

Syracuse University

SURFACE

Syracuse University Honors Program Capstone Projects Syracuse University Honors Program Capstone Projects

Spring 5-1-2010

Economic Implications of Anti-Americanism

Brenda Jennifer Bee

Follow this and additional works at: https://surface.syr.edu/honors_capstone



Part of the [Economics Commons](#), and the [Other International and Area Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Bee, Brenda Jennifer, "Economic Implications of Anti-Americanism" (2010). *Syracuse University Honors Program Capstone Projects*. 393.

https://surface.syr.edu/honors_capstone/393

This Honors Capstone Project is brought to you for free and open access by the Syracuse University Honors Program Capstone Projects at SURFACE. It has been accepted for inclusion in Syracuse University Honors Program Capstone Projects by an authorized administrator of SURFACE. For more information, please contact surface@syr.edu.

Economic Implications of Anti-Americanism

A Capstone Project Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements of the Renée Crown University Honors Program at
Syracuse University

Brenda Jennifer Bee

Candidate for B.A International Relations Degree,
B.A Economics Degree
and Renée Crown University Honors

May/2010

Honors Capstone Project in _____ International Relations _____

Capstone Project Advisor: _____
(Nick Wilkinson)

Honors Reader: _____
(Jerry Evensky)

Honors Director: _____
Samuel Gorovitz

Date: _____

Abstract

This capstone project is a multidisciplinary investigation into a problem that has surfaced with the rise of globalization. It explores the negative sentiments in Europe towards Americans, their recent history, and future implications. It was designed to be multidisciplinary because of the complexity of the issue at hand. It stretches from political to anthropological, both in the context of communications and economics and finally their synergistic affect in fostering certain feelings in different European nations about the American way of life. I show how certain negative feelings can change behavior and preferences for American goods and services and how it can affect the American economy.

I claim that negative American sentiments have been rising in Europe, sped up during the years of the Bush administration, and do have consequential effects in the marketplace. Such effects come from active and passive anti-Americanism. Active anti-American actions are those such as the boycotting of American goods and the vandalism of American stores. This is the stage where the effects of anti-Americanism can most clearly be seen and recorded. Passive anti-Americanism related more to the disfavor for American business and a fall in demand for American goods and services. This essay shows the implications of both types to the prosperity of the United States.

I found that politics and media have the largest effects on European attitudes towards Americans. Following the decade of the Marshall Plan, which started the feelings of resentment for Americans with perceived economic imperialism, a fear of cultural imperialism from the massive implosion of American entertainment in Europe developed. Soon the policies and controversies of the Bush administration exacerbated these perceptions and caused a spike in the growth of anti-Americanism.

Apart from using my personal experiences to develop theories, I found evidence to back up my claims through scholarly journals, research institutes, and class work. I used mostly the Internet to find quantitative data on attitudes and trends from the Pew Institute, GMI and Roper/ASW research institutions. I backed these up with newspaper and magazine articles I found in Europe while living there, and scholarly articles found online through the library resources.

Through my research I found that with the inauguration of President Obama, there was worldwide perception that he represented a change of the American people and a promise of better management and relations. The swell of anti-Americanism dropped almost overnight, and a celebration of a new era of cooperation started. From here it may be easy for America to recover its standing in the hearts of Europeans, however the government, businesses, and media must recognize and remain sensitive to the attitudes and perceptions of its neighbors so as not to foul the progress. I touch on number or foreign policies and internal management problems that must also be changed to facilitate the partnering of the two continents. I conclude with what the remaining problems are and suggestions for how to fix them.

Table of Contents

Preface

Capstone Project

Sources Cited and Consulted

Written Summary of Capstone Project

Preface

I am a first generation American. I was born to a Polish mother and Italian father. I had always had exposure to European cultures, but in the American context. Due to this I had always had an interest in America's relations with Europe, my scholastic interest in Anti-Americanism was initiated when I arrived in Paris, France in January of 2009 for a semester of study in the European political hub of Strasbourg, in Alsace. Within less than an hour of being in France, while paying for my first meal, a server yelled at me: "you Americans, you always use a credit card for even the smallest amount. In France we carry cash."

I left the restaurant with those words stuck in my head, "you Americans," what exactly did he mean? Why did he have to drastically separate his culture from ours with emphasis on the "you," and exactly how many more stigmas about the American people was I going to have screamed at me by angry French men the rest of the semester?

With these questions in mind I was more conscious of the many other negative sentiments I heard about the American people. As these accumulated in my head, I wondered if Americans knew about this, of course they knew the French disliked them but as I traveled through Europe, did they know these feelings were more widespread, and was it always this way? I traveled over France to Spain, then to a number of other countries in Central and Eastern Europe before settling in Poland for a summer. I met locals along the way and

had insightful conversations traveling on trains cross-country or at the counter in pubs about their feelings towards Americans, many echoing those of the French.

I returned to Syracuse for the fall of 2009 sadly confused with my home country. I attended a lecture by Keith Reinhard on the economic threats of Anti-Americanism. It was here that I realized not only were anti-American sentiments making it hard for me to travel in Europe without being scrutinized, but they also had the power to make life on my home continent more difficult as the economic wellbeing of the U.S. started to rely more on foreign relations with the start of globalization. From then on I decided to dedicate my studies to finding out the true implications of such a new phenomena of anti-cultural sentiments affecting global economics. I returned to Europe to study in London for the spring 2010 to gain more insider insight while I researched this topic and to find ways to reverse the trend. In this paper I will present to you my thesis, formulated from personal experience, scholarly articles, survey organizations and a host of other resources.

Captstone Project

The United States of America has a long-standing relationship with Europe. Coming from colonies that split from the content, and in its early years remaining mostly comprised of European immigrants, America and Europe have developed a sibling type relationship. Like most siblings it is a sort of love-hate relationship, but the continents rely heavily on one another. There has always been some resentment towards American success in Europe, notably after WWII and the Marshall plan, just as Americans have always had some green-eyed attitude towards European cultures. However, few years into the new millennia, a noticeable upsurge in negative attitudes towards America arose in Europe and around the globe. The movement became so present that it qualified itself as an 'ism;' anti-Americanism. The brewing negative attitudes manifested into public demonstrations of boycotts and violence, many times targeted against American brands visible in Europe. Corporations became alarmed and started to question the implications of such a movement. The concerns were of merit, as there was little evidence to show how the rise in negative feelings toward a culture would affect that culture's ability to do business in and around the world. This is one of the new problems posed by the extent of globalization and a new topic of concern for economics.

Of course, the most extreme case of anti-Americanism is the terrorist attacks of 9/11 and the continued plotting against the United States in rouge terrorist networks. As the purpose of this discussion is to investigate the changing

relationship and alienation of the United States and its closest ally, I will investigate anti-Americanism only in regards to the European continent and not account for the attitudes of Muslim or other nations.

As the only remaining superpower, the United States stands in the limelight of world attention. Even more importantly, the United States has become the country of greatest scrutiny and resentment in the last decade following large corporation scandals, the Bush administration's controversial policies, the war in Iraq, and most recently, the economic recession. The violence and threat to our security is of course the biggest cost, but boycotts and the dissolve of once powerful American brands poses a threat to our economic future as well. The costs of anti-American are particularly significant with the growing importance of the global market. The overwhelming increase in negative attitudes towards the United States in the international arena has caused businesses to fear that it will affect their ability to prosper in the global marketplace. The crumbling of the United States as a brand itself may mean the end of the United States reign as a lucrative superpower, and cost Americans some of their economic freedoms as other rising countries such as China, India and Brazil come to dominate the United States in international affairs.

Many organizations have focused their attention on the investigation of such trends, such as the Pew Institute and GMI. Organizations have even founded themselves on the prevention of such a grim possibility, such as the Business for Diplomatic Action. Thus, the United States provides a crucial case study into the implications of anti-cultural sediments in global affairs.

International business is essential to the U.S. economy. Many American companies, especially those in consumer products like Coke and McDonalds, have growth in foreign countries that far exceeds their growth in the United States. In this era of globalization, the United States has held a position as the leader of free markets. Europe is America's strongest ally, top trading partner and also, one of its biggest critics. Opposition to key elements of American foreign policy is widespread in Western Europe, and positive views of the U.S. have declined steeply among many of America's longtime European allies (Kohut). The initial break down of the American financial system that brought down foreign economies and the continued plunge into a global recession has lead to Europeans to blame the U.S. for the recession's negative economic effects on their country. Both pro-active, such as boycotting, and passive anti-Americanism, such as the disfavor of Brand America, have negative consequences.

Boycotting can be seen as a way for the global public to vote with their pockets, making globalization a sort of world democracy. Research like this has led some, like professor Douglas Massey at Princeton University's Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, to argue that continued unilateral action on the part of the U.S. will not only "isolate it politically, but economically as well, depressing worldwide demand for American products and services (Choudhury)." The stakes are undoubtedly high as annual trade between the United States and European Union totals about \$380 billion (Dearlove, and Crainer). Such threats to our economy can pull back the U.S. from being the

global powerhouse during this crucial time, especially with China quickly rising as the new superpower.

The effects of anti-Americanism promise more than decreased sales for top American brands in Europe. It can also cause weakening of the allure of Brand America in general. The National Brand Index did a survey asking people around the world to rate countries as if they were a public brand according to exports, governance, culture, people, tourism and immigration/investment. The “good old Brand USA manages to make it, barely into the list of the G7 peers overall, ranking as number seven (Lentini).” The fall of Brand America has several dire consequences, one possible outcome already being traced is the decrease in favorability of the U.S. in international trade, apart from boycotting others may just no longer desire American brands, decreasing demand, and American businesses will not have as strong leverage as when America was glorified. Also new barriers to entry in the global market may rise as the European Union responds to its lack of trust in the U.S. with strengthening its own international trade. Already competition for American businesses is becoming more difficult as low levels of trust and respect lead to hellish business meetings and growing trade restrictions. Declines in foreign business travelers and students to the United States in favor of European nations is also worrisome as a significant amount of the professional and academic talent in the U.S. has come from foreigners. Anti-Americanism could then lead to the U.S. innovation falling behind the growing European and Asian competitors, the driving force behind its competitive power. There is some optimism however, publics in the United States

and most of Europe found China's growing economic might worrisome in a 2008 survey by the Pew Institute and the Obama election has rejuvenated hope for Brand America (Kohut). The Obama election has freshly created admirable attention for the U.S. from Europe. This is an opportunity for the U.S. to reclaim positive diplomacy in the global market and extinguish the fuel of anti-Americanism.

This essay will explore the implications of anti-Americanism in Europe and explore the power of a “diverse set of phenomena, by which individually or collectively held beliefs motivate systematic negative or positive bias against the United States,” to adversely impact the American economy, and bring down a nation through external forces (Choudhury). It will start by exploring the European public attitudes towards America, how they follow the shifts in U.S. presidents’ favorability and if either affects consumer behavior, to address the initial concerns of this thesis, the American businesses’ concern over their decreasing sales in Europe. Critics of anti-Americanism say that it was the recession that led to declined sales, and that negative attitudes towards America do not effect purchasing decisions. I will show how decreasing sales became accepted as the effects of the oncoming recession and that this is how the paranoia of anti-Americanism died with a lack of empirical research, but that the threat from anti-Americanism was dismissed too easily.

The existence of such organizations such as the Business for Diplomatic Action, aimed at improving global attitudes towards Brand America through

better business practices, means there are another levels of threat from anti-Americanism that effect businesses from the other side of the scale by hampering their ability to rely on Brand America to grow globally. The fall of favor for Brand America has led to increased difficulty in trade business, brands and businessmen having to shed their American image, and altered a keystone of American success; attracting the best and the brightest. Through this exploration I will show, that the most worrisome economic effect of anti-Americanism isn't at the consumer level but the business level, a problem that is more cancerous. Information from survey companies, scholarly articles and business magazines and personal experience from living in Europe will by synthesized to try and gain a grasp on these affects of anti-Americanism on Brand America and its effect on the American economy.

My aim is to rejuvenate businesses' concern for their stakes in Europe but direct it from sales and marketing to improved business practices as a way to better their position in the global economy. The answer to their previously expressed worries does not lie in a fix for the recession, as anti-Americanism can manifest itself permanently as a ball and chain on the US economy if businesses do not take the opportunity to improve diplomacy given by the wide acceptance of Obama and the U.S. On a more general level I hope that highlighting the issue will spark interest by citizens and the government to propel changes to reverse anti-Americanism. I will end the paper with a few suggestions of how to finish combating the weakened anti-Americanism with suggestions. For businessmen the suggestions given are those promoted by the Business for Diplomatic Action.

