

## Cultural Amity: A Strategic Vision for ROK-US Alliance<sup>1</sup>

*Amity, from the Latin, amicus, friend, friendly. Friendship and goodwill especially as characterized by mutual acceptance and toleration of potentially antagonistic standpoints or aim (so the two women kept up an elaborate pretense of warm amity); specifically: friendly relations between large groups (nations striving for lasting amity).<sup>2</sup>*

*The North Korean Threat. U.S. intelligence agencies believe that [in 2004] North Korea has “one, possibly two” nuclear weapons. It agreed to freeze its nuclear weapons program in a 1994 deal with the United States but is now preparing to resume those activities. If unchecked, experts say, North Korea could produce five to seven nuclear bombs this year—and eight to 10 by the end of 2005—enough to alter the strategic balance in East Asia. North Korea is probably capable of deploying nuclear or chemical warheads on ballistic missiles able to strike South Korea and Japan, and it has worked on the Taepo Dong-2 missile, which has an estimated range that could include Alaska.<sup>3</sup>*

For decades there has been a persistent threat of war from North Korea. When the DPRK achieves the technological ability to place a nuclear warhead on its new missile the new, young dictator of North Korea, Kim Jung-Un, will have the ability to destroy Seoul, South Korea and Tokyo, Japan, fulfilling the threat made at U.N. Alone, neither South Korea nor Japan possesses the ability to guarantee the security of its people.<sup>4</sup> Only the military power of the United States can guarantee their national security, and the sustainment and commitment of that military power, is at least in part, a function of *cultural amity*.

Let me give you an argument: *cultural amity* is a critical element in the national security of nation-states. This argument is particularly true of smaller nation-states dependent upon the military power of larger, more powerful nation-states for their security.<sup>5</sup> The nation-state of Israel has created genuine affection, genuine concern, a very real *cultural amity* for itself in the hearts of many Americans. And, this amity, to large degree, guarantees the security and prosperity of the state of Israel. Cultural amity gives Israel the ability to influence decision-making in

---

<sup>1</sup> Professor Adrian R Lewis and I coauthored this paper. A few years ago, Professor Lewis wrote a part of this paper on the Foreign Policy Tom Rick's Blog website. Please do not cite this paper. The updated paper will be published soon.

<sup>2</sup> Philip Babcock Gove, edited, *Webster's Third New International Dictionary on the English Language Unabridged* (Springfield, Massachusetts: G. & C. Merriam Company, 1971), 70.

<sup>3</sup> Published in *U.S. News and World Report* in 2004.

<sup>4</sup> See, Tom Miles, “North Korea Threatens ‘final destruction’ of South Korea in UN debate,” Reuters, [http://worldnews.nbcnews.com/\\_new/2013/02/19/17016501-north-ko...](http://worldnews.nbcnews.com/_new/2013/02/19/17016501-north-ko...)

<sup>5</sup> The state is a political entity. The nation is a cultural entity. The modern nation-state is characterized by the legitimate authority and bureaucratic organization of states, and the cultural cohesion and nationalism of the nation. Together they still form the most powerful means for the organization of human beings on Earth.

Washington. It gives Israel the ability to acquire resources and guarantees. The American people have been extraordinarily generous to the state of Israel.<sup>6</sup> Few nations in the history have been as generous to a foreign state, thousands of miles from its geographic borders. *Cultural Amity* facilitates the Israeli acquisition of billions of dollars in economic and military assistance from the United States annually. It ties the American people, the *nation*, to the Israeli *state* in significant ways, ways which matter and produce real American resources for Israel. Other, small, democratic nation-states in tough neighborhoods, such as, South Korea, Japan, Taiwan, and the Philippines should learn from the Israeli example.<sup>7</sup>

During the election in 2012, I watched a reporter talking to a woman at the Republican National Convention on national television. The woman, a Democrat, had voted for Obama in 2008. When asked why she was supporting Mitt Romney, the Republican candidate, she said, because of Obama's treatment of Israel. She noted that the President had not visited Israel, and she believed that he had been too hard on the Prime Minister of Israel, Benjamin Netanyahu, by not meeting with him in New York City during a recent session of the United Nations. Because the President appeared on a popular television show, but not with the Israeli Prime Minister he received considerable criticism from conservative talk-show hosts. The reporter asked her: "are you Jewish?" She said, "No." He then asked her, "have you been to Israel?" Again she said, "No." He then asked her why Israel was so important to her. She seemed confused, and admitted she had no significant attachments to Israel through personal experiences or relationships. Yet, she was committed to Israel. What was the source of her concern for Israel, her amity and affection for a state she had never seen, and probably could not identify on a map? What was clear was that her concerns, her attachments to the *State of Israel*, were genuine. She was not attached to the people of Israel. She did not know any Israelis. Her amity, her attachments were to the State of Israel, an idea and possibly an ideal. This young lady, who looked to be in her twenties, could not articulate the sources of her amity, but that did not diminish it. She cared about the security of the state of Israel, and was willing to commit the resources of the United States, American treasure and lives to maintain the security of the state she had never seen.<sup>8</sup> Why?

