

Balgarina G.Z.,
Kuzembayeva A.B.

**Cultural policy as a element of
US soft power**

The article deals with the analyses the US cultural diplomacy evolution from the Cold War era to present day. The authors discuss the evolution of the major trends, institutions of U.S. foreign cultural policy. The authors consider such concepts as foreign cultural policy, cultural diplomacy, and 'soft power'. Analysis of evolution of US cultural diplomacy showed that the attitude of the American political establishment to the culture which was considered as a tool of political influence, and a component of «soft power» was not unique and dependent on external factors, historical circumstances, values and political attitudes of the ruling circles. It is shown that cultural and educational exchange programs remain a key component of the foreign policy.

Key words: US, cultural diplomacy, values, soft power, cultural programs.

Балгарина Г.Ж.,
Күзембаева А.Б.

**«Жұмсақ күштің» құрамдас
бөлігі ретіндегі АҚШ-тың
сыртқы мәдени саясаты**

Мақалада қырғи-қабақ соғысы кезеңінен бүгінгі күнге дейінгі АҚШ мәдени дипломатиясының дамуы қарастырылған. Авторлар негізгі үрдістерді, АҚШ сыртқы мәдени саясатының институттарына сипаттама берген. Мақалада сыртқы мәдени саясат, мәдени дипломатия, жұмсақ күш сияқты ұғымдар қарастырылған. Сыртқы мәдени саясат, мәдени дипломатия дипломатия ұғымдарына байланысты шетелдік ғалымдардың тұжырымдары сарапталған. АҚШ мәдени дипломатиясының тарихи дамуына талдау жасай отырып, авторлар «жұмсақ күштің» құрамдас бөлігі және сыртқы саяси ықпалдың құралы ретінде қарастырылатын мәдениетке қатысты американдық саяси истеблишменттің көзқарасы біртекті болмағандығын, сыртқы факторларға, тарихи жағдайға, билік басындағы саяси топтардың құндылықтарына байланысты болғандығын көрсетеді. Мәдени және білім беру бағдарламаларының сыртқы саясаттың негізгі құраушы болып табылатындығы айқындалды.

Түйін сөздер: АҚШ, мәдени дипломатия, құндылықтар, жұмсақ күш, мәдени бағдарламалар.

Балгарина Г.Ж.,
Күзембаева А.Б.

**Внешняя культурная политика
как компонент
«мягкой силы» США**

В статье рассматривается эволюция культурной дипломатии со времен холодной войны и до настоящего времени. Проводится анализ основополагающих тенденций в изучении американской внешней культурной политики. Авторы рассматривают основные подходы к определению понятий внешняя культурная политика, культурная дипломатия, мягкая сила. Анализ истории культурной дипломатии США показывает, что отношение американского политического истеблишмента к культуре как инструменту внешнеполитического влияния и компонента «мягкой силы» не было однозначным и зависело от внешних факторов, исторических обстоятельств, ценностно-политических установок властвующих кругов. Выявлено, что культурные и образовательные обмены являются ключевым элементом культурной дипломатии США.

Ключевые слова: США, культурная дипломатия, ценности, мягкая сила, культурные обмены.

**CULTURAL POLICY AS
A ELEMENT OF US SOFT
POWER****Introduction**

An increasing role of culture in the foreign policy of the states has become a key feature of current international relations. Nowadays, the application of cultural policy and cultural diplomacy has developed considerably and most countries today present their culture abroad as part of their international activity. Culture is often assumed to be a vehicle that facilitates processes of dialogue among different publics and across national boundaries.

Governments increasingly come to regard cultural policy as their special prerogative to represent the cultural achievements of their nation in international society. Joseph Nye argues that states should use not only their military and economic power in the international arena but should also quantify and wield their cultural resources to generate a certain power he calls «soft power.» According to Nye, soft power lies in the ability of a nation to entice, attract, and fascinate other countries and societies so that a country «may obtain the outcomes it wants in world politics because of other countries admiring its values, emulating its example, aspiring to its level of prosperity and openness—want to follow it» [1]. Nye first used this concept to describe America's capabilities, but later cited examples from Europe, Japan, India, and China. In this sense, if a certain state wants to succeed in world affairs and in the global economy, it needs to actively promote its culture and values abroad. Thus, the promotion of cultural resources by states directly relates to its interests: to the purported «soft power» of nations.