Some suggestions for governments and industries will follow because part of the purging of talent from the U.S. is because of foreign policy and travel restrictions. Finally suggestions for citizens will be included as well, although there is little citizens can do to directly combat anti-Americanism there are ways they can influence changes.

The decreased popularity of American brands in Europe in the early parts of the millennia prompted concern over the effects of anti-Americanism. It was speculated that the growing anti-American sentiments were caused by disagreements with U.S. foreign policy but negative attitudes towards America started before this with resentment of its culture. American clothing, automotive, cigarette, fast food and beverage brands were once the symbol of the American dream, a country where anything is possible. However, the cost of the war on terrorism, business scandals and health issues on these products was their degradation to symbolize the problems with America. Many articles surfaced expressing the turn in favorability of the U.S. in Europe expressed by Russian magazine Pravda magazine in 2004: “European young people ignore and disapprove the American lifestyle, which used to flourish for decades, selling many American products worldwide (Pravda).”

In 2005 the Pew Institute released a study that showed in most western counties surveyed, majorities associate Americans with the positive characteristics “honest,” “inventive” and “hard working.” However, at the same time a substantial numbers also associate Americans with the negative traits

“greedy” and “violent” (Kohut). Surveys such as this shed light on the rise of negative attitudes towards the U.S. that already been traced earlier by anthropologists. Anthropologists suggested that this was because even as foreigners devoured American cultural products, they feared the crowding out of their own cultures. Resistance to American cultural imperialism was one of the first stages of contemporary anti-Americanism and still has its seeds in recent attitudes, as another study released in 2008 by the Pew Institute reveals: “French and Germans found the spread of American culture unwelcome by a margin of more than 4 to 1” (Kohut).

Founder of the Business for Diplomatic Action, Keith Reinhard, believes that much of the hostility towards America can be traced to a type of cultural imperialism that results from ‘US global business expansion’ (Fullerton 205-207). The negative feelings towards American influence is magnified by studies that show not only that there is resistance to the spread of American cultural practices but that also show perceptions that the American influence is bad for their country’s economic well being as well. Following the recent economic gloom, a 2008 Pew survey found overwhelming agreement that the United States exerted "a great deal" or a "fair amount" of influence on other national economies. In most countries the vast majorities (90% in Britain and Germany) subscribed to this view, and majorities or pluralities in 18 of the 23 countries said the influence was negative, sometimes by large majorities (72% in both Britain and Germany) (Kohut). “In no country did a majority say that U.S. economic influence was positive (Kohut).” Thus, anti-Americanism has evolved from the early seeds of

protection of their own culture to recent expressions for protection of their country from an economic standpoint as well, and with the globalization of markets fears about translating into consumer behavior grew.

It was feared that disapproval of US business practices that led to the current global recession would lead to higher incidences of boycotts of American products in Europe. The relations between Europe and the U.S. are of grave concern since the EU is the biggest ally and trading partner of the U.S. Even Europeans are conscience of this dependence, and this may fuel their purchasing behavior more than other countries. International marketing expert Allyson Steward-Allen claims that Europeans are more ready to boycott American brands compared to other consumers because “most Europeans see their economies as highly dependant on the U.S., so anything the U.S. does to threaten America’s prosperity and popularity feels proximate to Europeans (Choudhury).”

Roper/ASW supported this theory. In 2003 they reported declines in foreign consumers’ expressed affinity towards American culture and trust in American companies paralleled their behavior towards American brands. The report highlighted the finding that American brands received higher premium ratings from those who indicated that they feel closer to American culture. It stated that while 46% of global consumers who feel “very distant” to American culture reported that American brands are “better and worth paying more for,” the figure went up to 59% of respondents who indicated that they feel very “close” to American culture (Choudhury). In contrast, respondents feeling “close” or “distant” with respect to Japanese or European culture exhibited a much smaller

gap in their attitudes towards Japanese or European brands (Choudhury). So those who feel closer to American culture display more thought behind the purchasing decision with American brands. The closeness with America that Europeans feel causes news to affect their inherent attitudes about American more than other nations, reinforcing either the good or bad attitudes, and thus affects their consumer behavior more than news about other cultures who Europeans feel distant from. The report concluded that the data demonstrates that “American brands may be facing a less receptive global audience (Choudhury).” Roper/ASW suggested that the negative attitude results may reflect the effect of anti-American sentiment over war in Iraq, and general resistance against American influence.” The heightened sensitivity to American brands means that while “global economic conditions are creating challenges for all brands, American brands are uniquely vulnerable and that credibility is key, and if lost, it is very difficult to regain” (Choudhury).

Anti-Americanism grew exponentially during the Bush Administration, and mostly because of the Bush administration. Attitude surveys kept producing results that showed that anti-Americanism was most heavily influenced by politics. The terrorist attacks on the U.S. helped stunt the growth of anti-Americanism as nations felt sorry for the U.S., but the sympathy for Americans in Europe was promptly ended by the responses of the Bush administration to these attacks. The Pew Institute showed that America won a measure of global sympathy after the terrorist attacks of Sept. 11, 2001, but by spring 2002 favorability ratings for the U.S. had already dropped in many countries since the

start of the decade (Kohut). Other unfortunate disasters, such as hurricane Katrina, did not gain any significant support for the U.S either as they just revealed more problems with the administration abilities. The “degree of schadenfrude with which America’s belated and confused response to Hurricane Katrina has been received, especially in Europe, points to the exposed nerve: small government had not been able to cope competently with a big calamity; a superpower aboard has been shown to have clay feet at home (Maidment).” The failures of the Bush administration “did considerable harm to the image of the American dream, as many Europeans were shocked by Katrina’s exposure of an underclass in New Orleans (Maidment).” As Bono amusingly put it “there is a brick through the storefront of Brand America (Maidment).”

Then, when Bush was reelected, the European community saw this as a discard of their opinions and concerns. In 2005 roughly three-quarters of the publics in Germany and France said that Bush’s re-election made them feel less favorable toward the U.S. and particularly in Western Europe, most of those who express an unfavorable view of the U.S. mostly blamed Bush, rather than a more general problem with the U.S. (Kohut). But the feelings towards the president bleed into the opinion of the people and business he represented in the democracy, best expressed by a French man’s statement I had read in a news article in France: “how could 300 million people be so stupid?”

Negative feelings towards the U.S. were exacerbated by the global disapproval and hatred of Bush and his reelection. Currently, Europe is the largest investor in the U.S., which is in turn the largest foreign investor in France (Welch,

and Welch). Even France, America's largest investment, publicized and voted for outright anti-American politics as a presidential candidate Ségolène Royal, made anti-American sentiment a cornerstone of her campaign in 2007; and 47% of the populace apparently thought she picked the right villain (Welch, and Welch). France was not the only country that had no confidence in Bush; majorities in 19 of the 24 countries surveyed by the Pew Institute in 2008 had little or no confidence in the American president. In the four Western European countries surveyed, majorities without much confidence ranged from 81% in Britain to 88% in Spain (Kohut).

The added anti-Americanism prompted by the reelection of the Bush administration seemed to be the needle in the haystack as Europeans moved beyond passive anti-Americanism to active counter-Americanism. American brand sales in Europe started to significantly decline during his presidency. This being an effect of anti-Americanism was supported by the GMI poll conducted in 2004, which stated that of the 8,000 individuals surveyed from all G8 countries, nearly 20% of respondents indicated that they were less willing to buy American products until the U.S. altered its approach to foreign affairs in Iraq and around the world (Choudhury). A second GMI World Poll found that one in five European consumers will avoid purchasing products and services by many American-based companies as a direct result of U.S. unilateral foreign policies and this discontent over President Bush's reelection (GMI E). The two countries with the highest percentage of consumers who indicated an intention to boycott iconic American brands were found to be Greece (40%) and France (25%)

(Choudhury). The fall in demand for American products is important because it affects the well being of the country as a whole, the Census Bureau reported that the trade deficit in goods and services was a whopping \$63 billion in October of 2007- and that of course was factor in the economic meltdown (Ross).

The GMI World Poll probed exactly how closely linked the boycotts by global consumers of U.S. products was to consumer's perceptions of U.S. foreign policy. It found that 35% of all international consumers surveyed indicated that U.S. foreign policy is the single most important factor in formulating their image of America (ranging from 49% in Italy to only 18% in Russia) (Choudhury). In contrast, the ingenuity of American products could do little to save their countries tarnished image, only 3% of all international consumers indicated that American brands and products are most important in molding their impression of the United States (Choudhury). Furthermore, two-thirds of all respondents indicated a negative change in their views towards America as a result of the US-led war in Iraq, with France (78%) and Greece (75%) demonstrating the most negative effect (Choudhury). Commentators like Simon Anholt, a brand specialist and co-author of *Brand America: The Mother of All Brands*, have argued that the power of U.S. foreign policies in shaping international consumers' image of America presents a serious problem for American multinationals marketing their products overseas (Choudhury). Political news can tarnish an unrelated company's image and for Europeans who are more at heart with America, this disapproval of American politics translates into disapproval over everything American, and ultimately

alters their preference for American brands, with some changes being as extreme as boycotting.

The link between consumer perceptions and behavior was made clear, and rather than American products influencing attitudes towards America abroad, it was American politics that influenced foreigners attitudes towards America and American products. In 2004 the number of consumers who said that they like American brands had already fallen by nine percentage point to 29%, while the number who said that they use American brands was down by three points to 27%, suggesting that boycotts have started to have an impact on consumer decisions (Whitehead). American companies like McDonalds, Coca Cola and Philip Morris suffered considerable losses in Europe in the third quarter the same year (Pravda). One source reported that Coca-Cola, the “most valuable brand according to the BusinessWeek/Interbrand survey, said boycotts have affected its business in general, and that the boycotts had hurt local economies, local bottling companies, and local employees (Choudhury).” Furthermore, politics affects the general trust in large visible brands. Between 2003 and 2004, trust in American brands fell from 36% to 35% with several high profile brands suffering badly (Whitehead). Coca cola saw trust levels fall from 55% last time to 52% this time, Nike’s from 56% to 53%, McDonalds from 36% to 33% and Microsoft from 45% to 39% (Whitehead).

Douglas Holt, a professor of Marketing at the Said Business School of the University of Oxford and the author of *How Brands Become Icons: The Principles of Cultural Branding*, explains, “What American multinational

companies must consider is: what brands serve as the most useful proxy for people to use to protest American policies? These have been brands that are most readily associated with an expansionist U.S.: particularly McDonalds and Coke (Choudhury).” When the GMI World Poll asked the 3400 consumers who indicated that they boycott American brands which brands they boycott from a list of 35 American and non-American international brands, Marlboro Cigarettes (42%) and McDonalds (29%) were the brands most cited. Likewise, Marlboro Cigarettes (59%) and McDonalds (77%) were also among the top brands identified as being extremely American companies (Choudhury). The GMI World Poll measured the greatest resistance to Coca-Cola in the United Kingdom and France where 28% and 27% of respondents professing an intention to boycott American goods indicated that they would avoid purchasing Coca-Cola products as a demonstration of protest to US foreign policy (Choudhury). Thus the predicted anti-American spurs of boycotts became a real world problem for major, extremely American brands with high stakes in Europe such as Coca-Cola, McDonalds and Philip Morris.

Distain for American brands became even more disastrous than just consumer boycotts purchasing behavior. In 1999, a plastic Ronald McDonald was discovered dangling from a French Bridge with a ball and chain fastened to one ankle (Mallaby). In southwestern France, protesters staged a “die-in” at a supermarket, where they daubed their clothes with red paint to represent blood and laid down next to a Coca-Cola display (Choudhury). In 2003, Ten restaurants in Hamburg, Germany, banned Cokes, Marloboro cigarettes, and American

Express cards (Ross). In the same year Reuters reported, “Consumer fury seems to be on the rise. Demonstrators in Paris smashed windows of a McDonald’s restaurant last week, forcing police in riot gear to move in to protect staff and customers...the attackers sprayed obscenities and ‘boycott’ on the windows (Ross).”

The evidence of intention to boycott and spurs of violence towards big name American brands definitely demonstrated the growing hold of anti-Americanism ideology in Europe and paralleled decreasing sales. The big American brands may have suffered some losses from boycotts but now research attributed the decline in sales during this time more accurately to the oncoming of the current recession. Also, the true economic impact depends on each product at issue; the consumer’s identification of it as American, as previously described, and the existence of non-American alternatives. The one thing that the surveys and protests did prove is that deeply rooted anti-Americanism will ultimately be taken out publicly on big American brands, but this is also the price they pay for being the visible leaders in their foreign market, which fuels the resentment towards them. They are the leaders because usually, few non-American alternatives exist for them.

