2019 Special Issue
European Foreign Affairs Review
Broadening Soft Power in EU-US Relations

Transatlantic Cultural Relations, Soft Power, and the Role of US Cultural Diplomacy in Europe

Giles Scott-Smith

This article considers the cultural relationship in the transatlantic space from the perspective of US cultural diplomacy. It interprets cultural diplomacy as the mobilization of soft power resources in the support of foreign policy goals, as distinct from the cultural relations pursued by non-state actors. During the second half of the 20th century, a large-scale investment by US cultural diplomacy was aimed at developing and nurturing the cultural ties with Europe, as part of the wider integration of (Western, later also Eastern) Europe into a US-led world order. This involved combining the unique outreach possibilities provided by the appeal and excellence of US cultural producers with an anti-communist agenda that sought to reverse the negative perception of the United States as culturally 'barren'. This effort declined following the end of the Cold War, since it was no longer considered important. The shock of 9/11 once again directed attention to how the US portrays itself abroad, reviving interest in cultural diplomacy and generating a wide range of programmes to (re-)engage with European publics, particularly minorities. The article begins by introducing the concept of cultural diplomacy, and examining its uses during the Cold War. It then evaluates the specific cultural tools that have been used to establish transatlantic connections in the wake of 9/11. It concludes by considering the growing significance of the 'transnational transatlantic' for developing goal-driven ties between the US and Europe across a range of issues.

1. INTRODUCTION

Through the 20th century and into the 21st, the United States (US) has had a unique and lasting influence on European political, economic, social and cultural affairs. US cultural phenomena, ranging from consumer styles and mass entertainment to education practices and forms of social communication, have represented a profoundly influential range of soft power resources through which the US has shaped, enticed, and aggravated European identities, desires, and futures. Whereas before World War II these cultural influences were channeled through the private sector, from the onset of the Cold War the US state took a guiding influence as part of its anti-communist campaign. The end of the Cold War brought a re-evaluation, since the departure of the ideological adversary was interpreted by some as a reason to cut

back on state investments in this field. US cultural diplomacy had 'succeeded' and was no longer necessary in Europe, the result being the eventual demise of the United States Information Agency (USIA) in 1999.[1] Although 9/11 and stuttering processes of democratization across Eurasia did generate a renewed interest in Europe, it has not reversed the trend towards investing more in cultural engagement with the Middle East and the Asia-Pacific.

This chapter gives an overview of the concept of cultural diplomacy and addresses the outreach activities that were practiced by US cultural diplomacy during the Cold War in the European area. It then considers the efforts of US cultural diplomacy to build integrative networks of trust across Europe in the changed international circumstances following 9/11. It concludes by considering the growing significance of the 'transnational transatlantic' for developing goal-driven ties between the US and Europe across a range of issues.

2. CULTURAL DIPLOMACY

An ever-present form of interaction between peoples and cultures, cultural diplomacy has taken many forms, from the 'tributary' system of allegiance required by Chinese emperors of their neighbours, to the use of culture as an extended form of inter-state competition between nation-states in late 19th century Europe, to the Cold War ideological 'battle of ideas' between the superpowers. Different methods have been used over time, ranging from the presentation of gifts to the celebration of anniversaries to the promotion of language.[2] Across all of these, 'impression management' is paramount,[3] leading some to regard cultural diplomacy as a form of 'nation branding', where culture communicates signals related to what sets of values a nation stands for.[4] For Nicolas Cull, cultural diplomacy is one of five key activities that fall under the rubric of public diplomacy, although others contest the primacy that should be given to either cultural diplomacy or public diplomacy as separate activities.[5] For the purposes of this article, cultural diplomacy is taken as the use of cultural products, performers and practices, broadly covering the arts but also education and training, as a form of directed inter-cultural communication between

* Giles Scott-Smith holds the Roosevelt Chair of New Diplomatic History at Leiden University, and is the Academic Director of the Roosevelt Institute for American Studies, Middelburg. This article has benefitted greatly from the research assistance of Leon Pauw.

[1] N. Cull, *The Decline and Fall of the United States Information Agency: US Public Diplomacy 1989-2001* (Palgrave Macmillan 2012).

[2] G. Scott-Smith, *Cultural Diplomacy,* 176-189 (A. Holmes & S. Rofe eds., *Global Diplomacy,* Rowman & Littlefield 2016).

[3] I. Neumann, *Diplomacy and the Arts*, 114 (C. Constantinou, Pauline Kerr & Paul Sharp eds. *The Sage Handbook of Diplomacy*, Sage 2013).

[4] C. Viktorin, J. Gienow-Hecht, A. Estner, & M. Will eds., *Nation Branding in Modern History* (Berghahn 2018).

[5] N. Cull, *Public Diplomacy: Taxonomies and Histories,* Annals of the American Association of Political and Social Sciences 616, 31-55 (2008).

nations that is coordinated by state agencies. This can be interpreted as the mobilization of soft power assets to achieve forms of international exchange.

There is an important difference between cultural relations and cultural diplomacy in this regard: whereas the former involves only private actors, the latter, as 'processes of diplomacy', necessarily involves one or other institutions of the state as initiators, sponsors, mediators, or guiders.[6] Cultural diplomacy for some observers is necessarily tied to state objectives abroad, otherwise the epithet 'diplomacy' would not apply. For others, the state should be kept at a distance to allow cultural exchange to take place outside of the shadow of foreign policy goals. Nevertheless, what unites both perspectives is the belief that cultural activities and artifacts are – if used well – ideal means through which to establish 'good relations' between peoples.[7] Thus definitions tend to emphasise the desire for achieving 'mutual understanding' through ideas, information, and creative expression.[8] Broadly speaking, cultural diplomacy *should* contribute to the furthering of more peaceful international relations by providing a space for dialogue and engagement. The analysis of US cultural diplomacy presented here confirms this to be the predominant outlook, albeit within the context of a US interpretation of engagement that looks to nurture social developments in particular directions. Cultural relations, on the other hand, are here explored more from the perspective of 'transnational Transatlantica', as laid out in the introduction to this special issue.[9]

3. STRENGTHENING TRANSATLANTIC COMMUNITY DURING THE COLD WAR

During the Cold War, the United States invested considerable resources into shaping the European cultural landscape. Whereas much of this was conducted through commercial enterprises and mass cultural artifacts such as films from Hollywood, the US government also played a key role. In the late 1940s the legislative foundations were laid for US cultural diplomacy in the ensuing decades. The 1948 Information and Educational Exchange Act, otherwise named after its congressional sponsors as 'Smith-Mundt', authorized the government 'to promote a better understanding of the United States in other countries, and to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries'.[10]

[6] J. Mitchell, *International Cultural Relations* (Allen & Unwin 1986).
[7] P. Goff, *Cultural Diplomacy* 419-435 (A. Cooper, J. Heine, & R. Thakur eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Diplomacy* Oxford University Press 2013) 419-435.
[8] W. Laqueur, *Save Public Diplomacy: Broadcasting America's Message Matters*, *Foreign Affairs* 73:5, 19-24 (1994); M. Cummings, *Cultural Diplomacy and the United States Government: A Survey* (Center for the Arts and Culture 2003).
[9] S. Schunz, G. Scott-Smith, & L. Van Langenhove, *Broadening Soft Power in EU-US Relations*, EFAR 24 (2019).
[10] P.L. 402, *US Information and Educational Exchange Act* (80th Congress 1948).

