



DEALING WITH ANTI-AMERICANISM A REPORT TO THE NEW ADMINISTRATION

Presented by the Princeton Task Force on Anti-Americanism
Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University



The Princeton Task Force on Anti-Americanism is a four-month project to develop a cost-effective U.S. policy strategy to combat anti-American sentiments around the world. Under the stewardship of Professor Sophie Meunier, the Princeton Task Force brought together eight Princeton students to analyze key issues and develop innovative responses to incidences of anti-Americanism. The Princeton Task Force on Anti-Americanism culminates with the release of this final report and its presentation in Washington D.C. on December 5, 2008.

Copyright © 2008 by the Princeton Task Force on Anti-Americanism

Designed and produced by Sarah Dajani and Marina Henke
Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University.

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS REPORT:

Carolyn Edelstein

Samuel Gulland

Lingzi Gui

Farrell Harding

Sarah Mousa

Ashley Schoettle

Mac Steele

Chris Xu

The Princeton Task Force on Anti-Americanism wishes to acknowledge the many people who made this report possible. Specifically, we wish to extend our gratitude to Ambassador Robert Finn, Ambassador James Gadsden, Colleen Graffy, Professor Peter Kenen, Thomas Miller, Professor Michael Oppenheimer, Professor Lynn White, Dr. Richard Wike and the librarians of Princeton University.

FOREWORD

Twenty-plus years ago the position of the United States in the world was marked by its reputation as defender of freedom, justice and democracy. Today, this golden image has become tarnished. Financial chaos, an unpopular war and a myriad of other perceived “wrongs” have fueled anti-Americanism in most countries around the world. While the U.S. may suffer from the “Mr. Big syndrome” and U.S. citizens can still feel confident in their own morals and convictions notwithstanding the opinions of others, it remains important to acknowledge the consequences of anti-Americanism for U.S. security, U.S. businesses and U.S. diplomacy on the world scene.

The new Obama Administration has set the stage for a reversal of the trends in global anti-Americanism. In order for the new Administration to capitalize on its potential, an array of soft power tactics need to be employed to address anti-Americanism symbolically and actually.

This report aims to provide creative input on how to strategically address the challenges of global anti-Americanism. It analyzes anti-Americanism from regional and topical perspectives, focusing on anti-Americanism in the Middle East, Pakistan and China, as well as anti-Americanism concerning climate change, the world economy and U.S. military conduct in Iraq.

Anti-Americanism is directly linked to our future world standing. Will the U.S. ever regain its position as the beacon of hope in a world characterized by “the rise of the rest”? Will President-elect Obama live up to the great expectations set for him by the international community? Can and should the U.S. reconcile its strategic objectives with the wishes of the rest of the world?

The answers to these questions lie in the future. However, our hands are not tied. We can influence them now. This report seeks to do exactly that.

*Princeton Task Force on Anti-Americanism
Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs
Princeton University
December 1, 2008*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword	p. i
Table of Contents	p. ii
I. Introduction	p. 1
II. Anti-Americanism and Climate Change	p. 3
III. Anti-Americanism and the World Economy	p. 5
IV. Anti-Americanism and the U.S. Military	p. 7
V. Anti-Americanism in the Arab Middle East	p. 9
VI. Anti-Americanism in Iran, Pakistan and Afghanistan	p. 11
VII. Anti-Americanism in China	p. 13
VIII. Anti-Americanism and Public Diplomacy	p. 15

I. INTRODUCTION

Over the past several years, the Pew Global Attitudes Project has chronicled the rise of anti-Americanism around the world. Polls of over 16,000 people have continuously shown that majorities in many countries hold unfavorable opinions of the United States. The recent targeting of U.S. citizens in the Mumbai terrorist attacks has underscored once more that anti-Americanism is still highly relevant and dramatically consequential.

The election of Barack Obama represents a unique opportunity to combat anti-Americanism. President-elect Obama embodies a different face of America – multicultural, open-minded, optimistic. Yet, it is naïve to think that his election alone is enough: while he might overcome anti-Bushism, anti-Americanism remains. Additionally, his election has inflated the world's expectations, which are impossible to meet.

This report hence proposes a more elaborate strategy to combat global anti-Americanism. This strategy is based on the logic of regaining American *soft power* – the power of attraction, of getting others to want the outcomes you want by appealing to common norms and values. The success of soft power heavily depends on the reputation of a country within the international community. It is this reputation which is threatened by anti-Americanism and which this report seeks to help restore.

For the purpose of this report, we define anti-Americanism as a systematic opposition of and/or aversion towards the United States. This includes negative opinion, distrust and bias against U.S. foreign policy, American society and U.S. citizens. In addition, we argue that there are certain key characteristics which divide anti-Americanism into two distinct categories: first, there are incidences for which a direct causality between unfavorable U.S. policies and anti-Americanism can be established. Second, there are other incidences in which the U.S., perceived as the world's hegemon, merely serves as the scapegoat for a nation's discontent with failed domestic policies - e.g. towards globalization and economic development. We define the first

type of anti-Americanism as **causal anti-Americanism** and the second type as **alibi anti-Americanism**. While some countries exhibit both types of anti-Americanism, we believe that through process tracing, we are able to determine which type is dominant in any situation.

We propose this distinction between causal and alibi anti-Americanism because it will enable policymakers to better allocate resources to issues and regions which are likely to be receptive to a shift in U.S. policy. More specifically, this distinction will allow the new U.S. government to minimize spending on incidences of anti-Americanism which will only be eliminated by foreign nations' domestic changes or the emergence of a multi-polar world.

