

*To Leave or to Take? How Thomas Jefferson’s and Alexander Hamilton’s Influences Still Resonate in the World Today.*

By: Knox Robinson



Introduction:

As an Anthropology student I have had the recent opportunity of looking at the world’s problems that I am used to seeing from a Political Science, or Sociology lens. In my Cultural & Social Anthropology class we read the book *Ishmael,* by author Daniel Quinn. The book highlights differences in culture from an ecological aware standpoint. The author, Quinn, highlights what he calls “Taker” and “Leaver” culture.

In this paper, I hope to use these two terms to highlight different schools of ideology when it comes to problems that we face in the contemporary world. These problems include; environmental, economic, social injustice and human rights, consumption patterns, population growth, and warfare. I will examine the problems of the modern world through the lens of taker and leaver culture, while also examining the philosophical and ideological differences of Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton. I know what the differences between the two are, as I am sure that you, the reader do also, but I would like to highlight their differences to explain the founding of the United States of America, and the path that the United States has taken as a country. Building on that I hope to explain how the path America has taken has played a role in the problems our world faces.

I will be examining the United States from the looking glass of “American Exceptionalism”; a term I will explain to much greater and complete detail later on. It is an idea that I became very familiar with when taking an American Experience class at LaGrange College, where I was exposed to the writings of Alexis de Tocqueville. In layman’s terms the idea of American exception is our nation having a superiority complex, whether that feeling of superiority is deserved or whether it is sure arrogance. For instance the United States President is frequently referred to as the leader of the free world, and it is almost an American value to assume that the United States is far superior to any country on the face of the planet.

But the question is, is this a good thing? Is the world a better place because of the role that the United States plays? We are always taught that this is indeed the case. But then again enlightened people know that the winners write the history books. Which is why the first source I sought out was Howard Zinn’s *A People’s History of the United States.* Zinn describes the founding of America as something different than what your basic Fifth Grade textbook describes it as. Zinn does not write from the point of view of the elites of the winning side, but rather from the viewpoint of the people, the masses, the sufferers, the people who fought to make our country, and our world a better place for everyone, not just the people at the top.

I believe that understanding the role of Hamilton’s and Jefferson’s differences as a starting point in the direction our world has taken is the key to making our world a better place. I believe that these two much esteemed men represented a new battle in taker vs. leaver culture, and that their respected differences continue to be a profound impact on our contemporary world.

Section One: Daniel Quinn’s “Ishmael”

In 1992, Daniel Quinn wrote a very influential novel, which is titled *Ishmael.* In this novel, Quinn touches on the themes of cultural mythology, thoughtful ethics, and sustainability/ecological awareness.

The cultural mythology concept was a new one for me the first time I read *Ishmael.* Whenever I hear the word mythology the first thought that comes into my mind is Poseidon or Hades that is not what Quinn was describing. Quinn described mythology as the story that we are born into (Quinn, *Ishmael,* 35). Quinn’s novel utilizes a Socratic Dialogue between the main characters. In this dialogue Quinn strives to deconstruct the notion that humans are the end of the creation story; that we have a right to use and abuse the earth, and the animals in it to better our life. According to Quinn, we are in captivity to our own stories and mythology, and have been put there by the culture we are born into (Quinn, *Ishmael*, 37). I very much connected to this novel early on because I have always felt captive to something bigger than myself and have felt that I had been lied to in some capacity. I just did not think that the world around us was created to be destroyed for our own gain. I never thought that animals’ purpose was to be inhumanely slaughtered and mistreated for the use of mankind. I felt like I was being held captive to the ideology that I was superior, like I was being drug along by a powerful undertow.

The character of Ishmael, for whom the novel is named, defines some of the terms that are prevalent throughout the novel. The novel describes the struggle between “takers” and “leavers” since the Agricultural Revolution that took place in the Fertile Crescent area of ancient Mesopotamia. This “story” is a intertwining relationship between the earth, mankind, and the deity's or deity that people believe in. This story has a beginning, middle, and end. We “enact” this story when we try, and succeed in trying to make this story come to pass. The groups of people whom enact a story comprise “culture.”

The story enacted by the takers is this, that they are the peak of the evolution pyramid. That the Earth was made solely for mankind, and that mankind’s sole purpose is to conquer and rule the world. As if the Earth is mankind’s enemy. This system of belief is meant to bring about a heaven on earth type paradise, as mankind increases their mastery of the world (Quinn, *Ishmael,* 81). However mankind is always failing because people are flawed. This story asserts that the knowledge of how to truly live life is out of the reach of mankind, which is why, in the character of Ishmael’s perspective that organized religions arose, and explains why Taker culture has always been reliant on the teachings of prophets like Jesus, Buddha, and Muhammad, just to name a few (Quinn, *Ishmael,* 85*)*. So, however hard humans labor to save the world, they are just going to go on defiling and spoiling it. Which is to say, no matter how hard mankind labors to save the earth, it will never happen, because we will just go on destroying it.

But this way of thinking is invalid. It is invalid because the Takers gathered only the evidence of their own culture’s history, which is not near enough to base an assumption that mankind is helpless to stop environmental destruction and human rights abuse (Quinn, *Ishmael, 83)*. Mankind is not helpless, nor are we unable to save the world, we just have not done it yet. Partly because of the cultural mythology that holds people captive into believing that mankind is flawed to the point where a paradise on this planet is unobtainable. The quote from the novel that best sums up this line of thinking is this...

*"There's nothing fundamentally wrong with people. Given a story to enact that puts them in accord with the world, they will live in accord with the world. But given a story to enact that puts them at odds with the world, as yours does, they will live at odds with the world. Given a story to enact in which they are the lords of the world, they will* act *as the lords of the world. And, given a story to enact in which the world is a foe to be conquered, they will conquer it like a foe, and one day, inevitably, their foe will lie bleeding to death at their feet, as the world is now."*

(Quinn, *Ishmael,* 84*)*

The idea of being ground in religious practices, such as that of Judeo-Christian faiths seem to almost be under fire by the author, Quinn, because of the role that they play in holding human civilization captive in cultural mythology. As in the quote, “We don’t need prophets to tell us how to live; we can find out for ourselves by consulting *what’s actually there.”* (Quinn, *Ishmael, 96).* It seems from this that Quinn is of the opinion that us as humans should be more practical about our values, and beliefs, instead of allowing ourselves to be swept up in the story.

Contrary to the belief of Taker Culture, there are certain laws of life that life on earth is subject is to, and we can see these laws in the natural world around us (Quinn, *Ishmael,* 105). One of the key laws that Taker Culture ignores is what Quinn dubbed “The Law of Limited Competition” (Quinn, *Ishmael,* 129). The summary of this law is that living beings may compete for survival, but if they harm another being’s pursuit of food, shelter, or the way in which they live life, they are in violation of this law. Mankind may compete, but may not wage war. Species that wage war on others eventually go instinct, but as with all of the immutable laws, Taker Culture openly, and blatantly ignores, and flouts their ignorance at every chance (Quinn, *Ishmael,* 118).

It is apparent to me that whatever mankind does to the environment and the animals living on this planet, they will eventually do to other humans; whether it is slavery, murder, or just the belief that our life is above that of others. That being said, the root of all evil started with the Taker Culture belief that we, as human beings are superior life forms (Quinn, *Ishmael*, 120).

