

Do Democracies Have the Same Values? The Transatlantic Case

by Nikos Christodoulides

Democratic countries do not go to war with each other because, among other factors, they share important features of democracy.¹ Among these features are common values that are reflected by their inhabitants. During 2004, two important events have challenged this notion of a commonality of values in democratic societies. This article, in light of the election of George W. Bush for a second term as president of the United States and the refusal of the European Parliament to accept Rocco Buttiglione, the Italian government's nominee for the post of European Union Commissioner, examines the main values of the people on the two historically democratic continents and how this situation influences the transatlantic relationship.

There are many articles dealing with the friction in the transatlantic alliance. Most of those articles explain today's relationship through analysis of developments in the international system, such as the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War, and developments within the US and the EU, such as the election of George W. Bush, the attacks of September 11, 2001, and the attempts of Europeans for more integration. Without questioning the validity of the above factors in the efforts to understand today's transatlantic relations, the examination of people's core values in the two continents will contribute to better understanding of the current situation.

DIFFERENCES ON VALUES THAT MATTER FOR AMERICANS AND EUROPEANS

Timothy Garton Ash, the well-known British historian, argues in his new book that Europeans and Americans believe in the same values, the so-called "western values."² However, commenting on Ash's argument, Charles Grant states that, "he is right that many of our values are similar, but not all."³ On the issue of values on the two continents, Ivo H. Daalder states that, "although American and European societies share similar perspectives on the importance of democracy, human rights, liberty, transparency and other socio-political values, their attitudes diverge notably on religious

Dr. Nikos Christodoulides is the consul general of the Republic of Cyprus in London and the vice president of the East Mediterranean Institute for Scientific Research and Studies. He studied at the City University of New York and New York University and received a doctorate in European and international studies at the University of Athens.

and traditional values. The United States is a far more religious country than the countries of Europe, and traditional values find far greater adherence in the United States than in European countries.”⁷⁴

Nobody can challenge the fact that some values are held in common by Europeans and Americans. Those values which can be characterized as basic, or “western” according to Ash, are mainly democracy, human rights, the rule of law, and freedom. At the same time however, Europeans and Americans have important differences on several other values that significantly affect their everyday lives, like religion and patriotism. These are the so-called traditional or “core values.”

Having said that Americans are very patriotic does not mean that Europeans are ashamed of or do not love their respective countries.

Values of patriotism and religious faith are unusually strong on the American continent. The sociologist Seymour Martin Lipset, in his 1995 book *American Exceptionalism*, claims that Americans “exhibit a greater sense of patriotism and of belief that their system is superior to all others... than the citizens of other industrialised democracies.”⁷⁵ According to a relevant survey, eighty-six percent of Americans said that they are very proud of their nationality. That is in great contrast to Europe, where only thirty-five percent of French and fifty-four percent of British surveyed said that they were proud of their countries.⁶ At the same time, the World Values Survey run by the University of Michigan proves to a great extent the important and serious differences of values that matter for Americans and Europeans. According to this survey, which took place before the events of September 11, Americans are the most patriotic people, with seventy-two percent claiming that they are very proud of their country.⁷ More specifically, the World Values Survey arranged values in two spectrums, one of which is traditional and secular values. Among the traditional values, the most important is patriotism, followed by religion and traditional family ties. Americans tend to be traditionalists. As many as eighty percent of the American population say that they hold “old fashioned values” about family and marriage. Europeans are on the other end of the spectrum and tend to be secular-rationalists. They believe “religion is personal, optional matter, patriotism is not a big concern and children have their own lives to lead.”⁸

