.”^{xxviii} Due to lack of political diversity, the American elections became banal. Chomsky explains that instead of competition of opinion, “the campaigns are run by the PR industry.”^{xxix} Instead of political argumentations and ideas, the elections are based only on a pompous image. “Ever since September 11 attacks,” Chomsky continues, “Republicans have used the terrorist threat as a pretext to accelerate their right-wing political agenda.”^{xxx} Chomsky declared that the differences between the Democratic and the Republican candidates are only in rhetoric; their goal is the same: to enforce American position in the world.

However, Chomsky is not despondent over America’s role in the world. He sees that as a result of the Bush presidency, opposition both on the international scene and within the United States has grown. He points towards the conditions of the Iraq invasion which has brought a change in world public opinion:

[this is] the first time in hundreds of years of the history of Europe and its North American offshoots that a war was massively protested even before it was officially launched. We may recall, by comparison, the war against South Vietnam launched by JFK in 1962, brutal and barbaric from the outset: bombing, chemical warfare to destroy food crops so as to starve out the civilian support for the indigenous resistance, programs to drive millions of people to virtual concentration camps or urban slums to eliminate its popular base... And when the protest did finally develop, many years too late, it was mostly directed against the peripheral crimes: the extension of the war against the South to the rest of Indochina – hideous crimes, but lesser ones.^{xxxi}

The protests against American politics have fundamental significance together with “the solidarity movements for Central America”^{xxxi} and other activities because these efforts keep the Bush presidency from gaining absolute control over the world. Even though George W. Bush in the second election formally won a mandate to continue his aggressive foreign policy, the polls suggest that the American people no longer support Bush’s foreign policy. Chomsky says that the public opinion polls show that majority of Americans believe that the USA should sign the Kyoto protocols and should allow the UN to take the lead in international crisis. Above all, the majority of Americans are against the war in Iraq:

The world is pretty awful today, but it is far better than yesterday, not only with regard to unwillingness to tolerate aggression, but also in many other ways, which we know tend to take for granted. There are very important lessons here, which should always be uppermost in our minds – for the same reason they are suppressed in the elite culture.^{xxiii}

The public calls for sharp cuts in military spending along with sharply increased spending for education, medical research, job training, conservation, renewable energy, and other social programs, as well for the United Nations and economic and humanitarian aid, along with the reversal of Bush’s tax cuts for the wealthy. Overall, popular preferences are virtually the opposite of the government budget decisions.^{xxiv}

According to Chomsky, under these circumstances Bush cannot declare a national emergency, as did Ronald Reagan during the Cold War, and thus cannot further strengthen the position of the elite – as did Reagan – who profit from American military interventions. Another positive impulse on the international scene is something that Chomsky calls liberalization of South America. Nowadays, “five centuries after the European conquest, South America is reasserting its independence.”^{xxv} These nations have a chance to find support and create a counterbalance to the United States for which, “the real enemy has always been independent nationalism...”^{xxvi} The fact is that Chomsky appreciates the rise of socialisms that if they were joined together, they would create a sound political and ideological opposition towards the United States.

Intermezzo

During the 1960s criticism of America as the most oppressive source of imperialism grew at American universities. The long and destructive war in Vietnam together with intellectual influence from Europe aroused student movements. Students, together with many professors, protested against the immorality of the Vietnam War, military drafts, and racial and gender inequality in America. The student protests started at the University of California in the 1964 with *the Free Speech Movement* and rapidly expanded to many other places, such as the University of Michigan, Cornell University, and Columbia University among others. It is hard to evaluate the impact of the movement on American society. The members of these movements were convinced that their efforts lessened racial and sexual bigotry, stopped the Vietnam War, and liberalized university campuses. After the sixties American universities created departments in peace studies, black and women’s studies. These departments studying sexism, racism and social inequality together with postmodernism and multiculturalism became very popular during the eighties and nineties when activists from sixties became teachers and professors.

Chomsky would probably agree that the most important contribution of the sixties was the development of these social movements; they united Americans with the European Left in protests against the Americanization of Europe and opposed US foreign policy, especially during Ronald Reagan’s presidency. Reagan’s administration was branded as “Nazi” and “rabid” because of American interventions to Latin America and the distribution of nuclear missiles in Western Europe.

Jean-Paul Sartre went beyond Chomsky’s criticism of American elite. And Sartre is responsible for the post-war Left’s most coherent, systematic and influential criticism of America. According to Sartre, Europe was culturally superior to America, but Americans didn’t want to admit – or in other words were not able to see – this fact. For Sartre and French intellectuals of his generation Americans were culturally ignorant with no hope of improvement.

For Sartre military interventions were only one threats posed by Americanization. Mass culture, consumerism, and capitalism represent other, even greater dangers. Although Chomsky criticized capitalistic society, he didn’t condemn America completely. Sartre, however, saw capitalism and America as synonymous: the evil of a consumer society. The Americanization of Europe was caused by America’s arrogance toward cultural diversity. The post war intellectual Left was

preoccupied with the simplistic thinking of Americans, especially the conviction that people of the world have the same or at least similar goals as Americans themselves. Another philosopher of this generation, Hebert Marcuse, in *One-Dimensional Man*, described Americanization as the decline of western society.^{xxvii} American military and economic expansions are, for Sartre, only different names for cultural barbarism.

First, I shall discuss Sartre's criticism of American foreign policy. At Bertrand Russell's suggestion Sartre, Simone de Beauvoir and other leading European intellectuals organized in the sixties the so-called *International War Crime Tribunal* which investigated American foreign policy, especially the Vietnam War. Even though the tribunal found the US government guilty of the deliberate, large-scale bombing of civilian targets, including schools, churches, and cultural monuments, Sartre wasn't completely satisfied with the verdict, because the tribunal took place in Sweden and Denmark. Sartre's intention was that the tribunal be held in France, but French president Charles de Gaulle would not allow it. Sartre argued that the "principle of the separation of the three powers is still advocated in our democracy. We must, then, try to understand what it means and decide whether or not the post-Gaullist Republic is still applying it."^{xxviii} The essence of American dominance, according to Sartre, was that it would attempt to establish the bourgeoisie in France, a development defended by de Gaulle. Sartre's concern was evidently to condemn Americans before French society as the model of bourgeoisie par excellence. For Sartre the bourgeoisie represented a loathsome "totality" and the suppression of French culture and identity.

Thus, Sartre felt that the most oppressive form of Americanism is capitalism what he called an American "neocolonialism." In his other political mediation about the Franco regime in Spain called *The Burgos Trial*, Sartre, warned the P.N.B. (the Basque National Party) to not fight for an independent state because "it would not take very long for the state to fall under influence of American capitalism."^{xxix} He feared that socialism and the Left in Europe could be defeated and even destroyed by the bourgeoisie; capitalism would further Americanize Europe. When de Gaulle, Sartre says, "took the power here, the leftist parties were crushed."^{xxx} It is evident that Sartre fought simultaneously against the capitalistic aggression and bourgeoisie represented by de Gaulle. Sartre's hatred of capitalism and his hopes that the Soviet system would succeed are the two sides of the same coin. During the fifties Sartre traveled to the Soviet Union as well as to the United States. In the seventies, Sartre concluded:

I continue to think that during the years of the Cold War the Communists were right. The U.S.S.R. – in spite of all the mistakes we know it made – was nevertheless being persecuted. It was not yet in position to hold its own in a war against America, and so it wanted peace. That was why we could go along with what the Communists were saying, because on the whole, their objections to America were the same as ours.^{xxxi}

In America, Sartre saw only cultural degeneration. Sartre discerned a process of cultural and intellectual transformation; something that he called the "melting pot." The "melting pot" transforms "Poles, Italians and Finns into United States citizens."^{xxxii} Sartre described his experience with a

Frenchman whom he met in America: “When he talked, with a deliberately vulgar accent, about “Paname,” he seemed much more like a Yankee bent on displaying his knowledge of Europe than an exiled Frenchman recalling his native land...The man’s face was still too expressive. It had retained the slightly irritating mimicry of intelligence that makes a French face recognizable anywhere. But he will soon be a tree or a rock.”^{xxxiii} The American lifestyle and language remove differences between the people, “everything is taught: serving, cooking and even flirting.”^{xxxiv} Besides the tendency towards conformism, Americans are individualists. For Sartre, these two tendencies are not in a tension because individualism for Americans means simply moneymaking; therefore American can be both individualist and conformist. The difference between European and American individualisms, Sartre explains:

For us, individualism has retained the old, classical form of “the individual’s struggle against society and, more particularly, against the State. There is no question of this in America. In the first place, for a long time the State was only an administrative body. In recent years, it has tended to play another role, but this has not changed the American’s attitude towards it. It is “their” State, the expression of “their” nation; they have both a profound respect for it and a proprietary love.”^{xxxv}

Individualism in America means simply competitive self-assertion, “individuality is something to be won.” It has nothing to do with personal convictions, but it is nothing more than competition over material goods. In reality, all Americans have the same values, ends and goals. Moreover, Americans believe that American values, rights, and goals are held by the whole world – that human rights are universal. According to Sartre every American is corrupted by the “American dream,” which is nothing more than a form of controlled economy. Americans fool each other about racial equality and equality of opportunity, when the former was never true and the latter only in the past. In the article for *The Nation* Sartre explained that beyond American self-propagation is only misery and doom:

There is a myth of equality and there is a myth of segregation, with those big beach-front hotels that post signs reading ‘Jews and dogs not allowed’ ... there is a myth of liberty and the dictatorship of public opinion; the myth of economic liberalism ... the hundred million Americans who satisfy their craving for the marvelous by reading everyday in the comics the incredible adventure of Superman...There are all those men and women who drink before making love in order to transgress in drunkenness and not remember...^{xxxvi}

One of the most evident demonstration of the conformity of Americans are America’s cities, with their narrow streets usually marked only by numbers, drably similar buildings: “In America just as any citizen can theoretically become President, so each Fontana can become Detroit or Minneapolis.”^{xxxvii} The sidewalks of the big cities are highways; in New York it is impossible to go for a leisure walk. American cities simply do not offer the unique characteristics of European cities, because streets and the whole cities are modernized with great frequency because America’s only interest according to Sartre is “progress.”

Simone de Beauvoir further explained the barbarization of Americans as an inability to see the world in a more profound context. Beauvoir criticized American vulgarity. Americans are concerned only by prosperity and do not see a higher truly human interests that for her are “an art or revolution.” She is primarily shocked by the situation at universities. American universities are not necessarily on the decline, but American students are not exposed to real moral decisions. Therefore, they live with an *idée fixe* of the simplicity of the world:

They want to believe that Good and Evil can be defined in precise categories, that Good already is, or will be easily achieved. I felt this from the beginning of my stay, but I have recently had striking confirmation of this. For one thing, I almost incited a riot among the students at Columbia, Yale, and Harvard, when I talked to them about the question of conscience in Rousset’s book, *The days of our Death*: what criteria should someone employ in making his choice if he found himself in a position to save the lives of two or three people in a camp of deportees? They stubbornly replied: “No one has the right to dispose of human life,” or “What would give him the right to choose?” When I objected that not choosing meant saving no one, and that, in any case, the positive act of saving two lives was worth more than a murderous abstention, they remained silent. I think that they, for their part, would have preferred to let them all die, rather than assume too heavy a responsibility. Or rather, they could not even imagine a situation in which they could have been forced to contribute to an evil...^{xxxviii}

Sartre and de Beauvoir observed that Americans are in some sense identical, they have the same beliefs and in large measure the same opinions. Americans are not exposed to the pressure of moral decisions as Europeans are and their thought is limited by the superficiality of their own culture and understanding of the world. An “American makes no distinction between American reason and ordinary reason.”^{xxxix} Americans are imperialistic and their expansionism has no understanding, no tolerance of foreign nations and cultures. According to Sartre Americans are bedeviled by and victims of their own society, “...there is a struggle for existence, which is extremely harsh.”^{xl} The individualism of Americans is their worst enemy. They have no means to deal with individuality that in America means mere loneliness. Americans talk to each other, but there is no real *gemeinschaft*, nothing like the warmth of collectivity of Europeans. Sartre explained that the American dream and opportunity are only illusions. “Everyone knows of the power of trusts in the United States, a power which represents another form of controlled economy.”^{xli}

Chomsky proclaimed that ordinary Americans are victims of American politics and the corrupted media. He seemed to believe that the top administrative positions in the US government are reserved for and controlled by elite, particularly by neoconservatives. In a discussion with William J. Bennett, Chomsky, after criticizing American foreign policy said, “I choose to live in what I think is the greatest country in the world, which is committing horrendous terrorist acts and should stop.”^{xlii} Even though Chomsky was influenced by Bertrand Russell, who had sympathy of the radical Left, socialism and communism, he didn’t condemn the core of the American system. Thus, Chomsky unlike Sartre believed that the evil of American politics is caused by the elitism, not by the conformity and ignorance of ordinary Americans.