The incidences of anti-Americanism, which we believe originate from questionable U.S. policies and thus have the potential for change given concerted action by the new U.S. government, are the following:

- **Anti-Americanism and Climate Change**

The United States' contribution to the climate change problem and its lackluster efforts to curb the problem are two of the most widespread criticisms of the U.S. This form of anti-Americanism is causal because of the U.S.'s well-publicized failure to ratify the Kyoto Protocol and its reluctance to impose European-style regulations on its domestic industries. Anti-Americanism stemming from climate change is particularly consequential, as the United States risks losing influence over a global movement that will likely define much of the next century.

- **Anti-Americanism and the World Economy**

The recent financial crisis is widely blamed on American capitalism. It has further exacerbated latent resentment against U.S.-based corporations and U.S. influence over international economic institutions. By ignoring this source of anti-Americanism, the United States risks alienating emerging economic superpow-

ers, which will be fundamental to U.S. prosperity and security in the 21st century.

- **Anti-Americanism and the U.S. Military**

The U.S. invasion of Iraq defied international law, provoking calls of hypocrisy from the global community. In the early occupation phase, the U.S. failed to preserve public order and did little to win the Iraqis' hearts and minds. Little has changed since, at least in public perception. These are serious problems; they threaten both the standing of the U.S. in the world and its own security.

- **Anti-Americanism in the Arab Middle East**

U.S. government policies towards the Palestinians and in Iraq have been the leading long-term and short-term causes of anti-Americanism in the Arab Middle East. The recent rhetoric of U.S. government officials and a double standard in the formulation of policies in this region have only served to further spread anti-American sentiments. While a complete turn-around in U.S. government policy cannot be quickly implemented, and might even be politically infeasible, there are a number of steps that can be taken to regain soft power in the region.

- **Anti-Americanism in Iran, Pakistan and Afghanistan**

A significant percentage of the Iranian, Pakistani and Afghani public hold unfavorable views of the United States. Afghanistan presents a fertile ground for terrorist recruitment which the U.S. must combat by strengthening Afghanistan's economy and public education system. Pakistan has been a key ally in U.S. efforts to combat terrorism in South Asia and it is necessary for the U.S. to maintain this support by aiding the public education system and promoting media freedom. It is in the best interest of the U.S. to resume diplomatic relations with Iran, a major power in the Middle East. The limits of hard power have been

demonstrated in these three very different countries. Increased soft power in this region will be crucial to forge amicable relations with the Muslim world.

- **Anti-Americanism in China**

Anti-Americanism in China is on the rise. U.S. officials' tendency to cast China's ascension as a threat has contributed to this development and to the emergence of rivalry between the two powers. This form of anti-Americanism is harmful to U.S. diplomacy efforts, U.S. businesses and the safety of U.S. citizens living or traveling in China.

In composing this report, we recognize the financial constraints placed on substantial foreign policy initiatives by the current domestic economic hardship. Thus, we choose to focus on strategies which are cost-efficient such as **targeted symbolic gestures** and a **change in U.S. foreign policy discourse**. Such change in the political discourse requires that the new administration leaves the "with us or against us" rhetoric in the past. This can be done through strategic communication expressing respect for cultural differences, accepting diverse points of view and acknowledging the importance of international cooperation.

Although we will never be able to completely eliminate anti-Americanism, its impact can be mitigated. By listening to our foreign partners and acknowledging the nuances of the world's regions and cultures, the U.S. will be able to regain its good reputation, restore its soft power and strengthen its position in the geopolitical system.

II. ANTI-AMERICANISM AND CLIMATE CHANGE

II. ANTI-AMERICANISM AND CLIMATE CHANGE

In the past eight years, anti-Americanism has increased worldwide. Though top causes vary region by region, the U.S.'s behavior towards curbing climate change is the most shared and widespread concern. In a 2008 Pew survey of 48 nations, 58% of respondents blamed the U.S. for global environmental problems and its lack of leadership. In September and October of this year, 43% of respondents across 11 countries ranked climate change as an issue of higher concern than the financial crisis. Climate change offers an opportunity to reduce systemic anti-American resentments among allies in developed and developing countries, and appropriate policies can support energy security, which could weaken the influence of the countries with the highest anti-American sentiments, most of which are large oil-producing states.

KEY PROBLEMS:

1) Countries blame the U.S. for failing to act against climate change and for being the world's greatest polluter.

When the Bush Administration flatly rejected the Kyoto Agreement, it fueled impressions of American stubbornness, callousness, unilateralism and disrespectful nature. According to Senator John Kerry, the Administration's policy on Kyoto was to "aim and fire, and the target they hit was [the U.S.] international reputation." Though most signatory nations are not meeting emissions targets, America is routinely singled out for failing to curb greenhouse gas emissions. The British Council reports that Americans at the 2007 UN Climate Change Conference "found themselves isolated and friendless, followed by a cacophony of decidedly undiplomatic catcalls and boos."

2) Emerging powers cite U.S. climate policy as evidence of an American threat.

The United States has consistently called for industrializing nations to accept emission reduction targets that reflect their present day emissions levels, a stance that the British Council says "infuriates" countries such as China and India. These nations, some of the world's largest,

view the U.S. stance as evidence that the U.S. is trying to control and undermine the growth of emerging powers. Furthermore, they feel the U.S. is subjecting them to an unfair double standard, as the U.S. developed without pollution regulations.

3) Lack of climate policy fuels economic support for highly anti-American regimes.

Climate change policy is closely tied with energy security, which can be designed to protect against extreme forms of anti-Americanism. Dependence on foreign oil props up anti-American regimes such as those in Venezuela (60% of Venezuelan oil exports provide 11% of U.S. oil imports) and the Middle East (12% of Persian Gulf exports provide 17% of U.S. oil imports). According to the Council of Foreign Relations, there is a "growing international anti-globalist alliance among countries such as Russia and Venezuela, the Syrians [sic] to form a counterbalance to the U.S."

