

Journal of
International and Cross-Cultural Studies

Volume 2, Issue 1, 2008

Anti-Americanism in World Affairs: Can the United States Do Anything About It?

Yannis A. Stivachtis¹, Director, International Studies Program, Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University, ystivach@vt.edu

Abstract

After the tragic events of 9/11, the U.S. and its citizens became the recipients of a significant degree of sympathy in many parts of the world. However, following the Iraq War, “anti-Americanism” has spread far and wide. But are these popular anti-American attitudes primarily a reaction to the George W. Bush Administration and its policies or do they result from more fundamental factors? On the domestic front, there is a divide between the Left and Right as to what the ‘real’ sources of anti-Americanism are. The present article reflects a growing dissatisfaction with the way anti-Americanism is explained and presented to the American public. Moreover, if anti-Americanism is so harmful to U.S. interests that it demands the creation of a stronger, better mechanism to deal with it, then one should have a better understanding of this phenomenon prior to designing any policies to respond to it. This article provides a comprehensive approach to the complicated phenomenon of anti-Americanism and discusses whether and to what extent the U.S. can respond to its negative effects.

Introduction

Few would doubt that the United States today is far from being universally admired despite the global leadership it has exercised since the end of the World War II. After the tragic events of 9/11, there was a significant degree of sympathy for the U.S. and its citizens in many parts of the world, albeit not in all. However, sixteen months later (February 15, 2003) the world witnessed the largest-ever global mass demonstration in history, protesting the U.S. attack on Iraq. The Pew Research Center conducted a poll of 16,000 people that showed that in the spring of 2003 majorities in only four of the fourteen countries that were also surveyed in 1999/2000 and 2002 held favorable opinions of the United States. By contrast, in both 1999/2000 and the summer of 2002, majorities in ten of the same fourteen countries had reported favorable views of the United States.² New polls at the end of 2004 and the beginning of 2005 showed that in sixteen of twenty-two countries surveyed, the majority of the public said that the U.S. had mainly a negative influence in the world.³ Poll results have not displayed any substantial change since 2005.

The above polls indicate that following the Iraq War, “anti-Americanism” has spread far and wide. But are these popular anti-American attitudes primarily a reaction to the George W. Bush Administration and its policies or do they result from more fundamental factors? The first purpose of this article is to address this fundamental question.

On the domestic front, there is a general agreement that the United States today is politically a deeply divided country. Almost all issues are approached from a partisan perspective despite argumentation to the opposite. Among the most fashionable discussion topics is the source of anti-Americanism. Generally speaking, the American

¹ The author would like to thank Peter Katzenstein, Robert Keohane, Richard Little and the three anonymous reviewers for their invaluable comments and suggestions.

² Pew Research Center 2003, <http://www.people-press.org>

³ Pew Research Center 2004 and 2005, <http://www.people-press.org>

Left believes that anti-Americanism reflects *opinion* rather than *bias* and that it is largely a reaction to American policy and very often a justified one. The Left also suggests that anti-Americanism poses a serious long-term problem for U.S. diplomacy, and that right-wing policies that induce it need to be altered. The American Right, on the other hand, argues that anti-Americanism reflects a deep bias against the U.S., that anti-Americanism can be ignored and that if the U.S. follows effective policies, pro-American views will follow.

The present article reflects a growing dissatisfaction with the way anti-Americanism is explained and presented to the American public. According to Pamela Hyde Smith (2007: 119), anti-Americanism is so harmful to U.S. interests that it demands the creation of a stronger, better mechanism to deal with it. If this is the case, then one should have a better understanding of this phenomenon prior to designing any policies in response to it. Therefore, the second purpose of this article is to provide a comprehensive approach to the complicated phenomenon of anti-Americanism and examine whether the U.S. can really do anything to deal effectively with this problem.

Explaining anti-Americanism

After the events of September 11th and the subsequent U.S. interventions in Afghanistan and Iraq, anti-Americanism is receiving growing attention among scholars, journalists, as well as practitioners of politics. Anti-Americanism, nevertheless, is not a new phenomenon. It represents a 'tidal phenomenon, which is as old as the United States of America itself' (Stefanidis, 2002: 1). For example, anti-Americanism has a long historical presence in France that precedes the Declaration of Independence (Revel 2002; Straus 1978). It has ebbed and flowed, however, intensified as the U.S. assumed the role of the leading Western power after World War II (Kroes & Rossem 1986) and the role of the dominant world power in the post-Cold War era (Joffe 2006).

Specifically, American soldiers were welcomed widely as liberators of a Europe occupied by Nazi Germany in the 1940s, and as protectors of a Europe that felt threatened by the Soviet Union in the 1950s. A few years later, however, "the ugly American" became an object of public dissatisfaction and concern (Lederer & Burdick 1958). In the second half of the 1960s, the Vietnam War caused a powerful anti-war movement that fueled anti-American sentiments in Europe. In the early 1980s, the same movement appeared once again in the form of mass protests against NATO's missile deployment plans and the military build-up of the Reagan administration.

Many scholars have studied and provided divergent explanations for the phenomenon of anti-Americanism (O'Connor & Griffiths 2006; Faath 2006; Gibson 2006; Rubin & Rubin 2004; Hollander 2004; Ross & Ross 2004; Berman 2004; Draxlbauer, Fellner & Froschl 2004; Crockatt 2003; Sardar & Davies 2002; Rubinstein & Smith 1985). One could place these explanations into three broad categories or associate them with three competing perspectives on the phenomenon.

Three Perspectives on anti-Americanism

The review of the literature on anti-Americanism in world politics reveals three popular explanations of this phenomenon: power imbalances, globalization backlash, and conflicting identities. Although these explanations cannot be applied easily to specific instances of anti-Americanism, they do serve as useful starting-points in thinking about the sources of anti-Americanism.