A central aspect of this endeavour was the collaboration with private partners within the United States to ensure the participation of US citizens in the cultural outreach of their own nation, in doing so preventing a government monopoly in setting out 'US cultural identity'. Cultural diplomacy was to be about generating trust, building relationships, and undermining negative stereotypes, for mutual gain. The assumption was that a greater access to US cultural output the world over would be enough to change attitudes abroad in a favourable direction. Hence 'Audiences did not need to be convinced so much as they needed to be aware of democracy and the United States'.[11] American principles of freedom and democracy were held to be universally applicable and possessing universal appeal. This grounded the fundamental belief that the United States held a monopoly on the truth, and only needed to spread its message far enough in order to undermine the false claims of propagandizing opponents. Crucially, although Smith-Mundt authorized governmental involvement, the key to success was seen to be in the mobilization of private-sector assets – US civil society had to tell the story, as that would be more effective. The 'Campaign of Truth' launched by President Truman soon after therefore relied heavily on collaboration with the US media to spread the 'correct message'.[12] The creation of the USIA in 1953 also saw the Agency building a myriad of public-private partnerships across US society in order to fulfill its mission.[13]

But Smith-Mundt did not resolve taxing issues concerning responsibility or integrity. Following World War II a continuous debate was conducted both inside and outside Congress as to the most effective and appropriate apparatus through which the US should express its cultural values and achievements abroad.[14] Opponents of government involvement in the cultural sector criticized the (as they saw it) controlling role of officials to 'determine' what forms American culture should take when shown abroad. This notoriously led to the cancellation in 1947 of the State Department's 'Advancing American Art' exhibition while it was on tour in Eastern Europe and Latin America. Meant to represent a showcase of the latest trends in American modern art, it drew criticism for its lack of artistic diversity and elitist bias towards modernism, triggering investigations from Congressmen who linked the avant-garde styles to alleged communist sympathies of the artists. While some of the arguments used were verging on the hysterical, the experience led the State Department to distance itself from taking such a hands-on role in the future, instead contracting out the promotion of American art abroad to private partners such as the Museum of Modern Art in New York.[15] A chastening experience, it was the first

[11] C. Hayden, *The Rhetoric of Soft Power: Public Diplomacy in Global Contexts* 232 (Lexington 2012).
[12] R. Ricaud *'The Campaign of Truth': Propaganda and the Fabrication of Truth under Truman*, Revue Francaise d'Etudes Americaines 133, 24-37 (2012).
[13] N. Cull, *The Cold War and the United States Information Agency: American Propaganda and Public Diplomacy 1945-1989* (Cambridge University Press 2009).
[14] L. Roth, *Public Diplomacy and the Past: The Search for an American Style of Propaganda (1952-1977),* Fletcher Forum 8, 353-396 (1984).
[15] T. Littleton & M. Sykes *Advancing American Art: Painting, Politics, and Cultural Confrontation at Mid-Century* (University of Alabama Press 1999).

major signal that culture was going to be a constant domestic 'political football' as the US looked to extend its influence around the world after 1945. The battle over who has the right to speak American culture to others has continued, as Schneider, writing after 9/11, recognized: 'The irony is that the country whose number one export is cultural products and whose popular culture permeates the world is struggling to define itself'.[16]

US cultural diplomacy towards Europe after 1945 was framed around two principal goals. Firstly, to promote the cause of Western unity by emphasizing the common cultural space within which North America and Western Europe were located. Central to this was the idea of an 'Atlantic Community', first put forward by Walter Lippmann in 1917 and again revived by him during WW II to project a common set of values, interests, and destiny shared by both sides of the ocean.[17] With the signing of the North Atlantic Treaty in 1949, it was of great importance that (a majority of) citizens in both North America and Western Europe would associate with this conception of the transatlantic region as a shared 'security community'.[18] In this context, exchange programmes such as the Foreign leader and Fulbright programs were a vital means to develop a constant circulation of knowledge across the transatlantic space, contributing to the formation of transnational networks that had the US as their central point.[19] The second goal concerned the need to confirm the US as a cultural producer worthy of inclusion in the 'Western canon' of artistic excellence. Since the nation was most closely associated with the mass production of cultural products, this involved overcoming widespread negative associations of being a 'cultural wasteland' driven only by profit motives and devoid of sophistication. In answer to this, US cultural diplomacy sought to emphasize the unique American contribution to the arts, in doing so also claiming that US leadership in the political, military and economic spheres was matched by a novel and refreshing leadership in culture. This involved the promotion of a recognizably American literature and forms of visual and performing arts within a narrative that placed the United States at the epicenter of Western culture *tout court*.[20]

Here the collaborative nature of public-private partnerships was a vital component, since the USIA, as the official face of US cultural diplomacy, could only achieve this

[16] C. Schneider, *Cultural Diplomacy: Hard to define, but you'd know it if you saw it*, Brown Journal of World Affairs 13, 200-201 (2006).
[17] W. Lippmann, *The Defense of the Atlantic World,* The New Republic 10 (17 Feb. 1917); W. Lippmann, *US Foreign Policy: Shield of the Republic* (Little, Brown 1943).
[18] K. Deutsch, et.al. *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area: International Organization in the Light of Historical Experience* (Princeton University Press 1957).
[19] G. Scott-Smith, *Building a Community around the Pax Americana: The US Government and Exchange Programs in the 1950s* (H. Laville & H. Wilford eds., *The US Government, Citizen Groups, and the Cold War: The State-Private Network* Routledge 2006); G. Scott-Smith, *Networks of Empire: The US State Department's Foreign Leader Program in the Netherlands, France, and Britain 1950-1970* (Peter Lang 2008).
[20] S. Guilbaut, *How New York Stole the Idea of Modern Art: Abstract Expressionism, Freedom, and the Cold War* University of Chicago Press 1983).

