



The Historical Construction the Ideas and Policies of U.S. “Cultural Diplomacy” in the Framework of the “Good Neighbor Policy”: A Neoliberal Institutional Perspective

Yu Sun

Department of International Relations, Dalian University of Foreign Languages

The global dissemination of American culture in the twentieth century was an important source of the “soft power” of the United States. However, compared with European countries such as Britain and France, the U.S. federal government intervened in cultural dissemination affairs relatively late. From the theory of neoliberal institutionalism put forward by Goldstein and Keohane, it can be found that the emergence of American “cultural diplomacy” is a result of the change of American “worldview”, “principled beliefs” and “causal beliefs” in foreign relations. The concept of “cultural diplomacy” was embedded in the framework of American foreign policy along the path of institutionalization, forming the “Good Neighbor Policy”, which is the result of the reconstruction of American “worldview”, “principled beliefs” and “causal beliefs” in foreign relations in the 1930s. Under the “Good Neighbor Policy”, the Division of Cultural Relations and the Office for Cooperation in Inter-American Affairs were established, along with various a variety of cultural exchange programs. With the coming of World War II, the tension between cultural internationalism and cultural nationalism within the U.S. “cultural diplomacy” became increasingly prominent. Eventually, after Pearl Harbor, the U.S. federal government formally incorporated “cultural diplomacy” into the framework of its national foreign strategy, which also marked a shift in the concept and policy of “cultural diplomacy”.

Keywords: “Good Neighbor Policy”, Historical construction, Neoliberal institutionalism

Received May 7, 2024

First Decision Made May 15, 2024

Accepted May 27, 2024

Corresponding Author

Yu Sun

Department of International Relations,
Dalian University of Foreign Languages.
Center for Northeast Asia Research, Dalian
University of Foreign Languages,
No. 6 West Section of Lvshunnan Road,
Dalian, Liaoning, PRC Postal code: 116044
E-mail: 46158747@qq.com

INTRODUCTION

On February 17, 1941, Henry Luce, editor-in-chief of the *Life Magazine*, published “The American Century”, an article arguing that after the Empire of Great Britain, the United States was destined to become the next global “hegemon” and that the 20th century was the American Century (Luce, 1999). American scholar Justin Hart believes that the connotation of “hegemony” had already changed under the historical conditions of that time: the traditional military and economic hegemony is not in line with the historical trend because of the huge consumption of national power by the hegemonic countries. Therefore, from the 1930s, the US government began to seek a new way to achieve “hegemony” without overly depleting the country’s military and economic resources. The global expansion of American culture and the “Americanization” of the world was the answer they

found (Hart, 2013: 8). About 50 years after the publication of "The American Century", Harvard professor Joseph Nye pointed out that power has a "second face", i.e. "soft power", and that "culture" is an important source of "soft power" (Nye, 2004: 5-11). Thus, the cultural expansion of United States was theorized.

Although the importance of the global expansion of culture in international relations was recognized early on, and American culture had already gained global influence by the end of the nineteenth century, the U.S. federal government in the early 20th century played the role of coordinator only, leaving this responsibility to a variety of private institutions. It was not until 1938, in view of the increasingly severe situation at home and abroad, that the U.S. federal government formally established the first official "cultural diplomacy"¹ organization—Division of Cultural Relations (DCR), which is responsible for the implementation of the Roosevelt administration's proposal of "good neighbor policy".

In order to reveal the historical factors behind the emergence of the U.S. government's "cultural diplomacy" policy, this paper analyzes the ideas and policies of U.S. foreign relations from a holistic and continuous historical perspective. By adopting the neoliberal institutionalism theories (Goldstein and Keohane, 1993), this paper analyses how the three kinds of beliefs—world views, principled beliefs, and causal beliefs—concerning U.S. foreign policies were reconstructed in the complex and changing historical contexts of the 1930s and 1940s, and how the changed beliefs influenced U.S. cultural diplomacy through institutionalization.