Rightists

Whereas Chomsky's and the European Left's criticisms were focused particularly on America, Martin Heidegger questioned the modernity. Chomsky and other current proponents of Anti-Americanism focus primarily on American imperialism, which is supported by technocratic and armament lobbies. Sartre was offended by the banality of American's life as well as by capitalism. Conformity, universal thinking and American form of individualism (selfish money-making) are the means to control the mass democracy of America. Behind this farce of mindless consumerism there is nothing but barrenness: no higher thought, no philosophy, and no culture. For Sartre Americans are focused only on progress. Therefore everything in America is the same, "The American uses his mechanical corkscrew, his refrigerator or his automobile in the same way and at the same time as all other Americans."^{xliii}

Heidegger traced the root of the banality of modern life to a philosophic error in Western thought, a miscalculation that led to a loss of the human dimension in the modern age. Heidegger considered the most profound philosophical issue to be the question of Being. The questioning of Being is the subject of philosophy from its origin. It makes philosophy different from any other human activity. In this sense, "only poetry stands in the same order as philosophy and its thinking, though poetry and thought are not the same thing."^{xliv} The fundamental question Heidegger formulated: "Why are there essents rather than nothing?" The essents or existents are things that are. Moreover, the essents more likely mean how things are: their "coming to presence." Finally, the essent [existent] itself goes beyond only *is* because the essents [existents] presuppose Being. Then nothing as nothing cannot be present and "to speak of nothing will always remain a horror and an absurdity of science."^{xlv}

The essents themselves are significant for their ambiguity. We see the essents, but we cannot see being. Heidegger explained, "Being remains unfindable, almost like nothing or ultimately quite so." Then Being is for Heidegger nothing, no-thing. The distinction between essents and being can be effected in "mere thought"^{xlvi} and only in thought. Therefore the question of Being is not only philosophical, but also fundamental for human beings. "What if it were possible that man, that nations in their greatest movements and traditions, are linked to being and yet had long fallen out of being, without knowing it, and that this was the most powerful and most central cause of their decline?"^{xlvii}

The catastrophe of the modern world is based on the loss of this ontological difference, the questioning of Being. "Intelligence no longer meant a wealth of talent, lavishly spent, and the command of energies, but only what could be learned by everyone, the practice of routine..."^{xlviii} Therefore the world indeed became indifferent: the examples *par excellence* are Russia and America. Therefore America and Russia are from the "metaphysical point of view the same." Such a "misinterpretation of the spirit" is caused by celebration of mediocrity, mere talent, practice, and "mass division of labor." The spirit falsified into intelligence thus falls to the level of a tool in the service of others.^{xlix} According to Heidegger, the dominance of Russia and America threatens the existence of Europe:

In America and in Russia this development grew into a boundless etcetera of indifference and always-the-sameness – so much so that the quantity took on a quality of its own. Since then the domination in those countries of a cross section of the indifferent mass has become something more than a dreary accident. It has become an active onslaught that destroys all rank and every world-creating impulse of the spirit, and calls it a lie. This is the onslaught of what we call the demonic (in the sense of destructing evil).¹

Whereas in *An Introduction to Metaphysics* Heidegger describes a distinction between nothing and essents and relation essents – Being (*is* and Being/no-thing in *Being and Time*), in *Discourse of Thinking* he interpreted the crisis of today world as “thoughtlessness.” Here he differed between “calculative thinking” and “meditative thinking.” When the former is typical for contemporary man who “is in flight-from-thinking,”^{li} the “calculative thinking” always has its purpose. And therefore it is necessary inferior to “meditative thinking,” because it always falls into the mere everydayness. “Meditative thinking,” Heidegger writes, does not just happen by itself any more than does calculative thinking. At the times it requires a greater effort. It demands more practice. It is indeed of even more delicate care than any other genuine craft.”^{lii} Science made people forget about the meditative thinking. It is especially atomic energy that will change our relation to the world. Thus, the catastrophe of today’s world is closely related to techno-logical progress:

This assentation is valid in the sense that the approaching tide of technological revolution in the atomic age could so captive, bewitch, dazzle, and beguile man that calculative thinking may some day come to be accepted and practiced as only way of thinking.^{liii}

Heidegger understood the necessity of science in the modern world, but he tried to warn the modern man that technology will inevitably “slip from human control.”^{liv} Technology changed human relation to nature, “Agriculture is now the mechanized food industry.”^{lv} The Rhine is no longer the river spanned with “the old wooden bridge,” because the Rhine is understood as a “water power supplier.” Nature has lost its romance; experience is bereft of wonder; life is without meaning; the world has been transformed into “standing reserve.” For Heidegger America symbolized this new reality.

The crisis of today’s world is caused by America’s consumerism, materialism and also by corruption of European languages. University of Virginia professor, James W. Ceaser said, “In another (and metaphorical) sense, however, ‘American’ is the name Heidegger gives to the deformation of all the advanced languages. It changes language from its poetic function as a medium able to capture the particular and the distinctive into a bland vehicle for technical communication, no matter what the supposed language (French, German, Italian) one happens to be speaking.”^{lvi} Thus according to Heidegger, Americanization changes the world entirely. In *Letter on Humanism* he, for instance, wrote:

Whoever takes “communism” only as a “party” or a “Weltanschauung” is thinking too shallowly, just as those who by the term “Americanism” mean, and mean derogatorily, nothing more than a particular lifestyle. The danger into which Europe as it has hitherto existed is ever

more clearly forced... is falling behind in the essential course of a dawning world destiny which nevertheless in the basic traits of its essential provenance remains European by definition.^{lvii}

Heidegger's critique of the modern world (or its Americanization) and its loss of interest in metaphysics have experienced a fundamental influence on philosophy and literature in the 20th century. If Sartre's thinking and the entire French Left after the Second World War led into postmodern critiques, then Heidegger could be understood as the originator. Sartre's existentialism was based on Heidegger's philosophy, even though Heidegger distanced himself from it. And it is Heidegger's phenomenology that leads into relativism of postmodern philosophy of language, structuralism, and multiculturalism.

Heidegger understood *Dasein* (also translated as being-there or being-in-the-world) as a truly human position which differentiates human beings from mere things, from the being of a stone, or the being of animals or of plants:

What man is – or, as it is called in the traditional language of metaphysics, the “essence” of man – lies in his ek-sistence. But ek-sistence thought in this way is not identical with the traditional concept of *existential*, which means actuality in contrast to the meaning of *essentia* as possibility. ... The ‘essence’ of *Dasein* lies in its existence.^{lviii}

Then, man is always thrown into the world (being-in-the-world) and he is significant for his care (*Sorge*) about being. *Dasein* does not exist like any of the other things in the universe. Everything else just *is*, but *Dasein* wonders why it is. According to Heidegger, the modern world and science allow us to forget this distinction, which forces us to live un-authentically. He does not mean that human life has lost its authenticity. To live authentically requires involve all possibilities and exclusively human finality as the hindermost possibility: that is, “We live toward-our-death.” Therefore every human being, in every age lives for the most part necessarily un-authentically, but the catastrophe of today's world is a loss of interest in this truly human position.

I have said about the modern man inevitably adheres in the everydayness. Without an awareness of Being, it is impossible to distinguish between true and false, just and unjust, that are the metaphysical condition. According to Heidegger, all these distinctions, as well as the hierarchy of values, are not always – or for everybody – the same. They were changed not only within the history of the Western culture, but also from place to place, from one nation to another.

That there are ‘eternal truths’ will not be adequately proved until someone has succeeded in demonstrating that *Dasein* has been and will be for all eternity. As long as such a proof is still outstanding, this principle remains a fanciful contention which does not gain legitimacy from having philosophers commonly ‘believe’ it... *Because the kind of Being that is essential to truth is of the character of Dasein, all truth is relative to Dasein's Being.*^{lix}

Thus according to Heidegger, the modern age – and America as its symbol – is the marginalization of the cultural distinctions and transformation into mere universality. In other words, the modern world

became the object of subjective experience and the loss of privileged human position at the same time. There is nothing like universal truth. In reality all truths are always a matter of the concrete situation of a nation and of a man, Heidegger argued. Modernity tends to eliminate such distinction. Therefore, Heidegger's most despairing prediction, expressed in *Discourse on Thinking*, was of the end of philosophy in modernity in an inevitable American dominance of the world. The Cold War as the danger of nuclear war was not the worst catastrophe itself. The catastrophe became reality when the United States and its concept of democracy and "calculative thinking" overcame all other possibilities, when it became the only way of thinking.

Conclusion

If Heidegger's philosophy had a fundamental influence on philosophical discourse, his political thought defined the development of political theory in the 20th century. Heidegger proclaimed that the truly human position – of a man who is aware of ontological difference – is far from being embraced by any specific political regime. Heidegger himself was involved in the National Socialist regime of Nazi's Germany. Although Heidegger's main interest wasn't criticism of America, America as a symbol of the catastrophe in the modern world is often mentioned in his major writings. His influence on modern philosophy cannot be separated from his political thought.

The main argument of modern Anti-Americanism can be recapitulated by the following hypothesis. The two World Wars offered the United States an opportunity to expand into postwar Europe. After World War II American companies exploited the devastation of Europe to reinforce their influence on the Western European markets and to acquire a monopoly in the post-war reconstruction of Europe. But the worst outcome of the post-war American presence in Europe was the Americanization of western culture. German writer Günter Grass summarized this idea in the fifties that "west German society became Americanized, that is, materialistic, greedy, and polluted physically as well as spiritually."^{lx} By economic and political oppression America introduced its own fast food, clothing, cinematography, and popular mass culture to overthrow European culture. American businesses now dominate European ones with a direct support of American government, they undercut a free competition. Moreover, this economic dominance is connected with the American military presence in Europe and other parts of the world. In the last sixty years the United States has set up military bases and nuclear missile silos in many European countries, particularly in Germany and Great Britain. Nowadays, America spends annually several times more on its military than all European countries combined and "even if all the other states in the world put all their military resources together they would not be able to mount a credible threat to the US."^{lxi} The American government justified its continually increasing armament with the Cold War and later with war on terrorism. In short, the economic exploitation and the military superiority of America are the two basic means of American imperialism. Thus American imperialism destroys and barbarizes different cultures.

The progress of this phenomenon in the last sixty years began with the Heideggerian conception of the decadence of the modern age. To understand postmodern criticism and

multiculturalism as well as Sartre's opposition toward the United States, Heidegger's philosophy is paramount. In *Hölderlin's Hymn "The Ister"* Heidegger suggested:

We know today that the Anglo-Saxon world of Americanism has resolved to annihilate Europe, that is, the homeland [*die Heimat*], and that means: the commencement of the Western world. Whatever has the character of commencement is indestructible. America's entry into this planetary war is not its entry into history; rather it is already the ultimate American act of American ahistoricity and self-devastation. For this act is the renunciation of commencement, and a decision in favor of that which is without commencement.^{lxii}

For Heidegger the evil of the modern age was the decay and fall of the modern man into mere "everydayness." The problems with Americanization are not only cultural pollution of the European cultures, but the doom of human kind, the loss of a truly human dimension and its authenticity and historicity. Heidegger constantly refers to America as the cause of his apprehension.

Even though Heidegger was not an existentialist, his conception of the phenomenology is the foundation of Sartre's existentialist philosophy and his understanding of humanity. Sartre's description of Americans as conformists is the Heideggerian fear of the everydayness and universal thinking that are the evil, not for the loss of individuality, but for the loss of the privileged human position. Thus, the American individualism described in Sartre's political essays is Heidegger's modern man orientated towards everydayness. It is evident that Heidegger's writings reestablished the significance of philosophy in contrast to the conception of science raised by rationalism at the end of the 19th century. Sartre's existentialism was the rejection of bourgeois capitalistic society; Marcuse's *One-Dimensional-Man* was a combination of Marxism and Heidegger's fear of the limitations of a modern thought.

Simone de Beauvoir's most depressing recognition is that Americans applauded the progress of technology and science. Americans lost individuality and their particularity. Americans overlooked and denied the existential question that troubled European leftist intellectuals and humanists of the twentieth century. Like Heidegger, Beauvoir criticized the modern technology that dehumanized human relation to the world. Heidegger's distrust of technology is clearly recognizable in Beauvoir observations. She explained her observations as follows:

Because they refused to accept the durability of things, they also refuse to recognize their quality; it is not only for economic reasons that "craftsmanship" does not exist in the States. Even in leisured occupations qualitative success is never sought for: food is cooked, just as fruit is ripened, as fast as possible; in every walk one must be hurry...^{lxiii}

Sartre similarly described American cities and houses, which resembled factories rather than residences, "One leaves with a slightly depressed feeling, with the feeling of having seen the careful, small-scale reconstruction of a 1944 flat in the year 3000. The moment one steps outside one sees hundreds of houses, all alike, piled up, squashed against the earth..."^{lxiv} Heidegger's un-authentic Being is Sartre's American bourgeoisie and capitalism.

Finally, Heidegger's emphasis on the differences between nations and his relativism set the background for postmodernism and deconstructionism represented by postmodernist intellectuals such as Noam Chomsky. Chomsky and postmodern philosophy recognized in Heidegger relativism, deconstruction, and the importance of cultural difference in understanding the world. The hegemony of the American elite and the powerful mass media are blind to the cultural differences. Postmodernism is projected in feminism and multiculturalism: both pointed to a complexity in the world that is overlooked by Americans and their culture. Instead of cultural diversity, Americans want a homogeneous mass society.

HAMILTONIAN POLITICS OF THE EMPIRE

The objections of intellectuals toward America discussed in this paper, particularly those of Martin Heidegger, are so fundamental to the origin of contemporary criticisms of the U.S. that I have chosen to contrast them with the fundamental and original ideas on which the United States is based. I shall investigate the principles of American government, democracy, and society. It was said by Alexis de Tocqueville and many others that America is a country founded on ideas: the most important ideas in creating and establishing powerful country with a strong government and a dynamic free market economy are those of Alexander Hamilton. Hamilton, more than any other person, shaped the destiny of America. Moreover, it was Hamilton's principles that fashioned exactly the kind of government and society that Heidegger, Sartre, and Chomsky detest. Hamilton's contribution to and influence on America and the character of the government are summarized by his biographer Ron Chernow:

The magnitude of Hamilton's feats as treasury secretary has overshadowed many other facets of his life: clerk, college, student, youthful poet, essayist, artillery captain, wartime adjutant to Washington, battlefield hero, congressman, abolitionist, Bank of New York founder, state assemblyman, member of Constitutional Convention and New York Ratifying Convention, orator, lawyer, polemicist, educator, patron of saint of *New-York Evening Post*, foreign-policy theorist, and major general in the army. Boldly uncompromising, he served as catalyst for the emergence of the first political parties and as the intellectual fountainhead for one of them, the Federalists. He was a pivotal force in four consecutive presidential elections and defined much of America's political agenda during the Washington and Adams administrations, leaving copious commentary on virtually every salient issue of the day.^{lxv}

Before he had reached forty, Hamilton managed to become one of the main architects of the Constitution and the most important cabinet secretary in American history. As the first Secretary of the Treasury during George Washington's presidency, Hamilton created the National Bank, issued the first stable currency, established a fund for paying the national debt, and instituted a mechanism for collecting taxes, thus making the administration of the government viable. He was influential in establishing the New York (Wall Street) stock exchange, the engine of the nation's capital-markets and the source of American economic vitality. He always justified his political ideals by theories and by practical policy, because as he said, "a great source of mistakes are abstract calculations governed by passion and prejudices than by enlightened sense of their interest." It is accurate to say that Hamilton hoped to create an American empire that would dominate the world politically and economically; he thought of it as an empire of liberty.