task by bringing in leading representatives of the cultural world to display US artistic excellence abroad. USIA therefore functioned as a facilitator for putting the cultural achievements of US civil society on show. A key collaborator in this regard was the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA) in New York, established by the Rockefeller family and by the 1940s a prominent institutional collector and exhibitor with international ambitions. In 1952 the Rockefeller Brothers Fund provided the finance for the Museum to establish an International Program, designed to maintain a circulating set of exhibitions abroad. In doing so, private philanthropy enabled the MoMA to effectively run cultural diplomacy by proxy in a period when the US government was facing political criticism for its involvement in promoting the arts.[21]

Resistance in Congress to financing cultural activities was based on several claims: that the art in question was somehow 'un-American' (a position often reflecting an anti-elitist stance), that it was produced by artists with left-wing backgrounds, or that it was simply not a field of activity that the government should waste its resources on. Nevertheless, under President Eisenhower (1953-1960) further legislation was passed to enable public finance to be used for the promotion of US interests abroad.[22] Here the commercial fused with the ideological. In 1958 the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act gave USIA – together with selected commercial partners – the mandate to develop US pavilions at World Fairs and Expos around the world. The resulting projects staged at the Brussels Worlds Fair in 1958 and at the American National Exhibition in Moscow in 1959 were principally aimed at extolling the present and future potential of capitalist enterprise, displaying the time-saving gadgets of everyday technology in the American home.[23] The political resistance would never entirely subside, as culture has always been vulnerable to cost-cutting drives, also because, when compared to 'fast media' such as radio or the press, it does not deliver quick tangible results.

US cultural diplomacy therefore had a particular modernist aesthetic, and in the 1950s and 1960s there were similarities with its Soviet counterpart. The 'cultural Cold War' with the Soviet Union was a contest between rival conceptions of society and competing models of economic development. From the arrival of the European Recovery Program in 1948, the United States invested heavily in convincing European publics that the 'American way' of individual freedom, efficient productivity and consumerist abundance was the means to achieve progress for all.[24] The culture of everyday life therefore became the battleground between different

[21] H. Franc, *The Early Years of the International Program and Council* (The Museum of Modern Art at Mid-Century: At Home and Abroad, Studies in Modern Art 4, Museum of Modern Art 1994).
[22] K. Osgood, *Total Cold War: Eisenhower's Secret Propaganda Battle at Home and Abroad* (University Press of Kansas 2006).
[23] M. Kushner, *Exhibiting Art at the American National Exhibition in Moscow, 1959: Domestic Politics and Cultural Diplomacy*, Journal of Cold War Studies 4, 6-26 (2002); J. Masey, *Cold War Confrontations: US Exhibitions and their Role in the Cultural Cold War* (Lars Müller 2008).
[24] M. Fritsche, *The American Marshall Plan Film Campaign and the Europeans: A Captivated Audience?* (Bloomsbury 2018).

ideologies of capitalism and communism.[25] Both systems projected the narratives, products, and iconography of a technologically efficient present and a better future that would in principal be accessible for all.[26] Of course, the main difference lay in the path that had to be taken to attain that future.

This points to a third element to US Cold War cultural diplomacy that needs to be addressed: the relationship between overt and covert operations. The European Recovery Program of 1948-52 sought to shape European economic reconstruction along lines that would fit within the interests of a US-led transatlantic economy. This required nurturing a social democratic consensus that would deliver on growth and close out more radical alternatives coming from either Soviet-supported communist parties or some kind of a nationalist-orientated European 'third way'.[27] While Smith-Mundt sanctioned and USIA pursued the public side to cultural diplomacy, the stakes were considered too high to be able to leave it at that. Faced with what appeared to be widespread Soviet subversion and clandestine influence operations across Western Europe, designed above all to question the US involvement in Europe and undermine the ideals of the projected 'Atlantic community', in 1947-48 the US developed an apparatus for covert operations that would be coordinated by the newly-created Central Intelligence Agency.[28] The covert operations that ensued, such as the clandestine support for the Congress for Cultural Freedom, involved supporting the notion of a vibrant Western culture firmly attached to the principals of individual liberty and grounded in the competitive environment of democratic society. Importantly, this was as much directed against the Soviet challenge as it was against neutralist or otherwise anti-American critics who defended the superiority of European culture, for instance in France.[29] While some question whether these covert activities can be labeled as cultural diplomacy, which should in its purist form be transparent as to its methods and motives, there is no doubt that the US campaign to solidify transatlantic cultural relations during the Cold War as a whole involved a diverse array of state and private actors working together through various forms of partnership.

The 1990s were in many ways a decade of lost opportunity for US cultural diplomacy. The report from that year of the US Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy spoke of the great need to promote the embedding of democratic values and free market principles across the nations of Central and Eastern Europe, and lamented the

[25] G. Castillo, *Cold War on the Home Front: The Soft Power of Midcentury Design* (University of Minnesota Press 2009).
[26] S. Buck-Morss, *Dreamworld and Catastrophe: The Passing of Mass Utopia in East and West* (MIT Press 2002); P. Romijn, J. Segal, & G. Scott-Smith *Divided Dreamworlds: The Cultural Cold War in East and West* (Amsterdam University Press 2012).
[27] B. Steil, *The Marshall Plan: Dawn of the Cold War* (Simon & Schuster 2018)
[28] W. Hixson, *Parting the Curtain: Propaganda, Culture and the Cold War* (Palgrave Macmillan 1998); F. Stonor Saunders, *Who Paid the Piper? The CIA and the Cultural Cold War* (Granta 2000).
[29] G. Scott-Smith, *The Politics of Apolitical Culture: The Congress for Cultural Freedom, the CIA, and Post-War American Hegemony* (Routledge 2002); V. Berghahn, *America and the Intellectual Cold Wars in Europe* (Princeton University Press 2002).

lack of any mobilization of resources to enable USIA to take on the task.[30] Although bilateral agreements did extend the Fulbright Program's educational exchanges across the region, helping to transform educational practices, integrate academics into Western professional networks, and foster the expansion of American Studies at universities, the general trend of the decade for US public diplomacy was one of retrenchment.[31] Between 1993 and 1998 USIA lost 29% of its budget, or around $400m.[32] The disbanding of USIA and the absorption of its activities by the State Department was the result. Significantly, the Clinton White House simultaneously put resources into a new Millennium Council to run a range of cultural diplomacy-type activities to explore the role of the United States and its people moving into the next century.[33]

4. POST-9/11 CULTURAL DIPLOMACY: PURSUING DE-RADICALISATION

The terrorist attacks in New York and Washington, DC, on 11 September 2001 brought an abrupt and violent end to the post-Cold War perception that the US was operating in a relatively benign global environment where its values of democratic freedoms and free market economics were widely shared. The dissolution of USIA in 1999 and the incorporation of its tasks into the State Department in principle brought the management of US public diplomacy closer to the conduct of US foreign policy, but the advantage was illusory. Instead, 1999 marked a false interpretation of global dynamics. Nations would exactly need to upgrade their cultural outreach in order to profile themselves in an increasingly competitive global market-place of ideas, images, and products. Not only that, but the increase in transnational challenges to nation-state competence, from terrorism and migration to epidemics and global warming, required a new set of tools to demonstrate timely responses and problem-solving effectiveness.