Assenting to Nye, Zbigniew Brzezinski stated that America's mass culture exercises a magnetic appeal, especially on the world's youth. Its attraction may be derived from the hedonistic quality of the lifestyle it projects, but its global appeal is undeniable [2].

US Government intervention in cultural diplomacy reached its height during the Cold War. When the United States assumed the mantle of global leadership after World War II, cultural diplomacy was considered a central part of its strategy. During the Cold War, cultural diplomacy focused on both elites and the public masses and included such initiatives as Voice of America, a multimedia international broadcasting service launched in 1942, the 1946 Fulbright Program for citizen cultural exchanges, Arts in Embassies Program

showcasing American art in embassies abroad, and the American Centers/Corners which often included open access to information.

The 1950s were a time when US foreign policy was supporting a range of initiatives that promoted Western values and democracy in Europe to counter Soviet Cold War propaganda. This included both overt and covert cultural diplomacy. The creation of the United States Information Agency (USIA) in 1953 provided an instrument for the promotion of US cultural diplomacy and music (especially jazz, rock and contemporary classical) was to be a particular focus of its operations – more than 100 performers were sent to 89 countries in a four year period in the 1950s.

In 1980s, foreign policy has changed considerably as culture has been considered as efficient tools of diplomacy. However, with the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the ‘Cold War’ the view that prevailed in Washington DC was that there was less need to pursue cultural diplomacy initiatives. Programme budgets suffered considerable reductions. The United States Information Agency and its programmes were absorbed and subsequently dismantled by the Department of State.

Following September 11, 2001, the United States has reinvigorated its cultural diplomacy initiatives. As a result, the U.S. government began to revive its cultural diplomacy efforts in order to improve its strained relations with the Middle East and restore its national image. However, it was not until 2009 that President Obama, in his Cairo speech, acknowledged that military power alone could not solve existing problems in the region, nor improve diplomatic relations.

This article casts a wide historical view to analyze the American government’s policy toward the promotion of its culture worldwide by focusing on main periods: during the cold war up to the present time. It is shown that at present, senior U.S. government officials have more precisely endorsed people to people exchanges to foster mutual understanding and respect between nations, and even to enhance national security and economic competitiveness.

Notion of Culture as Reflected in International Relations Literature

The study of cultural aspects of foreign policy is not clearly defined conceptually. Instead scholars refer to it as ‘cultural relations’ or ‘cultural diplomacy’, or simply use a descriptive combination of words, i.e. ‘culture and international relations’ and

the like. Content of the notion changes depending on the emphasis its user sets. For example, German scholar Martinus Emge emphasizes in his definition the function of cultural diplomacy as a vehicle of foreign policy. He adopts the view that foreign cultural policy is just another tool of a country’s diplomatic repertoire, enabling it to reach its goals [3].

Nowadays due to the reigning culturalism of our time, the term has come to be used as a partial or total replacement for many previously used notions such as foreign cultural relations, international cultural relations, international cultural exchange or international cultural cooperation.

Joseph Nye stated that cultural diplomacy was initially defined by governments as «a prime example of ‘soft power,’ or the ability to persuade through culture, value, and ideas, as opposed to ‘hard power,’ which conquers or coerces through military might» [1]. Cultural diplomacy is the official practice of governments conducting international relations (negotiating treaties, alliances, shaping policy, etc.) using soft power. For thousands of years, the use of violence has been the basis and ultimate sanction of power politics and the endpoint being war. Cultural diplomacy, by stressing soft power in politics, offers a potentially life-saving alternative.