Hamilton's genius is most apparent in his views on commerce and manufacturing in interaction with principles of republican government. He believed that through the functional free market economy system, America could achieve not only wealth and international dominance, but also

strengthen the Union of the states and in turn national security. But the most original of Hamilton's thoughts is a revolutionary argument that through self-government and the spur of personal achievement, Americans could become *virtuous*. This virtue would be the essence of American democracy.

Hamilton knew that one of the characteristics of democracy is conformity, but conformity is not itself a fault. Conformity fosters stability and brings the greatest advantage of democracy: the freedom of equals. The people as individuals should have the right to govern themselves. Self-government presupposes responsibility that in a society based on trust becomes virtuous. Self-confident, virtuous and equal individuals are the best citizens. In one of his early texts Hamilton wrote: "Americans are intitled to freedom, it is incontestable upon every rational principle. All men have one common original: they participate in one common nature, and consequently have one common right. No reason can be assigned why one man should exercise any power or pre-eminence over his fellow creatures more than another; unless they have voluntarily vested him with it."^{lxvi} Americans must have a common goal in accordance with their personal achievements.

A society of equal individuals can easily define a "common good." And the "common good" as the common interest of Americans goes beyond national security and prosperity. It can overcome the selfishness of individuals and create harmony between the ambitious and the rest of the society. Democracy, Hamilton claimed, requires a constant effort to protect it. The stress on individuality is the source of national glory and greatness of Americans. Hamilton, comparing American democracy to the Roman Empire, explained: "Neither the manners nor the genius of Rome are suited to the republic on the age we live in. All her maxims and habits were military, her government was constructed for war. Ours is unfit for it, and our situation still less than our constitution, invite us to emulate the conduct of Rome, or to attempt and display of unprofitable heroism."^{lxvii} The glory of Americans depends on morality of the American politicians and the virtue of the American people. Even on the international scene Americans must be responsible and able to defend their principles, because morality and the interest of the government are their own.

However, a society based only on commerce and equality would be a vain project. Hamilton's economic theories could not be separated from his politics. His writings cannot be misinterpreted to a claim that a society based on a free market economy does not need a government. On the other hand, the strong position of the federal government as it is articulated in Hamilton's writings is distinct from the welfare state. The welfare state requires a political system that guarantees its citizens a social standard. A side-effect of social democracies is that the individual's freedom and opportunities are proportionally limited by the measure of social comfort – an individual cannot be secure and free at the same time. Similar mistakes are constantly repeated by the proponents of the welfare state and today's "liberal" economists who believe that one can increase income together with economic security. "The only distinction between freedom and slavery," Hamilton said, "consists in this: In the former state, a man is governed by the laws to which he has given his consent, either in person, or by his representative: In the latter, he is governed by the will of another."^{lxviii} The preservation of individual freedoms in democracy presupposes people's willingness to sacrifice their security for their love of freedom.

A strong federal government in America has a diametrically different purpose. The ordinary people, preoccupied by the work and families, have neither the time nor the ability to articulate the common good in a broader context. They cannot see beyond the contemporary needs of their families or communities. Direct participation of the whole citizenry in governing, the direct democracy of ancient Athens, is not the principle of democracy, but its certain type. Hamilton did not believe and considered a direct democracy as a suitable political regime for the United States and as a defender of a strong federal government Hamilton asked rhetorically, “Has it been found that bodies of man act with more rectitude or greater distresses than individuals?”^{lxi} Regardless to the fatal faults of Athenian democracy, it ended in tyranny of a few. Thus, direct democracies are neither more justifiable nor more legitimate than representative democracy. The purpose of a strong federal government is to defend the nation against internal and external enemies. The role of the federal government, especially the function of executive power, is to preserve democracy, not to exercise it.

Hamilton understood that the tendency of an individualistic society based on the equality of opportunity is conformism, but conformism is preferable to the inequality of the vertically orientated elite societies. Conformity in America is not in conflict with individual achievement; elitism in Europe, on the other hand, often is.

Alexander Hamilton wanted to persuade the people of America that the thirteen States of the New World had a historic chance to establish a truly democratic society, a safe and prosperous Union, an Empire capable of fighting and defending its liberal principles. He understood and declared that such a society has to establish its government from the will of the people. “I know,” Hamilton concluded, in *Federalist #85*, “that powerful individuals, in this and in other states, are enemies to a general national government, in every possible shape.”^{lxx}

The significance of commerce

Hamilton was known and criticized for advocating the idea of a strong federal government and elitism on the one hand, and for that of a welfare state on the other.^{lxxi} Hamilton did not mean to regulate national economy or even the private sphere with the exception of the process, the national currency, regulations of international commerce, and establishing institutions such as the National Bank. The creation of a functional economic system was Hamilton’s most essential task. He understood and fully employed Adam Smith’s economic principles as the division of labor, the extensive use of machinery, and additional employment; he knew that these goals could be achieved only with the development of manufacturing based on the free market system, whereas agriculture cannot be the source of wealth in the modern world.^{lxxii}

Hamilton did not only employ the principles of modern economy, but determined the future development of America. He knew that the system of free economy would have an impact on the social structure, on science, and on American culture as well. He understood that his novel political theories could not be accomplished without a sound economy. The political regime is only one part of a functional society.

Middle Class

To have a stable democratic society requires persuading people to recognize the common good and common values. The middle class tends to work toward similar ends because the bourgeoisie stands for family values, and a comfortable, and secure life. Thus, Hamilton sought to create conditions under which the so-called bourgeoisie can flourish. The ideals of the American Revolution – equality, liberty and pursuit of happiness – must become the natural interest of the people. A society of equal individuals who stand for the same values can create universal thinking. The result of the universal thinking has two effects: it creates the mass society and conformity, but it preserves democratic character and stability. A good and stable democracy presupposes that self-confident individuals and a middle class advocate for the common good because by so doing it fosters its own status.

A society so constituted defines democratic regime: the middle class builds and preserves society based on the trust, by obedience of laws (even unwritten laws such as timekeeping, honesty and so on). The characteristics of middle class are moderation, common sense, and hard work. The main motivation of the middle class is a comfortable family life, but if it is challenged by opportunities, it will make sacrifices.

Opportunity

To achieve stability and simultaneously preserve the maximum of individual rights is according to Hamilton possible only in a free market economy that can generate almost infinite number of opportunities without the necessity of the government interventions. Hamilton's understanding of the people's right to pursue happiness was to make "the citizens in every regard more well-behaved, wealthier, wiser, richer, and more secure."^{lxxiii} Hamilton ideal was the artisan who is employed in only one kind of work and who masters by developing his own skills. Such employment affects not only quality of the whole production, but also the artisan's social position. Men who are continuously challenged by a variety of opportunities and by the opportunity to an individual progress are no longer burden on the community. Hamilton vehemently supported the manufacturing establishment as the only way to achieve diversity of opportunity and economic interconnections between people. Due to a diversity of talents, the entire population could find fulfillment and achieve its goals. In *the Report of the subject of Manufactures* Hamilton wrote:

Beside ... of occasional employment to classes having different occupation, there is another of a nature allied to it and of a similar tendency. This is – the employment of persons who would otherwise be idle (and in many cases burden on the community), either from the byass of temper, habit, infirmity of body, or some cause, indisposing, or disqualifying them from the toils of the Country.^{lxxiv}

From the passage above it is evident that Hamilton considered crucial to involve all members of society to economic process. It has not only economical advantage, because those who have a chance to be successful became self-confident defenders of democratic regime and in a society based on freedom and respect, but the people will be necessary more virtuous. Therefore the requisite of functional democracy is the creation of opportunities. And the free market economy, by the promotion of working opportunities, supports individualism and offers conditions for self-realization and creation of an American identity.

Outlet for the Ambitious

There are ambitious individuals who are starving for self-realization and who become interested in the public good simply through personal opportunity. Hamilton was convinced that these passions are to some extent natural to every human being. To deal with the anti-democratic and selfish character of the human soul is the fate of democracy.

“The love of fame” Hamilton wrote “is the ruling passion of noblest minds.” This desire, natural to a man, should be encouraged regardless of the fact that it could mean mere money-making. And a suppression of this desire always leads to the corruption. One of the greatest clichés of the intellectual Left is that there is something wrong with money-making, because to be rich is not a noble ideal. Yet, there is nothing noble and beautiful in poverty and the poor are as materialistic as (or even more likely) the rich. Plato and Aristotle described the desire of aristocrats for social significance, beauty and philosophy. Glaucon of Plato’s *Republic* desperately hungers for political influence and his intentions, albeit zealous and incoherent, are justice and a better society, not wealth and or hegemony. Aristotle similarly considered beauty as the strongest passion of a noble soul. Both Plato and Aristotle knew that philosopher’s natural allies are the noble. But it does not matter by which desire people are motivated; Hamilton argued there are individuals who want to achieve economic success and it is an obligation of the government to create conditions that do not obstruct such an endeavor. Ambitious individuals are the engine of a society.

But Hamilton did not intend to establish an elite; rather he argued that only successful individuals can create opportunities for others and promote the public good. Hamilton didn’t care who occupied these positions, but he did not support a dictatorship. He believed that over the time this issue can be solved by the free market.

The tendency of every society or of human nature generally is that rich people will dominate the poor. This is the evident truth and the fate of every society. But it isn’t necessarily evil. Hamilton was convinced that democracy and freedom can be preserved only in such societies where those who rule possess virtues:

Look through the rich and the poor of the community; the learned and the ignorant. Where does virtue predominate? The difference indeed consists, not in the quantity but kind of vices, which are incident to the various classes; and here the advantage of character belongs to the wealthy. Their vices are probably more favorable to the prosperity of the state, than those of the indigent; and partake less of moral depravity.^{lxxv}

Hamilton didn't intend to favor or create conditions for the establishing of elites. He simply concluded that those who are successful are aware of the advantages of a freedom society and the importance of its preservation, because they could render their own prosperity.

In short, whereas the free market can create the conditions for individual self-realization, the role of government is to protect individualism. The preservation of the United States rests on individuals, but the individualism can be achieved only by the creation of opportunities. Hamilton's idea of a strong government is significantly different from the strong government of a socialist state. The healthy self-confidence of Americans is the source of their patriotism; the source of the will to preserve freedom and democratic government. The bourgeoisie, the middle class itself stands and defends liberal principles of American democracy. The people would soon discover that protection of competition instead of social security is also their own concern. They will realize that the growth of the economy is their best interest. The people will from their own experience recognize that a welfare state is a utopia and they will prefer the freedom of the challenging uncertainty instead of dependence and security.

Competition to spur Achievement

Liberty and equality are possible only in a regime based on free competition. Free competition Hamilton understood as desirable and wanted. It challenges individuals who want to be successful. Free competition and flexibility of the free market mechanism encourages men to extraordinary performance. Thus, free competition is by the definition beneficial to the national economy and its growth.

Hamilton believed that free competition and the tools of the free market economy solve the main tension of society: the tension between individuals and the majority. This tension can be described as follows: the people want to have freedom, but on the other hand, they require social security. The middle class and poor people tend to vote for government intervention. The poor are constantly tempted to benefit from the nation's wealth. The problem is that whenever the state becomes more protective, it inevitably obstructs individual freedom, increases dependence and laziness. Thus, success was less an individual question, but rather a cultural and social one. There are poor in every society, but a free market economy offers a chance to radically improve, socialism does not. It could be objected that such examples are rare in regard to today's 300 million Americans, but personal challenge and conditions for enterprise are considerably higher in America than in any other country in the world.

Attempts by the state to control the economy are not only unjust, but they curtail freedom generally. If opportunity in the free market economy is a question only of one's talent, courage, or luck, a welfare state obstructs human endeavor drastically. A welfare state creates an undignified condition of dependence and irresponsibility. The free market businesses offer "a permanent addition to the general stock of productive labor."^{lxvii} Every sphere of a society except the national defense is

effectively promoted by the free economy. A welfare state artificially intensifies antagonism between the ambitious – hardworking and successful people – and the poor.