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1) The United States should immediately develop domestic policy objectives to curb national greenhouse gas emissions.

The Obama Administration can make a strong entrance on the international climate change stage, separating itself from the Bush Administration with an early commitment to developing a domestic plan to tackle greenhouse gas emissions. This should begin with an executive order to set a cap on emissions from federal agencies' operations. In addition, a visible display of the federal government's use of U.S. environmental technology could help combat the image of Americans as "gas-guzzling, SUV-driving consumaholics." Highly visible options include:

a) Outfitting federal cars with hybrid or electric technology in a public way, funded as operational costs in the 2009 federal budget.

b) Retrofitting government buildings to meet sustainability standards.

c) Ensuring that meetings, press conferences and social gatherings incorporate sustainability principles (for instance, if disposable food containers are offered at catered events, products can be similar to the NatureWorks® disposable items used in the Senate cafeteria).

2) The State Department should prioritize “green diplomacy” efforts.

The Public Diplomacy Office of the U.S. State Department has been touting its new “green diplomacy” efforts, promoting U.S. initiatives on environmental protection for cultural heritage sites, recycling, water quality and use, forestry, climate change and trade. However, the initiatives remain low-profile, yet it is to the United States’ advantage to raise the prominence of green diplomacy initiatives. This includes:

a) Media training on environmental issues for diplomats: preparation for conversations with journalists and stressing the importance that they seek out opportunities to speak to the press.

b) Setting climate change on an array of the highest bilateral/multilateral meeting agendas to demonstrate its place as a top priority for the U.S.

c) Actively supporting engagement through the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). Unlike President Bush’s Major Economies Meeting on energy security and climate change, this will signal U.S. participation within the existing international framework.

3) The United States should increase and publicize its support of sustainable development in developing countries.

This policy should mitigate the impression that the U.S. seeks a climate change agreement at the expense of eco-

nommic growth of developing nations. This can take several forms:

a) Declaring its unilateral commitment to substantial, mandatory reductions of greenhouse gas emissions as outlined by President-elect Obama, which are not contingent on commitments from China, India and other developing nations; at the same time, stressing the importance of commitments by emerging powers to improve energy intensity (ratio of energy consumption and economic growth) and curb emissions, with the help of U.S. technologies and technical assistance.

b) Mobilizing the U.S. private sector, with a focus on small businesses, to increase U.S. sustainable development projects overseas. The Overseas Private Investment Corporation should focus more of its investment on projects that incorporate environmental standards and technology. Demand the same focus from international development banking institutions.

c) Setting assessment criteria for government agencies’ future overseas development projects, asking that they meet international standards for environmental sustainability. On visits to developing countries, top U.S. officials should include visits to these project sites in their itinerary to draw further attention to the U.S. commitment to global action against climate change.

4) The United States should increase energy independence in order to avoid importing oil from countries that pose security concerns.

The Obama Administration should help make climate policy a bipartisan, national priority by underlining the security threats of further oil dependence. Implementation can be achieved with tax incentives for consumers, public relations campaigns to address “not in my backyard” concerns with wind and nuclear production, demonstration projects of technology such as carbon capture and storage and other associated programs.

III. ANTI-AMERICANISM AND THE WORLD ECONOMY

III. ANTI-AMERICANISM AND THE WORLD ECONOMY

World leaders and the international public have long accused the United States of imposing its economic model on other nations, thereby serving America's own economic interest while increasing inequality in the world. The current global financial crisis has been widely blamed on American-style capitalism, further exacerbating the already existent latent anti-Americanism. Economic anti-Americanism does not only hurt U.S. legitimacy and soft power in international economic organizations like the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, but also has long-term negative effects on U.S. business endeavors. Reasserting U.S.'s image in the world economy is hence a crucial task for the new Obama administration, especially amidst increasing globalization and the rise of emerging economic giants like China, India, and Brazil.

KEY PROBLEMS:

1) The U.S. government is perceived as imposing its economic model on other countries, thus serving its own commercial interests while neglecting the economic interests of other countries.

According to the Report of the Princeton Project on National Security, 52% of foreign citizens surveyed claim that U.S. involvement in the global economy increases inequality in developing nations. It is believed that the World Bank, the WTO and the IMF were created not to contribute to global economic development but to sustain the U.S. economy's continuous expansion by ensuring it sufficient access to foreign markets and raw materials.

2) U.S. businesses abroad—especially multinational corporations—are regarded as seeking to dominate local economies and hurt the competitiveness of indigenous businesses.

Also according to the Report of the Princeton Project on National Security, 36% of citizens surveyed in foreign countries cite the power of U.S. multi-national corporations as their main reason for disliking the United States. U.S. companies are perceived to act single-mindedly in pursuing profit in foreign economies. The global business expansion on the part of U.S. companies is seen as exploitative by the international community.

edly in pursuing profit in foreign economies. The global business expansion on the part of U.S. companies is seen as exploitative by the international community.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1) The U.S. should reform the World Bank and the IMF.

To remove the symbolism of American domination of international institutions, the United States in lockstep with its international partners, should launch major reforms of the economic and financial institutions.

a) Adopt new procedures to determine the leadership of the IMF and the World Bank.

Since 1944, the U.S.—as part of a tacit transatlantic bargain—has enjoyed the right to appoint a U.S. citizen to serve as the President of the World Bank in exchange for its support of a citizen from a Western European country to serve as the Managing Director of the IMF. The Department of Treasury, which nominates the Executive Director to the World Bank, should repeal this practice and advocate for a new open and transparent selection process that is analogous to the formal election of the UN Secretary-General. By opening a selection process that includes all nations, the United States will send a signal that industrialized countries are committed to ending the “Western” dominance of international economic institutions.

b) Revamp the “one dollar-one vote” governance structure in the World Bank to increase the voting share of developing countries.

