



## Again, why is 1-term a must?

By Frank Li, Ph.D.

Founder & President, West-East International, Inc.

December 15, 2010

In an earlier publication ([www.west-east-international.com/doc/1term.pdf](http://www.west-east-international.com/doc/1term.pdf)), I called for Congress to restore its credibility by setting the term-limit to be 1 (e.g. 6 years) before asking all of us to sacrifice in order to save the country. In this article, I will make the same call for 1-term from three foreign (policy) issues as follows: (1) the situation in Korea; (2) the war in Iraq; and (3) the war in Afghanistan.

### 1. The situation in Korea

I already published on this subject ([www.west-east-international.com/doc/Korea.pdf](http://www.west-east-international.com/doc/Korea.pdf)). Here I simply want to highlight two points as follows:

- (1) A scheme often used by a ruler, past and present, is when he faces a huge domestic problem, he finds a problem outside of the country as a distraction. The dear leader in North Korea has been very good at it over the past few years.
- (2) A ruler can be reckless, especially when his actions are inconsequential to him.

What's the point here with regard to the 1-term in the U.S.? A democratically elected leader can be worse than a dictator, if his goal is nothing but getting himself re-elected!

### 2. The war in Iraq

I already published on this subject ([www.west-east-international.com/doc/IraqWar.pdf](http://www.west-east-international.com/doc/IraqWar.pdf)). Here I simply want to highlight two points as follows:

- (1) Although several reasons were given for this war (e.g. WMD, oil, and spreading democracy), the simple truth is that with the start of the Iraq war, President Bush's re-election was secured ([www.west-east-international.com/doc/Afghan.pdf](http://www.west-east-international.com/doc/Afghan.pdf)). Nothing else has been consequential to George W. Bush, personally, even though this war is widely regarded as the biggest mistake in the history of American foreign policy.
- (2) How did Congress authorize this war? Just look at the votes! Could our Congressmen and Congresswomen afford not to vote for the war to risk their chances of not being re-elected? No! On the other hand, voting for the war and the war itself have been inconsequential to them, personally!

### 3. The war in Afghanistan

I already published on this subject ([www.west-east-international.com/doc/Afghan.pdf](http://www.west-east-international.com/doc/Afghan.pdf)). Here I simply want to highlight two points as follows:

- (1) This war was started legitimately. But it was badly executed, for which candidate Barack Obama scored a lot of political points during his presidential campaign.
- (2) By the time Mr. Obama took office in January 2009, this war was no longer winnable by any commonsense definition. But instead of ending it responsibly, President Obama chose to escalate it (which was okay), with a troop withdrawal plan so ridiculously hasty that there could be only one possible explanation: it was perfectly timed for his re-election (which was totally unacceptable)! In other words, the re-election is everything - Nothing else matters to President Obama!

### 4. Concluding remark

One term (e.g. 6 years) for all our top politicians, including the President and Congress!