According to Nicholas Cull, «Cultural diplomacy may be defined as an actor’s attempt to manage the international environment through making its cultural resources and achievements known overseas and/or facilitating cultural transmission abroad» [4]. As a subfield of public diplomacy, the practice of cultural diplomacy indeed shares the same goal as the one pursued by public diplomacy, which is to create a positive international environment for the conduct of the actor’s objectives. Cultural diplomacy’s scope of activity specifically corresponds to the promotion of the quite large field of cultural industries and artistic production as well as the support to the dissemination of the language abroad.

Jongsuk Chay stresses out that cultural diplomacy is a fundamental mechanism to connect cultures and promote cultural diversity. There is a need in the world today, to understand different cultures and what they imply for each of us as a means of conflict prevention. Interaction through the exchange of languages, ideas, music and the arts can improve communication between culturally opposed groups [5]. According to Richard T. Arndt, we need to differentiate between «cultural diplomacy» and «cultural relations». Cultural relations «grow naturally and organically, without government intervention» these include transfers of artworks, tourism, migra-

tion, media access, book circulations, the movement of musicians and other artists, whereas cultural diplomacy on the other hand, involves government intervention in the support of national interest [6]. But it is a distinction that has become completely blurred in recently years.

Milton Cummings established the most accepted definition of cultural diplomacy which is defined as «the exchange of ideas, information, values, systems, traditions, beliefs, and other aspects of culture, with the intention of fostering mutual understanding». Cummings' definition combines «cultural diplomacy» with the notion of cultural relations. Yet, Cummings points out that cultural diplomacy can be more of a one-way street than a two-way exchange, as when one nation concentrates its efforts on promoting the national language, explaining its policies and point of view, or «telling its story» to the rest of the world [7].

Cultural diplomacy is now often understood as a particular form or dimension of public diplomacy. Today it had become firmly settled in US public discourse. According to a 2005 State Department report, «Cultural diplomacy is the linchpin of public diplomacy; for it is in cultural activities that a nation's idea of itself is best represented. And cultural diplomacy can enhance our national security in subtle, wide-ranging, and sustainable ways. Indeed history may record that America's cultural riches played no less a role than military action in shaping our international leadership, including the war on terror. For the values embedded in our artistic and intellectual traditions form a bulwark against the forces of darkness» [8].

Thus, the notion 'foreign cultural policy' is thus a field that is complex and difficult to define semantically. Cultural policy refers to a wide range of governmental initiatives, programs, and measures designed to promote the country's culture, tradition, language, etc. The purpose of cultural policy varies greatly: it can be the dissemination of certain values and traditions the state chooses to articulate, the construction of a national community through the endorsement of shared symbols and narratives, or a way to articulate the country's culture and ideas for diplomatic or economic purposes.

US foreign cultural policy: from 1945 to present day

Deemed a critical soft power instrument in stemming the spread of communist ideology during the Cold War, cultural diplomacy was extensively sponsored and supported by U.S. government edu-

cational, professional, and cultural exchange programs. Between 1945 and 1954, more than 12,000 Germans and 2,000 Americans participated in the U.S. government's exchange programs between the two nations. A similar program was carried out in occupied Japan.

In 1946, Senator J. William Fulbright sponsored and helped to pass Public Law 79-584 – the Fulbright Act. Under the law, the Department of State was authorized to enter into executive agreements with foreign governments and to use foreign currencies acquired through the sale of U.S. war surplus to finance academic and cultural exchanges. In later years, the federal government made annual appropriations to maintain and continue what came to be called the Fulbright Program. The Fulbright program for educational exchange sponsored another 255,000 foreigners and Americans – among them future Nobel and Pulitzer prizewinners and artists as well as future government and business leaders.

Cultural diplomacy initiatives became «full-fledged weapons in the nation's Cold War diplomatic arsenal» after the election of President Eisenhower in 1952.