Developing nations—who make up more than 80% of the world population—hold only 39% of the World Bank voting shares due to the “one-dollar-one-vote” governance structure that favors rich nations. As a result, developing countries do not see the World Bank as representing their interests. To give developing countries a more prominent say, the Department of Treasury should advocate for a new dual voting structure. This

structure would require a double majority for decisions to pass: a 70% majority based on the “one dollar-one vote” mechanism and a 70% majority based on a “one man-one vote” population-based mechanism that is also used in the United Nations.

- c) Modify the “quota” governance system in the IMF to increase the voting power of developing countries.

Under the current “quota” system, the combined votes of China, India and Brazil are lower than the combined votes of Belgium, Italy and the Netherlands. The current formula for calculating quotas relies on basic macro-economic factors such as “gross domestic product” and “balance of payments”. The Department of Treasury should advocate for a new formula that incorporates “GDP based on Purchasing Power Parity”, a variable that takes country population into account and thus increases the voting power of developing countries. As the IMF remains the center of the new world financial architecture, this initiative will show that the U.S. is dedicated to incorporating developing countries in the global decision-making process.

2) The U.S. should improve the image of its businesses abroad by helping build the local talent and competitiveness of developing nations.

The United States must demonstrate its commitment to helping foreign workers and businesses benefit from the business ties between their country and U.S. companies.

- a) Involve U.S. private sector in new joint research in science and technology with developing countries.

In the long run, developing countries need to engage in active science and technology policies to diversify their economies and reduce dependence on a small number of commodity exports. The Office of Private Sector Outreach (State Department) should set up new bilateral joint research programs in developing countries using the “U.S.-Egypt Joint Science and Technology

Fund” as a model, soliciting support from mostly U.S. private sector research and development centers. This will strengthen the technological capacity of poorer nations as well as expand relations between the scientific communities.

- b) Engage multinational corporations in indigenous business development through the Millennium Challenge Corporation.

In addition to its main goal of combating poverty, the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC) should introduce “local business development” as a “Private Sector Initiative” program that targets indigenous entrepreneurs and businesses and provide them with capital and business know-how to compete in both domestic and global markets. To involve multinational corporations in this initiative, the MCC should actively pursue more “Memorandum of Understandings” (MOUs) with corporations from a wide variety of industries including textiles, energy and tourism. These new MOUs will include “local business development” as a top priority and encourage multinational corporations to commit to entrepreneurship development in their areas of operation.

- c) Sensitize and prepare U.S. businesses for anti-Americanism from abroad.

American businesses and multinationals should not only pursue their commercial interests abroad more effectively, but also use their influence to improve the overall image of the United States. Within the State Department, there should be a cross-bureau dialogue between the Office of Private Sector Outreach (Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs) and the Office of Commercial and Business Affairs (Economic, Energy, and Business Affairs) to establish a business-public relations program that emulates the “Business and Society Relations” program of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce’s Business Civic Leadership Center. This program will help U.S. companies understand the social and political situations of their business climates, while supporting their commercial interests.

IV. ANTI-AMERICANISM AND THE U.S. MILITARY

IV. ANTI-AMERICANISM AND THE U.S. MILITARY

The past six years have seen a considerable rise in anti-Americanism, and much of it has centered on the conduct of the U.S. military. The single action most responsible for this is the U.S. invasion of Iraq and its bungled aftermath. The preparations for and execution of that invasion have sparked anti-Americanism from both the Iraqi people, who have been frustrated with the ineffectiveness of the U.S. and appalled by its human rights' violations, and from traditional allies, who have been offended by the administration's skirting of international law.

KEY PROBLEMS:

1) U.S. defiance of international law.

During its preparations for the Iraq War, the U.S. created its coalition of the willing as an inadequate substitute for the endorsement of the international community. The U.S. also lacked proper preparation and deference in the field of international law. After declaring that the Third Geneva Convention does not apply to terrorists, President Bush made no attempt to explain under which international laws or by what standards he intended to treat captured enemy combatants. Furthermore, the U.S. did not formulate a policy to allow prisoners to contest their detainment or request a reason for it, a vital procedure in ongoing conflicts. Finally, the U.S. never clarified its definition of torture. The U.S. saw international law as an obstacle, rather than as the means of defining and justifying its conduct. Doing the bare minimum—or less—on the international stage has earned the U.S. the scorn of leaders and their people across the world.

2) Failure of the U.S. to win Iraqi hearts and minds.

In order to succeed in Iraq, the U.S. must persuade the Iraqis that their government will keep them safe and will represent their interests. In short, it must make the Iraqis believe in the “new” Iraq. The U.S. has spent a considerable amount of time and money on developing an Iraqi military, but has not adequately en-

couraged other kinds of service or instilled a sense of civic duty in the Iraqi people.

In addition, the treatment of detainees at U.S. prisons has outraged Iraqis and the world. Thus, it has made the job of al-Qaeda recruiters much easier. Moreover, these prisons have focused on the traditional military objectives of detention and interrogation, while failing to address issues such as prisoner rehabilitation. The failure of the U.S. military to adjust its doctrine for the Iraq War has fostered Iraqi anti-Americanism and has made the job of effectively ruling the country more difficult for the government of Iraq (GOI).

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1) Reopen the international discussion on Iraq and propose a new international law to govern U.S. actions on captured combatants.

a) Request international support for the final U.S. operations in Iraq.

President-elect Obama will have the open ears and minds of the international community after he takes office in January. He must seize the opportunity to reopen a UN discussion on Iraq, asking for UN approval of U.S. operations during the final two years in Iraq. He should explain that international approval is important for U.S. military operations and emphasize the significance of the final U.S. efforts in Iraq. Finally, President-elect Obama should also ask for help with funding for non-military operations. Taking these actions will help the U.S. regain worldwide support.

b) Define U.S. standards for the treatment of captured enemy combatants.