In a nation of self-made citizens, Hamilton became an emblematic figure because he believed that government ought to promote self-fulfillment, self-improvement, and self-reliance. His own life offered an extraordinary lesson in social mobility, and his unstinting energy illustrated his devout belief in the salutary power of work to develop people’s minds and bodies. As Secretary of the Treasury, he tried to make room for entrepreneurs. He was troubled by underdeveloped American industry and helped to finance projects could set manufacturers in the United States. He intuited America’s special genius for business: “As to whatever may depend on enterprise, we need not fear to be outdone by any people on earth. It may almost be said that enterprise is our element.”^{lxxvii}

The Great National Project

Hamilton foresaw the United States as a Superpower. He was convinced that American democracy would not be isolated from the rest of the world. Indeed, he proclaimed that for its self-preservation America must dominate other countries. Hamilton saw the future of America in a worldwide context. He did not see military predominance over the world as necessary. However, he warned, the relationships between the nations are similar relationships between people, “the causes of hostility among the nations are innumerable. There are some which have a general and almost constant operation upon the collective bodies of society: Of this description are the love of power or the desire of predominance and dominion – the jealousy of power, or the desire of equality and safety. There are some others which have more circumscribed, though an equally operative influence, within their spheres...”^{lxxviii}

Hamilton understood the great potential the United States had to offer. The United States’ involvement in international commerce is not only inevitable, but also necessary and desirable. Americans, however, must enter international relations from a position of the strong. America should not seek dominance, although the strength will be a natural result. The economic, political, and military powers of the Union would ensure its strength on the international scene. The American Revolution showed there was a common interest among the states to build an independent and strong democratic country capable of defending its principles. Hamilton believed in and foresaw a unique world project. In his Farewell address written by Hamilton, George Washington warned against the disunion to which Americans are exposed by external and internal enemies. In this famous address Washington did not try to discourage Americans from exercising foreign policy; he tried to remind them of the importance of a common interest. He knew that America was not strong enough to safely promote international politics: “The name of American,” Hamilton wrote in the draft of the Farewell Address, “must always gratify and exalt the just pride of patriotism more than any denomination which can be derived from local discrimination. You have with slight shades of difference the same religion manners habits & political institution & principles. You have in common cause fought and

triumphed together. The independence and liberty you enjoy are the work of joint councils efforts – danger suffering & success. By your Union you will achieved them, by your union you will most effectually maintain them.”^{lxxix}

One of Hamilton’s greatest ideals is his stand on encouraging immigration. Manufacturing, technology, the condition of more equal society, and the promotion of employment opportunities would necessarily increase immigration. For most immigrants a job had priority over even religious equality. Manufacturing offered a future to impoverished European peasants who had no promise of a better life in Europe. It is a matter of fact that the majority of immigrants was composed of illiterate and dispirited former citizens of European ancient regimes. Among them, there were also ambitious and talented people who found in America unique conditions:

Manufactures who listening to the powerful invitations of a better price for their fabrics, or their labour, of grater cheapness of provisions and raw materials, of an exception from the chief part of the taxes, burthens and restrains, which they endure in the old world, of greater personal independence and consequence, under the operation of a more equal government, and of what is far more precious than mere religious toleration – a perfect equality of religious privileges; would probably flock from Europe to the United States to pursue their own trades or professions...^{lxxx}

No less important is patriotism; proud citizens tend to be virtuous; politicians especially will be more virtuous and less corrupt. Gerald Strouzh observed that “one of Hamilton’s most serious reservations on political democracy, usually overlooked, was the people’s lack of interest in important matters of policy. Political incompetence was not so much result of inborn stupidity as of the lack of genuine concern. Democracy as a theory of the principles of political obligation, as expressed in the image of social contract, presupposes political interest, talent and training in everyone.”^{lxxxii}

Independence of Commerce and Manufacturing

But how is it possible to achieve such goals? Hamilton would answer that manufacturer established under the condition of a free market with a minimum of state interventions are ideal. From the previous arguments it is evident that commercial and industrial undertakings have both social importance and national importance. The entire society has to be involved in the economy; people have to recognize that they are part of it. Hamilton knew that “industry, if left to itself, will naturally find its way to most useful and profitable employment.”^{lxxxii}

The potential of technology has its own importance. “The establishment and diffusion of Manufactures,” Hamilton argued, “have to effect of rendering the total mass of useful and productive labor in a community, greater than it would otherwise be.”^{lxxxiii} Manufacturers allow continuous work and they are able to employ all members of family and therefore increase family income:

Besides the advantages of occasional employment to classes having different occupations, there is another of a nature allied to it of a similar tendency. This is the employment of persons who

would otherwise be idle (and in many cases burden on the community), either from byass of temper, habit, infirmity of body, or some other cause, indisposing, or disqualifying them for the toils of the Country. It is worthy of particular remark, that, in general, women and Children are rendered more useful and the latter more early useful by manufacturing establishments, than they would otherwise be.^{lxxxiv}

Although this argument could seem somehow harsh to a contemporary man, one cannot refute Hamilton's good intention. Technological progress and industry strengthen the position of America in the world and also foster individualism, self-realization and American identity that are proclamations of the American Revolution, the only revolution that at least in the history of modern age, led to a truly democratic society. Industry together with monetary system, a National Bank, and manufacturing gave England a leading position in the world at the time. Hamilton wrote:

The prosperity of commerce is now perceived and acknowledged, by all enlightened statesmen, to be the most useful as well as the most productive source of national wealth; and has accordingly become a primary object of their political cares...The assiduous merchant, the laborious husbandman, the active mechanic, and the industrious manufacturer, all others of men look forward with eager and expectation an growing alacrity to this pleasing reward of their toils.^{lxxxv}

Hamilton pointed towards the technological underdevelopment of America and proclaimed that the preservation of independence of the United States is the question of the functional and healthy industry.

Manufacturers use the natural wealth of the country to increase the national wealth and reduce demand for a foreign supply, whereas the export of raw goods enriches and creates dependence. Manufacturers are also "the means of promoting such as will to render the United States, independent on foreign nation, for military and other essential supplies."^{lxxxvi} Hamilton warned that inequity in this exchange between nations inevitably leads to the "vain project of selling everything and buying nothing."^{lxxxvii} And "the substitution of foreign for domestic manufactures is a transfer to foreign nations of the advantages accruing from the employment of Machinery, in the modes in which it is capable of being employed, with most utility and to the greatest extend."^{lxxxviii} Besides other economic disadvantages, an agricultural state will very soon depend in many aspects on European industrialized countries.

Money and Defense Industry

Hamilton analyzed the most powerful nations of his time and concluded that their success is based on obtaining foreign capital. These nations, France and England used foreign capital to finance and stimulate their economic development. Hamilton knew that foreign capital must be part of the wealth of the United States and he supported the stock market as well as state's obligations. The competitiveness of manufacturing establishments encourages such investments. "It is at least evident,

that in a Country situated like the United States, with an infinite fund of resources yet to be unfolded, every farthing of foreign capital, which is laid out in internal ameliorations, and in industrious establishment of a permanent nature, is a precious acquisition.^{lxxxix}

As the Secretary of the Treasury, Hamilton argued for the establishment of National Bank, Public Credit, and the necessity of unified currency. An economically developing country may capitalize its own progression – attracting investors to public funds. Foreign capital can help establish domestic manufacturers and finance such project as roads or bridges:

It cannot but merit particular attention, that among ourselves the most enlightened friends of good government are those, whose expectations are the highest. To justify and preserve their confidence; to promote the encreasing respectability of the American name; to answer the call for justice; to restore landed property to its value; to furnish new resources both to agriculture and commerce; to cement more closely the union of the states; to add to their security against foreign attack; to establish public order on the basis of an upright and liberal policy. These are the great and invaluable ends to be secured, by a proper and adequate provision, at the present period, for the support of public credit.^{xc}

Hamilton's greatest success in the national economy was his idea to use national debt to create national currency. He established the National Bank and enforced the protection of industries as "protective duties on those foreign articles, which are the rival of domestic ones ... prohibitions of exportation of the materials of manufactures ... pecuniary bounties to encouraging manufactures." But such remedies could disappear once a strong free market economy made them unnecessary.^{xcii}

National defense

The most important issue for Hamilton was the national defense. He insisted a strong and centralized military power in practically every one of the *Federalist papers* and in other writings. The most coherent and radical view on his understanding to the national defense, Hamilton described in the *Federalist* #23:

The authoritatives essential to the care of the common defence are these – to raise armies – to build and equip fleets – to prescribe rules for the government of both – to direct their operations – to provide for their support. These powers ought to exist without limitations: *Because it is impossible to foresee or define the extent and variety of national emergencies, or the correspondent extent & variety of the means which may be necessary to satisfy them.*^{xcii}

The Constitution has to ensure that the national defense will be concentrated in the hands of a centralized executive power that has to have the means to enforce its policy in the case of national danger. Hamilton argued that only executive power can effectively obtain means for the military. First, the executive power can effect agreement between the states. Second, an effective national defense is in the national interest of all the people of the United States. Finally, the efficiency of the military in

the time of war as well as in peace can be achieved only from the central executive. A strong military ensures sovereignty of the nation.

According to Hamilton manufacturers give “the means of promoting such as will to render the United States, independent on foreign nation, for military and other essential supplies.”^{xciii} He saw Europe as the greatest danger to the unique American political regime and the United States too weak to defend its own interests. He understood that there is no chance for a preservation of a nation that cannot defend its own interests.

The danger from foreign countries is constant and unpredictable. Therefore, the federal government must have unlimited powers to raise money, “...the union ought to be invested with full power to levy troops; to build and equip fleets, and to raise the revenues, which will be required for the formation and support of an army, and navy, in the customary and ordinary modes practiced in other governments,” Hamilton claimed.^{xciv}

The Federal Government

For Alexander Hamilton economy has primarily political importance: “A unity of commercial, as well as political interests, can only result from an unity of government.”^{xcv} He was convinced that without guidance the people cannot preserve any political system. He knew that the biggest dangers to Americans are Americans themselves. Hamilton did not distrust the people. Nor did he aspire to create a restrictive government. Human passions are merely selfish. This quality is more dangerous in democracies where freedom makes it easier for the people to achieve their goals and where the laws are created by the people. Rather passions can be directed toward the public good. In the *Federalist #1* he wrote that the Constitution of the United State has fundamental importance as the most important document of the future empire, “The subject speaks its own importance; comprehending in its consequences, nothing less than the existence of the UNION, the safety and welfare of the parts of which is composed, the fate of an empire, in many respect, the most interesting on the world.”^{xcvi} He knew that the United States could become an Empire. America, unlike Europe, had few traditions and few complicated historical issues that burdened Europe. As a new nation that just fought for its independence, America had a historically unique chance to establish a society based on ideas corresponding with human nature. Reading David Hume and other philosophers of Enlightenment, Hamilton claimed that passions often overcome reason. Yet, passions do not make a political community impossible. Most important for the future of the Union, Hamilton viewed an encouragement of the people’s public spirit and people’s interest in politics. Patriotism and the willingness to sacrifice for the nation are unreal. A zeal to risk one’s life for the nation is not an idealistic vision, but one of the aspects of humane nature. “The confidence of the people,” Hamilton argued, “will easily be gained by a good administration.”^{xcvii}

The functional and efficient federal government has to be a sovereign institution among the States. Once the rule of law, the national currency and bank were established, there had to be something, which bound such establishments together. The government had to provide further balance. Hamilton summarized these opinions and the function of the federal government in *the Federalist # 72*:

The actual conduct of foreign negotiations, the preparatory plans for finance, the application and disbursement of the public monies, in conformity the general appropriations of the legislature, the arrangement of the army and navy, the direction of the operation of war; these and other matters of a like nature constitute what seems to be most properly understood by the administration of government.^{xcviii}

It is necessary to define the role of the government clearly and involve the great number citizens into certain political levels. Historian Forrest McDonald explained Hamilton's vision of the relation between the federal and individual states: "each level of the government in America was sovereign, but only in regard to the object entrusted to it...Hamilton believed the government would have powers inherent in sovereignty that were limited only by the ends for which it was created."^{xcix} People have to be involved in politics to understand and accept the importance of the government. The federal government is geographically and institutionally far from the people and they have neither the time nor the means to understand federal politics. "The human affections, like the solar heat, lose their intensity, as they depart from the center; and become languid, in proportion to the expansion of the circle, on which they act. On these principles, the attachment of the individual will be first and forever secured by the states governments."^c But they have to be involved into the local politics. This idea created the unique character of the republican government of the United States of America.

The Chief of the Administrative

The Chief Executive is essential to the Federal government. Hamilton supported a strong and centralized executive. "Energy in the executive power" Hamilton said "is a leading character in the definition of good government." He understood centralized executive power as the key to a functional republican government. A single man... would be greatly preferable. It would give us a chance of more knowledge, more activity, more responsibility and of course more zeal and attention."^{ci} Assemblies on the other hand are always less efficient and often irresponsible.

To be effective the executive power has to be emancipated from public opinion and even from legislative branch of the federal government. "A feeble execution is but another word for a bad execution," Hamilton explained. Thus one argument for a strong executive is the necessary ability to promote an effective and consistent domestic and foreign policy. The history of the world shows adequacy of such a requirement. One does not have to go far into history of the Western culture to find examples supporting arguments for a strong executive in the time of crisis: Winston Churchill, Margaret Thatcher, Ronald Reagan or even Charles de Gaulle are the most recent examples. From these examples it is also evident that the will of public opinion and the truth are often two different things. Therefore Hamilton warned that the president of the United States should not depend on public opinion. Hamilton believed in the retroactive function of the chief Executive – every second presidential election gives to the people a remedy against the executive.

Yet, Hamilton also argued the executive power should not rule the nation and it is easier to control executive power vested in one person. Hamilton believed that because the president was solely

responsible for the executive power, he would be more virtuous. The president will not try exploit the position to his own profit. When the United States became the most powerful and democratic country on the world, the president would be too proud to abuse presidential office for personal gain: “The best security for the fidelity of mankind is to make their interest coincide with their duty,” Hamilton claimed.^{cii} He believed that the desire for fame is the strongest of the human passions and the presidential office offers great opportunity to fulfill such a desire. Therefore there is a small risk the executive power would be corrupt.

The government has to have means to defend common values and to en-sure the stability.

If we are in earnest about giving the Union energy and duration, we must abandon the vain project of legislating upon the States in their collective capacities: We must extend the laws of the Federal Government to the individual citizens of America: We must discard the fallacious scheme of quotas and requisitions, as equally impracticable and unjust.^{ciii}

He stood for the centralized government because all other possibilities will inevitable lead into disunion and weakening of the Union.

Conclusion

Hamilton, himself passionate and ambitious, understood how important the role of individualism would be in the creation of American identity. He believed and persuaded Americans that the power of the free market could heal the diseases of every political community. Even though industry could ensure future American prosperity and autonomy, Hamilton also believed that a strong centralized federal government is equally important. A nation made up of individuals with different ideas, capacities, and interests needs to establish the unity; the common interest of Americans is wealth, which leads to power: “A very powerful state may frequently hazard a high and haughty tone with good policy, but the weak state can scarcely ever do it without imprudence. The last is yet our character, though we are the embryo of a great empire.”^{civ}

Selfishness is natural to people, but when the people see a public good, they will make sacrifices. Selfish passions endanger every society and a strong center, the federal government is necessary to overcome such passions. But how to persuade democratic and self-confident citizens about the necessity of the strong political center? James F. Pontuso finds in this issue the explanation for Hamilton’s deep interest in economy. Hamilton wanted to bring people toward acceptance of the strong federal government “by establishing a stable financial system... People would come to see their material well-being tied to the continued existence of the central government... Hamilton favored establishing an advanced industrial economy in the United States not simply because it would make people rich, but, rather, because it would make the nation independent and its people proud and free, Pontuso explained.”^{cv} A monetary system, taxes, and manufacturing will unite people and government and promote interdependence among the people. If one seeks material wealth, he will also be

interested in the protection of such activity. There will be always rich and poor, but the free market economy satisfies the rich and simultaneously offers opportunity to the poor. It is crucial for the people to understand the public good is to some extent their own.

