"Cultural Diplomacy and U.S. Security" A PLENARY PRESENTATION

by HELENA KANE FINN,
fellow in diplomaic studies Council on Foreign Relations,
and former acting Assistant Secretary of State
for Education and Cultural Affairs

ANDRÁS SZÁNTÓ

(Deputy Director, National Arts Journalism Program):

Our first speaker is here to talk about the past, present and future of cultural diplomacy as practiced by the United States. Helena Kane Finn was acting assistant secretary of state for education and cultural affairs for three years, and as such, the senior career diplomat at the Department of State for public diplomacy. She is currently on leave from the State Department as the Cyrus Vance Fellow in Diplomatic Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations. Ms. Finn's primary expertise is on Turkey, where she served several tours of duty as a career foreign service officer. She has also served as a diplomat in Pakistan, Germany and Austria. An expert on public diplomacy, press, educational and cultural affairs, she is a long-time champion of cultural initiatives within the State Department and an advocate of understanding art on its own terms. As you will hear, she sees cultural diplomacy as a two-way street, involving a genuine dialogue and a cultural exchange between nations.

FINN: It is most significant that the National Arts Journalism Program, the Center for Arts and Culture and Arts International have chosen to sponsor an event titled "Arts & Minds: A Conference on Cultural Diplomacy amid Global Tensions" at the Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism at a time when we have embarked on an ambitious project to bring democracy to one of the countries of the Arab world. In a National Public Radio interview, just last week, our Deputy Defense Secretary, Dr. Paul Wolfowitz, observed that two decades ago, few believed that democracy could flourish in Korea and other countries of the Far East. He noted that he was troubled by the assertion that for some unexplained reason, democracy could not thrive in the countries of the Arab world.

It remains to be seen whether the goal of a democratic Iraq with equal rights and privileges for all its citizens, regardless of ethnicity, religion or gender, can be achieved. Since this goal has long since been met by another majority Muslim country in the region, Iraq's neighbor to the north, Turkey, there is reason to be hopeful. Although Turkey is not an Arab country, it shares some regional characteristics with Iraq. Its democratization has been a long process, beginning with the creation of the Turkish Republic in 1923. Perhaps the most important feature of Turkish democracy is that it has been generated from within the society. It is evident that there are Iraqi dissenters in all leading ethnic and religious groups, who are anxious to take on this enormous task.

In the course of this conference, we are going to take a close look at the image of the United States in the world and examine the ways in which that image is established. There is no question that we have a very serious job to do, when much of the world views our liberation of Iraq as an occupation and questions the legitimacy of the war. Is this view of the United States a temporary aberration, or will this negative image adhere? It seems to me that the world will look closely at what we do in Iraq over the next few months to make a determination. Marketing experts know that purchasers want to review the product performance. We will be judged not only on what we say, what messages we transmit about democracy and human rights, but by what we do. If Iraq remains a united country with full civil liberties for all, a country whose vast oil reserves are used to benefit all its citizens, we will be vindicated. If Iraq dissolves into chaos and civil war, we can be certain that anti-American sentiments around the globe will be considerably exacerbated.

During this conference we are going to discuss the history of cultural diplomacy. It is no secret that such efforts during the Cold War were funded to some extent by the Central Intelligence Agency. While it would be completely inappropriate for such sponsorship to take place today, it is useful to recognize that promotion of the American culture was considered vital to the security of the United States. In an era when this great city of New York has been the victim of a horrific act of terrorism, perpetrated by extremists willing to cause the deaths of thousands of civilians in the name of some distorted religious ideology, it is clear that cultural diplomacy is very much in the security interest of the United States.