The largest export from the US is undoubtedly its entertainment media; American television shows are broadcast all over the world and dubbed into almost every language. The U.S. puts a considerable amount of resources into the production of such goods, which makes them incomparable to most other nation’s entertainment products. Also, Americans were perceived as inventive, stylish and

modern in previously mentioned opinion polls and these are traits that do merit admiration for other cultures especially when it comes to fashion and technology. Admiration for U.S. science and technology remains nearly universal, and despite resistance to the spread of U.S. ideas and customs in many parts of the world, the appetite for American movies, music and television shows remained strong in the 2007 poll (Kohut). The media, fashion and technological pull that the U.S. has keeps brands specializing in exporting such products safe from being immediately turned on as opposed to other consumer goods that are viewed just as American but not admired enough because of their negative effects such as unhealthy fast food, sugary beverages and nicotine that were more susceptible to boycotts.

The more positively viewed brands help admiration for the U.S. survive during fungal anti-Americanism. This is proven by the Pew studies that show even during the height of anti-Americanism; around the world, many admired American scientific and technological achievements, embraced American popular culture, and respected American ways of doing business (Remez). Countries that have more exposure to the U.S. are able to make more of a distinction between their attitudes towards politics, business and people. The interdependency discussed earlier that Europeans feel with America explains why Western Europeans are more sensitive to America and more drastically shift their attitudes according to new information. Negative feelings towards politics may fuel the distrust and boycotts of American brands, but the studies discussed thus far suggest the effect of negative feelings about politics effect feelings are isolated to the businesses that lost respect for their general products, where the negative

health effects became public. The drop in demand for these products may just be that they have naturally lost the benefits once associated and are being overtaken by competition. A company cannot advertise to create a great product without the product actually delivering its promises because consumers eventually realize the truth.

The previous studies may have also had procedural defects in the way that the questions were framed, perhaps by not isolating the opinions so that the negative attitude towards politics influenced their answers about possible behavior after being put in that context. In 2003, Robert Worcester, chairman of MORI, a British polling firm, cited the contrast between a poll in January, showing 64% of British people distrusted President Bush on matters of world security, and one two months earlier, showing 81% of British people liked Americans (Guyon 179-182). Even a more recent poll in 2007 shows that in Europe people dislike American foreign policy, particularly with regard to the war in Iraq, but that they separate those feelings from American products, people and business (Fullerton 205-207). There is no evidence that the existence of anti-Americanism means there cannot exist at the same time admiration for America, in fact studies from early on in the decade show that like and dislike could exist in the same demographic.

Many of the big American brands recorded making profits by the end of these years. The fluctuations in sales that the big American brands are concerned about is more something they need to get used to as globalization makes foreign consumption of their goods effect their company on a grander scale than home

sales and makes them more vulnerable to economic and political trends overseas. But even the recorded fluctuations cannot be attributed to only attitudes since the current recession was making way. The brands also need to get used sensationalist protests because as Roberts explains, these big brands can be both lovemarks and loathemarks brands in the same demographic just like the attitudes towards general Brand America. Thus, American brands can do well in a society when members are happy with their situations and worst when members need to blame someone for worsening conditions and point the finger. They do well in attitude surveys if members have an image of America that associates with the perceived positive aspect of American culture and do worse if they are associated with the negative aspects especially, if a statement wants to be made; after all statistics are all relative.

As a symbol Roberts identified the hallmarks of a lovemark brand, which include emotional attachment and intense loyalty, yet it is not known what the underlying factors might be for loathemarks as identified in the study but most likely it is anti-Americanism (Fullerton 205-207). Results of this study of student attitudes indicate that the same brand can occupy both lovemark and loathemark states among the same demographic group (Fullerton 205-207). Nike, Coke, and McDonald's are among those rare international brands to which Saatchi & Saatchi has assigned the status of Lovemarks (Fullerton 205-207). That is perhaps why the same GMI poll that showed these brands were the most vulnerable to boycotts also showed that few people would actually carry out this behavior. Also, those reporting intent to boycott may not favor the product overall and thus don't

consume the products regularly. Looking at the same statistics, while 77% respondents to the GMI World Poll identified Coca-Cola as an extremely American company, only 29% of those professing an intention to boycott American goods indicated that they would avoid purchasing Coke products.

The biggest reason may be that Coca-Cola—like Microsoft and Levis—were products that global respondents identified as American, but for which limited alternatives are available overseas and many people for any given reason love consuming them (Choudhury). Consumers just don't dislike America enough to not enjoy its products. During times of crisis, the loathemark aspect may gain more ground than the lovemark with those who are indifferent and being non essential items they are thus more sensitive to fluctuations in consumer attitudes however, the fluctuations cannot be accurately measured to see if changing attitudes pose any serious threat because of the underlying recession.

Before the initial declines in 2004 that provoked the concern for anti-Americanism, the brands were actually doing well. In 2003, Coke said European sales were up between 5% and 8% in the first half of the year, depending on the country (Guyon 179-182). McDonald's European sales rose 1% through August 2003, an increase the company called "huge," and individual franchisees in Paris say their same-store sales are up between 8% and 10% (Guyon 179-182). And still even today, signs of continued strength of American brands exists. Business Week's ranking of the top 100 most valuable brands worldwide showed that American brands still held 62 of the top spots in 2007 (Fullerton 205-207). With all the vague data and reported profit it can be assumed that the most valuable

brand names in the world, appear to be “largely unaffected” by the growing disillusionment with the United States and American culture, and a Businessweek survey shows this is especially true since American military entered Iraq (Choudhury).

Even more, a recent empirical study conducted by researchers at Princeton and Cornell showed no relationship between rising anti-Americanism and sales of the top U.S. brands. The researchers concluded in 2007 that “reports of consumer anti-Americanism damaging sales of U.S. based firms in Europe are highly exaggerated (Fullerton 205-207).” Even France, the most vocal of its anti-American sentiments makes up McDonalds second largest profits after the U.S. (Mallaby). McDonald's sales in France amounted to 3.6 billion euros (\$5 billion) in 2009, according to numbers released in late January. That was an 8.5 percent increase over the 2008 figure, which was 11.2 percent higher than the previous year. For 2009, McDonald's France marked the sixth consecutive year that sales increased at a more rapid rate than any of the chain's other European subsidiaries (Washington Post). McDonald's reported its strongest business results in three decades, and brisk sales in supposedly anti-American countries were a large part of the reason (Mallaby). However, it should be noted that the weakening of the dollar masks any true trends and makes it hard to draw any implications on consumerism from these polls and sales.

The loathemark, anti-Americanism argument has little empirical evidence to draw any conclusions, however positive associations have proven to aid sales. The ability for American brands to symbolize something means that an American

brand can become and are lovemarks; brands that serve as the consumer's statement about themselves. Ownership of brands from the West increases the owner's status in many developing countries (Alden, Steenkamp, and Batra 75-87). Consumers may purchase certain brands to reinforce their membership in a specific global segment, such as teenager, business, governmental/diplomatic, elite, and so forth, and/or their self-image as cosmopolitan, knowledgeable, and modern. In addition, globally positioned brands are likely to have special credibility and authority (Alden, Steenkamp, and Batra 75-87). The excitability of consumption of Western goods in Eastern Europe also parallels the Pew Institutes 2005 findings that attitudes toward the U.S in the former Soviet bloc nations of Poland and Russia are much more positive than in most of Western Europe and why the biggest resistance to American products is in Western Europe (Kohut). As a stranger I met in Hungary best put it when I asked him about how he felt about the openings of McDonalds in his country: "when the first McDonalds opened over here it was celebrated, it really announced the fall of communism and the new era where we could now can have what people in the Western nations have, it became a symbol of our advancement." Some Polish friends told me stories of how they remember when the first McDonalds opened in Poland, with coverage stories flooding the news about people lining up out the door and down the streets to get their taste of democracy.

The ability for an American product to symbolize a larger ideology important to the local culture it is in is also a great strength of American marketing and deeply penetrating global products. Global products can position

themselves as global consumer culture products (GCCP), foreign culture consumer products (FCCP) or local consumer culture products (LCCP). American brands who used the FCCP and position themselves as American put themselves at the greatest risk for anti-Americanism. However GCCP is what my Hungarian friend was talking about when he said that McDonalds symbolized an attainment of sorts for them. Thematic signs used to symbolize GCCP might include appeals to “freedom,” “individual rights,” or “democracy,” which Appadurai argues constitute the emerging global ideoscape (Alden, Steenkamp, and Batra 75-87). These signs do help global brands acceptance across cultures since these are things that seem to be progressively wanted by the world’s public. For places where they are not already fully installed such as in Eastern Europe, American brands symbolizing this in their community are their first steps towards defining their community as such. The quickness and ease at which American companies can do this at also makes them so prevalent and gives little room for alternatives to root.

While globally positioning a product helps American products dissolve their American-ness, locally positioning it also helps it camouflage in foreign communities. As the Economist’s earlier statement indicated, many of the companies, especially franchises such as McDonalds, are now rooted in their host society and affect locals as much as they do Americans. Also, McDonald's has marketed itself with an emphasis on what the French like to eat and how they like to eat it. "We still have some work to do on the quality. But more than 70 percent of our products come from France," said a communication department spokesman

at the McDonald's France headquarters in the Washington Post. Two other students also voiced positive feelings; "Here we can stay studying for hours, the food is cheap, and no one is going to tell you to leave," said Layan, a 17-year-old student from the Palestinian territories. Her friends from New York added: "It is so different from the United States. There, it's dirty. Here, you can have Wi-Fi and macaroons (Washington Post)." GE, McDonald's, and Boeing attribute their staying power to decisions made years ago to localize their global businesses. All employ hundreds of thousands of people overseas and attempt to bend their products and selling strategies to fit local tastes. In Belgium, Coke ran a promotion featuring Coke cans designed by Belgian fashion stylists. In Saudi Arabia, Abdul Mejid Abdullah, a top singer, is Coke's celebrity endorser. In France, McDonald's sells fresh fruit and Danone water in addition to fries and Coca-Cola. The seating and ambiance of its restaurants there have proved so conducive to sales that the French architect hired to transform their stores there is now designing new stores for the U.S. To better penetrate the European market, Boeing three years ago stopped flying salesmen in from Seattle and hired a group of powerful country presidents with political ties to local governments. Boeing CEO Phil Condit decided, "we had to become a truly global company and not a large American company that was successful globally," says Boeing spokesman Charles Miller (Guyon 179-182). These efforts helped the companies to really root themselves in the societies both economically and culturally and so they could not be so easily purged.

Although global culture positioning seems to be the best safeguard against negative sentiments, being aware of your host society and building bridges with them through tailoring your product seems to be the key to a deeper, harmonious relationship. Local culture positioning is usually more employed than either foreign or global. In the early years of 2000s 25.6% of advertisements in other countries used GCCP, but LCCP would be employed more frequently than either of the other two strategies (Alden, Steenkamp, and Batra 75-87). Local positioning also serves as a response to the original roots of the more contemporary anti-Americanism that arose from globalization, the resistance to American culture overcrowding.

Furthermore a trend, of regionality is coming back in “vogue,” perhaps also as a reaction to that initial fear of overcrowding through globalization (Ford 36-37). Using food as an example given its usefulness for cultural identity, I have noticed in my travels that countries that were quickly finding themselves importing more, developed trends for ‘locally produced’ products, such as British Sainsbury’s prideful stamp of “British” on their food products, and France’s stern rejection of food imports with any unfamiliar genetic enhancement, the French have always taken pride in their farmers and take large steps to protect them and their food. Where as in the U.S., farmers are not given a such a high social standing, many times considered red-necks, and thus genetically enhanced food is considered just as patriotic given the pride and trust in their technology, but organic and local is just as trendy as in the U.K. On the other hand Poland, whose largest export is food product, does not use any local positioning to sell their

foodstuff, mostly because they don't need to. The lower prices of locally produced foods there withstand any threat from imported food that would essentially cost more, and so where there is no threat from overcrowding, local positioning has no place.

The growing local positioning of American brands in European countries fit these need and adapt to these trends as they realized what was effective marketing. This means more local positioning in Western Europe where people are protective of their culture and more global positioning in Eastern Europe where global brand savvyness is more valuable. The continued morphing approaches of American products abroad show that it they are not just sitting ducks and are in fact strategic leaders that can comfort its audiences' hesitance of globalization by showing it will not mean Americanization, this helps relieve anti-Americanism. Before the signals of an oncoming depression where mistaken for strong influences of anti-Americanism on consumer behavior, these strategies were actually working for U.S. brands, and still do so. The falling of favor for a particular product overseas more likely means its time for product innovation, and is all in all just a natural process of the marketplace.