Since the end of the Cold War, the U.S. has been the most powerful state in the international system. Balance of power theorists argue that imbalances of power lead to

the formation of balancing coalitions (Waltz 1979). Consequently, one may argue that anti-Americanism constitutes a reflection of the predictable effects of U.S. hegemony and dominance. This implies two things. First, there is a clear distinction between attitudes towards U.S. citizens and attitudes towards U.S. foreign policy. In other words, Americans may be liked but the policies of their administration may be resented. Second, only a new kind of foreign policy that would be based on multilateralism could alter anti-American sentiments and attitudes to the extent they are related to the hegemonic behavior of the United States.

Although one may accept in principle that there is a distinction between attitudes towards U.S. citizens and attitudes towards U.S. foreign policy, in the minds of many people around the world this distinction has for some time been blurred. This is due to the insistence on the extraordinary value of American democracy. If democracy in America really allows the U.S. citizens to express their opinions and choose among alternatives and the U.S. foreign policy is resented, then the U.S. citizens are consequently resented since they are responsible for electing and re-electing Presidents and other political representatives who are primarily responsible for or align themselves with this policy. This is why the killing of innocent people on 9/11 did not touch every person around the world. Since the U.S. has been held responsible for the killing of innocent people in various occasions and the U.S. citizens did not do anything about it, then they are regarded as equally responsible and therefore legitimate targets of reprisals. Consequently, only a massive and radical resistance by U.S. citizens at home to what is seen abroad as an unwelcomed U.S. foreign policy could de-legitimize the targeting of U.S. citizens and reduce hostile sentiments directed to American people.

On the other hand, a new U.S. foreign policy could alter anti-American sentiments and attitudes only to the extent that it could be widely accepted to be truly 'multilateral'. For example, under the Clinton Administration, the U.S. was seen as acting multilaterally by some states but not by others. In the case of Kosovo, for instance, Western European states aligned themselves with the U.S. and multilateralism, for them, was not an issue. However, for countries like Greece (member of NATO and the European Union), Russia, China and many others, the by-passing of the UN Security Council de-legitimized the Western military intervention in Kosovo. In other words, for these countries, the bombardment of Serbia did not represent a real multilateral action. This and many other cases indicate that the concept of 'multilateralism' and its contents need to be further investigated instead of be taken for granted. Unless this is done, one should not expect that a 'multilateral' U.S. foreign policy would contribute significantly to the demise of anti-American sentiments abroad.

Moreover, there has been a political and psychological need for U.S. citizens to distinguish between different American administrations and their effect on anti-Americanism. For example, Democrats largely believe that anti-Americanism has been the product of the policies of the Bush Administration. However, this is not accurate. Although governmental and other elites in many countries were happy with President Clinton, still a very high percentage of population in the Balkans, Russia, the Middle East, in various parts of Asia, Africa, and Latin America did not like the policies of the Clinton Administration. What is interesting in this case, is to distinguish between what the elites of a country believe and what the population in the same country might feel. For example, almost all post-WWII governments in Greece have held a pro-American stance but the majority of the Greek population has consistently been anti-American.

It is worth noting that there is a belief shared among a significant number of people around the world and across continents that no matter who the American President is, the U.S. foreign policy remains the same. In other words, no matter what the tensions between Democrats and Republicans are at home, externally, the U.S. is expected to display (and indeed is seen as displaying) almost similar attitudes. If there is any

difference in U.S. actions abroad, this is usually seen as a difference of degree rather than of kind. The problem is that there has been a growing tendency to view the U.S. foreign policy as reflecting the beliefs and choices of American people, or, at least, the majority of them. This is not something entirely new although its current degree differs considerably from the past. Indeed, since the creation of the modern nation-state, there has been a tendency to consider it as constituting a uniform whole stretching from its head of government to the newest born child within its territory. Unfortunately, more than in the past, this tendency transforms the American citizen into "accessory to crime".

To assess the degree of anti-Americanism in world affairs, one should necessarily focus on population attitudes and therefore society becomes one's level of analysis. The trouble is that people, in general, are not very informed about political processes, political differences, and political controversies in other countries and they have the tendency either to generalize or to focus on the aggregate result. The United States is not an exception to this rule. Therefore, people around the world are not necessarily aware of what is going on within the United States and even if they are, the depth of their understanding may not be considerable. As a result, people may generalize and although their anti-Americanism may be displaced and unjustified, it exists nevertheless. To address this problem, the U.S. needs to effectively employ the means of public diplomacy in conjunction with educational programs abroad both of which should aim at making people aware of the issues, debates, and controversies in the U.S. and increase their understanding of the way in which the American society is structured and functions, as well as its cultural, economic, political, and ideological dynamics.

In addition, the end of the Cold War meant, among other things, that countries formerly requiring American protection from the Soviet Union no longer need such support. This change has enabled political leaders and publics in these countries to be more critical of the United States. In addition, American political hegemony makes the U.S. a focal point for opposition since "Mr. Big" is never liked (Joffe 2001). Moreover, acting in its own interest and in accordance with its own values, the U.S. can have enormous impact on other states and societies. When it fails, like the Iraq case illustrates, the costs of failure are often imposed on others more than on itself. Therefore, it is no accident that American political power is at its highest while American standing is at its lowest. However, U.S. political hegemony is not a necessary condition for Anti-Americanism, but it seems to be conducive to it. Moreover, the lack of restraint in the exercise of power by the U.S. provides a basis for understanding why great powers like China, France, and Russia feel offended or threatened by U.S. power.