We must reenter the battlefield of ideas with every bit as much determination as we did during the Cold War. Years ago, desperate and disenfranchised young people in developing countries around the world sought the solace and solutions of radical communist ideology. The collapse of the Soviet Union gave us a short decade of respite before these same young people became subject to a far more pernicious ideology masquerading as one of the world's great religions. One only has to study the history of Arab Spain or the civilizations created by the Ottomans, the Sefavids and the Moguls, to understand that Islam has given the world some of its greatest architecture and most beautiful poetry. When these empires were at their peak, Muslims and Jews studied together in the universities in Andalusia; Hindus and Muslims experienced a cultural tolerance and artistic expression seldom seen elsewhere

during the reign of Akbar in India; and Muslims, Christians and Jews lived in peace and harmony in the Ottoman cities of Sarajevo, Salonika and Istanbul. It is tragic that such a high civilization should be hijacked by a few fanatics.

The great powers of Europe—Great Britain, France, Germany—have long understood the importance of cultural diplomacy. Anyone who has lived or worked in the countries of the developing world understands the enormous impact of European ideas and values transmitted through cultural programs. Societies in transformation will strike a balance between preservation of their indigenous culture and exploration of the new world of ideas and values inherent in the cultural presentations of these European embassies. Although France, for example, has no historic ties to Pakistan, its cultural programs in Lahore and Islamabad have introduced great works of film and literature to fascinated audiences.

During the military rule of the fundamentalist General Zia-ul-Haq, the German Goethe Institut produced plays like George Bernard Shaw's "Arms and the Man" which spoke to audiences yearning for a return to democracy. I have observed with huge admiration the work of the British Council, the Alliance Française and the Goethe Institut in countries like Turkey and Pakistan. Our European friends understand the extent to which cultural programs can empower the forces of progress and modernity in democratizing societies.

When it comes to the enormous challenge posed by the negative image of the United States throughout the Muslim world, I believe that there are several things that we should keep in mind. While the followers of bin Laden would unify the entire Muslim world in hatred of all that we represent, they are a relatively small, radical element. We do not want to fall into the dangerous track of assuming that this world is a monolith, or that the deranged views of the few are representative of the many. There are 1.2 billion Muslims around the globe. Indonesia in the Far East is the largest Muslim country in the world. India comes second, with its enormous Muslim minority. Nigeria and other countries in Africa have significant Muslim populations. This is true as well of western China. We hear often of the Turkic Muslim peoples of Central Asia and the Caucasus, but few know that the Tartars and other Turkic Muslim people are the second largest ethnic group in Russia proper. We should remember as well, that the United Kingdom has a very large number of Indian and Pakistani Muslims. France has a large number of Muslims from North Africa. The vast majority of these people, while possibly critical of specific policies of the United States, are often filled with admiration for our accomplishments and are desirous of visiting or emigrating to America.

It is to this huge silent majority that we must speak effectively. When there are policy differences, we must make the extra effort to engage in dialogue. When there are opportunities to stress our shared values, we must seize those opportunities and make the most of them.

Although there are many elements in the Cold War's diplomacy efforts that could be useful, I believe that what we do today must be tailored to the vastly different circumstances in which we find ourselves. The enemy, let's call it bin Ladenism, is certainly different, employing box cutters and low-tech strategies instead of the grand arsenals of nuclear weapons housed by the Soviet Union.

The victims of Bin Ladenism are the children around the world infected by the germs of hatred at madrassas and other educational institutions originally intended for the benign instruction of religion. The distortion of these educational institutions is one of the great tragedies of the modern Muslim world. Fleeting images of tolerance and the acceptance of Islam in the United States are not sufficient to pose a counterpoint to indoctrination so pervasive.

It is essential that we find ways to assist the many moderate people in these societies to create educational institutions that foster the study of science, history, math, literature and technology so that these young people can enter adulthood interested in interacting with the modern world and equipped to meet its requirements. Children everywhere are filled with curiosity and a thirst for knowledge. The children, who sat on the dirt floor of a school

Children from the slums of India have figured out how to get connected to the Internet. Imagine the potential of the world's children with the kind of support and encouragement we are able to give.

in Karachi shortly after the partition of the Indian subcontinent, have gone on to study abroad and to make a contribution to the world. Despite the severity of the conditions, their instructors were dedicated to imparting useful knowledge. Children from the slums of India have figured out how to get connected to the Internet. Imagine the potential of the world's children with the kind of support and encouragement we are able to give.

