



From the Afghan story to America: the good, the bad, and the ugly

By Frank Li, Ph.D.

Founder & President, West-East International, Inc.

June 25, 2010

The story is President Obama recently replaced General Stanley McChrystal, the top U.S. commander in Afghanistan, as a result of an article in the Rolling Stone magazine. From that, let's look at America: the good, the bad, and the ugly.

1. America: the good

Read the article by Michael Hastings (www.rollingstone.com/politics/news/17390/119236). What a good writer, a beautifully written inside story, and great journalism! It was an invaluable service to the country as well as to the world. Because of that, the name of Michael Hastings will be in the history book forever and I wish him well in everything he does from now on, including, of course, a great career in journalism.

Through the article, it was further re-affirmed to me that General McChrystal is a great soldier, for a nearly impossible mission though.

President Obama did the right thing to have replaced General McChrystal under this circumstance!

2. America: the bad

I have three basic questions:

- (1) Why did General McChrystal give Michael Hastings such great accesses to him personally, resulting in a profile article like that?
- (2) Why did General McChrystal go on TV, a few months ago, to make a public demand for additional troops? He should have been fired then for the same reason as this time. However, instead of firing him, President Obama largely granted his wish for more troops. Why was that?
- (3) Is our government really so dysfunctional that the top military brass had to show the dirty laundry twice for some purposes, only to get totally opposite results from President Obama?

3. America: the ugly

I was terrified after reading this article a few months ago: "For Obama the Road to Reelection Runs Through Kabul" (www.huffingtonpost.com/christian-parenti/for-obama-the-road-to-reelection_b_380459.html). Here is an excerpt: "The real goals of the Afghanistan escalation are domestic and electoral ... The real purpose of these 300,000 soldiers is to make Obama look tough as he heads toward the next US presidential election." While it's debatable what's really real, the perception alone is frightening. Hastings's article only confirmed this perception more.

No, this is not a partisan issue, but a presidential re-election issue, because the same thing was said about George W. Bush for the Iraq war in 2003. Although many reasons were given for the Iraq war (e.g. "for WMDs" per some initially; "for oil," per Alan Greenspan; and "for spreading democracy," per President George W. Bush), the simple truth is that with the start of the Iraq war, President Bush's re-election was secured. For the real cost of the Iraq war, read this: www.west-east-international.com/doc/IraqWar.pdf.



Here are two bottom-line questions:

- (1) Is our president, during his 1st-term, for nothing but getting himself re-elected, with everything else being secondary?
- (2) Because of that, we cannot expect the president to do the “right” things all the time during his 1-term?

4. Discussion

On February 15, 2010 (President’s Day), I published an article calling for a new government (structure) for the USA (www.west-east-international.com/doc/USAstruct.pdf), with 1-term for the same office being a principal solution (www.west-east-international.com/doc/KeepItSimple.pdf). The “ugly” part of this article only confirms the validity of my solution to solve many fundamental and structural problems of our country.

5. Concluding remarks

Change or perish! We must change, big and fundamental, to survive and thrive, starting with 1-term for the same office, including the US presidency (www.west-east-international.com/doc/USAstruct.pdf).