A second explanation focuses on the globalization backlash. The expansion of capitalism through the process of globalization generates many problems. Those adversely affected by this process tend to resist it. According to Karl Polanyi (1957: 219), an unregulated market violates deep-rooted social values and thus supports political resistance movements that demand effective protection. Furthermore, the spread of American practices and popular culture is widely resented even by people who find aspects of it very attractive. The anti-Americanism generated by what has been termed "McWorld" is diffused and widely distributed in the world (Barber 1995). However, it does not generate resistance through the form of suicide bombings or demands for the overthrow of the capitalist system. Hostility toward the U.S. follows market changes (which displace people from their localities and livelihoods, as it happened in East Asia in 1997-98) in conjunction with rapid economic change and the uncertainty deriving from dependence on distant markets and sources of capital generate resentment at the U.S., which is viewed as the center of pressures for such changes. Therefore, hostility -in this view- emanates from areas of the world facing such experiences.

In order to respond to this type of anti-Americanism, the U.S. should utilize its 'soft power' and work closely with developing countries within the framework of international financial

and trade institutions, like the IMF, the World Bank, and the World Trade Organization (WTO), in order to reverse the negative effects of globalization and assist their economic and social development.

A third explanation relates anti-Americanism to conflicting identities (Nau 2002; Lieven 2004; Huntington 2004). In this view, anti-Americanism is generated by cultural and religious identities that are antithetical to the American values. As Seyla Behabib suggests (2002: 251), the products of American secular mass culture, which bring images of sexual freedom, female emancipation, and equality among the sexes into the homes of patriarchal and authoritarian communities, irrespective of religion, are a source of international value conflict and therefore generate antipathy and resistance. In addition, religion has become a very important aspect in the lives of Americans. As a result, an important divide between the U.S. and its traditional European allies has been created on issues such as abortion, the death penalty, and the use of new biological technologies (Norris & Inglehart 2004: 110; Berman 2004). Moreover, the activities of Christian missionaries constitute a threat to the socialist type of Chinese capitalism, to Hindu radicalism in South Asia, and to Muslim fundamentalism throughout the Islamic world. Secular states in Europe and East Asia object more to the rise of religiosity in American life and foreign policy, and less to the effects of the spread of American popular culture. Religious states in the Middle East and South Asia object to their exposure to the products of American popular culture and, in the case of Christian missionaries, to the rise of American religiosity.

One may argue that no matter what the people outside the U.S. believe, at home there is a significant social and political debate about gender and race equality and the influence of religion on political life. This is absolutely true. However, once again, one is confronted by a painful reality: people around the world do not possess an in-depth understanding of what is going on in the American society (not even some Americans may have). As a result, people tend to generalize or oversimplify. That is why public diplomacy and international educational programs should be utilized as a means to inform the international public opinion. Of course, ideas related to gender equality or the role of religion in politics may not please everybody since different people in different parts of the world disagree on these issues.

Therefore, unlike with the other two types of anti-Americanism, the U.S. may find it almost impossible to deal effectively with this third type of anti-American sentiments. There are two reasons for this. First, this would presuppose that the U.S. constitutes a socially and culturally coherent unit, which is not the case. Second, a response to the latter type of anti-Americanism would first require a deep social and cultural change within the U.S. to fit the social and cultural patterns of other countries. This begs the question of why should the U.S. do it. In other words, on which basis could one justify one's request for the U.S. to change without at the same time requesting the other countries to do the same in order to fit the American social and cultural patterns? But even if such a change could be attempted, the very fact that there exists a great variety of social and cultural patterns in the world, many of which contradict one another, in conjunction with the realization that one cannot satisfy everybody, anti-American sentiments stemming from conflict of identities would continue to exist.

The problem with these three perspectives is that each of them provides only a partial picture of the phenomenon of anti-Americanism while they all offer inadequate accounts for the variety of anti-Americanisms that exist. Specifically, an in-depth analysis of the literature on anti-Americanism suggests that there are different types of anti-Americanism, each concentrating on different aspects of American society that are resented by different people or by the same people at different times, and each type alters in response to changing situations. Therefore, Peter Katzenstein and Robert Keohane (2007: 2) are very correct when they argue that all three perspectives discussed

previously resonate with expressions of anti-Americanism in some parts of the world at some times, but are insufficient for understanding other forms of anti-Americanism at other times. Furthermore, anti-Americanism can take different forms, depending on the climate of opinions and ideological sentiments, as well as on power politics. Therefore, for many societies, distinctive combinations of different explanatory factors will best help in accounting for different forms of anti-Americanisms (Katzenstein & Sil 2004). Moreover, Katzenstein and Keohane (2007: introduction) suggest that anti-American views are simply too heterogeneous to be explained by one or a few broad factors.

Katzenstein, Keohane and their colleagues (2007) have undertaken the most notable comprehensive attempt to conceptualize anti-Americanism and examine its implications for world politics. They have examined the profile of anti-American attitudes across space and time asking questions about the conditions that shape the politics of anti-Americanism in different contexts. Their work focuses on the dynamic changes that affect anti-Americanism; inquires into the political effects of anti-Americanism, and brings new evidence and interpretation to bear on different facets of this important political issue. This project has now been enlarged to include not only the examination of anti-Americanism in many more countries in different continents but also a comparative study of the nature of anti-Americanism between countries. In their framework, the sources of anti-Americanism are examined and categorized through the establishment of a typology of the phenomenon.

A Typology of anti-Americanism

Katzenstein and Keohane have identified six sets of individual attitudes and collective beliefs toward the U.S. and American society, which are observable among different sets of people in various societies. Although later in their volume these clusters blend together in four distinct types of anti-Americanism, it seems that the six-fold classification offers a more comprehensive view of the phenomenon of anti-Americanism. One of the key features of the six different forms of anti-Americanism is that they are not mutually exclusive, while some of the most interesting situations are those in which more than one form of anti-Americanism is at work.