Classifying terrorists in a new category, “enemy combatants”, was valid but left the U.S. with no international law by which to regulate detainment. In 2009, the U.S. should propose an amendment to the Third Geneva Convention which would outline the treat-

ment of enemy combatants (who do not serve in traditional militaries and are therefore not “prisoners of war”). This should be simple: the UN should delineate which articles of the Third Geneva Convention apply to enemy combatants. All of the articles should apply except the ones that are specifically designed to show respect for military structure and chain of command. In terms of prisoner medical care and standards of living, the rules for enemy combatants should be identical to those governing prisoners of war. Clarifying this international law will convince Iraq and other countries that the U.S. wants to live up to its ideals.

c) Require that the U.S. military justify detention of prisoners to an international judge.

The landmark case of *Al Odah v. United States* justly established the writ of *habeas corpus* on an international level, granting detained prisoners the right to appeal to U.S. courts, rather than military tribunals, and demand a reason for their detention. But given the international nature of the issue, the U.S. should propose that the UN provide judges for all international prisons. These judges would review the cases of the detainees and decide whether the detaining power is justified. Iraqis will respect this effort to enforce standards and check U.S. military power in an unbiased way.

d) Define “torture”.

The U.S. should propose a change in the UN definition of torture. The 1987 UN Convention Against Torture outlawed only the infliction of “severe” pain and suffering. To clarify the issue and to prove the goodness of its intentions, the U.S. should propose the removal of the word “severe” from the definition, thereby simplifying and clarifying issues surrounding the use of torture. Holding the military to this new standard will demonstrate the U.S. deep-rooted respect for human rights.

2) Integrate the rehabilitation process with the detention process.

The U.S. military should follow the example of General Douglas Stone, who made several wise reforms at Camp Bucca in 2006 - 2007. The general separated the fanatical al-Qaeda members from the rest of the prisoners to prevent the extremists from recruiting other prisoners. Next, Stone allowed moderate imams to teach classes in his prison, in hopes of diffusing extremism among the detainees. These initiatives were successful; thus, the U.S. military should make these methods a standard policy. The U.S. should also encourage the GOI to establish its own version of the Saudi Arabian rehabilitation facilities that have converted young jihadists to less extreme versions of Islam. These recommendations deal with the al-Qaeda threat while showing respect for Islam.

3) Increase opportunities for national service in Iraq.

The U.S. government should encourage the GOI to instill a higher sense of civic duty and service in Iraq. Both the U.S. and Iraq have failed to adequately capitalize on the important role of non-military government workers. Iraq should create a large program of public careers, including construction workers and school teachers. The employees should wear government uniforms. This will foster Iraqi pride and will help build important national institutions. Because these programs are non-military operations and would require only financial support, the U.S. should request funding from allies. While the Iraqis would create and manage these programs, it is reasonable and legitimate for foreign aid to help a new government involve its people in the service of the state.

V. ANTI-AMERICANISM IN THE ARAB MIDDLE EAST

V. ANTI-AMERICANISM IN THE ARAB MIDDLE EAST

According to a 2002 Zogby Poll, 86% of Egyptians and 88.2% of Kuwaitis and Saudi Arabians view U.S. foreign policy towards Arab nations unfavorably. In other realms, however, attitudes are less negative: for example, American efforts in science and technology are viewed favorably by over 80% of the populations in Kuwait, Lebanon and the United Arab Emirates as well as by over 70% of Egyptians and Saudi Arabians. These contrasting figures indicate an association between U.S. foreign policy and Arab anti-Americanism, dating from the United States' support for Israel in the 1967 War. Despite the global optimism surrounding the new Obama presidency, many in the Middle East are less enthusiastic and expect little to change in U.S. Middle Eastern foreign policy.

KEY PROBLEMS:

1) U.S. government policy towards Palestinians.

According to a 2002 Zogby Poll, the United States' support for Israel is viewed negatively by a majority of Arabs (ranging from 83.2% in the United Arab Emirates to 93.8% in Egypt) and appears to be the leading cause of Arab anti-Americanism. Outside of the Arab world, ruling elites have also questioned the U.S.'s role as a credible world leader due to its relationship with Israel. Additionally, the United States has lost credibility in the UN, where it has vetoed more resolutions than all other members combined in protection of Israeli interests.

2) U.S. policies in Iraq.

Throughout the 1990s, U.S.-dominated UN sanctions caused severe economic hardship in Iraq. According to a 2002 Zogby Poll, a majority of Arabs viewed these sanctions negatively. Further causes of anti-American sentiments throughout the region

include: the 2003 invasion of Iraq, war-associated civilian casualties, the destruction of infrastructure and the abuse of prisoners in U.S. custody.

3) Perceived U.S. disrespect towards Islam and Arabs.

When American Christian missionaries traveled to the Arab world in the early 1900s, their actions often reflected little understanding or respect for Islam. Their presence stirred anger among the local population and became symbolic as the first direct interaction between Americans and Arabs. Later, double standards in U.S. foreign policy in the region further fueled anti-Americanism in the Middle East. Prime examples of this are the U.S. alliance with the Saudi monarchy, which has come under fire for human rights abuses, and the U.S. rejection and denunciation of the democratically-elected Hamas government in 2006 despite U.S. calls for democracy in the region. The Bush Administration's use of terms such as "Crusades" and its repeated declarations of war on "Islamic Radicalism" further inflamed Arab anti-Americanism. Ideas such as a "clash of civilizations" and the "war of ideas" alienated many in the Arab world, fostering extremism and, in some cases, terrorism.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1) Deepening and diversifying perspectives of the U.S. public by promoting the broadcast of foreign news services.