This woman is not unique. Millions of Americans feel exactly the same as she does. But they too cannot articulate why they feel the way they do. How is such amity created? We can point to

---

<sup>6</sup> The American Israel Public Affairs Committee website highlights American giving to the state of Israel. For example on 12/18/2006 it was noted that: "**Securing Critical Foreign Aid to Israel**, totaling \$2.52 billion this year in military and economic assistance. **Obtaining \$9 billion in Loan Guarantees** for Israel to offset the economic crisis brought on by the global recession and Palestinian terrorist war. **Increasing Military Aid to Israel by \$1 Billion** in grants to help cover the escalating costs of the war on terrorism," and much more. [http://www.aipac.org/recently\\_Achived.cfm](http://www.aipac.org/recently_Achived.cfm).

<sup>7</sup> Other small non-democratic states in tough neighborhoods, such as Kuwait, Qatar, and the United Arab Emirates can also learn from the Israeli example.

<sup>8</sup> It should be noted that most Americans have no obligation to defend their own nation. Less than 1 percent of the American people serve in the Armed Forces of the United States. Most Americans have little or no idea of what they do, the commitments and sacrifices they make. They well understand they have the most powerful military on Earth, but since it costs them nothing when it is committed to war, it is easier for them to support war.

many factors that contribute to the *American cultural amity*, American affection for the *state* of Israel. Consider the following:

1. There are over 7 million American Jews in the United States, who are all considered citizens of Israel. They exert considerable influence on the American media, film industry, Congress, and numerous other key American institutions. For example, opinion leaders, such as, Mortimer B. Zuckerman, the long-term Editor-in-Chief of *U.S. New & World Report*, in his weekly editorials regularly championed the cause of Israel. The mayor of New York City, Michael Bloomberg, is an American opinion leader who is regularly seen on national television and is also a staunch supporter of Israel. Senator Joseph Lieberman of Connecticut and many other prominent Jewish Americans influence Americans attitude towards and opinions of Israel.
2. The Jewish lobbies, particularly AIPAC (American Israel Public Affairs Committee), work tenaciously to influence American public opinion and influence Congress.<sup>9</sup> It is well funded and considered by many to be the most effective lobby in America. In March 2013 AIPAC held its annual conference in Washington DC. The title of an article published online read: “Take a Look Inside AIPAC’s Massive Lobbying Machine.”<sup>10</sup> A photo of the opening ceremony showed the Vice President of the United States, Joe Biden, embracing Israel Defense Minister Ehud Barak. It is indeed a massive and effective lobbying organization. Former President Bill Clinton noted that the Congress of the United States is the most pro-Israel legislative body in the world. It is very generous to the Israel, and AIPAC is very generous to them.
3. Religion is also a factor. Many Christians believe that the reestablishment of the Jewish State in the Holy Lands of the Middle East is a sign of the second coming of Christ. Southern Baptist and other religious communities emphatically embrace this belief. Televised religious leaders embrace and promulgate this belief, which enhances American support the Jewish State. The word “Israel” is spoken again and again every Sunday morning in churches across America. It is not difficult for Americans to draw connections from the biblical “Israel” to the new state of Israel. While Jews, according Christian beliefs, will not see Heaven, because they have not accepted Jesus Christ as their savior, many American have formed a cultural amity for the state of Israel because of their religious beliefs.
4. Images and words, history and the media, keep the Holocaust present in American minds. The National Holocaust Museum, and its many activities; major films, such as

---

<sup>9</sup> See John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen M. Walt, *The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2007). This book has been very controversial in its claims on causes of the second war in Iraq; however, it is an excellent source of information on AIPAC. Alan Dershowitz, Harvard Law School, responded to Mearsheimer and Walt in a paper titled “Debunking the Newest—and Oldest—Jewish Conspiracy: A Reply to the Mearsheimer-Walt “Working Paper.” David Gergen, Editor-at-Large of *U.S. New & World Report*, also responded to Mearsheimer and Walt is an editorial titled, “An Unfair Attack” (*U.S. News & World Report*, April 3, 2006, 68).

<sup>10</sup> David Weigel, “Take a Look Inside AIPAC’s Massive Lobbying Machine,” March 4, 2013, [www.slate.com/articles/news\\_and\\_politics/politics/2013/03/aipa...](http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/politics/2013/03/aipa...)