Hamilton goes beyond the prosperity and the security of the United States. He offers insight into the conflict between citizen's personal interests and the prosperity of the nation. Hamilton knew importance to find agreement between the self-interest of a man and the government: "As too much power leads to despotism, too little leads to anarchy, and both eventually to the ruin of the people."^{cvi} The people have to be persuaded about the common good of their government and the government must to have power to overcome the passions of the people.

America for Hamilton had no choice, except become an empire. A part of the American identity has to be chance and challenge, the greatest values that could be offered to a freedom man. The United States, unlike European democracies, based its democracy on the principles that were rediscovered and popularized by Enlightenment. The greatness of Alexander Hamilton is his awareness of this unique historical chance and its possibility and necessity.

Today, the greatest danger for American democracy is not a monarchy or elite. A successful democracy can easily resist such temptations. The greatest enemies of democratic mass society are demagogues. America could hardly be turned into a tyranny, but even intelligent and well-educated people are not immune to demagoguery. Chomsky and his popularity among left-liberals, for instance, show how contagious and irresistible is the lure of demagogue.

THE AGE OF EMPIRE

Like the critics of America discussed in the first chapter, Alexander Hamilton believed that America someday would be an Empire. Hamilton's two major interests are recognizable in today's America: the principles of liberal democracy and the free market economy system. These two are supposed to promote and secure the claims of the Constitution and to build the national wealth, as Hamilton believed, necessary for the preservation and prosperity of the United States. Even though Hamilton was a founding father of regime, he along with politics in its abstract sense occupied himself with matters of the real world. In other words, Hamilton brought accord between political principles and people's everyday life. Hamilton believed that there is a common good, an ideal that the people could grasp and want to follow. The Anti-Americanism of Martin Heidegger, Jean-Paul Sartre and Noam Chomsky, in contrast, presents an ideal world, but an impractical one.

Imperfections of American Democracy

Let us consider the difference between the real society and its theoretical ideal, which is a matter of the greatest difficulty for all statesmen and philosophers in the history of human race. There are injustices in every political system and in every society. However, the solution for such imperfections, I think, is not to abandon the everydayness as Heidegger wanted, to deny the ability of the people to bear the responsibility for their own lives as Sartre believed, or to point out individual failings or the imperfection of the regime as Chomsky does. In all the work of all three American critics there is a lack of positive or constructive theory, which is essential problem with Anti-Americanism generally.

The framers of the Constitution argued that because people are not perfect, the government arises as necessity. The people have their selfish interests. A government must provide an order that overcomes this tension and preserves the maximum individual freedoms at the same time. James Madison's famous argument that a good government is not an illusion, because people possess reason refers to the foundation of American democracy. Roger Barrus in *The Deconstitutionalization of America* says, "The strategy Madison adopted for bringing about the rule of reason is to turn the passions against themselves. The means for this purpose are the forms of constitutional democracy: representation, federalism, legislative bicameralism, the system of check and balances, and other institutions of modern republicanism."^{cvii} Similarly Hamilton knew that in practice human nature makes an ideal political system a utopian vision. His emphasis on practical politics is the best evidence that Hamilton was aware of this problem.

One of the typical examples of the misunderstanding of the interconnection between political principles on one side and the reality of the society on the other is a discussion held from the time of ratification of the Constitution to the present day. From the first decades of the American republic^{cviii},

the arguments of the opponents of the Constitution are based on the reasoning that the Constitution as well as the Declaration of the Independence are not broad enough to include the whole of mankind and that the framers excluded certain groups of people from exercise of equal rights. Thus, the very similar rhetoric Chomsky uses in his description of the “real intentions” of the framers: “[Madison] felt that power should be in the hands of the wealth of the nation – the set of men who have sympathy for property owners and their rights – not the general population, which has to be fragmented and marginalized somehow.”^{ciX} Chomsky, except for the conviction that the Constitution protects wealthy elite, shows typical reasoning of today’s academic Left in America who are constantly horrified at even minor injustices and corruption in politics. The conviction about the decay of the western world binds them since the end of the World War II.

A brilliant explanation of why the certain groups (the slaves, women, the poor) are not in the text of the Constitution or in Declaration of Independence was presented by Abraham Lincoln in the speech called: *The Meaning of the Declaration of the Independence*: “I think,” Lincoln said, “the authors of that notable instrument intend to include all men, but they did not intend to declare all men equal in all respects. They did not mean to say all were equal in color, size, intellect, moral developments or social capacity. They defined with tolerable distinctness, in what respects they did consider all men created equal – equal in ‘certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness’... They meant simply to declare the right, so that the enforcement of it might follow as fast as circumstances should permit.” The framers up held the principle of human equal rights. The Constitution, properly understood, is the beginning of the whole progress towards liberal democracy. Although the poor, women, and slaves are not mentioned from the very opposite reason: the framers of the Constitution used phrases such as “human beings” or simply “persons” because whenever people were treated as “whites,” “blacks” or “women,” it would be impossible to set up equality among them, simply because “blacks” and “women” would be always considered first as “blacks” and “women,” not as human beings. Robert A. Goldwin, addressing this issue, explained: “A constitution will be a failure if it is no more than a beautiful portrait of an ugly society. But it must be more than an accurate depiction of how the society is constituted. A good constitution provides guidance and structure for the improvement of the society. A good constitution is designed to make the political society better than it is and the citizens better persons.”^{cx} Goldwin asserts the intentions of the Founding Fathers, particularly Alexander Hamilton, who believed that such a theory might move people towards an ideal acceptance of the ideas of liberal democracy.

Chomsky on the other hand argues the Founding fathers favored one group over another that they intended to create an elite or aristocracy, and thus deliberately excluded ordinary Americans. It is true that the Constitution does not discuss what political system should be established. The preamble declares: “We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common good defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessing of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.” Properly understood the Constitution establishes nothing else than democracy. The republican government, the goal of the Founding Fathers, must preserve liberal democracy. Liberal democracy I wish to define as a political regime based on the protection of certain

rights. The Declaration of Independence, the most important document of the American Revolution describes these rights: “all men are equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.” The Constitution, then, implements the principles of American democracy into the concept of the federal government. Even a brief consideration of *the Federalist Papers* makes that clear.

Chomsky further sees a “conspiracy” in the conception of federal government; he feels that the Constitution was constructed against democracy because it entrusted too much power to the federal government. The strong federal government of the “elite” controls the “great beast,” the people. Chomsky is convinced that America was stolen or given to the hands of the “aristocracy” when the Constitution was ratified, but he nowhere explains what should have been done. What is the origin of America that was usurped by the Founding Fathers? Chomsky does not explain, but his own vision of society is a radical extension of a social welfare state.

To put aside problems of social democracies, political power in America is the main interest of Hamilton’s political theory. Hamilton was aware, more than everybody else, of the problem of diversity of powers in democracy. In the many pages of *the Federalist Papers*, Hamilton mentioned the conflict between and difficulty of the centralized government and individuals. The government has to have instruments to overcome conflicts that could lead to disunity or to the weakening of the Union, to promote the defense, and to aim at the common good, but the powers entrusted to all the parts of the government had to be clearly defined. If the U.S. Constitution sets up a strong federal government, it also limits its sovereignty. There are the separation of the three powers and a division of the legislative power into two houses. The executive power, then, is vested into the hands of the president of the United States. The purpose of the Constitution is to create a political system whose representatives have the means to overcome antagonistic concerns and interests. In short, the Constitution presupposed a democratic regime. The Constitution intended to reduce the imperfection and not to protect certain social or political groups.

Repeating clichés, Chomsky attacks Hamilton directly for elitism and the intention to create a monarchy. Hamilton’s argument for a strong federal government has entirely different meaning. If Hamilton intended to suppress the people, why he was such an eager supporter of liberal democracy? Hamilton’s controversial argument that the vices of wealthy men in democracy “are probably more favorable to the prosperity of the state, than those of the indigent; and partake less of moral depravity,”^{cxix} is only a rational consideration, but he in the same breath added:

As riches increase and accumulate in few hands; as luxury prevails in society; virtue will be in a greater degree considered as only a graceful appendage of wealth, and the tendency of things will be to depart from the republican standard. This is the real disposition of human nature: It is what, neither the honorable member nor myself can correct. It is a common misfortune, that awaits our state constitution, as well as all others.^{cxii}

It is impossible to prevent these tendencies in any society. The only defense will be to create such conditions when all the people would be equal in their slavery. Thus, the strength of the federal

government has the very opposite effect. Democracy, according to Hamilton, could be preserved only if the federal government would have the means to protect it.

Chomsky expresses the strongest antagonism for and the deepest distrust towards executive power. Chomsky sees as evil that the chief executive of the United States of America has in his hands the fate of foreign policy. Chomsky dislikes the centralized executive power; he understands it as the most oppressive and antidemocratic principle of the American political system: American presidents since Theodor Roosevelt (who began with the oppressive foreign and domestic policy) protected by the Constitution, commit “war crimes” and violate civil rights by “cruel and savage” politics.

Arguing for a centralized and powerful executive, Hamilton opened *the Federalist* #70, devoted to executive power of the federal government, with these words:

Energy in executive is a leading character in definition of good government. It is essential to the protection of the community against foreign attack: It is no less essential to the steady administration of the laws, to the protection of property against those irregular and high handed combinations, which sometimes interrupt the ordinary course of justice to the security of liberty against the enterprises and assault of ambition, of faction and anarchy.^{cxiii}

Here we see the urgency that led Hamilton to such a consideration. A weak executive cannot address crises. The executive has to be effective and operational. Particularly, in the field the foreign policy, he has to display integrity and homogeneity. If a strong executive power is a mark of antidemocratic character, its weakness is the demonstration of the incapability of defending democracy itself. The executive of the federal government is balanced by the legislature and retroactively by presidential elections. In *the Federalist* #11 and in almost every other of his texts or speeches concerned with the ratification of the Constitution, Hamilton explained the danger to which America could be exposed without the operative executive:

The world may politically, as well as geographically, divided into four parts, each having a distinct set of interests. Unhappily for the other three, Europe by her arms and by her negotiations, by force and by fraud, has, in different degrees, extend her domination over them all. Africa, Asia, and America have successively felt her domination. The superiority, she has long maintained, has tempted her to plume herself as the Mistress of the World, and to consider the rest of mankind as created for her benefit. Men admired as profound philosophers have, in direct terms, attributed to her inhabitants a physical superiority; and have gravely asserted that all animals, and with them the human species, degenerate in America – that even dog cease to bark... It belongs to us to vindicate the honor of the human race, and to teach that assuming brother moderation. Union will enable us to do it. Disunion will add another victim to his triumph. Let Americas disdain to be the instruments of European greatness! Let the thirteen States, bound together in a strict and indissoluble union, concur in erecting one great American system, superior to the control of all trans-Atlantic force or influence, and able to dictate the terms of the connection between the old and new world!^{cxiv}

If Chomsky's political theorizing lacks any constructive element, his criticism of and advises for the executive and American foreign policy express are more factual. He believes that executive branch of the federal government should not exercise any power: "executive power would be held at the level of workers' councils and could be transferred up to federal organizations."^{cxv} Would Chomsky really be for a weak and decentralized position of Executive? In other words, he does not answer how America could resist the real evils of the 20th century: Nazism and Communism. The United States was only democratic county in the world capable politically and militarily resist to both totalitarian regimes, largely because of its strong executive. I doubt, without consideration of imbecility of the idea itself, that "workers' councils" could be that operational. World War II is a great demonstration of the Hamilton's theory on executive power in practice: before World War II the United States of America had about 120,000 soldiers. At the end of the war America with 16 million men in arms had the strongest Navy and Air Force in the world. The stark contrast in these numbers shows not only the necessity of centralized executive in American democracy, but the demonstration of how extensive is the executive power in the time of peace.

If America is an Empire, World War II was the beginning of American imperialism. Yet, I prefer to use word the imperialism of liberty, fairness and generosity rather than "hegemony" and "oppression." After World War II, Americans saved Europe from hunger, promoted humanitarian and economical aids as the action of the federal government and private organizations and foundations. Marshall's plan represented the biggest program of foreign help in American and world history. The United States offered war-destroyed Europe \$20 billions and it consumed in the six years about two percent of American GDP.^{cxvi} Today America to call the "*Index on Global Philanthropy*, the report tallies \$71 billion in international donations by U.S. private charities, religious organizations, universities, corporations, foundations had been donated to international cases. That compares to \$20 billion in government foreign aid for the same year (2004). The Organization of Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) ranks the United States as the biggest donor of government foreign aid among developed countries in terms of total dollars given."^{cxvii} Americans were shown to be very generous, spending collectively annually over \$200 billions dollars on domestic and foreign charities.

Since World War II American foreign policy has accepted responsibility for the whole world. Americans themselves understand their new role. I was surprised seeing a great number of students of Hampden-Sydney College in Virginia attending a lecture on the recent political situation in Pakistan. They showed an eager interest (they did not received any credit for it). Also in American presidential elections, the question of foreign policy traditionally plays an important role. Since World War II, America has spent three times more on its military than all European countries combined. The US also pays 22 percent of the UN expenses. Americans accept their responsibility for world events and do not seek to be isolated from the rest of the world.

In crisis Americans have recognized the value of a strong executive: Abraham Lincoln during the Civil War and or Ronald Reagan in the Cold War. Both presidents exercised their authority even over its limits. Yet, Chomsky's denunciation of the foreign policy of American presidents loses its attractiveness whenever it is put into confrontation with the reality. Chomsky denounces "terrorism of

the US government” and the “imperialistic ambition of John F. Kennedy’s administration,” but ignores 800,000 Vietnamese refugees, so-called “boat people” who escaped from Vietnam and found a new life in America. Similarly, Chomsky lost popularity during the presidency of Ronald Reagan, almost becoming a forgotten man.