American public opinion of U.S. foreign policies is shaped in large part by the biases existent in U.S. media. For example, the U.S. media has largely depicted the Palestinians as aggressors in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict whereas foreign media outlets have painted a more nuanced picture of the issue,

criticizing Israel for violations of Palestinian human rights. The disparity in coverage between U.S. news sources and European or Middle Eastern (including Israeli) sources explains a significant part of the vastly different views on the region. The U.S. should increase foreign media broadcasts, such as BBC World news or Al-Jazeera English, with the goal of fostering a better-informed U.S. public. This recommendation would be implemented through the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) in one of two possible ways: encouraging cable companies to allocate bandwidth to these news sources or pressuring networks such as ABC and PBS to allocate airtime to international news programs.

2) Change of rhetoric used by U.S. government officials.

The Bush Administration's use of terms such as "Islamic fascists" to refer to a broad range of organizations and groups of people fosters anger among moderate Muslims and portrays Islam negatively to the U.S. public. This "demonization" of Muslims has contributed to the increase in domestic attacks on American Muslims and vandalism of U.S. mosques. Extremist groups from abroad use this rhetoric to call upon Muslims to defend the attacks on their religion. The U.S. government should change its rhetoric when referring to the Middle East or Islam, incorporating nuances to avoid representing both the region and the religion as monolithic.

3) Dialogue with Syria.

Whether or not the U.S. agrees with the ideals and tactics of the Syrian government, dialogue is crucial to prevent the further spread of anti-Americanism in the region and to regain the deteriorating position of the U.S. as a world leader. The overarching theme of the Obama campaign was the promotion of dialogue as a means of avoiding an increase in tensions that could lead to war. The U.S.

should fulfill this promise and open dialogue with Syria. Such an action would add to the credibility of the U.S. government and prove to the Arab Middle East that the U.S. is willing to take a new direction in its approach to the region. Dialogue with Syria will also send a message to groups such as Hamas and Hizballah, and thus promote peace and stability in the region.

4) Financial compensation.

The U.S. government should provide financial compensation for Iraqis who lost families or homes during the war and should increase funding to Iraqi committees dedicated to rebuilding basic institutions such as schools, hospitals and historical sites. These funds can be reallocated from existing funds for the Iraq War or can be requested by the U.S. from its allies in the form of non-military aid. Unless there are sincere efforts on the part of the U.S. government to rebuild some of what it has destroyed, anger caused by the war and the extremism it has created will not be calmed.

VI. ANTI-AMERICANISM IN IRAN, PAKISTAN AND AFGHANISTAN

VI. ANTI-AMERICANISM IN IRAN, PAKISTAN AND AFGHANISTAN

A 2005-2006 Gallup poll shows that anti-American sentiment from Muslims worldwide has risen to an all-time high, with 52% of Iranians and 65% of Pakistanis expressing negative views toward the U.S. While a 2006 world public opinion poll shows that the majority of Afghans support the U.S. presence in Afghanistan, this approval has been lately declining because of the slow rate of reconstruction. The threat of attacks against U.S. citizens or U.S. allies by extremist anti-American groups, especially in Afghanistan, Iran and Pakistan, who justify their actions as a resistance to “Americanization”, are the impetus that the U.S. government needs to address anti-Americanism in these three countries.

KEY PROBLEMS:

1) Unstable economic and living conditions in Afghanistan incite anti-Americanism.

In Afghanistan, anti-Americanism stems from the U.S.’s history of failed policies and abandonment of the Afghani people. Because of U.S. support for the Taliban as a means to fight the Soviets, the U.S. fostered the growth of Islamic extremism in communist and post-communist Afghanistan. Today, although U.S. and NATO forces are rebuilding Afghanistan, Afghani people suffer under food shortages and high rates of unemployment.

2) The Iran Air Flight 655 tragedy continues to fuel anti-Americanism.

A large cause of anti-Americanism in Iran stems from the Iran Air Flight 655 incident in 1988, when U.S. Navy missiles shot down a passenger airliner. While the U.S. finally agreed to pay \$61.8 million as compensation for the 290 passengers and crew killed, it has yet to admit responsibility or apologize to the Iranians.

3) U.S. history of sanctions on Iran causes anti-American sentiment.

Much anti-American sentiment in Iran comes from the imposition of economic sanctions on Iran by the U.S. as a result of Iran’s nuclear program. These sanctions that cut off Iranian military and banking institutions from the U.S. financial system have significantly damaged the Iranian economy and caused anti-Americanism among the Iranian people.

4) Pakistani madrasas continue to breed anti-Americanism.

Anti-Americanism in Pakistan has taken a more tangible form than elsewhere. Pakistanis have staged anti-American and anti-war demonstrations, with Pakistanis carrying coffins to signify the death of any American who comes to Pakistan. Islamic militants have orchestrated several terrorist attacks against American institutions and diplomats, including the well-known abduction and decapitation of Daniel Pearl in January 2002. Much of this anti-American sentiment is cultivated in Pakistan’s madrasas. These religious schools, which originally were broad centers of learning, have, in recent decades, begun leaning towards teaching Islamic extremism. Many parents who normally would not send their children to these schools do so because they offer free food for the children and a stable education.

5) Pakistan's lack of media freedom contributes to anti-Americanism.

Pakistan's media has been severely repressed by the Pakistani government under PEMRA, the Pakistan Electronic Media Regulatory Authority. Journalists who have spoken out against the Pakistani government have been threatened, arrested and abducted. Because Pakistanis do not have access to free and open media, many believe the anti-American rhetoric of biased news sources.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1) Strengthen Afghanistan's trade system.

