KASIYARNO

Understanding
AMERICAN
HEGEMONY

2022

Understanding American Hegemony

ISBN: 978-623-5335-47-6

Author: Kasiyarno
Publisher: PT. Djava Sinar Perkasa (Djasiper)
Adress: Jl. Merpati RT 2 RW VI depan Puskesmas Randugunting - Tegal

To my wife …………..
and to the students of American Studies around the globe
and with wholehearted hug to my lovely sons and grandsons

Table of Contents

Acknowledgement

The author would like to express the highest respect to all personal who have contributed in providing enlightenment to the author, especially to the late Prof. Djuertati Imam Muhni, M.A., Ph.D., and Prof. Dr. Yahya Muhaimin, M.A. Also to the entire academic community of Ahmad Dahlan University, Yogyakarta, who proudly dedicate this work. The author also does not forget to express his gratitude to Prof. James T. Collins, Ph.D. which has opened up wide opportunities for the author to take the Sandwitch program at Northern Illinois University (NIU), also to Ms Nancy Schuneman and Ms. Srie Ramly, Ph.D. which helped a lot in obtaining important data that the author needed while undergoing the Sandwitch program at NIU in the United States.

Finally, the author expresses his gratitude and deepest gratitude to his late beloved mother and beloved wife and children who have been the driving force for the author to continue to work and create. The author hopes that this book will be of wide use. God willing.

Yogyakarta, August 17, 2022

List of Acronyms

ACTU	Australian Council of Trade Unions
APEC	Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation
APPG	All-Party Parliamentary Group
AS	Amerika Serikat
BITAC	Bilateral Training and Consultation
CDA	Critical Discourse Analysis
EDC	European Defense Community
ESA	Event Structure Analysis
ESDP	European Security and Defence Policy
EU	European Union
GATT	General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade
ILO	International Labour Organisation
IMF	International Monetary Fund
NAFTA	North American Free Trade Agreement
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NEC	National Economic Policy
NSS	National Security Strategy
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OHCHR	Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights
PAFTAD	Pacific Trade and Development
PBB	Perserikatan bangsa Bangsa
PBEC	Pacific Basin Economic Council
PECC	Pacific Economic Cooperation Council
PSA	Political Speech Analysis, disingkat
SM	Sebelum Masehi
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USIA	United States Information Agency
VOA	Voice of America
WMD	Weapon Massive Destruction
WTO	World Trade Organization

Foreword

As an Asian, especially from the Archipelago, of course, the writer has pride in the past history of our ancestors who once ruled various parts of the world and became a beacon of global civilization. Historically, we know that the kingdoms of Southeast Asia, China, Mongolia, Japan, India, Iraq were respected by European nations. Now that global leadership has shifted to Western nations, especially the United States, whose power had become unrivaled as soon as the Cold War ended.

Considering that this book emphasizes the study of how the US experience grew and developed abroad and the reaction of the world or the world community to US policies in disseminating its cultural values abroad, this book is expected to enrich American Studies not only in its regional scopes. but also on the direction of the study, which is not only based on the results of inward-looking but also outward-looking, not only studies that are pro but also equipped with contra, so that this study can be viewed as a new perspective in American Studies, which in turn is expected to can change or at least be able to correct the attitude or perspective of Western nations, especially the US, which considers itself to be the nation that knows best about the nature, character and meaning of the existence of other nations, so that different opinions that come from other nations are considered non-existent or wrong.

Kasiyarno

Ahmad Dahlan University

Preface

In the era of the rapid growth of science and technology and the increasing complexity of the problems faced by mankind today, it is almost inevitable that there will be intersections and even integration (or synthesis processes) of a branch of science (discipline) through an approach called the interdisciplinary approach, namely the interdisciplinary approach. It is an approach to critically examine an issue or theme of discussion based on two or more disciplines that lead to the unification (integration) of all the views given by each of these disciplines (Newell and Green, 1982). An interdisciplinary approach is a process for answering a problem, solving a problem, or proposing a topic that is too broad or complex to be viewed only by one discipline, and integrating all views into a construction or perspective that is more comprehensive (Klein and Newell, 1997: 393–394).

The study of the experience of the United States has now been recognized as an independent scientific discipline and is considered the most successful in the area of interdisciplinary studies (Klein, 2005: 153), mainly because it has carried out two syntheses, namely the synthesis of various disciplines history, literature, philosophy, sociology, social psychology, political science, economics, geography, and so on; and synthesis of the past with the present. More than that, this discipline is also believed to be able to encourage humans to relate to the present and give social science meaning to its own history (Shryock, et al. 1950: 287).

The emergence of American Studies can also be seen as a continuation of the "discoveries" and "new breakthroughs" in American popular culture during the New Deal (1930s) and the Second World War. Cultural projects during the New Deal focused on literature and art exploring local histories, folkways and American life in general. Later, the study of ethnography

and folklore became the next interest in the study of American culture, as did the idea of 'exceptionalism' (Klein, 2005: 154). Lohof (1978: 3-5) notes three important principles in American Studies, namely first, this science is holistic in its approach to American culture, because it unites all its cultural diversity; secondly, this science is also interdisciplinary in its approach to American culture; and third, this science integrates perspectives about the United States both in the past, present and future.

Since this book examines US hegemony in the perspective of American Studies, the theoretical framework of this book departs from the interdisciplinary approach, namely US hegemony in the perspective of culture (cultural hegemony), history and political science (international relations), economics, military and regionalism (regionalism). However, as a basis, in this study these forms of hegemony are products or outputs of hegemonic culture to describe the special role of the United States on the world stage (Pease, 2007: 108).

Traditionally, a scientific discipline in the universe of knowledge (university) is a particular branch or part (particular) of the body of science, which has distinctive elements—such as symptoms, assumptions, epistemology, conceptions, theories and methods— which distinguishes it from other branches of knowledge and aims to explain a natural phenomenon from within the study area itself. Each of these disciplines has its own intellectual history, agreements and debates or disputes regarding subject matter and methods, and has a 'scholarly society or community that is interested in the development of the discipline' (Huber and Morreale, 2002: 2) .

However, in the era of the rapid growth of science and technology and the increasing complexity of the problems faced by mankind today, it is almost inevitable that there will be intersections and even integration (or synthesis processes)

of a branch of science (discipline) through an approach called the Interdisciplinary Approach , which is an approach to critically examine an issue or theme of discussion based on two or more disciplines that lead to the unification (integration) of all the views given by each of these disciplines (Newell and Green, 1982). An interdisciplinary approach is a process to answer a problem, solve a problem, or propose a topic that is too broad or complex to be seen by one discipline only, and integrates all views into a construction or perspective that is more comprehensive (Klein and Newell, 1997: 393–394) .

The study of the American experience has now been recognized as an independent scientific discipline and is considered the most successful in the area of interdisciplinary studies (Klein, 2005: 153), mainly because it has carried out two syntheses, namely the synthesis of various disciplines history, literature , philosophy, sociology, social psychology, political science, economics, geography, and so on; and synthesis of the past with the present. More than that, this discipline is also believed to be able to encourage humans to relate to the present and give social science meaning to its own history (Shryock, et al. 1950: 287) .

The emergence of American Studies can also be seen as a continuation of the "discoveries" and "new breakthroughs" in American popular culture during the New Deal (1930s) and the Second World War. Cultural projects during the New Deal focused on literature and art exploring local histories, folkways and American life in general. Later, the study of ethnography and folklore became the next interest in the study of American culture, as did the idea of 'exceptionalism' (Klein, 2005: 154) . Lohof (1978: 3-5) notes three important principles in American Studies, namely first, this science is holistic in its approach to American culture, because it unites all its cultural diversity; secondly, this science is also interdisciplinary in its approach to American culture; and third, it integrates perspectives about the United States in the past, present and future.

Since this book examines US hegemony in the perspective of American Studies, the theoretical framework of this book departs from the interdisciplinary approach, namely US hegemony in the perspective of culture (cultural hegemony), history and political science (international relations), economics. , military and regionalism (regionalism). However, as a basis, in this study these forms of hegemony are products or outputs of hegemonic culture to describe the special role of the United States on the world stage (Pease, 2007: 108).

That is the main difference between the discussion of hegemony in American Studies and the discussion of hegemony in International Relations, which emphasizes the issue of central states as the main actors in international life, which will expand their influence in peripheral countries to create a conducive global environment for their interests. Studies of hegemony in International Relations are limited to looking at the practices and political ideologies of hegemony without looking deeper into the culture of hegemony.

Chapter 1:
What is Hegemonic Culture

According to its etymology, the word "hegemony" comes from the Greek hegemonia, which means leadership, especially military leadership, for example when a group of Spartan soldiers defeated the Persian army in the 5th century B.C.E. Traditionally, hegemony is defined as a form of international interaction and leadership relationship that occurs and persists through the use of power resources, the strategic will and capabilities of the hegemonic state, and the voluntary submission of the hegemoned states. (Robel, 2001:21).

In the context of global power, Doran (1971: 70), Keohane (1984: 32) and Calleo, D. P., (1987) use the term "hegemony", which is often interchanged with the term "imperium" or empire. In fact, Geir Lundestad (1990) firmly believes that hegemony and empire are essentially the same entity. However, according to Agnew, the terms hegemony and empire have different origins and meanings. In fact, it is very possible for an empire to build its power without hegemony (Agnew, 2005: 13).

1

In many studies of post-Cold War foreign policy, hegemony is usually used in a synonymous sense with domination or omnipotence, and sometimes it is also interpreted with imperial power. In other words, international hegemony, in the definition given in various literatures, has been associated with the domination and leadership of a sovereign state in the international relations system, which gains power over other states (Gill, 2003: 41-41). . For example, it can be seen from the definition of hegemony given by Schroeder (2003: th) below, "Hegemony means decisive and recognized leadership, and dominant influence by one unit in a community that is not under one authority." Therefore, in a hegemonic system, a superpower (paramount state) maintains an order commensurate with itself (semblance order) and uses power and persuasion to enforce rules in the international system (O'Brien, 2002: 3-4).

William I. Robinson (2005: 1-2) states that the perspective of experts on hegemony in studies of the international order (international order) and the world capitalist system (the world capitalist system) is divided into four points of view as follows:

1) Hegemony as a form of international domination referred to by the structuralism paradigm as a theory of

hegemonic stability as developed by Kenneth Waltz (1979) and Robert O. Keohane (1984).

2) Hegemony as a form of state hegemony, as illustrated in Wallerstein's essay, 'The Three Instances of Hegemony in the History of the Capitalist World-Economy' (1984), and Arrighi's (1994) study entitled The Long Twentieth Century.

3) Hegemony as a form of consensual domination or ideological hegemony, which is shown in the works of Gramsci, Habermas and Bordeau.

4) Hegemony as a form of leadership exercise within historical blocs of a particular world order as demonstrated by Robert Cox and the neo-Gramscian perspective, and well illustrated by Rupert's study entitled "Producing Hegemony" (1995).

In the perspective of Immanuel Wallerstein (2002: 357), hegemony is a situation in which one state is able to impose its own rules into the inter-state system, and is able to create a new political order, where the state enjoys extra benefits over various companies that are in the system. Countries that are controlled or protected, the real benefits are not achieved through the 'market' but through political pressure. Robert Cox

(1993: 42) provides an inclusive definition of hegemony: "Hegemony is a value structure and understanding of the nature of the order that fills the entire system of state and non-state entities." According to Cox, in a hegemonic order, the value structure and understanding of the characteristics of the order tend to be stable and taken for granted through the process of the power structure of a dominant state that grips the social strata of other countries.

J. Josep (2002: 128) divides hegemony into two forms, namely: (1) structural forms of hegemony, which emphasize deep-rooted conditions in society and the unity of social formations; and (2) a strategic form of hegemony by emphasizing the real practice of hegemony. Structuralists divide hegemony into three forms: (1) Unipolarity, namely the hegemony held dominantly by one country such as the United States after the Cold War, (2) Bipolarity or dual-hegemonic power, namely two countries jointly holding dominating powers such as Athens and Sparta in the mid-15th century or the United States and the Soviet Union during the Cold War, and (3) Multi-Axis Hegemony (Multipolarity) or collective-hegemonic power, where three or more states are collectively jointly holding domination powers such as the five kingdoms (United Kingdom, France, Russia, Austria and Prussia) in Europe after 1815. Kenneth N. Waltz (1979: 131) explained, to be able

to have polar powers, the state must have the highest score in all components of 'power', such as population and territory; legal rights of owned resources (resource ewdownment); toughness in the fields of economy (economic capabilities) and military (military strength); and other specific excellence values (competency).

Hegemony can also be seen in two faces: hard hegemony and soft hegemony. Hegemony in the first face shows a system of domination that is enforced through coercion, but still seeks to seek support from subordinated states, as Ikenberry and Kupchan (1990: 56) think in the 'coercion model' which they propose, as well as Pederson (2002: 682) in his model of 'unilateral hegemony'; while on the other hand, hegemony seeks to modify and re-sharpen the norms and values of the subordinated state as described in the 'persuasion model' proposed by Ikenberry and Kupchan (1990: 57).

Mearsheimer (2001: 40) defines a hegemonic state (hegemon) as "a state that is so powerful that it is able to control all other countries into its power system." To become a hegemonic country today, Uzgel (2003: 31) mentions several requirements, including: a powerful currency in the world monetary system, a posture of great military power with allied

countries with military bases. in several parts of the world, have respected leadership in times of crisis or conflict in the region, hold the world's nuclear powers,be able to influence and even determine the strategic policies of other countries, AND have status legitimacy through the cultural spread of values and standards of living throughout the world; while Brzezinski (2004: 87) summarizes it into a triad (the troika of a hegemon): money, production capacity, and military power. Nye, Jr. J. S. (2003: 30) explains that the source of a country's hegemonic power comes from leadership in technology (technological leadership), superiority in the military and economy (supremacy in military and economy), soft power, and the ability to control international communication lines.

The picture of the ups and downs of the power of hegemonic states in history is illustrated by George Modelski (1987: 6) in the form of a graph where the hegemonic power of the United States after the Second World War, especially after the Cold War, is the greatest in the history of modern civilization. Economically, Modelski and Thompson (1996: 69, 171, 191) see that every hegemonic country has one or several sectors that are the leading sector for its hegemonic strength.

A hegemonic system exists when one nation-state has attained dominant military and economic power and has also

convinced the vassal states that it is in their best interest to accept the leadership of the dominant power, because of that hegemonic ideology will most likely promote national and collective interests. from vassal states (Sanchez, 2007: 8). Sanchez emphasized the economic and military power that could convince a subordinate state to accept his leadership as a prerequisite for the establishment of a hegemony. Both of these forces (economic and military) have important values as a determining factor for a country to be able to become a hegemon over other countries.

Giovanni Arrighi (1994: 4-6) uses a Braudelian approach to the analysis of what he calls the 'systemic cycle of accumulation'. Arrighi sees hegemony as a successful collaboration between financial capitalists and the wielders of state power. His study of hegemony begins by examining the relationship between Genoese financiers who allied themselves with Spanish and Portuguese statesmen to carry out hegemonic roles in the fifteenth century. In Arrighi's approach the role of the hegemon itself evolves, becoming more deeply interwoven with the institutional and economic spheres of organization that allow for successful capitalist accumulation. This is what he calls the systemic cycle of accumulation. Each period is named after the state holding the hegemony: the Genoese-Iberian cycle, which ran from the fifteenth through the early seventh

century; the Dutch cycle, which runs from the late sixteenth through the late eighteenth century; the English cycle, stretching from the mid-eighteenth through the early twentieth century; and the US cycle, which stretches from the late nineteenth century through a current phase of financial expansion (Arrighi and Silver, 1999: 38-39).

ANTONIO GRAMSCI

The theory of hegemony cannot be separated from the influence of Gramsci, an Italian communist activist who had been imprisoned by Mussolini, especially in his notes during his imprisonment which were recorded in the title The Prison Notebooks in 1971.

The term 'hegemony' is used to describe 'the complex interplay between coercion and consensus' carried out by the United States economically, socially, politically and culturally into the Southeast Asian Region. This interpretation is used by Howson and Smith (2008: ix) when studying Gramsci's conception of hegemony in the Asia Pacific region. In this interpretation, hegemony is seen as a process that occurs before 'power' is institutionalized or realized, as well as a result of the process of institutionalizing 'power'. Thus, various logical relationships between events and political discourses conveyed

by leaders of hegemonic countries are explained both in the context before the institutionalization of hegemony and as a form of hegemony itself.