In response, post-9/11 US cultural diplomacy around the globe was 'securitised'. Cultural initiatives would be directed towards (re-)establishing ties with the US in order to revive the channels of 'mutual understanding' and reduce the perception of the US and its value system as threatening. 'Securitisation' here does not mean that cultural initiatives were granted a higher level of priority in the foreign policy process;[34] instead, it refers to the shaping of cultural diplomacy according to the demands of security priorities, something that was already present through the Cold War but which now took on more overt forms. Thus 'de-radicalisation' – efforts to

[30] US Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy, *Public Diplomacy in a New Europe* (1990)
[31] J. Sablosky, *Reinvention, Reorganization, Retreat: American Cultural Diplomacy at Century's End, 1978-1998*, Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society 29, 30-46 (1999).
[32] US Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy, *Publics and Diplomats in the Global Communications Age* (1998).
[33] Cummings, 11-12.
[34] B. Buzan, O. Waever, & J. de Wilde eds., *Security: A New Framework for Analysis* (Lynne Rienner 1998).

prevent acts of terrorism by encouraging the adoption of more moderate political and religious views opposed to forms of intolerant extremism – has been a central focus for post-9/11 cultural diplomacy programming. The original campaign, led by Under Secretary of State for Public Affairs Charlotte Beers, was initiated on the same basis as the Cold War outlook described above: 're-present the values and beliefs of the people of America, which inform our policies and practices', since 'words like 'freedom' and 'tolerance' and 'diversity of human beings' are precious to us, and I don't think they're very well understood'.[35] As in the Cold War, the assumption was that if others would learn about what drives America and the American people, the reasons for hatred and aggression would fade away. In the case of Europe, this placed an emphasis on reaching out to those Muslim communities who perhaps felt marginalized in their home societies and for whom the US was nothing more than an enforcer of an unjust and immoral system, both in the Middle East and globally. Alongside this approach, more traditional mechanisms of cultural diplomacy were applied to strengthen transatlantic ties and once again solidify the sense of a shared cultural space. To achieve this, new channels for outreach were developed that once again portrayed the US as a nation of innovation, vibrant expression, and energy, such as film, music, and sport.

The problem with much of this initial burst of activity was that it 'was very much a Washington-driven, or source-driven, rather than audience-driven campaign'.[36] For instance, Beers' much publicized *Shared Values* commercials that portrayed content American Muslims going about their daily lives in Michigan or Ohio were not going to have a positive effect in European cities, never mind war-torn Baghdad or the poverty-stricken Gaza Strip. More careful attention would be needed to interact with on-the-ground needs, interests, and desires, building trust from the street level up. This would involve emboldening more moderate voices within these communities to provide outlets for anti-extremist discourse, and increasing the opportunities for socio-economic advancement in the home country through the provision of extra opportunities that the US could provide.

4.1. Channels of Cultural Diplomacy

The State Department's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (ECA) was created in 1999 to incorporate the personnel and activities of the disbanded USIA. In a transatlantic context, ECA works alongside the Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs, and 'Europe' therefore represents a much larger space of cultural interaction than simply the EU. ECA works closely with private partners, including the National Endowment for the Arts, Meridian International, and various universities, to realize

[35] R.S. Zaharna, *Battles to Bridges: US Strategic Communication and Public Diplomacy after 9/11* 31 (Palgrave Macmillan 2014).
[36] Ibid. 47.

its agenda.[37] Its 2018 policy framework states that it 'designs and implements educational, professional, and cultural exchange programs that promote American leadership and advance U.S. foreign policy goals'. 'Strategic direction' for this is provided by the National Security Strategies put together by presidential administrations, and the overall implementation of these goals by the State Department and partners such as the US Agency for International Development (USAID). Broadly, this involves the use of cultural diplomacy and exchange programmes to further an agenda of 'trust and mutual understanding between nations', promoting democracy and 'civic participation', maintaining US economic interests, and 'addressing the threats of radicalization and disinformation' (ECA 2018: 3).[38]

ECA also works alongside the Bureau of International Information Programs (IIP), which is differentiated from ECA's long-term relationship building activities by its focus on the short-term advancement of US foreign policy goals. Nevertheless, IIP does include the promotion of US culture within its remit, particularly through the use of American Spaces. The Office of American Spaces was established in 2011 and operates out of both the State Department and a subsidiary office in Vienna, with 650 locations worldwide. Each Space is a physical, open-access site run with a local partner (such as a library or school) to provide 'direct foreign audience engagement' outside of the confines of the (often protected and inaccessible) embassies. A continuation of the famous 'America Houses' and libraries of the post-WW II era, American Spaces operate in various forms, for instance as the small-scale but information-rich American Corners. The former American Libraries were geared to expanding understanding and awareness of US history and culture, and the new expanding American Spaces network does the same, for instance via newly-developed 'toolkits' that provide advice on running educational programmes on topics such as Native American heritage. But the Spaces are also aimed at linking public and private initiatives, particularly through the use of ICT, to empower citizens and stimulate entrepreneurship as a positive contribution for social progress. Of the Office's budget of $13.7M for 2017, almost $3.5m was devoted to Europe and Eurasia. Most of the Spaces and resource centres are located across Eastern Europe, from Poland and Slovakia to Central Asia, where the recently-opened site in Almaty, Kazakhstan, came about through a partnership between the US Embassy, a local property developer, and Chevron.[39]

ECA pursues several specific channels for profiling US culture, promoting values of participation and achievement, and engaging with youthful communities abroad.