Poverty breeds anti-Americanism. The U.S. must hence focus its efforts on rebuilding Afghanistan's economy. The U.S. should give grants to entrepreneurs to strengthen businesses and enter new markets as well as increase competitiveness in private sector businesses. The U.S. should aid Afghanistan in opening ports for Afghan products as well as easing the customs procedures to strengthen the economy so that the country can become self-sufficient. This would be enacted by USAID in the same way the Pakistan Initiative for Strategic Development and Competitiveness has been. USAID should work with AISA, Afghanistan Investment Support Agency, to encourage foreign investment in Afghanistan, which would create jobs and stimulate the economy.

2) Apologize for Iran Air Flight 655.

The U.S. should admit responsibility and apologize to the Iranian people and Iranian government for the Iran Air Flight 655 debacle. This can be accomplished with a public statement by President-elect Obama that acknowledges and apologizes for the deaths of innocent civilians.

3) Invest in Pakistan's public education system.

To revive the education system of Pakistan, the U.S. should dedicate aid to the reformation of education. While not explicitly opening U.S.-funded schools, the U.S. can provide computers, books, and other school supplies for public schools that follow a broader curriculum. The U.S. should offer free meals to students at these schools, since many Pakistanis would not send their children to radical madrasas except for the free meals. The U.S. could also provide higher pay to teachers who follow a broader curriculum as well as work with the Pakistani government to monitor the madrasa system. These reforms should be enacted and funded in partnership with USAID's current education programs, ED-LINKS, STEP and the Fulbright Program.

4) Promote media freedom in Pakistan.

The U.S. should promote independent media outlets in Pakistan and throughout the Middle East. In particular, the U.S. should fund domestic independent channels and encourage media freedom to the Pakistani government using U.S. aid threats and incentives. Independent media allows a moderate voice to combat anti-American propaganda channels and can work to encourage democracy. USAID currently devotes aid specifically to fund democratic efforts in Pakistan and should expand its focus to the promotion of media freedom by supporting independent media.

VII. ANTI-AMERICANISM IN CHINA

VII. ANTI-AMERICANISM IN CHINA

China is predicted to be the super power of the 21st century and is becoming increasingly important to the United States and the world as a whole. A harmonious Sino-American relationship is thus not only in the interests of the U.S. and China but also necessary to sustaining long-term development and peace in the world. While anti-Americanism in China is not as strong as in other regions, it remains significant enough to be harmful to U.S. bilateral diplomacy, U.S. businesses and the safety of the large number of Americans living or traveling in China.

KEY PROBLEMS:

1) The Chinese government uses anti-American rhetoric to manipulate the Chinese population.

Chinese leaders are tacitly promoting anti-Americanism to strengthen the Chinese political regime and legitimize its authoritarian practices. For instance, the Chinese government intends to foster Chinese nationalism by reminding the public of past foreign invasions. This rhetoric produces among the Chinese population a strong sentiment of distrust towards the West. In addition, the Chinese government propagates the notion that the development process of a country requires a strong centralized political structure to prevent the creation of dangerous social cleavages. As a result, many Chinese citizens are led to view the U.S. democracy promotion efforts as a Western conspiracy to prevent China from achieving economic prosperity and social stability.

2) Extreme nationalism among the Chinese youth.

Both government propaganda and China's recent economic development have given rise to extreme nationalism among the Chinese youth. As a result,

the Chinese youth is particularly sensitive to U.S. remarks on "fraudulent" Chinese policies and perceives any U.S. criticism as a U.S. malign effort to interfere with China's "internal affairs".

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1) Increase the number of internship/fellowship programs for U.S. college and high school graduates and require participants to initiate social or cultural activities.

The U.S. government in cooperation with the Chinese Ministry of Commerce, Chinese NGOs and businesses should create and provide funding for attractive internship/fellowship opportunities in China for U.S. students. To participate in one of these internship/fellowship programs, U.S. students must agree to periodically organize cultural events or engage in community service in China. All participants would thus serve as U.S. goodwill ambassadors to China and would reach out to the Chinese population in a cost-efficient way.

2) Increase public outreach of the U.S. Embassy in China by setting up local-level American cultural centers and clubs.

In order to increase people's interest in the U.S. and American culture, the Education and Cultural Affairs Office of the U.S. Embassy in China should set up numerous small-scale local-level American Cultural Centers. These centers should organize cultural activities, provide a selection of American literature and movies and offer English language classes.

These centers should draw upon the support of U.S. Foreign Service officials, businessmen, and the student fellows mentioned earlier.

In addition, the U.S. Embassy should encourage and provide funding for Chinese students at local universities to start *American Clubs*. These clubs will function as student-run organizations. Each year the U.S. Embassy in China should award a prize to the *Best American Club* based on its success in organizing activities to strengthen the Sino-American friendship.

3) Establish awards and competitions to encourage positive local media coverage on the U.S.

Chinese local media coverage plays an important role in influencing the Chinese public opinion on the U.S. While it is impossible to eliminate negative reports, as media in China must strictly comply with the government's instructions, the U.S. Embassy could still take measures to encourage positive and accurate coverage. For example, setting up annual press awards like the "Best Writing on Sino-American Relations" could encourage Chinese media to portray the U.S. in a friendlier manner.

4) Plan an extensive China tour for Obama.

While President-elect Obama is very popular in many countries, the Chinese public has been less enthusiastic about his election. The new U.S. administration should hence plan an *Obama Tour* through China shortly after his inauguration. The tour should not only include talks with top leaders in Beijing but also enable Obama to interact with the Chinese public, e.g. via visits to Chinese universities and cultural sites to demonstrate the President's genuine interests in Chinese people and Chinese culture.

5) Avoid labeling China as an enemy in government rhetoric.