One of the values in contemporary culture that is relevant to Antonio Gramsci's theory and conception is the aspect of hegemony, even Gramsci's conception of hegemony has opened academic and practical discourse in a wider area (Matsuda and Ohara, 2008: 53). Hegemony for Gramsci (1971: 145) is an option for civil society to surrender voluntarily to the ruling party (hegemon) based on consensus, in contrast to the political society (political society) which gives confidence because it is forced. Because so far the United States has often won in several world wars, the theory of hegemony is often associated with this super power country. Antonio Gramsci (1971: 169), himself defines hegemony as the ability of a social group to direct society politically and morally.

According to Gramsci, the hegemonic group obtains authority through intellectual, moral and cultural persuasion, or is approved by the governed community without applying coercive methods, whether violent, political or economic. Coercion is always the last thing used to support hegemony. To become a hegemon, a group must unite the features of coercion and consent through a 'dual perspective' frame,

namely at the level of force and consent: authority and hegemony, violence and civilization, individual moments and universal moments. Therefore, coercion or domination and consent or intellectual-moral leadership become consensual aspects of the 'dialectical strategy' of a social group to hold the highest power in society.

Gramsci himself is actually not an original figure in the theory of hegemony. He called Ilich Lenin as the person who most responsible for the 'conception and practice' of hegemony (Gramsci, 1971: 381). He even took the term from Lenin's pamphlet "What is to be Done?" (1902), with the original term 'gegemoniya' (Boothman, 2008: 35). Even so, Gramsci had different views with the communist figure. While Lenin viewed the economy as determining culture and politics, Gramsci believed that culture and economy were organized in a mutually beneficial form of reciprocity. This process is called the term 'hegemony' (Jones, 2006: 5).

In Gramsci's theory, hegemony is a conception that can explain at least two things: first, about how the state apparatus or a political society - by giving and obtaining support from certain economic groups - can force various strata in society to accept the status quo, through legal institutions, the police, the army and detainees; and second, more importantly, hegemony

is a conception that explains not only how an economic group uses the state apparatus forcibly for the sake of the perpetuation of the status quo but also how and where the political community, as well as civil society, together with all other institutions what they have, ranging from educational, religious, and family institutions to the smallest units of social life, produce meanings and values which in turn can produce, direct and confirm forms of 'spontaneous' agreements from various strata in society with other parties. status quo (Holub, 1992: 5).

In terms of cultural practices, Gramsci not only focuses on the aspect of consumption or cultural acceptance, but also examines the importance of aspects of production or how the culture is produced. Gramsci's analysis of the production of hegemonic culture explains that the material organization of the hegemonic structure provides and guarantees a large space for the development of popular culture. Therefore, the whole process of cultural production propagated by hegemony not only needs to be explained through an analysis of the functions of the main cultural institutions, but also through an analysis of the social and cultural practices carried out by all strata of the cultural society (Holub, 1992: 101- 103).

In his reflection on cultural practices as a counter-hegemony to the ideology and culture of the bourgeoisie, Gramsci applies a number of levels of analysis. At one level, Gramsci views reality as a rational and functional order or pattern; on another level, it provides the rationality of the hegemony of the bourgeoisie. Because the process of hegemony is something complex, Gramsci suggests in his analysis of popular culture to validate the cultural expressions. Therefore, according to Gramsci, the emergence and strength of a counter-hegemony will depend on and from intellectual activities. These activities will produce, reproduce and disseminate the values and meanings inherent in the conception of the world that is upheld by democratic principles and respect for human values (Holub, 1992: 108). In general, we can state that the theories or conceptions developed by Antonio Gramsci are very relevant to contemporary cultural studies (Jones, 2006: 1).

AMERICAN HEGEMONIC CULTURE

The term 'hegemonic culture' is used in several works by American Studies experts, including Cornel West (1982), Richard Jacquemond (1992), Eva Cherniavsky (1996), Mark D. Wood (2001), Patrick D. Murphy (2003), Bronner and Kellner (1983) and Carlos Antonio Aguirre Rojas (2005). The hegemonic

culture inherent in the identity, values, ideas and behavior of the United States of America is one of the most important and interesting study themes in American Studies research, especially after America emerged as a superpower after the Cold War. This culture can be seen as a legacy of the British Empire, the origin of the American 'white people' who succeeded in establishing a rival imperial power and eventually emerged beyond the hegemonic power of Great Britain itself.

The hegemonic culture covers various broad aspects of life, ranging from aspects of education, art, economy, politics, defense and security, information, health and so on, which are born from the ideal values of the American nation (American ideals) regarding 'what and who the nation is'. America is real', as a pretext for building a world culture according to the views and beliefs of the American people (McDowell, 1948:93). The breadth of this hegemonic cultural product area is not surprising, because the study of culture itself is a cross-disciplinary study (Miller, 2005: 1).

Hegemonic culture in this book contains the meaning as termed by West (1982: 119): "A hegemonic culture encourages people to cleverly and effectively identify themselves with behaviors, emotional feelings and worldviews that support the perpetuation of the status quo and dominant class interests. ."

This understanding of 'smart and effective' in a hegemonic culture is in line with the emphasis on the words "rational" and "functional" as explained by Gramsci.

The intersection between the globalization process and the widespread expansion of American culture is an important point seen by American Studies experts as an effective medium for the hegemony of the United States on the world stage (Oldenziel, 2007: 86). In addition, the depiction of globalization as a continuation of colonialism and imperialism allows comparative studies of American ethnicity and race in trans-national relations to develop (Gikandi, 2001: 635). In practice, both domestic and international political culture, the political manifestations of each actor are rarely shown as they really are, namely the struggle for power, especially for those who apply imperialism politics, what is actually being fought for is hidden behind a veil of disguises or justifications. ideological and rationalizations (Morgenthau, 1973: 71). By using moral justifications and rationalizations, making laws or rules of the game, and compelling excuses for humanitarian assistance, various political policies of a country appear rational and sound noble, making it difficult for other nations to find reasons not to approve or support them.

The study of resistance to the hegemonic culture of America departs from the assumption that the hegemonic country has a sense of discomfort or loss of trust in the hegemonic country as a result of the incompatibility or inability of the hegemonic state to fulfill the demands of the role given by the hegemonic state. In the perspective of American Studies, the theoretical framework chosen to explain the 'resistance' attitudes towards US hegemony is the development of anti-American sentiment (anti-americanism), resistance to globalization and resistance to American imperialism. These three things are actually interrelated with each other, and lead to one goal, namely resistance to US hegemony in a conditional context.

As the hegemonic cultural approach in American Studies is interdisciplinary, the approach to Anti-American Sentiment (anti-americanism) in this study also includes cultural, political, economic and military aspects (Miller, 2005:6). Everything that is "anti-ism" always contains five elements, namely (a) accusations or negative prejudice (stereotypization), namely a set of general statements that put things that smell negative to the alleged group, (b) blasphemy (denigration). , namely the assumption that bad things come from the moral lowness of the alleged group, (c) giving a bad identity (demonization), which is a step after accusing 'who' is bad, continuing to

'nothing' bad behavior or actions that are attached to the group accused, (d) obsession (obsession), namely the development of the belief compulsively (forced) without any room for explanation of what is alleged, and (e) efforts and actions to eliminate the alleged group (elimination), can be in the form of a ban , expulsion, resuscitation, total annihilation (Josef Joffe, 2004: 2).

The attitude given by the hegemonic state to the domination of the American hegemonic culture can be broadly grouped into four forms, namely: (1) unambigous support, (2) full resistance or opposition, (3) tactical support and hidden defection, (4) conditional consensus (partial consensus – partial difference). In the fourth option (conditional consensus), hegemonic countries are willing to cooperate "with respect to commonly shared values and principles", but "insistence on differences that must be maintained" (Matzner, 2002: 22 and 2003: 5). In this conditional form of hegemony, the hegemonic state provides a number of requirements that must be met by the hegemonic state. These requirements are essentially role expectations from the hegemonic state to the hegemonic state.

This theory can be understood in the conception of Joseph S. Nye Jr (2002a) regarding "The Paradox of American Power". America's paradox, according to Nye, shows a situation

where on the one hand the power of the United States is too great to be matched, but on the other hand the United States is unable to achieve all its goals and interests alone. This situation gave birth to "limits of American power" which made America unable to fully become a hegemon country. Nye (2002b: 557), states that if hegemony means being able to dictate, or at least dominate, the rules and arrangements in which international relations are carried out then the United States is difficult to be called a hegemony state today.

In such a limited power, countries that are in the grip of the hegemonic power of the United States carry out a strategy of "balance of power" (balance of power) in the context of bargaining with Washington. America, on the other hand, must intensify its "soft power" so these countries are willing to accept its hegemonic power. Thus, the consensus given by these countries to the United States is a "conditional consensus", while the hegemonic power of the United States is directed at obtaining legitimacy from these countries. Nye (2002a: 10) states that if a state can make its power legitimate in the eyes of others it will accept less resistance to the will of that state. Power and resistance to that power are two separate things, although they are interdependent.

The form of resistance can be qualified from the smallest scale (tactical support), medium (conditional consensus) to high (full resistance). Meanwhile, resistance in the context of counter-hegemony, according to Yaseen Noorani (2007: 76), is a form of natural disposition that is not only recognized by hegemonic discourse, but is required by them to project the after effects of the hegemonic relationship. As a natural form, this resistance can also be considered as a form of cultural dialogue from the hegemonic state to the hegemonic state.

In reality, the American hegemony gets contestation (competition) from other nations such as China, South Korea, Japan and India. These four nations also build a hegemonic spirit in the Southeast Asian region, especially through cultural and economic channels. But in general, we can see that the value they share is not much different from that given by the American dream, namely a luxurious and easy lifestyle. In contrast to America, these four Asian nations love to export their legendary stories in the form of television series programs, which again quietly offer viewers the luxury of a palace lifestyle.

In a contestation or competition, it is normal for the competing party to do their best to defeat the opposing party.

Those who have a great desire to always excel in every battle are considered to have the spirit to become a true champion (the real champion) who is powerful without anyone being able to match (the lonely power). This condition is targeted by cultural and political experts in the framework of the theory of "hegemony". The superiority of the United States of America cannot be separated from the ego to realize their dream of becoming a chosen nation (exceptional) that lives in luxury and convenience (instant). As a consequence, natural resources and other capital must be controlled and fully utilized for the sake of these ambitions.

The dream of living in luxury and convenience is then disseminated to all corners of the world through the machines of globalization, especially information technology and media, popular culture and technology that changes the way of life of non-Americans. Hollywood film products depict the luxurious life in the lives of celebrities both in the world of films and the real world. Luxury is increasingly shown at the award night for celebrity stars who then inspire the lifestyles of many young people around the world, through fashion, hairstyles and so on.

Curtis and Pettigrew (2009: 13-14) mention a number of important features in contemporary American culture, namely: (a) Individualism: since the 1980s, Western cultural values and

practices have increasingly focused on individual interests; (b) Consumerism: nowadays, people buy something not because of need, but rather because of pleasure or desire. In consumerism, value is reduced to economic value; (c) Globalization: various collaborations between countries are increasingly being intensified both in the economic realm (World Bank, multinational companies, international trade), in the political realm (the formation of the European Union Community, the United Nations and the G-8 Group), as well as in the cultural realm (such as the style of fashion, music, movies, tv, food and entertainment). (d) Migration between countries encourages the birth of many 'multi-cultural' countries. At the same time, the dominance of the US as a cultural exporting country confirms the belief of many that the US has practiced 'cultural imperialism': McDonalds, Coca Cola, Nike and the television series Friends, are examples of brands that easily penetrate global markets; (e) Technophilia (Technophilia): the influence of and dependence on technology is also increasingly spreading to almost all cultural centers, it can even be said that email, mobile phones, laptops and computers, SatNav, iPod to the internet have now become a lifestyle for some. large population of cities in the world, (f) Internet hegemony (Internet hegemony): the large role given by various social networks and search engines on the internet:

networking sites (the web) started operating in 1993, Google in 1996, Wikipedia in 2001, My Space in 2003, Facebook in 2004, and YouTube in 2005; all of them seem to have become a hegemonic culture in all modern human activities today.

UNITED STATES HEGEMONIC CULTURAL ROOTS

Where did the current hegemonic culture of the US come from? It is very important to raise this question in order to understand the hegemonic culture itself, even though the search for answers to this question is enough to dominate various discourses and scientific writings in the field of American Studies. There are at least two similar answers that can be expressed to this question. In his book entitled 'America's British Culture', Russel Kirk (1993) states that the roots of the US hegemonic culture come from the cultural heritage of the British Empire, a country that is considered the ancestral land of the modern American nation, so that if the elements of British culture are cleaned of all cultural patterns in the United States, it is certain that the American nation will lose its own cultural value. The next view reveals that 'America will forever be the Western European nation'. It is based on the history of the conquest of the Americas by British Americans.

These two opinions are then summed up by Fallon (1995: 150) in his statement which says that "the Americans have a specific national culture, although essentially it is actually the culture of the British people through modification by their wild character". American culture is said to be specific because it is "a configuration of ways and means used by the American people to express their own collective feelings", and this culture still emphasizes the presence of the nation's imperialistic character which is equated with the character of the power of the Roman empire (Kroes, 1999: 465) see also: Garrison, 2004: 4). The power of the empire was inherited by the US from the United Kingdom, which implemented global hegemony in various parts of the world and became the basis for determining its foreign policy (Mead, W. R., 2002: 125; Garrison, 2004: 76).

Chapter 2
American Dream, Myth, and Illusion

A number of studies on the hegemony of the United States in American Studies are not as vibrant as that of political scientists in International Relations. This is because the analyzes in American Studies do not recognize the concept of a monopoly of power. Various analyzes in this discipline are always marked by the absence of studies on monopoly of power. Because America has never had the experience of being a monarchy, the US has always upheld democratic principles against the concentration of power, but more importantly against the traditional form of inheritance or preservation of power throughout the ages (Fisher, 1991: xxii). The themes of hegemonic US global leadership are found more in various studies and reviews in International Relations. Nye, Jr. (1992, 2002), Ferguson (2004), Garrison (2004), Musa (2003), Prestowitz (2003), and Soderberg (2005) discussions on the role of US leadership in international relations and also the nature of its hegemony have been written by Nye, Jr. (1992, 2002).

One of the central themes in the study of American history so far is that the American Empire does not currently exist. Most historians, if they were forced to say so, would

admit that the United States was once an empire. But it will soon be added with the statement that the empire is gone. However, they will also continue to talk about America as a World Power (Williams, 1955). However, the United States is actually a military empire more than we realize (Kaplan, 2003: 15).

America assumes that the peace and safety of life between countries is not created through a balance of power, but through efforts to create conditions for an imbalance of power in the interests of the countries concerned, namely by realizing hegemony (Layne, 1998: 9-10). Hegemony, according to Layne, is not only a goal but also a strategy known as The Strategy of Preponderance, which is a realistic strategy used to preserve US geopolitical dominance by maximizing the use of force so that rival forces from other countries do not emerge. The influence of America's hegemonic culture into values and behavior runs in a planned and deliberate manner until it penetrates into the subconscious of the hegemonic nation or country, even into the subconscious of those who oppose this influence. "The Americans have colonized our subconscious," says the famous quote from Wim Wenders (Wenders, 1991: 98).

AMERICAN DREAM

What is the relationship between "dream" and "culture"? For many Americans, dreams are an integral part of their own identity and a vital function in American culture (Kasiyarno, 2014: 14). The spirit of the American Dream has been established in the American mind from the very beginning of America as a new nation. As Samuel, L. R (2012: 2) put it: "There is no better way to understand America than by understanding the cultural history of the American Dream." Indeed, no idea can more fully describe American cultural idealism in its entirety. symbolic of other than the American dream, which over time has revealed a paradigmatic structure for national and individual achievement in the United States.