[37] J. Pamment, *New Public Diplomacy in the 21st Century: A Comparative Study of Policy and Practice* (Routledge 2013).
[38] Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, *Functional Bureau Strategy* (2018). Online: <https://www.state.gov/documents/organization/284589.pdf>
[39] American Spaces, *Annual Report* (2017). Online: <https://americanspaces.state.gov/2017-american-spaces-annual-report/>

Starting in 2003 with only four staff and a focus on using sports as a means for furthering de-radicalisation within communities of concern, ECA's use of 'sports diplomacy' now encompasses a range of purposes, in particular to assist reaching goals set by other US agencies concerning gender equality, public health, and educational access. Some sports such as basketball have become embedded into European sports itineraries, so much so that some claim this particular sport reveals a positive 'hidden' side to otherwise tense US-French diplomatic relations.[40] The short-term Sports Envoys programme makes use of celebrities to run two-week training exercises in selected locations, 'leveraging the universal passion for sport' through the audience-pulling tactic of sending role-models like Shaq O'Neal abroad to teach basketball in Cuba.[41] Sports Envoys have been active in Europe and Eurasia, involving professionals in American Football (Russia, 2016), baseball (Lithuania, 2015), men's basketball (Georgia 2009, 2016; Greece 2012; Italy 2015; Kazakhstan 2008, 2017; Moldova 2014; Poland 2015; Spain 2014; UK 2012), and women's basketball (Armenia 2018; Georgia 2009, 2016, 2018; Greece 2012; Kazakhstan 2008, 2013, 2017; Moldova 2014; Poland 2015; UK 2012; Ukraine 2013). Members of the famous 'Harlem Globetrotters' basketball team toured Estonia, Lithuania, Belgium, and Germany in 2017-2018. Western European nations have received far fewer Sports Envoys, indicating how this particular form of cultural diplomacy has been used in nations experiencing disruptive post-Cold War democratization and marketization. Notable exceptions have been women's soccer (Germany 2011; Netherlands 2016) and judo (France 2017). Between 2012-2018 Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Russia also received envoys for figure skating, ice hockey and snowboarding. Under the heading of Sport for Change, Project Harmony has focused on nurturing youth leadership in sports by partnering with local institutions in Kosovo, Moldova, Russia and Ukraine. The Break the Ice initiative, sponsored by the US embassy in Kiev, has since 2014 run hockey table tournaments and ice hockey events as a means to integrate children uprooted by the war in eastern Ukraine, in the process also dealing with trauma, non-violent communication, and issues of tolerance.

The innovative use of 'street sports' such as skateboarding has been particularly successful as a means for US representatives to interact with migrant/refugee communities around Europe. In April 2016, US public diplomacy academic and skateboarder Neftalie Williams joined the US embassy in the Netherlands for a skateboard training event to assist with the integration of Syrian refugees in Eindhoven:

> In the Netherlands, I lectured at the international high school there, talking with Dutch students about the new wave of migration to their country, asking them, 'What are your parents telling you? What are you hearing in the media? What are your own personal feelings?' …. After I talked to the Dutch students

[40] L. Krasnoff, *Joie des Hoops: The Hidden Story of Franco-American Diplomacy* Washington Post (25 April 2018).
[41] T. Bolton, Sports Diplomacy Division, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, interview with the author (17 August 2018).

> about the refugees being granted asylum, and explaining the skate event we had planned for them prompted all the Dutch kids to ask me, 'Hey, I know this is for the Syrian kids, but is it okay if we come too?' So we all skated together, a lot of them skating for the first time, and it was really powerful, too. Think about that: The kids that go to the international school in the Netherlands, many are the sons and daughters of ambassadors, diplomats, heads of state. Those kids are going to be in positions of power one day, and if you reach them early, like we did, then the way they think about immigration is going to be entirely different than the way their parents think.[42]

Williams' success in bringing refugee and local communities together in this Dutch city led to follow-up 'skateboarding diplomacy' in Kazakhstan in 2018.

Music has long been a means to display American cultural uniqueness and excellence, with the international tours of jazz musicians and symphony orchestras through the Cold War being the most significant examples. Eastern Europe was a key recipient, and Louis Armstrong's 1965 tour of the Soviet bloc, along with the performances of Leonard Bernstein and the New York Philharmonic in Berlin and Moscow in 1959, encapsulated these efforts. Music was a means to establish new forms of dialogue, gain critical recognition for US artists, and, crucially, overcome the 'colour line' in cultural diplomacy by highlighting the contribution of black Americans to US culture in general.[43] ECA's American Music Abroad programme has continued this approach by coordinating the sending abroad of a range of ensembles and musical styles since 1975. Recent tours of youth musicians have emphasised US-European ties, as with the 2019 Red Tour of US college musicians to France, Germany, Czech Republic, Switzerland and Austria, while efforts are also made to interact with audiences across Eurasia who would rarely see US musicians in action. Other programmes such as OneBeat have a strong focus on youth creativity, female empowerment and community building, bringing an array of musicians to the United States for a four-week immersion of training, sessions, and performance. NextLevel, a collaboration between ECA, Meridian International, and the University of North Carolina, sends US hip-hop and dance artists and DJs abroad to deprived or conflict-affected communities in order to establish cross-cultural exchange and understanding through music. In 2014-2018 NextLevel organized residencies of several weeks for groups of hiphop and graffiti artists in Bosnia, Montenegro, Serbia, Croatia, Azerbaijan, and Turkey.

Film has also been a means to showcase US talent and productive capacities. A collaboration between ECA and the University of Southern California, since 2012 the

---

[42] C. Kerr, *Meet America's First Ambassador of Skateboarding, Neftalie Williams*, Jenkem (1 March 2016). Online: <http://www.jenkemmag.com/home/2017/03/01/americas-ambassador-of-skateboarding-neftalie-williams/>.

[43] P. von Eschen, *Satchmo Blows Up the World: Jazz Ambassadors Play the Cold War* (Harvard University Press 2006); J. Rosenberg, *The Best Diplomats are often the Great Musicians: Leonard Bernstein and the New York Philharmonic play Berlin New Global Studies* 8, 65-86 (2014).