IDEAS AND FOREIGN POLICY IN THE PERSPECTIVE OF NEOLIBERAL INSTITUTIONALISM

The role of material and ideal aspects of international relations has always been a point of contention in western international relation theory. Realists emphasize the "hard power" represented by military and economic power; while constructivism, as a kind of "idealism", advocates that ideas constrain the actors' interpretation of material interests, which in turn affects international relations. Therefore, ideas and culture constitute "soft power". In *Idea and foreign policy: beliefs, institutions, and political change*, Goldstein and Keohane put forward a "eclectic" position, arguing that ideal and material factors jointly influence foreign policy, and for the first time clarified the three kinds of ideas and the three pathways through which ideas influence foreign policy.

The two scholars begin by distinguishing three kinds of ideas that influence foreign policy, namely, world views, principled beliefs and causal beliefs (Goldstein and Keohane, 1993: 7-8). World views are rooted in cultural symbols and profoundly influence human thinking and didactic patterns. World views encompass cosmological and ontological perspectives as well as ethical perspectives. World views are often derived from religious beliefs, but they are equally derived from the scientific rationality that symbolizes modernity. Ideas have the broadest impact on human actions when they take the form of world views. Ideas in the second category are principled beliefs, including normative ideas that distinguish right and wrong, justice and injustice. And the third category of ideas is causal beliefs, i.e., beliefs about cause-effect relationships. It derives its authority from the consensus reached by recognized elites. These causal beliefs provide individuals with guidelines on how to achieve their goals.

Goldstein and Keohane point out that while categorization is clear in the abstract, in social life all three aspects of ideas can be linked to form "epistemic communities" (Hass, 1992) of experts who hold both causal and principled beliefs.

¹ "Cultural diplomacy" generally refers to foreign cultural and educational exchange programmes initiated by governments and involving private forces, with the aim of enhancing mutual understanding between countries, fostering international goodwill, building a good image for the country, disseminating a country's culture and values, and ultimately realizing national interests. In contrast to political propaganda, cultural diplomacy focuses primarily on long-term political goals, namely, promoting mutual understanding and fostering international goodwill, rather than on short-term policy objectives.

The most important contribution of neoliberal institutionalism has been to address the question of how ideas influence foreign policy. Goldstein and Keohane point out that ideas influence policy in three ways: the principled or causal beliefs provide a road-map for actors to gain a clearer understanding of the means-ends relationship; ideas affect strategies where there is no unique equilibrium; and ideas can be embedded in institutions (Goldstein and Keohane, 1993: 8). Among all three pathways, ideas exert long-term impact on foreign policy through institutionalization. Ideas can influence politics by integrating themselves into political discourse, but a set of ideas can also have an impact through the operation of institutions by embedding themselves in them. Typically, when institutionalization occurs, the impact of ideas can last for decades or even generations.

THE HISTORICAL TRADITION OF IDEAS AND POLICIES FOR THE INTERNATIONAL DISSEMINATION OF U.S. CULTURE

The “American exceptionalism” put forward by Protestants constitutes the “world view” for the dissemination of American culture. According to a 2015 survey conducted by the Pew Research Center, 70.6% of adult Americans are Christians; among them, Protestants account for 46.5% (Pew Research Center, 2015). Although the United States is a secularized country, Protestantism still plays an important role in American political and social life. According to Wang Xiaode’s study, “American exceptionalism” has an important place in the Anglo-Saxon Protestant cultural belief system. It is a proposition that fundamentally distinguishes the United States from the rest of the world and provides a rational explanation for its special responsibilities and obligations to the world. In essence, he argues, “American exceptionalism” justifies America’s outward expansion in various forms in the name of fulfilling a special God-given “mission”. Thus, “American exceptionalism” is not only one of the ideological roots of America’s ongoing global cultural expansion, but it also allows the U.S. government to find a rational explanation for it (Wang, 2006). As Ninkovich points out in his analysis of the religious origins of U.S. foreign cultural expansion, early U.S. merchants, missionaries, military officers, and travelers began spreading U.S. culture abroad through cross-cultural contacts before the twentieth century. But they did not act with personal gain in mind. “They viewed such actions as a means to a nobler end, whether that end was called ‘God’s will,’ ‘civilized indoctrination,’ or simply a religious sense of ‘the journey’” (Ninkovich, 1981: 8). It was in this sense of mission brought about by “cultural exceptionalism” that the early American cultural communicators were called upon to engage in communication activities.