As a career diplomat, I have had the opportunity to serve at our embassies around the world. Aside from tours in Frankfurt, Germany and Vienna, Austria, I've had two in Turkey and Pakistan. For the better part of the past two decades, I have lived and worked abroad as an American diplomat. When I returned to Washington three years ago, I had the good fortune to hold the most senior career position in the field of public diplomacy at the Department of State. I know what it means to live for years at a time in another culture with the responsibility of conveying our policy positions and communicating our intellectual and cultural values to extremely varied audiences. I also know how things work at the Washington end, especially since the consolidation of the USIA into the State Department.

It is my belief that diplomacy is always a two-way street. Indeed, I have often thought that in many ways the study of literature is the best preparation, in the sense that it teaches one to enter into the minds, hearts and social circumstances of others. Balzac, Thackeray and Dickens, to say nothing of our own Henry James and James Baldwin, are the best possible exercises to master in preparation for this life work. To be effective, a good diplomat should know the language, culture and history of the country in which he or she is posted. To be effective, a good diplomat must know how to listen—both to what is said and what remains

8 ARTS & MINDS 9

unsaid. To be effective, a good diplomat must be able to imagine the sentiments and aspirations of those he or she encounters. Traditional diplomacy is the art of negotiation. These skills are crucial. Public diplomacy involves selling America—its ideals, its values, its beliefs to people in far-flung places across the globe.

I once heard that when a salesman knocks on the door, it is not the actual product that he is selling that counts most, but his own presentation. Of course, both are important. The customer will inspect the product. But the customer will initially evaluate the salesperson. The salesperson who speaks his language, knows the cultural sights of his city, is aware of the history of his country, will be far more effective than the bombastic character who tells him what to think without reference to his own point of view.

This is why good diplomacy can never depend on the messages created by people stifled by a bureaucracy that does not encourage them to go out and explore the world. When Secretary Colin Powell first addressed the State Department, he told us to listen to the field. Those were his exact words, the words of a military man, "Listen to the field." This is profound advice. It is the officer in the field, the person with the language and cultural skills, who knows how to craft the message. It is the officer in the field who sends home the warnings about the deterioration of our image and suggests appropriate remedies. At our embassies and consulates, we have citizens of the host country who assist us in the difficult job of interpreting local reaction to events and devising successful approaches. These wonderful people are called "foreign service nationals," and they are the bedrock of our outreach overseas.

This conference deals with cultural diplomacy, but I would like to review the range of activities under the rubric of public diplomacy. It is my belief that culture, like politics, can be a part of almost everything we do. I use the term "culture" in the broadest American sense to include all those activities that Senator Fulbright liked to call "mutual understanding." While the creation of immediate images and impressions through the use of television and radio has tremendous importance, it is the long-term investment in people through our exchange programs that really makes the difference. Every good financial portfolio has its blue-chip stocks. The exchange programs, and especially Fulbright, are our blue-chip stocks. I would even go so far as to say that if the Department of State has a "brand" name around the world, that brand name is Fulbright. Fortunately, despite the misguided draconian budget cuts of the '90s, Fulbright, and its stellar companion, the International Visitor Program, remain intact, if small. Huge damage has been done to the cultural diplomacy infrastructure, but luckily these two most effective vehicles are at the ready for amplification.

What happened in the '90s? Well, it was the end of history, as we all know. The Soviet Union collapsed. We became the sole remaining superpower. Everyone wanted American blue jeans and Coca Cola, so why bother with libraries and dance troupes? Our stunningly isolationist Congress, an amazing mismatch for our new leadership role, challenged the idea that we would want to disseminate information about the United States through cultural centers and libraries. After all, we had won the Cold War. It was time to pack our bags and get out of the business of interaction with our counterparts abroad. After all, technology could do it all.