Americans rarely criticize their country and they criticize those that do so. “Patriotism is one of the core traditional values and there is an obvious link between it, military might and popular willingness to sustain large defence budgets.”⁹ The fact that patriotism is one of their main traditional values explains why they support large defense budgets and military solutions in international problems while they have a very strong war lobby, which has become even stronger after September 11.¹⁰ In this way they associate patriotism with militarism and ethnic strife. The total federal spending on defense in the US has risen by more than fifty percent (from \$354 billion to \$547billion) from the last US budget adopted before 9/11 to the 2004

fiscal year. What is important about the increase of the defense spending is the fact that it enjoys support from both Democrats and Republicans.¹¹ In this regard, it is not surprising that “in February [2004], 62% of Americans said that they had a great deal of confidence in their armed forces; [whereas] the next most respected body, ‘major educational institutions’, got just 37%.”¹²

Having said that Americans are very patriotic does not mean that Europeans are ashamed of or do not love their respective countries. European and American patriotism simply differs. “Patriotic Europeans take pride in a nation, a tract of land or a language they are born into. You cannot become un-French.”¹³ In contrast, patriotic Americans have a dual loyalty: both to their country and to the ideas it embodies. “He loved his country,” said Abraham Lincoln of Henry Clay, “partly because it was his own country, but mostly because it was a free country.”¹⁴ As the English writer G. K. Chesterton said in 1922,

*America is the only country based on a creed, enshrined in its constitution and declaration of independence. People become American by adopting the creed, regardless of their place of birth, parentage or language. And you can become un-American by rejecting the creed.*¹⁵

As a result, Francis Fukuyama is right to claim that “the kind of patriotism that is commonplace in America is highly suspect in many parts of Europe.”¹⁶

Americans’ patriotic feelings influence other aspects of life, such as beliefs in religion and family values. Most churches in the US, in contrast with Europe, are full every Sunday. The results from several surveys on the issue of religiosity present findings that are parallel to the results on the issue of patriotism presented before. Thirty-six percent of the Americans surveyed claim that the Bible is the literal word of God, and fifty percent of the population say that the US enjoys divine protection.¹⁷ In a Global Attitudes survey of the Pew Research Centre in 2002, as many as fifty-nine percent of Americans replied positively to the question of whether religion plays a very important role in their lives, in comparison with thirty-two percent of British, twenty-seven percent of Italians, twenty-one percent of Germans and eleven percent of French.¹⁸ As it is correctly stated, church attendance is a far better predictor of political affiliation than income in the US.¹⁹ The importance of religion for Americans is described successfully in a statement by US Lieutenant-General William (Jerry) Boykin, the deputy undersecretary of defense for intelligence: terrorism is “our spiritual enemy that will only be defeated if we come against them in the name of Jesus.”²⁰ This senior Pentagon official, commenting on Bush’s election in 2000, claimed that while the majority of Americans did not vote for George W. Bush, he was put into the White House by God.²¹ There is also a connection between America’s religiosity and its tendency to see foreign policy in moral terms.

*To Americans, evil exists and can be fought in their lives and in the world. Compared with Europe, this is a different world-view in both senses: different prevailing attitudes, different ways of looking at the world.*²²

As the case of patriotism, the issue of religiosity also touches upon other issues like family ties, homosexuality and gay marriage. Before the 2000 election between George W. Bush and Al Gore, the *New York Times* published a map of the market for pornography in the US. The results of the election show that Gore won “the areas with the highest percentages of sex films in the home-video market and Mr. Bush carried the areas with the lowest percentage.”²³

In contrast, Europeans, because they are not as religious as Americans, approach homosexuality and gay marriage in a more liberal way. In fact, for the last twenty years, the trend in Europe has been towards liberalization in the area of social legislation dealing with divorce, abortion, and sexual behaviour.²⁴ Recently, for example, the Spanish government approved a bill to legalize gay marriages. Even in the case of the United Kingdom, where the Queen is the Supreme Governor of the Church of England and has the designation “Defender of the Faith,” religion does not play a major role in the political life of the country and/or the way the British choose their leaders. For historical reasons, the Archbishop of Canterbury and York and certain other senior bishops of the Church of England are entitled to sit in the House of Lords, but never use religion either to interpret political events or to ask people to vote for a specific candidate. In fact, during 2004, the British government introduced for discussion in the Parliament two bills that are characterized as a further step towards greater liberalization in the area of social legislation.²⁵ The same path towards greater liberalization has characterized the relevant EU legislation. Abba Seraphim of the Coptic Orthodox church in the UK, commenting on the recent EU legislation that banned discrimination in the workplace on the grounds of religion, belief or sexual orientation, states that:

*if implemented here [in the UK] it could mean that religious schools, charities and churches could face legal action for either refusing to employ atheists or for dismissing staff who convert to non-Christian beliefs.*²⁶

The gap in important values for Europeans and Americans is becoming more serious, if we examine how the inhabitants of the two continents approach the “core values” of the other. Europeans are bothered by those features of American life, and Americans are bothered by the liberal approaches taken by Europeans. As has been discussed:

*To Europeans, religion is the strangest and most disturbing feature of American exceptionalism. They worry that fundamentalists are hijacking the country. They find it extraordinary that three times as many Americans believe in the virgin birth as in evolution. They fear that America will go on a “crusade” (a term briefly used by Mr Bush himself) in the Muslim world or cut aid to poor countries lest it be used for birth control.*²⁷

Like the philosophers of the Enlightenment, Europeans argue that modernization is the enemy of religion. In this way, bearing in mind what has happened in their own case, they believe that as countries modernize and get richer, organized religion will decline. However, such a development has not taken place in the American case, and Europeans cannot understand this.²⁸ The same lack of comprehension exists with

the Americans who cannot understand the liberal approaches of Europeans on issues like religion, gay marriages, and homosexuality in general.

The gap in value differences, even though it existed in the past, has been widening in recent years. Americans are becoming more conservative than they were in the 1960s. During that period a Gallup poll found that

53% of Americans thought churches should not be involved in politics, and 22% thought members of the clergy should not even mention candidates for public office from the pulpit. By 1996, these numbers had reversed: 54% thought it was fine for churches to talk about political and social issues, and 20% thought even stump speeches were permissible in church. These shifts in opinion have given a boost to one particular group of churches: evangelical Protestants.²⁹

As it will be presented later, this path towards religion is of crucial importance and plays a decisive role in the way Americans choose their leaders.

The events of September 11 not only increased the importance that Americans place on moral values, but also was a reminder of the necessity for moral values to govern their actions. After September 11,

expressions of both love of country and love of God spiked. This did not necessarily mean Americans suddenly became more patriotic or religious. Rather, the spike was a reminder of what is important to them. It was like a bolt of lightning, briefly illuminating the landscape but not changing it.³⁰

The murder of over 3,000 people in the events of 9/11 increased the patriotic feelings of Americans since it was the first time in many years that America had been attacked. In this context, in 2002, the “[US] army met its recruitment target in record time, suggesting that the obligations of citizenship were being taken up more enthusiastically.”³¹ After 9/11, several books on the apocalypse became bestsellers in the US.³² Americans increased their trust in the president, the Congress and other national institutions, distancing themselves even more from Europeans who accept and support the pooling of their countries’ sovereignty in Brussels.

Even though this article does not touch on anti-Americanism or anti-Europeanism, it is important to mention that the differences on important values inevitably influences the way Europeans and Americans view each other. A survey by the Pew Research Centre at the University of Maryland published in March 2004 shows that only thirty-seven percent of French surveyed and thirty-eight percent of Germans had a positive attitude towards America. In the same poll, thirty-three percent of Americans had a positive view of France and fifty percent of Americans had a good view of Germany.³³ In the same spirit, the survey shows that fifty-eight percent of French and sixty percent of Germans believed that the US war on terrorism “was being fought ‘to control Middle East oil.’”³⁴

In general, Europeans and Americans have important differences over the values that matter. Europe is a secular place compared with the US, and America is conservative, compared with Europe. Social tides in Europe are moving against the conservative values championed by the American people. The Brookings Institution,

knowing the importance of moral values in American political life, recently organized an event with the title “Moral Values, Politics and the Faith Factor.” In describing the event, the Brookings Institution writes:

as President Bush begins his second presidential term on January 20, he is expected to continue to frame his approach to governance and political decisions within the context of his faith and to infuse the political process with his personal set of values. Bush's re-election was boosted by the overwhelming support he received from evangelical Christians and from those who ranked 'moral values' as the determining factor in how they cast their ballots.³⁵