If American exceptionalism is the foundation of the American world view of cultural expansion, cultural internationalism, which emerged during the inter-war years, has created a “causal belief” between the international dissemination of culture and world peace. Akira Iriye summarizes cultural internationalism as “the undertaking of various tasks of nation-to-nation and people-to-people interconnections through the exchange of ideas and people, academic cooperation, or other efforts to achieve mutual understanding among nations” (Iriye, 1997: 3). After the First World War, some British and American cultural elites began to reflect on the root causes of the war. Alfred Zimmern, professor of international relations at the University of Oxford, believed that the ignorance of human nature led to war, and that education could improve the quality of the people, form a benign public opinion in the international community, and prevent the rulers from fooling the public through propaganda. He was convinced that the international dissemination of culture would enable people to transcend their national differences, and ultimately to reach a mutual understanding between nations, thus realizing peace in the world. At the same time, Zimmern emphasized that such changes do not occur naturally, but require human efforts. “It is indeed one of the common fallacies of this age to believe that international understanding is brought about automatically...” (Zimmern, 1929: 55). To this end, he even proposed the creation of an international library to enhance cultural exchanges among peoples from different countries. English poet and educator Matthew Arnold held similar views. He believes that culture is the “sweetness and sunshine” of mankind, and that if people become cultured, they will change

their behavior and become more civilized and enlightened. In the short term, this would prevent wars; and in the long run, this would re-establish the international order (Arnold, 1938). Such views have profoundly influenced intellectuals in American universities and executives in private foundations. Nicholas Murray Butler of the Carnegie Endowment for Peace, for example, argued that the international dissemination of culture and education could create a common system of values around the world that would prevent the recurrence of world war (Butler, 1917).

Secondly, in terms of the actors of international cultural dissemination, the United States, influenced by liberalism, believes that cultural affairs belong to the "sphere of liberty" (Ninkovich, 1981: 14) and that the government should not interfere with such affairs. It became an important "principled belief" of the United States in international cultural dissemination. This explains why, until the 1930s, the United States relied on nongovernmental actors—philanthropic foundations, academic societies and missionary groups, such as the Carnegie Endowment for Peace (CEIP), the American Library Association (ALA) and the Young Men's Christian Associations (YMCA), to engage in the international dissemination of culture. The U.S. federal government adopted a "laissez-faire" policy of cultural dissemination during this period. Emily Rosenberg, in her book *The Spread of the American Dream*, describes the United States at this stage of its history as a "promotional" and later, a "cooperative" state, with the federal government playing a supporting role in economic and cultural affairs (Rosenberg, 1982). This strategy took full advantage of the innovations of private groups and at the same time avoided the accusations of "propaganda"² that might be brought about by government involvement in cultural affairs. From a foreign policy point of view, having private organizations responsible for the international dissemination of culture is also in line with the "open door" policy of the United States, thus increasing the international influence of the United States without interfering in the disputes of other countries around the world. Therefore, although the international dissemination of culture by private organizations did not always have the national interest as its ultimate goal, it was objectively in line with the fundamental interests of the United States at the time.

In terms of content and media outlets, the United States has traditionally used international educational exchanges, particularly student exchange programs, as an important medium of communication. This tradition can be traced back to the "Boxer Indemnity" of 1904. Richard Arndt, historian of American cultural diplomacy, refers to it as the "bi-national" tradition, which emphasizes the equal status of the sender and receiver and the reciprocity of the content (Arndt, 2005: 22). Broadly speaking, international education also includes book dissemination abroad, the establishment of libraries abroad, and language education. Such "slow-media" communication does not seek short-term changes in audience attitudes, but rather focuses on the long-term effects of communicating and harmonizing the values of both senders and receivers.