In the context of US hegemony, hegemonic culture is seen as the need for the whole world itself to solve all the problems of all nations according to the American way (Garrison, 2004: 35). This culture arises from the values, beliefs and practices of a tradition that is widely developed in America called the American ideal, namely the idea that America is a nation chosen by God to save the world which is promised to always obtain victory and peace (McDougall, 2004: 7) . The American ideal is the embodiment of an ideal or dream called the American Dream, which departs from the mystical aspect of

the Vision of "America" (the Vision of "America"), namely that long before "America" became a nation, it was still a nation. a continent, and long before it became a continent, it already existed in the form of visions and dreams (Freese, 1990: 8).

The term American Dream was first coined in 1931 by James Truslow Adams, in his book The Epic of America, who described the American Dream as America's dream for a better, richer, and happier life for all its citizens at all levels as a donation. America's largest in thinking and world welfare (Muller, 2003:11). Approximately seventy-eight years later, in line with Adams, Goodman and Goodman (2009: 1) describing the American Dream with the phrase that:

> *America is a great and wonderful nation, but it's time for us to build a new light for our American Dream. This is a time when all individuals, families, business groups, communities and our nation all create dreams that are in harmony with the times*

So, the American Dream starts from the personal lives of American citizens who enter the business world, then develops in various communities, and forms a new America that is able to build the world. The 'American dream' to build the world encourages the growth of the process of spreading

American values (American ideals) through the issue of globalization, which ultimately becomes a "global shared dream" (Delbanco, 1999: 117).

The existence of the American dream and American ideals that have been present along with the birth of the United States of America is a proof as well as a strong foundation for the existence of a hegemonic culture in this superpower. The hegemonized nation and state unconsciously enter into the vortex of the American dreams, so 'becoming America' is something that must be achieved if you want to become a superior nation. The spread of the dream is operated by Americanized machines that work in almost every field in its various forms. The choice and belief to become a great nation is a choice and belief that is constantly alive in the hearts of the American people.

America is "… the land of dreams where life should be better and richer and fuller for all (Adams, 1931: 404). The spirit of the dream has been set in the American mind since the very beginning of America's birth as a new nation. In March 1630, Puritan leader John Winthrop declared America a model nation for the world, calling it "a City upon the hill", and asking his comrades to "let your light shine before men, that they may see your deeds." good and glorify your Father who is in

heaven." On his visit to America in 1831, a French writer Alexis de Tocqueville asserted that it was an extraordinary nation with a special role to play in history (Bossy, 2011).

On June 7, 1776, Richard Henry Lee proposed that the Continental Congress pass a resolution for the independence of the thirteen American colonies. Congress appointed John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, Robert R. Livingston, and Roger Sherman to draft the Declaration of Independence. The key to the Declaration of Independence is the opening clause of the second paragraph, which describes the idea of the American dream in the minds of the founding fathers of the US which reads: "We hold fast to this indisputable Truth, that all human beings are created equal, that they are blessed by their Creator with rights. certain human rights, including the right to live (Life), the right to be independent (Liberty), and the right to obtain happiness (Pursuit of Happiness).

James Truslow Adams, the person who first introduced the term American dream in 1931, wrote (Adams, 1931: 415): The dream or hope has been present from the beginning. Even since we became an independent nation, every generation has witnessed the struggle of ordinary Americans to save the dreams of these seemingly extraordinary powers." The

backdrop for Adams' short text on The Epic of America is a talk delivered by President Herbert Hoover which inspired an impromptu historiography related to the roots of American popular culture (Olsson and Bolton, 2010: 21-22).

The hope of success is the key point of Adams' term. This is also supported by Hochschild (1995: 35) by saying that the American dream has provided "the promise that all Americans have a reasonable chance of achieving success as they define it—materially or otherwise—through their own efforts, and to achieve virtue and fulfillment. through success." Its success can be measured on three levels: absolute, where the expectation of success reaches some threshold of well-being, relative, when it consists in being better than some point of comparison, and competitive, at the point where people achieve victory over others (Hochschild , 1995: 17-18).

All measurements actually show that the American dream is similar to the hope of success and victory. Both can also be seen as the main reason for the birth of the United States of America. These features came to the American mindset and developed a specific North American culture, which was then referred to as the hegemonic culture. The American Dream is the main starting point and analysis on this

paper. It is traditionally understood as the American myth of success, fame and fortune through hard work and frugality.

AMERICAN MYTH

The myths and dreams of the American nation (American myth and dreams) as the chosen nation to lead and save the world is one of the discourses that is quite central in various studies of American history and culture. Both are a consequence of civilization consciousness, which expresses an American identity that is 'unmatched in the world' either as a nation or a culture, which is then often referred to as 'American exceptionalism' or 'Americanism' (Crockatt, 2007: 16) . This illustrates the desire of the American nation to see its own history as a New World History that is above all nations by the holy command of God (Madsen, 2010: 371) .

American idealism to become a world leader has actually been pledged since 1620 by John Winthrop, the leader of the Puritans, with the phrase America as a City upon a Hill as one of the American creedos that inspires Americans in building international relations (Minderop, 2006). . The phrase "a city on a hill" shows a picture of a civilization that can be used as an example for other people who are under the city. This means that the United States is situated on a higher level that all

nations of the world can look to for a more advanced way of life. Therefore, in the context of American Studies, the theme of Americanism can be examined in the conception of its cultural aspects, the American way of life which can be called a hegemonic culture for other nations around the world.

In practice, these hegemonic ideas or ideas and actions have encouraged America to develop as a country that practices imperial power. Broadly speaking, the power of the American empire can be divided into three phases, namely: (a) the phase of imperial rule at the continental level, from 1783 to 1883 (continental empire); (b) the phase of imperial rule at the hemispheric level, from 1898 to 1941 (hemispheric empire); and (c) the phase of imperial rule at the global level (global empire), from 1945 to the decade of the 2000s (Mann, 2008).

History records that the hegemonic culture that has the character to always win and dominate has been going on since the occupation of the American continent itself. In the first phase, the control of the continental region even claimed the lives of nearly 97% of the 4-9 million indigenous people who had previously occupied this continent and 360,000 dead soldiers. This phase can be called the clearest era in the practice of American colonialism (the most colonial phase of American imperialism), it can even be called the early era of

"the rise of capitalism" (Goldin and Lewis, 1975: 320). During the United States Civil War or also known as the Civil War between 1861 and 1865, most of the United States public still did not really care about foreign policy; their attention is more on domestic issues and industrialization.

Through the Monroe Doctrine of 1823, this practice was manifested in the second phase through the American-Spanish War between April 25 and August 12, 1898 which confirmed the United States' desire to become a 'formal colonial empire' by expanding its territory into the American hemisphere, covering Central America to The Caribbean Islands and a number of islands in the Pacific region, even to the Philippines. This period was also marked by the rise of capitalism in the form of corporations (corporate capitalism) in which businesses in agriculture and bank loans monopolized large concessions abroad. The third phase is marked by the events of the World War which took quite a lot of victims. The victory of the allies in these two wars placed the United States as a country holding an important role in the West.

In the 1970s, America implemented a new style of imperialism that took advantage of the benefits of global control over various economic regulations after the Second World War through the Bretton Woods System, but this economic

imperialism was met with resistance or challenge from Europe and Japan. As a result, America changed its strategy of expanding its power from the form of virtual colonialism (virtual colonialism) into the form of hegemony (Mann, 2008: 2-12).

In the 90s, the fall of the Soviet Union had confirmed America's position as the best nation in the world, and it is difficult to deny that the history of humanity today is the glorious century of the American nation. Never before has a country in the history of the world dominated the international stage in an area as wide as the United States today (Cameron, 2006: xvi). US victories in various World Wars and the Cold War have changed the US position from only being the leader of Western allied countries to being the only superpower and world leader that has no comparable opponent (the lonely super power) (Huntington, 1999: th).) .

In his theory of the Curve of American Power, Wallerstein (2006) divides the global empire phase into three periods: first, the period 1945-1970, namely the period of US hegemony that was carried out with a fairly strong grip, especially in the European region. and Asia which was fought over by Germany and Japan in the Second World War; this period can be called the golden age of US hegemony; second, in

the period 1970-2001, the hegemony of the United States which was initially brilliant began to loosen, especially when the Cold War ended in 1990 when the United States emerged as the only superpower.

The decade of the 90s, said Wallerstein (2006: 12) was a long-term institutionalization moment for the neo-liberal global order that worsened economic conditions in many countries until the Asian Crisis in 1997. The strengthening of international institutions that weakened the global economic power had two sides: first, showing the success of the United States' strategy to dominate the global order; second, the failure of the United States to demonstrate its ability to resolve various global crises. The second consequence, if allowed to drag on, will actually lead to the development of anti-US sentiments which in turn hardens the counter-hegemony movement, especially in Asian and Latin American countries. In the third period from 2001 to 2005, the hegemony of the United States was built through a more unilateral policy with the ideology of neo-conservatism which resulted in weakening the hegemony of the United States. Wallerstein's theory regarding the weakening of the hegemonic power of the United States which began in the 90s is an interesting thing to study further. With the support of economic, political and military power, the hegemony should be getting bigger and bigger.

ILLUSION IN MIAMI

In addition to success, fame and wealth, the dreams that America often offers through its various popular culture products are grandeur, luxury, valor or heroism (Kasiyarno, 2014: 18). Perhaps Miami is the best example to tell about the dream of living in glamor or luxury. The following is a small illustration as told by Friedman, AT (2010):

In a recent interview at his home in Miami Beach, Lapidus emphasized to me then that he often makes in those writings: (I) have learned a lot from films about what glitz and glamour might look like and how they might be staged. . Mansions are full of antiques, statues made of ebony and gold, pearl necklaces and blazing chandeliers- all these items are part of the Hollywood dream.

In this respect, the concept of glamor as depicted in Hollywood films has been developed as a professional reference for American designers. "Miami" has become a commodity for Hollywood filmmakers to sell images of luxury. A film made by Ian Fleming entitled Goldfinger (released in 1964) took the Hotel Floridiana in Miami as "the perfect setting for a gathering of American millionaires and secret agents, gamblers,

gangsters, hitmen and prostitutes" (Fleming, Ian 2002: 26-26). 27) .

The Greater Miami Convention & Visitors Bureau (2013) stated that "overnight visitor numbers for Greater Miami and the Beaches increased by +3.5% breaking a record 13.9 million overnight visitors in 2012 which was filled by a +5.2% increase for a record 6.8 million international visitors and an increase of +1.8% to a record 7.1 million domestic visitors." This large number of international visitors to Miami should be attributed to Miami's image as Alpha World City after being ranked as the "Cleanest City America" in 2008 by Forbes magazine. Therefore, it can be said that the real interest of visitors is not only for holidays, but also cultural visits, namely to see the luxurious style of America. Filmmakers have taken so much advantage of this reality.

SUPERHERO ILLUSION

Apart from offering luxury, the American dream also expresses pride in being a hero that no one can beat. Winckler (2003: 6) defines the hero in the American psyche as one of the manifestations of the American dream that America is the Chosen Nation "who faces an extraordinary enemy who needs superhumans to save his life or the lives of others or to defend

his values. universal." A superhero is a person who inherits the leadership task of saving the world.

In the golden age of comics, - from 1938 when Superman was first introduced to 1961 when the Fantastic Four was created - American comics creators expressed values and heroes in ideas of independence, autonomy, certainty, supremacy, and cultural hegemony. (Mills, A. 2013: 23) . This hero then appeared in the Hollywood industry and achieved box office records in the world.

Apart from offering luxury, the American dream also expresses pride in being a hero that no one can beat. Winckler (2003: 6) defines the hero in the American psyche as one of the manifestations of the American dream that America is the Chosen Nation "who faces an extraordinary enemy who needs superhumans to save his life or the lives of others or to defend his values. universal." A superhero is a person who inherits the leadership task of saving the world.

In the golden age of comics, - from 1938 when Superman was first introduced to 1961 when the Fantastic Four was created - American comics creators expressed values and heroes in ideas of independence, autonomy, certainty, supremacy, and cultural hegemony. (Mills, A. 2013: 23) . This

hero then appeared in the Hollywood industry and achieved box office records in the world.

A fantasy of becoming an invincible being is definitely an American dream that has stuck in the minds of many of the world's citizens. In Japan, American fantasy has influenced manga (Japanese comics) and anime (Japanese animated films). One well-known mangaka (manga writer) is Masakazu Katsura, who was influenced by the famous American Superhero, Batman. In Indonesia, Bumi Langit published the comic Harya Suraminata in the 1970s. Suramita introduces *Gundala Putra Petir, Godam, Maza, Prince Mlaar, Kalong* and *Labah-labah Merah* as Indonesian heroes who actually adapt similar characters from American comics.

American heroes are symbols of victory for the American nation. Superhero is one of the dream products owned by the superpower. As a consequence of the victorious side in the cold war, America became "the only Superpower of the World", as if with that position the US had the right to build its own culture to the world. This is what we call the "American mind," a declaration of the heights of American culture and nation. By accepting the American mind, world culture will embrace the domination of American culture without coercion (no reserve).

Chapter 3:
American Exceptionalism

*America is an exceptional nation, with an exceptional people
and an exceptional role to play in the world
(Calabresi, 2006: 1337)*

Almost every nations in this world feel proud of themselves, even feel greater than other nations. These feelings often lead to various forms of conflict and competition, political, economic, cultural and military. However, after World War I, II until the Cold War ended, the United States seemed to get a breath of fresh air to feel most entitled to be called the greatest and strongest country above all other nations. This feeling is defined as "American exceptionalism". American exceptionalism will often arise in situations where international norms significantly intersect with the perception of the United States, especially in terms of international security (Sabrina Safrin, 2008: 1316).

The idea of American exceptionalism began when a Frenchman named Alexis de Tocqueville (1805–59) in 1835 wrote the term 'American exceptionalism'. Tocqueville saw the United States as something unique and different from most traditional societies of the Old World era. According to him, this

country 'is very distinctive in applying the principles and institutionalization of religion and politics from other Western societies, because it more reflects social egalitarianism and high social mobility, has enthusiasm for religion, patriotism, and diversity in terms of ethnicity and race (Watts, 2010: 10).

This notion has become increasingly strong after the Cold War since the spectacular success of the US after the Cold War, which was used to describe the US as an extraordinary nation with a special role in the history of humanity; a nation that is not only unique but superior (Bacevich, 2002:43; McCrisken, 2002:63, 72-73). In this idea, the United States is believed to be the most special region in the world because of its location as a continent that is not easily penetrated by enemies, has abundant natural resources, the ability to protect itself, and has a stable political system (Hoff, J. 2008: 8).

American exceptionalism is an idea that lived among the founders of the United States of America and continues to be disseminated domestically throughout the world that the United States is a nation and state that has the privilege to govern and lead the world according to the American way and way of life. This idea has continued to develop since the founding of the United States of America until today, which can

be one of the important keys to understanding all the actions of the United States throughout the history of world civilization.

Edward C. Luck (2003: 27) mentions four exceptional characteristics of a country: (1) the will to walk alone in various areas of life by putting aside various criticisms and pressures from other parties, (2) the belief that the practices and values in he has universal truth and the policies he pursues have moral legitimacy, (3) a strong tendency to always see things from his own point of view, even sometimes forcing the rule of law in his country to be accepted by other parties even if it is contrary to international agreements; (4) the attitude of policy makers and national legislators who easily override common interests in multilateral institutions. Based on the criteria above, Luck mentions the United States as the country that most qualifies as an exceptional country.

American exceptionalism can refer to the idea that there is (a) something different about America or (b) something special or special about America. "Different" is the meaning generally adopted by descriptive social science. It is the result of an investigation of various features of society in developed countries to find out whether America as a whole displays major differences from other nations. "Special" or "special" means different in a certain way. The notion of this is beyond

the reach of more normative empirical inquiry, usually for what is worthy or better but sometimes just the opposite. But the idiosyncrasies themselves can again be divided into two distinct ideas: (a) having a certain quality or (b) a combination of tasks or missions. In the first sense, which has entered into the politics of discourse, defenders of exceptionalism will refer, for example, to the idea of freedom or the efforts to fight for that freedom. In the second sense, the privilege refers to what Americans think or believe in what the country ask them to do. A mission is carried out not for pleasure or profit, but as a responsibility to fulfill a larger purpose (Ceaser, 2012: 6-7).

Frederick Schauer (2005: 30-31) classifies the study of American Exceptionalism into two forms: (a) substantive exceptionalism, namely the study of exceptionalism in terms of actual outcomes and actual doctrines; and (b) methodological exceptionalism, namely the study of exceptionalism in terms of methods and approaches. In the first form, Schauer explains that free speech is a distinctly American democratic tradition.