The examination of these six sets of individual attitudes and beliefs is central to understanding the sources of anti-Americanism. In turn, this understanding would assist the policy-maker to formulate policies aiming at reducing the impact of anti-Americanism or accept that little can be done to deal effectively with this phenomenon.

Liberal anti-Americanism

Liberals worldwide share many of the ideas that are characteristic of the American liberalism. However, the U.S. is often criticized for not living up to its own ideals. In the political field, critics argue that a country dedicated to democracy and self-determination has continuously supported dictatorships around the world during and after the end Cold War (like in the Middle East). Moreover, the war against terrorism has led the U.S. to begin supporting a variety of oppressive regimes, such as that of Pakistan.

In the economic field, critics suggest that although the U.S. claims to favor freedom of trade, it protects its own economy from competition stemming both from developing and developed countries. The result is that the U.S. has been charged of being hypocritical (Gaddis 2004: 27).

Liberal anti-Americanism is prevalent in the liberal societies of advanced industrialized countries. For a long time it was prominent in the Middle East, among secular, western-

educated elites. As the influence of these groups has fallen, it has been replaced by more radical forms of anti-Americanism.

The potential impact of liberal anti-Americanism would be the decline of support for U.S. policy. The more the U.S. is seen as a self-interested power hiding behind the banners of democracy and human rights, rather than a true proponent of those values, the less willing other liberals may be to defend it with words or actions. Since liberal anti-Americanism feeds on perceptions of hypocrisy, a less hypocritical set of U.S. policies could presumably reduce it. But as Katzenstein and Keohane correctly point out, hypocrisy is inherent in the situation of a superpower that professes universalistic ideals. History has shown that when democracies engage in international political competition, they generally find it necessary and convenient to mobilize public support by referring to ideals, such as democracy and freedom. Since states involved in power competition in an anarchic international system often find it useful to resort to measures that undercut democracy and freedom elsewhere, the potential for hypocrisy is inherent in global activism by democracies.

Furthermore, a central feature of pluralist democracy is that its leaders find it necessary both to claim that they are acting consistently with democratic ideals, while they have to respond to groups seeking to pursue their own self-interests, usually narrowly defined. When the interests of politically strong groups imply policies that do not reflect democratic ideals, the ideals are typically compromised.

Hypocrisy in U.S. foreign policy is not so much the result of the ethical failings of American leaders as a by-product of the role played by the U.S. in global politics and of pluralist politics at home. Therefore, one should not expect that it will be eradicated. Since the U.S. cannot do much to eradicate the hypocrisy of its policies, one should not consequently expect liberal anti-Americanism to disappear; unless the U.S. decides to significantly alter its self-image (a superpower with universalistic ideals) and role (actively pursuing the establishment of a world order that reflects its ideals) world affairs.

Social anti-Americanism

Social anti-Americanism is based on value conflicts between the U.S. and other democratic countries that reflect relevant differences in many spheres of life. "American conditions", which are market-driven are resented by many countries and people; especially those finding themselves in times of financial crisis. The public attitudes during the Mexican crises of 1984 and 1994, the Asian crisis of 1997, and the Argentinean crisis of 2001 are very illustrative of this fact. However, similar attitudes have also been observed in Western advanced industrial countries, such as Germany (The Economist 2004). In addition, different democratic regimes have different priorities and different approaches to social, political, and economic issues. For example, many democracies support a variety of social programs that are not politically feasible or socially acceptable in the United States, while the injustice embedded in American policies that favor the rich over the poor is often decried. Social democratic welfare states in Scandinavia, Christian democratic welfare states in Europe, and developmental industrial states in Asia are prime examples. Many smaller capitalist democracies which are market-liberal in the international economy are social or Christian democratic in their domestic arrangements.

Likewise, civil liberties in the war on terror are often better protected in social and Christian democratic regimes, like those in Europe than in the United States. Genuine value conflicts exist, on issues such as the death penalty, the desirability of generous social protections, preference for multilateral approaches over unilateral ones, and the sanctity of international treaties. Still, these value conflicts are not so significant since social anti-Americanism shares in core American values. However, unless the U.S. rejects through its words and actions the idea that its democracy is superior to the

democracies of other states, social anti-Americanism will not be reduced or eliminated. During the current political campaigns, candidates who wish to receive their political parties' nomination to run for President of the U.S., repeatedly and almost boringly state their conviction that "America is the greatest nation on earth". Such rhetoric, which is perceived by the rest of the world as reflecting American arrogance and ignorance, does not help the situation.

Sovereign-nationalist anti-Americanism

Sovereign-nationalists focus on two values: the importance of not losing control over state territory and the inherent importance and value of collective national identities. These identities often embody values that are at odds with the American ones. State sovereignty thus becomes a shield against unwanted U.S. interference. Sovereign-nationalist anti-Americanism resonates well in political communities that have strong state traditions, like China and Russia. Anti-Americanism of this kind is very powerful since it stirs nationalist passions.

Specifically, there are three types of sovereign-nationalist attitudes. First, emphasis can be on nationalism. National identity is one of the most important political values in contemporary world politics. Such identities create the potential for anti-Americanism, both when they are strong (since they provide positive counter-values) and when they are weak (since anti-Americanism can become a substitute for the absence of positive values).

Second, sovereign nationalists can emphasize sovereignty. In many parts of the world, like in some parts of Asia, the Middle East, and Africa, where state sovereignty was achieved only after wars of national liberation, sovereignty is an essential good that is to be defended, while in Latin America with its very different history, the preeminence of the U.S. has reinforced the perceived value of sovereignty (Rubinstein & Smith 1985). Encroachments on state sovereignty are particularly resented and nationalist passions are stirred when a powerful state, such as the U.S., has the capacity and a tradition of interfering in the domestic affairs of other states.