THE NATIONALISTIC TURN IN CULTURAL INTERNATIONALISM AND U.S. "GOOD NEIGHBOR POLICY" IN LATIN AMERICA

"Depressions, wars...may all cause ideas to become important because all constitute exogenous shocks that undermine the existing orders" (Goldstein and Keohane, 1993: 17). In the late 1920s and early 1930s, the world experienced a dramatic upheaval that greatly weakened the order of international relations at that time and provided an opportunity for the coming of new ideas. In October 1929, the Great Depression, which originated in the U.S., spread to the major Western countries, and the Nazis began to emerge in Germany and Japan. As a result of the

² It is generally recognized that the "propaganda" refers to the selective presentation of facts or the use of agitprop to influence the audience to produce an emotional and irrational response in order to achieve the goals set by the communicator. The word is derived from the Latin word "propagare", meaning to "spread" or to "multiply". It can be traced back to the founding of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith in 1622 by Pope Gregory XV during the Counter-Reformation. In the 1890s, the word "propaganda" began to be used to refer to secular propaganda activities. From the mid-19th century it began to be used in the political sphere, with a progressively more negative connotation.

Depression, nongovernmental organizations in the U.S. were financially unable to undertake international cultural dissemination activities; and as a result of the Nazi propaganda campaign, the major powers began to realize the impact of international cultural dissemination on international relations. The ideas of cultural internationalism, once prevalent in the 1920s, began to take a nationalistic turn: the governments of the major Western powers began to interfere with matters of cultural and international dissemination, arguing that it should serve the self-interests of the nation-states.

In the domestic politics of the U.S., Roosevelt administration began to reconstruct the idea of “liberalism”. In the 19th century, liberalism was a political philosophy characterized by limited government and free market economy. Roosevelt, however, used “Fireside Chats” and other media strategies to change the American public’s interpretation of “freedom”. He proposed that “freedom” meant more security for ordinary people, especially in economic terms, and that people should have “freedom from want” (FDR Presidential Library & Museum, 1941). In order to achieve this goal, the U.S. federal government should not adopt laissez-faire policies, but to expand its authority to eradicate economic inequality in American society. This reconstruction of the idea of “freedom” completely overturned the traditional concept of “limited government” in the United States, and laid the foundation for Roosevelt administration’s “principled belief” that the international dissemination of culture should be formally included in the framework of national diplomacy.

In the realm of foreign relations, the cultural internationalist groups that had formed in the United States over the previous two decades were replaced by the new “epistemic community” that supported “America First”. Some intellectuals, represented by Charles Beard, pointed out that the economic internationalism of the 1920s only increased the wealth of the rich and did not bring real benefits to the whole country. As a result, Beard argued that the U.S. government should prioritize the domestic affairs rather than seeking economic recovery by returning to multilateralism. He also argued that in order to prevent further worsening of the economic crisis, the United States should reduce its commitments and ties to foreign countries (Beard, 1934). The rejection of economic internationalism reflects the abandonment of the basic principles of interdependence and cooperation that had characterized the world affairs after World War I. The national interests of the United States were once again prioritized over the interests of humanity as a whole.

As cultural nationalism became a trend, and the world’s major powers gradually linked the international dissemination of culture to political objectives, it became difficult for the international cultural dissemination in the United States led by non-governmental actors to survive and thrive in power politics. Therefore, the Roosevelt Administration began to incorporate it into the diplomatic framework, and Latin America became its “testing ground”.

There are historical reasons why the United States chose Latin America as the first place for cultural diplomacy. The United States was deeply influenced by isolationism and did not intervene in the affairs of the European continent. At the same time, the United States regarded Latin America as its own “backyard” and opposed the intervention of European powers in American affairs. In 1823, James Monroe declared in his State of the Union address that the United States would not intervene in European affairs, but if European countries further colonized the Americas or intervened in their political regimes, the United States would regard it as an act of aggression, and the U.S. government would intervene, which is known as the “Monroe Doctrine” (National Archives, 1823). In 1904, Theodore Roosevelt proposed the more aggressive “Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine” (National Archives, 1905), which stated that in order to avoid third-party involvement in Latin American affairs, the United States must maintain order in the Western Hemisphere. The United States had the right to intervene militarily in the case of misbehaving countries. This kind of “big stick diplomacy” did not show local people the goodwill from U.S., but rather strengthened their anti-Americanism sentiments. Latin American elites were deeply influenced by European culture, especially German culture. They believed that most Americans were uneducated and called them

"Yankees" (yanqui in Spanish), and some even saw the United States as a potential threat to peace and stability in the Americas, calling the United States the "Giant of the North" (El Coloso del Norte in Spanish).