The situation is also well described in an article in *The Economist*:

Europe's landscape, architecture, customs and place-names may be steeped in Christian history, but few Europeans go to church...Over abortion, the transatlantic gap is wide and widening. In America, the political initiative lies with those who want tighter curbs; in most parts of Europe the opposite is true.³⁶

BUSH'S RE-ELECTION

The majority of the analyses of the reasons for Bush's victory in the first US presidential race since September 11 and with a turnout of some 120 million people (the largest as a share of the electorate since 1968) were based on the findings of the relevant exit polls. According to the National Election Poll, the majority of voters in the 2004 elections, twenty-two percent, placed moral values above other issues, such as the economy or terrorism, when choosing the president. Four-fifths of those who had moral values as a top concern voted for Bush. At the same time, Bush got seventy-six percent of the evangelical vote and the great majority of the people who attend religious service weekly, married women and white born-again Christians.³⁷ Exit polls proved clearly that issues like abortion and gay marriage were more important for Americans than transatlantic relations, the war on terrorism, and the economy. In analyzing the results of the 2004 elections, political experts at the Brookings Institution who expected Kerry to be elected, concluded that they

didn't appreciate the extent to which other Americans felt that the whole nature of their belief system—their faith, their lifestyles—were being threatened, and this was an opportunity to act on that.³⁸

As it is stated in the first issue of *The Economist* after the US elections, “the most important explanation for Mr Bush's success was the unexpected appearance of ‘moral values’ as the top issue of the campaign.”³⁹

In this regard, the re-election of President Bush was a logical consequence, since the American nation viewed him as a candidate who shared its values. Americans had chosen Bush's “Manichaeic clash of conflicting world views” approach because they felt that his policies were inspired from the same value as theirs.⁴⁰ Americans showed approval of the nature and direction of his domestic and foreign policies

since every election with a sitting president can be considered a “referendum on the incumbent.”⁴¹ The results proved the importance of conservatism in the US and how much moral values matter.⁴² The result of the elections was a clear message to George W. Bush to continue his own agenda on both domestic (including abortion and gay marriage) and international issues.⁴³

Religion is one key dimension of moral values. Americans voted for a president that “starts every cabinet meeting with a prayer. He has woven religious themes into his presidency...[and] interpreted September 11th in terms of ‘an axis of evil’ and finding the ‘evil ones.’”⁴⁴ Americans chose the candidate who made the claim that God wanted him to be president.⁴⁵ Bush, the most openly religious president that the US has ever had, has called Jesus his favourite philosopher. Members of his administration arrange Bible study classes and support the major involvement of religious institutions on social policy issues.⁴⁶

Bush’s election is also a depiction of the other major dimension of moral values, patriotism. His administration

*wears patriotism on its sleeve...it flaunts this quality [patriotism] more openly, using images of the flag on every occasion and relishing America’s military might to an unusual extent. More than any administration since Ronald Reagan’s, this one is focused narrowly on America’s national interest.*⁴⁷

Americans voted for the candidate who works closely with conservative activists: members of the American Conservative Union, the National Rifle Association, and the Evangelical Community.⁴⁸

In no other developed country are religion, abortion, stem cell research, and gay marriages such galvanizing political issues. In other developed countries, leading politicians do not even mention these issues that are so critical for American politicians.⁴⁹ In no European country would a candidate with the beliefs of George W. Bush have a high probability of being elected. In this regard, Americans and Europeans have different criteria on the values that matter. One may consider, for example, the issue of war, which is related to moral values. “Americans tend to believe wars settle things. They are willing to support vast military spending and to see the most fearsome weapons deployed.”⁵⁰ In a way, this also explains Bush’s re-election, since no US president has lost an election in the midst of a war.⁵¹ The findings of a recent Pew Research poll prove the connection among the basic values of Americans. According to the poll, nine out of ten Americans regard measures to protect the United States from a terrorist attack as a top priority. “Only three in ten think that Mr. Bush has gone too far in restricting civil liberties as part of the fight against terrorism; half feel that his measures to protect the country are not tough enough. Four in ten even say that torture can sometimes be justified.”⁵²