American Film Showcase has sent US independent film-makers abroad for short tours involving master classes and screenings, hosted by US embassies. In September of that first year, independent film-maker Anne Makepeace travelled to Sarajevo, Tuzla, Doboj and Banja Luka in Bosnia, presenting her documentary *We Still Live Here* and giving talks to students at universities and American Centers. 'Film ambassadors' have also toured France, Germany, Estonia, Hungary, Belarus, Ukraine, and Russia.[44]

4.2. Integrating Minorities and Societies in Stress

By the mid-2000s, ongoing concerns over the prevalence of Islamic extremism in Europe in the wake of 9/11 led to the development of specific initiatives to try and establish new channels of communication.[45] Testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on 6 April 2006, Assistant Secretary for European and Eurasian Affairs Daniel Fried sketched the reasons for those concerns:

> Muslims' struggles with unemployment, discrimination, and issues of integration have created an audience within that community potentially open to receiving an extremist message …. Add to this a deeply negative perception and a distorted perception of United States foreign policy among many of Western Europe's Muslim communities, and relative freedom of movement across the Atlantic, and you have a particularly dangerous mix.[46]

Even though Fried estimated that those of the Muslim faith represented around 5 percent of the total population of Western Europe, and of them only around 1-2 percent may be attracted to radicalism, the proven threat capacity of underground networks and highly motivated individuals made this a priority. Fried spoke of the need to 'bolster moderate voices and the appreciation for democracy in Muslim communities as part of a greater effort by minorities to fulfill the obligations of living in a Western country'.[47] Only two months before the hearings, Danish embassies (along with Norwegian, German, and EU missions) had been attacked across the Middle East in response to the printing of caricature cartoons of the prophet Mohammed in *Jyllands-Post*. The US response was to focus on the socio-economic and 'spiritual alienation' felt particularly by the second and third generation immigrants who lacked the belief in building a 'new life' held by their elders. A Senior Advisor for Muslim Engagement, Farah Pandith, was brought in to advise the Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs on its policy initiatives in this area. Pandith had previously worked with USAID and on the National Security Council, and she went on to become the State Department's first Special Representative to Muslim Communities from 2009-2014.

---

[44] American Film Showcase (2018). Online: <http://americanfilmshowcase.com>
[45] C. Dickey et.al.. *Europe's Time Bomb*, Newsweek, 146, 20-26 (2005);
R. Leiken, *Europe's Angry Muslims* Foreign Affairs, 84, 120-135 (2005).
[46] Committee on Foreign Relations, Subcommittee on European Affairs, US Senate, *Islamist Extremism in Europe* 3 (2006).
[47] Ibid. 11.

An important element to these forms of outreach is that US cultural diplomacy necessarily had to work alongside existing programmes of the European governments themselves. But there was also pressure on European authorities to invest more in providing opportunities for education and social advancement. Promoting the United States as a place of opportunity for disenfranchised groups could also inadvertently add to the sense of alienation felt on a daily basis in a European urban environment. Efforts were therefore made to integrate these forms of outreach with local, regional and national levels of government to ensure that no contravening of competences was taking place. Speaking in 2008, head of public affairs at the US embassy in Paris James Bullock referred to 'de-legitimizing the appeal of terrorist recruiters' and 'getting to know the future movers and shakers of Europe, because these young people are part of the future of Europe'.[48] Thus US embassies in Denmark and the Netherlands arranged for American Chambers of Commerce to take in 'minority youth interns', not only to enhance opportunities for personal advancement, but also for 'fostering tolerance among European business leaders for their Muslim co-workers and neighbors'. The assumption that the (positive but ongoing) experience of the US Civil Rights movement could be translated to the contemporary European political and legal context was also a direct challenge to European cultural sensibilities.[49]

In 2006 Fried's Bureau, together with Educational and Cultural Affairs, then rolled out the Muslim Incentive Program (MIP) to encourage US embassies across the region to nominate more individuals from Muslim minorities for exchange opportunities. Running in Britain, Belgium, France, the Netherlands, and the Scandinavian countries, the emphasis was on reaching those who had no direct experience of life in the US, and were unlikely to gain that without extra opportunities being provided. This saw a rise in participants from these backgrounds for both the International Visitor Leadership Program (IVLP, formerly the Foreign Leader Program) and the Fulbright Program for guided visits to the United States of two-three weeks (IVLP) or several months of educational study (Fulbright). The State Department, in partnership with private sector partners, also contracted two additional pilot projects: the Muslim Youth Workers Exchange and Muslim (Teenager) Youth Exchange.[50] Coordinated efforts by US embassies in the Netherlands, Belgium, France, Britain, and Italy during 2005-2006 brought together US and European Muslims to discuss mutual concerns over social integration, access to the labour market, and political representation.[51] In 2010 the State Department ran 25 European Regional Programs involving group exchange visits on specific themes, including

[48] K. Bennold, *US courts the support of French Muslims* International Herald Tribune (26 May 2008).
[49] Committee on Foreign Relations, op.cit, 11,13.
[50] G. Scott-Smith, *The Heineken Factor? Using Exchanges to extend the reach of US Soft Power*, American Diplomacy (2011). Online: <http://www.unc.edu/depts/diplomat/item/2011/0104/comm/scottsmith_heineken.html>
[51] J. Laurence & J. Vaisse, *Integrating Islam: Political and Religious Challenges in Contemporary France* 265-266(Brookings Institution Press 2006).

'Managing Diversity in a Multi-Ethnic Society,' 'Religion and Community Activism in a Democratic Society,' and 'Current US Political, Social and Educational Issues for Young Muslim Leaders', bringing participants into direct contact with US students and exploring the realities of diversity, equality, and tolerance at the local level. Hosting Iftar dinners to mark the end of Ramadan became a fixed annual event for US embassies across Europe around this time.[52] These efforts not only sought to link like-minded groups who would otherwise never meet, but also to grant respect to European Muslims at a time when they felt 'under siege'.

Participants in these exchanges were impressed how they allowed sufficient space for dialogue on and enquiry into US social realities to overcome suspicions. In particular, the ways in which US citizens accommodated dual or multiple identities (e.g. Chinese-American) was striking compared to the situation in most European nations. But there were also clear limitations to this form of outreach. The aim to nurture 'social leaders' of moderate opinion within these communities was hampered by the fact that the pool of potential talent was relatively small. It was also problematic to run such programmes that obviously flagged Muslims, however much it was denied, as a 'community of concern', ignoring both the multiple divisions (ethnic, national, religions) within the Muslim community itself, and the wish of many exactly not to be typecast as 'Muslim' in the first place.[53] The testimony of US Ambassador to Belgium Tom Korologos, who spoke of the need to 'mobilize the moderates and marginalize the militants' was entirely understandable, but also detrimental.[54] On the positive side, the effort to re-cast the US as a 'mediator of opportunity' did achieve some results. Dutch grantees who were participants in the MIP have spoken of not so much an altered view of the United States, but of the benefits of being in the United States with others facing similar social challenges in their home countries in Europe, and having the space to reflect, make connections, and consider futures. US cultural diplomacy therefore created new situations through which participants could re-evaluate their outlook, even if this did not involve an increasingly favourable attitude towards the US itself.[55]

Operating in Europe but outside of the European Union, a prominent role has been played by USAID in developing public-private partnerships to promote democratic political systems. In 2011 the Agency issued a set of detailed policy guidelines outlining how it would coordinate and pursue the use of development assistance to achieve a reduction in proselytizing and recruitment for extremist groups. Focusing on the negative impact of social fragmentation, endemic corruption, and the perception of threats to cultural identity, USAID's approach crossed over into the use