After Hitler came to power, Nazi Germany began to use all kinds of media to propagate anti-American ideas in Latin America: German radio stations news agencies broadcast news to Latin America with a clear bias, and even the German airline Lufthansa and the steamship company of the time were used to spread Nazi ideas. The U.S. federal government therefore urgently needed to improve the image of their country in the minds of the Latin American people.

In view of this international situation, President Roosevelt changed the interventionist "big stick" foreign policy of previous presidents. In his first inaugural address on March 4, 1933, he introduced the "Good Neighbor Policy", in which he promised that "In the field of world policy I would dedicate this Nation to the policy of the good neighbor—the neighbor who resolutely respects himself and, because he does so, respects the rights of others" (Avalon Project, 1933). Although the speech did not specify the geographical scope of application of the "good-neighbor policy", in practice the United States first chose Latin America. The choice was based on geopolitical considerations as well as specific historical conditions at the time. Some scholars believe that the U.S. government intended to use Latin America as a testing ground for its foreign policies, and that these policies would eventually be pushed around the world after the Second World War (Wang, 2007). In the years following the introduction of the Good Neighbor Policy, the countries of the Americas held several conferences on inter-American cooperation, the most productive of which was the one held in December 1936 in Buenos Aires, the capital of Argentina. At this conference, 21 countries of the Americas signed the *Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations*, which provided for the signatories to send two students and one professor to each other each year, so that the United States would receive about 40 students and 20 professors each year, while sending the same number of students and professors to the American countries (United Nations Library & Archives Geneva, 1939). This agreement marked the beginning of the U.S. federal government's involvement in the international dissemination of culture.

IDEAS AND POLICIES OF U.S. "CULTURAL DIPLOMACY" TOWARD LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES

Since U.S. government's involvement in cultural affairs, the international dissemination of American culture has begun to deviate from its tradition. However, the deviation was not a complete abandonment of tradition, but a reconstruction of tradition in the historical context of the time.

First, in terms of the motives of cultural diplomacy, although the *Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations* claimed to enhance mutual understanding among the American countries, the fundamental purpose of the U.S. participation in this convention was to resist Nazi cultural penetration in South America and to improve the U.S. national image. Therefore, if the international dissemination of culture during the interwar years was an act of cultural

internationalism aimed at world peace, the "cultural diplomacy" within the framework of the "Good Neighbor Policy" was an act of cultural nationalism with U.S. national interests as its ultimate goal. Secondly, in terms of actors, although the U.S. government decided to intervene in the international dissemination of culture, it had not attempted to control the entire dissemination process. In view of the experience gained by the private sector over the previous 20 years, the U.S. government decided to continue to play the role of coordinator. In 1938, the U.S. Department of State set up the Division of Cultural Relations (DCR), headed by Ben Cherrington, was responsible for integrating and coordinating cultural communication resources, but specific projects were still undertaken by private organizations.

On Sept. 1, 1939, Nazi Germany invaded Poland, the act that started World War II. In view of the growing

international tension, Roosevelt announced the creation of a new agency, the Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs (OCIAA), two months after the fall of Paris, headed by Nelson Rockefeller. The agency was not part of the State Department, but reported directly to the President, and was funded by the President's Emergency Fund, not by Congress.