In returning to the discussion about the implications of politics, attitudes towards a country's politics have a vague effect on attitudes towards that whole culture. It seems that people associate politics more with business and are more willing to express dislike of foreign policies by boycotting that country's products, but only the ones they didn't really like anyway. This is an interesting contribution of globalization to globalizing democracy, as many people have

recognized that they can vote with their wallets. However distinctions between a country's politics, business and people are recognized and all the different variables at play in this subject that make for vague determinations on polling. Also, most people do not behave in the marketplace as they indicate in the polls simply because people do not think that hard when making low investment purchasing decisions. In 2002, Research International surveyed 1500 people in 41 countries aged 18-34 and found that most people separate their politics from their behavior as consumers, this held true even for political activists (Choudhury). Even though many of the early studies attributed the unexplained decline in American brand sales to the affect of anti-Americanism other studies in have denied that anti-Americanism is hurting U.S. brands, citing economic effects rather than political effects as a source of declining sales and the current economic situation solidified their objection (Fullerton 205-207). Ultimately, "people love to see you are paying attention to their culture, but at the end of the day, they love their Big Macs (Guyon 179-182)."

With all the different variables in determining the effect of anti-Americanism on consumer behavior, it is hard to develop any theory based on monetary analyses. "Skeptics point to a widely circulated study that compared the European sales of Coke, McDonald's, and Nike between 2000 and 2004. All three companies increased their European sales an average of 26%—even though anti-Americanism was at a fever pitch following the March 2003 invasion of Iraq. But it's important to note that the U.S. companies' sales were made in euros and reported in dollars, which fell by 31% in the period (Martin)." So for the moment,

the effect of anti-Americanism on U.S. companies' foreign sales is masked by a declining dollar. Nonetheless there is a relation between attitudes towards a society's politics, and attitudes towards its brands. At Harvard, international marketing authority John Quelch said, "Never before have global concerns about American foreign policy so threatened to change consumer behavior." He added, according to an article in the July 17th, 2003, British Independent, "We are not speaking here of the frivolous grandstanding associated with temporary boycotts by a student minority. We are witnessing the emergence of a consumer lifestyle with broad international appeal that is grounded in a rejection of American capitalism, American foreign policy and Brand America." The extent of popularity of such a lifestyle and its true effect remains unaccounted for but the acknowledgement of such a trend of rejection of America means it is now a force in the world, meaning that anti-Americanism is adopted by some. The influence this has on consumers is what remains vague, but Quelch is correct in bringing up rejection of American capitalism, foreign policy and Brand America as a main concern and I will next address how this should cause more worry for different aspects business other than consumerism.

The growing anti-Americanism may have led to spurs of boycotts of American goods that somewhat hurt sales, but through my research I have come to believe that corporations were focusing on the less costly implications of anti-Americanism when they worried about sales of American brands. Their concerns are not obsolete as they have helped shed light on the subject of anti-

Americanism, however the real threat does not lie with declines of favorability for American brands but with the decline of Brand America itself. The degradation of brand America means that there's a generation of Europeans that is not going to be influenced by the United States in the way that previous generations were. While it remains an economic power, American as lost some of its moral and intellectual leadership (Dearlove, and Crainer). The loss of such an influence most definitely will work against American businesses trying to strengthen global presence and the attraction of America for the world's brightest youth. These internal factors will more untraceably prevent global expansion central to the growth of corporations in an era of globalization and leave America altogether behind.

Author David Rohkopf noted in 2008 in the Washington Post that the widespread perception is that the U.S. contributes to global inequality, and he found the seeds of a "new anti-Americanism" in the current financial crisis (Wike, and Carriere-Kretschmer). The new form on anti-Americanism that Rohkopf is referring to positions America as a less reliable partner; degrading it from the economy that most other countries would want to have ties with to an economy others are hesitant about forming ties with. This lowered attraction of brand America weakens the pull that Brand America used to have for U.S. businesses, thereby crippling the ability for U.S. businesses to have the upper hand in implementing themselves in global business. This less radical form of anti-Americanism does not produce sensationalist boycotts but does cause more friction for America in global business. One can say it is a more direct negative

effect of negative attitudes than boycotts as it creates a barrier for the products to even have the ease of presence as once was welcomed. Its manifestation within the business practitioners causes frustration for American businessmen who find that they not only have to properly present their products at meetings but also they country, which they represent.

This level of anti-Americanism had its early roots with the Bush administration. Many businessmen have had the same experience as Joshua Jampol, who reported in 2005: “There is a tendency now to associate Americans, all Americans, with what the Bush administration is doing. When I meet new business contracts, I seem to spend the first hour just defusing the tension (Dearlove, and Crainer). But unlike the previous form of anti-Americanism that was more attributed to negative views of political and cultural practices and had more effect on the consumer thus more easily defused by using LCCP or GCCP, this one is more diplomatic and financial. The political anti-Americanism is also easily changed with administration changes, as we will see when I discuss the impact of Obama election. The anti-American financial sediments started to arise in 2005 with Bush policies and Enron: The American cooperate approach, based on turning iconic U.S. brands into global brands, is under attack; and the recent scandals have sapped the credibility of U.S. management principles, the same ones that dominated the first phase of and is gaining ground with the recession globalization (Dearlove, and Crainer). Research by conducted in 17 countries by DDB found that “America and American business are regarded in many parts of the world as arrogant and insensitive towards local cultures; as exploitative

because they take more from countries than it invest into them; and as corrupting because of their promotion of a culture of hyper-consumerism and materialism (De Waal).” And this is not something that a change in administration can easily fix, businesses will need to take on this anti-Americanism themselves and improve their approach to the global market.

Being the world's leader led to strong perceptions of American influence in the world. People's attitudes are thus stronger towards the U.S. since as the old adage goes, when “the U.S. sneezes the rest of the world catches a cold.” People want to be protected from mistakes in a foreign land causing troubles for themselves, especially if it is perceived that they have nothing to really gain for American success but something to lose from our failures. As a world leader the US inherits the responsibility of other nations. Therefore, faults on the part of the U.S. are seen as irresponsible: “as the world's No. 1 economic as well as military power, the United States is taking a hefty share of the blame for the financial crisis that engulfed most of the world in 2008 (Kohut).” America's vulnerable position is even more threatened as the recession deepens, and its top trading partners look for someone to blame for their deteriorating health. Among the 21 countries surveyed in 2008 and 2009, the median percentage rating their economy as bad is 74% in 2009, compared with 62% in 2008. Evaluations of economic conditions soured the most over the past year in Europe – specifically in Britain, Germany, Spain, Poland and Russia (Kohut). It should be expected that U.S. failures will be to blame for this since even in spring 2008, long before the current economic crisis evolved from a U.S. to a global one, nine-in-ten- in Britain and

Germany, and roughly eight-in-ten in France said the U.S. economy had a great deal or fair amount of influence on their country's economy (Carriere-Kretschmer). Seven-in-ten or more also viewed that impact as negative (Carriere-Kretschmer).

To add to this, U.S. business practices came to be seen as irresponsible in light of global climate change. In the eyes of the world, America and China rank Nos. 1 and 2 in contributing to the world's environmental problems, with 16 of the 24 countries surveyed in 2008 naming the United States and seven naming China (Kohut). American business practices are now facing intense scrutiny that prevents them from popularity in this phase of globalization. A 2008 survey finds that 41% of the global public says the United States plays a less important and powerful role as a world leader today than it did 10 years ago – the highest percentage ever in a Pew Research survey (Pew Research Survey).” With China growing so fast, its influence may then supersede the U.S. as attitudes about both countries become more similar but with perceptions that the U.S. needs help and China powering forward.

These changes that are leveling the playing field for countries competing with the U.S. are even more worrisome as a set of other perceptions opens up opportunities for the victor. More countries are warming up to the idea of free markets and international trade, especially among the previous Soviet Bloc states. The new generation that is taking power in these countries will help implement more trade as they become responsible for their country's future. These growing economies are great potential investments, and should be guarded by the U.S.,

especially since anti-Americanism is much lower there. However the resistance towards growing Russia and the weakening of the U.S. may cause them to make these new ties with China, as they had a half century ago and Brand America may just not carry enough weight as it did back then this time to take over when it wishes.

Growing favorability towards free markets seems to be a growing trend. As in the past, majorities in most nations continue to endorse a free market economy and most people polled continue to endorse growing international trade ties. However, still more people say their governments should take steps to protect their countries economically, even if other friendly nations object. And as in previous surveys in this series, large percentages of people believe that their country needs to be protected against foreign influence and most favor greater restrictions and control on immigration (d. Kohut). Among the countries that are favoring more protection of their economies, are the western European states. Their skepticism of other countries may not lead them to connect with china precisely, but it may push them to strengthen the EU more and become more self-reliant, especially since the western European states lead and push for the EU the most.

The EU has been trying to protect itself from foreign influence to strengthen itself since the start of globalization. Even before the decade of growing anti-American sentiment in Europe, Europe was trying to butt out American influence to strengthen itself, and it had considerable consequences. The European Union's decision in 1993 to enact a restrictive quota system, which

limited the access of Chiquita (and other non-European companies) to what was then its largest and most profitable market--the 15 member states of the EU. Overnight, the company says, its share of the European banana trade was cut in half. For the following eight years, Chiquita has engaged in an expensive and well-publicized trade dispute with the EU to force it to reverse its position, a battle Chiquita says has cost the company hundreds of millions of dollars and left it without the resources to service its debt (Stein). Chiquita was then forced to claim bankruptcy and a great American brand died quickly at the hands of the EU. The criticism of Chiquita's labor in South America certainly did not help it gain sympathy, and when the EU realized they could strengthen their former colonies by trading with them instead the loss of respect made it much easier for the EU to turn its back on the company. This could be the case for any American business now that losses respect in Europe.

The erosion of respect for America strengthens the negotiating postures of foreign governments on issues of international trade in general. The basis for this concern is the European Commission's (EC) all-out assault on American business. In several prominent cases the EC has shown a complete disregard for intellectual property, antitrust laws, and court decisions in the U.S. (Schatz , and Elliott). A January 17 *Wall Street Journal* article noted that the EU, since September, has "dialed up a case against Qualcomm, continued processing claims against Intel, charged MasterCard with setting illegal fees, searched for reasons to block Google's purchase of DoubleClick, and forced Apple to cut prices for digital songs (though the iPod maker was cleared of any wrongdoing) (Schatz ,

and Elliott).” The most widely publicized case involves Microsoft. The company was forced to hand over valuable intellectual property, unbundle its software, and pay a \$612 million fine, the largest ever handed out by the EU at the time (Schatz, and Elliott). A negative sentiment towards the countries no doubt debilitates their ability to arrive at consensus on trade issues.

The EU is trying to strengthen its member countries and their laws before it gives consideration to American business. Protection from the US, China and other foreigners may lead to the EU trying to close its borders more all together, slowing globalization. “Nearly everywhere people are worried about the global economy, but whether the current downturn will result in greater doubts about these key features of globalization – or in greater anti-Americanism- remains to be seen (Wike, and Carriere-Kretschmer).” The issue of trade has never rated very high on Pew Research's annual list of the public's policy priorities. But in 2009, 44% of the American public said that free trade agreements like NAFTA and the policies of the World Trade Organization are good for the country, up from 35% a year ago. Slightly more than a third (35%) say that such agreements and policies are bad for the country, down from 48% in April 2008. (e. Kohut).

Anti-Americanism may also undermine another pivotal factor of American success, the ability to attract the world's highest talent. The U.S. has a reputation for having the resources to highly educate youth and finance scientific investigation and technological innovation. However, over the last decade, other countries have made the leap to compete with the U.S. in these areas. NASA, a source of pride for Americans who cared so deeply about American leading the

arms race in the 1960s, is now having its funding cut. Countries such as Russia and China may take over our lead in the international arena in space exploration, which may be considered our ability to expand globally as well. Also, our education system has been heavily criticized since the No Child Left Behind Act, the most under funded act in US history. Healthcare also causes concern in this area. European nations' nationalized healthcare systems are more attractive to talented prospective citizens and students coming from developing countries. The costs of our higher education compared to those of European nations are also unaffordable for struggling foreigners. Above all, the visa restrictions make applying very costly, so foreigners see this as having to pay more to move to a place where you pay more. Although American consumer goods market may be more affordable than those of other countries, and if you want to consume America is the place to be, its other markets (the ones that supply basic needs like health and education) are completely out of whack. All these factors that make the U.S. less desirable to move to when compared with European nations means less of the world's talent will come to the US to do business, practice or learn. Also, the attempt of American businesses to appeal to their European clients more has resulted in more Europeans leading American businesses in Europe and American businesses sending out less expats to Europe. The idea that American's really cannot deal with anything that is beyond American is thus found in American business itself. Steering away the best and the brightest and shifting more control to Europeans like this would seriously hamper America's power, even within their own businesses.