The importance of moral values in the re-election of George W. Bush was a continuation of the way Americans voted in 2000. In the 2000 election, sixty-three percent of those who went to church more than once a week voted for George W. Bush; sixty-one percent of those who never went voted for Al Gore. About seventy

percent of those who believed that abortion should always be available voted for Mr. Gore, while seventy-four percent of those who believed that abortion should always be illegal voted for Mr. Bush. “As Pete du Pont, a former governor of Delaware, pointed out, a map showing the sales and rentals of porn movies bore an eerie resemblance to the map of the 2000 election results.”⁵³

On November 2, 2004, Americans voted not only for the President, but also for congressmen and other political positions at various levels of government. The relevant exit polls showed that voters regarded moral values as their top concern. These results proved the importance of moral values for the American people, as the balance in Congress shifted in a distinctly conservative direction, both in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

*Many Republican candidates painted their opponents as “liberal”, while highlighting their own socially conservative credentials. In Louisiana, for instance, David Vitter became the state’s first Republican senator since Reconstruction thanks, in large part, to his uncompromising stance on abortion. In South Carolina, Jim DeMint not only pledged his opposition to all abortions, but announced that neither homosexuals nor unmarried pregnant women should be able to teach in public schools.*⁵⁴

The victory of the Republicans in both chambers made them more conservative, “not just because there are more Republicans but because the new Republicans are a particularly conservative lot, both economically and socially. Moderate Republicans in Congress are now an “endangered species.”⁵⁵

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT’S REJECTION OF ROCCO BUTTIGLIONE

Most of the academics, politicians, and journalists who are dealing with the European Union’s affairs claim that one of the major problems in the functioning of the Union is the “democratic deficit”—the fact that all major institutions of the EU are governed by people not elected by the European population, but appointed by the governments of the member states. In this regard, there is a continual discussion on the necessity to increase the power of the European Parliament, which is the only European body directly elected by the people. An incident that took place in the European Parliament in 2004 was a welcoming development in the attempts to face the EU’s current “democratic deficit.”

Rocco Buttiglione, the Italian nominated for the justice and home affairs portfolio in the European Commission, a philosopher and devout Catholic who has written papal encyclicals, was rejected by the European Parliament after his hearing in the relevant committee. At his confirmation hearings, Buttiglione supported that woman’s role was to stay at home and raise children, and considered homosexuality a sin. His comments in the hearing procedure, along with some other similar statements, like “the family exists in order to allow women to have children and to have the protection of a male who takes care of them”⁵⁶ led the Civil Liberties Committee of the European Parliament to vote against his appointment.

The president of the European Parliament, Josep Borrel, commenting on Buttiglione's statements, described them as shocking, while other members of the Parliament heavily criticized Italy's European Commission nominee. As a result, the incoming President of the European Commission, Jose Manuel Barroso, was obliged to withdraw his proposed list of EU commissioners, since the European Parliament does not have the power to reject individual members of the European Commission and can only endorse or reject the entire twenty-five-member Commission.

In an article written after his rejection from the European Parliament, Rocco Buttiglione touches on the issue of value differences between Europeans and Americans. He states in his article, "George W. Bush concluded his election victory speech with 'God bless America.' It's likely that in the European Parliament, the U.S. president would be considered unfit for his job on account of his religious beliefs."⁵⁷

Buttiglione's case was the second incident within the EU during the last year that proves how different Americans and Europeans are in approaching these so-called "moral values." During the two-year long effort to write a constitution for the EU,

one of the most fraught issues was whether to insert a reference to Europe's Christian roots into the statement of European values that serves as the constitution's preamble. Despite the Vatican's strenuous lobbying, Christianity did not make it into the final version of the constitution agreed to last June [2004]

since the great majority of Europeans were against such a development.⁵⁸

The incident of the rejection of the Italian politician's nomination was a very important development for Europe and all major European channels, while those which normally ignored the parliament covered it extensively.