In terms of content and channels of dissemination, international education remains the main medium of cultural diplomacy of the DCR, including the exchange of scholars between countries, the establishment of overseas libraries and the dissemination of books abroad. Based on the *Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations*, some United States universities offer such courses as Latin American literature, demonstrating the interest of the U.S. elite in learning about the cultures of countries in South America. Unlike the DCR, the OCIAA enriched the “cultural diplomacy” practices by incorporating economic and technical cooperation programs into cultural exchange programs with South America. Rockefeller believed that exchanges of “high culture” could only benefit the elite, while economic and technical cooperation could increase productivity and benefit the masses. Therefore, he believed that “cultural exchanges and economic programs are inseparable” (Sadlier, 2012: 10-13). However, since the U.S. was clearly superior to South American countries in terms of economic and technological strength, the cultural exchange activities of the OCIAA gradually changed into a one-way export. Looking at it from another angle, as the European continent was suffering from war, the U.S. was in urgent need of the Latin American market, so although Rockefeller's approach undermined the reciprocal nature of cultural diplomacy, it was still in line with the national interests of the United States at that time. Another major contribution of Rockefeller is to introduce the “information program” into the cultural exchange programs. Unlike the traditional cultural programs, which relied on “slow media”, OCIAA took advantage of the creativity and flexibility of the private sectors to explore a variety of “fast-media” forms of dissemination, including radio, film, and the printing media.

OCIAA's partnership with Disney produced two famous animated films— “To My Friends” (1942) and “The Three Caballeros” (1944). Both films conveyed the theme that the peoples of the Americas should be kind to one another and strengthen their cooperation. In the field of music, the OCIAA utilized shortwave radio to broadcast symphonies and American jazz played by American orchestras to Latin American countries. OCIAA also sponsored a visit to Latin America by renowned musician Aaron Copland. When it comes to arts, Rockefeller used his family's connections with the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA) in New York to organize visits to South America and Cuba via Mexico by well-known contemporary artists, including painters Georgia O'Keeffe and Edward Hopper (Sadlier, 2012: 189).

Objectively speaking, the cultural exchanges led by both DCR and OCIAA towards South America deviate to varying degrees from the U.S. tradition of liberalism: the former was attached to the State Department, marking the U.S. government's formal involvement in cultural affairs; while the latter undermined the reciprocity of the international dissemination of culture, particularly its use of one-way media of communication, such as radio and cinema, which reminded some Americans of the notorious propaganda apparatus during the First World War—Committee on Public Information. Both indeed used the idea of “selling America” as a means of communication, and “selling” implies a sender-centered approach, with the audience being passive and even deceived. Rockefeller, for example, sponsored \$600,000 in advertising in a Latin American newspaper in 1942 in return for the newspaper running advertisements promoting a favorable image of the United States (Hart, 2013: 39).

As a matter of fact, since the establishment of the DCR, there has been constant criticism from some cultural “purists” who are deeply influenced by cultural internationalism. They insisted that cultural exchanges between countries should maintain their “purity” by rejecting any political purposes behind them. But U.S. government's involvement in cultural affairs created a paradox: why would any government be happy to participate in cultural activities without any political purpose? Although the U.S. government has constantly claimed that it is not involved in “propaganda”, the line between “propaganda” and “cultural diplomacy” is becoming increasingly blurred in

the face of the looming war and the growing demand for culture to serve the interests of the nation. In the face of this turn toward cultural nationalism, representatives of the U.S. government and the intellectual community used the State Department's General Advisory Conference as a platform to discuss relevant topics. Participants in the conference could be broadly divided into "cultural purists" and "cultural diplomacy" proponents. The former believed that culture and politics should be kept separate. If politics was involved, cultural communication became propaganda; while supporters of cultural diplomacy believed that culture had already become a political tool in the international environment at that time, and the United States should incorporate culture into the framework of foreign policy. As Stanford historian Harley Notter pointed out:

Cultural relations have become a concern of national policies. All major governments now engage in one or more phases of cultural relations as generally conceived. Propaganda, for example, is a preoccupation of nearly all major and many minor powers. Because the potential advantages in the realm of cultural relations are seen by governments to be powerful supports to national aims, they represent a force which government cannot leave alone to private foundations and organizations. Cultural relations have become an obligation upon government (Hart, 2013: 62)

In this discussion, Harley Notter takes a view of the rise and fall of great powers and predicts that the United States is destined to become the next empire after the decline of the British Empire. Unlike Britain, which exported its industrial technology to foreign countries, he argued that the United States should become the representative of Western civilization and the most culturally attractive power (Hart 51).