As Ross Perot so aptly put it, "What do we need diplomats for?

Just send a fax." He actually said that. So as the war raged in the Balkans, we closed our American library in Belgrade—the only place that Serbs could access information from the outside. As the struggle for Turkey's soul between social democrats and fundamentalists fomented, we closed our American library in Ankara—the only place where university professors and their students could turn for our latest publications. As the implementation of the Dayton Peace Accords took hold, we closed the Center for Democracy that had been created in the Vienna Amerika Haus as a neutral territory for reconciliation between Croats, Serbs and Muslims of Bosnia-Herzegovina. As fundamentalist forces gained ground in Pakistan, we closed our magnificent American Center in Islamabad, allowing the fundamentalist opponents of Salman Rushdie, who had attacked it years before, to have the last laugh.

The America I grew up in was one that wished to share its bounty with the world. Have we grown parsimonious in our unprecedented prosperity? Do our young people want to purchase SUVs instead of volunteering for the Peace Corps?

I cannot exaggerate the importance of the American Centers known in the German-speaking world as the Amerika Hauser, or America Houses, an extension of the USIS operation in virtually every corner of the globe. These centers were not just libraries, although that alone would have been ample justification for their existence. The American Centers provided a venue for engagement between American experts invited from the United States—on everything from foreign policy to family planning—and the most influential academics, government officials and journalists in the host country.

The American Centers served another purpose as well. As put to me by a Turkish professor who is an expert in NATO issues, the American Center in Ankara provided a place where Turks, working in different universities and ministries and media, could meet not only with diplomats from the U.S. Embassy, but with one another to share their views about the United States. Needless to say, most of these centers were designed with an auditorium and an exhibition place, lending themselves to every sort of cultural presentation.

During the reckless and short-sighted isolationist budget slashing of the 1990s, these were downgraded to information resource centers—places where a select, few senior scholars could make an appointment by the hour to do research on an Internet outlet. No more could students come to write their papers. No more did faculty come to research their books. No more did journalists come to debate foreign and economic policy issues with American experts and diplomatic staff. No more did we talk

to one another. And all the people of all those countries, from the richest to the poorest, bemoaned the loss of contact with the United States. And the people of all those countries were made to feel that we did not think they were worth talking to, let alone listening to.

By the year 2000, the White House recognized that some serious mistakes had been made. A White House conference on cultural diplomacy was organized that November. The President, the First Lady and the Secretary of State invited a host of prominent artists, writers and cultural figures to participate. Yo-Yo Ma and Rita Dove joined with performers and writers from around the world to discuss winning hearts and minds. The Aga Khan made an eloquent plea for greater contact with the Muslim world. Not even a year later, on Sept. 11, we discovered with horrific severity how right he had been. We discovered that something was dangerously amiss

The conference had its lighter moments as well, as when the French cultural attaché complained that she had to sponsor cultural programs in both directions, paying not only for French groups to perform in the United States, but for American groups to perform in France. I was reminded that while in Ankara, to my immense embarrassment, it was the French Embassy that sponsored the American Jazz Festival. Even the Fulbright Programs in some countries such as Germany and Japan are almost entirely subsidized from German and Japanese resources. What does this say about us? We do not care enough about such exchange programs to pay even our half?

So what is to be done? It is clear that the resources allocated to public diplomacy are utterly inadequate. An investment of a few billion a year in public diplomacy could prevent wars that cost many, many billions, to say nothing of the loss of human life and the destruction of the environment, and as we've seen recently, the destruction of a very, very important historic treasure—the museum in Baghdad. We are the greatest military power since the Roman Empire. However, successful empires—the Greek, the Roman, the Byzantine, the Ottoman, the British, even the Mongol—built roads and bridges, schools and hospitals, aqueducts and canal systems, public baths and theaters. If we are to don the imperial mantle, should we not also take responsibility for the follow-up?

