

## PART THREE

# Freedom and Order

### *Preface*

The essential difference between the New World and the Old is not a hypothesis by social scientists, but a legacy with which we have been endowed. It establishes the priority we place on freedom versus order. It is the idea of individual liberty from the bottom up that gives America its identity in contrast to the identity of Europe as a tree of rule from the top down.

We see the contrast everywhere, in how we describe who we are, the qualities of life we prize, the leadership we admire, and the societies we respect. The contrast is made bolder by the lessons we draw from our respective historical experiences, and therefore by our descriptions of the paths that lead to freedom and peace. The contrast is found in how we explain who we are, in how we lead, in how we address one another with words of condescension (Europeans speaking to Americans) or incredulity (Americans addressing Europeans) when we disagree, and in the different priorities we place on freedom and order.

All these things, in the current context, become the yeast for acerbic disputes on all manner of concerns: free trade and protectionism, agricultural policy, environmental protection and global warming, governance of the Internet, acceptable tools of diplomacy, cultural diversity and globalization, the international criminal court, the death penalty, how to alleviate poverty and combat the spread of AIDS, the advantages of “soft”

versus “hard” power, how to promote peace in the Middle East, the use of military force, how to control the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, how to address the causes of terrorism, the role and authority of UNESCO and the United Nations, and finally, how to define what constitutes threats to freedom and peace and how to employ the means to preserve both.

The most colorful illustrations of how we have conversed with each other recently, and also the most lamentable, are not yet bold examples in history textbooks. Since 2002, however, they have been cited with relish and documented ad infinitum in the European and American press. For the multitude of examples we have ourselves to thank. It has been with our own words that we have provided future historians ample proof that the essential difference is still alive, well, and very much with us.

The references and citations presented in the three essays which follow should not be dismissed as simply a collection of excerpts from press clippings. That is not what they are. Rather, they are the evidence of how we, Americans and Europeans, have more recently chosen to unravel and analyze the complexities of the world around us. The object is not to resolve arguments nor to pass judgment on who is right and who is wrong, but to shed light on why we do not always agree on the meaning of what we see.

There is also a specific purpose. How we consort together warrants our reflection because new crossroads await Europeans and Americans. Sooner, rather than later, we will have to decide where the crossroads lead and which way we want to go. Will we act as rivals, or to recall the words of Benjamin Franklin, will we hang together? Will it be the force of things that determines our choice, or will it be obligations written in our hearts?