Quinn proposes that the Agricultural Revolution was actually a revolution against the story of the leavers. Leaver Culture takes only what they need to survive, “leaving” the rest alone, for others. Quinn refers to this way of life as “living in the hands of the gods”; because under this way of life, evolution can actually take place, with leavers dwindling in times of scarcity and thriving in times of abundance. Quinn asserts that the Agricultural Revolution was not just a change in agricultural techniques, but serves as a function of mythology. When we are able to build surpluses of food we can diminish the power of the gods in that we can survive when the gods decide it is time for us to do without and die off.

As I already stated leavers live in “the hands of the gods” (Quinn, *Ishmael,* 229). This means that they live under the conditions where evolution takes place. Since takers believe that man has ended evolution it became imperative for them to enact a story in which we end the process of evolution. Quinn has pointed out that tribal “uncivilized” societies live in the manner of leavers, but established “civilized” societies live in the manner of takers. Taker Culture has attempted and is succeeding in putting an end to creation. “The premise of the Taker story is th*e world belongs to man...*The premise of the Leaver story is that *man belongs to the world” (*Quinn, *Ishmael,* 239), in the exact same manner that birds, fish, or anything else does. For millions of years mankind lived in this manner, belonging to the world, and because man lived in this manner, mankind grew and evolved, changed gradually over time and became ever more enlightened. Until the day man became so enlightened that they decided that they no longer live this way, and that mankind was the master of life.

Towards the end of the book, Quinn outlines what must be done to save the world. The first is that we must realize that leavers are the most valuable endangered species. Not just because they are humans, but because they have the knowledge to reverse the ills that plague human civilization, and have the ability to teach the takers that there is another way to live, one that does not involve destruction. The second is that mankind must consciously forfeit the knowledge that we have the right to decide who or what lives, and who or what dies.

If the world is indeed to be saved I believe something else must occur, and that is a change of motivation. People must not be made to feel guilty, or scolded, or be made to see a vision of the world being destroyed. Instead we must realize a vision in which we begin to make this world better, and truly believe that we have the capability of doing so. We must escape the bondage in which we believe that we are helpless in enacting positive change, and come to the realization that change starts with the person we see in the mirror, and all work towards that.

Section Two: The American Role

It is certainly easy to think about the United States of America and identify with this country being a paradigm in human history. A nation that was founded on a new land by outsiders; a dominant society largely comprised of those of Western European descent, and a working class of indigenous peoples from the Americas, and slave labor brought in from the continent of Africa. Revolutions occurred, power was wrestled away from the colonizing countries, and a new nation was formed. But how “new” was this new country?

According to famed historian Howard Zinn, not much of a Revolution occurred. In fact he names chapter five of his book, *A People’s History of the United States: 1492-Present*, “A Kind of Revolution” (Zinn, *A People’s History,* 77), which really sets the tone for the story he tells.

Zinn not only covers the American Revolution, but resistance to participating in said war. As the war, and transition of power that was a result of the war did not benefit a large number of people, Zinn even quotes John Adams, stating that only one third of people living in the colonies actually supported the war (Zinn, *A People’s History*, 77.) To connect Zinn’s thoughts of America’s founding with Quinn’s thoughts of Taker and Leaver culture I assert that the founding of the United States was just a transition power of one group of elites to another, one group of Takers to the next. I believe this opinion is summed up by Zinn’s quoting of Charles Beard; Mr. Beard warned that “...governments - including the government of the United States - are not neutral, that they represent the dominant economic interests, and that their constitutions are intended to serve these interests” (Zinn, *A People’s History,* 98).

Despite the legacy of the American Revolution, the way of life for majority of the people living in the continental United States did not change, and many inequalities that existed under European rule of the colonies continued to exist in the new nation. The plight of Native Americans only worsened, as the practice of inhumanely removing them from their land, and the violence and murder against those that resisted began after the United States was established (Zinn, *A People’s History,* 86). In the deep south, more African Americans were put into slavery, as the southern planter elite benefited from the Revolution (Zinn, *A People’s History,* 88).

So in all actuality, there was not a whole lot that was new in this new nation. Taker culture just moved from Western Europe, to North America. Leaver societies were steam rolled, and the ecology and biological life on this new continent would pay the price. One reason for this may be that the general idea echoed through the religious, and scientific principles of the United States around the time of its founding was that mankind, most notably dominant societies had the right and privilege to exercise their dominance over indigenous societies and the natural ecology.

The history of America is marred by the inhumane and unethical treatments of the disenfranchised, by those with wealth and power. Especially with the way the Indigenous Americans were treated by those of migrant descent. In a speech given by Chief Seattle (whom city of Seattle was named) in 1854 to a collection of tribes preparing to sign their land away to the United States government, the chief warned against the presence of Taker cultures into the land that has traditionally belonged to Native, Leaver cultures. Chief Seattle describes them as this; “...he is a stranger who comes in the night and takes from the land whatever he needs. The earth is not his brother, it’s his enemy, and when he has conquered it, he moves on. He leaves his father’s graves behind, and he does not care. He kidnaps the earth from his children...His appetite will devour the earth and leave behind only a dessert” (Maybury-Lewis, “On the Importance of Being Tribal”, 396). David Maybury-Lewis sums it up like this; “Whether human dominion was guaranteed by the Bible or by Science, the result was the same - the natural world was ours to exploit” (Maybury-Lewis, “On the Importance of Being Tribal”, 394). This is eerily similar to Quinn’s assertions that our cultural beliefs are favoring this trend of destruction from the hands of a dominant taker culture.

\* \* \*

If problems are the result of established, powerful, societies carelessly rolling over passive, less advanced ones, where does this come from? What can we pin point as a reason for this trend? I believe that in the case of America's role in the world's problems, we can point to the idea that America is exceptional, which is commonly referred to as American exceptionalism.

But what does this term actually mean? It does not actually mean superiority, but the uses of it by American Conservatives and Neo-Conservatives have caused that to be it's chief connotation (Lipset, *American Exceptionalism,* 197). They have caused the theory to move towards that of the United States as the proverbial mountain peak (Koh, "America's Jekyll-and-Hyde Exceptionalism”, 117); acting as if America is exempt from the things that have ruined societies in the past. The idea that the United States is of higher quality than other nations stems from America having its own unique ideology and from its revolutionary beginning. American values that contribute to the theory that America is exceptional are; individualism, populism, and egalitarianism, which were described by writer Alexis de Tocqueville, as he said "The position of the Americans is therefore quite exceptional, and it may be believed that no other democratic people will ever be placed in a similar one" (Tocqueville, *Democracy in America,* 36).

There are several reasons as to why American exceptionalism rose to be a theory. One of the main reasons is that America provided a nation that was liberated from some of the corruption and problems that plagued European countries around the time of The American Revolution. The idea that power should reside with the people as opposed to a hierarchical ruling class provides a basis for the belief that America is exceptional.