A third variant of sovereign-national anti-Americanism appears where people see their own states as potential great powers. Such societies may define their own situations partly in opposition to dominant states.

China, which is perceived both by the American public and their political representatives as the new challenger of the American power and prominence, provides the best example of this kind of anti-Americanism since all three elements of sovereign-nationalist attitudes are present there. The Chinese elites and public are highly nationalistic and very sensitive to threats to Chinese sovereignty. In addition, China is already a great power, and has aspirations to become even more powerful. The superior military capacity of the United States, however, and its expressed willingness to use that capacity (for instance, in the case of an attack by China on Taiwan) create latent anti-Americanism. Incidents, like U.S. bombing of the Chinese embassy in Belgrade in 1999 and the episode of the EC-3 spy plane in 2001, contribute to the quick rise of anti-Americanism.

The problem with sovereign-nationalist anti-Americanism is that the efforts of great powers, like the U.S., to establish and maintain order in an anarchical international system often leads to policies that undermine the sovereignty of smaller states or sacrifice the national aspirations of some political communities. No matter its type, sovereign-nationalist anti-Americanism is very difficult to be eradicated since the U.S. can do little to deal effectively with the issues involved. Only a policy that would diminish the involvement of the U.S. in world affairs may lead to the reduction of this type of anti-Americanism. The problem is that a U.S. withdrawal from international affairs –even a

minimal one- may have significant consequences for international order in an anarchical world. In other words, the main issue here is whether the advantages of reducing sovereign-nationalist anti-Americanism would outweigh the disadvantages of international disorder stemming from the efforts of major states to fill the power gap that the U.S. withdrawal –partial or not – would create.

Radical anti-Americanism

Radical anti-Americanism is built around the belief that America's identity, as reflected in the internal economic and political power relations and institutional practices of the U.S., ensures that its actions will be hostile to the existence and development of values, practices, and institutions elsewhere in the world. Thus for some societies for progress to take place, the American economy and society will have to be transformed, either from within or without.

Radical anti-Americanism is characteristic of Marxist-Leninist states, such as the Soviet Union until its demise and Cuba and North Korea today. When Marxist revolutionary zeal was great, radical anti-Americanism was associated with violent revolution against U.S.-sponsored regimes, if not the U.S. itself. Its Marxist-Leninist adherents are now so weak that it is mostly confined to the realm of rhetoric. However, under the leadership of the Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez, one may observe a new kind of active anti-American resistance that is partially built up on Marxist principles.

Another contemporary variant of radical anti-Americanism is what has been termed "Occidentalism" (Buruma and Margalit 2004). The most extreme versions of Occidentalism hold that Western civilization includes values, such as equality for women, the public display of the human body, and the belief in the superiority of Christianity that are extremely dangerous. As the leading state of the West, the U.S. is the central source of evil (Faath 2006). Thus religiously-inspired and secular radical anti-Americanism argues for the weakening, destruction or transformation of the political and economic institutions of the United States.

The distinctive mark of both strands of anti-Americanism is the demand for revolutionary changes in the nature of American society. Only a long-term dialogue among religions actively sponsored by the U.S. could effectively address the "Occidental" type of anti-Americanism. However, one should not expect this type of anti-Americanism to disappear entirely since the value systems at hand will remain in opposition. Either both sides would learn to accept and tolerate each other's cultural particularities and live in peace, or a clash of cultures would occur which may result in one's cultural dominance and the other's continuous resentment. The example of Iranian Revolution is very illustrative.

On the other hand, the Marxist type of radical anti-Americanism is very difficult to be addressed since it requires the fundamental change of the American political and economic system. Since this cannot happen, this type of radical anti-Americanism will continue to exist as long as its proponents exist. Its effects, however, can be diminished if the U.S. manages to create a more egalitarian type of society providing "liberty and justice for all".

Elitist anti-Americanism

This type of anti-Americanism arises in countries in which the elites have a long history of looking down on American culture, like in France. Americans are often seen either as materialists, seeking individual personal advancement without concern for the arts or as excessively religious and therefore insufficiently rational.

Elitist anti-Americanism has always been centered in Europe. Since elitist anti-Americanism is rooted in different identities, its adherents neither expect nor desire that the U.S. change its practices. On the contrary, the perception of America's continuing lack of commitment to "high culture" provides a sense of superiority to these elites and the countries they come from. Moreover, the character of the American system of secondary education, and particularly the all-encompassing impact of the commercialized mass media, ensure that cultural elites worldwide will continue to find many aspects of American society distasteful.

Although this type of anti-Americanism does not have significant implications for international affairs, an even greater commitment to "high culture" by the U.S. and cultural exchange programs could create deeper and stronger cultural and identity bonds with Europeans and other countries and consequently contribute to the decline of elitist anti-Americanism. However, one should acknowledge the fact that in comparison with the past the U.S. has indeed displayed a stronger commitment to promoting "high culture". But there is nothing that the U.S. could do to prevent those who see themselves as the only holders of "high culture" to view the U.S. as culturally inferior.

Legacy anti-Americanism

"Legacy anti-Americanism" stems from resentment of past wrongs committed by the U.S. to another country or society. For example, Mexican anti-Americanism is prompted by the experiences of U.S. military attack and various forms of imperialism during the last two hundred years. The Iranian revolution of 1979 and the subsequent hostage crisis were fueled by memories of American intervention in Iranian politics since the 1950s. Between the late 1960s and the end of the twentieth century, the highest levels of anti-Americanism recorded in Western Europe and especially in Spain and Greece since both countries experienced civil wars and the U.S. supported repressive dictators.