The US education system has come to be criticized as lacking. US citizens are regarded as naive about the world, as well as their own country. On top of that an American education is extremely expensive to obtain compared to countries in Europe where college is subsidized by the government, such as Poland. Also, tighter visa restrictions make it hard for students or professionals to enter the US. The expensive procedure deters many intelligent and talented people who can find it easier to practice and learn in Europe, especially since the implementation of the EU has made crossing borders easier for Europeans. Thus, many people within Europe who would once travel to America to widen their opportunities could now much easier, move to the United Kingdom or France. “Of the 1.4 million graduate students studying in the United States, 17 percent are international, but, more significant, in engineering non-US citizens make up over 50 percent of graduate enrollment, and in the physical sciences over 40 percent. As research assistants, these international students are key players in producing the research and innovation on which a prosperous U.S. economy and domestic job creation depend (Stewart).” In 2003, *The Economist* reported that American business schools noted a decrease in the applications of foreign students to their programs (Choudhury). The “proportion of the US college-aged population earning degrees in science and engineering in 2004 was lower than 16 countries in Asia and Europe (Stewart).” On the professional side the World Travel Market 2006 report, conducted by Euromonitor International, found that “total business arrivals to the United States fell by 10 percent to 7 million over the 2004-2005 period, while the number of the business visitors to Europe grew by 8 percent to

84 million over the same period (Press MSNBC).” Keeping talent out of the U.S. and the degradation of the worlds leading research outlets, school system and business practices will mean that stronger leaders will arise to lead in their fields in other countries.

A trend that has accelerated since George W. Bush moved into the White House, is a decline in the number of U.S companies sending American expats to Europe (Dearlove, and Crainer). Prospective businessmen would come to the U.S. to learn from the some of the best schools in the world. But for the reasons mentioned above, and the rise of arguably better schools in Europe means that businessmen can train in their home country. This on top of American companies trying to infiltrate the European hearts more by adapting more of a global luster means that Europeans are becoming more qualified to work for American companies in Europe. Although this is great for globalization, and a benefit to the companies doing so, it is eroding the Brand of America and the power of the American Brand businessman. Even before the recession a lot of businesspeople in the United States saw the fallibility of the American approach to globalization and were de-Americanizing their global efforts (Dearlove, and Crainer).

The weakening power of the American brand businessmen leads us to my next point and to a closing about my discussion of the death of the affinity for Brand America’s the vicious cycle of anti-Americanism. Take for example South African billboards that touted the Smart car for its "German engineering," "Swiss innovation" and "American nothing (Martin)." Brand America is becoming a joke. The dying affinity towards Brand America is once again of concern to big

American brands, but this time from the other side, causing them to become anti-American themselves. Their fear of being associated with a humiliating failing country has led them to turn their backs on it themselves. As anti-Americanism grows, some global marketers have redesigned their logos and brand names to shed their 'all American' image (Fullerton 205-207). As a final attempt to save themselves, American companies will disassociate with Brand America, as associations start to cause them more trouble than benefit. The ideology that the individual is more important than the community that American democracy grows on, may lead to its souring.

The U.S. does have a positive image that makes American products somewhat desirable to foreigners. New York trends provide the U.S. with an image that foreigners remain zealous about. In fact, non-American companies have tried adopting this associate with the U.S. to actually improve sales. Maybelline was an American company acquired by France's O'Loreal. In 2005, Maybelline began an international rollout, with "New York" added to the brand name world wide because, as Owen-Jones says, "there are lots of people in the world who think that American street smart is just as much fun as French chic (Tomlinson)." Maybelline's results prove the point. Last year 56% of the brand's \$1 billion in sales came from outside the U.S. Maybelline was the leading medium-priced makeup brand in Western Europe, with a 20% market share. (Tomlinson). New York and L.A. still provide the U.S. with a positive melting pot image where anyone is accepted and progression arises, a cosmopolitan image that is comparable to the likes of Paris or London. Making large U.S. cities and

attractive to foreigners, and representing the U.S. culture in a positive modern light.

Maybelline is a modern contemporary brand for all women and all races," says Ketan Patel, the brand's worldwide general manager (Tomlinson). Global image like this is a powerful means of increasing sales...building a global image gives a brand more power and value (Alden, Steenkamp, and Batra 75-87). In the same way, building a global image for any American brand is just as important. They must reach out to the communities they are entering and also represent the global culture as a whole. It is American brands' ability to rely on the affinity for brand America that may hamper their ability to grow. The disassociation with their home country from the beginning and throughout is a server test for marketing teams and can mean failure for brands that have no image to build a trustworthy global image from. Recent international advertising studies have shown that connecting products to America, once a brand asset, may now be a negative strategy (Fullerton 205-207). If brand America declines further, consumer brands that portray themselves as slices of Americana may need to distance themselves from the values association that made them in the first place. With the dominance of U.S brands, no other country's stakes are higher; eight of the world's top brands are American, worth \$327 billion in brand value alone (Maidment). Having to avoid their American roots in marketing will cause a lot of companies stress as growing distrust of Brand America causes American brands to reconsider their positioning.

Roper/ASW asked global consumers about their feelings of “trust” toward a list of multinational companies that included well-known American companies. While some American companies ranked high on the aggregate “trust” list (Levi’s, Coca-Cola, and Ford), more dominated the bottom of the list (AOL, American Express, MTV) (Choudhury). The issue of trust is what is most important for a company-client relation, and although some brands may be able to fly with the trust in metropolitan New York American image such as Maybelline and Levis, for other brands with an American image the failing trust in brand America may lead to lowered loyalty.

There is no doubt that companies can expand globally, purchase motivation is the same the world over. With this, marketing will continue to change as globalization is having companies test out which marketing tactics work best on a global scale, design for the future will have to respond to the demands of human needs, but consumers yearn for credibility and respect brands that are open, honest and down-to-earth (Ford 36-37). Building a global image does give a brand more power and marketing can adjust to localities, but universally there needs to remain some trust in the brand. For companies to not be able to build a global image from the roots of brand America because of issues of distrust seriously hampers their ability to project themselves in this period of globalization. Even the famous American approach was to turn iconic American brands into global brands, starting companies who cannot use the stepping stone of becoming iconic will not have the leverage to become a global brand.

We can see from this discussion that "there's no brand in the world in greater trouble at the moment than Brand America; we are now seen by the world as a negative influence, lumped with Iran and North Korea (PR Newswire). Visibility of anti-Americanism is striking at the U.S. peoples' pride, as they can longer be "proud to be an American." As Americans are realizing that they are losing their position in the world, concern is growing. American's are polling that they in addition to businessmen are concerned with the growth of anti-Americanism. A majority of Americans now sees the loss of international respect for the United States as a major problem, the percentage of Americans saying this has risen from 43% in 2005 to 48% in 2006 and 56% currently (Kohut). But in all this pessimism, there is hope.

The election of President Barak Obama has shattered any sentiments of the U.S. as a bygone leader in the international arena. National brands are not like corporate brands in the important aspect of competition, competition between the U.S. and China cannot be managed in the same tight way as competition between Coke and Pepsi, but all commercial brands do embody and project a set of values and purposes in the same way a nation does (Maidment). This is especially true for the U.S., a country that was founded on a set of ideals; Obama has done much to reconnect Brand America with its ideals.

The election of President Obama has changed the foreign perception of the US from incompetent to progressive. There are many aspects of Obama that represent a change in U.S. and world leadership. The fact that Obama is of African American ethnicity demonstrated the open-mindedness of the American

culture, where he proved that the American dream was still alive and thriving. To many, the election showcased what they liked about the United States, the vitality of its democracy and the notion of America as a land of opportunity. And just as importantly, Obama represents a significant change from an administration widely disliked around the globe (Remez). His soft “listening and addressing” approach was immediately different from Bush’s hard military approach to diplomacy. His campaign ran on the promise of change, and he represented that change not only with his ethnicity and democratic political party but also with the immediate aggressiveness to change policies once in office. This was a signal to the world that the American people finally saw the flaws and troubles brought about by their previously elected administration and did not want to continue in that direction. It was a signal to the world that the American people were changing in general and capable of making intelligent choices that required freedom from political bias and the norm. It demonstrated the independence of the U.S. and how contemporary American culture was. But most of all it signaled America’s growing awareness of the state of things.

This was a good thing because the image of the U.S. as untraditional compared to European standards of politics was becoming a major criticism of anti-Americanism. Our free love consumer culture and undiplomatic leaders made it possible to easily frame American culture as adolescent and arrogant. With a president who almost was forced into resignation because of a poor dry cleaning service on a dress, followed by a president who has difficulty with English grammar and threw up on foreign leaders, the U.S. seemed shamelessly

incompetent. However, Obama was a step further away from the traditional norms of European politics, as a woman of color politician I heard speak in France said “you would never see the European people elect a black president...this had to happen in the U.S. before it could be possible in Europe.” Even though one would then think that Europe would further reject American ideals with the election of a minority figure, the European people came to embrace it; I think more than the American people have. It was something bigger in Europe than it was in the U.S. solely on the fact that Americans genuinely didn’t see him as possible leader from a minority ethnicity but as a leader from a minority party. The shock of having a black man win was more received in Europe, where their expectations for racism were higher. Thus, it has salvaged some well-deserved respect for true American values, especially the values of equality and independence. It showed that American values and materialistic culture does not come at the price of a sense of awareness of the real world.

European people embraced the election of a president in the U.S. that they would probably resist in their own nations and even more ironically such a move bettered the perception of the U.S. Although he promised a change in policies, these were just promises, and even now it is too early to tell if his administration is truly making a positive change. I also doubt that the European public paid close attention to the specific policies to know exactly what those changes would be. Nonetheless they welcomed the change, while living in France a few months before the inauguration, I experienced very poor treatment for being American, being ignored at restaurants and ridiculed in the streets when my accent was

heard. Once Obama was president and about to arrive to Strasbourg for NATO, the tone completely changed. Most stores offered “Obama” discounts, from restaurants to hair salons. I received warm welcomes in places I would have previously been rejected from and the French became friendly and inquisitive when hearing my accent. The strange thing about this was, NATO was a multinational conference, yet Obama stole the show.

I believe that the adoration for president Obama comes from first, the overall prospect of change in policies he promised, and secondly but as importantly, from the change of image for a U.S. leader. Obama’s mannerisms are noticeably more diplomatic than the previous presidents. He retains an air of dignity and sturdiness that was lacking in American politics before and marketing products feeds off it. All Obama memorabilia use pictures of him with a stern, pondering look with an American flag in the background as compared to Bush’s clueless face adorning toilet paper rolls. The propaganda on behalf of Obama has created a new form of nationalism; it is globally fashionable to sport your Hope t-shirt with Obama’s picture in front of the American flag. “Everyone has now fallen freshly in love with the new America, the other America, the good America, Obamerica, even (Remez).” Europe adores Obama’s the way the American people adored the Kennedy’s in the 1960s. Coverage of his wife can easily be compared to Jackie O, as housewives and gossip magazines religiously follow her fashion picks she was the number 2 newsmaker overseas of the last week of February in 2009, with her husband being the first (Jurkowitz). The odd fashionable politics is a way that the American consumer and entertainment

culture has influenced Europe to show support for their politics. For those who support his policies, his celebrated image gives them pride in their position and reinforces their support for him. For those who do not follow politics, there is now a social bandwagon to jump on. Europeans and Americans can share a new bond in showing pride for Obamerica. All this makes it easy to love Obama, although it does not mean that it is not rooted in his plan for policy change; in fact you could say that Obama hype is inspired by widespread support of his policies. As the same French woman said during her speech “Obama has made politics fashionable,” one could even say he’s made the U.S. fashionable.