This theory is expressed by Thomas Paine’s manifesto, *Common Sense,* which for the first time outlined the idea of American Exceptionalism, in that there should be pride in a new nation, because it was different than the scene that was Europe; that there should be a sense of pride about a nation that matured and grew apart from the Mother Country. That in this sense of something new, there lied unlimited potential for prosperity for the new nation (Paine, “Common Sense”). Through this came the ideas of Republicanism, which served as the chief source of pride in the revolutionary aspect of American exceptionalism, because the idea that power lied not with the ruling class, but with the citizens of that nation were very revolutionary, even if they did not quite execute their ideology.

To go back to the idea of a group of people seeking to enact a story, Christianity in the new country and American exceptionalism are closely related to one another. James Madison and Thomas Jefferson fought valiantly to make sure that there would be a wall of separation between the new republic and religion, which was different from the nations of Europe, which practiced forms of state religion; which further enhances the idea that America is an innovator in the idea of personal freedom. This is what led to the idea of Manifest Destiny, or the idea that God had a special purpose for this new nation, which of course would mean that the United States was destined for greatness (Kidd, *God of Liberty,* 9).

Thomas Jefferson expressed and added to the views of American exceptionalism, which were prevalent in this time. In the words of Jefferson, America would be the world’s “Empire of Liberty”. Most of today’s thoughts on American exceptionalism favor the side of the down-pressor, the established power, but the views of it from men like Jefferson, Paine, and Tocqueville were different. They saw it as an intellectual, spiritual, and philosophical break from the ills of European societies. So in America, I believe that men such as these saw a chance to start a new way of life in a new land, a chance to leave Taker culture on the other side of the Atlantic, and create a new path for the world. Jefferson saw the founding of America as a chance to make a revolutionary break from the traditions and beliefs that a ruling family could exercise power over a nation of people, he saw it as a chance to form an isolationist nation of pacifist farmers as opposed to a mercantilist nation that relies on foreign diplomacy. Jefferson saw the United States as a model and example of republicanism, a lighthouse that shines out for the lost people of the world. Jefferson envisioned America as a positive role model to the world to show that the European systems which promoted “reason of state”, that advocates a Machiavellian means justify the measures type philosophy was inferior to a virtuous republic. Jefferson had faith that America would become a great “empire of liberty” that would drive out governing systems that were geared towards the needs of a ruling family over the needs of the people (Hendrickson and Tucker, *Empire of Liberty,* ix). The quote from Jefferson that best sums this up was an excerpt from a letter written by him in 1809.

*“Trusted with the destinies of this solitary republic of the world, the only monument of human rights, and the sole depositary of the sacred fire of freedom and self-government, whence it is to be lighted up in other regions of the earth, if other regions of the earth shall ever become susceptible of its benign influence.”*

(Jefferson, *Jeffersonian Cyclopedia,* 8691)

Whether or not a person views American exceptionalism as a positive thing, or a negative, one cannot discredit the idea that the United States is a unique paradigm in human history. With this sense of being unique comes power and responsibility. But how has our nation done with that? How has the path the Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton set us on influenced this nation, and the world we live in today?

Section Three: Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton

Progressing along our line of thought, we arrive to the idea of Thomas Jefferson, and Alexander Hamilton, and how their differing ideologies have influenced American life, and life around the world. These two men basically caused a chasm in American political philosophy. You could almost say that because of Jefferson’s views we have “blue”, and because of Hamilton’s views we have “red”; even though Jefferson’s quotes and beliefs have been used for advantage in Republican politics. But that is not what is being discussed, the reason that we have arrived at these two are that I believe the founding of the United States as a nation, and the role that this country has played in the world represent a struggle between Taker and Leaver cultures.

I am prone to say off the top that Thomas Jefferson represents the Leavers, and Hamilton, the Takers. But that would not be completely accurate. Both of them belong to Taker society, as they were descended from European immigrants on a new continent, practicing dominance over less technologically developed societies. However Jefferson’s views, philosophy, and lifestyle was geared towards that of Leaver culture, whilst that of Hamilton were significantly more in-tune with Taker culture.

To further prove this point, and to further prove that Jefferson versus Hamilton ideology battles have raged throughout American political history, United States Presidents of differing political philosophy have paid homage to both of these men. In a speech commemorating the Jefferson Memorial in Washington, D.C. President Franklin Delano Roosevelt said that, "Thomas Jefferson believed, as we believe, in Man. He believed, as we believe, that men are capable of their own government, and that no king, no tyrant, no dictator can govern for them as well as they can govern themselves"; President John F. Kennedy also similarly praised Jefferson, whilst a much more conservative President Ronald Reagan had Jefferson paintings removed in favor of paintings of President Calvin Coolidge around the White House (Wagoner, Jr. “In Pursuit of Freedom”, 123-124).

Hamilton’s legacy in the light of Taker and Leaver culture is differing. While Kennedy praised Jefferson for being an intellectual titan, and multi-talented Renaissance man, Hamilton is primarily known as the “Father of American Capitalism” (Curott and Watts, “Hamilton and State Capitalism”). This school of thought proposes that Hamiltonian advocates of state capitalism “argue that the institutions of capitalism should be forcefully imposed even if they are unwanted; the theory is that this will make the nation wealthier and so it should be done regardless of any objections” (Curott and Watts, “Hamilton and State Capitalism”). So it is easy to see how both Jefferson and Hamilton slide into their seats on either side of the Taker and Leaver aisle.

While I have already stated that in the eyes of Quinn, or other Anthropologists, and scholars who prescribe to this school of thought, that both Jefferson and Hamilton are technically members of Taker society. However there are numerous differences between Hamilton and Jefferson, and the influence that they have which makes them representatives of Taker and Leaver philosophy in American History.

The ironic part is that even though Jefferson embodies Leaver thought, and Hamilton, Taker thought, their respective upbringings were the opposite of their viewpoints. Jefferson is a paradoxical “man of the people”, who fought for the rights of all men, or white men, even though he was born into and died a member of Virginia’s wealthy planter elite. While Hamilton was born and raised a member of lower class society in the West Indies before making his way to the United States to pursue a career and education. But once Hamilton had risen through the ranks to become an influential founder of the new country was distrustful of the mass of people, and felt that power should be concentrated amongst a small group of ruling elite, that would rule for a long time.

I believe the proof of which man represents which philosophy, and the proof of how their influence set America down the path it has gone in relation to the world’s problems lies in the differences of these two men; their differing philosophical viewpoints in society, government, economics, and religion. Also in the legacies of each man’s intellectual brainchild; Jefferson, the Declaration of Independence, and Hamilton, the Constitution of the United States.

*“Hamilton the Taker”*

Along with James Madison, Alexander Hamilton’s legacy will be forever intertwined with that of the United States Constitution. But what does that mean for Hamilton, and why? Well first off it is important to note that while Madison and Hamilton both share collaborator status with the Constitution, their ideals about what the Constitution should be, as well as their influence on the document differ. Madison is known for having a close political partnership, and personal friendship with Thomas Jefferson, in addition to this friendship, Madison shared Jefferson’s views of a new nation based on libertarian principles (Wilkins, “Jefferson and Madison”, 596). What Madison brought to the Constitution is one of its most famous features, The Bill of Rights, which championed the rights of the people over the central government, and was believed to be fought for by Madison at the urging of Jefferson, who was in France at the time (Wilkins, “Jefferson and Madison”, 603).