If not reinforced by new "wrongs" (which is very easy to happen in a competitive and anarchic international system) or another form of anti-Americanism, "legacy anti-Americanism" can be expected to decline over time. While and where it persists, it is likely to take the form of support for anti-American policies and tolerance of more radical anti-American movements, rather than being a source of direct attacks on the U.S. or on American citizens abroad. However, as the case of Greece indicates, attacks on American embassies and diplomatic personnel should not be ruled entirely out.

Moreover, other forms of anti-Americanism could generate legacy anti-Americanism. For instance, sovereign-nationalists or radicals could be convinced that their societies have been harmed by the U.S. while liberals and social democrats could view the effects of the U.S. as largely benign.

To respond effectively to the "legacy" type of anti-Americanism, the U.S. should be very careful when formulating and implementing its foreign policy towards countries where "legacy anti-Americanism" is still strong. Rejecting interventionist policies, avoiding "bully" type of rhetoric, and taking account of the positions of the governments of third countries and the public sentiment existing in those countries, would help the U.S. prevent the reinforcement of "legacy anti-Americanism".

Anti-Americanism in Perspective

According to Katzenstein and Keohane (2007: 45), these six different types of anti-Americanism are not simply variants of the same schema. On the contrary, adherents of different types of anti-Americanism can express antithetical attitudes. For instance, radical Muslims oppose a popular culture that commercializes sex and portrays women as liberated from the control of men, and are also critical of secular-liberal values. Social

and Christian democratic Europeans, by contrast, may enjoy American popular culture but criticize the U.S. for the death penalty, and for not living up to secular values they share with liberals. Liberal anti-Americanism is only “anti” because its proponents regard the U.S. as failing to live up to its professed values – values that are entirely opposed to those of religious radicals and largely embraced by liberals. Secular radical anti-Americans may oppose capitalism and the American embrace of capitalism, but may accept scientific rationalism, gender egalitarianism, and secularism.

Moreover, anti-Americanism can be fostered by Islamic fundamentalism, liberalism, or Marxism and it can be embraced by people who, not accepting any of these sets of beliefs, fear the practices or deplore the policies of the United States. Except for radical anti-Americans, people who express anti-American attitudes with respect to some aspects of the U.S. – such as U.S. foreign policy – can be quite pro-American with respect to other aspects of American society. Furthermore, at other times, they may be pro-American in policy terms. When the U.S. acts in ways in which they approve liberals, social democrats, and sovereign-nationalists may all be supportive of its actions.

The taxonomy of different types of anti-American views suggests that anti-Americanism is not easily explained by the three perspectives, which were initially discussed in this paper, although each one of them contributes some insights. Sovereign-nationalist anti-Americanism could be activated by power imbalances generating threats. Social anti-Americanism may be heightened by the contrasts between European and American values, while radical anti-Americanism can be generated by clashes of identity. However, liberal, legacy, and elitist anti-American views do not fit well within any of these broad themes; and even the other types of anti-Americanism are only partially congruent with the broad themes of power imbalances, globalization, and identity clashes.

So, why does a rich variety of anti-Americanism persist? What accounts for the persistence of heterogeneous anti-American views? And why do persistent and adaptable anti-American views have so little direct impact on policy and political practice? In the concluding part of their volume, Katzenstein and Keohane argue that the situation becomes less puzzling in light of the fact that American symbols are *polyvalent* in the sense that they embody a variety of values with different meanings to different people or even to the same individual.

Polyvalent America and anti-Americanism

Since anti-American views are simply too heterogeneous to be explained by one or a few types of anti-Americanism, Katzenstein and Keohane have sought to reframe the question by inquiring into why a large variety of anti-American views persists and why persistent and adaptable anti-American views have so little direct impact on policy and political practice. They argue that the symbolism generated by America is so *polyvalent* that it continually generates and diffuses anti-American views (Katzenstein & Keohane 2007: conclusion). It is suggested that the polyvalence of the U.S. embodies a large variety of values, while different values associated with America resonate differently with the cognitive schemas held by individuals and reinforced by groups. Which schemas predominate varies cross-nationally. Furthermore, these schemas are internally complex and contain elements that are in tension or contradiction with one another.

Furthermore, to understand anti-Americanism, one needs to understand “Americanism,” and the way the U.S. is perceived abroad (Hertsgaard 2002). The diversity of anti-Americanism is due to the diversity of the United States. As a country of settlers and immigrants, U.S. represents a spectrum of values. Processes of anti-Americanism and pro-Americanism have a common source. The heterogeneity of anti-Americanism is thus matched by the heterogeneity of Americanism. The U.S. is characterized by tensions and

contradictions in the sense that the country is both intensely secular and intensely religious, unilateralist and multilateralist, statist and anti-statist. That is, American symbols refer simultaneously to a variety of values, which may appeal differentially to different people in different societies, and despite their contradiction may appeal even to the same person at one time. The U.S. self-image as well as the image of America abroad have moved in parallel, but have often been at odds with one another. Both anti-Americanism and pro-Americanism, as attitudes held by people outside the U.S., draw on rich and varied images of America as well as on the complexity of American life and the impact of the U.S. on the world.

According to Katzenstein and Keohane (2007: 27), the U.S. has a vigorous and expressive popular culture, which is very appealing not only to Americans but to many people around the world. This popular culture is quite hedonistic and oriented toward material possessions and sensual pleasure. At the same time, as Inglehart and Baker argue (2001: 20), the U.S. is much more religious than most other Western societies and has a much more traditional value system than any other advanced industrial society. One important root of America's polyvalence is the tension between these two characteristics. Moreover, both American popular culture and religious practices are subject to rapid change, expanding further the varieties of expression in the society, and continually opening new options. As Katzenstein and Keohane point out, "the dynamism and heterogeneity of American society create a vast set of choices: of values, institutions and practices".