Despite Chomsky’s anti-capitalistic rhetoric and his longing for socialism, it was capitalism that made him rich and Chomsky evidently understands, applies, and benefits from capitalism. Chomsky honors communistic Cuba and socialism, but his monthly salary of over \$10,000 as an elite professor at MIT is ultimately result of the universities dependence on the free market economy. Besides, the first-rank American universities hardly can find any serious rivals in the world. According to Shanghai Jiao Tong University that annually evaluate the world top universities, among the world top twenty universities there are seventeen American institutions of higher education.^{cxviii} Today’s Nobel Prize winners are usually Americans, or scientists who were educated in the United States. The American education system seems to be more effective than the European socialized school systems.

Although Chomsky’s recent books (as the latest one *Interventions*) are only collections of his recent speeches and newspaper’s articles, his books are International bestsellers. While Chomsky calls himself a “political dissident,” he does not compare his conditions with dissidents in totalitarian regimes of the past. Blaming a corrupt media, Chomsky periodically writes for magazines such as *The Nation*, *The Village Voice*, *The Progressive*, *The Guardian*, *The Socialist Review*, *Foreign Policy*, *Prospect* that are available in every newsstand or public library in the United States. Moreover, he gives interviews for CNN or socialistically orientated BBC. Chomsky ranked among the ten most cited authors in the history of the world.^{cxix} Thus, the opportunity and freedom that he exercises are not comparable with those of political dissidents of Nazi Germany or the Soviet Union. Chomsky in fact attacked dissent in correspondence with Alexander Cockburn, where he called Václav Havel a “hypocrite,” for Havel’s recognition of the United States as “the defender of freedom.” Chomsky called Havel’s speech to the US Congress as “silly and morally repugnant Sunday School sermon.”^{cxx}

As I mentioned above, the wants of the social welfare state is one of the most antagonistic proposal of Chomsky’s utopia. He calls for extension of individual freedom, yet a welfare state presupposes great dependence of the people on the government and drastically truncates individual’s freedom. American democracy with its strong federal government prizes individual rights over social security. To accuse Hamilton of protecting the elite is a misunderstanding of his thought. He knew that an ordinary citizen can decide complicated political and economic questions. Such a society might lead to relativism or a paradoxically stronger dependence on the government and to the destruction of civil society. A single president who embodies executive power of the federal government is naturally more flexible, responsible and honest than masses. American presidents could be accused of particular mistakes and faults, but hardly of corruption.

Finally, capitalism in America does not seem to generate more social problems than European social democracies. Hamilton himself didn’t overlook social problems, but he believed that they could be solved by expanding opportunities in free market capitalism. Robert E. Rector and Kirk A. Johnson argue that American poor are better off than the under class of other countries:

The typical poor American has more living space than the average individual living in Paris, London, Vienna, Athens, and other cities throughout Europe. (These comparisons are to the average citizens in foreign countries, not to those classified as poor.)... the typical American defined as poor by the government has a car, air conditioning, a refrigerator, a stove, a clothes washer and dryer, and microwave. He has two color televisions, cable or satellite TV reception, a VCR or DVD player, and a stereo. He is able to obtain medical care. His home is in good repair and is not overcrowded. By his own report, his family is not hungry, and he had sufficient funds in the past year to meet his family's essential needs. While this individual's life is not opulent, it is equally far from the popular images of dire poverty conveyed by the press, liberal activists, and politicians.^{cxxi}

The 35 million people identified as living in poverty in the United States of America would be considered as middle class in other world countries. Capitalism not welfare gives them a high standard of living. Private charities and funds play an important role in America. American politicians, including those who stand for a restricted social policy, openly support, participate and encourage the activities of charities. It is a myth that a poor American cannot change his social conditions or obtain a medical care. These organizations, after all, are usually more effective than the welfare state, because they work directly with individuals.

Intelligentsia

Jean-Paul Sartre's criticism is deeper than that presented by Noam Chomsky. When Sartre described the situation of the ordinary American, he saw a different failure of capitalism. Sartre pointed out what can be called a cultural poverty. He saw that suburban areas and neighborhoods of American cities are all alike. He criticized conformity in the American lifestyle and was afraid of American "presence" in Europe from the very same reason. If the "melting pot" in America transforms immigrants into the homogenous mass culture, the American cultural and economic influence in Europe sets up "melting pots" in culturally developed western European countries. Sartre detested the bourgeoisie for supporting sameness and conformity, "In any event, it is no based on our kind of individualism, but on conformism. Personality must be won. It is a social function or the affirmation of society."^{cxxii} In other words, Sartre believed that liberal democracy with its accent on equality inevitably creates conformity. De Tocqueville in *Democracy in America*,^{cxxiii} had predicted that conformity would be in America. To oversimplify, Tocqueville thought that conformity is a product of the democratic emphasis on equality. In mass democracy, therefore, one can not expect a great diversity of opinions or an aspiration to be different. Democracies tend to achieve equality because in democracy equality comes from freedom. Conformists in democracy are necessary because they can define a common good. And people can believe in universal truth only if they have common ends and wants. America with its universal values, consumerism, material wealth – the characteristics of middle class, "a rabid dog" so hated by Sartre, conquered communism and American lifestyle gradually experienced a great success in not only in Europe, but also in Asia and in the Middle East.

After all, America does have a cultural life. Whereas Paris has faded as the cultural center of the world, American cities enjoy cultural life. Today's artists seek galleries in New York, Chicago, Seattle or Tokyo. With the strongest economy in the world, a non-hierarchical society, and equality of the opportunities, the United States offers the greatest opportunities for scientists, artists and intellectuals. Another proof of a cultural potency of democracies is the transformation of post-communist Eastern European countries. When communism collapsed, gray, monotonous Eastern European cities were transformed into colorful metropolises. While many factors contributed to this renaissance, "American influence and imperialism" should be seen in a broader context than presence of McDonalds in European metropolises.

With its admiration of communism, socialism and "people's democratic republics," Sartre's generation was characterized by its own conformity of literary salons and its hatred of the United States. The conformity of the Left bank writers is different from the conformity of Americans. But these men of letters tolerated something worse than American conformism can ever create: mediocrity. I think of mediocrity that hides average man. In America such mediocrity is challenged by individualism, by "individualism that has to be won" in Sartre's own words. But mediocrity flourishing in socialisms and vertically orientated societies where loyalty is always more rewarded than talent was also typical for European intellectual Left. America, offers political and cultural diversity: challenging conditions far from centralized and hierarchically orientated European social democracies.

Sartre did not believe that an ordinary man is capable of choice; conditions of equality in America require a man to choose. When Sartre rejected the idea that individuals carry responsibility for their life, he demonstrated his belief in his own superiority. The British historian Paul Johnson formulated these convictions of the leftist intellectuals most clearly:

They cannot openly admit that an entire people – especially one comprising nearly 300 million, who enjoy all the freedoms – can be mistaken. But in their hearts these intellectuals do not accept the principle of one person, one vote. They scornfully, if privately, rejected the notion that a farmer in Kansas, a miner in Pennsylvania or an auto assembler in Michigan can carry as much social and moral weight as they do. In fact, they have a special derogatory word for anyone who acts on this assumption: "populist"... In the jargon of intellectual persiflage, populism is almost as bad as fascism – indeed, it's a step toward it. Hence, the argument goes, the U.S. is not so much as "educated democracy" as it is a media-swayed and interest-group-controlled populist regime.^{cxix}

The intellectuals around Sartre detested criticism and ostracized anyone who tried to challenge their beliefs. A typical example of their arrogance is Beauvoir's book *The Mandarines*. Besides describing her sexual experiences in the USA, Beauvoir attacks Albert Camus for nothing else than his questioning of the French intellectual left. Czech exiled poet Jan Vladislav described rigidity of Sartrian intellectuals: "What we experienced from 1948 to 1989 was only an extreme form of the thinking and orientations that were latent in France." The French intellectuals around Sartre shared past with Eastern European communists. Other exiled intellectuals of the last century agree with

Vladislav's conclusion: Polish poet Czesław Miłosz, for instance, was called by the French Left "a madman or an agent of America" for leaving the position of an intellectual in the People's Democracy for the decadent West.^{cxxv}

What then were the ideas of French intellectuals? They stood against American universal thinking, but they themselves spread their ideas all over the world and whomever had other ideas than "ideés générales" of the French Left was doomed. Beauvoir proclaimed that Americans do not believe in the future of revolution. In his political essays, Sartre attacked the bourgeoisie that could be overcome only by a revolution. He praised communists and later French Maoists who gave him hope that French democracy could be transformed into socialism through revolution. But did Sartre or entire intellectual movement really know the purpose of a revolution? Even Sartre could not say. He is trapped by his romantic image of an existential individual striking out against society. Like Chomsky, Sartre was not obstructed by "bourgeoisie" that he called totalitarian, but he benefited from his attacks on it. He became a celebrity far different from loneliness of a prototypical existentialist hero. In his work and lifestyle, Sartre rejected moral integrity and personal responsibility. He admired "revolutionists" such as Fidel Castro and expressed contempt for the American Revolution, the only true revolutionists in modern history. The slogan "Better be wrong with Sartre than to be right with Aron" display not only intellectual dishonesty, but unintended irony.

Sartre and Beauvoir openly ridiculed Americans and their habits. These humanists of the last great French intellectual movement compared Americans to machines and criticized American respect for the law, their inability to cheat and their love for their political system. One had to spend some time in the United States to understand the "conformity" of Americans. They are self-confident individuals able to define their goals. Their conformity includes universal belief that nobody in the world would choose to live in slavery or under oppression. Like Sartre, Beauvoir believed in her own cultural, moral and intellectual superiority. She questioned and ridiculed the distinction between Good and Evil and therefore moral responsibility of a freedom man and one of the genuine of American foreign policy.

The Founder

Heidegger's portrait of modernity and its darkness foreshadow all the elements of later criticisms of America. Sartre's mere rhetoric and secondary views on Americans and American democracy are heavily indebted to Heidegger's account of the failure of the "modern world." Heidegger's discourse was primarily philosophical. When Heidegger said that "America and Russia are metaphysically the same or that "-isms" (communism and liberalism) are identical results of the modern world, he meant that remark to be taken in a broader philosophical context.^{cxxvi} Ironically, he collaborated with Nazism and accepted a rector's office that in a totalitarian regime made him a political lackey. The influence of his political thought is so massive that to discuss modern Anti-Americanism always means considering Heidegger's positions and in his major philosophical writings, Heidegger does mention America and catastrophe of Americanism. James W. Ceaser in *Reconstructing America* explains Heidegger's endeavor to distinguish Germans from other nations:

It is characteristic of Heidegger's writing that the style is designed to be of a piece with message. In accordance with his emphasis on the particular encounter, he often directly addresses his argument to a particular audience – to those who are situated in a particular setting or context. The group addressed is the relevant “we” or “us” of his discourse... Every “we” or “us” has, by implication, a “they” or “them” who is excluded. At the heart of Heidegger's rhetorical strategy is the technique of building the solidarity of one's own group by pitting it in a struggle against someone or something else. Man needs enemy to maintain his spirit.^{cxxvii}

Like Sartre, Heidegger had hopes for communistic Russia. Whereas Sartre saw in the USSR the victory of socialism, Heidegger hoped that the ideological competition between Russia and America would protect Europe from American influence and decadence. Even more Heidegger hoped that Nazism would awake Germany's nationalism and preserve German tradition. In a lecture called *The Self-Assertion of the German Universities* from 1933 Heidegger proclaimed, “The German universities will...unite in overwhelming force, if both teachers and students in their adherence to tradition place themselves side by side in the thick of the fight... Everything that is great is in the midst of the storm.”^{cxxviii} Nazism, Heidegger hoped, offered a way out of the decline caused by modernity. The fate of European culture and tradition seemed to be in the hand of German nation. Heidegger's nationalism was “rediscovered” by Sartre, by Herbert Marcuse, and by Bertrand Russell, all of whom used it to support their Marxist utopian theories. The common thread among these men is the conviction of the superiority of intellectuals, whose attacks on America became clichés.

Although Heidegger later abandoned Nazism, he did not change his views on America. The rhetoric of *Memorial address* from 1955 echoes the vehemence of his rector's speeches from 1933.^{cxxix} The stress on National identity was replaced by a protest against the banality of modernity – National Socialism replaced by Hölderin's poetry. Heidegger's accent on nationalism was primarily a rail against liberal democracy. Liberal democracy, Heidegger proclaimed, is the transformation into mere universality, but universal truth does not exist.

The four sins of America

Four aspects of Heidegger's philosophy can be seen as the origin of the Anti-Americanism in twentieth century. These are the loss of humanity, the lack of individualism, the sameness or banality of today's world, and technological progress. Heidegger's main objection to the “modern world” is the loss of human dimension. The understanding of human situation in the world is for Heidegger not only philosophical question, but a fundamental question for human beings. Heidegger believed that modern man “felt out of being” and “to fall out being” in the history of human race always caused a decline. In other words, the modern world is in crisis, because it lacks both individualism and philosophy.

Studying the greatest nations in the history of the world, Hamilton observed that their decline was caused by the loss of common interest that led into anarchy and then to destruction of the nation either by foreign enemies or its political transformation into tyranny. For Hamilton, the greatness of a

nation is a function of a political and social system that is able to withstand all changes and define and secure interests of its citizens. The spirit of government offers a common ground between antagonistic interests that are present in every society.