This Libertarian purpose of what the Constitution should be was not shared by Madison’s colleague Hamilton. While you could make the argument that the Madisonian and Jeffersonian view of the Constitution was more Leaveresque in nature, Hamilton’s definitely favored Taker society. Hamilton was known for being sympathetic to the British monarchy, which very much embodied Taker society, and sought to shape the founding of the new nation to make it more like Rome, with the President and Senators being elected for life, which would keep power concentrated at the top. There is a school of thought amongst historians that asserts that the purpose of the Constitution was to protect the economic interests of the rich elites, while insuring that governmental control would remain in their hands as well (Zinn, *A People’s History of the United States*, 90).

It is inherently apparent that Hamilton did not want to see power and control in the hands of citizens, he felt as though there should be a strong presence of a central government, with strong leaders involved. In a lot of ways you could say that Hamilton’s view of what the United States President should be is not all to different from European monarchs of that day and age. The only difference is that the powers vested into a king or monarch come from a religious function, where as the power of Hamilton’s would be American monarch would come from the Constitution, and the charisma of that would be leader (Scheuerman, “American Kingship?”, 24). The credit for the inclusion of European monarchical theory into the powers of the Constitution is given to Hamilton. Howard Zinn refers to Hamilton as “one of the most forceful and leaders of the new aristocracy” (Zinn, *A People’s History of the United States,* 95). This quote, which was made by Hamilton himself, sums up his views of the sovereignty of the people compared to the sovereignty of elitist rulers.

*“All communities divide themselves between the few and the many. The first are the rich and well-born, the other the mass of people. The voice of the people has been said to be the voice of God; and however generally this maxim has been quoted and believed, it is not true in fact. The people are turbulent and changing; they seldom judge and determine right. Give therefore to the first class a distinct permanent share in the government....Can a democratic assembly who annually revolve in the mass of the people be supposed steadily to pursue public good? Nothing but a permanent body can check the imprudence of democracy....”*

(Zinn, *A People’s History of the United States,* 96).

This shows what kind of direction he envisioned the new country to go in. Hamilton wanted a President and Senate chosen for life (Zinn, *A People’s History of the United States,* 96). This differs from Jefferson’s and Madison’s views of what the Constitution should be, as Madison wrote in *Federalist #10* that our nation should be governed by a representative democracy so that peace would be maintained and wealth would be equally distributed, and not concentrated in the hands of the few and powerful (Madison “Federalist #10). This is in stark contrast to Hamilton’s views.

In examining Hamilton’s legacy of the Constitution we begin to understand his economic and political philosophy. Politically, Hamilton hoped for a revival of monarchist type leadership, as he saw the Articles of Confederation as being weak, and that the new nation needed strong leadership (Sheuerman, “American Kingship?”, 29). So in some ways we have Hamilton to thank for the way the office of the President is today; as Hamilton thought the office of President should a very prestigious, powerful, and lifelong occupation. Despite his influence on American political philosophy, Hamilton’s lasting legacy is as an economist, and his influence on American economics is still very much prevalent today; especially the legacy of Hamilton’s famous document “Report on Manufactures”, which he wrote in 1791. Many of his tariff recommendations were adopted by Congress in 1792, and have remained influential economic doctrines. Hamilton helped to encourage and push the United States to be major player in world economics, as it was his idea to heavily tax imports as a way to fund the national debt (Irwin, “Aftermath of Hamilton”, 800). In Hamilton’s report that he delivered to Congress he begins by attacking the belief that an agrarian society is the key to obtaining societal wealth. He then proceeded to make a strong case for the government to become actively involved in manufacturing, through promotion and shifting policy for the advantage of it (Irwin, “Aftermath of Hamilton”, 802). His attempt to implement his economic philosophy in the new republic did not go unopposed however, Hamilton’s proposals were fought by Madison and Jefferson, whom championed the ideals of less government involvement in economics (Irwin, “Aftermath of Hamilton”, 804).

This way of policy was detrimental to many citizens of the United States, as his idea of protecting imports for taxation purposes benefited American commerce and the economy more so than the actual people of the United States. Not to mention it made the United States a world presence, which would mean that the early nation took a large step in the direction of Taker culture, as success on the world economic stage often involves “taking” from somewhere else in the world, or “taking” from those at home. It is unfortunate that Hamilton would be a catalyst in pushing our nation in that direction, as earlier in his career he criticized protecting imports for taxation as a means accumulating money to the central government in *Federalist #35.* He claimed that this act “tend to render other classes of the community tributary in an improper degree to manufacturing classes to whom they give a premature monopoly of the market” (Hamilton, “Federalist #35”). So basically he admits the fault and wrongdoing for this school of economic thought, as a violation against the right of man by means of an overstepping of governmental power.

Economically, Hamilton pushed the United States to accommodate and engage in free trade with Britain, who at that time was most prevalent on the world’s economic stage, and was the world’s foremost Taker society (Irwin, “Aftermath of Hamilton”, 816). This led political advocacy groups who primary aim was to protect the American market, which was the life-blood of American citizens at the time, to take allegiance with Madison and Jefferson in their opposition to Hamilton’s pro-British economic policies (Irwin, “Aftermath of Hamilton” 817).

It is apparent how influential Hamilton’s views are on the path that the United States has taken since its founding. But how influential are the religious views of a man who was described by his college roommate as being “in the habit of praying on his knees night and morning” (Hamilton, *The Life of Alexander Hamilton,* 10).

It appears that throughout his life, Hamilton has remained religious, though at times it has seemed more sincere, and at times more convenient. Some experts contend that his religious beliefs, much like his belief in liberty, are rooted in classical Christian theological theory of nobility and philanthropy; which conflicts with his Machiavellian approach to government and economics (Rosano, “Liberty, Nobility, Philanthropy, and Power”, 61).

He at times used religion to oppose his political rival Jefferson, and many of his pro-French viewpoints. But at other times has seemed quite devout about his religious belief, so it is tough to really say in which way has the religious belief has served as an influence on the shaping of the United States. Although it seems that there is a correlation in his religious beliefs and his political ones, I am not sure as to which serves the purpose of the other, although I am of the opinion that Hamilton’s beliefs were sincere as his most famous biographer Ron Chernow noted that he wrote several hymns of praise for God that were published in newspapers (Chernow, *Alexander Hamilton,* 38). Although it seems that his belief system was rooted in, and served the purpose and ideals of the Taker culture that Hamilton promoted throughout his career.

*“Jefferson the Leaver”*

Unlike his political rival Hamilton, Jefferson grew up in a very privileged background, and was born a member and died a member of the elites in his society. Jefferson grew up, and became educated according to the traditions of being a member of Virginia’s planter elite class. But just as Hamilton would be born of lower class, rise through the ranks and seek to make sure power be concentrated at the top, Jefferson would do the opposite. Jefferson was a paradoxical man of the people. A man who spoke of the equality of all men, yet remained a lifelong slave owner, he was a man who fought for the empowerment of all people instead of a concentration of power at the top, despite the fact that he was always at the top of the power chain.