*Schindler's List*; significant books, such as Christopher Browning's *Ordinary Men*, and Daniel Goldhagen's *Hitler's Willing Executioners*, insure that Americans never forget the Holocaust in Europe. More recent holocausts, genocide, in other parts of the world—Cambodia and Africa, for example—fail to sustain the attention of the American people. They are not constantly renewed in the minds of Americans; and hence, fade with memory.

5. Jewish study programs, professorships, and libraries at colleges and universities across the United States educate young Americans on Jewish history, the Holocaust, Zionism, the founding of Israel, and Israeli national security problems.
6. Israel has a well-developed information campaign designed to educate Americans on issues important to Israel. The campaign insures that Israel receive significant prime-time television, radio, and magazine coverage. On the cover of the May 28, 2012 issue of *Time Magazine* the Prime Minister of Israel, Benjamin Netanyahu, was featured with the captions, "King BIBI." On 17 February 2013 the popular TV news magazine *60 Minutes* featured the Israeli Irondome antimissile, missile system. On 29 January 2013 the Israeli Ambassador, Michael Oren, gave the prestigious Landon Lecture at Kansas State University. His words were later carried over National Public Radio. Issues important to Israel regularly receive significant news coverage in the American media. This is not by chance or accident.
7. Commerce and trade promote cultural exchange between the two countries. Trade, business interactions and relationships, technology exchanges and thousands of other relationships that are a function of economic activity insure a high degree of traffic between the two countries. During the Landon lecture the Israeli Ambassador noted that trade between the U.S. and Israel was up 300 percent in the last twenty years. These interactions keep Israel's security problems front and center in the United States.
8. American military technologies and equipment provided to Israel for almost nothing helps to maintain a significant military exchange. The Obama Administration deployed a small number of U.S. forces to Israel to help with missile defenses. The Pentagon funds weapons development in Israel. The Israelis fly jets and helicopters made in America.
9. American enmity towards Arabs and the Muslim world, the civilization and culture that created Saddam Hussein and Osama Bin Laden, the man most responsible for the worse attack on American soil in history, creates an "enemy of my enemy, is my friend disposition" in the United States. The terrorist attacks on 9/11 also gave Americans common cause with Israel. Now both nations were fighting Islamic extremists and Middle East terrorism, both nations were now, so to speak, "in the same boat."<sup>11</sup> Consider the words of Rousseau: "But when the strength of an expansive soul makes me identify myself with my fellow, and I feel that I am, so to speak, in him, it is in order not to suffer that I do not want him to suffer. I am interested in him for love of myself, and the reason for the precept is

---

<sup>11</sup> Arguably the terrorist attacks on 9/11 created *empathy* between Israelis and Americans. There is no intimacy in the relationship, very little real, physical contact. Still, Americans were now put into the position of Israelis, threaten from the same sources.

nature itself, which inspires in me the desire of my well-being in whatever place I feel my existence.”<sup>12</sup> Rousseau recognized the human ability to empathize: the ability to see one’s own identity in the eyes of another. Empathy can be artificially produced, and used to secure aid and assistance. In fact, the American and Israeli situations are quite different. We are not in the same boat.

10. Conservative and neoconservative think-tanks and organizations such as FLAME (Facts and Logic About the Middle East) and the Project for a New American Century, insure that the Israeli perspective is advanced and defended.<sup>13</sup>
11. The underdog status of Israel, the David and Goliath story, respect for what this little nation has accomplished, all feed into American cultural narratives to the benefit of Israel.
12. Finally, “imitation is the sincerest form of flattery.” Israelis look like us, like white America. Israelis imitate Americans. Downtown Tel Aviv looks like downtown Seattle or Boston or Baltimore or Dallas. You will find the same big named hotels, the same iconic names in stores and shops. You will find MacDonal’d’s, Starbucks, Kentucky Fried Chicken, and other major American institutions. Israel is often called the 51<sup>st</sup> State. If we got rid of the thousands of miles of ocean Americans could cross from their home state into Israel almost as easily as they would go from Oklahoma into Texas. While Hebrew is the national language, a great many Israelis speak American English. Israelis look like us, helping to establish and maintain cultural affinity. While few Americans have travelled to Israel, the images they see of the country, on television and in other media, look like what Americans would expect to see here at home in the U.S. Americans can thus elevate Israel to almost American status, and thereby, identify with Israel. This is an enormously important factor in creating cultural amity. People love themselves, and more easily love those who look like them.