He was also convinced that the battle of ideas would be a long-term enterprise requiring a wide range of means to resolve the conflict. In 1953, he initiated a total reorganization of the information and cultural diplomacy apparatus, resulting in the establishment of the United States Information Agency, whose primary purpose was «to persuade foreign peoples that it lies in their own interest to take actions which are consistent with the national objectives of the United States.»

U.S. government Cold War cultural diplomacy programming can be broken down into a few key categories:

- Cultural exchange programs, sponsored by the State Department until 1978 and then by USIA, which sent artists, art works, filmmakers, writers, and performers overseas;
- American Libraries and Centers, sponsored by USIA, which offered a range of literature, exhibits, films, speakers, and discussions as well as news and English lessons;
- Radio Broadcasting, first Voice of America and later Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty, and others (all housed within USIA), which broadcast cultural content to parts of the world where it was unavailable or forbidden;
- Student, professional, and citizen exchanges, conducted under the auspices of the State Department until 1978, which have brought more than 250,000 visitors to the U.S. and more than 100,000

Americans abroad. While not targeted directly at cultural affairs in most cases, these exchanges did have profound effects in spreading a positive view of American culture in general and in building appetites for American cultural products [9].

In the 1960's and 1970's, there were two more events which helped to shape the direction of the U.S. government's programs in cultural policy. In 1961 the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act, the Fulbright-Hays Act, was passed. As one State Department official put it, that legislation «restored international educational and exchange programs as a recognized area of our official foreign relations.» During the Jimmy Carter Administration, the United States International Communication Agency was created as an independent agency. The reorganization combined the functions of the United States Information Agency (USIA) and the Department of State's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs. In a letter to Congress, President Carter stressed the new agency's dual mandate. It was «to tell the world about our society and politics – in particular our commitment to cultural diversity and individual liberty.» But the agency was also «to tell ourselves about the world, so as to enrich our own culture as well as to give us the understanding to deal effectively with problems among nations.» During the Reagan administration culture has been considered an efficient tool of diplomacy. In 1980s, the USIA budget exceeded one billion per year in unadjusted dollars.

In the decade after the Cold War threat had dissipated and international tension relaxed, policy-makers in the United States government saw little need for such programs and the cultural diplomacy apparatus began to be disassembled. The bureaucratic organization of cultural diplomacy efforts has undergone extensive revamping, beginning with the 1999 re-absorption of the U.S. Information Agency (USIA) by the State Department. Moreover, the traditional State Department hierarchy of international cultural work is today challenged by echelons of de facto public diplomacy practitioners in other government departments, from the Centers for Disease Control to the Defense Department.

Today, the discussion about the utility of cultural diplomacy is resuming as some see cultural dialogue as a necessary tool to improve America's image in the world and its relations with Muslim countries in the post-9/11 world. However, in contrast to the Cold War era, today, privately funded organizations have taken the place of governments in promoting cross-cultural exchanges including global tours by symphonies and dance companies,

international traveling art exhibitions at private museums, and privately funded organizations dedicated to creating cultural dialogue between people of different nationalities.

The Bush administration rolled out some of the most innovative cultural diplomacy initiatives in U.S. history. The first under secretary of state for public diplomacy, Charlotte Beers, held out the promise of branding and selling America to the Islamic world through the first-ever international advertising campaign. The \$12 million campaign incorporated radio, television and print advertising with Internet publications, lecture tours and other outreach programs [10].

In 2005, Karen Hughes, Bush's long-time communication advisor took the helm of U.S. public diplomacy. Hughes immediately embarked on a «listening tour» to demonstrate the U.S. desire to reach out to people in the Arab and Islamic world. Under her helm, she spearheaded the first U.S. National Strategy for Public Diplomacy and Strategic Communication. In 2006, the US State Department, through the First Lady Laura Bush, launched its «Global Cultural Initiative» to «coordinate, enhance and expand America's cultural diplomacy efforts worldwide.»

When Barak Obama became the new U.S. president, one of the primary concerns for many was restoring America's image in the eyes of the world. Already in his inauguration speech, President Obama promised to reach out to people all over the world in a way that emphasized mutual respect and tolerance.