[52] US State Department, Bureau of European Affairs, *Did You Know? Public Diplomacy at Home and in Europe* (2007).
[53] Scott-Smith, *Heineken Factor*, op.cit.
[54] Committee on Foreign Relations, 24.
[55] Scott-Smith, *Heineken Factor*, op.cit.

of culture and education to strengthen democratic legitimacy in societies at risk.[56] Since then, Preventing Violent Extremism programmes in Albania, Bosnia and Kosovo have assisted in promoting media literacy, civic participation, and social cohesion. The Bosnia programme ran from 2015-2018 and targeted 1300 'youth at risk' across 15 municipalities to deal professionally with psychological traumas and connect individuals to encourage entrepreneurship and enhance the opportunities for socio-economic advancement.[57] Since November 2017 USAID's Office of Transition Initiatives has also been working closely with Bosnian civil society organisations to identify and counter social marginalisation and disrupt recruitment networks.

In Moldova, the US Embassy's cultural outreach programmes has combined with USAID's focus on economic development, democratic governance and social cohesion. USIAD's annual $33m budget for the nation includes a Competitiveness Project that supports investments in areas such as wine production and tourism within an overall strategy to establish a more vibrant economy. Russian leverage on the future development of Moldova has been considerable, notably in the field of energy supplies, and the US response has been to nurture the growing westward-orientation of Moldovan trade, particular towards the EU, in order to reduce dependence on Russian trade links, counter corruption, and create a sustainable national economy no longer suffering from 'brain drain' emigration. US cultural diplomacy has promoted English language teaching through the placement of Fulbright English Teaching Assistants (ETAs), including in 2018 in the disputed territory of Transnistria, in order to push back against 'Russian dominance of the cultural space'. As public affairs officer Aaron Honn has put it, the ETAs

> are also unparalleled ambassadors for American culture. For many of the students with whom they interact, our ETAS are the first Americans they have ever met. By living in Transnistria and engaging every day with students and teachers, the ETAs have a unique opportunity to build meaningful relationships across the cultural divide.[58]

5. THE TRANSNATIONAL TRANSATLANTIC: A NEW PHASE?

As we survey the landscape of cultural diplomacy in a transatlantic context in the early 21st century, it is clear that more attention needs to be given to the role of non-state actors, acting independently from state agencies, in forging a new phase of US-European interaction.

[56] USAID, *The Development Response to Violent Extremism and Insurgency* (2011). Online: <https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1870/VEI_Policy_Final.pdf>
[57] USAID, *Bosnian Woman becomes Agent of Change* (2018). Online: https://www.usaid.gov/results-data/success-stories/taking-matters-her-own-hands-bosnia-and-herzegovina.
[58] I. Pacheco, *Moldova: Strengthening Institutions and Bolstering Democracy in Eastern Europe* State_Magazine (November 2018). Online: https://www.state.gov/m/dghr/statemag/.

In January 2018 Chatham House issued a report on the status of transatlantic relations, concluding that, among other things,

> transatlantic coordination will best be led by other actors, be they cities, regional state leaders or non-state actors (as is currently taking place in order to uphold the US's responsibilities in line with the Paris Agreement). While in many respects it is imperfect to rely on non-governmental actors to drive progress, their actions could do much to preserve the best of the status quo, or even create initial advances in some cases, and thus prepare the ground for a new cycle of transatlantic convergence when the opportunity next arises.[59]

This striking observation adds to the assumption that we need to look beyond state-coordinated cultural diplomacy, towards a re-configuration of the transatlantic space as being increasingly shaped according to non-state narratives. Diplomatic disagreements have been long present between the US and Europe, but since the election of US President Trump they have reached a new level of open rancor. In these circumstances, as state-led cultural diplomacy continues to try and mollify tensions by emphasizing mutual interests, sites of innovation are increasingly being occupied by other actors.

The 'transnational transatlantic' can be understood through two broad developments.[60] Firstly, it can be conceived through the notion of 'surrogate states'. Non-state actors are necessarily considered to be of secondary importance within a state system, yet in an era where inter-state transatlantic relations lack fundamental consensus on key issues, the non-state arena takes on a whole different level of importance. A surrogate state here refers to philanthropic ventures that have the assets and outreach capabilities to pursue a wide-ranging programme of cultural engagement, in a way that is agenda-setting outside of state coordination. During the Cold War this role was filled by major US philanthropies such as the Ford Foundation, but in the current period the most prominent example is the German Marshall Fund of the United States (GMF). Founded in 1972 with an endowment from the West German government to mark the 25th anniversary of the Marshall Plan, the Fund's operations have promoted US-European partnership through media, academic and political exchanges, economic planning, democracy promotion, opinion polling, and dialogue platforms that include Latin American, African, and Chinese participants. Since opening offices in Brussels and Paris in 2001, the Fund has taken on an expanded role as a 'brain trust' for public policy in the transatlantic space.[61] In recent years the GMF has been joined by new players, such as the Bosch Foundation and the BMW Foundation, creating a dense web of non-state philanthropic actors, sustaining the transatlantic as a key networked space within a global context.

---

[59] X. Wickett, *Transatlantic Relations: Converging or Diverging?* vi (Chatham House January 2018).
[60] For an interpretation of the 'transnational transatlantic' through the 20th century, see G. Scott-Smith, *The Transnational Transatlantic: Private Organisations and Governmentality* (C. Lerg, S. Lachenicht & M. Kimmage eds., *The Transatlantic Reconsidered*, Manchester University Press 2018).
[61] N. Siegel, *The German Marshall Fund of the United States: A Brief History* (GMF 2012).

