

草蠅鬥公雞 愛拼不會贏

從兩岸實力和美國棄臺論談起

前些天，有一位名嘴在某電視臺「新臺灣加油」節目中說：「很多國民黨的人說中共有能力武統臺灣，那都是胡說八道，中國絕對沒有這個能力」。他進一步指出，他本人看過一份日本出版的報告，中共只有三個陸戰隊師，根本沒有渡海能力，所以臺灣人不用害怕，不要被嚇倒，要支持蔡英文所說的不要屈服於中共的壓力。這番言論一出，引來臺灣島內許多人反唇相譏，稱這位名嘴是騙人至死的義和團，更引起許多大陸網友反罵說，如果臺灣造反，保證解放軍進攻，可輕輕鬆鬆在三日內拿下臺灣。

筆者很佩服這位名嘴不屈的勇氣，但對他的有眼無珠，看不清世界大勢所趨，有點替他和他同樣「阿達馬」的人擔心，不能不站出來指他幾句，要他明白愛拼不一定會贏，如果不拼也能贏才是大家最智慧的選擇。

現在的解放軍力量已非昔日吳下阿蒙，連美日對它都不敢小覷，臺灣更不在同一個檔次；中共之所以遲遲不解決臺灣問題，不是它不能而是它不願，它們認為既然臺灣已經被它牢牢掌控，一定要選一個最佳時間，在玉不碎瓦不破的情況下把臺灣收回到中華民族版圖來，如果能用不戰而屈人之兵的兵法上策，達到和平統一臺灣的目的，又何必在乎早幾年晚幾年呢，於是它釋出一國兩制和九二共識的善意，希望能喚回臺灣人民的民族認同感情，

◎范湘濤

一起來為偉大的民族復興與共同努力，如果臺獨份子誓死不屈(如同這位名嘴的一些人)，則它自然會啟動它們地動山搖的策略。

中共讓臺灣地動山搖的手段太多，如停止官方交流管道，減少大陸人民到臺灣旅遊的人數，封殺臺灣的國際空間，經濟上的不再讓利，不讓臺灣再享有對大陸的貿易順差，讓臺灣房地產和股票市場崩盤，進行海上封鎖，宣佈對臺灣使用國家反分裂法.....，手段太多，不勝枚舉；蔡英文執政才一百多天，因為不領九二共識的善意，老共僅僅用了其手段中的一兩分力道，看看今天臺灣的小小震盪已是一個什麼局面，請問這位名嘴，老共有必要真的用武力攻臺嗎？臺灣如果經濟下滑，社會必定不安，一個已經長期對立的社會必定會內亂，到時候人心思漢，很快就有百分之八十的人想重新選擇願當中國人了，箝食壺漿，以迎王師的場面也可能出現，一夜之間臺灣變成了克里米亞，到時候美國老大哥可能還蒙在鼓裏呢？

講到美國，美國真的會為臺灣而戰嗎？我們來參考一下最近美國一家智庫所做的民意調查，報告顯示美國人願意為世界重大事件而戰的人數勉強過半，而其中所列出的當前世界十二項重大事件，臺灣問題的重要性只被排到第八，懂點算術的臺灣兄弟們，看了以上的報告結果，大概可以算得出美國會為臺灣

而戰的機會率了吧；更有進者，自1998年約瑟夫·奈(Joseph Nye)發表支持中國的一國兩制以來，美國學界便不斷出現棄臺論，2011年，紐約時報刊出著名學者保羅·凱恩(Paul Kane)的文章[拯救我們的經濟，拋棄臺灣](To save our economy,Ditch Taiwan),呼籲奧巴馬總統以停止對臺援助和軍售換取中國一筆勾銷中國所持有的美國國債來挽救美國經濟；由凱恩先生的大文可以看出，臺灣在美國人的眼中只是一根食之無味、棄之可惜的雞肋而已，如果雞肋還可以用賣點錢，他們又何樂而不為呢，筆者認為凱恩先生的建議到目前為止雖然還沒看到什麼動靜，但檯面下正在進行什麼交易，誰也不知道，尤其是像川普先生這樣的生意人，一旦當上了美國總統，說不定會馬上和老共討價還價，很快成交呢，這也許是老共願意讓臺灣問題拖下去的另一原因吧？

中國已經是超級經濟大國，許多國家都想爭取它的援助，依靠它的財力來發展自己；臺灣得天獨厚，被中國認為是自己人而得到特別照顧，臺灣為什麼不肯在九二共識的框架下好好生活下去呢？臺灣人民要知道九二共識四個字是可以堵住中共武統的免戰牌，是保衛臺灣最好的利器。草蠅鬥不過公雞，小個子在大塊頭面前千萬不要叫「你不敢打我」那樣的挑釁話，講多了惹得大塊頭真動手，被打得頭破血流之後，才明白愛拼不會贏的時候已經太晚了....。

◎孫大衛

堅決支持統一？

當人民幣正式成為全球通用貨幣、天宮二號太空站順利運行、第二艘航母即將下水、一帶一路已儼然成形之際，無論下屆美國總統是誰當選，勢必都要調整美國對中國的圍堵政策，加上TPP在總統大選三

次辯論中根本就不成為議題，顯然也將隨著歐巴馬下台而不了了之。當大陸佔盡天時地利人和之際，想要競食基礎建設大餅但無法和中國接軌的形勢下，日本似乎也漸驅下風。困獸猶鬥的台獨政府在錯估情勢之下一意孤行，勢將再次面臨比太平島降格還更為窘迫的境界，不但將成為亞洲棄子更可能賠上全台灣人民的生計！