Since Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941 brought the United States into World War II, the federal government began to place greater emphasis on the propaganda role of cultural programs. Soon after, the DCR began to take control of the cultural activities of the OCIAA. In 1944, President Roosevelt appointed Rockefeller as the assistant secretary of state for Latin American affairs (1944-1945). This meant that the U.S. federal government had begun to take a strategic view of cultural dissemination within the framework of the Good Neighbor Policy as a means of achieving geopolitical goals, and that the debate on the relationship between culture and foreign policy had come to an end. The complex and changing historical context of this period and the American tradition of cultural liberalism jointly constructed the ideas and strategies of American "cultural diplomacy".

CONCLUSION

With the help of neoliberal institutionalist theory, it can be found that the U.S. "cultural diplomacy" towards Latin America, which began in the 1930s, was the result of the reconstruction of its "world view", "principled beliefs" and "causal beliefs" in foreign relations. Broadly speaking, it is a history of the gradual replacement of cultural internationalism by cultural nationalism, and U.S. "cultural diplomacy" is the product of a short-lived compromise between the two. In terms of communication actors, the U.S. federal government has gradually overturned its traditional "principled belief" of not intervening in matters of international cultural communication, until it has fully integrated it into the overall strategy of national diplomacy. In terms of content and media, it has evolved from religious culture carried by Christian missionaries to cultural and educational exchange of ideas carried via "slow media" under the framework of the "Good Neighbor Policy". Eventually, it transformed into a popular culture in the form of a variety of "fast media". In this process, the flow of information has gradually become unidirectional. All these changes laid the foundation for the "propagandization" of American cultural diplomacy.

Through the above analysis, it is not difficult to see that the United States at this stage of history is leaping from a Western Hemisphere power to a global hegemony, and that the change of its national identity and the reconstruction of its own national interests are the fundamental causes for the changes in the field of international dissemination of its culture.

Acknowledgment

This paper is one of the outcomes of *Research on the Ideas and Policies of International Communication of Chinese Culture in the New Era from the Perspective of "Dialogue of Civilizations"*.

This research project was supported by "2021 Dalian University of Foreign Languages Research Fund Project", No. 2021XJYB27.

REFERENCES

- Arndt, R. T. (2005). *The first resort of kings: American cultural diplomacy in the twentieth century*. Washington, DC: Potomac Books.
- Arnold, M. (1938). *Culture and anarchy: An essay in political and social criticism*. London: Macmillan.
- Avalon Project. (1933). *First inaugural address of Franklin D. Roosevelt*. Retrieved April 23, 2024 from https://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/froos1.asp.
- Beard, C. A. (1934). *The open door at home: A trial philosophy of national interest*. New York: Macmillan.
- Butler, N. M. (1917). The international mind: How to develop it. *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science in the City of New York*, 7(2), 16-20.
- FDR Presidential Library & Museum. (1941). *Message to congress - 1941*. Retrieved April 28, 2024 from <https://www.fdrlibrary.org/documents/356632/390886/readingcopy.pdf/42234a77-8127-4015-95af-bcf831db311d>.
- Goldstein, J., & Keohane, R. O. (Ed.). (1993). *Idea and foreign policy: Beliefs, institutions, and political change*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Hart, J. (2013). *Empire of ideas: The origins of public diplomacy and the transformation of U.S. foreign policy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hass, P. M. (1992). Introduction: Epistemic communities and international policy coordination. *International Organization*, 46(1), 1-35.
- Iriye, A. (1997). *Cultural internationalism and world order*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Luce, H. R. (1999). The American Century. *Diplomatic History*, 23(2), 159-171.
- National Archives. (1823). *Monroe Doctrine*. Retrieved April 29, 2024 from <https://www.archives.gov/milestone-documents/monroe-doctrine#transcript>.
- National Archives. (1905). *Theodore Roosevelt's corollary to the Monroe Doctrine*. Retrieved April 23, 2024 from <https://www.archives.gov/milestone-documents/roosevelt-corollary>.
- Ninkovich, F. A. (1981). *The diplomacy of ideas: U.S. foreign policy and cultural relations, 1938-1950*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nye, J. S., Jr. (2004). *Soft power: The means to success in world politics*. New York: Public Affairs.
- Pew Research Center. (2015). *America's changing religious landscape*. Retrieved April 28, 2024 from <https://www.pewresearch.org/religion/2015/05/12/americas-changing-religious-landscape>.
- Rosenberg, E. S. (1982). *Spreading the American Dream: American economic and cultural expansion, 1890-1945*. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Sadlier, D. J. (2012). *Americans all: Good neighbor cultural diplomacy in World War II*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- United Nations Library & Archives Geneva. (1939). *Convention for the promotion of Inter-American cultural relations, signed at Buenos Aires on 23 December 1936, by the United States of America and other American Republics - Registration*. Retrieved April 17, 2024 from <https://archives.ungeneva.org/registration-175>.
- Wang, X. (2006). "American exceptionalism" and the roots of American cultural global expansion. *World Economics and Politics*, 7, 46-52.
- Wang, X. (2007). Latin America and the origins of U.S. cultural diplomacy. *Latin American Studies*, 3, 10-17.
- Zimmern, A. E. (1929). *The prospects of democracy and other essays*. London: Chatto & Windus.