Only by arguing about values, rather than economics-so the theory goes-can EU politicians engage ordinary citizens, and convince them that the Union does more than regulate the curvature of bananas. The federalist hope the battle of Buttiglione will mark the coming-of-age of the European Parliament.⁵⁹

Even the President of the European Commission, who supposedly was "obliged" to defend Buttiglione, stated after the incident,

These last days have demonstrated that the European Union is a strong political construction and that this [European] Parliament, elected by popular vote across all our member states, has indeed a vital role to play in the governance of Europe.⁶⁰

In this regard, Buttiglione's case was not a minor incident in the EU, but something that would influence decisively the future of the Union, since it was the first time that ordinary Europeans felt that their ideas and beliefs were rightly represented in an EU institution.

CONCLUSION

The gap on core values between Americans and Europeans is widening and is “starting to affect perceptions of foreign policy interest on which the transatlantic alliance is based.”⁶¹ The disappearance of the common enemy, the Soviet Union, which kept the two continents together, has made it much easier for value differences to influence transatlantic relations. Also, “in the past, cultural differences have been suppressed by the shared values of American and European elites.”⁶² However, today, “elite opinion is now even more sharply divided than popular opinion.”⁶³

It is obvious from the above analysis that there are important differences in the values of importance between Europeans and Americans. These differences become more obvious when the citizens of the two continents choose their leadership. As it is correctly stated, “American politicians clearly spend much more time debating questions of values than do most politicians in Europe.”⁶⁴ In this regard, values influence the conduct of a country’s affairs, including foreign policy. Therefore, differences in values are able to help explain today’s rift in the transatlantic alliance. It is part of the reason why the US and Europe have differences over the importance of international treaties and the appropriate uses of soft or hard power. It is why opinion polls in Europe show strong support for the European Union to be developed as a global player and counterbalance to US power.⁶⁵ As Buttiglione, the European who has been rejected for the position of the European Commissioner, states,

*If you consider that Mr. Bush won re-election in part because of his firm stand on family values and other moral issues, it becomes apparent that Europe and the United States are drifting apart not only on foreign policy but also on their vision of a democratic society and of the proper relationship between politics and ethics.*⁶⁶

Perhaps it might be useful to reflect upon Robert Kagan’s statement that Americans are from Mars and Europeans are from Venus.

Notes

¹ Bruce Russett, *Grasping the Democratic Peace* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993), 11.

² Timothy Garton Ash, *Free World: Why a Crisis of the West Reveals the Opportunity of our Time* (London: Penguin Group, 2004). In an article in the *Guardian*, Timothy Garton Ash describes an incident that shows at a certain extent how certain values are very important for Americans. He writes “I was driving down Broadway the other day and the cab driver had his radio turned to a Christian gospel station called Family Radio. The announcer was describing a book called *The Light and the Glory: Did God have a Plan for America?* The answer is yes. God’s plan the intelligence dossier on this one, if you’re wondering, is in the gospel according to St. Luke, chapter 2, verse 32—is that the Americans should be “a light to lighten the Gentiles.” Or, as the announcer put it, in a slightly sexed-up version of Luke’s faith-based intelligence, Americans have been sent “as a light to the world.” Timothy Garton Ash, “What to do about Bush,” *The Guardian*, 11 November 2004. Read also the speech of Timothy Garton Ash at the Council on Foreign Relations in New York, “America and Europe: The Future of the West,” available at: www.cfr.org, accessed on November 26, 2004.

³ Charles Grant, “Choosing Europe,” *Perspect* (August 26, 2004), 32-35. In the same article, Grant claims that “About half of Americans attend church once a week, compared with less a fifth of Europeans. Americans and Europeans think differently about patriotism, gun control and the death penalty”, 35.