While Thomas Jefferson was many things, and will be remembered for a plethora of reasons, one of the foundations of his legacy will most likely be in his authorship of the Declaration of Independence, which to this day remains the world’s most famous break up letter. Jefferson aired grievances felt by the colonies towards the mother country, and criticized the king and the British monarch. In this document we get some timeless quotes that will always be associated with the legacy and character of Thomas Jefferson, especially the preamble, which states...

*“When in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one People to dissolve the Political Bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the Powers of the Earth, the separate and equal Station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God entitle them, a decent Respect to the Opinions of Mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the Separation.*

*WE hold these Truths to be self evident, that all Men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness.”*

(The Declaration of American Independence)

Jefferson’s preamble to this day remains one of this world’s most famous and lasting quotes on human rights, and has been an inspiration for people all over the world, and in the U.S. alike. It has been used by abolitionists, and those who fought for civil rights. Within this document many of Jefferson’s views and beliefs come forth. In many ways you could point to the Declaration of Independence as a Leaver manifesto.

This opening of the Declaration especially is chock full of Leaver rhetoric. Jefferson speaks of what Quinn would call “living in the hands of the gods” (Quinn, *Ishmael,* 229). Living according to natural laws of the laws and seeing a spiritual significance in this. Jefferson seems to believe that people have a right to pursue life in the manner of their choosing, and that if they are being forced to live in a manner that is against their will, or are victims of equality then those people have a right and responsibility to revolution.

In this document Jefferson professes that power should be in the hands of the people, not in a ruler, for all men are equal, not just those born with money or power. Jefferson also asserts that people have a right to revolt if their needs are not being met by a governing body. That slavery is an abomination, and for the most part that people should be left to live their own way. Jefferson feels that people are meant to be free, free to pursue happiness and secure their basic needs with no interference from oppressive leadership.

Jefferson strikes out against the cultural mythology of having an almost religious responsibility of forced loyalty and obedience to a monarch. It is clear within this document that Jefferson detests tyranny of any kind, and sees the way of life that he promotes within this text as a somewhat spiritual calling. In many ways this document can be seen as an indictment against Taker culture.

To say that the Declaration is a statement of human rights and that it make Jefferson seem like a liberal thinker sets the tone for Jefferson’s political and economic philosophy.

Economically, I would say that Jefferson is extremely liberal; which may surprise some since his quotes have been used to justify the TEA party’s very conservative fiscal demands. Jefferson opposed government spending, but on a liberal premise; praised individual liberty as a forerunner to prosperous commerce. However Jefferson saw liberty as a means to promote equal wealth, and economic freedom (Katz, “Jefferson’s Anticapitalism”, 1). Jefferson can be described as being an anti-capitalist, because he opposed the idea of acquiring personal property, and thought that Native American cultures that had no concept of personal wealth, was superior to any European or the new American system (Katz, “Jefferson’s Anticapitalism”,7). Jefferson felt that Native Americans did the best job of exemplifying what it means to live in the laws of nature. As in Jefferson’s words, “having never submitted themselves to any laws, any coercive power, any shadow of government” (Jefferson, “Notes on the State of Virginia”). What higher praise could Jefferson give to Leaver culture? In Jefferson’s views, those who are the least political, are more political. That in allowing others their personal freedom, not to attain property, but to pursue happiness, and working together for a common good that benefits free men equally (Katz, “Jefferson’s Anticapitalism”, 9).

Jefferson theorized an economic condition that he termed the “harm principle”, which in Jefferson’s words, taking for some one’s own good must happen “without violating the similar rights of other sensible beings” (Katz, “Jefferson’s Anticapitalism”, 10). This is remarkably similar to the “Law of Limited Competition” in Quinn’s *Ishmael* (Quinn, *Ishmael,* 129)*.*

Another reason that Jefferson opposed the kind of capitalism that Hamilton is known as the father of is because of what he saw of England’s similar supply and demand type economic system. Jefferson saw how the poor suffered, he saw the have’s attain more and the have not’s have less (Katz, “Jefferson’s Anticapitalism”, 14)*.*

Jefferson’s economic beliefs are very Leaver leaning, and from them does his overall liberal approach to almost everything in his philosophy. As a political idealist, Jefferson wished to form a Utopian nation of pacifist, yeomen farmers. He hoped that Americans could spread out, with very little governmental interference, and pursue their own way of living, or as Jefferson would probably say, happiness. This is in direct contrast with the vision his political rival Hamilton had for the new nation. Jefferson opposed the idea of mercantilism, manufacturing, heavy government influence in economics, and taxation for the purpose of governmental accumulation of capital. He opposed the idea of wage work as he felt that it reinforced a form of economic class slavery (Katz, “Jefferson’s Anticapitalism”, 14).

Moving away from economic based political theory, Jefferson remained consistent on his views of the role of government in relation to the personal liberties he felt each person should have. Jefferson never saw a certain regime, or a certain flag, or certain ideals as the number one symbol of loyalty. But sovereignty of the people, which is why he consistently asserted that people had every right to rise up in revolution, fight for their rights, and to overthrow an existing government to establish their own, that serves their needs.

Throughout his political career Jefferson expressed anarchist sentiments. But Jefferson’s anarchist thoughts seemed to come from a belief in the sovereignty of people, and a devout faith in the ideals of liberty, and moral reasoning. As war-time governor of Virginia, Jefferson attempted to make sweeping reforms to make Virginia a democratic state, these reforms show that Jefferson’s vision of society is aligned with that of a liberal, Leaver type premise. As governor, Jefferson sought to implement a system of free public education, reform Virginia’s capital penalty policies, abolish the international slave trade in Virginia, establish a wall of separation of church & state by limiting the influence of clergymen on government and rule and dissolving the Anglican Church’s status as the official state religion (Peterson, *Jefferson and the New Nation,* 106).

As our nation’s first Secretary of State, and a member of George Washington’s cabinet, Jefferson opposed the vision of how the nation should be run by the nation’s first Secretary of Treasury, Alexander Hamilton. Jefferson teamed up with his friend James Madison to oppose Hamilton’s Federalist party. Jefferson referred to this schism of political philosophy when he termed the two camps “the parties styled Federalist and Republican” (Bernstein, *Thomas Jefferson,* 81). Jefferson and Hamilton, although bitter rivals maintained a cordial working relationship and saw eye to eye the need to establish and legitimize a new nation, and that the first step in that was to deal with the nation’s debt problem. They differed what actions should be taken however, as Jefferson stood in direct opposition to Hamilton’s idea of the establishment of a central bank, and the idea of taxation to fund the debt (Bernstein, *Thomas Jefferson*, 86). Interestingly enough though, after encountering a frazzled and worried Hamilton on the streets Philadelphia, which at the time was the nation’s capital. Hamilton who expressed to Jefferson his fear that without a tangible plan to rid the new nation of its debt, that the nation would crumble. Sympathetic to Hamilton’s concerns, Jefferson arranged a dinner, between himself, Hamilton, and Madison so that they could compromise their differing philosophical opinions to end the partisan gridlock and come up with a plan to eliminate the nation’s post-war debt. The result was that Madison and Jefferson would end their opposition to Hamilton’s national bank, and that Hamilton would endorse Jefferson’s and Madison’s wish that the new capital would be built along the Potomac River (Bernstein, *Thomas Jefferson,* 86). The latter two believed that in placing a capital between the southern states and the northeastern states would ensure a governmental balance of favor between the agrarian south and the manufacturing north-east. Later on down the road, Jefferson would obtain the Presidency over Aaron Burr by the hand of Hamilton, and once President he would use Hamilton’s bank to execute the Louisiana Purchase. Which Jefferson saw as a very step in developing America into a virtuous, democratic republic where people were allowed to spread out and live in liberty without government influence.