President Obama proved his words during his first years in office when the strategic documents like the «National Security Strategy», «Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review», and «Strategic Framework for Public Diplomacy» outlined by the Obama administration reconfirmed the commitment to redefine the way the United States engaged with the world. The National Security Strategy of 2010 likewise emphasizes the importance of people-to-people contact: «Time and again, we have seen that the best ambassadors for American values and interests are the American people – our businesses, nongovernmental organizations, scientists, athletes, artists, military service members, students» [11]. President Obama made a reference to his commitment of increasing exchanges in his renowned Cairo speech, making it even more personal by saying «we will expand exchange programs, and increase scholarships, like the one that brought my father to America» [12].

In the current budget request of his presidency,

Obama requested \$628.9 million for core Department of State educational and cultural exchange programs. This request represents an approximately 6.4% increase over the 2016 funding level of \$590.9 million—a robust number in difficult budget times (nearly \$6 million higher than last year’s request of \$623 million), and a concrete sign of the Obama administration’s support of exchanges [13].

Conclusion

Looking back on the development of US cultural diplomacy, the basic trend is evident. Active promotion of cultural diplomacy programs has most often been stimulated by a perceived foreign threat or crisis. The threat posed by international terrorism is bound to have pervasive effects on the nature and direction of American cultural diplomacy. The

U.S. government began to build cultural understanding in the Middle East in order to improve relations and restore its national image. Since 2009, President Obama has emphasized his belief in people-to-people contacts and soft power. Such programs as cultural and educational exchanges are supported to increase mutual understanding and create lifelong friends for the United States. Programmes are deployed to promote people-to-people exchange as a means of winning friends and counteracting negative perceptions of US economic and military power and the threat of extremism. Moreover, the resources made available for such initiatives are very small for a country that has the world’s largest economy. One reason for this is a political perception that there is already a lot of US culture ‘out there’ in the wider world, because of the power and dominance of the audio-visual sector in general and Hollywood in particular.

References

- 1 Joseph S. Nye Jr. *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*. – New York: Public Affairs, 2004. – P.15
- 2 Brzezinski Zb. *The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and its Geostrategic Imperatives*. – New York: Basic Books, 1997. – P.25
- 3 Haigh A. *Cultural Diplomacy in Europe* // <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED102067.pdf>
- 4 Nicholas J. Cull. *Public Diplomacy: Lessons from the Past* // <http://uscpublicdiplomacy.org/sites/uscpublicdiplomacy.org/files/legacy/publications/perspectives/CPDPerspectivesLessons.pdf>
- 5 Chay J. *Culture and International Relations*. Praeger Publishers. – New York, 1990.
- 6 Arndt R. T. *The First Resort of Kings: American Cultural Diplomacy in the Twentieth Century*. – Washington, D.C. Potomac Books, 2005 – P. XVIII
- 7 Milton C. Cummings, Jr. *Cultural Diplomacy and the United States Government: A Survey*. – Washington: Center for Arts and Culture, 2003. – P. 1
- 8 *Cultural diplomacy: the linchpin of public diplomacy* // www.state.gov/documents/.../54374.pdf
- 9 Ivey B. *Cultural Diplomacy and the National Interest* // <http://www.vanderbilt.edu/curbcenter/files/Cultural-Diplomacy-and-the-National-Interest.pdf>
- 10 Zaharna R.S. *Public Diplomacy through the Looking Glass: Obama, US Public Diplomacy and the Islamic World* // <https://american.edu/soc/faculty/upload/Public-diplomacy-through-the-looking-glass.pdf>
- 11 *National Security Strategy of the United States, 2010* // https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/rss_viewer/national_security_strategy.pdf
- 12 *Remarks by the President at Cairo University, 6-04-09* // <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-cairo-university-6-04-09>
- 13 *Exchanges see 6.4% increase in final Obama budget request* // <http://www.alliance-exchange.org/policy-monitor/02/09/2016/exchanges-see-64-increase-final-obama-budget-request>