The dynamism of American culture partly results from its openness to the rest of the world. However, as the examples of the American fast-food and film industries indicate, the U.S. is itself - product of the rest of the world as well as of its own internal characteristics. For example, Hollywood is a brand-name. In the 1990s, however, only few major Hollywood studios were controlled by U.S. corporations. Many of Hollywood's most celebrated directors and actors are non-American and many of Hollywood's films about America are made by non-Americans. "Americanization", therefore, does not describe a simple extension of American products and processes to other parts of the world. It rather refers to the selective appropriation of American symbols and values by individuals and groups in other societies. Americanization thus is a profoundly interactive process between the U.S. and all parts of the world and it is deeply intertwined with anti-American views.

Americanization and anti-Americanism interact and occur through a variety of venues (Stephan 2005; Nolan 2005). For example, through its distinctive combination of territorial (military) and non-territorial (soft) power, the U.S. has affected the world since 1945. The Middle East, Latin America, and East and Southeast Asia have experienced American military might first-hand. By contrast, Western Europe has been exposed only to the peaceful, market-based face of American hegemony. Moreover, while American popular culture is generally accepted in Europe, sometimes it is also viewed as undermining local cultures; a charge that nationalist politicians and movements often seek to exploit to create a political backlash against processes of Americanization. Thus European and American popular culture often co-exist in a complicated symbiosis.

Today, the interactions that generate Americanization may involve markets, informal networks, the exercise of corporate power or governmental authority or a combination of them. The open and interactive character of American society is evident in many areas with technology being one of the most important ones. Another example is the American higher education, which attracts foreign students and scholars who may decide to stay in the U.S. instead of returning to their countries. All these reflect and reinforce the polyvalent nature of American society, as expressed in the activities of Americans, who freely export and import products and practices (Katzenstein 2005: 198). But they also reflect the variations in attitudes and interests of people in other societies, seeking to use,

resist, and recast symbols that are associated with the United States (Stephan 2005). The receptivity of other societies for American culture varies greatly, as they interact with a complex, diverse and dynamic America.

Furthermore, American corporations are especially apt in transforming basic advances in science and technology into marketable products. Nevertheless, Americanization does not create a norm of best practice to which others simply adjust. Rather, piecemeal borrowing and selective adaptation are more typical processes (Zeitlin & Herriguel 2000). Americanization is as much about the learning capacity of local actors as about the diffusion of standardized American practices.

In sum, anti- and pro-Americanism have as much to do with the conceptual lenses through which individuals and groups living in very different societies view the U.S., as with the U.S. itself. Since there is so much in the U.S. to dislike, as well as to admire, polyvalence makes anti-Americanism persistent.

Conclusion

A set of conclusions can be drawn following the preceded analysis. First, the article started with the observation that anti-Americanism constitutes a tidal phenomenon, which is as old as the U.S. itself. This means that anti-Americanism is not associated with any particular American administration (i.e George W. Bush), as the American Left suggests. Although the policies of different administrations may affect the degree of anti-Americanism, research has shown that anti-Americanism in certain parts of the world was very high even under certain Democratic administrations. Moreover, recent history has shown that multilateralism alone cannot guarantee a low level of anti-Americanism among the international public although it may assure the collaboration of certain states and governments.

Second, it has been shown that the six-fold classification of anti-Americanism can produce a richer understanding of this complex set of phenomena than the use of any single perspective to the exclusion of others.

Third, since WWII, the deep American involvement in world affairs has created enormous changes, some sought by the U.S. and others unsought and unanticipated. Others had to react, positively or negatively, to America's impact. Resentment and anti-Americanism have been among the undesired results of American power and engagement with the world. Consequently, one should distinguish between anti-Americanism as a set of attitudes towards U.S. citizens from behavior towards U.S. foreign policy. However, in the minds of many people around the world this distinction does not exist since the U.S. citizens not only have freely chosen their leaders but also they passively accept their policies no matter what the consequences of those policies are.

Fourth, the principles and structure of the American political and economic system, the superpower status of the U.S., the structure of the international system and the nature of international politics associated with it, assure to a great degree that the liberal, sovereign-nationalist, radical, and probably the legacy types of anti-Americanism will continue to exist and there is little any U.S. administration can do to prevent it. On the other hand, it appears easier for the U.S. to deal with the elitist and social types of anti-Americanism.

Fifth, the positions on anti-Americanism of both Left and Right in the U.S. are internally inconsistent. If anti-Americanism reflects ephemeral opinion, as the Left claims, changes in policy should consequently be greeted enthusiastically by those who had earlier expressed negative views toward the United States. The long-term effects of anti-

Americanism should therefore be small unless periods of intense negative opinion lead to significant social movements, even though experience shows that this is not true. Moreover, contrary to what the Left claims, evidence shows that anti-Americanism often expresses long-term distrust.

Since the essence of bias is the rejection of information inconsistent with one's prior view, as the Right suggests, broadly biased foreign publics should not be expected to change their opinions quickly in response to successes scored by a country that they fear and detest. The Right overestimates resentment toward American power and hatred of American values and overlooks the political salience of the distrust that American action can create. If the Right were correct, anti-Americanism would have risen more sharply in the 1990s after the collapse of the Soviet Union. But the U.S. remained quite popular in some parts of the world until 2002. The Right seems to be correct in its claim that as long as anti-Americanism reflects short-term and volatile opinion rather than long-term institutionalized bias, it does not pose serious problems for American foreign policy. However, if international public opinion hardens into distrust, as it appears to have happened in recent years in Europe, Latin America, the Middle East and parts of Asia, the political consequences for the medium and long-term could be severe.