Have we finished the job we started in Afghanistan? While some progress has been made in Kabul, the rest of the country has yet to be brought to order. Is this a good indicator for what is to come in Iraq? It is all too well and good to be cast as Sparta, but whatever happened to Periclean Athens? Did that go out with the Kennedys? We recall with nostalgia the days when Pablo Casals was invited to the White House and no one questioned the wisdom of sending the Merce Cunningham Dance Company or the Boston Symphony Orchestra to perform at the Istanbul Festival. The America I grew up in was one that wished to share its bounty with the world. Have we grown parsimonious in our unprecedented prosperity? Do our young people want to purchase SUVs instead of volunteering for the Peace Corps?

Let's pretend, then, if only for the most brutally assessed reasons of pure, strategic self-interest, we were to allocate sufficient funding for public diplomacy. What would we do with those funds? We would immediately amplify the Fulbright Program,

enabling more faculty and students to study in the United States, especially from the countries of the Muslim world, and send more American faculty and students abroad. We would expand the International Visitor and Voluntary Visitor Programs to enable more young political leaders, academics, journalists, intellectuals, educators and cultural figures to travel to the United States to meet their American counterparts. We would support youth exchange programs that would enable young people around the world to come to the United States to spend one high school year with an American family and enable young Americans to do the same abroad. We would support secular education systems in developing countries through teacher training and curriculum development programs.

We would reopen the American Centers, including the libraries, worldwide, adapting each to the design most suited for its constituency. We would expand Arts America, the division of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, to enable it to provide once again, performing groups and exhibitions for our American Centers worldwide. We would ensure that every American Center had effective programs for English teaching and computer training and student counseling. We would expand our speakers programs, sending more American experts around the world to engage directly with foreign audiences. We would use each and every program to advance mutual understanding through cultural exchange. Fulbright Commissions would grant scholarships to artists and writers. Performing artists and literary figures would be included in the International Visitors Program.

We have spent about \$2 billion a month bombing Afghanistan. We will spend upwards of \$75 billion bombing Iraq, and that's just the beginning. No one questions expenditures that are justified by the need for greater security. Just one or two billion spent in the human investment described above could go a long way to preventing future wars.

There has been no greater gift to humanity than the development of information technology; however, it must be used to support the human effort, not replace it. Ironically, both the CIA and the USIA made the same mistake in the '90s. Our colleagues in the intelligence community relied far too heavily on electronically acquired data and too little on what they call HUMINT, or human intelligence, information gathered by real, live people. USIA, ordered by Congress to downsize, replaced many diplomatic postings with technology overseas. So the newspaper editor did not get a visit anymore from the press attaché. Instead he got an electronically transmitted mass mailing. Person to person dialogue was out, data was in. When I asked Middle East peace negotiator Dennis Ross what he would have done differently over the many years he had worked on the Middle East peace process, he answered without hesitation, more person to person contact. There is no substitute. When it is not possible to have direct human contact, technology can provide a second best option. I recently sat in on a wonderful conversation via DVC, digital video conference, between New York novelist Gary Shteyngart and a group of writers invited for this purpose to the home of the public affairs officer in Tel Aviv. When the speaker is unable to travel abroad, this technology enables a good discussion.

In general, the traditional focus in our programs has been telling America's story. There is nothing wrong with that. We have

10 ARTS & MINDS 11

a good story to tell, and one that fascinates people around the world. Yet when the Aga Khan addressed the White House Conference on Culture and Diplomacy in the fall of 2000, he hit upon something that is missing from our planning. We have not made an effort to make sure we listen to the stories of others. We can do this by making it possible for writers and artists from other countries to come to the United States. Indeed, the International Visitors Program did provide grants for writers to attend the Iowa Workshop for two-month stints. This effort has largely disappeared due to budget cuts, but I was very touched to hear the brilliant Turkish novelist Orhan Pamuk tell PBS correspondent Elizabeth Farnsworth that he first came to understand the United States while at Iowa on an International Visitor Program grant.