The Obama administration should strongly urge U.S. government officials not to label China as the U.S.'s enemy in their speeches and reports. Instead, the U.S. government should portray China as a partner and friend that is worthy of respect. These efforts will also gradually influence the tone of the U.S. media coverage on China, which Chinese audiences have found to be highly inflammatory in recent years. This tempering of rhetoric will not only result in the respect from the Chinese government and public, but will also reduce the anti-China sentiment in the U.S.

VII. ANTI-AMERICANISM AND PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

V. ANTI-AMERICANISM AND PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

Public diplomacy, the main instrument through which the Bush Administration has attempted to counter the growing anti-American sentiments around the world, has been largely unsuccessful in recent years. Public diplomacy offers a long-term solution to anti-American concerns in a non-combative, persuasive manner, commonly termed “soft power”. The inception of the Obama administration provides the rare opportunity for the United States to redeem its image in the world’s eyes, although it has to do so with prudence and consideration so as to not lose its existing auspicious position of hope and change.

KEY PROBLEMS:

1) Lack of organization.

A challenge with public diplomacy over the past decade has been the rapid turnover of leadership and the inefficient use of funding. Ever since the dissolution of the United States Information Agency (USIA) after the Cold War, public diplomacy has taken a relatively low priority in the U.S. government, explaining why many efforts have been merely superficial and/or short-lived. The State Department does not give public diplomacy the priority that it gives to other issues, such as security. In addition, because public diplomacy is not an independent department, the changing of administrations coincides with changes in public diplomacy goals and efforts, leading to mixed messages and conflicting priorities.

2) Ways in which public diplomacy is perceived.

Public diplomacy over the past eight years (and even stemming back to the Cold War) has been largely perceived as propaganda, with a focus on broadcasting American views and values into other nations. Although the creation of the Broadcasting Board of Governors (BBG) to implement radio programs such as the Voice of America (VOA), alHurra, Radio Sawa, Radio Free Europe, and Radio Liberty has succeeded in broadcasting in over 27 languages around the

world, there are doubts to how well this money and effort are being spent. Such radio programs have been criticized as “arrogant” and as “mere propaganda”, not harnessing the value of soft power. Additionally, ever since the leadership of Karen Hughes, public diplomacy has been depicted through the lens of “waging peace” and now as “the war of ideas”, combative terms that may inherently portray the U.S. as aggressive and imperialist.

3) Educational exchanges target a narrow audience.

Despite increases in cultural and educational exchange programs, these programs have primarily targeted privileged white youth and have neglected to look at a diverse range of citizens on both sides of the exchange, thus largely limiting the wide-reaching impacts of public diplomacy.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1) Establish an independent public diplomacy agency.

The first action the U.S. must take to improve its image in the world is to create an independent public diplomacy organization, such as the proposed “USA-World Trust” outlined by Kristin Lord’s recent “Voices of America” public diplomacy report. This agency, however, needs a title that does not imply U.S. hegemony in the world, such as the “Agency for Communications and International Outreach”. An independent integrated public diplomacy organization will preclude sentiments of a “government-run propaganda” agency and eliminate organizational confusion. Although the Lord report recommends annual funding from the State Department to maintain sustainability and accountability, the government needs to be very careful in funding and leading such an agency, as close ties to the government negate the purpose of an agency independent from government motives.

Sustainability and accountability can still be maintained by an agency funded by a combination of the public and private sectors, with government funds set aside in an emergency trust in case of funding challenges. Finally, although the Lord report recommends that the agency staff be composed of Americans, the inclusion of international staff would beneficially diversify and expand knowledge and understanding. This agency should also appoint and train a public diplomacy specialist for each State Department bureau to close the gap and increase understanding between policy and public diplomacy in all sections of government.

2) Establish and support corporate exchanges.

a) The State Department should expand the target audience of current exchanges while adding a focus on business exchanges. It should first collaborate with the Senate to expand the 2007 Paul Simon Act, which provides opportunities for low-income and minority students to participate in exchanges. The State Department should contribute \$50 million to significantly expand this program and allow a more diverse group of Americans to study abroad.

b) Additionally, in order to practically increase business/corporate exchanges, the U.S. government should expand the Humphrey Scholarship Program (which currently brings mid-career professions from 90 countries to U.S. universities) to include more two-way exchanges with opportunities for U.S. professionals to study abroad.

c) The State Department should also add a business exchange program to the already well-established and reputable Fulbright scholarship program, which will emulate the independent NGO and non-partisan organization Business for Diplomatic Action by facilitating workshops on cross-cultural communications and sharing information and business skills through direct exchanges. The costs involved in creating a business sub-division of the Fulbright program

would likely be diminished by the contributions of businesses and governments around the world who wish to participate in the program.

3) Train ambassadors to be Public Diplomats.

a) U.S. ambassadors to foreign countries should be given the training to not only represent the U.S., but to also actively engage with foreign leaders and diplomats to determine how they see the U.S. and how they plan to deal with threats. A specific public diplomacy training session should be added to the current ambassador training to teach ambassadors the importance of engaging with and listening to foreign publics and leaders (and perhaps current expatriate communities as well), in addition to mandatory basic language training in the country's national language.

b) The practice of hiring political appointees as ambassadors should be eliminated (or significantly limited) to ensure that career diplomats, who have much more experience and knowledge about dealing with foreign publics and policy in general, are selected as ambassadors.

c) Finally, in order to comprehensively understand the effects and perceptions of public diplomacy efforts in certain countries, the U.S. embassies should regularly ask reputable private polling agencies to research the perception of the U.S.'s public diplomacy efforts in each country. No such comprehensive reporting system currently exists. This will allow U.S. diplomats and policy makers to improve and modify public diplomacy programs and will show the world that the U.S. wants to listen and will take foreign views into account when making policy.

