

# US cultural diplomacy

# History of US cultural diplomacy

- ▶ 1898 - American-Spanish war (gained Philippines and the Caribbean) - start of cultural diplomacy

During the First World War following Germany - Propaganda

Creel Committee - 1917-1919 (information campaigns, scholarships for Europeans, cultural exchange, university exchange)

“How we advertised America” (before it - a negative image of US as nobody knew about it)

# History of US cultural diplomacy

- ▶ 1930s - response to Nazi Germany's "cultural offensive" and USSR in Latin America  
a Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations

"Considering that the purpose for which the Conference was called would be advanced by greater mutual knowledge and understanding of the people and institutions of the countries represented...; and that such results would be appreciably promoted by an exchange of professors, teachers, and students among the American countries, as well as by encouragement of a closer relationship between unofficial organizations which exert an influence on the formation of public opinion ...the Governments represented here have resolved to conclude a convention for that purpose"

# History of US cultural diplomacy

- ▶ 1936 - cultural department in State department
- ▶ 1938 - a meeting on inter-American cultural cooperation
- ▶ 1939 - II World War → closer relations with Latin America
- ▶ 1942 - Voice of America
- ▶ After the war - different views on the development of cultural diplomacy
- ▶ After the War - cultural programs for Germany and Japan
- ▶ 1948 - the United States Information and Cultural Exchange Act (promotion of liberal values for the global elite)
- ▶ 1990-es - concept of cultural transfer (dialogue between cultural values)



More profound cultural programs in terms  
of the Cold War

# Digital diplomacy in US (2010-2012)

- ▶ Direct dialogue between the US and active foreign bloggers
- ▶ Creation of special sites and accounts
- ▶ Transfer of technology to foreign political leaders
- ▶ Interest of State secretary of H. Clinton
- ▶ Political instrument for support of liberal movements and values

## Aims:

- Social activism (fight for the citizen's rights)
- Cyber-dissidents (organization of street protests)
- Digital activism (passive people who listen and transfer the information)

# Digital diplomacy in US (2010-2012)

- ▶ Special sites (Alliance for youth movements, voices for democracy, Movements.org) for political and social activists
- ▶ Creation of viral videos (democratic videos)
- ▶ Representation of political units in Facebook to contact foreign audience (followed by France, Russia, Iran)
- ▶ Twitter-diplomacy (retweets and hashtags) and online conferences
- ▶ Local social networks (Afghanistan Twitter, Cuba Facebook, etc)
- ▶ Conference on Cyber Dissidents, Global success and Challenges

# THE RESULTS OF B.OBAMA PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

- ▶ 2013 - Concept of strategic communication (propaganda) in public diplomacy of USA (short information campaign)
- ▶ Center of antiterrorist communication (rapid reaction to anti-American announcements)
- ▶ 2016 - change in the law of external informational activity ( channels must coordinate its information with external policy of the USA)
- ▶ The new beginning of the Cold War (return to propaganda in Russia - channel Current Time)
- ▶ Following the ideas of H.Clinton about the support of activists in the Internet
- ▶ Anti terrorist movement (anti-ISIS)
- ▶ Anti-propaganda department in State department - using active bloggers, deleting of terrorist accounts in Google, Facebook, Twitter

# US anti-terrorist diplomacy in Afghanistan and Pakistan

- ▶ 2014 - stabilization of the situation
  - Find some moderate people in the local society → create local elite from them
  - Creation of new channels (against propaganda of Taliban and Al-Qaida)
  - the 24\7 hour control

## Results

- ✓ SMS - propaganda
- ✓ New channels with new TV programs (civil rights, role of women, change of the image of police and army) - 65% of population
- ✓ Radio “Free Afghanistan” and “Radio Ashna”
- ✓ Active radio stations in frontier regions (not very popular -11% of people in these regions)
- ✓ Still the US government is losing



# Middle East

From the *end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century*: religious movements, private schools, charity funds