This freedom is contained in the First Amendment to the US Constitution which reads:

Congress shall not enact laws concerning the establishment or preservation of religion, or prohibiting the

free practice of religion; or impede freedom of speech, or freedom of the press; or the right of the people to assemble peacefully, and to petition the Government for redress for their complaints.

The consequence of this freedom of speech is that there is no prohibition against spreading hate speech, or in other words, freedom to hate. Books that specifically explore this topic include the essay by Samuel Walker (1994) entitled "Hate Speech: The History of an American Controversy". In this book, Walker describes in full the controversial history of "hate speech" in the United States, from the secretive Ku Klux Klan clashes in the 1920s to pro-Nazi groups in the 30s, the 1977-78 episode of Skokie to the cultural wars on campus. College in the 90's. According to Walker, the civil rights movement played an important role in spreading the tradition of free speech.

The online journal "The Keystone" (2013) describes Freedom to Hate as a distinctly American tradition as follows: The United States is an exceptional country that allows all forms of freedom of expression. This condition then gave birth to various new ideas in the midst of an already established society. Without freedom of expression, a nation will not be able to achieve a bright future—its importance cannot be doubted.

Ironically, the application of freedom to hate does not apply to "anti-Jewish sentiment" (anti-Semitic). In front of the Auschwitz concentration camp museum, Poland on May 31, 2003 President Bush made a speech: This site is a building that seriously always reminds us that when we encounter Anti-Semitism, whether in Europe or anywhere else, then we must unite and work hand in hand to against this evil move.

Dorothy Ross (1991), an American historian, describes that the study of American exceptionalism can be explained in three forms: (1) supernatural explanations, (2) genetic explanations, and (3) environmental explanations. The first explanation means that Protestants in America believe this country will lead the Christian Golden Age (Christian Millineum). The second explanation shows the connection of American ideological roots with the traditions of the Anglo-Saxon and Roman empires. The third explanation expresses the expression of the founders of this republic who put their hope in America as "the promised land of God."

Interestingly, Angela E. Kamrath (2013) on her book entitled "The Miracle of America: The Influence of the Bible on the Founding History & Principles of the United States for a People of Every Belief " noted that:

…… many colonists believed that God had a special covenant with America as the New Israel, the "promised land" of God's people, and thus desired America's freedom. This covenant, they believed, could not be practiced in an oppressive environment because it required God's Word to be authoritative and His people to freely, voluntarily commit to its principles. Drawing from Exodus where God leads the Israelites out of captivity in Egypt, many colonists and clergy believed that God would similarly defend America's freedom.

In its actualization, Michael Ignatieff (2005: 3-8) divides this American exceptionalism into three different faces, namely: (1) American exemptionalism (America's arbitrariness to unilaterally disobey the rules of law and international treaties); 2) double standard (using different assessment standards between himself and other countries; between friendly countries and countries he doesn't like); 3) legal isolationism (the United States' unilateral interpretation of law and sense of justice).

By looking at Michael Ignatieff's division, the notion of exceptionalism is actually irrelevant if it is associated with America's label as a country that fights for democracy, in fact America uses double standards in formulating and practicing democracy, but rather as a 'luck' in history due to its ability to

become a nation. Which is rich in human and natural resources, and its success in being a winner in two World Wars and the Cold War, as written by Godfrey Hodgson (2009: 157-158):

In the twentieth century, America became exceptional not because of its commitment to democratic ideals but for two other reasons. First, the United States is exceptionally a very rich country, in part because of its natural and human resources; secondly, unlike its European rival, America was not destroyed and poor but was enriched by two world wars.

The victories that America has won in various battles on a global scale both physically and ideologically, "America crushed the spread of the Fascism ideology of Germany and Japan in the Second World War, and the ideology of communism in the Cold War", encouraged the growth of awareness and confidence so great that it the American nation and state truly believe in being a superior and special nation. Based on this view of feeling special, it is not surprising that the US then perceives this world in America's own eyes, thus encouraging a cultural process called Americanization, as written by He Jiantao (2007: 39):

After the World War I, especially after World War II, with the unprecedented development of American economy,

the abundant supply of material goods prompted the rise of the popular culture based on the consumption and entertainment, and since then Americanization has been used to describe the process of American popular culture influencing, reshaping other countries' culture and the latter's converging to the former.

American exceptionalism is also used for the politics of isolation, namely policies to isolate, isolate, and monitor all movements of leaders or other nations that are considered to violate democracy and human rights according to American standards. This policy is the result of the policy of placing America's role as the 'world police'. Because they feel like the World Police, said Guo Jiemin (2005), the US never listens to voices or criticisms from other countries or other groups who do not agree with the practice of US foreign policy.

In other words, all countries in the world must be willing to accept and follow their wishes, and anyone who opposes US interests, culture or worldview is seen as a threat to human life and made a common enemy (Sardar and Davies, 2004: 64-65, and Soderberg, 2005). This is where the hegemonic culture of the United States develops, namely a cultural value, belief, idea and practice that always wishes to

dominate, defeat and regulate other cultures within its circle of cultural power.

Chapter 4:
American Creed and Brand

AMERICAN CREED

Specifically, the term "American Creed" was coined by William Tyler Page, a typist, written in 1917 and accepted by the United States House of Representatives on April 3, 1918. The creed reads as follows:

I believe in the United States of America as a Government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic, a sovereign Nation of many sovereign States; a perfect union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it, to support its Constitution; to obey its laws; to respect its Flag; and to defend it against all enemies.

—Written by
William Tyler Page

Enacted June 7, 1935, from the 1935 Laws of Wisconsin, Chapter 132. Listedas American Creed Day in Wis. Stat. sec. 118.02 Special Observance Days.

William Tyler Page is a descendant of John Page, who came to America in 1650 and has settled in Williamsburg, Virginia. Another of his ancestors, Carter Braxton had signed the US Declaration of Independence. Still another ancestor of Tyler, namely John Tyler, was the tenth president of the United States.

On his article entitled Democracy in America, Alexis de Tocqueville identifies five values crucial to America's success as a democratic republic, namely; (a) freedom or independence (liberty), (b) equality (egalitarianism), (c) respect for individual rights (individualism), (d) defense of people's rights (populism) and (e) laissez-faire. This conception was later known as "the American Creed", which describes how the world views and knowledge and truth concepts are believed and practiced by the Americans.

AMERICAN BRAND

When giving the foreword to their book, "Brand America: The Making, Unmaking and Remaking of the Greatest National Image of All Time," Simon Anholt and Jeremy Hildreth

emphasized that, "America is not just a country, it is also a brand." "Made in America" seems to emphasize that all products created by America must have advantages over products made in other countries. According to Anholt and Hildreth, these products seem to answer the basic human need for the presence of "a shining city on a hill", a phrase that clearly describes the spirit of the American dream.

The products with the American trademark (America brand) are not only limited to goods and services, but more broadly also include any ideas or values that are considered unique or created by the American nation that are the embodiment of the American creed. There are three main points or keywords of the American creed, which want to be disseminated throughout the world, namely "hr-gg-dd": human rights, setting up a good governance system and developing democracy (human rights – good governance – democratic development).

The first creed can also be referred to as 'Brand America', namely the creed of freedom and independence (Liberty) which is considered a 'trademark' (brand) which is peddled to all countries in the world, including the values of freedom or independence that are fundamental in nature (fundamental freedoms), such as freedom to adhere to or

practice one's own religion, freedom of speech, freedom of association, freedom to publish ideas and equality before the law.

Regarding the importance of this freedom, there is a fragment of George HW Bush's speech on January 31, 1990 which stated that:

The anchor in our world today is freedom, holding us steady in times of change, a symbol of hope to all the world. This speech is a reaffirmation of what one of his most important confidants and advisers, Secretary of State James Baker, who has declared himself a 'liberal democratic internationalist', stated in early 1989 at a hearing that: "The only sure guide" for American foreign policy was "the compass of American ideals and values—freedom, democracy, equal rights, respect for human dignity, fair play—the principles to which I adhere to."

Then on September 11, 1990, while speaking in front of the US congress, President George HW Bush also declared his enthusiasm to establish a new order for the international world that: "...freer from the threat of terror, stronger in the pursuit of justice, and more secure in the quest for peace.." These speeches can be interpreted as an affirmation of the 'American

creed' that wants to be spread to the international world globally. Compare this with what was stated by UNDP (the United Nations Development Program) (2000:2) which reads "Human freedom is the common purpose and common motivation of human rights and human development." This statement can be understood as an affirmation of his support for the 'American creed' on freedom or 'human freedom' which can be read as truth values originating from traditions that developed in the Western hemisphere. UNDP's acknowledgment of this creed can be summed up as a successful globalization of American cultural values throughout the world on a conceptual level.

Chapter 5:
Psychological War

The end of the Cold War not only made the US lose its toughest competitor in the struggle for world supremacy, but also affected the core principles of its foreign policy which had been practiced for the last four decades. However, there are still some points of similarity in US foreign policy during and after the Cold War, namely in the characteristics of its foreign and security policies. Since the 1970s, especially after the end of the Cold War, the attention of international relations experts has been increasingly given to the global power run by the United States (Destradi, 2008: 7).

The years 1990, 1991 and 1992 can be called the years of US ambition to establish a new world order on the basis of its hegemony over all other nations and countries in the world. However, in practice, the use of hard power in solving international problems is still an option even though it is only intended for a number of countries that are deemed worthy of being 'punished by violence', such as Panama (1989), Iraq (1991) and Somalia (1992). . Meanwhile, for other countries that are considered 'naughty' (critical) but do not threaten or endanger their hegemonic positions and ambitions, the US still tends to use 'soft power', one of which is through the use of

globalization issues. Washington's various actions are often noted by these experts as a form of hegemony or exploitation (Snidal, 1985: 614), or leadership that is willing to win itself, thus giving rise to debates as to whether US superiority can be seen as a form of empire or not, or as an actor. main and sole in the order of the new global empire in the name of globalization (Hardt and Antonio Negri, 2000).

The era of George HW Bush illustrates the seriousness of the United States to develop its post-Cold War hegemonic culture through various policies and practices that the Pentagon calls 'full of spectrum dominance'. In this form of hegemony, many policies and practices are 'hard power', namely the use of military force to secure national interests and unipolar policies at the global level. Thus, it can be said that the policies and practices of the US hegemonic culture, in this context, aim to 'victory at war'. The spirit to fight again is built through the anxiety management developed by the Ministry of Defense at the Pentagon. On February 7, 1991, Admiral David E. Jeremiah, a deputy in The State Department Secretary led by Colin L Powell, identified a number of major threats to US national security, namely: the emergence of a new regime of aggressive Russian government to rebuild the Warsaw Pact, the invasion Russia's entry into the Baltic region, Cuba's attack on the Panama Canal, numerous attacks on US citizens in the

Philippines and in several other Far East Asian countries, and in particular, Iraq and North Korea's acquisition of weapons of mass destruction.

When he accepted his re-nomination as President of the Republican Party on August 20, 1992, George HW Bush's speech had already shown his aggressive political nature, namely by using words that gave the impression or symbol of thirst for war to arouse the enthusiasm of the American nation to build its global power:

Now, tonight I say to you: Join Me in our new Crusade, to reap the fruits of our global victory, to win peace, so that we can make America safer and stronger for all of our people.

The choice of the phrase 'crusade' clearly shows Bush's tactics to evoke the heroic spirit of the American nation as once ignited by the Holy Knights (knight templars) when facing Islamic forces in Europe and throughout the world. The word 'new' implies that there is a new dynamic that is different from the situation in the previous crusade.

GLOBAL ANXIETY MANAGEMENT

For some international observers, the end of the Cold War is seen as the victory of Ronald Reagan, not George HW

Bush. During his time as President of the United States, Reagan repeatedly expressed his belief that the Soviet Union was not as strong as many had imagined. In his famous "Reagan Doctrine" speech on June 8, 1989 in London, the ex-movie-actor president said:

The decay of the Soviet experiment should come as no surprise to us. Wherever the comparisons have been made between free and closed societies -- West Germany and East Germany, Austria and Czechoslovakia, Malaysia and Vietnam -- it is the democratic countries that are prosperous and responsive to the needs of their people. And one of the simple but overwhelming facts of our time is this: Of all the millions of refugees we've seen in the modern world, their flight is always away from, not toward the Communist world. Today on the NATO line, our military forces face east to prevent a possible invasion. On the other side of the line, the Soviet forces also face east to prevent their people from leaving.

On his speech, Reagan publicly expressed his opposition to the spread of the Soviet Union's Marxist-Leninist ideology and promised to stop it even if necessary by military force. Programmatically, America raised the resistance of the people who were in the territory of the Soviet Union such as in Poland. Two years after Reagan's reign ended, in December 1991, the

Berlin wall as a symbol of the Cold War finally collapsed, signaling the United States' victory over its main rival. Even though Reagan can be called the US president who has won his country in the Cold War with the Soviet Union, it cannot be denied that George HW Bush actually played an active role in helping Gorbachev's reform spirit that led to the birth of the "velvet revolutions" (velvet revolutions) in Prague, Czechoslovakia in 1989.

Bush can be called as the most successful successor to the anti-Soviet anti-ideological policies that have been implemented by previous US presidents. A few weeks after the fall of the Berlin Wall, Bush invited Gorbachev to a table at the Malta Negotiations on December 2-3, 1989. By looking at Bush's success, it is interesting to learn about his strategy to build the hegemonic power of the United States globally to all regions that were previously controlled by the state. other superpowers. One of the areas that became a struggle for the power of the superpowers (US, Soviet Union and China) at that time was Southeast Asia. This area is very thick with ideological struggles down to the grass root level.

This whole strategy can be summed up in one phrase: Anxiety Management. In the hands of Bush Senior, global anxiety which was originally directed at the communist forces

of the Soviet Union during the Cold War, is now directed to new forms. Anxiety is nurtured as energy used to build dependence on the power of the United States; a strategy that culminated in efforts to preserve US hegemony after the Cold War. In this strategy, anxiety is instead managed as a pretext to justify America's repressive actions against its rival countries. Even in today's American life, anxiety also seems to be kept alive in people's minds. John W. Whitehead, President of The Rutherford Institute and author of 'Battlefield America', quipped:

Turn on the TV or flip open the newspaper on any given day, and you will find yourself accosted by reports of government corruption, corporate malfeasance, militarized police and marauding SWAT teams. America is entering a new phase, one in which children are arrested in schools, military veterans are forcibly detained by government agents because of the content of their Facebook posts, and law-abiding Americans are being subjected to the latest in government spy technology.

GLOBAL INFORMATION CONTROL

During the Cold War, America's foreign information programs grew more substantially, i.e. more ideologically as a form of

psychological warfare with the communist Soviets. The Voice of America (VOA) expanded its language broadcast, while its successor, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty attempted to penetrate the Iron Curtain breakthrough in the Eastern Bloc. Washington has a policy of spreading ideology as well as controlling global information in order to maintain its hegemonic power. One of Washington's most important instruments for carrying out this operation to spread US ideology abroad was The US Information Agency (USIA) which was founded in 1953. Until the end of its tenure in 1999, USIA played an important role in influencing world public opinion to side with US interests. even injecting various 'US ideological viruses' into the social, cultural and even economic and political life of people in the developing world. In 1999, all functions of the USIA, except for the International Broadcasting Bureau (IBB), were transferred to the Department of State.

POST-COLD WAR INFORMATION DISSEMINATION STRATEGY

The general principles in controlling US information after the Cold War are three things: first, the ability to quickly identify all forms of threats, both in the medium and long term; second, the ability to personally identify anyone involved in terrorist activities and acts; and third, the ability to implement all measures of emergency management, protection, response,

deterrence, prevention, and detection based on risk and information.