The common interest as a principle of democracy leads my discussion to the second Heidegger's objection: the American political and social regime is an "unrestricted organization of the average man."^{cxix} The loss of ontological difference is also a loss of individualism because the question of being is always subjective. Everydayness is expressed by the orientation on "the practice of routine." In conformity, Americans lose their individuality. In *Hölderlin's Poetry*, Heidegger wrote: "Americanism is the most dangerous shape of boundlessness because it appears in the form of a democratic middle-class way of life mixed with Christianity, and all this in an atmosphere that lacks completely any sense of history."^{cxixi} In other words, certain verticality in the society, some sort of intellectual elitism is necessary because only intellectuals and traditions can preserve society. The middle class has no interest in traditions except superficially. Thus, the question of individualism is for Heidegger connected with truth and truth subjectively understood is always relative, or as he said, "*truth is of the character of Dasein, all truth is relative to Dasein's Being.*"^{cxixii} Sartre echoing Heidegger sought personal independence; each blames America for the loss of individualism because Americans seek conformity and believe that the whole mankind shares their convictions. Sartre's favorite object of ridicule was the American need to distinguish between good and evil, the belief that categories of good and evil are transparent. Heidegger believed individualism can not be separated from language and nationalism. Therefore, the distinction between good and evil, as well as morality itself is always relative, which is not only inevitable, but even desirable. In my opinion, the relativity of the good and evil brings a real moral crisis. This relativity is the most unfair of all criticisms of America. The loss of this distinction allows to call the United States the "greatest danger to the world peace" or to see "America and the Soviet Union as the same." Heidegger and Sartre championed an individualism that excluded all, but a few. Sartre reserved individualism for intellectuals, specifically for the leftist radicals who had undeniable right to lead society as well as the right to decide question of morality. Heidegger's search for the authentic life or the constant requirement to hold ontological difference offers an even more limited circle of privileged individuals – philosophers.

In contrast to Heidegger, Hamilton believed that liberal democracy requires some conformity. The success of American democracy rises and falls with the citizens' competence to take the risk of freedom and responsibility. The majority of every society is created by the ordinary people, not by intellectuals. He knew the difficulty and disadvantages of such a project. However, he saw that vertically orientated and elitism would be fatal to the United States. Although Hamilton has not answer what it will happen with the "higher" intellectual life, it is clear that he believed that even the most civilized societies can fall into anarchy and total terror if they can not define the common goals of their citizens. People's interests are always egoistic, but this problem can be overcome if the good of the society becomes their own. He explained the nature of men as follows:

There are certain social principles in human nature, from which we may draw the most solid conclusions with respect to the conduct of individuals, and of communities. We love our

families, more than our neighbors... The human affections, like the solar heat, lose their intensity, as they depart from the center... On these principles, the attachment of the individual will be first and forever secured by the states governments: They will be a mutual protection and support... The state officers will ever be important, because they are necessary and useful. Their powers are such, as are extremely interesting to the people; such as affect their property, their liberty and life. What is more important, than the administration of justice, and execution of the civil and criminal laws?... The states can never lose their powers, till the people of America are robbed of their liberties. These must go together, they must support each other, or meet one common fate.^{cxxxiii}

Thus, Hamilton approached the question of individualism in democracy from a different perspective. He knew that American democracy must stand on a different foundation than European regimes based on traditions and hierarchies. In the core of American democracy are self-evident truths – life, liberty, equality and pursuit of happiness – the best possible universal principles. He emphasized the importance at creating space for talented and ambitious people and one of the greatest interests of his political effort was the protection of individual opportunity. He understood that if individualism existed in opposition to society, everything would be lost. Ambitious individuals are interested in the fate of the nation only if the society does not persecute their personal achievement. If society tries to control or suppress its citizens' achievements, it would destroy itself. Nazism made this mistake: it claimed to stimulate German culture and civilization, while persecuting intelligentsia. Expatriated intellectuals of Nazism and Communism found asylum in so doomed America. Hamilton did not know how prophetic his arguments in *Report on the Subject of Manufactures* would prove:

The disturbed state of Europe, inclining its citizens to emigration, the requisite workmen, will be more easily acquired, than at another time; ... To find pleasure in the calamities of the nation, would be criminal; but to benefit ourselves, by opening an asylum to those who suffer. In consequence of them, is as justifiable as it is politic.^{cxxxiv}

Hamilton's egalitarianism, as well as the egalitarianism of the United States, is based on a creation of opportunities and protection for competition, not on the creation of grey undistinguished mass.

Also, Heidegger's prophecy about American universal thinking was fulfilled: liberal democracy is accepted and wanted around the world, yet it does not seem to be a decline of intellectual life. After all, today's European intellectuals and scholars – together with many American ones – are still aware of dangers Americanization as were Sartre and Heidegger. Cafés, even though their popularity was hurt particularly after Alexander Solzhenitsyn's *Gulag Archipelago* was published, still have numerous clientelé and European media compete in ridiculing America and Americans.

The most striking of the arguments of twentieth century intellectuals who criticized America is the conviction that the people abandoned what Heidegger called "meditative thinking." How can a society preserve higher life, if ordinary men cannot carry the responsibility and understand the higher truth? Yet, the "ordinary American" showed that he can preserve democracy. An "ordinary American" usually understands the evil of the totalitarianisms. Communism for him represents the same evil as

Nazism, a point which is not necessarily clear to many university professors and scholars, including Heidegger, Sartre and Chomsky. Ironically, it was the bourgeoisie, the American middle class that resisted communism in 1960's, whereas intellectuals were admired Mao, Che Guevara, Castro and Lenin.

The final aspect and danger of modern life in Heidegger's philosophy is technology. Heidegger argued that science represents a fall into everydayness because technological progress supports materialism and consumerism. Consumerism, materialism and superficiality are illnesses in today's world, but I personally doubt that these problems were greatly different in the past. History gives few examples when people sought only spiritual life. Often spirituality led to fanaticism, which often ended in real catastrophe.

Hamilton saw in technologies and manufacturers a great opportunity to employ all members of society and to emancipate the United States from the dependence on the foreign nations. After all, starving people are no less concerned in the question of being and ontological differences than materially orientated capitalists. Technologies and the free market economy created in America the highest living standard in the world and brought military predominance over the world. And Europe seems to appreciate the achievements of American industry from Coca-Cola to computer technology, internet or cell phones.

Even if American society has an intellectual decline, it is more than evident that this decline has nothing to do with the decline of the mankind as Heidegger has predicted.

Conclusion

Tocqueville described the United States as the most equal society in education, opportunities and living standard, but without a higher cultural life. America, he believed, preserved individual freedom because it had created a civil society. In de Tocqueville's time France was based on an ancient regime and lacked the preconditions of a truly democratic society. It is more that one and half century since de Tocqueville wrote his most famous book *Democracy in America*; in the meantime America, continuously ridiculed for its cultural impotence, has become the world superpower competent to preserve ideologically, economically and militarily the maximum of individual freedoms, something that cannot be said of most European regimes.

Alexander Hamilton knew that greatest danger to American democracy are Americans themselves. Today's American universities are dominated by the Left – by direct intellectuals descendants of Sartre, Beauvoir and the entire twentieth century European Left – post-modernists, multiculturalists, feminists, fighters for “equal” rights, “political correctness” and other exhibitionists who seek to magnify the injustices of America. They strengthened their position during the student strikes of the 1960s. Allan Bloom said that the students from sixties – today's professors – went beyond the rights declared by *Declaration of Independence* and added to life, liberty and pursuit of happiness, the right to be happy.

Heidegger's original ideas seem to be the most reasonable and his objections toward modernity have value. But finally, his philosophy fails. It fails, I believe, for two reasons. First, Heidegger's

criticism does not offer any serious alternatives to the catastrophe of the modernity. Heidegger's only answer is an abstract philosophical world that deliberately excludes everyone, but philosophers. The second reason has the very same roots. Heidegger left out morality in traditional sense. Morality became abstract, relative, and individual that for example justifies the excesses of Nazism. Simply, morality can be changed sometimes.

The most dangerous element Heidegger's thought accepted as gospel by the European intellectual left is a sense of European exceptionalism or superiority. Europeans insist their own intellectual superiority, but are afraid of American influence. Europeans constantly think about America, but Americans ignore Europe. Americans have no need to reflect on Europe because America's principles of liberal democracy have fully conquered the European continent. Americans, thinking that all people should be free and equal, are immune from attacks on their way of life because they are content that Europeans *behave* in ways that are fully consistent with Hamilton's dream of an empire of liberty.

NOTES

-
- ⁱ Alexis de Tocqueville, *The Old Regime and the Revolution* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998-2001), p. 216
- ⁱⁱ Alexander Hamilton, *Writings*, "The Federalist No. 1," (New York: The library of America, 2001), p. 171
- ⁱⁱⁱ Czesław Miłosz, *Conversation*. Edited by Cynthia L. Haven (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2006), p. 124-125. To understand student movements from 1960s see also Allan Bloom, *The Closing of the American Mind, Part three: The University* (New York: Simon & Schuster Paperbacks, 1987)
- ^{iv} Noam Chomsky, *Interventions* (San Francisco: City lights Books, 2006), on the cover
- ^v Alexander Cockburn, *The Golden Age Is In Us: Journeys & Encounters, 1987-1994* (New York: Verso, 1995), p. 149-151
- ^{vi} Noam Chomsky, *The Cold War II* (ZNet, August 27, 2007)
- ^{vii} Noam Chomsky and Herman Edward S. Herman *Manufacturing Consent, The Political Economy of Mass Media* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1988), p. 4
- ^{viii} Noam Chomsky debates with Bill Bennett, "On 9-11" (CNN, May 30, 2002)
- ^{ix} Ziauddin Sardar & Merryl Wyn Davies, *Why Do People Hate America* (New York: Disinformation, 2002), p. 90
- ^x Noam Chomsky, "2004 Elections" (ZNET, November 29, 2004)
- ^{xi} Chomsky, "2004 Elections"
- ^{xii} Chomsky, "2004 Elections"
- ^{xiii} Noam Chomsky, "On the future of Democracy," Noam Chomsky interviewed by John P. Titlow (Dragonfire, June, 2005); "Radical Democracy" (Capital Times, March 3, 1997); *On Hegemony and Survival*, Delivered at Illinois State University (October 7, 2003)
- ^{xiv} Zbigniew Brzezinski, *Second Chance: Three Presidents and the Crisis of American Superpower* (New York: Basic Books, 2007), p. 1
- ^{xv} Noam Chomsky, "Imperial Presidency" (Canadian Dimension, Volume 39, Number 1, January/February 2005)
- ^{xvi} Doug Stokes, *America's Other War: Terrorizing Colombia* (New York: Zed Books, 2005), quoted from introduction written by Noam Chomsky
- ^{xvii} Noam Chomsky, "Noam Chomsky chats with Washington Post readers" (The Washington Post, March 24, 2006)
- ^{xviii} Walter Dean Burnham, quoted from: Noam Chomsky, "2004 Elections"
- ^{xix} Noam Chomsky, "2004 Elections"
- ^{xx} Chomsky, *Intervention*, .p. 7
- ^{xxi} Noam Chomsky, "Imperial Presidency" (Canadian Dimension, Volume 39, Number 1, January/February, 2005)

-
- ^{xxii} Chomsky, “Imperial Presidency”
- ^{xxiii} Chomsky, “Imperial Presidency”
- ^{xxiv} Chomsky, *Interventions*, “The Universality of Human Rights,” p. 121
- ^{xxv} Chomsky, *Interventions*, “Latin America Declares its Independence,” p. 193
- ^{xxvi} Chomsky, *Interventions*, “Alternatives for the Americans,” p. 198
- ^{xxvii} Herbert Marcuse, *One-Dimensional Man* (Boston: Beacon, 1964).
- ^{xxviii} Jean Paul Sartre, *Life/Situations Essay Written and Spoken by Jean-Paul Sartre* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1977), p. 173
- ^{xxix} Sartre, *Life/Situations Essay*, p. 152
- ^{xxx} Sartre, *Life/Situations Essay*, p. 162
- ^{xxxi} Sartre, *Life/Situations Essay*, p. 50
- ^{xxxii} Jean Paul Sartre, *Literary and Philosophical Essays* (New York: Criterion Books, 1955), p. 104
- ^{xxxiii} Sartre, *Literary and Philosophical Essays*, p. 105
- ^{xxxiv} Sartre, *Literary and Philosophical Essays*, p. 107
- ^{xxxv} Sartre, *Literary and Philosophical Essays*, p. 109-110
- ^{xxxvi} Jean Paul Sartre, “Americans and Their Myths” (The Nation, October 18, 1947) According to Sartre, there are even lakes in Connecticut where Jews may not bathe.
- ^{xxxvii} Sartre, *Literary and Philosophical Essays, Literary and Philosophical Essays*, p. 116
- ^{xxxviii} Simone de Beauvoir, *America Day by Day* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), p. 358
- ^{xxxix} Sartre, *Literary and Philosophical Essays*, p. 108
- ^{xl} Sartre, *Literary and Philosophical Essays*, p. 110
- ^{xli} Sartre, *Literary and Philosophical Essays*, p. 112
- ^{xlvi} Noam Chomsky debates with Bill Bennett, “On 9-11” (CNN, May 30, 2002)
- ^{xlvi} Jean Paul Sartre, *Literary and Philosophical Essays*, p. 109
- ^{xliii} Martin Heidegger, *An Introduction to Metaphysics* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959), p. 26
- ^{xliii} Heidegger, *An Introduction to Metaphysics*, p. 26
- ^{xliii} Heidegger, *An Introduction to Metaphysics*, p. 31
- ^{xliii} Heidegger, *An Introduction to Metaphysics*, p. 37
- ^{xliii} Heidegger, *An Introduction to Metaphysics*, p. 46
- ^{xliii} Heidegger, *An Introduction to Metaphysics*, p. 46-7