Despite their cordiality and moments of compromise, the two different thinkers would always remain bitter political rivals. Jefferson described Hamilton’s vision as chasing after the royalty, power, and monarchy that defined the British monarchy. It seems as though Jefferson’s experience of travel through Europe led him to appreciate the differences between the old world and the new one, to appreciate what Daniel Quinn would describe as the differences between Taker and Leaver culture. Jefferson was horrified by the levels of inequality that existed in Europe, as well as the gap between the rich and the poor. Jefferson referred to Europe as a “vaunted scene” because of the ills in their society, and the results that it has yielded (Bernstein, *Thomas Jefferson,* 82).

As a member of Washington’s cabinet Jefferson almost relentlessly sought to undermine Hamilton’s influence on the nation, as by this time Hamilton was Washington’s most favored confidant. The French Minister once made a remark that basically expressed that Washington was under the thumb of Hamilton, and that Jefferson was fighting tooth and nail to counterbalance their pro-Federalist administration (Elkins and McKitrick, *The Age of Federalism,* 344).

Over the course of his political career Jefferson would show time and time again that his allegiance was not to a certain government or country, but to the ideals of liberty, and the virtues of republicanism. My conclusion is that while not using the terms Leaver and Taker, Jefferson was determined to fight for the lifestyle of the Leaver, as he saw the harvest often reaped from Taker ways of life. Jefferson supported the French in their conflict with Britain in the 1790’s, which was in contrast to Hamilton’s and the Federalist pro-British stance. Jefferson expressed sentiments that the cause of liberty was the most important, and in opposing the French in favor of the British was to condemn the idea of republican governance in favor of European styled aristocracy.

As Vice President in the cabinet of John Adams, Jefferson teamed up with Madison to pen a declaration of states rights over that of the federal government, the Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions, which expressed the ideas of interposition and nullification. They were written to undermine the Alien & Sedition Acts imposed by the Adams Administration. Jefferson saw these acts as an attempt to establish tyranny in the new republic. The Alien Act sought to restrict immigration of peoples who would bring dangerous, revolutionary ideas that would endanger religion and order in America; The Sedition Act was modeled after the British law “Seditious Libel”, and enabled the government to lower punishment on anyone who criticized the government, or government officials (Bernstein, *Thomas Jefferson*, 124). These resolutions were written anonymously, and criticized the Adams Administration for violating the rights of man, set forth in the Constitution, while at the same time urging state governments and giving them permission to nullify any law from the federal government that they saw as unfair, unreasonable, or not beneficial to the way of life in that state.

While Jefferson has received great praise and acclaim for his sentiments of revolution, liberty, and republican values, he has also came under fire for promoting violence through his encouragement of people taking matters into their own hands and pursuing freedom and establishing governmental institutions that serve to benefit the people, as opposed to governments that are beneficial to the higher ups at expense of the people. Jefferson has been painted as a radical thinker who has sought to undermine the power of the federal government of the United States. The opinion of some historians is that Jefferson’s radical thinking has tip toed the line of treason, and that he sought to and succeeded in undermining the Constitution, and called for outright action and revolution against the same government in which he served as Secretary of State, Vice President, and eventually President (Chernow, *Alexander Hamilton,* 587). In these critiques is where I see Jefferson’s logic and wisdom.

Jefferson, while extremely paradoxical at times in his life, remained consistent in his line of thought about politics and society, economics, and religion. Jefferson was a liberal thinker. He was distrustful of strong governments, with established churches and strong economies aligned with the government. Throughout his life Jefferson would remain distrustful of banks, bankers, financiers, crowded cities. He idealized the yeomen farmer as the building blocks of a virtuous republican society. He saw the virtue of spreading out, and living off of the land through agriculture as being much superior to a money based, wage labor way of life. He thought that financing was an evil practice, as the banks that loan money would be a mechanism to control people, and build monopolies (Swanson). Jefferson sees each person as having a natural entitlement to certain rights; which we today refer to as human rights. Jefferson could sum up the definition of human rights into one word, *liberty*. Much like the ideas set forth in *Ishmael*, that govern Leaver culture, Jefferson defines his idea of liberty like this; “Rightful liberty is unobstructed action according to our will within limits drawn around us by the equal rights of others. I do not add ‘within the limits of the law’, because law is often but the tyrant’s will, and always so when it violates the rights of the individual” (Jefferson, *Political Writings*, 224). So what Jefferson is basically saying is that an ideal societal structure is one that prohibits individuals from violating the liberty of others, but more importantly, the structure itself does violate the liberty of the citizens of the society.

In much of the same way that Jefferson opposed established economic and governmental institutions, did he oppose the organized religion of his day. And although he has been called an atheist and an enemy of God and religion, Jefferson was far from that. The general consensus is that Jefferson was deist. It is apparent from just skimming through the Declaration of Independence that at the very least he believes in a creator.

Through much of his career Jefferson showed an interest in the studying of religious theology, and an interest in morality in general. But remained critical of the Christian church, even though according to a letter in which he wrote to Dr. Benjamin Rush, he proclaimed that he was a “Christian”. Jefferson told Dr. Rush that “to the corruptions of Christianity I am indeed, opposed; but not to the general precepts of Jesus Himself. I am a Christian, in the only sense in which he wished anyone to be; sincerely attached to his doctrines, in preference to all others; ascribing to himself every human excellence..” (Jefferson, “Letter to Benjamin Rush”). So it is clear that Jefferson, if anything saw Christianity as being a sound in morals and ethics, but that it had been corrupted by established religion. In an excerpt from Jefferson’s *Notes on the State of Virginia* we see him give his opinion of Christianity as an established religion. “Millions of innocent men, women and children, since the introduction of Christianity, have been burned, tortured, fined and imprisoned. What has been the effect of this coercion? To make one half the world fools and the other half hypocrites; to support roguery and error all over the earth...” (Jefferson, “Notes on the State of Virginia”).

When Jefferson wrote his epitaph he had three accomplishments listed, one could almost say that they were spiritual accomplishments for Jefferson. In addition to listing his authorship of what Jefferson called the “Declaration of American Independence”, he listed two other accomplishments that have much to do with free thinking, and religious freedom; his authorship “of the Statute of Virginia for Religious Freedom & Father of the University of Virginia” (Bernstein, *Thomas Jefferson,* 143). The significance of this for Jefferson was that in founding UVA he wanted to promote liberal education and not academic curriculum controlled by the church. In writing Virginia’s Statute for Religious Freedom he wanted to not only protect the state from religion, but he wanted to protect religion from being corrupted by the state.