These three general principles are used through the following strategies:

1. Effective dissemination of information comes through strong partnerships between Federal, State, local and local authorities, private sector organizations, and our overseas partners and allies;

2. Information obtained for a single purpose, or under a single set of authorities, may provide unique insights when combined, in accordance with applicable law, with apparently pertinent information from other sources, and therefore a culture of awareness should be developed in which people -people at all levels of government remain aware of the functions and needs of others and use knowledge and information from all sources to support counterterrorism efforts;

3. Information dissemination should be woven into all aspects of counterterrorism activities, which include preventive and protective measures, actionable responses, criminal investigations and counterterrorism

activities, event preparedness, and response to and recovery from disaster events;

4. Procedures, processes and systems that support information dissemination should draw on and integrate based on technical capabilities and should respect existing information authorities and responsibilities; and

5. State and urban centers that represent valuable information dissemination share resources and should be incorporated into national information dissemination frameworks, which require dissemination centers to achieve a basic level of capability to collect, process, share, and utilize information and operate in a manner that which respects individual privacy rights and other legal rights protected by US law.

SPREADING THE IDEA OF "ROGUE STATES"

The term "rogue states" first emerged as a result of the dynamics of the Cold War. In a bipolar world, most countries are divided into two major blocs, the United States or the Soviet Union. The two superpowers view the countries in their circle of allies as "our best friends" while those in the other circle are seen as "the cat's paws of our enemy." Rogue States, also known as Outlaw States, Backlash States, or States of

Concern, do not actually have a specific "dictionary definition". The term rogue is generally defined as "a mischievous but playful person" or "a large wild animal with destructive tendencies that is driven out or lives outside the herd or herd" or "a corrupted or unexpected person or thing" (Totman, 2009: 34).

A (considered) rogue state tends to be one that acts against the wishes of other great powers, especially the superpower, America - and engages in actions that are unacceptable to those major powers (America). Which classification goes into the Rogue State completely depends on the decisions of these Western countries. Iran, Cuba, Libya, Iraq, North Korea, Sudan and Syria were the countries that classified as Rogue States or Rogue Nations. President George H.W. Bush viewed the Rogue States as a major threat to the global order, and his foreign policy aimed to change the behavior of rogue states, to eliminate their regimes that refuse to play by the rules and policies of the White House. Some of these rogue states have responded to the threat of war with Washington and its allies by developing the one instrument that allows the smallest and poorest countries to fight the strongest and richest, namely nuclear weapons.

When George W. Bush became president in 2001, he appointed Rumsfeld as Secretary of Defense and Wolfowitz as co-secretary of Defense. Vice President Dick Cheney appointed Libby as his Chief of Staff. Bush's four subordinates, Rumsfeld, Wolfowitz, Libby, and Cheney were the core constituents of the neo-conservative policies on national security issues in the Bush administration. They intend to revise previous defense and security policies and encourage the US government to confront Islamic militants and US enemy regimes head-on. They also loudly call for democracy and capitalism to be spread throughout the world. In 2001, Wolfowitz and other neo-conservatist elites urged the US to immediately attack Iraq. Defense Secretary Colin Powell wants Bush to attack Al Qaeda and the Taliban regime in Afghanistan first. In January 2002, Bush identified Iraq, Iran and North Korea as "the axis of evil."

The policy of viewing countries that were not subject to the will of Washington's elite as Rogue States was continued by the administration after Bush. Despite trying to give a more friendly impression to the international community, Clinton did not fail to irritate several countries that had been known to be critical or antipathetic towards America. In 1994, Clinton expanded the term 'terrorist state list' to 'rogue state', which is a country that America considers to be led by an authoritarian regime that violates human rights, supports terrorism and

develops weapons of mass murder, such as Iraq. , Iran, North Korea, Pakistan and Syria. Clinton viewed these countries as a serious danger to regional stability in all corners of the earth (Garrison, 2004: 56). Anthony Lake, a Clinton Security Adviser, said that the countries that were included in the Backlash States were categorized as countries led by dictators, with deviant and aggressive behavior, inability to relate to the world constructively and enjoy using weapons of mass destruction (WMD-weapon massive destruction) (Litwak, Robert S. 2000: 2).

Both Bush and Clinton clearly used this category of Rogue States as an excuse to strengthen US hegemony on the world stage (Miles, 2013: 5) . The policies issued by the two governments were solely carried out to safeguard the interests and national security of the United States as the victor of the Cold War. Other countries seem to be forced to avoid being classified as Rogue States if they don't want bad luck like Iraq, Libya and other 'really' countries.

SPREAD OF FAILED STATE IDEAS: "POSTCARDS FROM HELL"

The Failed Countries Index, as announced by The Fund for Peace this year, does not usually get the sharp attention of political experts and practitioners in the country. Even though

in fact the preparation of the index has been commonly done in previous years, the results of the survey by the research institute in Washington this time are quite shocking for many parties, especially because it places Indonesia in a fairly critical ranking. If last year Indonesia was ranked 64th, this year it has dropped to rank 63 among 177 other countries in the world with a score of 80.6.

The extent to which the validity of the research methods and results is actually not very important in question, because what actually needs to be considered carefully is what the motivations and implications are expected by the research institute. The existence of a research institute located in the heart of the United States of America is one of the important things that cannot be ignored. Likewise, various events that characterize unilateral relations between developing world countries and Western countries are key factors in reading the research results of this institution.

John W. Warnock (2008: 21) reminds that the Failed State Index is nothing but a Western way to justify interfering in the sovereignty of a country. "When a country is declared a Failed State, at that time the faucet is wide open for Western powers to intervene militarily with that country through NATO or UN powers based on Security Council resolutions," he wrote.

Richard Devetak (2008) also emphasized that this conception departs from the interests of countries in the North to maintain their differences with countries in the southern hemisphere. If the countries in the southern region are in an increasingly worrying situation, they will be classified as failed states. However, if it becomes more dangerous, it will be branded as a rogue state that deserves punishment and lessons.

The concept of 'Failed State' has become a hot issue in contemporary international relations studies which is described as 'a remarkable odyssey from the periphery to the very center of global politics'. Elizabeth Dickinson (Foreign Policy, June 2011) describes news of a state declared a failed state as a "postcard from hell". This picture refers to countries that are considered to have failed to improve the welfare of their citizens. That is, these countries are like "hell", a place that is not only uninhabitable, but also torments anyone who is in it.

In the 2012 Index, there are 13 countries classified as "hell": Somalia, Chad, Sudan, Congo, Haiti, Zimbabwe, Afghanistan, Central African Republic, Iraq, Cote d'Ivoire, Guinea, Pakistan and Yemen. Most of the country's territory is in Africa and Asia. A total of 11 countries were classified as "very stable": Czech Republic, South Korea, Singapore, United Kingdom, United States, Portugal, Slovenia, France, Belgium

and Germany. Interestingly, all of these very stable countries have very close ties to the United States and NATO. In other words, "hell" is when you are far apart or hostile to America, while "heaven" is when you are very friendly and even become the main supporter of US hegemony.

Through this concept, Western countries which incidentally become the axis of neo-liberalism power intend to develop international mechanisms and instruments to safeguard their national interests and security. The international community certainly still remembers how the US Presidents have used this strategy when they were about to start an open war with countries which they classified as 'failed countries'. Referring to these countries as 'failed states', Bush Senior pressured institutions and the international community to support his actions to intervene militarily into Iraq in 1991; Clinton bombarded Somalia, Haiti, Yugoslavia, Kosovo and Sudan; Bush Junior and Obama continued a strategy that was not much different.

In American Studies, this kind of categorization is nothing but a strategy to expand the dominance of Western countries, especially the United States, throughout the world. Despite the fact that there are still many humanitarian problems in various countries in Asia and Africa, this

categorization has forgotten the contribution of colonialization and imperialism of the Western world in weakening the power of countries in the third world. The "postcard from hell" which portrays various social inequalities and political instability in Asia and Africa has also covered a fact: the same thing is happening on various scales in Western countries.

Chapter 6
Americanization

AMERICANIZATION AS STRATEGY AND THE PURPOSE OF UNITED STATES HEGEMONY

A number of experts, such as Garcia Gancini, (1996); Mike Featherstone (2006: 390) and Xia, G. (2003: 709) view today's cultural globalization as 'the process of making the world America' or Americanization. Americanization is even considered a cousin of the neo-Marxian conception of economic imperialism and cultural hegemony (Ritzer and Stillman, 2003: 31). The term 'Americanization' first appeared in the early 19th century to refer to the notion of '... the real and tendentious influence of one or more forms of Americanism on a number of social entities, material objects or cultural practices (Elteren, 2006: 3).

The term Americanization can also be intended to describe or indicate the greatness of the power and height of American culture as well as foreign recognition of the greatness of this nation. This term was even reaffirmed by W. T. Stead, an editor at the British magazine Review of Reviews published in 1902 with the term 'Americanization of the World' (the Americanization of the World) which is seen as an expression to

describe the strength of the American nation that is able to color world civilization (Stead, 1902: 7).

Americanization is a process that emphasizes the transformation of cultural identity, which may result from an admiration for American civilization and subjectivity or from an unavoidable drive to conform to the American lifestyle in order to take advantage of what America has to offer. The first case is especially true for individuals outside the US, who may wish to rediscover their identity assuming that America is a new, desirable citizen of the world. The second, on the other hand, seems to apply especially to individuals who have found themselves under US influence and have no choice but to accept American norms of behavior (Obododimma Oha, 2008: 70).

There are also those who interpret Americanization as the importation of goods from America by other nations. While Van Elteren (2006: 3) sees Americanization as the real or purported influence of one or more forms of Americanism on some social entity, material object or cultural practice (the real or purported influence of one or more forms of Americanism on some social entity, material object or cultural practice). From these understandings, it is more important to understand the Americanization carried out by the United States is to know

the relationship between transnational forces, especially neoliberalism and internationalization in economic and social settings" (Bonnett, 2006: 1084).

The willingness to accept the globalization of the American lifestyle reflects the success of US business, the need to play by the rules of the world's largest open market, US leadership in technological innovation and the information revolution, and the appeal of universal American values. It also reflects the victories over fascism, militarism, and communism during the twentieth century that enabled Anglo-American powers to build the United Nations system, design institutions for international economic and financial cooperation, and press for acceptance of common standards and the rule of law that are essential to globalization (Ritzer, 2010: 86). In this picture, it is clear how globalization has placed America as the most advantaged country both economically, politically, and even ideologically by pushing the values and national interests of the United States into all lines at the global level.

Another projected way to Americanize the world is the spread of democracy. There is no doubt that America uses democracy as a way to 'make other countries America'. In the Cold War, democracy was the ideological weapon of the United States to face the threat of communism ideology. Karin von

Hippel (2004: 9) underlines that the promotion or support of democracy, also known as 'democratization', has developed in several stages since World War II, when movements emerged for the demilitarization, de-nazification and re-education of the population. across the country, to Vietnam and later in Central America, when it was equated with fighting communism. Later, more attention was placed on challenges to communist progress than on actually implementing democratic reforms. From von Hoppel's statement above, it can be concluded that the democratization agenda that has been disseminated by the US since World War II is actually more of an effort to ensure the release of the US as the winner in its competition against the Soviet Union in the Cold War.

McDONALDIZATION

One phenomenon of globalization that has brought cultural resonance and has gained the attention of many publics, activists, observers and cultural experts is the so-called McDonaldization, an idea that is considered useful for describing everything from religion (Drane, 2000) to universities (Parker and Jary, 1995) to museums (Kirchberg, 2000). The term McDonaldization comes from George Ritzer (1993: 1) which is defined as "the process by which the principles of the fast-food restaurant increasingly invade almost all sectors of

American society and the entire world population (the process by which the principles of the fast-food restaurant) are coming to dominate more and more sectors of American society as well as of the rest of the world)". Ritzer also explicitly recognizes McDonald's as "the foundation for one of the most influential developments in contemporary society." This core thesis is the most inspiring reason to explore more broadly in viewing McDonaldization as one of the most influential products of American hegemony.

The main idea of McDonaldization is primarily as an attempt to re-create the concept of rationalization initiated by Marx Weber. In Weber's view, contemporary society is characterized by practical rationality in their entire system of life. Through practical rationality, people come to believe in "the methodical attainment of practical and highly measurable goals through abstract but increasingly precise ideas" (Weber, 1958: 293). This is expressed in many aspects, including economic activity. This is what actually counts as specific features of culture and the basis of Western modernity.The most characteristic of modernity is that all social changes are built on the basis of the commercialization of society when the production and consumption of commodities in the market more and more becomes the dominant economic activity (Luke, T. 2006: 136).

McDonald's has fulfilled this core principle and has even influenced many other sectors of contemporary society. McDonald's is a fast food restaurant that currently best represents and leads the formal rationalization process and its basic components-efficiency, predictability, quantifica-tion, control through non-human substitution for human technology, and primary irrationality for formal rationality (Ritzer, 2010: 45-6). The application of efficiency, predictability, quantification, and control at McDonald's such as that of Ray Kroc (1902-1984), the genius behind the McDonald's restaurant franchise, has spread throughout the world. It is difficult to argue that the concept of "process-based quality management system" has been influenced by these rationalization principles.

In 1990, McDonald's had 3000 branches, which then grew to 30,000 branches in 2003 in 130 countries. This phenomenon is not enough to describe McDonald's success in terms of business when compared to other competitors (such as KFC, Pizza Hut), but McDonald's increasingly globalized growth in many countries has no doubt had an influence on the traditional ways of life of people in these countries. developing (Ritzer and Stillman, 2003:34).

McDonaldization clearly brings new cultural values to Asian nations, especially in the business organization model,

consumption style and consumerism. This is because McDonaldization is the process by which the principles of fast food restaurants come to dominate more and more sectors of American society and other world societies, and because fast food, fashion, entertainment and the language of the West carry hidden cultural communications about values. which one is considered more important in the aspects of morality, identity and life (Marsella, 2005: 3).

What is noteworthy is that McDonaldization as part of America's global industrial power tends to harm local markets and threaten uncompetitive foreign industries. The American domination inevitably hurts the local market, because the majority of foreign industries cannot compete with the power of the US industrial economy. Because it serves the interests of the American economy, it is easy for companies to overlook the detrimental effects of American control of foreign markets (Galeota, 2004: 22).

AMERICAN CULTURAL IMPERIALISM

The notion of 'cultural globalization' reflects a view that 'Americanization' or 'Westernization' is very significant in influencing many cultures in third world countries and former Soviet Union territories (Haynes, 2003: 1041). Therefore, in

various writings and analyzes of hegemony in American Studies, cultural hegemony is often seen as having a close relationship with cultural imperialism. What needs to be taken seriously is the 'hegemonic' imposition of the values most often associated with North American popular culture (i.e. the United States), which includes individualism, materialism, competitive culture, hedonism, rapid change, profit, greed, packaging culture, consumerism, reductionism, celebrity culture, privatization and the choice of English as the preferred language (Marsella, 2005: 2).

In general, there are five characteristics inherent in imperialism: 1) concentration of production and capital is developed to such a stage that creates monopolies which play an important role in economic life, 2) merger of bank capital with industrial capital, and creation, on the basis of 'financial capital' from the financial oligarchy, 3) The export of capital, which has become of great importance, as it is distinguished from the export of commodities, 4) the establishment of an international monopoly of capitalists who share the world among themselves, and 5) the division of the territory of the whole world between the capitalists of the greatest powers is complete (Lenin , 1917 : 237) .

The paradigm of cultural imperialism has dominated various researches in the field of international communication, especially in the 70s and 80s (Chalaby, 2006: 33). Cultural imperialism has also become a major issue in developing countries during the Cold War era, especially in the context of US intervention and the widespread belief that cultural currents have a propaganda effect, justifying wider intervention through the promotion of the 'American dream'. The term 'cultural imperialism' can be cited as originating from Herbert Schiller (1976) in his book "Communication and Cultural Domination" which defines it as the overall result of the process by which a society is brought into the modern world system, and how this aspect of domination is displayed, attractively, forcibly and sometimes even dispossessed to form social institutions related to, or elevated to, the values and structures of the dominant system center.

Beltran (1978: 184) defines it as a process of social influence by which a nation imposes on other countries its set of beliefs, values, knowledge and behavioral norms as well as its overall style of life. If we look at this definition in relation to the Third World, cultural imperialism can be interpreted as the systematic penetration and domination of the cultural life of the popular classes by the ruling class of the west in order to reorder the values, behaviour, institutions and identity of the

oppressed peoples to conform with the interests of the imperial classes (Petras, 1994: 270).

Tomlinson (1991) divides this type of cultural imperialism into four categories: (a) as media imperialism, (b) as a discourse of nationality, (c) as a critique of global capitalism, and (d) as a critique of modernity. What is meant by media imperialism is the process by which the ownership rights, structure, distribution and content of media in a country are individually or collectively directed by outside pressures in favor of the media interests of other countries without interference from the affected state (Boyd-Barrett, 1998: 117).