The cumulative and aggregate effect of all these varied actions and interactions was the development and sustainment of a form of *cultural amity* in many Americans, evident in the woman noted above.<sup>14</sup> Cultural amity creates influence: the stronger the cultural amity, the greater the ability to influence. Cultural amity makes it possible for foreign governments to put

---

<sup>12</sup> Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Emile or On Education*, translated by Allan Bloom (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1979). 221, 235. Also see the work on *empathy* of Neuroscientist Jean Decety of the University of Chicago.

<sup>13</sup> FIAME typically publishes one page essays in publications such as *U.S. News & World Report* (which is now published exclusively online), explaining and advancing the Israeli positions and perspectives. Essays with titles such as: “Arabian Fables (II): More fanciful Arab myths to sway world opinion,” “The Big Lie (II): What about those Arab ‘refugees’?”, and “The Forgotten Refugees: Why does nobody care about the Jewish refugees from Arab lands?” *U.S. News & World Report* (June 7, 2004, p. 61), (June 5, 2006, p 47), and (March 19, 2007, p. 63) respectively. See: [www.factsandlogic.org](http://www.factsandlogic.org).

<sup>14</sup> It should be noted that many nation-states pursue similar activities in the United States. None are as focused, pervasive, systematic, and effective as the Israelis. It should also be noted that these activities create the opposite effect in some Americans. They create a backlash, a belief that their country is being exploited and manipulated by a foreign power. Of course, such exploitation is, and has been, a norm of international relations since the days of the ancient Greek city-states. Read Thucydides, *The Peloponnesian War*, edited Robert B. Strassler (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996).

political pressure on the President and Congress of the United States. This cultural amity, in the case of Israel, is not because of any affinity for the Israeli people, people Americans don't know. It is for the state of Israel, which most Americans cannot find on a map. Now, is all this created *cultural amity* a function of natural processes, a function of the natural evolution of relationships, or some other processes?

Americans have *cultural amity* for a number of nation-states. We have a cultural amity for the British people that was naturally formed. It is a function of hundreds of years of intimate history, of cultural interaction, of fighting each other, and fighting and dying together in the most traumatic event in the twentieth century, World War II. It is a function of always showing up for one another, war after war, even in unnecessary wars—such as Operation Iraqi Freedom. It is a function of James Bond, Harry Potter, Sherlock Holmes, and an almost common language. It is a function of BP (British Petroleum), where many Americans fuel their cars, and numerous other business relations. Americans have some degree of cultural amity for the German people too, our World War II enemy.<sup>15</sup> It is in part a function of a half of century of occupation and later the invitation to 250,000 American soldiers and their families, who were stationed in Germany for 2 to 3 years periods each.<sup>16</sup> Millions of Americans have served in Germany forming intimate relations with the German people. This includes significant numbers of marriages. It is also a function of respect and admiration for Germans culture, for Mozart and Beethoven, Kant and Hegel; for the Germany military thought, achievements, and leaders, Clausewitz, Manstein, and Rommel; for German science and technology, the V-2 rocket, the first true guided missile and the forerunner of the American space program, and jet aircraft; for German engineering and products, Mercedes, Porsches, and BMWs, prestigious automobiles Americans love to drive. The American people have no such intimate history with the Israeli people or state, which was not formed until 1948. How then was this *cultural amity* produced?

Some of it is naturally occurring, arguably in much the same way that globalization is taking place, but in reverse. The internets, social media, cell phones, television, and other forms of mass communication insure that the world is becoming more and more interconnected in significant ways. However, without a doubt Israeli foreign policy and lobbies target the American people to make sure they have and maintain a positive impression of the tiny Jewish state of Israel.

Let me argue that in regard to the security of Israel, Jews in Israel and America are probably the most motivated people on Earth. The Holocaust is never far from their minds. It is always there, and at times it is evident. Consider the words of Avner Cohen, written in his book, *Israel and the Bomb*:

---

<sup>15</sup> The term, “some,” as used in this sentence is imprecise and unsatisfactory. An accurate measure of the *cultural amity* is beyond the scope of this paper. Perhaps Political Scientist will one day develop a statistical means to measure cultural amity; however, I think it is safe to say that Americans have greater *cultural amity* for the British people than any other people on Earth. And, just as there is *cultural amity*, there is *cultural enmity*. In the case of Germany both amity and enmity are at work. The name “Hitler” still brings to mind war and racism.

<sup>16</sup> This figure represents the high point in U.S. forces in Germany. The actually number varied between 180,000 to 252,000 throughout the Cold War; however, this figure does not include family members.