There are no better signs of President Obama’s potential to revitalize ‘Brand America’ abroad than his extraordinary reception in Berlin and the avalanche of congratulatory notes from world leaders, who heretofore, limited their public association with the United States, its leadership and policies (Advertising Age). The way Obama carries the title of U.S. president makes one want to brush the dirt off his shoulder. The prestige he gives U.S. leadership is attractive to foreign politicians, who actually want to associate themselves with the American presidency now. During my volunteer work in the NATO 2009 summit in Strasbourg, France I got the opportunity to talk to a lot of politically involved people about why exactly they love Obama so much. I was given very reasonable answers all surrounding the idea that he listens. Obama had an incredibly busy schedule during his visit because every world leader wanted to talk to him because they felt like their concerns would actually be heard. I was told that Obama always listened to what people told him and asked more

questions, letting them know that he was truly interested, and giving them hope that even if there is nothing he can do to appease their interests, at least they were not ignored. From this you can infer that European leaders truly regard him as an opportunity for change as well, as a vehicle for new positive relations.

Listening like this seems to be a key to the situation all together, the heart of the problem for America was its unilateralism during the Bush years. Bush's godsent cowboy attitude disregarded foreign opinions. He took pride in the lone ranger approach, with a country whose actions have the largest affect in foreign nations; to international affairs this seemed retarded. Prof. Wilkinson at the London center for Syracuse University helped explain to me that Bush's dismissal of foreign opinions and pride behind his catholic background made his actions even more detestable, with Europeans perceiving his attitude as the will of God instead of the people. During Obama's campaign for the White House European leaders made it clear that they supported Obama. Obama himself drew the most favorable response of the major contenders for the U.S. presidency at the time of the survey (Obama and Sens. Hillary Clinton and John McCain), with confidence in his leadership especially strong among U.S. allies in Western Europe and the Asia/Pacific region (Kohut). Thus, Europeans wanted him but couldn't elect him. When the American people did, whether or not the American people cared what the Europeans thought, it meant something to Europeans, a feeling that they were heard, a vote for them. Confidence in the U.S. to be a good world leader is now emerging. The celebration of Obama shows restored admiration for the U.S. He represents a positive American image, which can combat anti-Americanism.

Views of the U.S. are being driven much more by personal confidence in Obama than by opinions about his specific policies. That is, a 2009 poll showed that global public opinions personally are more associated with views of the U.S. than are judgments of his policies (Kohut). Americans can now be seen as responsible. Most important for America's newly elected president, a 2008 survey found signs in many countries that people are optimistic about the future course of America's approach to the larger world (Kohut).

All this positive feedback for Americans after Obama's election can bring together the EU and the U.S. as strong allies. The positive reception of Obama will "fuse well with the boldly pro-American president, Nicolas Sarkozy, in France, and the leaders of Britain and Germany who are also U.S. supporters (Welch, and Welch)." General publics are also changing their views to more pro-American. Improvements in the U.S. image have been most pronounced in Western Europe, where favorable ratings for both the nation and the American people have soared (Kohut). In a 2009 poll in France and Germany, no fewer than nine-on-ten express confidence in the new American president (Kohut). In Germany favorable opinion of the U.S. jumped from 31% in 2008 to 64% in 2009 (Kohut). Large boosts in U.S. favorability ratings since 2008 are also recorded in Britain, Spain and France (Kohut). The results of the 2009 NBI suggest that the new U.S. administration has been well received abroad and the American electorate's decision to vote in President Obama has given the United States the status of the world's most admired country, as the U.S. moved up from its previous position at number 7 to number 1 (United Business Media).

This is good news in light of the current deepening recession and the reported anti-American sentiments of blame for it. As discussed earlier, rising anti-Americanism may threaten the ability of the US to do business with the EU, especially when the EU is trying to strength itself and has access to more trading partners with the globalizing world. Obama's approach to fix the economy by spending more is once again out of tune with the traditional world politics and economics. But Obama has been able to still gather support for this approach in Europe among those who remain skeptical about the Euro. In Europe, only the French and Germans express strong confidence in the European Union. In 2009 in Britain and Spain, where many favor the U.S. approach, confidence in the EU is lower (Kohut). Euro skeptics have been even more inclined to criticize the EU now since the failing economy of Greece and the soon to go Spain and Ireland economies will weaken the euro. Obama is proving himself to be a strong leader to fix the economy by cracking down on banks and proposing new tactics. His performance is following the expectations of productive change and appeasing many of his supporters in Europe. The world may come to trust in him and trust in America.

A country's leader definitely represents the ideals of their country, especially in a democracy. Where anti-Americanism is largely rooted, such as in Western Europe, the American presidential policies seem to be the largest variable in anti-Americanism. Even though little can be proven about the link between attitudes and consumer spending with all the variables in the research, it is true that attitudes towards the president mirror attitudes towards the public even

if people insist that they draw a distinction between culture people and politics. This can be seen with how improvements in U.S. ratings are less evident in countries where the country's image has not declined consistently during the Bush years, including Poland, while in countries where opinions of the US have improved, many say that Obama's election led them to have a more favorable view of the U.S. This admission is most apparent in Western Europe (Kohut). The "Bush administration seemed to stand for the former America, while Obama represented the more benign image of the classic melting pot story (Remez)." Obama thus provides the U.S. with the opportunity to shed its negative image while still retaining the most important aspects of our culture, which he foremost represents.

Regardless of the success of his specific policies, the Obama movement has already opened up a window for Americans to follow through with improving relations. With the resurrection of fashionable brand American through oddly enough a direct political influence Americans need to take advantage. The fact that European leaders have shown that they want to improve relations and the growing confidence in the U.S., in some EU member states even more than the EU itself, shows that America does have a chance to reconcile with Europeans. Even Americans are now more hopeful of their standing in the world since Obama has taken office. When Ad Age readers were asked in 2008 if they felt "Brand America" would bounce back with the Obama administration: 78% of respondents said it would. (Advertising Age). Although for anti-Americanism to take a backseat to pro-Americanism things actually do need to change.

Ultimately, “the danger, as with any re-branding or re-labeling, is that the product or behavior behind the label does not change (Layaline Review).”

For businesses that initiated the concern to investigate the implications of anti-Americanism, the threats should not be neglected in the hopes the President will fix everything. There are negative stigmas about Americans that Europeans come to expect regardless of how the political climate has changed. For the Obama movement to truly have a lasting effect Americans need to use the same strategy he used to combat anti-Americanism, to listen and care. There is now an open window for change and businesses should not wait around for the hard evidence of the implications of anti-Americanism. It is clear that the declining respect for the U.S. is one of the top concerns for even citizens now.

The Business for Diplomatic Action recognizes the threat of the falling standing of America in the world. Resentment of our status as the sole remaining superpower is understandable, just as is the possibility of a degree of envy of our wealth and success. These are things we can do little about. The BDA points out the four basic root causes of anti-Americanism that I have discussed in this essay. The widespread disagreement with current U.S. foreign policy was the largest variable in anti-American sentiments; however things seem to be changing with the Obama Administration. Another problem arises out of the effects of globalization, which has led to a perception that U.S. led global expansion has been exploitive and has left many people behind. A more general problem is that even though much of our entertainment product is liked and enjoyed around the

world, there is a discernible global cooling toward American pop culture. The last paradoxical problem is that although Americans are still admired for their youthful enthusiasm, their openness, their creativity, and their “can-do” spirit, their collective personality as a people is broadly seen as arrogant, insensitive, ignorant about the world, and loud (BDA).

There is little American citizens can do to change the foreign policies; this is something they will have to rely on their President for. However, the Business for Diplomatic Action has launched a campaign to restore worldwide admiration for the United States that focuses on addressing the last three negative influences. By following their strategy to public diplomacy, American businessmen and citizens can help improve Americas standing in the world. This would help to irradiate the threats to U.S. security, economy, and ability to travel freely and do business in a global society. I will briefly explore the initiatives the BDA is taking and their suggested strategies for business and citizens to combat any pessimism about a cultures ability to improve their relations.

The BDA calls their approach their STAR strategy. It first seeks to Sensitize Americans to the problem. Many Americans remain unaware of the standing of their country. By raising awareness of the problem and its implications, more Americans will realize that actions need to be taken to stop the growth of anti-Americanism. The next step is to Transform the attitudes and behaviors of American people. To change the perception that Americans are rude and show a lack of respect for other cultures, they are focusing on educating citizens on foreign cultures. This would help drive more global awareness in

American culture. Many American children reject learning another language or another culture's products simply because they know nothing of its history and usefulness. Encouraging more exchange programs and visits abroad will ignite excitement in learning about other cultures. They are also trying to building better citizen diplomacy programs and by making the visa policies and port of entry procedures more user friendly. Their third step is to Accentuate the positive. There are many aspects of American culture that are admired around the globe, being friendly to visitors and inviting foreigners to come visit and experience the culture themselves is part of their attempt to help the world gain a better understanding of American culture and soften some resentment towards the culture. Their next step is to Reach out to build new bridges. Americans can shift the global discussion away from their foreign policy to shared business and social interests. Surveys by the Pew Institute show that America's image improves when the world hears about our disaster relief efforts. Following Obama's lead on improving the U.S. image as a world neighbor by assisting the current crisis in Haiti is a small step towards global respect. Obama's closing of Guantanamo Bay prison that other countries deemed violated human rights received praise from the EU, which considers the violation of human rights one of its top priorities. Supporting such peace-keeping measures of their president will reduce tensions. Lastly, the try to Serve as a connection between governments and the private sector, they make themselves available to the government, connecting federal officials to the experience and creativity of the private sector.

American corporations can relieve their own worries by following a few suggestions given by the BDA. They suggest engaging employees in good corporate citizenship, they provide a guide with tips for businessmen traveling abroad to follow. American businesses often tend to place more stock in talent and skills than they place in polish and style (Williams). Knowing how to act in a foreign business meeting will help reduce initial tensions and make the meeting more pleasant all around, which facilitates good transactions.

Cultivating International media is another essential step, working PR on an international level will prevent the opportunity of negative stigmas from arising. In light of the recession, PR firms were expected to fall back, however, the PR industry actually got 4% last year. Making sure that American companies get a share of the positive PR incentives will keep their image in line with other large firms. Building tourism for the U.S. will also help raise its GDP. The “United States is the only developed country with no federal department of tourism and no national budget for tourist promotion,” Reinhard pointed out in *The Layline Review*. The “U.S. share of the international tourism market, which should have benefited from the weak dollar, fell by a third from 1992 to 2006 (Martin).”

I believe that this is especially important with our media exports. From living in three different countries across Europe and first hand experiencing how much of my generation in Europe consumes American entertainment, I’ve noticed it always has the same effect, awe-inspiring and confusing. Mostly everyone loves American blockbusters, the amount of money poured into the moviemaking

industry in the U.S. produces movies like Avatar, that draw people into the theaters to get a taste of what the future of entertainment will be like. 3D IMAX screens that can showcase American innovation in technology like this add to the effect of bigger and better. But as much as they love to see what is the new American film, most people are always confused by the story lines. Its no secret that blockbuster films are dumbed down in the narrative to make them easier to translate and market internationally, which gives way to so much effort being put into the graphics and fighting scenes, but foreigners are actually more confused by the approach. They see the storyline as something that was trying to be artistic because they don't understand the American practice of appeal over expression or copywrite laws that can give one iconic person the credit of a psychoanalytical writing team's work. They then interpret the story line as a true reflection of an American personality; dumb, violent, and loud.

American free speech and copywrite laws create the opportunity for films like Borat, that shamelessly pick fun at America. These films are celebrated by my friends in the U.S. as finally revealing the people who elected Bush and making fun of them in that blue state red state, north vs. south context. But to people from Europe who find it hard to believe that many Americans regard each state as a different culture, and not knowing that we take complete advantage of free speech and the power of our media for any type of protest, see this as an accurate reflection of the whole America. Both films were made to be criticisms of certain American groups by other American groups with Avatar commenting on military and Borat at small town America, but outside of the U.S. they are

taken as a smack at the entire American culture. Especially with the Borat film, where a number of people I discussed it with perceived it as Europe making fun of America since the star was of British origin, everyone I spoke to was surprised to hear that it was actually an American company that produced the film, and were confused about why we would allow for such poor portrayal of one another. Our media feeds off of our failures, broadcasting them all over the world, people in other countries see American teens carousing in decadent movies, but they don't know that U.S. teens are among the world's leaders in community service (Zaslow).

America needs to be more conscious of the media it releases to the world, especially in Europe where national and cultural pride are taken seriously, Europeans have a hard time understanding that Americans love to make fun of one another in an extremely degrading ways. I found myself baffled at why media like this is released without any public relations management on a global scale. Other companies are riding the wave of anti-Americanism rather than to trying to fight it. Budweiser, for example, earlier this year launched a hugely successful advertising campaign in the UK that portrays American men as dim-witted boors (De Waal). The poor taste American entertainment media has displayed in the last decade that glorify stupidity is unattractive to the European cultures that prize intellectualism and authenticity, and causing the cooling down effect towards American pop culture. The release of such media that publicizes the most embarrassing parts of American culture without public relations management is perhaps the biggest PR mistake for international relations next to the Council of

Europe allowing the EU to use their circle of stars on their flag and then having to eventually give the symbol over entirely.