While Jefferson was on the moral side of Christianity, he disagreed with many other parts of it. In addition to the anti-clerical beliefs of Jefferson, he was very much against the supernatural, and superstitious aspects of Christianity. In 1814, Jefferson wrote to Horatio Spafford and said “in every country and every age, the priest has been hostile to liberty. He is always in alliance with the despot, abetting his abuses in return for protection to his own. It is easier to acquire wealth and power in this way than by deserving them, and to effect this, they have perverted the purest religion ever preached to man into mystery and jargon, unintelligible to all mankind, and therefore the safer for their purposes” (Jefferson, “Quotations on the Separation of State and Church”). This sums up Jefferson’s view of Christianity in a nutshell. That the teachings of one of the finest moral teachers has been distorted by tyrants as a means to control people; holding people victim of cultural mythology.

Jefferson believed that enlightened, free, liberal thinking was the key to combating the evils that come along with tyranny. Jefferson felt that if people were educated then society as a whole would be much better. Much in this same train of thought did Jefferson attempt to combat the cultural mythology that he felt distorted the true moral teachings of Jesus Christ. Today, one of Jefferson’s most intriguing works is a compilation of Christ’s teachings which has to this day been often given the false title known as “The Jefferson Bible.” The intended title is *The Life and Morals of Jesus of Nazareth,* which omitted the supernatural aspects of the four Gospels of the New Testament. Jefferson laid out texts of the four gospels; The Gospels of Matthew, Mark Luke, and John in English, Greek, Latin and French. With a penknife and bottle of glue, he preceded to compile all the passages and scriptures that he felt represented the purest form of Christ’s moral teachings (Goodspeed, “Jefferson and the Bible”, 71). It is unclear whether or not Jefferson wished for his private handbook to ever be published, as the scrutiny that Jefferson faced throughout his life and career for being an alleged infidel, or enemy of religion, would have rose to a fever pitch if his work were made public in his lifetime. As Jefferson made sure there was no mention of the resurrection of Jesus after his death, and all passages that dealt with miracles or angel visitations were not included (Bernstein, *Thomas Jefferson,* 179). While it is confirmed that Jefferson consulted his handbook on a daily basis after its completion there is speculation about whether or not Jefferson ever wanted it to be published. Despite the backlash of criticism Jefferson would have received I believe that he would have taken great pride in educating others against superstitious dogmas and what he sometimes called “priestcraft”, and while helping to spread the morals of Jesus (Bernstein, *Thomas Jefferson,* 179). Because after all, Jefferson knew that morality was the basis of any good society.

Jefferson felt as though people could never be free as long as they were held captive to the mythology of what Quinn would call “Taker” culture. Which is why Jefferson disagreed with the idea that salvation comes from repentance of sin. Jefferson was a materialist who believed that a certain number of good works must be performed to counteract all bad done by a person. Jefferson felt that people were being made to feel guilty just for being alive, and in that guilt, which Jefferson felt like came from the Catholic Church, people began to believe that they were not able to do good on their own, but needed the presence of the church in their lives; and along with that came tithes that were paid back to the church (Hutson, “Controversy Revisited”, 783). Jefferson felt like people, once they became more and more enlightened would begin to follow the actual moral teachings that come with the religion of Christianity, and using Quinn’s terminology would form a new “story to enact”. A story in which man is capable of inherent good, and in which free, virtuous people would form the basis of society.

Section Four: Problems of the Modern World

Arriving at the last section of this paper is almost like approaching a crossroads. Intersecting at this point are Quinn’s battle of Leavers and Takers, the American role and it’s influences from Jefferson and Hamilton.

The role that America plays in the world, as an economic and military power is much more what Hamilton envisioned that what Jefferson did.

In David Maybury-Lewis’ article “On the Importance of Being Tribal” he asserts that we need a Quinn like Tribal movement, to restore indigenous peoples place in the world. In this restoration Maybury-Lewis sees a solution for the world’s problems. He feels as if the United States expanding power through military and economic expansion will result in dire consequences as the way of life of powerful Taker societies has obvious downsides such as leaving a trail of human rights abuse and environmental degradation. The author asserts that there is no single way of life that would be considered “tribal”, but he feels that in mimicking indigenous societies practices of community importance and reverence to the environment that many of the world’s problems can be solved (Maybury-Lewis, “On the Importance of Being Tribal”, 390).

The general idea among anthropologists is that the topic of global consumption should be the chief issue, as the world’s trend of mass consumption is causing the destruction of the environment, which in turn causes human rights abuse. This is especially proven in those who have been victims of the spread of capitalist economics, led by the United States. World financial institutions will encourage developing countries to use their land and resources to mass produce and export their products to established nations. Leaving local environments destroyed and local people starving and poor. This has been the primary tool of economic growth in established nations, especially since mass production has proven to be so efficient in economic growth post World War II (Gupta, “Peasants and Global Environmentalism”, 311).

It is apparent that both economics and politics go hand in hand, which is why it is important to realize that often times there is a correlation between the political liberty citizens are afforded, and the economic liberty. Thomas Jefferson was an enemy of a capitalist economic infrastructure because he felt that as long as people were employed under wage labor that they were enslaved (Katz, “Jefferson’s Anticapitalism, 1). While Alexander Hamilton fathered what is now a day known as American capitalism (Curott and Watts, “Perils of State Capitalism”). Hamilton always sought the strengthen the power of the U.S. federal government, as saw people’s rights as secondary to that the power of the U.S. government, which is why he saw a capitalist economic infrastructure as a key element to maintaining control and accumulating wealth to American elites. From this conflict perspective the future of democracy and true liberty look shaky at best. Because it is difficult for political and economic liberty, which are the cornerstones of a democratic society, to flourish in the midst of extreme social and economic inequality which is brought upon by globalization or the spreading of American capitalism throughout the world (Chomsky, “The Domestic Scene”, 59). Economic strains and enforcement of a class system enable representative democracies to keep power concentrated at the top, amongst wealthy elites (Chomsky, “The Domestic Scene”, 63).

Under this system of foreign policy that Hamilton revered and Jefferson feared, the importing and exporting of goods is regarded as a key component. But the exportation of United States goods to the world has resulted in dire consequences, although it was beneficial to the United States economy. Capitalism encourages the production, buying and selling of goods that will make the biggest profit to the player in the economic game. Between 1992 and 1994 the U.S. garnered over $50 Billion in exports of weapons to the world (Lumpe, “Arms Merchants to the World”, 184). While this helped the American economy, what has this done to the world around us? Today there are over 30 wars being fought, majority of weapons used were imports, and because of U.S. market dominance most of these weapons were U.S. manufactured (Lumpe, “Arms Merchants to the World”, 188).

Not only is the United States destroying life in other countries for benefit of the American economy, but it is happening in the United States as well. This violation of human rights and environmental degradation is summed up by Grace Thorpe, who much in tune with Leaver culture sees a spiritual responsibility to be a steward of the earth, and leave others alone, to pursue their own way of life in peace. Thorpe states that “The Great Spirit instructed us that, as Native people, we have a sacred obligation to our fellow creatures that live upon it. For this reason it is both painful and disturbing that the United States government and the nuclear power industry seem intent on forever ruining some of the little land we have remaining” (Thorpe, “Our Homes Are Not Dumps”, 236).