‘좋은 이웃 정책’의 틀에서 본 미국 ‘문화외교’의 이념과 정책의 역사적 구성: 신자유주의적 제도주의를 중심으로

Yu Sun

Department of International Relations, Dalian University of Foreign Languages

20세기 미국 문화의 세계적 전파는 미국의 중요한 “소프트 파워” 원천이었습니다. 그러나 영국과 프랑스와 같은 유럽 국가들과 비교할 때, 미국 연방 정부는 상대적으로 늦게 문화 전파 사업에 개입했습니다. Goldstein과 Keohane이 제안한 신자유주의 제도주의 이론에서 발견할 수 있듯이, 미국의 “문화 외교”의 출현은 미국의 외교 관계에서의 “세계관”, “원칙적 신념” 및 “원인적 신념”의 변화의 결과입니다. “문화 외교”의 개념은 제도화의 과정에서 미국 외교 정책의 틀에 녹아들어 1930년대 미국의 “세계관”, “원칙적 신념” 및 “원인적 신념”의 재구성 결과인 “굿 네이버 정책”의 일환으로 형성되었습니다. “굿 네이버 정책” 하에 문화 관계 부문과 미주 상호 협력 사무소가 설립되었으며, 다양한 문화 교류 프로그램이 추진되었습니다. 2차 세계 대전이 도래하면서 미국 “문화 외교” 내의 문화 국제주의와 문화 국가주의 간의 긴장은 점점 두드러지게 되었습니다. 결국 펠 하버 공격 이후, 미국 연방 정부는 공식적으로 “문화 외교”를 국가 외교 전략의 틀에 포함시키며, “문화 외교”의 개념과 정책에 변화를 가져왔습니다.

주제어: “굿 네이버 정책”, 역사적 건설, 신자유주의 제도주의

논문접수일 May 7, 2024

논문수정일 May 15, 2024

게재확정일 May 27, 2024

Corresponding Author

Yu Sun

Department of International Relations,
Dalian University of Foreign Languages.
Center for Northeast Asia Research, Dalian
University of Foreign Languages,
No. 6 West Section of Lvshunnan Road,
Dalian, Liaoning, PRC Postal code: 116044
E-mail: 46158747@qq.com

저자

Yu Sun

Obtained his Ph.D. from the Department of Communication Studies at Communication University of China. He conducted research on international communication and global governance. Currently, he is an associate professor at the Department of International Relations, Dalian University of Foreign Languages. He is also a research fellow at the Center for Northeast Asia Research, Dalian University of Foreign Languages. His main research areas are cultural diplomacy and cultural governance. Email: sunyu@dlufl.edu.cn