In the context of American hegemony, cultural imperialism can be seen as the worldwide spread and domination of consumerism culture and American products, which many countries claim has eroded their local cultural values and traditions and is a form of global cultural regulation. The main objectives of US cultural imperialism are broadly twofold, namely: (a) to seize the market for its cultural commodities, and (b) to maintain US hegemony by sharpening awareness of US popular culture throughout the world (Petras, 1994: 270).

In terms of the spread of capitalism as an economic system and a set of class relations, cultural imperialism is seen as the result of the global domination of capitalist culture, because capitalism does not only refer to forms or modes of production, but also implies a totality of culture that is technical-economic in nature. , politics, social relations, symbolic moments and experiences, a lesson taken from Marx (Tomlinson, 1991: 26) . Therefore, it is not surprising that the culture of the United States is the most imitated culture in the world, while what drives American cultural imperialism is the expansion of markets and foreign recognition of America's greatness (Mark T. McKenzie, 2005: 6) .

The motivation behind American cultural imperialism runs parallel to the justification for US imperialism throughout history, namely the desire to gain entry to foreign markets and the belief in superior values to American culture (Galeota 2004: 22). American cultural imperialism has been around for a long time and is growing more sophisticated. From the very beginning of its history, colonialism, trade, migration, missionary activities, technological changes (in particular, advances in production and communication systems) incorporation of tribes into states and large-scale systems of exchange were the main factors behind cultural diffusion which resulted in cultural imperialism or cultural globalization. As a

result, American culture is now a global phenomenon because it is the most imitated culture in the world (McKenzie, 2005: 6) .

The spread of American culture occurs in the form of consumption of 'cultural commodities' which are vehicles for the transmission of American values, lifestyles and even ideologies that often undermine the recipient culture. The spread of American culture into the daily life of global society has led this country into a new form of colonialism, namely 'cultural imperialism', so that globalization as 'an international system has replaced the Cold War', where tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union ended and were replaced with the tensions of the United States with many other countries through its imperialistic cultural policies and practices (Prestowitz, 2003: 42, see also Daalder and Kagan, 2007: 3).

Chapter 7
Conclusion

In terms of the nature and character of US hegemony, the author differs with G. John Ikenberry and Andrew Moravcsik. These two international relations experts note that overall hegemony can be characterized by reluctant, open, and highly institutionalized characteristics; where it is explained that the reluctance is seen in the absence of a strong incentive to directly dominate or manage the weak and middle countries in the American order. While the notion of open US hegemony is because the United States is a large and decentralized democracy, which provides transparency and voting rights opportunities for other countries in its structure. This creates the possibility for political access, incentives for reciprocity, and meaningful potential for partner countries to influence the way hegemonic power is exercised. The US hegemony is very strong in institutionalizing, because the United States has also tried to build its hegemonic order towards international and intergovernmental institutions strictly (Ikenberry and Moravcsik. 2004: 7).

Ikenberry and Moravcsik's assessment that the US hegemony is reluctant is based on the consideration that the extent of US influence, especially in the European and Asian regions is actually the will of the political elites in the region, so it can also be said that the US hegemony in this region is in the form of "empire by invitation". . This thesis explains why the US, by some experts such as John Ikenberry, Daniel Deudney, Andrew Hurrell and John Agnew, is more accurately seen as a country that exercises global power in the form of hegemony and not in the form of an empire. However, is it true that the reluctant US hegemony is assumed to be the need of the hegemoned state, and not because of the US ambition to hegemony?

Douglas Robinson (1997: 31-32) in his book Translation and Empire concludes four outlines of the character of hegemonic culture according to Jacquemond's opinion (1992: 139), namely: (1) a dominant culture will always translate hegemonic culture as a broader culture and higher than the dominated culture; (2) if the hegemonic culture is translated by a dominated culture, the translation tends to describe the hegemonic culture as difficult, mysterious, esoteric and requires high intellectual ability to interpret it; while the dominating culture reads the hegemonic culture as something that can be accessed by everyone; (3) a hegemonic culture will

consider only the works of writers from the dominating culture that have meaning; and (4) authors in dominating cultures tend to write translations in hegemonic languages which often contain stereotyped values.

United States politics since the 1960s has been marked by the emergence of the character of 'conservatism' which colored so strongly the election process of the 104th Congress in 1994. After the Cold War, these values of conservatism developed into 'new conservatism' where unilateralism has marginalized the role of the United Nations as an institution. legitimate to regulate and maintain world peace (Leonie G. Murray, 2008: 22-23). This unilateralism was launched openly by George HW Bush since the early days of his administration, which made globalization and Americanization his main machine and weapon. In front of the United Nations General Assembly on October 1, 1990, Bush described the post-Cold War world scene in the following illustration:

I see a world of open borders, open trade and, most importantly, open minds; a world that celebrates the common heritage that belongs to all the world's people, taking pride not just in hometown or homeland but in humanity itself. I see a world touched by a spirit like that of the Olympics, based not on competition that's driven by fear but sought out of joy and

exhilaration and a true quest for excellence. And I see a world where democracy continues to win new friends and convert old foes and where the Americas -- North, Central, and South -- can provide a model for the future of all humankind: the world's first completely democratic hemisphere. And I see a world building on the emerging new model of European unity, not just Europe but the whole world whole and free.

This speech can be used as an important material to describe how the nature and character of the US hegemonic culture developed by Bush Senior. First, the culture claims all good values as belonging to the American nation (claim of the truth). It is this culture that is the basis for policies to Americanize all nations and other countries in the world (See the sentence "…*And I see a world where democracy continues to make new friends and convert old enemies and where America – North, Central, and South – can provide a model for the future of all mankind*..). Second, a culture that forces all countries and nations in the world to open themselves to the entry of all economic and cultural products from the United States (obtrusive hegemonic culture) (note the sentence "...*I see a world whose borders are wide open, trade is open and, most importantly, open mind*). This culture can be called the basis for carrying out the cultural imperialism of the United

States of America throughout the world through the machines of globalization.

Third, a culture that hypnotizes or dramatizes reality in the form of dreams so that other countries and nations in the world feel as if they are in a pleasant situation (hypnotizing hegemonic culture). This culture is used to anesthetize the consciousness of nations and countries in the world to accept the US hegemony without fighting and even feeling proud of the situation (note the sentence "…*I see the world is touched by the spirit like that of the Olympics, not based on competition driven by fear but seeking joy and joy and the true search for excellence*…).

In addition to the three cultures that can be seen through the Political Speech Analysis Method above, Bush has also developed another hegemonic cultural character, namely a culture to alienate countries or political leaders that he does not like or is considered as countries that are still backward in upholding democracy and human rights culture of isolation), as he did to Iran and Iraq in the mid-1990s. This culture of isolation will then be continued by subsequent administrations, especially during the Clinton and George W. Bush eras.

In the context of discussing US hegemony in Malaysia, events that occurred during the Bush Senior administration have not been sufficiently used as direct evidence of US hegemony. However, through the Event Structural Analysis, it can be seen that from the four hegemonic cultures above, there are two hegemonic cultures applied by American hegemons, namely the claim of the truth and the hypnotizing hegemonic culture; while research findings during the Clinton administration strongly indicate how the United States does not remain silent when Malaysia, in this case Mahathir in particular, tries to build the Asia Pacific region as an economic region that is free from the influence and power of the United States. In other words, hegemonic steps will always be taken if there is a rejection of the US hegemony.

The hegemonic culture of America which is reflected in various policies of President Clinton is very clearly described by Jack Godwin (2009: 26) that "Clinton wants to restore America's 'dream' of opportunity and America's 'value' of responsibility; he wanted to bring the American people together so that all could go into the new century together." Clinton gave hope to many Americans, as is often reflected in his political speeches, to give America a new color with the term 'the new century', a term that refers not only to the dimension of time but also the order of values.

This culture of hope in Clinton became clearer when Clinton compiled a book entitled "Between Hope and History: Meeting America's Challenges for the 21st Century" (first published in 1996) which outlines three main points (triumvirate). Clinton's New Democratic philosophy, namely: opportunity, responsibility and community. Not surprisingly, Clinton also earned the nickname "a Baby Boomer Democratic president Bill Clinton, the man from Hope, Arkansas" (Nancy Snow, 2009: 5). The word Hope there is not only meant to refer to a physical sense, "he was born in the city of Hope in the state of Arkansas on August 19, 1946"; but also in a symbolic meaning intended as a charismatic depiction of his personality.

In contrast to Bush Senior, Bill Clinton developed policies based on the values of 'multilateralism, cooperative security, humanitarian intervention and peacekeeping'. Among other things, this policy was formulated in a document entitled "A National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement" (February 1996). One of the statements in the document reads:

When our national security interests are threatened, we will, as America always has, use diplomacy when we can, but force if we must. We will act with others when we can, but alone when we must. We recognize, however, that while force can defeat an aggressor, it cannot solve underlying problems.

Democracy and economic prosperity can take root in a struggling society only through local solutions carried out by the society itself. We must use military force selectively, recognizing that its use may do no more than provide a window of opportunity for a society - and diplomacy - to work.

The statements in the document quoted above clearly demonstrate Clinton's horrific foreign policy principle of avoiding the use of hard power (...*while force may defeat the aggressor, it will not solve the more fundamental problem*...). In another part of the document it is also emphasized that "...*our nation can never again isolate itself from global developments. Domestic reform will not succeed if we fail to engage abroad to open foreign markets, promote democracy in key and counter countries and stem emerging threats*." Through this statement, Clinton shows her choice to implement a culture of multi-lateral cooperation strategy. In practice, this culture tends to maintain a coordinated relationship between hegemonic countries based on generalized principles of conduct, namely the principles that determine appropriate behavior for a group of actions, without regard to the particularistic interests of a group of groups or the strategic urgency that may exists in every particular event (John Gerrad Ruggie, 1993: 11).

Through these general principles, Clinton built institutional commitments with international agencies and regimes, particularly the United Nations. While Bush often puts the US role ahead and ignores the UN, the Clinton administration tends to make the UN an important tool and a simultaneous partner in the struggle for a peaceful and democratic post-Cold War world (Leonie G. Murray, 2008: 29). Assisted by his foreign policy team, including Anthony Lake, Madeleine Albright and Warren Christopher, Clinton worked hard to win the sympathy of the international community, which had experienced tensions during the previous Bush administration.

To see the differences in the visions of the two leaders, it would be interesting to analyze the differences in their views as happened in the US Presidential Candidate Debate on October 11, 1992 in St. Louis. In the session on foreign affairs, the moderator, Jim Lehrer, forwarded a question that was originally directed by Sander Vanocur for the independent presidential candidate Ross Perot, but was later forwarded by the moderator to Clinton and Bush. The content of the question is: "… *in the post-cold war situation, what can override US national interests? And what can the United States do, and what can this country offer to do in defense of that national interest?*" This question from Sander Vanocur, one of the three

journalists invited as a questioner, is strategic enough to explore the views of the two US leaders in the relationship between the US role in the post-Cold War global arena and efforts to safeguard and protect America's national interests. In this case Bush gave the following answer:

We still are the envy of the world in terms of our military; there's no question about that. We're the envy of the world in terms of our economy, in spite of the difficulties we're having; there's no question about that. Our exports are dramatically up.

I might say to Mr. Perot, I can understand why you might have missed it because there's so much fascination by trivia, but I worked out a deal with Boris Yeltsin to eliminate, get rid of entirely, the most destabilizing weapons of all, the SS-18, the big intercontinental ballistic missile. I mean, that's been done. And thank God it has, because the parents of these young people around here go to bed at night without the same fear of nuclear war. We've made dramatic progress.

So we've got a good military -- the question that says get a new military, get the best in the world -- we've got it, and they're keeping the peace. They're respected around the world,

and we are more respected because of the way we have conducted ourselves.

At first glance, it seems as if there are no principal differences in the views of these two political actors, but if we analyze the logical building that underlies these views, it is clear that the two have different foreign policy paradigms:

1. Clinton's statement implies a fundamental criticism of Bush's global leadership style which tends to be considered arrogant and militarily aggressive by many countries in the world, so that he uses emphasis on the choice of the phrase "a smaller permanent military force"; while Bush tends to choose authority and economic and military superiority over all nations in the world through the choice of the phrase "the envy of the world".

2. Clinton tends to prioritize strategy and cultural diplomacy as her foreign policy through the phrase "they're reliable friends in the future"; while Bush remained unmoved from his passion to lead the world by calling military power "respected around the world, and we are more respected of the way we have conducted ourselves."

3. Clinton emphatically stated that the main basis of US national security is economic resilience, while Bush did not mention his main choice of what is most important to the US national interest.

Even though both have different foreign policy paradigms, in principle both paradigms are still aimed at strengthening US hegemony in the post-Cold War global arena, especially in neoliberal economic policy. Bush and Clinton's support for a world economic order centered on the US hegemonic power which is carried out through a globalization strategy is an implementation of the cultural character of neoliberalism that works through international monetary institutions. Neoconservatism and Neoliberalism which became the ideologies of Bush and Clinton, respectively, manifested in the form of the hegemony of US influence in world financial institutions, even to groups of countries as well as business and political elites globally. International institutions, political elites as well as transnational corporations, intellectuals, and groups of developed countries are new sources of power called 'soft power' which have the capacity and ability to influence the world community through their ideas and the various regulations they issue. . Thus the US strategy of instilling its hegemonic influence throughout the world gains broad justification and legitimacy.

THE CONTINUITY
OF AMERICAN HEGEMONIC CULTURE

American exceptionalism and the American dream can be said to be a common thread that links the entire ideological view and practice of government policies of all US presidents from the beginning of the country's founding until the post-Cold War (David Grondin, 2006: 10). These two important features in America's hegemonic culture have become guidelines for foreign policy directions which are characterized by three interconnected symptoms, namely the Globalization of American Culture, Americanization and Cultural Imperialism. Therefore, it is very natural that there are many basic similarities between the policies of the government in the era of George HW Bush and Bill Clinton and those that followed.

In terms of American exceptionalism, there is a common ambition in every president to liberate and enlighten the whole world based on the values of human rights and democracy as believed by America (America's self-perception of democracy). This ambition is, of course, motivated by things that are idealistic (such as ideology, paradigms, the belief that America is a nation that is qualitatively above all other nations in the world) and realists (that is, things that are more practical, such as national interests, national security, economic benefits and

so on). This clash between ideal ideas and realistic practical demands is often the source of the so-called double standard policy.

Several cases that occurred after the Bush Senior and Clinton administrations that can be called the implementation of the double standard policy include: (1) the cancellation of the signing of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court by George W. Bush in May 2002 after Clinton signed the agreement on December 31, 2000; (2) the refusal to sign the Kyoto Protocol on Climate Change; (3) rejection of the order of the International Court of Justice related to the death penalty decision; (4) the waiver of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations; (5) the waiver of the Geneva Conventions in the case of the detention of the Taliban in Guantanamo Prison; (6) Iraq-Kuwait conflict resolution policy.

America's double standard policy particularly in operations on behalf of human rights is commented by Michael Ignatieff (2005a: 24) as follows, "When US policy consistently uses human rights measures as a predictor of internal stability and external harm , then it is better directed to make a national security assessment of who to trust and who to rely on. When using security relations to pressure the regime into better human rights performance, it is more beneficial to carry out a

stabilization program in areas where US security interests are at stake." All of these double standard policies depart from the pretext that "what should apply to other nations cannot always be imposed on America because America has privileged rights which are called "distinctive rights culture" (Harold Hongju Koh, 2003: 1483-1486). ; a right that is used to legitimize the views and ideas of American exceptionalism.

In terms of the American dream, every president of the United States in his inauguration speech always lifts the spirit of the American nation to achieve a better future. This spirit is grown through building awareness that every citizen has the same opportunity to achieve success. Called a dream, because the awareness is actually more hopeful to fix all the shortcomings that existed at that time. The dream is even growing on a wider scale, namely the hope and belief to rule the whole world. Barrack Obama even specifically wrote a book entitled "The Audacity of Hope: Thoughts on Reclaiming the American Dream" (first published in 2007) which, among other things, describes various important themes in his political speech before the 2004 Democratic National Convention, various views that describe his personal views on faith and values and his ideas about America's future vision.