One of the most important newer innovations is something called the Ambassador's Fund for Cultural Preservation. The program invites embassies from the third poorest countries in the world to submit projects for cultural preservation to a committee of regional experts, art historians and archaeologists. Small grants of up to \$20,000 are awarded to the top proposals in this annual competition. The ambassador then has the occasion to publicly announce, and then award, the grant. Ambassadors, needless to say, are wild about this program. The reason they like it so much is that it lets local people know that we value their culture. In countries where cultural artifacts are endangered through neglect, or worse, such a ceremony sends the message that the United States values cultural heritage and thinks it is worth preserving.

In this presentation I have focused extensively on countries of the developing world; however, we have to think seriously about putting money into programs in wealthy countries as well. Both Germany and Japan are eager to have more exchange programs of every kind. It is no secret we have some serious differences with our closest allies. Perhaps these differences would have been more equitably resolved had the relationships not been so neglected over the past decade. Another thing to think about when dealing with the wealthy countries of the Arab world is that we still might want to cover certain expenses. Two decades ago, there were thousands of Saudi students in the United States. Then Saudi Arabia built its own university system, and many stopped coming here. For the past decade, there has been little of the intellectual cross-fertilization that occurred earlier. It is perhaps no accident that this coin-

cided with the rise of radical Wahhabism in Saudi Arabia. It might be very much in our interest to continue to encourage Saudis to be educated in the United States.

I've not spoken at length about the arts because I believe that it is so utterly self-evident that we would want to share our rich cultural life—music, painting, dance, theater, sculpture—with the rest of the world. Of course, many of our leading artists perform or exhibit in the wealthy countries of the world. They go to Japan and Europe at the invitation of local entrepreneurs. However, it is very much in our interest that our artists visit those countries that cannot afford to extend such invitations. There are Russiantrained musicians and dancers throughout Central Asia and the Caucasus who would relish performances by visiting Americans.

I believe that it would make eminent sense to create a public-private sector board dedicated to supporting such tours through corporate sponsorship. The board would include diplomats with regional expertise and experience, government officials and representatives from the private sector. Such a board could function in a manner similar to that of Fulbright. In the fall of 2000, we sent the Dance Theater of Harlem to China under such a program. Not only did the dancers perform in major cities, they gave master classes. The performances were broadcast on television, bringing this marvelous artistic experience into millions of Chinese homes. We should be doing much more of this. Unfortunately, the light lit briefly then quickly dimmed.

I'd like to mention here the conference co-sponsor, Arts International, which provides support for U.S. artists invited to participate in major international performing arts festivals and visual arts exhibitions. This fund was founded as a public-private partnership of two federal agencies, the National Endowment for the Arts and the U.S. Department of State and two foundations—The Pew Charitable Trusts and The Rockefeller Foundation. Since 2001 The Doris Duke Charitable Foundation has provided additional support for the performing arts program.

I wish you well at this conference and look forward to the day when its recommendations can be implemented. I certainly implore all of you to demand that the necessary resources be allocated for public diplomacy. There are dedicated professionals at the ready to revitalize the American cultural outreach. It may be the best way to tell an angry world that we care.

America's Global Image: Short-Term Branding or Long-Term Exchange?

MODERATOR: HODDING CARTER, president, Knight Foundation, and fomer Sate Department spikesman PANELISTS:
RICHARD W. BULLIET, professor & Middle Eastern History,
Columbia University
ANDREW KOHUT, director,
The Pew Researh Center for the People and the Pess
JOSHUA MURAVCHIK, resident scholar
American Enterprise Institute
JOHN ROMANO, schenwiter and producer