Ben Gurion's vision of an Israel secured against existential threats has now been realized. Though nuclear weapons have not been officially acknowledged, they have greatly contributed to Israel's image as the strongest nation in the Middle East. The Jews of Israel will never be like the Jews in the Holocaust. Israel will be able to visit terrible retribution on those who would attempt its destruction.<sup>17</sup>

When the security of Israel comes into question, the Holocaust comes out. The refrain, "Never again," is spoken in silence and sometimes out-loud. I had a one-time friend, a Jewish professor, get very angry at me. The intensity of his emotion caught me by surprise. I had said to him that American expenditures for the defense of Israel were too high. This observation caused his ire and an emotional outburst. He said to me in essence that no amount of American money was enough when it came to the security of Israel. He went further and said, "That if there was a God, I hate the fucker" for what happened to Jews in Europe during World War II. Such emotions and feeling are hard to deal with in a rational, calm manner. However, it occurred to me that these intense feeling were not unique. The discussion ended, but I never forgot it, and ultimately concluded that other Jews, American and Israeli, must share many of these same attitudes, emotions, and opinions with possibly the same level intensity.

Israel is geographically situated in a tough neighborhood. The long chain of Arab-Israeli Wars creates passions and anger that motivate behavior. While there is a natural process at work, the creation of *cultural amity* in the United States is intentional, but it is not simply a function of Israeli foreign policy and lobbies. It is a function of a history and memories of pain and suffering, death and destruction. It is a function of a system and set of beliefs about human nature and how the world works that was informed by the Destruction of the European Jews in World War II. A high degree of cultural amity for Israel, gives the Prime Minister of Israel and other Israel leaders the ability to influence decision-making in Washington, in both the White House and the Congress. Cultural amity results in the allocation of real resource, national treasure and even American lives. This is no small matter.

Can other nations learn from Israel? Can other nations adopt the Israeli model and strategy of creating *cultural amity*? Yes and No. Nation-states such as South Korea, Taiwan, and to a lesser extent Japan can and ought to adopt aspects of the Israel model to create *cultural amity* for their country in the United States. They ought to have an equivalence to AIPAC, operating in the United States to advance their interests. Cultural amity should be an essential part of their foreign policy. While the intensity and passion of the world-wide Jewish community probably cannot be matched, their strategies and methods can be adapted to the particular situation and needs of each nation-state. If other nation-states adopted the practices and strategy of Israel it would create greater balance in Washington.

---

<sup>17</sup> Avner Cohen, *Israel and the Bomb* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998), 342.

South Korea, like Israel, is in a tough, tough neighborhood. With the expanding economic and military power of the People's Republic of China, with its undemocratic, communist government, with its objective of securing the resources of the East and South China Seas, and with the unstable regime of Kim Jong-Un next door in North Korea, threatening the "final destruction" of South Korea, the ROK needs the amity of the American people to guarantee its national security more so than any other nation-state on Earth.<sup>18</sup> *Cultural amity helps to secure the military power necessary to guarantee the survival of the state.* It makes America's commitment clear to all.<sup>19</sup> The Armed Forces of the ROK, alone, absolutely cannot guarantee the survival of the South Korea. Arguably South Vietnam ceased to exist when it lost the amity of the American people. To be sure, there are many explanations and arguments on the causes of American defeat in Vietnam, but many of them center on the loss of the will of the American people to continue to fight the war for the security of the Vietnamese people.<sup>20</sup> The strategy of Vietnamization adopted by the Nixon Administration in 1969, was the implementation of the will of the American people. International agreements and commitments that do not have the support of the American people are more easily broken and discarded by political leaders seeking to do what is expedient to achieve their immediate political objectives and reelection.

Arguably cultural amity is more difficult to develop and sustain for non-Western cultures, such as, Korean and Japanese cultures. However, many of the necessary elements, significant relationships, trade, cultural exchanges, respect, similar systems of values and ethics, commitment to a particular way of life, commitment to democracy, and common security concerns are already prevalent. They simply need to be focused and advanced for the purposes of national security. When the government of South Korea considers its national security policies, "Gangnam Style" ought to be a consideration.<sup>21</sup> How can we leverage this cultural Icon, which received 834,000,000 hits on YouTube, to create and sustain *culture amity* in the United States, and thereby enhance the security of South Korea?<sup>22</sup> When the government of South Korea considers its national security policies, the strength of Korean companies doing business in the United States, selling products to Americans, ought to be a consideration. How can we leverage

---

<sup>18</sup> North Korea already has nuclear weapons. Dictators and nuclear weapons are an extremely dangerous combination.

<sup>19</sup> The failure to make clear American military commitments has in recent history led to war. The Korean War and the first Persian Gulf War were both, in part, a function of the failure of the United States to make clear it would defend these distant lands with military forces if necessary.