⁴ Ivo H. Daalder, “The End of Atlanticism,” *Beyond Paradise and Power*, Tod Lindberg ed. (New York: Routledge, 2005), 55.

- ⁵ “Night Fell on a Different World,” *The Economist* 364, 7 September 2002, 22.
- ⁶ “Night Fell on a Different World,” 22.
- ⁷ “Living with a Superpower,” *The Economist* 366, 4 January 2003, p. 19.
- ⁸ “Us Versus Us; American Values Divide as Well as Define the Country,” *The Economist* 369, 8 November 2003, 9.
- ⁹ “Living with a Superpower,” *The Economist* 366, 4 January 2003, 20.
- ¹⁰ “Night Fell on a Different World,” *The Economist* 364, 7 September 2002, 22.
- ¹¹ “One Nation After All,” *The Economist* 372, 11 September 2004, 32.
- ¹² “The Vietnam Syndrome,” *The Economist* 371, 17 April 2002, 34.
- ¹³ “Home of the Brave,” *The Economist* 369, 8 November 2003.
- ¹⁴ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁵ *Ibid.* at 14.
- ¹⁶ Francis Fukuyama, “Does ‘the West’ still exist?” *Beyond Paradise and Power*, Tod Lindberg ed., (NY: Routledge, 2005) 152. In the same article Fukuyama states that “Germans for many years after World War II taught their children not to display the German flag or cheer too loudly at football matches. Although the French and, in a different way, the British continue to feel a sense of broader national mission in the world, it is safe to say that few other European countries regard their own political institutions as universal models for the rest of the world to follow. Indeed, many Europeans regard their national institutions as having a much lower degree of legitimacy than international ones, with the European Union occupying a place in between.”
- ¹⁷ “Night Fell on a Different World,” 22.
- ¹⁸ “Real Politics, at Last?” *The Economist* 373, 30 October 2004, 60.
- ¹⁹ “The Politics of Values,” *The Economist* 372, 9 October 2004, 28.
- ²⁰ “A Tale of Two Faces,” *The Economist* 369, 25 October 2003, 32.
- ²¹ *Ibid.* In the same articles, the author writes that “General Boykin has been going round evangelical churches (often in uniform) saying such things as ‘I knew my God was bigger than his God, and his was an idol’ (referring to a Muslim Somali warlord). In June 2002, he showed the congregation of the First Baptist Church of Broken Arrow, Oklahoma, photographs of Mogadishu, Somalia’s capital, with a dark smudge on them. ‘Ladies and gentlemen,’ he declared, ‘this is your enemy. It is a demonic presence in the city that God revealed to me.’”
- ²² “Living with a Superpower,” 19.
- ²³ “The Politics of Values,” 29.
- ²⁴ Abba Seraphim, “Christians Living in a Secular Society,” *The Glastonbury Review*, Vol. xii, No. 111, December 2004, 102-10.
- ²⁵ The Gender Recognition Bill and the Civil Partnership Bill.
- ²⁶ Abba Seraphim, “Christians Living in a Secular Society,” 105.
- ²⁷ “Therapy of the masses,” *The Economist* 369, 8 Nov. 2003, 12.
- ²⁸ *Ibid.*
- ²⁹ “Therapy of the Masses,” 12.
- ³⁰ “A Nation Apart,” *The Economist* 369, 8 November 2003, 3.
- ³¹ “Night Fell on a Different World,” 22.
- ³² *Ibid.*, 22.
- ³³ “A Creaking Partnership,” *The Economist* 371, 5 June 2004, 23.
- ³⁴ *Ibid.*, 24.
- ³⁵ The Brookings Institution, “Moral Values, Politics and the Faith Factor,” (18 Jan. 2005), available at: <http://www.brookings.edu/comm/events/20050118.htm>, accessed on 24 January 2005. Full transcript available at <http://www.brookings.edu/dybdocroot/comm/events/20050118.pdf>. During the event, Dr. Richard Land, President of the Southern Baptist Convention’s Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission, claimed that “...when I say that we won this debate with the secular fundamentalists, I point to the 2004 elections as sort of the final test of that. The American people have decided that they want religious values to be part of public policy...I was part of a BBC special on what the world thinks about God, and the BBC was surprised to find that when they did their polling they found that

only 17 percent of people in the United Kingdom said that religion was important in their lives....Sixty-one percent of Americans said that religion was very important in their lives. And I would argue that it's getting more important, not less important," 33-34.