-
- ^l Heidegger, *An Introduction to Metaphysics*. p 46
- ^{li} Martin Heidegger, *Discourse on Thinking* (New York: Harper & Row, 1966), p. 46
- ^{lii} Heidegger, *Discourse on Thinking*, p.47
- ^{liii} Heidegger, *Discourse on Thinking*, p. 56
- ^{liv} Martin Heidegger, *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays* (New York: Harper & Row, 1977), p. 5
- ^{lv} Heidegger, *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*, p.15
- ^{lvi} James W. Ceaser, *Reconstructing America. The Symbol of America in Modern Thought* (New Haven: Yale University press, 1997), p. 197
- ^{lvii} Martin Heidegger, "Letter on Humanism," in *Basic Writings* (New York: Harper & Row, 1977), p. 220-1
- ^{lviii} Heidegger, "Letter on Humanism," p. 205
- ^{lix} Heidegger, Martin, *Being and Time*, Quoted from: James F. Pontuso, *Václav Havel. Civic Responsibility in the Postmodern Age* (New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2004), p. 24
- ^{lx} Günter Grass, quoted from Paul Hollander, *Anti-Americanism – Critiques at Home and Abroad 1965-1990* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), p. 381
- ^{lxi} Sardar & Davies, *Why Do People Hate America*, p. 100
- ^{lxii} Martin Heidegger, *Hölderlin's Hymn "The Ister"* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996), p. 54- 55
- ^{lxiii} Beauvoir, *America Day by Day*, p. 356
- ^{lxiv} Sartre, *Literary and Philosophical Essays*, p. 115
- ^{lxv} Ron Chernow, *Alexander Hamilton* (New York: The Penguin Press, 2004), p. 5
- ^{lxvi} Alexander Hamilton, *Writings*, "A full Vindication of the Measures of the Congress," (New York: The library of America, 2001)p. 11-12
- ^{lxvii} Alexander Hamilton, quoted from: Gerald Stourzh, *Alexander Hamilton and the Idea of Republican Government* (Stanford: Stanford university press, 1970), p. 173
- ^{lxviii} Hamilton, *Writings*, "A full Vindication of the Measures of the Congress," p. 12
- ^{lxix} Hamilton, *Writings*, "Federalist No. 15," p. 233
- ^{lxx} Hamilton, *Writings*, "Federalist No. 85," p. 484
- ^{lxxi} See Stourzh, *Alexander Hamilton and the Idea of Republican Government*
- ^{lxxii} An agricultural state was the idea pronounced by Hamilton's opponents as Thomas Jefferson or George Clinton. Jefferson's America was a country of independent farmers.
- ^{lxxiii} Forrest McDonald, *Alexander Hamilton: a Biography* (New York: Norton, 1979), p. 117

-
- ^{lxxiv} Hamilton, *Writings*, “The Report on the subject of manufactures,” p. 661
- ^{lxxv} Hamilton, *Writings*, “Speech in the New York Ratifying Convention on Representation,” p. 493
- ^{lxxvi} Hamilton, *Writings*, “The Report on the subject of manufactures,” p. 701
- ^{lxxvii} Chernow, *Alexander Hamilton*, p. 345
- ^{lxxviii} Hamilton, *Writings*, “The Federalist No. 6,” p. 176
- ^{lxxix} Hamilton, *Writings*, “A draft of the Farewell Address. To George Washington,” p. 855
- ^{lxxx} Hamilton, *Writings*, “The Report on the subject of manufactures,” p. 662
- ^{lxxxi} Stourzh, *Alexander Hamilton and the Idea of Republican Government*, p. 82
- ^{lxxxii} Hamilton, *Writings*, “The Report on the subject of manufactures,” p. 670
- ^{lxxxiii} Hamilton, *Writings*, “The Report on the subject of manufactures,” p. 656
- ^{lxxxiv} Hamilton, *Writings*, “The Report on the subject of manufactures,” p. 661
- ^{lxxxv} Hamilton, *Writings*, “The Federalist No. 12,” p. 209
- ^{lxxxvi} Hamilton, *Writings*, “The Report on the subject of manufactures,” p. 647
- ^{lxxxvii} Hamilton, *Writings*, “The Report on the subject of manufactures,” p. 665
- ^{lxxxviii} Hamilton, *Writings*, “The Report on the subject of manufactures,” p. 661
- ^{lxxxix} Hamilton, *Writings*, “The Report on the subject of manufactures,” p. 679
- ^{xc} Hamilton, *Writings*, “Report on Public Credit,” p. 534
- ^{xci} Hamilton, *Writings*, “The Report on the subject of manufactures,” p. 697-698
- ^{xcii} Hamilton, *Writings*, “The Federalist No. 23,” p. 253
- ^{xciii} Hamilton, *Writings*, “The Report on the subject of manufactures,” p. 647
- ^{xciv} Hamilton, *Writings*, “The Federalist No. 23,” p. 254
- ^{xcv} Hamilton, *Writings*, “The Federalist No. 11,” p. 207
- ^{xcvi} Hamilton, *Writings*, “The Federalist No. 1,” p. 171
- ^{xcvii} Hamilton, *Writings*, “Speech in the New York Ratifying Convention on Representation,” p. 490
- ^{xcviii} Hamilton, *Writings*, “The Federalist No. 72,” p. 388,
- ^{xcix} McDonald, *Alexander Hamilton : a Biography*, p. 110
- ^c Hamilton, *Writings*, “Speech in the distribution of powers,” p. 509
- ^{ci} Hamilton, *Writings*, “to James Duane,” p. 75
- ^{cii} Hamilton, *Writings*, “The Federalist No. 72,” p. 389

-
- ^{ciii} Hamilton, *Writings*, “The Federalist No. 23,” p. 254-255
- ^{civ} Alexander Hamilton, *The papers of Alexander Hamilton*, vol. 2., “The Defence No.2” (New York: Columbia University Press, 1961-87), p. 493-501
- ^{cv} James F. Pontuso, “Political Passion and the Creation of the American National Community: The Case of Alexander Hamilton” (*Perspectives on Political Science*, Spring 1993, Volume 22, Number 2), p.77, 79
- ^{cvi} Hamilton, *Writings*, “The Continentalist No. 1,” p. 99
- ^{cvii} Roger M. Barrus, John H. Eastby, Joseph H. Lane Jr., David E. Marion and James F. Pontuso, *The Deconstitutionalization of America* (New York: Lexington Books, 2004), p. 15
- ^{cviii} Among early opponents of the broad reading of the Constitution are, for instance, John C. Calhoun and Steven Douglas who believed that the Constitution protects white people and slavery.
- ^{cix} Noam Chomsky, “On the Future of Democracy,” Noam Chomsky interviewed by John P. Titlow (*Dragonfire*, June, 2005)
- ^{cx} Robert A. Goldwin, *Why Blacks, Women, and Jews Are Not Mentioned in the Constitution, and other unorthodox views* (Washington: The AEI Press, 1990), p. 15
- ^{cxii} Alexander Hamilton, *Writings*, “Speech in the New York Ratifying Convention on Representation,” p. 493
- ^{cxiii} Hamilton, *Writings*, “Speech in the New York Ratifying Convention on Representation,” p. 492
- ^{cxiiii} Hamilton, *Writings*, “Federalist No. 70,” p. 374
- ^{cxv} Hamilton, *Writings*, “The Federalist No. 11,” p. 207-208
- ^{cxvi} Noam Chomsky, “On Human Nature,” Noam Chomsky interviewed by Kate Soper (*Red Pepper*, August, 1998)
- ^{cxvii} The Ford Foundation spent millions of dollar into cultural projects in West Berlin. “In 1951 and 1954, the Foundation granted a total of \$1,434,500 to help provide basic Facilities for the Free University of Berlin as a center of intellectual freedom within Central Europe...”, from <http://www.fordfound.org/elibrary/documents/1956/toc.cfm>
- ^{cxviii} American Private Giving Outpaces U.S. Government Aid, from <http://usinfo.state.gov/ei/Archive/2006/Apr/11-160471.html>
- ^{cxviii} The research was made by the Institute of Higher Education, Shanghai Jiao Tong University. Shanghai Jiao Tong University monitors the best world higher education

institutes since 2003, their criteria are following: an academic or research performance, including alumni and staff winning Nobel Prizes and Fields Medals, highly cited researchers, articles published in Nature and Science, articles indexed in major citation indices, and the per capita academic performance of an institution.

From <http://ed.sjtu.edu.cn/ranking.htm>.

^{cxix} Keith Windschuttle, *A disgraceful carrier*, The review of The Anti-Chomsky Reader by Peter Collier and David Horowitz (The New Criterion, vol. 23, September 2004)

^{cxx} Alexander Cockburn, *The Golden Age Is In Us* (New York: Verso, 1995). Chomsky to Alexander Cockburn *On Vaclav Havel Speech* (21 February 1990)

^{cxxi} Robert E. Rector and Kirk A. Johnson, "Understanding Poverty in America" (Backgrounder, No. 1713, January 5, 2004)

^{cxxii} Jean-Paul, *Literary and Philosophical Essays*, p. 113

^{cxxiii} Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, Anchor, 1968)

^{cxxiv} Paul Johnson, "Anti-Americanism Is Racist Envy" (Forbes Global, Volume 6 Issue 15, July 21, 2003)

^{cxv} Czesław Miłosz, *Conversation*. Edited by Cynthia L. Haven (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2006), p. 161

^{cxvi} See: Martin Heidegger, *An Introduction to Metaphysics and Basic Writings*, Letters on Humanism.

^{cxvii} Ceaser, James W., *Reconstructing America – The Symbol of America in Modern Thought*, p. 210

^{cxviii} Martin Heidegger, *German Existentialism* (New York: Book Sales, 1965), p. 20

^{cxix} See: Martin Heidegger, *Discourse of Thinking*, Memorial address.

^{cxx} Martin Heidegger, *An Introduction to Metaphysics*, p. 37

^{cxxi} Heidegger, Martin, *Hölderlins Hymne*, quoted from: Ceaser, James W., *Reconstructing America: The Symbol of America in Modern Thought*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), p. 189

^{cxxii} Heidegger, Martin, *Being and Time*, Quoted from: James F. Pontuso, *Václav Havel. Civic Responsibility in the Postmodern Age* (New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2004), p. 24

^{cxxiii} Alexander Hamilton, *Writings*, "Speech on the Distribution of powers," p. 509-510

^{cxxiv} Hamilton, *Writings*, "Report on the Subject of Manufactures," p. 697

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Roger M. Barrus, John H. Eastby, Joseph H. Lane Jr., David E. Marion and James F. Pontuso. *The Deconstitutionalization of America*. New York: Lexington Books, 2004.
- de Beauvoir, Simone. *America Day by Day*. Translated by Carol Cosman. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.
- Bloom, Allan. *The Closing of the American Mind*. New York: Simon & Schuster Paperbacks, 1987.
- Brzezinski, Zbigniew. *Second Chance: Three Presidents and the Crisis of American Superpower*. New York: Basic Books, 2007.
- Ceaser, James W. *Reconstructing America. The Symbol of America in Modern Thought*. New Haven: Yale University press, 1997.
- Chernow, Ron. *Alexander Hamilton*. New York: The Penguin Press, 2004.
- Chomsky, Noam. "2004 Elections," ZNet (November 29, 2004).
- _____. *Interventions*. San Francisco: City lights Books, 2006.
- _____. and Herman, Edward S. *Manufacturing Consent, The Political Economy of the Mass Media*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1988.
- _____. "On the future of Democracy," Noam Chomsky interviewed by John P. Titlow. Dragonfire (June, 2005).
- _____. "Radical Democracy," Capital Times (March 3, 1997).
- _____. "On Hegemony and Survival," Delivered at Illinois State University (October 7, 2003).
- _____. "The Cold War II," ZNet (August 27, 2007).
- _____. "Noam Chomsky debates with Bill Bennett On 9-11," CNN (May 30, 2002).
- _____. "Imperial Presidency," Canadian Dimension (Volume 39, Number 1,

January/February 2005).

_____. "Noam Chomsky chats with Washington Post readers," *The Washington Post* (March 24, 2006).

_____. "On Human Nature," Noam Chomsky interviewed by Kate Soper. *Red Pepper* (August, 1998).

Cockburn, Alexander. *The Golden Age Is In Us: Journeys & Encounters, 1987-1994*. New York: Verso, 1995.

Goldwin, Robert A. *Why Blacks, Women, and Jews Are Not Mentioned in the Constitution, and other unorthodox views*. Washington: The AEI Press, 1990.

Hamilton, Alexander. *Writings*. New York: The library of America, 2001.

_____. *The papers of Alexander Hamilton*. Ed. Harold C. Syrett and Jacob E. Cooke. New York: Columbia University Press, 1961-87.

Heidegger, Martin. *An Introduction to Metaphysics*. Translated by Ralph Manheim. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959.

_____. *Discourse on Thinking*. Translated by John M. Anderson and E. Hans Freund. New York: Harper & Row, 1966.

_____. *German Existentialism*. Translated by Dagobert D. Runes. New York: Book Sales, 1965.

_____. *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*. Translated by William Lovitt. New York: Harper & Row, 1977.

_____. *The Basic Writings*. Ed. David Farrell Krell. New York: Harper & Row, 1977.

_____. *Hölderlin's Hymn "The Ister."* Translated by William McNeill and Julia Davis. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996.

Hollander, Paul. *Anti-Americanism – Critiques at Home and Abroad 1965-1990*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Johnson, Paul. "Anti-Americanism Is Racist Envy," *Forbes Global* (Volume 6

Issue 15, July 21, 2003).

Marcuse, Herbert. *One-Dimensional Man*. Boston: Beacon, 1964.

McDonald, Forrest. *Alexander Hamilton: a Biography*. New York: Norton, 1979.

Miłosz, Czesław, *Conversation*. Ed. by Cynthia L. Haven Jacskon: University Press of Missisipy 2006.

Pontuso, James F., *Václav Havel. Civic Responsibility in the Postmodern Age*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2004.

Rector, Robert E. and Johnson, Kirk A. "Understanding Poverty in America," Backgrounder (No. 1713, January 5, 2004).

Sardar, Ziauddin and Davies, Merryl Wyn. *Why Do People Hate America*. New York: Disinformation, 2002.

Sartre, J.-Paul. *Life/Situations Essay Written and Spoken by Jean-Paul Sartre*. Translated by Paul Auster and Lydia Davis. New York: Pantheon Books, 1977.

_____. *Literary and Philosophical Essay*. Translated by Annette Michelson. New York: Criterion Books, 1955.

_____. "Americans and Their Myths," *The Nation* (October 18, 1947)
Stokes, Doug. *America's Other War: Terrorizing Colombia*. New York: Zed Books, 2005.

Stourzh, Gerald. *Alexander Hamilton and the Idea of Republican Government*. Stanford: Stanford university press, 1970.

Tocqueville, Alexis de. *Democracy in America*. Translated by George Lawrence. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, Anchor, 1968.

_____. *The Old Regime and the Revolution*. Translated by Alan S. Kahan, edited by François Furet and Françoise Mélonio. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998-2001.

Windschuttle, Keith. *A disgraceful carrier*. The review of *The Anti-Chomsky Reader* by Peter Collier and David Horowitz. *The New Criterion* (vol. 23, September 2004)