<sup>20</sup> The Armed Forces of the United States were not defeated in Vietnam. The "center of gravity" in the Vietnam War was not in Vietnam. It was in the United States. For a brief study on the historiography of the Vietnam War see: Marc Jason Gilbert, edited, *Why the North Won the Vietnam War* (New York: Palgrave, 2002). Also see: Adrian R. Lewis, *The American Culture of War*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (New York: Routledge, 2012).

<sup>21</sup> On December 10, 2012 *Time Magazine* reported that the "Gangnam Style" video clip had received 834,000,000 viewing on YouTube (see page 54). *Time's* report stated, "YouTube hits for Psy's "Gangnam Style," which is now the platform's most watched video clip; Justin Bieber's "Baby," with 806 million hits, has been relegated to runner-up."

<sup>22</sup> The internet and social media, such as YouTube, are strong tools, strong weapon systems, for exporting culture and advancing cultural amity. It ought to be fully exploited by small nations seeking to enhance their security through the power of more powerful nations.

the popularity of Korean cars, Hyundai, and cell phones, Samsung, to enhance cultural amity and, as a consequence, national security? If the government of South Korea is not asking these questions, if it is not working to create, sustain, and build *cultural amity*, it is failing its people. Following the recent North Korean nuclear test an article was published in *Foreign Policy* titled, "Few Korea hands on the U.S administration's Asia leadership team."<sup>23</sup> South Korea has not insured that its interests are represented in the U.S Administration. And this is a mistake.

North Korea's nuclear weapons program is a greater threat to peace and stability than the Iranian program. Yet, the policies of the U.S Administration toward Iran are much more certain and aggressive than those towards North Korea. The Israeli government has worked tenacious and effectively to develop an affirmative American policy and military strategy for dealing with Iran and its nuclear weapon program. President Obama had stated again and again that Iran will *not* be permitted to develop a nuclear weapon. These pronouncements were in large part a function of Israeli pressure. North Korea already has nuclear weapons, and is moving aggressively to miniaturize its weapon into a warhead that can be placed on its missile. The ruling parties in Iran, political and religious, have proven again and again to be rational actors. They occasion excite the West and Israel with their aggressive pronouncements, but then they act with prudence. We do not yet know whether Kim Jung-Un is a rational actor. We do not even know if he is actually in charge, or if he is acting in a bellicose manner to establish his authority and credentials among the ruling elite of North Korea. Our lack of knowledge, the existence of nuclear weapons, and its geographic proximity to Seoul and Tokyo makes North Korea the more dangerous state. Uncertainty is dangerous. And, the Obama Administration, at least publically, had done almost nothing to make the threat of American power real to the rulers of North Korea.<sup>24</sup> In fact, the haggling over the federal budget between the President and the Congress, particularly the Department of Defense budget, has made the American threat less credible to bad actors.<sup>25</sup> The less credible the American threat, the more likely bad actors, foreign aggressors will make mistakes that might lead to war. We have seen this again and again.<sup>26</sup>

The political leaders of South Korea have to be more aggressive in making their argument to the U.S Administration and the American people. This is a matter of national security. They need to

---

<sup>23</sup> Josh Rogin, "Few Korea hands on Obama administration's Asia leadership team," *Foreign Policy*, Tuesday, February 12, 2013. In the posting it was noted that: "There are no people who work Korea at the top levels of the policy team," senior Washington Asia hand told *The Cable*. "They've been in the driver's seat, but they don't know where they are going." See:

[thecable.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2013/02/12/few\\_korea\\_hands\\_in\\_obama\\_administration\\_s\\_asia\\_leadership\\_team](http://thecable.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2013/02/12/few_korea_hands_in_obama_administration_s_asia_leadership_team).

<sup>24</sup> The Obama Administration has appealed to China to use its influence with the DPRK; however, this appeal did not stop the recent nuclear test. Deference to China is influencing the Obama Administration.

<sup>25</sup> In February 2013, the Secretary of Defense made the decision to park the *USS Truman*, Aircraft carrier strike group, because of budget concerns. This decision sent the wrong signals to Tehran and Pyongyang.

<sup>26</sup> The first Korean War initiated by Kim Il Sung in June 1950, with the approval of Stalin and Mao Zedong, was in part a function of the failure of the Truman Administration to state publically that the United States would defend South Korea. In fact, the Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, told the world the U.S. would *not* defend South Korea. This lack of precision in thinking, strategy, and language caused war. The U.S Administration today lacks clarity in its dealings with North Korea.