Also, the U.S. administration needs to do more to promote America's image abroad. In 2004, it spent \$685 million on promoting America, while consumer product companies put more effort into promoting their brands. Coca Cola's annual non-U.S. marketing budget tops \$1 billion and has some of Madison Avenue's brightest and best laboring in its cause (Maidment). American brands succeed in the world because they morph, shape-shift, learn from their mistakes; they are too paranoid, too anxious to please their customers, to stick with formulas that aren't working (Mallaby). The American government could learn from its country's examples of excellent branding in consumer goods.

Citizens also have a variety of options to help improve their countries image through their own actions. Embracing the issue and informing themselves and others is an essential step, especially when it comes to opening childrens' eyes to the world. Encouraging them to learn another language or choosing educational entertainment about other cultures will help inspire them to become more aware in the world they live in. Pressuring school systems to emphasize geography, social studies, world history, and languages is also a way to ensure that the next generation of Americans grows up aware of their place the world. Tuning into international media to get more of a world prospective can help adults become more aware as well. Finally, becoming a diplomatic citizen can establish to foreigners the idea that Americans are making efforts. If traveling abroad, citizens could follow the similar guides as the businessmen to intermingle into a

foreign culture more. Promoting international exchange is another way to help accentuate the positive and build bridges.

The most ironic thing I have discovered through personal experiences, are that the people who have the most anti-American sentiments have never even been to America, or have met any Americans. The disdain of American culture comes from misunderstanding of it, and the fear of crowding out of their own cultures comes from a fear of having to deal with an invasion of the unknown. As Rod Serling once said, the biggest fear is the unknown. Many times, I was the only American that sat down to have a one-on-one conversation with them over lunch or a pint. When I asked them about what they thought about America or Americans, the same myths came up. The one I heard the most is: “you all don’t care about other cultures, something like 80% of you don’t even have passports.” To which I explained to them that to enter Canada or Mexico, until a year ago, and a few years prior for other countries, Americans didn’t need passports. An explanation of how vast the North American continent is, how cheap airlines like Ryan Air don’t exist to connect working class Americans easily to other countries, how intercontinental flights were much cheaper than transatlantic, and that each state truly has a separate culture so that traveling from one coast to another could be as exciting as flying overseas made them realize that this myth may have had some validity but was interpreted the wrong way. Another one criticism was that Americans all fat from colas and fast food, but explaining to them that the cola and burger consumption is the practically same in Europe, but that trade restrictions between Cuba and the U.S. make it so that American cannot

import the amount of sugar needed for soft drinks and other goods and so with the inability to grow cane sugar America invented high fructose corn syrup as a substitute, which has much more dire consequences for health. Also adding that the food standards for meat in Europe are much higher than they are in the U.S. makes for fast food is much more unhealthy in the States. Another popular criticism was that all Americans drive because they are lazy; when really American suburbia is not as condensed as in Europe and public transportation never had a chance for the amount of funding it has in Europe. I gave the example that most of my American schoolmates would probably prefer to take the train from Syracuse to New York City, if it didn't take 8 hours and go through Albany, in the complete opposite direction for a few hours, compared to only 4 hours by car. Another criticism is that Americans all have guns and support capital punishment, and this I heard from someone who had been studying the war on terrorism and American politics for three years in Britain's SOMA. I had to remind him that we have state and federal laws and that the states that do allow for guns and capital punishment are the minority. Trying to explain that 10% of Americans in the U.S. live in California, the state that foreigners adore the most, helps show them that they actually do like a considerable portion of American people, not only the 2% they assumed were associated with such progressive politics. It's hard to explain how Americans have to put up with so many unhealthy things because of such strong lobbying, and that they are now cracking down on the people who profited off creating these situations. However, Europeans do understand once it is explained, and with having already started to

catch on with the excitement surrounding Obama's promise for change, they understood the magnitude of change was larger than they could conceive. The sad part is that no one is explaining anything to them! Even if Americans at home don't experience the negative effects of negative cultural sediments, negative sentiments make it hard for Americans to travel abroad. There are other Americans who study abroad that found representing their country as hard as I did. Meredith Caplin, a Lehigh University senior who studied in Paris shared the exact experiences I did: "Oftentimes I told cab drivers or random people that I was Canadian or British so I wouldn't be discriminated against (Ehrlich)."

Out of the Europeans I met that had met Americans, they have told me that the more Americans they meet the more they like the culture. Of course there are the expectations with the obvious clueless Americans who are unfortunately also loud, so they can't help but draw attention to it, but eventually those Americans learn to become sensitive to European ways too. Out of those Europeans who have traveled to the U.S. they say that the culture is one of the friendliest and soulful they have experienced.

Although Europeans may fear the crowding out of their own culture I believe that people are resistant to change, by nature. Once the initial shock of the idea of globalization settles and people all over the world learn how to promote their cultures and indulge in others, then American culture won't be so feared. It is absolutely dire that transatlantic travel be made easier and travel to Europe promoted in the U.S. and visa restrictions relaxed for Europeans. It is the biggest trend I have noticed thus far, those who have gotten to experience the other

culture harbor the least negative feelings against the other and are more sensitive to concerns.

In conclusion, anti-Americanism is a serious threat to the prosperity of the United State of America. Following its trends in Europe it's easy to see how it arises out of fear of economic and cultural imperialism. These are two factors that will be difficult to control as European nations and the rest of the world will continue to see the prevalence of American business and cultural products with continued globalization. Although these basic fears cannot be eradicated, good international and relations and public communication can prevent harsher feelings from brewing with anger over foreign policy or confusion about consumer cultural practices. Containing American resentment in this way will help to degrade anti-Americanism from an 'ism' and keep levels at their manageable states where they aren't strong enough to cause a shift in preferences and changes in behavior. Preventing feelings from growing will reduce active anti-Americanism considerably, as it will make it harder for people to unite over a weak feelings or political movement. The U.S. multinationals that did report profits may have had more if not for the anti-war mood. Passive anti-Americanism would be reduced to American brands just falling out of favor because of new competition and not because of the products' relationship with Brand America. Thus, the efficiency of the global free market will be improved as well. From now on the U.S. must select leaders that do not run the country unilaterally but instead are diplomatic in regards to representing the country in an attractive manner to other nations and capable of cooperating fruitfully. Changes

in foreign policy and internal management need to bring back the competitive advantage of the U.S. with attracting the best and the brightest. Better filtering of the media exported from the U.S. needs to take place as the U.S. has a very untraditional culture compared to the rest of the world that can be found easily offensive and ridiculed. In addition, public relations management on a global scale for products and services, especially with media and tourism (and even moreso with public scandals) needs to take place. There are a variety of different things businesses and citizens can do to facilitate better relations with visiting foreigners or with foreign nations, some as simple as just educating themselves on the other culture. All in all, it is not too late for the U.S. to regain a high stance in financial markets and hearts of other cultures. My capstone focuses on its relationship with Europe but all the information can easily be transferred to relations with other nations. It is essential that these changes take place as soon as possible while the cloud of hope that followed Obama into office is still lingering.

Sources Cited and Consulted

Alden, Dana, Jan Steenkamp, and Rajeeve Batra . "Brand Positioning Through Advertising in Asia, North. America, and Europe: The Role of Global Consumer Culture." JSTOR. Journal of Marketing, Jan 1999. Web. 3 May 2010. <<http://www.jstor.org/pss/1252002>>.

"America Is Now the Most Admired Country Globally - Jumping to the Top of the 2009 Anholt-GfK Roper Nation Brands Index(SM)." United Business Media 05 Oct 2009: n. pag. Web. 3 May 2010.
<<http://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/america-is-now-the-most-admired-country-globally---jumping-to-the-top-of-the-2009-anholt-gfk-roper-nation-brands-indexsm-63522002.html>>.

Carriere-Kretschmer, Erin. "Optimism and Obstacles for Obama in Europe." Pew Research Center 25 Mar 2009: n. pag. Web. 3 May 2010.
<<http://pewresearch.org/pubs/1166/obama-trip-turkey-europe-likely-reactions>>.

Choudbury, Nusrat. "The Economic Impact of Anti-Americanism." The Princeton Project. The Princeton Review, 2005. Web. 3 May 2010.
<www.princeton.edu/~ppns/papers/choudhury.pdf>.

Dearlove, Des, and Stuart Crainer. "Is U.S. Business Losing Europe?." Conference Board Review 2005: n. pag. Web. 3 May 2010.
<http://www.conference-board.org/articles/atb_article.cfm?id=308>.

De Waal, Spark. "and America under siege." Idea Engineers. Idea Engineers, n.d. Web. 3 May 2010.

<<http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:sJ1yn1-F7XsJ:www.ideaengineers.co.za/file.php%3FfileId%3D52%26download%3Dtrue+brand+america+under+seige&cd=1&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=uk&client=firefox-a>>.

Dombey, Daniel , and Stanley Pignal . "Europeans see US as Biggest Threat to Peace." *Financial Times* 02 Jul 2007: n. pag. Web. 3 May 2010.

<<http://www.sott.net/articles/show/135743>>.

Ehrlich, Jennifer. "Election ." *Boston Globe* 26 Oct 2008: n. pag. Web. 3 May 2010.

<http://www.boston.com/travel/articles/2008/10/26/election_08_the_world_weights_in/>.

"European consumers ignore most famous US brands." *Pravda*. 28 Oct. 2004. *Pravda.Rus*, Web. 28 Jan 2010.

<http://english.pravda.ru/world/20/91/365/14508_usgoods.html>.

Ford, Jonathan. "Design for Global Appeal." *GCI Magazine*. GCI, Feb 2004. Web. 3 May 2010. <www.gcimagazine.com>.

Fullerton, Jami, Alice Kendrick, and Chan Kara. "Attitudes towards American brands and Brand America ." *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy* 3.3 (2007): 205-212. Web. 3 May 2010.

<<http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/pal/pbpd/2007/00000003/00000003/art00003>>.

"Global Views of USA Improve." BBC World Service Poll (2008): n. pag. Web. 3 May 2010.

<http://www.globescan.com/news_archives/bbcntryview08/>.

Guyon , Janet. "Brand America. Is anti-Americanism bad for business?." Fortune Magazine 27 Oct 2003: n. pag. Web. 3 May 2010.

<www.archetypediscoveriesworldwide.com/28.pdf>.

Jurkowitz, Mark. "Media Follow Obama, Economy to Europe." Pew Research Center 08 Apr 2009: n. pag. Web. 3 May 2010.

<<http://pewresearch.org/pubs/1183/obama--europe-trip-global-economic-crisis-coverage>>.

Kohut, Andrew. "Confidence in Obama Lifts U.S. Image Around the World."

Pew Research Center . Pew Institute, 23 Jul 2009. Web. 3 May 2010.

<pewglobal.org/reports/pdf/264.pdf>.

Kohut , Andrew. "Global Public Opinion in the Bush Years (2001-2008)." Pew

Global Attitudes Project. Pew Institute, 18 Dec 2008. Web. 3 May 2010.

<pewglobal.org/reports/pdf/263.pdf>.

Kohut, Andrew. "Obama Unlikely to Find a Quick Fix for U.S. Global Image."

Pew Research Center 31 Mar 2009: n. pag. Web. 3 May 2010.

<<http://pewresearch.org/pubs/1175/obama-europe-trip-bush-legacy>>.

Kohut, Andrew. "SUPPORT FOR FREE TRADE RECOVERS DESPITE

RECESSION." Pew Research Center . Pew Institute, 28 Apr 2009. Web. 3

May 2010. <people-press.org/reports/pdf/511.pdf>.