*Cold War:*

- ▶ THE USA didn't try to create its positive image
- ▶ Oil is the most important
- ▶ The elite wasn't ready to follow the western educational patterns
- ▶ Cultural policy of the USSR (necessity to restrain USSR)
- ▶ Educational programs for military
- ▶ Wide spread of English

1990-es - reduce of cultural programs due to collapse of the Soviet Union → 2000-es anti-American movements

# Middle East

2000-es:

- ▶ Skilled military men educated in the US
- ▶ Good knowledge of English
- ▶ Anti-Americanism



Terrorist attacks  
2001

# Middle East

- ▶ 2003 - the beginning of cultural diplomacy for the Middle East

Middle East Partnership Initiative (MEPI) 

The aim:

- The democratization of the society (political parties, role of women, loyal youth)
- The reform of the educational system
- The create of a new elite with western education



Shared values campaign  
(happy Muslims living in US)



*Fail!!!!*

## Middle East

- ▶ 2004 - new channel “Al-Horra” for Arab countries (documentaries: Arabs have a hand in developing America, positive response)
- ▶ Youth programs for active youngsters (from 1998 till 2009 - 19 times rise)
- ▶ Women emancipation (new programs for women - business programs, political programs)
- ▶ English learning (program: “Access” short-learning program)

# Russia

## Steps:

1. Cold-war period (support of dissidents, not mass propaganda, traditional cultural programs)
2. 1990-es (construction of democracy - different social classes)
3. 2000-es (support of social activism - youth programs)
4. 2015 - till now (support of dissidents)

# Cold-war period

- ▶ 1955 - East-west exchange (creation of new youth, reforms in 30 years)
- ▶ Show the soviet society an American society (Gorbachev)
- ▶ 1958 - treaty of programs of cultural diplomacy (5-7 people a year)
- ▶ Voice of America → in the beginning of 1960-es the ban of radio (jazz, nationalism among nations) - 10% of population
- ▶ Cultural representation - exhibitions (new technologies, painters, everyday life of ordinary people - consumer society) - 1959 (5 million people in Moscow and Leningrad)
- ▶ “Kitchen debates” between Khruchev and Nixon
- ▶ Magazine exchange (destabilization of elite)

# Post-soviet space

- ▶ At first - the reduction of public diplomacy funds and programs
- ▶ Agency of international development - instrument for political reforms, education of politicians, creation of parties and NGO
- ▶ Aim: democratization and Americanization of new countries
- ▶ 1989 - Support for east European Democracy (SEED)
- ▶ 1992 - Freedom Support Act (FSA) - 2milliards dollars (Russia, Ukraine, Kirgizia, Armenia)



Support of parties and civil initiatives (each year changing of budget)

New structures for elections

New Mass media

Democracy Corps (creation of new system)

New structures for market economy

New educational system

# Post-soviet space

- ▶ 1995-1996 - no to “Russian influence/Russian imperialism”
- ▶ Ukraine - the first priority (less support to Russia)
  - Creation of parties and new election system
  - Creation of new independent mass media
  - Network of NGOs



# Russia after the cold war

- ▶ 1992 - Freedom Support act
- ▶ SABIT - business traineeships for Russian entrepreneurs (19000 people) 

American companies come to Russian market

Creation of parties (“Yabloko”)

NGOs in regions (protection of human rights), direct support of projects

2000-es - reduce of financial support for these projects

Experts noted that civil society in Russia is dying  need for new strategy 

Stimulation of public activity of citizens in different area (political, ecological, health care)

Not very active use of the internet

Creation of association “Voice”

Youth exchange programs

# Russia after the cold war


- ▶ 2014 - new strategy (“information diplomacy”)
- ▶ Support of social activists through the internet (B.Obama - Stand with Civil society)
  - creation of new opposition leaders
- ▶ From 2016 - regional hubs in Eastern Europe (Prague civil society centre)
- ▶ Discretization of Russian interpretation of events (35 additional programs in Russian for post soviet space, massive support only in Ukraine)
- ▶ Current Time TV - American interpretation of Russian news (youth from 15 to 24)