recognize and understand the significance of *cultural amity*. South Korea should leverage the strength of Korean companies and products, such as, Samsung,—a company most Americans believe is Japanese—LG, and Hyundai to create cultural amity.<sup>27</sup> Korean companies should emphasize the quality of Korean engineering, the way Germans celebrate the quality of “German engineering” in every television commercial for BMWs, VWs, and Mercedes.<sup>28</sup> The Korean government should leverage the goodwill, prosperity, and achievements of the Korean Americans to enhance its cultural amity. It should harness the Korean War the way Jews in America harness the Holocaust to create cultural amity.<sup>29</sup> It should create and lavishly support an American Korean Political Affairs Committee that employs methods similar to those used by AIPAC. It should seek clout similar to that of AIPAC in the U.S. Congress. The South Korea government should develop a comprehensive information campaign designed to educate Americans on the security problems facing its small democracy.<sup>30</sup> The governments of South Korea and Japan should form a strategic alliance with the objective of guaranteeing national security through cultural amity with the American people. The President of South Korea and Prime Minister of Japan ought to seek to address the U.S. Congress, to present their case directly to the American people—in the same way the Prime Minister of Israel did during the U.S. Administration. Their diplomats ought to be on the Sunday morning talk shows, Meet the Press, Face the Nation, and other such programs, frequently making their argument.

Such a strategy would do more to enhance and guarantee the security of South Korean and Japan than all the F-15s and other military hardware the government of South Korean and Japan can buy from the United States. In fact, *cultural amity* ought to be considered as significant a part of South Korean national security strategy as airpower or intelligence. The Japanese too ought to consider cultural amity an essential part of its national security strategy. Both nation-states should work together to enhance their national security through achieving a high degree of cultural amity. Americans should ultimately come to view the survival of the Korean and Japanese capitalist, democracies as critical to the survival of the American capitalist, democracy.<sup>31</sup> As the power of China continues to grow, so will its ability to threaten, to make

---

<sup>27</sup> The only Korean company doing business in the United States that emphasizes its Korean origins is Korean Airline. Other Korean companies have sought to down play their Korean origins in order to exploit the reputation for product quality Americans associate with Japanese goods.

<sup>28</sup> Korean Companies initially benefitted from the American inability to disassociate Korean products from Japanese products. The quality automatically attributed to Japanese products was projected on to Korean products, improving the bottom line of Korean companies. However, this little subterfuge is no longer necessary. Korean products have developed a significant reputation for quality, and can stand on their own.

<sup>29</sup> The Korean War and the Holocaust are not similar events; however, they were both a function of total war. For Koreans the Korean War was a total war. The war devastated the country. The Korean people suffered greatly. The passions, emotions, and anger from the war, have for the most part left the current generation of Koreans. Still, the Korean War in American memory should not be the “Forgotten War,” nor should it be a sitcom, such as the long-running television show, “MASH.” While this sitcom dealt with the Korean War and American soldiers with dignity, the Korean War in the American mind should have greater significance. It should mean more than this.

<sup>30</sup> It is noteworthy that the PRC has a nascent information campaign operating in the United States. CCTV regularly introduces Americans to the Chinese side of the story, advances Chinese interests, and shows the PRC in a positive light.

greater demands on the region. This behavior is already evident. The most consistent lesson of history and international relations is that: *power in existence has to be balanced*. *Cultural amity* can help small nations achieve the necessary *balance of power*, without bankruptcy, without becoming a police state, and without surrendering sovereignty. Korea and Japan have options. They can either draw closer to the United States, seek security guarantees and affirmation of those guarantees in the same that Israel does, or they can start to rearm, and to build their own nuclear weapons arsenals at great cost, sacrifice, and risk. If they seek the first option *cultural amity* is vital.<sup>32</sup>

South Korea and Israel are both distant nations, far from the borders of the United States. Both have neighbors who have nuclear ambitions, Iran and North Korea. Both have been publically threatened with destruction. And both will be extremely vulnerable if these states acquire nuclear capabilities with the necessary delivery systems. Both know that only the Armed Forces of the United States can manage and/or eliminate these threats, and the situation on the Korean peninsula is much more dangerous because North Korea has nuclear weapons and a new, unstable government. Yet, only one of these nation-states has an aggressive, focused information campaign designed to educate and influence the American people and pressure the President and Congress to act.<sup>33</sup> The government of South Korea is *not* doing all it can to guarantee the commitment of the American people to the security of the people of South Korea. Ultimately national security is about people. It is about relationships, and what one people are willing to do for another. The quality and character of these relationships matter. To make the commitment of American Armed Forces real to the peoples of South Korea, or Israel, or Japan, *cultural amity* is necessary. Peoples and governments dependent upon the Armed Forces of the United States to maintain their security should not rely *just* upon treaties, international agreements, and laws, and the current occupant of the White House to protect their interests. They should also rely on their relationship with the American people. To maintain the commitment of the American people to the security of these distant nation-states, *cultural amity is absolutely necessary*.