- Krishnamurthy, Vidya. "Pew Global Attitudes Project Releases Major International Poll Examining Views of America, China and the Global Economy." Pew Charitable Trusts (2008): 2. Web. 3 May 2010. <http://www.pewtrusts.org/news_room_detail.aspx?id=40328>.
- Lakin, Max. "The question: Do you think "Brand America" will bounce back with the Obama administration? 78% said Barack Obama can bring back Brand America.." Advertising Age 17 Nov 2008: n. pag. Web. 3 May 2010. <<http://www.accessmylibrary.com/article-1G1-189551117/question-do-you-think.html>>.
- Lentini, Nina . "'Brand USA' Is Most Lopsided Of All 50 Nations Studied." Marketing Daily 25 Sept 2008: n. pag. Web. 3 May 2010. <http://www.mediapost.com/publications/?fa=Articles.showArticle&art_a_id=91341>.
- Lindberg, Tod, and Suzanne Nossel. "REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON ANTI-AMERICANISM." The Princeton Project. The Princeton Review, n.d. Web. 3 May 2010. <www.princeton.edu/~ppns/conferences/reports/fall/aa_exec.pdf>.
- Luce, Edward. "Self-doubt tarnishes Brand America." Financial Times 30 Dec 2009: n. pag. Web. 3 May 2010. <<http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/226234ca-f4a7-11de-9cba-00144feab49a.html?catid=191&SID=google>>.
- Maidment, Paul. "Is Brand America In Trouble?." Forbes 21 Jul 2005: n. pag. Web. 3 May 2010. <http://www.forbes.com/2005/09/21/us-branding-politics-cx_pm_0921brandamerica.html>.

Mallaby, Sebastian. "Winning Hearts and Stomachs." Washington Post 29 Jan 2007: n. pag. Web. 3 May 2010. <<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/01/28/AR2007012801048.html>>.

Martin, Dick. "The Dangers of Anti-Americanism." Business Week 03 Apr 2007: n. pag. Web. 3 May 2010. <http://www.businessweek.com/bwdaily/dnflash/content/apr2007/db20070403_445889.htm?chan=top+news_top+news+index>.

Menasce Horowitz, Juliana. "The Post-Communist Generation in the Former Eastern Bloc." PewResearchCenter Publications. 20 Jan. 2008. Pew Institute, Web. 28 Jan 2010. <<http://pewresearch.org/pubs/1467/post-communist-millennial-generation-more-positive-democracy-free-market>>.

"More See America's Loss of Global Respect as Major Problem."

PewResearchCenter Publications. Jun. 2008. Pew Institute, Web. 28 Jan 2010. <<http://people-press.org/report/429/america-loss-of-respect>>.

"Obama's Nobel Prize." Pew Research Center 09 Oct 2009: n. pag. Web. 3 May 2010. <<http://pewresearch.org/pubs/1376/obama-nobel-prize-global-opinion>>.

"Perception and Reality: Revitalizing America's Image." Layalina Review V.22 (2009): n. pag. Web. 3 May 2010. <http://www.layalina.tv/Publications/Review/PR_V.22/article6.html>.

Press MSNBC, Associated. "U.S. losing business travelers to Europe." MSNBC
02 Nov 2006: n. pag. Web. 3 May 2010.

<<http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/15590942/>>.

Remez, Michael, and Richard Wike. "Global Media Celebrate Obama Victory --
But Cautious Too." Pew Research Center 13 Nov 2008: n. pag. Web. 3

May 2010. <<http://pewresearch.org/pubs/1033/global-media-celebrate-obama-victory-but-cautious-too>>.

Ross, Sherwood. "Boycotts of U.S. Brands Affecting Economy." OpEdNews 21
Jan 2008: n. pag. Web. 3 May 2010.

<http://www.opednews.com/articles/genera_sherwood_080121_boycotts_of_u_s_bra.htm>.

Schatz, Tom, and Matthew Elliot. "Europe Assaults U.S. Businesses." British Tax
Payers' Alliance 26 Feb 2008: n. pag. Web. 3 May 2010.

<<http://www.cagw.org/newsroom/waste-watcher/2008/February/europe-assaults-us.html>>.

Stein, Nicholas. "Yes, We Have No Profits The rise and fall of Chiquita Banana:
How a great American brand lost its way." Fortune Magazine 26 Nov

2001: n. pag. Web. 3 May 2010.

<http://money.cnn.com/magazines/fortune/fortune_archive/2001/11/26/314058/index.htm>.

Stewart , Debra. "THE BRAIN DRAIN US COLLEGES LOSING FOREIGN
STUDENTS." The Boston Globe. The Boston Globe, 08 May 2005. Web.

3 May 2010. <www.cgsnet.org/portals/0/pdf/N_GlobeBrainDrain.pdf>.

- "Tribal DDB Worldwide Becomes First Digital Shop to Win Global Agency Network of the Year.." PR Newswire (U.S.) 28 Sep 2007: n. pag. Web. 3 May 2010. <http://www.accessmylibrary.com/coms2/summary_0286-33733160_ITM>.
- Tomlinson, Richard. "L'Oreal's Global Makeover How did a Brit from Liverpool turn an emblem of French chic into an international star? One brand at a time.." Fortune Magazine 30 Sep 2002: n. pag. Web. 3 May 2010. <http://money.cnn.com/magazines/fortune/fortune_archive/2002/09/30/329290/index.htm>.
- "U.S. Image Up Slightly, But Still Negative." Pew Research Center . Pew Institute, 23 Jun 2005. Web. 3 May 2010. <pewglobal.org/reports/pdf/247.pdf>.
- "U.S. Seen as Less Important, China as More Powerful." Pew Research Center 03 Dec 2009: n. pag. Web. 3 May 2010. <<http://people-press.org/report/569/americas-place-in-the-world>>.
- Welch, Jack, and Suzy Welch. "Don't Count Brand America Out ." Business Week 06 Aug 2007: n. pag. Web. 3 May 2010. <http://www.businessweek.com/perm/content/07_32/b4045090.htm?chan=careers_the+welch+way_the+welch+way>
- Whitehead, Jennifer. " Top American brands suffer as attitudes to US changes." Brand Republic. 11 May. 2004. Brand Republic, Web. 28 Jan 2010. <<http://www.brandrepublic.com/News/210599/Top-American-brands-suffer-attitudes-US-changes/?DCMP=ILC-SEARCH>>.

Williams , Paula. "Doing Business in Europe - an Etiquette Primer for Americans

Read more: <http://www.articlesbase.com/international-business-articles/doing-business-in-europe-an-etiquette-primer-for-americans-684399.html#ixzz0mrzdc47w> Under Creative Commons License: Attribution." Ravenwerks 16 Jul 2009: n. pag. Web. 3 May 2010. <<http://www.articlesbase.com/international-business-articles/doing-business-in-europe-an-etiquette-primer-for-americans-684399.html>>.

Wike, Richard. "Eastern Europe: A Crisis of Confidence in Capitalism?." Pew

Research Center 05 Mar 2009: n. pag. Web. 3 May 2010. <<http://pewresearch.org/pubs/1142/eastern-europe-crisis-capitalism-poll>>.

Wike, Richard, and Erin Carriere-Kretschmer. "Trickle-Down Global Economics:

World Already Saw U.S. Influence as Negative." PewResearchCenter Publications. Oct. 2008. Pew Institute, Web. 28 Jan 2010. <<http://pewresearch.org/pubs/987/trickle-down-global-economics>>.

Wong , Nancy. "A Comparison of American, Canadian and European Perceptions

of the U.S.." Business for Diplomatic Action. U.S. National Council on Public Polls, 02 Apr 2004. Web. 3 May 2010. <http://docs.google.com/viewer?a=v&q=cache:2bcEm0nWFHAJ:www.businessfordiplomaticaction.org/learn/articles/harris_study_europe_april_2004.pdf+comparison+of+american,+canadian+and+european&hl=en&gl=uk&pid=bl&srcid=ADGEEShUpa4NkYBbj3Ye8zf_h5BTI3VSICL1KECAxYiGvgICpDcv8LiRiEPpWDF_Rywc1n04VAfmuOhufCVxCLYu0acwQgXKkvPwOyx6I1PW1EVfsx>

ginIm3FvOECrbNLiXJjf0XVOl&sig=AHIEtbTp9IeXalXbOg30JtHyGGT
wHkcdcQ>.

Zaslow, Jeffrey. "How the Torrent of Anti-Americanism Affects Teenagers."

Wall Street Journal 05 Oct 2006: n. pag. Web. 3 May 2010.

<<http://www.post-gazette.com/pg/06278/727655-298.stm>>.

Written Summary of Capstone Project

This capstone project is a multidisciplinary investigation into a problem that has surfaced with the rise of globalization. It explores the negative sentiments in Europe towards Americans, their recent history, and future implications. It was designed to be multidisciplinary because of the complexity of the issue at hand. It stretches from political to anthropological, both in the context of communications and economics and finally their synergistic affect in fostering certain feelings in different European nations about the American way of life. I show how certain negative feelings can change behavior and preferences for American goods and services and how it can affect the American economy.

I claim that negative American sentiments have been rising in Europe, sped up during the years of the Bush administration, and do drive the demand for American goods and services down. Such effects come from active and passive anti-Americanism. It was believed that only active anti-Americanism gave cause to worry, active actions are those such as the boycotting of American goods and the vandalism of American stores. This is the stage where the effects of anti-Americanism can most clearly be seen and recorded. Passive anti-Americanism related more to the disfavor for American business and a fall in demand for American goods and services, but is the real culprit. This essay shows the implications of both types to the prosperity of the United States.

I found that politics and media have the largest effects on European attitudes towards Americans. With the end of World War II, the United States implemented the Marshall Plan, an economic recovery plan for Western Europe,

although successful this came to be criticized by many as exertion of economic imperialism. Following the decade of the Marshall Plan, which started the feelings of resentment for America, a fear of cultural imperialism from the massive implosion of American entertainment in Europe developed. Soon the policies and controversies of the Bush administration exacerbated these perceptions and caused a spike in the growth of anti-Americanism.

Apart from using my personal experiences to develop theories, I found evidence to back up my claims through scholarly journals, research institutes, and class work. I used mostly the Internet to find quantitative data on attitudes and trends from the Pew Institute, GMI and Roper/ASW research institutions. I backed these up with newspaper and magazine articles I found in Europe while living there, and scholarly articles found online through the library resources.

Through my research I found that with the inauguration of President Obama, there was worldwide perception that he represented a change of the American people and a promise of better management and relations. The swell of anti-Americanism dropped almost overnight, and a celebration of a new era of cooperation started. From here it may be easy for America to recover its standing in the hearts of Europeans, however the government, businesses, and media must recognize and remain sensitive to the attitudes and perceptions of its neighbors so as not to foul the progress. I touch on number of foreign policies and internal management problems that must also be changed to facilitate the partnering of the two continents. I conclude with what the remaining problems are and suggestions for how to fix them.

This topic is a vital issue for the American people. If we do not address the concerns of other nations it means that we are continuing the unwise unilateral leadership of former President Bush. Uncooperative and unwelcoming foreign policy and problematic internal systems will discourage foreign support and drive out foreign talent. Such practice did and will hamper American innovation and decrease the demand for American goods and services.

My capstone focuses on the United States' relationship with Europe but can be applied to relations with most other nations. It shows the grim outlook of unwise actions and the downward trend that occurred during the last decade can continue until the United States falls down from its rank as one of the most prosperous nations. The unwise actions go against American ideals and it can be argued that they be changed solely on this account.

I have noticed that many Americans, especially those who have not left the country or do not follow politics, don't recognize these problems. It is essential that we bring these issues to light to spark a debate and facilitate change. Although many of these specific issues are hard to explain to the public, there has been some acknowledgement of a general problem with international relations that has created some concern.

Businesses that were concerned with active anti-Americanism on their sales overseas, such as with boycotts, must realize the larger threat underlying the phenomena of negative feelings affecting their ability to attract talent and enter the global marketplace. They must push for lobbying on behalf of this and train their workers to be sensitive to the problem.

A push from the American people and businesses will force local and national government to push the issue towards the top of their agenda. With the acceptance and encouragement for change initiated by the change of administration and induction of Obama into government the momentum must be continued to ensure quick progress. The purpose of this capstone is gather and combine all the issues surrounding anti-Americanism to show the overall effect. It is meant to clear up any confusion about the controversy and discredit any arguments that there is no real threat.

It is clear that although some research, mostly that on boycotts suggests that the effects are exaggerated, less noticeable effects such as the purging of talent from the U.S. and difficulties in trade negotiations are more disastrous. I hope to create more concern over these issues and give reason for further research. The cooling down of excitement over American pop culture and the effects of releasing culture degrading media entertainment to the world should be studied further so that the entertainment business can avoid shooting themselves in the foot. The effects of increased American public relations campaigning should be studied further as well to see how much funding should be redirected to this operation.

Overall I would like to generate more concern in the United States about foreign attitudes towards Americans. Not all Americans can witness and experience the effects by traveling to another country so I would like to bring it to them through this essay. Hopefully then, interest in other cultures will increase education about them and understanding. It is vital that a country leading

globalization understand the cultures of the world, both in the professional and public world. Understanding will help prevent unwise actions from occurring again in the future.