# Education as an instrument of foreign policy

## ▶ Influence on educational system:

- Occupation of the country (Germany, Iraq)
- Aid in educational reform (Eastern Europe, Russia)
- National universities (American university in Egypt, Kirgizia)

## Germany:

- New disciplines (American studies, political science, humanitarian studies) to create a new student
  - Criticism: traditional conservative professors, elitism
  - Interdisciplinary method (professors are against)
  - New generation of young professors
- 
- Criticism from German professors
    - Structural change
  - Difficult to change the thinking of intellectuals (values are preserved)

# Education as an instrument of foreign policy

- ▶ 1940-es - Europe is far from American culture and values
- ▶ Transatlantic consensus through education

## “Reeducation of Europeans”

1. “Reeducation of elite” - US orientation
2. “Reform of economy” - creation of consumer society
3. “Reeducation of intellectuals” (US influence, not USSR one)
4. New youth with liberal values



Atlantic institute of international relations in Paris

- ▶ Spread of scientific and expert information about the unity Europe-US
  - ▶ Loyal and friendly discussions
  - ▶ New elite

# Education as an instrument of foreign policy

- ▶ Educational programs for new managers (more than 15000, MBA program, reeducation of professors) - 1970-es
- ▶ Trade unions (proliberal values)
- ▶ Education for intellectuals - transfer of values (The congress for cultural freedom till 1967 - criticism of USSR)
- ▶ Youth programs (new disciplines - European ideas, American studies, new textbooks, summer schools, NATO work)



- ▶ Americanization of Europe
- ▶ Anti-Americanism in universities

# US cultural diplomacy

## Mechanism:

- ▶ Governmental approach
- ▶ Foreign policy defines the priorities

## Aims:

- ▶ Political (change of political culture, change of regime)
- ▶ Educational (spread of values, reform of educational system)
- ▶ Creation of friendly atmosphere (loyal elite)

## Effectiveness:

- ▶ serious choosing of candidates - leaders
- ▶ maintenance of the link with a graduate
- ▶ communication with politicians, NGOs, journalists

# US cultural diplomacy

## Trends:

- ▶ *Information programs and propaganda* (short information campaigns, emotions, social networks, monologue propaganda against fact-checking)
- ▶ *Post-truth society*

# Trends in US cultural diplomacy

- ▶ Active involvement in - and funding for - cultural diplomacy programs by the federal government has most often been stimulated by a perceived foreign threat or crisis
- ▶ There may therefore be special challenges in maintaining the government's interest and funding, to say nothing of the creativity of its cultural diplomacy activities, in times when there seems to be less of a foreign policy threat
- ▶ The new threat to American security posed by international terrorism after September 11, 2001, is bound to have pervasive effects on the nature and direction of American cultural diplomacy
- ▶ In the world of American cultural diplomacy, there has often been a thin line between making the case for America's perceived interests, the "propaganda" side of United States information programs, and the softer side of U.S. cultural diplomacy, the programs that primarily emphasize the two-way building of cultural understanding, with all that implies



# Trends in US cultural diplomacy

- ▶ Foreign policy making and domestic policymaking are inextricably intertwined
- ▶ Government organizational structures and government reorganizations of the federal government's cultural diplomacy activities have involved some very real stakes and some very real policy values
- ▶ Programs in cultural diplomacy are often strongest if they have a firm institutional base, grounded in legislation, and when they have strong support at the top of the federal government
- ▶ Cultural diplomacy programs also may benefit if they are fortunate enough to develop a political constituency that cares about those programs
- ▶ Programs remain an important aspect of the policy despite budget difficulties
- ▶ Some of the fundamental goals of cultural diplomacy appear to be like the value of the arts