³⁶ "Real Politics, at Last?," 60.

³⁷ "A Sweet Victory... and a Tough Loss," *Newsweek* 144, 15 November 2004, 10. For further details, see the summary of Pew Research Center findings, "Moral Values: How Important?" 11 November 2004, available at <http://people-press.org/reports/print.php3?PageID=909> (accessed 16 Dec. 2004)

³⁸ The Brookings Institution, "Event Summary: The 2004 Election Results," (5 Nov. 2004), <http://www.brookings.edu/printme.wbs?page=/comm/op-ed/20041105results.htm>. In the same meeting, Visiting Fellow Michael McDonald, who worked with the exit-polling firm Edison Mitofsky on Election Day, stated that, "Gay marriage was clearly pulling people to the polls," citing evidence that gay marriage issues in battleground states drew a 6.6 percent increase in voter turnout.

³⁹ "Back to Basics," *The Economist* 373, 6 November 2004, 28.

⁴⁰ "A Sweet Victory...and a Tough Loss," 14.

⁴¹ "How to Pick a President," *The Economist* 372, 9 Oct. 2004, 3.

⁴² Read the comments of representatives of several US based conservative groups, <http://www.baptistpress.org/bpnews.asp?ID=19475>, seen on November 10, 2004.

⁴³ "And Now... Four More Years: Bush Pleads for Unity as Clear Victory Consolidates Power," *Guardian*, 4 November 2004, 1

⁴⁴ "So Now You Know," *The Economist* 372, 8 October 2004, 7.

⁴⁵ "A Hot Line to Heaven," *The Economist*, 18 December 2004, 39.

⁴⁶ "A Nation Apart," 4.

⁴⁷ *Ibid*, 4.

⁴⁸ "So Now you Know," *The Economist* 372, 9 Oct. 2004, 8.

⁴⁹ "The Politics of Values," 28.

⁵⁰ "Night Fell on a Different World," 22.

⁵¹ Fareed Zakaria, "Writing Prose For a New Term," *Newsweek*, 144, 15 November 2004, 33.

⁵² "The Enemy Within," *The Economist* 372, 9 Oct. 2004, 24.

⁵³ "Us Versus Us," 9.

⁵⁴ "The Republican Grip Tightens," *The Economist* 373, 6 Nov. 2004, 30.

⁵⁵ "The Republican Grip Tightens," 31.

⁵⁶ "EU Panel Opposes Justice Nominee," BBC News (11 Oct 2004), available at: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/3734572.stm>.

⁵⁷ Rocco Buttiglione, "Of God and Men," 10 November 2004, available at:

<http://opinionjournal.com/extra/?id=110005873>, accessed on November 20, 2004. See also Rocco Buttiglione, "Social Justice in the Changing Economic Environment: Encounter or Conflict," (in the winter 1991 issue of *Faith and Reason* published from US based Christendom Press), available at: <http://ewtn.com/library/BUSINESS/FR91402.htm> accessed on November 19, 2004.

⁵⁸ "Real Politics, at Last?" 60.

⁵⁹ "Real Politics, at Last?" 60.

⁶⁰ Geoff Meade, "MEPs [Members of European Parliament] win battle over anti-gay commissioner," *Independence*, 27 October 2004.

⁶¹ "Living with a Superpower," 20.

⁶² *Ibid*.

⁶³ *Ibid*.

⁶⁴ "The Politics of Values," 28.

⁶⁵ "A Creaking Partnership," 24.

⁶⁶ Buttiglione, "Of God and Men."