Although anti-Americanism cannot be eradicated, its effects can be mitigated through an extensive public diplomacy campaign, the establishment of international educational programs, the exercise of "soft power", the use of diplomacy and the contact of foreign relations via multiple diplomatic channels, engaging in a substantial diplomatic dialogue even with the greatest 'enemies', relying less on the threat and exercise of military power and placing more emphasis on normative power, rejecting hegemonic policies and discourses, avoiding the vocabulary of arrogance and substituting it with a vocabulary of modesty and humility, a greater commitment to multilateralism (which requires a prior understanding of what this concept entails), and an intense engagement with global environmental affairs and development.

References

- Barber, Benjamin (1995) *Jihad vs. McWorld*. New York: Random House.
- Benhabib, Seyla (2002) "Unholy Wars: Reclaiming Democratic Virtues after September 11," in Craig Calhoun, Paul Price and Ashley Timmer (eds.), *Understanding September 11*. New York: New Press.
- Berman, Russell, A. (2004), *Anti-Americanism in Europe: A Cultural Problem*. Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press.
- Buruma, Iain and Avishai Margalit (2004) *Occidentalism: The West in the Eyes of Its Enemies*. New York: Penguin Press.
- Crockatt, Richard (2003) *Embattled: September 11, anti-Americanism and Global Order*. London: Routledge.
- Draxlbauer, Michael, Atrid M. Fellner, and Thomas Froschl (eds.) (2004) *(Anti)Americanisms*. Vienna: Lit Verlag.
- Economist, The* (2004) "Is It Rejection or Seduction: Both anti-Americanism and the Opposite have Deep Roots in Germany," (July 31): 46.
- Faath, Sigrid (ed.) (2006) *Anti-Americanism in the Islamic World*. London: Hurst & Company.

- Gaddis, John Lewis (2004) *Surprise, Security and the American Experience*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Gibson, John (2006) *Hating America*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Hertsgaard, Mark (2002) *The Eagle's Shadow: Why America Fascinates and Infuriates the World*. New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux.
- Hollander, Paul (ed.) (2004) *Understanding Anti-Americanism: Its Origins and Impact at Home and Abroad*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Huntington, Samuel P. (2004) *Who Are We? The Challenges to America's National Identity*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Hyde Smith, Pamela. (2007). "The Hard Road Back to Soft Power". *Georgetown Journal of International Affairs*, Winter/Spring 2007, pp. 113-121.
- Inglehart, Ronald and Wayne E. Baker (2001) "Modernization's Challenge to Traditional Values: Who's Afraid of Ronald McDonald?" *Futurist* 35, 2: 16-21.
- Joffe, Josef (2006) *Uberpower: The Imperial Temptation of America*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Joffe, Josef (2001) "Who's Afraid of Mr. Big?" *The National Interest* (Summer 2001): 43-52.
- Katzenstein, Peter and Robert O. Keohane (eds.) (2007) *Anti-Americanism(s) in World Politics*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Katzenstein, Peter and Rudra Sil (2004) "Rethinking Asian Security: A Case for Analytical Eclecticism," in J.J. Suh, Peter J. Katzenstein and Allen Carlson, eds., *Rethinking Security in East Asia: Identity, Power, and Efficiency*, pp. 1-33. Stanford, Ca.: Stanford University Press.
- Kroes, Rob and Maarten van Rossem (eds.) (1986) *Anti-Americanism in Europe*. Amsterdam: Free University Press.
- Lederer, William J., and Eugene R. Burdick (1958) *The Ugly American*. New York: Norton.
- Lieven, Anatol (2004) *America Right or Wrong: An Anatomy of American Nationalism*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Nau, Henry R. (2002) *At Home Abroad: Identity and Power in American Foreign Policy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2002.
- Nolan, Mary (2005) "Anti-Americanism and Americanization in Germany," *Politics & Society* 33,1 (March): 88-122.
- Norris, Pippa and Ronald Inglehart (2004) *Sacred and Secular. Religion and Politics Worldwide*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- O'Connor, Brendon and Martin Griffiths (2006) *The Rise of anti-Americanism*. London: Routledge.

- Pew Research Center for People and the Press 2002, 2003, 2004 and 2005,
<http://people-press.org>
- Polanyi, Karl (1957). *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of our Time*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Revel, Jean-Francois (2002) *Anti-Americanism*. San Francisco: Encounter Books.
- Ross, Andrew and Kristin Ross (eds.) (2004) *Anti-Americanism*. New York: New York University Press.
- Rubin, Barry and Judith Colp Rubin (2004) *Hating America: A History*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rubinstein, Alvin Z. and Donald E. Smith (eds.) (1985) *Anti-Americanism in the Third World: Implications for U.S. foreign Policy*. New York: Praeger.
- Sardar, Ziauddin and Merry Wyn Davies (2002) *Why Do People Hate America?* New York: Disinformation Company.
- Stephan, Alexander (ed.) (2005) *Americanization and Anti-Americanism: The German Encounter with American Culture after 1945*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Stephanidis, Ioannis D. (2002) *Asymmetrical Partners: Greece and the United States in the Cold War*. Athens.
- Strauss, David (1978) *Menace in the West: The Rise of French Anti-Americanism in Modern Times*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press.
- Waltz, Kenneth N. (1979) *Theory of International Politics*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Zeitlin, Jonathan and Gary Herriguel (eds.) (2000) *Americanization and its Limits: Reworking US Technology and Management in Post-War Europe and Japan*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.