From a Eurasian perspective, an equally important actor are the Open Society Foundations (OSF) established by entrepreneur George Soros in 1979. Geared to everything from promoting democratic values through education to providing emergency infrastructure in crisis zones, the OSF has complemented US cultural diplomacy efforts to further social integration in Europe, but has done so as an independent actor following its own agenda of humanitarian assistance – including in the US itself. With annual expenditures of over $940m, the OSF is committed to transnational causes that oppose the divisive domestic and international policies of chauvinist nationalisms.[62]

Secondly, cities have taken on a new significance as an additional, goal-driven layer of global governance. Saskia Sassen already spoke of Global Cities in 1991 (New York-London-Tokyo) as the new structural nodes for global capitalism, but this prominent position has since taken on a broader meaning due to the increasing demand on municipal authorities for social services, infrastructure, environmental regulation, and security.[63] Cities therefore represent an essential node in debates on citizenship, sovereignty, territoriality, inclusion and exclusion, use of resources, and governance. While some of these developments represent the adaptation of nation-state structures to meet new demands, cities – often under the direction of democratically-elected mayors claiming popular legitimacy – are developing transnational policy networks that are directly challenging state behaviour, also in the transatlantic space. The GMF itself has pointed out the pivotal role now played by urban authorities in meeting current challenges:

> U.S. and European cities are on the front lines of a fragile global system and an increasingly complex transatlantic relationship. Local actors are among the instigators of this fragility as demonstrated by Brexit, the rise of populism, and the turn against TTIP; but they are also profoundly impacted by global trends, transatlantic decisions, and national policy agendas that shape the difficult problems many local leaders confront on a daily basis.[64]

Examples of such city-driven cooperation, include the Bertelsmann Foundation's Transatlantic Policy Lab, a partnership with the Rockefeller Foundation's Resilient Cities initiative and the OSF, which has focused attention on solutions for social inequity in pilot projects in Boston and Athens. The BMW Foundation's Connected Cities initiative has linked social entrepreneurs and policy-makers in Chicago and Hamburg to compare best practices at the urban level. Mayors have emerged as key representatives of the transnational transatlantic, striking prominent poses of

[62] O. Calligaro, *Une organisation hybride dans l'arène européenne: Open Society Foundations et la construction du champ de la lutte contre les discriminations*, Politix 1/121, 151-172 (2018).
[63] S. Sassen, *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo* (Princeton 2001); M. Acuto, *Global Cities, Governance and Diplomacy* (Routledge 2013).
[64] G. Gardner, *Cities become the new drivers of transatlantic trust*, GMF blog (26 October 2016) http://www.gmfus.org/blog/2016/10/26/cities-become-new-drivers-transatlantic-trust

collaboration on politically testing issues such as refugees and climate change.[65] Although many, such as Citiscope or the Carbon Neutral Cities Alliance, are orientated on a global scale, the transatlantic axis of major cities still provides the motor for these initiatives of urban-driven change. Other, more bottom-up projects supported by the Rosa Luxembourg Foundation have linked communities under pressure from urban redevelopment schemes in Hamburg, New York, Barcelona, Dublin, and Stockholm.[66]

The transnational transatlantic therefore involves top-down as well as bottom-up initiatives, involving a merger of models of state-led cultural diplomacy with what Manuel Castells' has referred to as 'diplomacy of the public'. This is 'not to assert the power of a state or of a social actor … It is instead to harness the dialogue between different social collectives and their cultures in the hope of sharing meaning and understanding'.[67]

6. CONCLUSION

US cultural exports have undoubtedly had a major impact on European social behavior and norms through the 20th century and into the 21st, shaping European perceptions of the United States, its values, and its role in the international realm.[68] Cultural diplomacy has contributed to these processes by enabling the display of specific aspects of US culture, and those who produce it, in Europe, giving the represented culture an official imprimatur. The existing widespread appeal of phenomena such as jazz and hip hop has greatly helped this side of US cultural diplomacy to achieve positive responses. Public-private collaboration has been central to these activities, emphasizing an image of the government simply channeling the expertise of private citizens and institutions for the good of the nation as a whole. This has involved the deliberate inclusion of US minorities to highlight diversity, inclusiveness, and civic participation as key traits of US society, and to present role models for minorities elsewhere.

Since 1990, US cultural diplomacy has followed two broad tracks. Firstly, in Eastern Europe, the focus has been on promotion of democratic governance and the marketization of economies to enable gradual integration into wider European and global systems of exchange. Secondly, since 9/11 there has been a greater emphasis

---

[65] B. Barber, *If Mayors Ruled the World: Dysfunctional Nations, Rising Cities* (Yale 2014); B. de Blasio, A. Hidalgo & S. Khan, *Our Immigrants, Our Strength*, New York Times (20 September 2016).
[66] On the Bertelsmann initiative, see: <http://www.bfna.org/project/transatlantic-policy-lab-2/>; On the BMW Foundation's Connected Cities, see: <http://connectedcities.info>; on Citiscope, see: <http://citiscope.org/about/mission>; on the Rosa Luxemburg Foundation, see: <http://www.rosalux-nyc.org/right-to-the-city-a-transatlantic-roundtable/>.
[67] M. Castells, *The New Public Sphere: Global Civil Society, Communication Networks, and Global Governance*, Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences 616, 91 (2008).
[68] R. Pells, *Not Like Us: How Europeans have Loved, Hated, and Transformed American Culture since World War II* (Basic Books 1998); V. de Grazia, *Irresistible Empire: America's Advance through Twentieth Century Europe* (Harvard University Press 2006).

on directing cultural resources towards de-radicalisation projects across Europe and Eurasia. These efforts make use of various cultural tools and 'ambassadors' to link up communities, in the process pursuing greater inter-cultural communication, promoting gender equality, encouraging entrepreneurship, and strengthening economic development.

In a transatlantic context, post-Cold War (and especially post-9/11) US cultural diplomacy has been used to bind together nations and communities within the European space, overcoming the lingering effects of the Cold War's East-West divide politically, economically, and culturally. By assisting to reduce prejudice, crime, corruption and violence from undermining social cohesion, US cultural diplomacy looks to overcome social alienation among minorities, in doing so preventing potential support for political movements that could, through terrorism, harm the US. As with Cold War cultural diplomacy, the aim is still to raise awareness and appreciation of the United States, its culture, values, and role in the world, maintaining its image as the 'land of opportunity'. But this is now complemented by a more important goal – using cultural diplomacy to break down social barriers and achieve greater integration within Europe itself, in the broader interests of US national security.

Alongside these developments, the landscape of cultural diplomacy and the state-led coordination of soft power assets is changing radically. The rise of a 'transnational transatlantic' of non-state actors, led in particular by well-endowed philanthropies able to pursue and sustain their own agendas of transatlantic linkage and integration, demonstrates that state-led initiatives are declining in relative importance. Under the Trump administration ECA is facing a dramatic challenge to its resources, with the Fiscal Year 2019 budget proposal projecting an allocation of only $159m, around a quarter of what the Bureau had available in 2017.[69] Although this was rejected by the Senate, for the foreseeable future the annual appropriations for cultural diplomacy are going to be highly contested. From a US perspective, therefore, it is quite possible that the trend of cultural diplomacy becoming more directed by the private sector will continue.

[69] Department of State, *Congressional Budget Justification* 46 (2018). Online: <https://www.state.gov/documents/organization/277155.pdf>