After the administrations of Bush Senior (Republican) and Clinton (Democratic), America was led by two figures who were quite controversial and attracted the world's attention, namely George W. Bush (Republican) and Obama (Democrat). The Bush administration is seen as a continuation of the Republican Party's neo-conservatism ideology which puts forward a global military solution, has a unilateral view and is passionate about building democratic life in other countries in the world. The strength of this neo-conservatism thought was strengthened by the support of people close to Bush, such as Richard Cheney (Vice President), Donald Rumsfeld (former Minister of Agriculture), Paul Wolfowitz (former Deputy Secretary of Defense) and John Bolton (former Deputy Secretary of Defense); while the Obama administration positioned the US more as a friendly country to all nations in the world by using a multilateralism approach that is 'smart power'.

In his inaugural address as US President on January 20, 2001, George W. Bush stated, "The enemies of freedom and our country must make no mistake: America will remain involved in the world by the dictates of history and by its own choice, sharpening the balance of power that can produce freedom." In this speech, Bush Junior equated the enemy of America as an enemy of the values of freedom or

independence, affirmed his commitment to saving the world, considered that the role of savior was a call to history and the consciousness of the American nation; and promised to regulate the balance of power throughout the world to ensure the upholding of the values of freedom and independence.

In order to clarify this unilateral policy, the Bush administration published two documents related to the national security strategy, namely: *first*, a document entitled "The National Security Strategy of the United States" dated September 20, 2002 which was based on Bush's political statements in front of the US Military Academy in West Point on June 1, 2002, at which time Bush said:

This war will take many turns we cannot predict. Yet I am certain of this: Wherever we carry it, the American flag will stand not only for our power, but for freedom. (Applause.) Our nation's cause has always been larger than our nation's defense. We fight, as we always fight, for a just peace -- a peace that favors human liberty. We will defend the peace against threats from terrorists and tyrants. We will preserve the peace by building good relations among the great powers. And we will extend the peace by encouraging free and open societies on every continent.

In the statement above, Bush puts the influence of American power as something bigger and respected by all his opponents in the world, so that throughout his history, the American nation has played more external roles. Unlike other countries which are more busy building their national defenses, America is busy solving world problems through the power it already has.

As a concluding sentence in the preface to this first document, Bush wrote

Freedom is the non-negotiable demand of human dignity; the birthright of every person—in every civilization. Throughout history, freedom has been threatened by war and terror; it has been challenged by the clashing wills of powerful states and the evil designs of tyrants; and it has been tested by widespread poverty and disease. Today, humanity holds in its hands the opportunity to further freedom's triumph over all these foes. The United States welcomes our responsibility to lead in this great mission.

In this statement, it is clear that Bush put the responsibility of the American people to solve various humanitarian crises perpetrated by terrorists and tyrants. The

American struggle to save the values of freedom and independence by Bush is called a 'great mission'.

Second, a document entitled "National Security Strategy (NSS) 2006" March 2006 which is based on a statement in Bush's March 16, 2006 letter introducing to the document which reads:

> "The ideals that have inspired our history – freedom, democracy, and human dignity – are increasingly inspiring individuals and nations throughout the world. … We choose leadership over isolationism, and the pursuit of free trade and open markets over protectionism. We choose to deal with challenges now rather than leaving them for future generations. We fight our enemies abroad instead of waiting for them to arrive in our country. We seek to shape the world, not merely be shaped by it; to influence events for the better instead of being at their mercy."

The spirit built by the two documents is indeed directed at fighting terrorism; However, this enthusiasm is used as an excuse to choose a unilateralism approach that is hard power so that it is considered by many as a form of arrogant attitude.

In the settlement of the Gulf War crisis in 1990, the use of hard power was carried out through a strategy of building an international coalition, but still based on an approach of unilateralism, it can even be called "a triumph of unilateralism". The international coalition was not built on the basis of friendly cooperation between countries, but solely to fulfill the Bush administration's ambition to establish a New World Order as a manifestation of Pax Americana (Michael T. Klare, 1992: 141).

The impression that America is an arrogant nation is then tried to be corrected by the next government. To see how far this approach has been taken by the next president, we can use the Political Speech Analysis Method on two of President Obama's political speeches; namely: (a) Obama's speech at the event titled Address to the Nation on Libya on March 28, 2011, and (b) Obama's speech at the event entitled Speech on US Policy in Middle East and North Africa on May 19, 2011.

In his first address, Address to the Nation on Libya, Obama stated:

> To summarize, then: In just one month, the United States has worked with our international partners to mobilize a broad coalition, secure an international mandate to protect civilians, stop an

advancing army, prevent a massacre, and establish a no-fly zone with our allies and partners. To lend some perspective on how rapidly this military and diplomatic response came together, when people were being brutalized in Bosnia in the 1990s, it took the international community more than a year to intervene with air power to protect civilians. It took us 31 days.

In the statement, Obama emphasized the importance of cooperation with the international community to resolve the Libya issue, while the US role itself was limited to a supporting role as stated by Obama," *In that effort, the United States will play a supporting role -- including intelligence, logistical support, search and rescue assistance, and capabilities to jam regime communications*."

Two years before making the above statement, upon receiving the Nobel Peace Prize at Oslo City Hall, Norway on December 10, 2009, Obama had stated, "… *in a world where threats are rampant, and missions are becoming more difficult, America cannot act alone. America alone cannot secure peace.*" This statement shows that Obama chose a multilateralism approach that is soft power, which is different from the Bush Junior administration which tends to enforce hard power

unilateralism in its foreign policy, something that Obama had already stated when he ran as a candidate for US President in 2007," *…to renew U.S. leadership, I intend to rebuild the need for alliances, partnerships, and institutions to confront shared threats and enhance shared security.*" By choosing the phrase "renew", Obama clearly shows that there is something different between himself and the US administration, especially in terms of choosing a multilateralism approach that is soft power.

One of the other statements that made many experts and the press community consider it as a firmness of Obama's choice to prefer a soft power approach- while showing the difference with the previous administration, namely Bush Junior- was when Obama said, "*…The United States will not be able to dictate speed and space. the scope of this change. Only people from the area can do that.*" Obama's assertion is a new milestone for America's global role around the world, as it withdraws from interfering in the affairs of other countries. However, in the second speech, Speech on US Policy in Middle East and North Africa, Obama actually showed his endorsement of the intervention policy in the name of upholding human rights and democracy as has been carried out by the Bush Junior administration. In this second speech, Obama stated:

The United States opposes the use of violence and repression against the people of the region. (Applause.)

The United States supports a set of universal rights. And these rights include free speech, the freedom of peaceful assembly, the freedom of religion, equality for men and women under the rule of law, and the right to choose your own leaders -– whether you live in Baghdad or Damascus, Sanaa or Tehran.

And we support political and economic reform in the Middle East and North Africa that can meet the legitimate aspirations of ordinary people throughout the region.

On this speech, we see two important things to note: first, the statement that America rejects the use of violence and repression against a nation by government regimes in the region while supporting the upholding of human rights in freedom of expression; and second, the statement that America supports economic and political reforms in the Middle East and North Africa. Both of these show Obama's position to endorse various intervention policies in the name of democracy

and human rights; something that previous US presidents, including George W. Bush, have done.

The policy not to remain silent on violations of the principles of human rights and democracy around the world, even Obama emphasized as a top priority in his foreign policy, "Our support for these principles is not trivial. Today I will state clearly that such support is a top priority that must be translated into concrete action, and supported by all the diplomatic, economic and strategic tools at our disposal." Obama's two political speeches do not show any firmness, not to mention the existence of double standards, in Obama's foreign policy choices: whether hard power or soft power is actually the basis of American foreign policy. Political experts who work to develop the US national security and defense strategy call this policy an approach that uses 'smart power', which can be considered as a combination of hard power and soft power approaches. The use of smart power is described by Joseph S. Nye, Jr. (2008: 62) as follows:

Today the United States is unlikely to face countries that challenge its superiority unless the country acts arrogantly so that America must help other countries to overcome the situation and cooperate. The bigger challenge for the United States in the future is learning how to work with other

countries to better control the non-state actors who will increasingly share the stage with the nation-state. How to control the bottom chessboard in a three-dimensional game and how to make hard and soft power mutually reinforcing are major foreign policy challenges for American leadership.

In the smart power approach, the challenge for US foreign policy is no longer how to dominate other countries, but rather how to cooperate with other countries, as explained by Richard L. Armitage and Dr. Joseph S. Nye, Jr. before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on 24 April 2008, the smart power approach is based on the following principles; First, America is in world problems that are closely related to the security and prosperity of its citizens. Second, today's challenges can only be overcome with capable and willing allies and partners. Third, civic tools can increase the legitimacy, effectiveness, and sustainability of US Government policies.

In this smart power practice, in particular, Richard L. Armitage and Joseph S. Nye, Jr. (2007: 5) suggested that America should focus on five main programs, namely: (1) building alliances, partnerships and institutions (alliances, partnerships, and institutions), (2) global development (global development), (3) public diplomacy. (public diplomacy), (4)

economic integration, and (5) technology and innovation, particularly energy security and climate change.

In the context of hegemony, Obama can be seen as a US leader who prioritizes 'consensus' as the basis for his hegemonic power rather than 'coercion'. Unlike his predecessor, who was known as an arrogant leader, Obama would prefer if he and his country were seen as friendly countries rather than enemies by other countries in the world. This approach is in line with the concept of smart power, especially on the second principle formulated by Richard L. Armitage and Joseph S. Nye, Jr. (2007: 11), namely "American leaders ought to eliminate the symbols that have come to represent the image of an intolerant, abusive, unjust America." In the two points above, we can conclude that although the current US administration led by Obama prioritizes a smart power approach, fundamentally its foreign policy still applies a hegemonic culture and double standard policy to other countries around the world.

REFERENCES

Adams, J. T. (1931). *The Epic of America*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company

Agnew, J. (2005). *Hegemony: The New Shape of Global Power.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press,

Armitage, D. T. Jr. (2005). Enduring Dilemmas: Sources of American Ambivalence toward European Defense Autonomy, the EDC and ESDP in Comparative Perspective. University of Maryland.

Arrighi, G. (1994). *The Long Twentieth Century; Money, Power, and the Origins of Our Times*. London: Verso

Arrighi, G dan Silver, BJ. (1999). Chaos and Governance in the Modern World System. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Bacevich, A. J. (2002). *American Empire: The Realities and Consequences of U.S. Diplomacy*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press

Beltran, L.R. (1978). Communication and Cultural Domination: USA-Latin American Case. *Media Asia*, 5, (4): 183-192.

Bonnett, A. (2006). The Americanisation of Anti-Racism? Global Power and Hegemony in Ethnic Equity. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*. Vol. 32, No. 7: 1083 -1103.

Boothman, D. (2008). Hegemony: Political and Linguistic Sources for Gramsci's Concept of Hegemony. Dalam: Howson, R. dan Smith, K. (eds.). (2008). *Hegemony Studies in Consensus and Coercion.* New York: Routledge, 33-50

Bossy, D. (2011). A City upon a Hill. *The Daily Caller*.

Boyd-Barrett , Oliver. (1998). Media imperialism reformulated. In: D.K.Thussu (Ed.). *Electronic Empires*. London: Edward Arnold.

Bronner, S. and Kellner, D.(1983). *Passion and Rebellion: The Expressionist Heritage.* London: Universe Books and Bergin Publishers (USA), New York dan Croom Helm (Inggris).

Brzezinski, Zbigniew. (2004), Choice (Tercih), İnkıkap Kitapevi, İstanbul.

Callahan, Michael T. (1992). *Construction Project Schedulling*. USA : McGraw-. Hill. Carapedia

Calleo, D.P., (1987). *Beyond American Hegemony: The Future of the Western Alliance.* New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers.

Chalaby. J. K. (2006). American Cultural Primacy in A New Media Order: A European Perspective. *The International Communication Gazette*, Vol. 68, No.1: 33–51. London: SAGE Publications Ltd

Ceaser, J.W.(2012). The Origins and Character of American Exceptionalism. *American Political Thought: A Journal of Ideas, Institutions, and Culture*, vol. 1: 1-25.

Cherniavsky, Eva. (1996). Subaltern Studies in a U. S. Frame. *Boundary 2*, Vol. 23, No. 2: 85-110. North Carolina: Duke University Press.

Cox, R. W. (1993). Gramsci, Hegemony and International Relations: An Essay in Method. *Gramsci, Historical Materialism and International Relations*, Stephen Gill (ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crockatt, R. 2007. *After 9/11: Cultural Dimensions of American Global Power*. New York: Routledge.

Curtis, W. dan Pettigrew, A (2009). *Learning in Contemporary Culture*. Exeter: Learning Matters.

Delbanco, A. (1999). *The Real American Dream: A Meditation on Hope.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Destradi, S. (2008). Empire, Hegemony, and Leadership: Developing a Research Framework for the Study of Regional Powers. *Giga Working Papers*. No. 79.

Devetak, Richard. (2008). Failures, Rogues and Terrorists: States of Exception and The North/South Divide. In: Bellamy, Alex J. Bleiker, Roland., Davies, Sara E. dan Devetak, Richard (Ed.), *Security and the War on Terror*. London, England: Routledge: 125-141.

Doran, C. F., (1971). *The Politics of Assimilation: Hegemony and Its Aftermath*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Drane, J.W. (2000). *The McDonaldization of the Church: Spirituality, Creativity and the Future of the Church.* London: Darton, Longman & Todd.

Elteren, van M. (2003). U.S. Cultural Imperialism Today: Only a Chimera? *SAIS Review* vol. XXIII no. 2: 169-188.

Fallon, J. (1995). The Roots of American Order. *The Social Contract*, Winter: 150-151.

Featherstone, Mike.(2006). Archive. *Theory, Culture & Society.* Volume 23 (2-3): 6

Ferguson, N.(2004). A World Without Power. *Foreign Policy*. Washington: The Foreign Policy Group: 32-39

Fleming, Ian, (2002). *Goldfinger*. London: Penguin.

Freese, P. (1990)*.* 'America'. Dream or Nightmare? Reflections on a Composite Image. Die Blaue Eule, Essen.

Friedman. A.T. (2010). The Luxury of Lapidus: Glamour, Class, and Architecture in Miami Beach. *Design Magazine,* no. 11: 39-47.

Galeota, J. (2004). Cultural Imperialism: An American Tradition. *Humanist Essay Contest Winners*: 22-46.

Canclini, N. G., & Yúdice, G. (2014). *Imagined Globalization*. Duke University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv 113140k

Garrison, J. (2004). *America as Empire: Global Leader or Rogue Power?*. First Edition. San Francisco: Berrett Koehler Publishers, Inc.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selection from the Prison Notebooks*. Dalam Q. Hoare and G. Nowell Smith (ed. dan penj.). London: Lawrence & Wishart.

Grondin, D. (2006). Introduction Coming to Terms with America's Liberal Hegemony/Empire. In: David, CP. dan Grondin, D. (eds.). *Hegemony or Empire: The Redefinition of US Power under George W. Bush*. Hampshire: Ashgate.

Gikandi, S. (2001). Globalization and the Claims of Postcoloniality. *South Atlantic Quarterly.* 100(3): 627–58.

Gill, S. (2003). *Power and Resistance in the New World Order*. London and New York. Macmillan-Palgrave.

Godwin, Jack (2009). *Clintonomics: How Bill Clinton Reengineered the Reagan Revolution*. New York: Amacom

Goodman, D. dan Goodman, E. (2009). *Creating The New American Dream. C*alifornia: Goodman Experiences, LLC.

Hardt, Michael and Negri, Antonio. (2000). *Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. https://doi.org/10. 2307/ j.ctvjnrw54

Haynes, J. (2003). Tracing Connections between Comparative Politics and Globalisation. *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 24, No. 6: 1029-1047. Taylor & Francis, Ltd.

Hippel, Karin von. (2004). *Democracy by Force: US Military Intervention in the Post-Cold War World.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hochschild, Jennifer L (1995). *Facing up to the American Dream: Race, Class, and the Soul of the Nation*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Hodgson, G. (2009). *The Myth of American Exceptionalism*. New Haven dan London: Yale University Press.