This is the role that the United States government plays in the world. I am afraid that Thomas Jefferson was right in his assumptions that unless people’s unalienable rights are the number one priority of a governing body that violations against people and the environment would occur. So far Taker culture is winning.

Conclusion:

The conclusion of this research is that there are dangerous trends in United States economic, and foreign policy. Not only are they dangerous in the human rights violations that occur because of them but they are dangerous in the sense that unless something is done to reverse the environmental degradation and mass consumption patterns that are the result of the spreading of Western capitalist economic doctrines that something catastrophic will happen.

How can this be done. Do we need a tribal movement like Quinn or Maybury-Lewis would call for, or do we continue on our path and take our chances?

I believe that the key to reversing these dangerous trends will have to come from a reformation of U.S. political policy. One that would incorporate the best of Jefferson’s and Hamilton’s views on what a government should be.

Through Hamiltonian means of an active and strong national government, that would enable positive change to take root. These means, which can often times be used to enforce Taker culture must be used to obtain an end result of Jeffersonian measures, which is liberty, freedom, and justice afforded to the great body of the world’s population, while seeking to restrain the power and wealth usually concentrated at the top, with the world’s elites.

Bibliography:

* Bernstein, R.B. *Thomas Jefferson.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.
* Chernow, Ron. *Alexander Hamilton.* New York: Penguin, 2004.
* Chomsky, Noam. “The Domestic Scene”. In *Social Problems of the Modern World: A Reader,* Edited by Frances V. Moulder, 59-64. Belmont: Wadsworth Thomson Learning, 2000.
* Curott, Nicholas; Watts, Tyler. “Alexander Hamilton and the Perils of State Capitalism”. *The Freeman: Ideas On Liberty.* September 2010. Volume 60, Issue 7.<http://www.thefreemanonline.org/featured/alexander-hamilton-and-the-perils-of-state-capitalism/>
* Elkins, Stanley and McKitrick, Eric. *The Age of Federalism.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.
* Goodspeed, Edgar J. “Thomas Jefferson and the Bible”. *Harvard Theological Review.* Vol. 40, No. 1, January 1947. pp 71-76.
* Gupta, Akhil. “Peasants and Local Environmentalism”. In *The Environment in Anthropology,* edited by Nora Haenn and Richard R. Wilk, 302-324. New York: New York University Press, 2006.
* Hamilton, Alexander. “Federalist #35: Concerning The General Power of Taxation.” *Independent Journal.* Saturday, January 5, 1788.<http://www.constitution.org/fed/federa35.htm>
* Hamilton, John Church. *The Life of Alexander Hamilton.* New York: Halsted and Voorhries, 1834.
* Hendrickson, David C; Tucker, Robert W. *Empire of Liberty: The Statecraft of Thomas Jefferson.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1992
* Hutson, James H. “Thomas Jefferson’s Letter to the Danbury Baptists: A Controversy Rejoined”. *The William and Mary Quarterly.* Vol. 56, No. 4. October, 1999. pp 775-790
* Irwin, Douglas A. “The Aftermath of Hamilton’s ‘Report on Manufacture.’ “*Journal of Economic History.* Vol. 64, No. 3. September 2004. pp 800-824
* Jefferson, Thomas. *Thomas Jefferson: Political Writings.* Edited by Joyce Appleby and Terrence Ball. Cambridge University Press. Accessed February 20 2012.<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=107255488>
* Jefferson, Thomas. *Thomas Jefferson: Writings : Autobiography/ Notes on the State of Virginia/ Public and Private Papers/ Addresses/ Letters.* Edited by Merrill D. Peterson. The Library of America
* Jefferson, Thomas. 1743-1826. *The Jeffersonian Cyclopedia.* Thomas Jefferson Collection. Electronic Text Center, University of Virginia Library. Accessed February 9 2012. http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/toc/modeng/public/JefCycl.html
* Katz, Claudio J. “Thomas Jefferson’s Liberal Anticapitalism.” *American Journal of Political Science.* Vol. 47, No. 1. January 2003, pp. 1-17.
* Kidd, Thomas S. *God of Liberty: A Religious History of the United States.* New York: Basic Books, 2010.
* Koh, Harold Hongju. "America's Jekyll-and-Hyde Exceptionalism.” In *American Exceptionalism and Human Rights,* Edited by Michael Ignatieff, 111-144. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005
* Lipset, Seymour Martin. *American Exceptionalism: A Double Edged Sword.* New York. W.W. Norton & Co. Inc, 1996
* Lumpe, Lora. “Bill Clinton’s America: Arms Merchants to the World”. In *Social Problems of the Modern World: A Reader,* Edited by Frances V. Moulder, 184-189. Belmont: Wadsworth Thomson Learning, 2000.
* Madison, James. “Federalist #10: The Utility of the Union as a Safeguard Against Domestic Faction and Insurrection.” *Daily Advertiser.* Thursday, November 22, 1987.<http://www.constitution.org/fed/federa10.htm>
* Maybury-Lewis, David. “On the Importance of Being Tribal: Tribal Wisdom.” In *The Environment in Anthropology,* edited by Nora Haenn and Richard R. Wilk, 390-399. New York: New York University Press, 2006.
* Paine, Thomas. “Common Sense.” In *Archiving Early America*, edited by Don Vitale. February 14, 1776. Accessed February 6, 2012.<http://www.earlyamerica.com/earlyamerica/milestones/commonsense/text.html>
* Peterson, Merrill D. *Thomas Jefferson and the New Nation; A Biography.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1970.
* Quinn, Daniel. *Ishmael.* United States: Bantam, 1992.
* Rosano, Michael J. “Liberty, Nobility, Philanthropy and Power in Alexander Hamilton’s Conception of Human Nature”. *American Journal of Political Science.* Vol. 47, No. 1. January, 2003, pp 61-74.
* Secular Web, The. “Quotations that Support the Separation of State and Church.” Last Modified March 26, 1993.<http://www.infidels.org/library/modern/ed_buckner/quotations.html#II>
* Swanson, Donald F. “Bank Notes Will Be But As Oak Leaves”: Thomas Jefferson on Paper Money”. *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography.* Vol. 101, No. 1. pp. 37-52.
* Wagoner, Jr. Jennings L. “ In Pursuit of Reason: The Life of Thomas Jefferson by Noble E. Cunningham, Jr.”  *History of Education Quarterly.* Vol. 28, No. 1, Spring, 1988, pp. 123-126
* Wilkins, Lee. “Jefferson and Madison: The Making of a Friendship” *Political Psychology.* Vol. 12, No. 4. December 1991, pp. 593-608
* Scheuerman, William E. “American Kingship? Monarchical Origins of Modern Presidentialism.” *Polity.* Vol. 37, No. 1. January 2005, pp 24-53
* Thorpe, Grace. “Our Homes Are Not Dumps: Creating Nuclear-Free Zones”. In *Social Problems of the Modern World: A Reader,* Edited by Frances V. Moulder, 236-240. Belmont: Wadsworth Thomson Learning, 2000.
* Tocqueville, Alexis de. *Democracy in America.* New York: Langley, 1840.
* Zinn, Howard. *A People’s History of the United States: 1492-Present.* New York: Harper Collins, 1980.