CARTER: In 1953, my father was offered the head position of the United States Information Agency (USIA). We had a family conference about it, and I insisted, throwing myself on the floor and screaming and beating my head on the floor, that he must not do it. "Why?" he said. "Because I'll have to leave Sheila," I said. There were things that mattered on that day to me much more than the notions of what we were doing in the world, but he didn't listen. and he took off for Washington to accept, from the man he had supported in the election of '52, his mandate. He got off the plane in Atlanta and called mother and said, "I'm not doing it." She said, "Why?" He said, "Because when I go up to the Senate to talk about my new job, that Irish son of a bitch from Wisconsin is going to ask me, 'Did I know that my researcher at PMin the 1940s was a communist?' And I'm going to punch him out." So he came back up from that non-existent rendezvous, and a year later spent four months touring Asia under the auspices of the very agency he had turned down, from which he came back an even-more convinced convert to the notion that soft diplomacy in the world was at least as important in the world as heavy nuclear weapons.

Well, we go forward some 23 years thereafter, and when asked by the incoming president of the United States' minions what I wished to do, I declared, of course, first that I wanted to be deputy secretary of state, and they laughed. Then I said I'd like to be assistant secretary of state for Europe, and they laughed. Then I said I'd really like to do USIA, and they fell on the ground laughing, and they gave me the job of chief of staff at the Department of State—a job which, in its own way, mandated a reaching out to the rest of the world, as well as to the United States, in ways that tried to be somewhat persuasive, but not very soft about what it was and the virtues of our own policies.

A few years ago there was a brief moment in which it seemed that the new administration, which had inherited the collapse of the Soviet Union, might be persuaded to not back away. But that collapse that Ambassador Finn discussed rather eloquently was, in fact, a collapse of the administration that came into office in 1992. It was a deliberate backing away—from the center-left perspective—that we no longer needed to be actively in the world, because that was a Cold War relic, and now we had to be about other businesses later to be defined. We are still suffering from a variety of such beatings, which were amplified from the other side of the ideological spectrum by an all-out assault on the State Department and USIA, whose net result was the configuration we now find ourselves in, in which there's no longer a separate agency for con-

ducting our cultural and soft diplomacy in the world, but in fact a reduced presence of state.

Here we are, more than 50 years into what we do well, discussing whether we ought to do it better or at all.I think from this panel we're going to be hearing a variety of views on this subject, which is a good and sufficient thing.

KOHUT: The United States' image became the subject of The Pew Research Center's first *Global Attitudes* survey, the largest public opinion survey ever conducted. It was conducted in 44 nations—44 independent national surveys among 38,000 people. It was released at the end of last year, and it documented what everyone suspected—that is, that America had a real image problem, a growing image problem. The outpouring of sympathy post-9/11, a year and a half earlier, had been transformed into increasing hostility, not only in the Arab world, not only among Muslims more generally, but all around the world—in NATO countries, in the developing nations of Africa and Asia, even to the north and south of us. Still, in about the third paragraph of that report, we wrote, "But there's a great reserve of liking and support for the United States. It still exists in most countries." That was then.

We have since conducted surveys that measured the toll of antiwar sentiment on the image of the United States, and we changed the verbs. Rather than "America's image is slipping," "America's image has plummeted." I won't read many numbers to you, but these are so dramatic that I will. In a survey we conducted in early March, in Great Britain, we found that only 48 percent of the British public that we had spoken to had a favorable image of the United States. It had been 75 percent just six months earlier, and the State Department had pegged it at 83 percent in 2000. So it went from 83 to 75 to 48, and that was as good as it got. In the other eight countries, it was dramatically worse. In Germany, the trend was 78 percent pre-2001, 61 percent in 2002, and 25 percent in March of 2003. Even in Italy, where we have such a history of favorable attitudes toward the United States, only 34 percent of the Italians had a favorable view of us.

Unfortunately, clearly the impact of opposition to the war, among the publics of the willing nations, the coalition of the willing and the unwilling, was responsible for this. I'm not so sure that the speed of the war, or the pictures of cheering crowds in Baghdad, will change the image of America very quickly. The poll that we conducted in early March showed that despite opposition to the war, the majorities in most of these countries believed that

12 ARTS & MINDS 13