---

<sup>31</sup> In World War II, President Roosevelt prior to the Japanese attack at Pearl Harbor recognized that the survival of Britain was essential to the survival of the United States. This was evident in the Atlantic Charter, signed and promulgated, months before December 7, 1941. Roosevelt later accepted Churchill's conclusion that the survival of France as a capitalist, democracy was essential to survival of both Britain and the United States, and later still that the survival of Germany as a capitalist, democracy was essential to the survival of France, Britain, and the U.S.

<sup>32</sup> Korea and Japan need an "Atlantic Charter," the agreement between Churchill and Roosevelt that committed the United States to war against Nazi Germany. This agreement and statement of "national policies" was promulgated on August 12, 1941, before the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. It read in part as follows: "Sixth, after the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny they hope to see established a peace which will afford all nations the means to dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want." Roosevelt committed the United States to war against Germany without an act of Congress. Churchill later wrote: "The fact alone of the United States, still technically neutral, joining with a belligerent Power in making such a declaration was astonishing." Korea and Japan need "astonishing" American commitments. Something they have not received from the Obama Administration.

<sup>33</sup> Without doubt South Korea has to be concerned about earning the ire of the PRC; however, at this point the attitude and disposition of China is clearly a secondary issue.

What is clear is that the Korean and Japanese governments need to put considerably more pressure on the U.S Administration, which to this date has sent all the wrong signals to the PRC and North Korea. By relying on drones to fight our enemy, by parking the *USS Truman* because budgetary constraints, by not reinforcing U.S. and ROK forces in South Korea in the face of a nuclear threat from North Korea, by taking a neutral stance in the Japanese dispute with the PRC over islands and sea control, by drawing down an Army that has worldwide commitments and has proven time-and-again to be too small, by slowing the maintenance of the *USS Abraham Lincoln* and other warships, the U.S Administration has embolden bad actor, has made the threat of American power less real.<sup>34</sup> This is not a good thing. This is the way the first Korean War started. This is the way the first war in Iraq started. This is probably the way the next war will start—by America sending the wrong signals to would be aggressors. With sufficient cultural amity, the Koreans and Japanese could take their argument directly to the American people, could put pressure on the U.S Administration through the court of public opinion, in much the same way Benjamin Netanyahu has. In the long term, the good will of the American people that comes through cultural amity is a better guarantee of American support than the good will of the current occupant of the White House, which is too frequently a function of domestic politics, not international realities.

President Obama had also said something about the character of his Administration that is not positive and not good for the long term image of the United States. The use of drones to fight wars, to kill enemies, and to kill innocent by standards is absolutely wrong. In the midst of the Korean War, when the U.S. Eighth Army was facing its possible destruction at the hands of hundreds of thousands of soldiers from the Chinese People's Liberation Army, President Truman had the power to destroy the entire invading Chinese Army in seconds.<sup>35</sup> He could have deployed nuclear weapons, in the same way he deployed them against the Japanese to bring World War II to an end. But, he did not. He decided to fight a limited war. By so doing he set a precedent that has remained in effect to this day. He and the U.S. Army also demonstrate the character of the American people. The use of drones to kill people is *not* a reflection of the American character. I do not believe this is who we are. A great nation, a great people does not kill innocent people who happen to be in the vicinity of a bad guy, nor should it kill anyone without the due process of law (something we are not sure is taking place). The U.S Administration's use of drones, this new American practice of war, has established the wrong precedents, and, in some ways it has diminished us.

---

<sup>34</sup> One of the dumbest things the Johnson Administration did during the Vietnam War was to inform the Chinese and Communist North Vietnam that the United States would not invade North Vietnam. When we eliminated the threat we eliminated our ability to influence China and greatly diminished our ability to influence North Vietnam. It is the enemy's perception of our power and our willingness to use that keeps bad actors from acting badly.

<sup>35</sup> The national Chinese Army is the People's Liberation Army (PLA). During the Korean War it was call the Chinese People's Volunteer Army (CPV), a Chinese attempt to limit the war, or the Chinese Communist Forces (CCF). However, it was in fact the national Army of China, the PLA, we fought on the Korean peninsula form 1950 to 1953.

*Israel's national security strategy has been effective in securing the resources of the United States to advance and guarantee the security of the Israeli people. Israeli's strategy is a model for small nation-states seeking to enhance their security through the power of more powerful nation-states.* While each nation-state is unique, attributes of the Israel model can be adapted to the individual circumstances and needs of the state to produce *cultural amity* in the United States, current the most powerful nation-state on Earth. And, given the technological advantages, existing capabilities, defense spending, Congressional support, and the support of the American people this is not likely to change significantly in the near future. While our actions can be misinterpreted, our capabilities at this point in time are still overwhelming.