Hoff, J. (2008). *Dreams of Perfectibility: A Faustian Foreign Policy from Woodrow Wilson to George W. Bush*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Holub, Renate. (1992). *Antonio Gramsci: Beyond Marxism and Postmodernism*. London dan New York: Routledge.

Howson, Richard. and Smith, Kylie. (eds.). (2008).*Hegemony Studies in Consensus and Coercion.* New York: Routledge, 51-62

Huber, Mary Taylor and Morreale, Sherwyn P. (eds). (2002). *Disciplinary Styles in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: Exploring Common Ground*. Washington, DC: AAHE and the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning.

Ignatieff, M. (2005). *American Exceptionalism and Human Rights*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Ikenberry, John G. dan Kupchan, Charles A. (1990). The Legitimation of Hegemonic Power, in: Rapkin, David P. (ed.): *World Leadership and Hegemony*. Boulder, Col./London: Lynne Rienner: 49-69.

Jacquemond, Richard (1992). Translation and Cultural Hegemony: The Case of French/Arabic Translation. In: Lawrence Venuti (ed.), Rethinking Translation, Routledge, London: 139-158.

Jiantao, He. (2007).Hurricanes from the South: On the Situations and Reasons of Canadian Americanization since World War2, *Korean Review of Canadian Studies,* South Korea,Volume 13: 39-67.

Guo, Jiemin. (2005). *Cultural Power and Cultural Conflict*. In: http://www.crvp.org/book/Series03/III-20

Jones, Steve. (2006). *Antonio Gramsci*. New York: Routledge.

Joffe, Josef. (2004). *Nations We Love to Hate: Israel, America and the New Antisemitism.* Artikel perkuliahan untuk Pusat Studi Jerman (*the Center for German Studies*) di Ben Gurion University. Dayton: Sicsa.

Joseph, Jonathan. (2002). *Hegemony: A Realist Analysis*. London and New York: Routledge

Kamrath, Angela E. (2013. *The Miracle of America: The Influence of the Bible on the Founding History & Principles of the United States for a People of Every Belief (3rd ed)*. Florida: Xulon Press

Kaplan, R. D. (2003). America and the Tragic Limits of Imperialism. *The Hedgehog Review*: 56–76. Virginia: Institute for Advanced Studies in Culture, University of Virginia.

Kasiyarno. (2014). American Dream: The American Hegemonic Culture and its Itmplications to the World. *Humaniora.* Vol. 26: 13-21

Keohane, R. O., (1984), *After Hegemony*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, N.J.

Kirchberg, V. (2000). The McDonaldization of German Museums. A Discussion of a Postmodern Cultural and Leisure World. *Tourismus-Journal*, 4: 117–144

Kirk. Russell. (1993). *America's British Culture.* New Brunswick, Nj: Transaction Publishers Klare,

Klein, J. T. (2005). Humanities, Culture, and Interdisciplinarity: The Changing American Academy. New York: State University of New York Press, 131-142.

Klein, J. T., and Newell, W. H. (1997). Advancing interdisciplinary studies. Dalam: J. Gaff & J. Ratcliff (Eds.), *Handbook of the undergraduate curriculum: A comprehensive guide to purposes, structures, practices, and change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Koh, Harold Hongju, (2003). On American Exceptionalism. *Faculty Scholarship Series.* Paper 1778.

Kroes, R. (1999). American Empire and Cultural Imperialism: A View from the Receiving End. *Diplomatic History*, Vol. 23 No. 3: 463-477

Layne. (1998). Rethinking American Grand Strategy: Hegemony or Balance of Power in the Twenty First Century? *World Policy Journal*. Vol. 15: no.2: 8-28. California: SAGE Publication,Inc.

Lenin, Vladimir Ilyich. (1917). Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism. Dalam: Henry M. Christman (ed.) *Essential Works of Lenin*, New York: Dover: 177–270.

Litwak, Robert S. (2000). *Rogue States and U.S. Foreign Policy: Containment After the Cold War*. Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson Center Press.

Lohof, B. A. (1978). *Through the Eyes of the World: International Essays in American Studies*. Delhi: The Macmillan Company of India.

Luck, Edward. C. (2003). American Exceptionalism and International Organization: Lessons from the 1990s. Dalam: Foot, R. (eds.). *US Hegemony and International Organizations*. New York: Oxford University Press: 25-48.

Lundestad, G. (1990). The *American "Empire" and Other Studies of US Foreign Policy in a Comparative Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Madsen, D. L. (2010). The West and Manifest Destiny. Dalam: Rowe, J. C. (ed.). *A Concise Companion to American Studies*. West Sussex: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Mann, Michael. (2008). American Empires: Past And Present. *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*. The.FindArticles.com.

Marsella, A.J. (2005). "Hegemonic" Globalization and Cultural Diversity. *Australian Mosaic* Fall, 2005, Issue 11, No. 13: 15-19.

Matsuda, M. and Ohara, K. (2008). Hegemony and the Elaboration of the Process of Subalternity. Dalam: Howson, R. dan Smith, K. (eds.). *Hegemony Studies in Consensus and Coercion.* New York: Routledge, 51-62

Matzner, E. (2002). *Globalisation in a Monopolar World*. http://www.epoc.uni-bremen.de/publications/ pup2002/files2002/ Matzner_Globalisation.pdf

McCrisken, T.B. (2002). Exceptionalism*.* Dalam: DeConde, A., Burns, R. D. dan Logevall, F. (eds.) *Encyclopedia of American Foreign Policy: Studies of the Principal Movements and Ideas*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

McDougall, W. A. (2004).*The Constitutional History of U.S. Foreign Policy: 222 Years of Tension in the Twilight Zone*. Philadelphia: Center for the Study of America and the West at the Foreign Policy Research Institute.

McDowell, T. (1948). *American Studies*. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press.

McKenzie, Mark T. (2005). *Defeating Anti-Americanism*. Report. Pennsylvania: USAWC Strategy Research Project, U.S. Army War College, Carlisle Barracks.

Mead, Water Russel, (2002). *Special Providence: The American Foreign Policy Tradition*. New York: Routledge

Mearsheimer, J. J. (2001). *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. New York: Norton.

Miller, T. (2005). Anti-Americanism and Popular Culture. *Anti-Americanism Working Papers.* Budapest, Hungary: Central European University.

Mills, A. (2013). *American Theology, Superhero Comics, and Cinema: The Marvel of Stan Lee and the Revolution of a Genre*. London: Routledge.

Minderop, A. (2006). *Pragmatisme, Sikap Hidup dan Prinsip Politik Luar Negeri Amerika*. Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia.

Modelski, G. (1987). The Study of Long Cycles. Dalam : Ders. (Ed.), Exploring Long Cycles. Lynne Rienner. *Boulder*: 1-15.

Modelski, G. dan Thompson, W.R. (1996). *Leading Sectors and World Powers: The Coevolution of Global Politics and Economies*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.

Morgenthau, H. J. (1973). *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*. Fourth Edition. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.

Murphy , Patrick D. (2003). Without Ideology? Rethinking Hegemony in the Age of Transnational Media. Dalam: Artz, L. dan Kamalipour, Y. R. (eds.) The Globalization of Corporate Media Hegemony. Albany: State University

Murray, Leonie G. (2008). *Clinton, Peacekeeping, and Humanitarian Intervention: Rise and Fall of a Policy*. New York: Routledge.

Musa, Muhammad (2003), *Hegemoni barat percaturan politik dunia sebuah potret hubungan internasional.* Jakarta: Wahyu Press

Newell, W.H dan Green, W. J. (1982). Defining and Teaching Interdisciplinary Studies. *Improving College and University Teaching*. Vol. 30:1.

Noorani, Yaseen. (2007). Redefining Resistance: Counterhegemony, the Repressive Hypothesis and the Case of Arabic Modernism. Dalam: Chalcraft, J. dan Noorani, Y. (eds.) *Counterhegemony in the Colony and Postcolony*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan™, 75-99.

Nye, Jr. J. S. (2002a). The Paradox of American Power: Why the World's only Superpower can't Go it Alone. New York: Oxford University Press.

Nye, Jr. J. S. (2002b). Limits of American Power. *Political Science Quarterly*. Vol. 117, No. 4: 545-559.

Nye, Jr. J.S. (2007). Culture, Soft Power, and 'Americanization'. Dalam: Held , D., Moore, H.L., dan Young, K. (eds.). *Cultural Politics In A Global Age: Uncertainty, Solidarity and Innovation.* Oxford: Oneworld Publications.

Nye, Jr. J. S. (2008). *The Powers to Lead.* New York: Oxford University Press.

O'Brien, P. K. (2002). 'The Pax Britannica and American Hegemony: Precedent, Antecedent or Just another History?', in O'Brien & Clesse (eds.) *Two hegemonies: Britain 1846-1914 and the United States 1941- 2001*. Aldershot & Burlington: 3-64.

Oha, Obodimma. (2008). Glocalizing Americanness: Language and American Identity in Nigerian Video Films. Dalam:

Glass, W.R. dan Graff, A. (eds.). *The Americanist: American Popular Culture as Import and Export*. Vol. 24. Warsaw University: The American Studies Center.

Oha, O. (2008). Glocalizing Americanness: Language and American Identity in Nigerian Video Films. Dalam: Glass, W.R. dan Graff, A. (eds.). *The Americanist: American Popular Culture as Import and Export*. Vol. 24. Warsaw University: The American Studies Center.

Olsson, J, and Bolton, K. (2010). Mediated America: Americana as Hollywodiana. In: Olsson, J, and Bolton, K. *Media, Popular Culture, and the American Century*. Stockholm: National Library of Sweden.

Parker, M. dan Jary, D. (1995). The McUniversity: Organization, Management and Academic Subjectivity. *Organization.* Vol. 2, No.2: 319-338

Pease, D. (2007). Exceptionalism. Dalam: Burgett, B. dan Glenn Hendler, G. (eds.). *Keywords for American Cultural Studies*. New York: New York University Press, 108-112.

Pedersen, T. (2002). Cooperative Hegemony: Power, Ideas and Institutions in Regional Integration. *Review of International Studies* 28: 677-696.

Petras, James. (1994). Cultural Imperialism in Late 20th Century. *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 29, No.: 2070-2073.

Prestowitz, C. (2003). *Rogue Nation: American Unilateralism and the Failure of Good Intentions*. New York: Basic Books.

Ritzer, George. (1993). *The McDonaldization of Society*. Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press

_____. (2010). The Weberian Theory of Rationalization and the McDonaldization of Contemporary Society. In: Kivisto, Peter J. (ed.) *Illuminating Social Life: Classical*

and Contemporary Theory Revisited. Sage Publications: 41-59

Ritzer, G. dan Stillman, T. (2003). Assessing McDonaldization, Americanization and Globalization. Dalam: Beck, U., Sznaider, N. dan Winter, R. (eds.) *Global America? The Cultural Consequences of Globalization.* Liverpool University Press, Liverpool: 30-48.

Robel, S. (2001). *Hegemonie in den Internationalen Beziehungen: Lehren aus dem Scheitern der 'Theorie Hegemonialer Stabilität'*, Dresdner Arbeitspapiere Internationale Beziehungen, DAP- 2, Dresden

Robinson, D. (1997). *Translation and Empire: Postcolonial Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Robinson, W. I. (2005). Gramsci and Globalisation: From Nation-State to Transnational Hegemony. *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy.* Vol. 8, No. 4, 1–16.

Rojas, C. A. A. (2005). Hegemonic Cultures and Subaltern Cultures: Between Dialogue and Conflict. *Review*, Vol. 28, No. 2: 187-210.

Ross, D. (1991). *The Origins of American Social Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ruggie, John Gerrad (ed.). (1993). *Multilateralism Matters: the Theory and Praxis of an Institutional Form.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Safrin, Sabrina. (2008). The Un-Exceptionalism of U.S. Exceptionalism, Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law. Vol.41: 1307-1354.

Samuel, L. R. (2012).*The American Dream: A Cultural History*. Syracuse, NY, Syracuse University Press.

Sánchez, P. M. (2007). *Panama Lost? US Hegemony, Democracy, and the Canal*. Gainesville, Florida: University Press of Florida.

Sardar, Z. dan Davies, M. W., (2004). *Why Do People Hate America?* Cambridge: Icon Books Ltd.

Schauer, F. (2005). The Exceptional First Amendment. Dalam: Ignatieff, M. 2005. *American Exceptionalism and Human Rights*. Princeton, New Jersey: 29-56

Schiller, Herbert I. (1976). *Communication and Cultural Domination*. New York:: M E Sharpe Inc

Shryock, R. H. dkk. (1950). A Statement by the Committee on American Civilization of the American Council of Learned Societies. *American Quarterly*. Vol. 2.

Snow, Nancy. (2009). Rethinking Public Diplomacy. Dalam: Snow, N. dan Taylor, P.M. *Routledge Handbook of Public Diplomacy.* New York: Routledge

Snidal, D. (1985). The Limits of Hegemonic Stability Theory. *International Organization*, 39: 579-614.

Soderberg, N. (2005). The *Superpower Myth: the Use and Misuse of American Might*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc, Hoboken.

Stead, W. T. (1902). *The Americanisation of the World or the Trend of the Twentieth Century*. London: The "Review of Reviews" Office, Mowbray House, Norfolk Street.

Tomlinson, J. (1991). *Cultural Imperialism: A Critical Introduction*. London: Pinter.

Totman, Sally-Ann. (2009). *How Hollywood Projects Foreign Policy*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Uzgel, I. (2003). Hegemonic Power Box (Hegemon Güç Kutusu), (Ed. Baskın Oran), Türk Dıs Politikası,Cilt I, Iletisim Yayınları, Istanbul., dikutip dari Yilmaz, S. 2010. State,

Power, and Hegemony. *International Journal of Business and Social Science,* Vol. 1 No. 3: 192-205.

Van Elteren, Mel. (2006). *Americanism and Americanization*. Jefferson: McFarland and Co.

Walker, Samuel. (1994). *Hate Speech: The History of an American Controversy*. Lincoln, dan London: University of Nebraska Press

Wallerstein, I. (2002.) 'Three hegemonies', dalam O'Brien, P. K. & Clesse, A. (eds.). *Two hegemonies: Britain 1846-1914 and the United States 1941-2001.* Aldershot & Burlington: Asgate.

Waltz, Kenneh. N. (1979). *Theory of International Politics*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing.

Warnock, J. W. (2008). *Creating a Failed State, the US and Canada in Afghanistan*, Black Point: Fernwood Pub. Co

Weber, M. (1958). The Three Types of legitimate Rule. Berkeley Publications in Society and Institutions, 4 (1): 1-11

Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. 2 Vols. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Wenders, W. (1991). *The Logic of Images: Essays and Conversations* , terj. Michael Hofmann. London: Faber and Faber Limited.

West, C. R. (1982). *Prophecy Deliverance!* Philadelphia:Westminster Press.

Williams, W. A. (1955). The Frontier Thesis and American Foreign Policy. *Pasific Historical Review*. Vol. 24, No. 4: 379-395.

Winckler, M. (2003). *Super Héros*, Paris: E.P.A.

Wood, Mark D. (2001). Religions Studies as Critical Organic Intellectual Practice. *Journal of the American Academy*

of Religion. Vol 69, No. 1: 129-162. Atlanta: The American Academy of Religion.

Xia, Gung. (2003). Review Essay: Globalization at Odds with Americanization. *Current Sociology*. Volume 51, Issue 6. https://doi.org/10.1177/00113921030516010

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Dr. Kasiyarno, MHum is an observer of the cultural hegemony of the United States as well as a practitioner in the world of education. His career in education began as a teacher at SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Yogyakarta to a senior lecturer at Ahmad Dahlan University (UAD). His love for the world brought him to the position of Rector of Ahmad Dahlan University for three periods (from 2007-2019).

In the academic field, he completed his undergraduate program at the Yogyakarta State IKIP (now Yogyakarta State University (1982), his master's and doctoral programs at the Postgraduate Faculty of Cultural Sciences (FIB) UGM in the American Studies Study Program, in 1995 and 2013, respectively, and briefly took the Sandwich program at Northern Illinois University in 2010.

As a lecturer, the author teaches courses on Cross Culture Understanding and American Society Institutions in the English Literature Study Program (S1) at the Faculty of Culture and Communication, as well as courses in Theories of Culture and Culture and English Language Teaching in the Program Postgraduate English Education Studies (S2) FKIP UAD.