別再「馬」後炮了

◎轉載自中時快評

前任國民黨主席馬英九24日邀請任內副主席共商黨計，會後前任國民黨主席馬英九與現任黨主席洪秀柱共同出席會場。

前總統馬英九邀集國民黨內大咖們，共商救黨大計，話題很自然地談到即將登場的「洪習會」；馬英九果然又發揮起馬教授的本色，對著柱柱姐上起「一中各表」的歷史課，據轉述，洪秀柱則是板著臉孔邊補她的妝，邊冷回「我聽到了！」

不管現場有沒有這麼強的戲劇性場面，或是如媒體標題形容的馬、洪「舌戰」、「互嗆」、「槓上」，

可以想見，這頓黨高層餐敘氣氛肯定既熱烈又尷尬。針對眾所矚目的「洪習會」，前主席對現任主席的耳提面命、叮嚀交代，無論是內容說法或角色身分，一定都讓柱柱姐很不舒服。

儘管馬英九自認他是苦口婆心，但許多人恐怕更覺得他是何苦來哉，自討苦吃。畢竟馬英九都已經卸任下台了，如果他還要隔空或者幕後來遙控黨局，那真是置現任黨主席、黨機制於何地！過去國民黨



論中 壇美 US-CHINA FORUM
網址 http://www.us-chinaforum.org 投稿信箱: uschinaforum138@gmail.com
社務委員: 張紹遷 周友道 水秉和 張一飛 陳立家 陳憲中 馬在莊 侯秉宇 高志雲 范湘濤 張文基 兼社長
每星期六出刊 第169期
推進中美相互瞭解合作 促成海峽兩岸和平統一 倡導和諧平等多元世界

國民黨應重拾孫中山先生國共合作的遺訓

◎謝芷生

民進黨520全面執政後，正一步步加緊對國民黨進行抄家滅族。一向養尊處優慣了的國民黨，在其黨產遭追殺凍結後，除了求情外，竟一籌莫展，現在窮到幾乎連黨工的生活費都發不出來了，能不令人唏噓乎？

一個組織或團體能否在遇到危難時，仍能團結一致，共同面對並克服困難，要看它究竟是義還是以利作為其結合的原動力。孫中山先生創導革命之初，與其志同道合者可謂鳳毛麟角。革命之初與孫中山先生來往最密切的有陳少白、尤列，楊鶴齡共四人，當時被稱為「四大寇」。當年與革命沾上邊是要坐牢，甚至殺頭的。因此參加革命，成為孫中山先生同志的都是抱有崇高理想，不惜為國家民族的前途犧牲生命的仁人志士。當時既沒有官做，也沒有財發。正由於都是由這樣一群高風亮節之士結合的團體，才寫下了黃花崗七十二烈士壯烈成仁這般可歌可泣的動人篇章。先烈的血跡為後人指出了前進的方向。

1922年陳炯明炮打觀音山，燒毀了孫中山先生三民主義的手稿，孫中山先生連夜化妝出逃，九死一生。至此國民黨的革命陷入了空前的低潮。正在孫中山先生為前途彷徨之際，年輕的中國共產黨找上了孫中山先生，向他提出了國共合作的建議。他們首先建議孫中山先生，要想革命成功，必須建立一支革命的武裝力量，不可再靠軍閥支

持，拉一幫打一派。其次必須團結中國人民中間為數最多的工農力量，使革命獲得可靠的支持，其三必須結合國際間同情中國革命以蘇聯為首的社會主義陣營。孫中山先生有自己己的認識，也有自己的判斷，因此從善如流。1924年國民黨在廣州召開的第一次全國代表大會，聚集了國共兩黨的精英。他們除了成立培養革命武裝力量的黃埔軍校外，並將三民主義加入了富有社會主義色彩的平均地權，節制資本的內容，此外還配套制定了聯俄容共，扶助農工三大政策，作為國共合作的共同綱領。

國共合作後，革命的力量獲得了快速發展。1926年便完成了北伐，統一中國的準備。北伐軍勢如破竹，所向之處，軍閥望風披靡。當時對北伐軍感到害怕的，除了北洋軍閥外，還有在華擁有龐大利益的各西方列強，包括日本。他們不希望看到中國統一，擔心新的統治勢力不再照顧代表他們的既得利益，因此千方百計，想阻擋北伐順利推展。待眼看北伐勢破竹，不可阻擋時，又設法在革命隊伍中進行分化，收買。因此始有1927年發生在上海的「412流血政變」的悲劇，許多中共的精英分子措手不及，被屠殺在血泊之中。造成中國革命的極大損失。

1924年國共第一次合作，完成了北伐，統一了中國。1937年國共第二次合作，又取得了抗戰勝利，使中國成為了世界五強之一。如此看來，國共合作並不如有人宣傳的那樣，國民黨吃了大虧。難道北伐成功，抗戰勝利不是國民黨所希望看到的結果嗎？至於國民黨敗退臺灣，並非中共造成的結果，必須虛心地去檢討內部的原因。102歲老國民黨員的家母說，以國民黨在大陸的表現，敗退臺灣是必然的，沒有中共，也會有別的力量將它推翻。中共再厲害，還不曾逼得國民黨走投無路過，反而不時流露出對國民黨的一份關懷。畢竟國民黨光復，並守護臺灣，以及收復南海諸島礁，劃定11段線，維護南海主權等，功不可沒。再說孫中山先生親手締造的中國國民黨，又怎能讓幾個台獨分子將其抄家滅族呢？國民黨自救之道，應儘快重拾孫中山先生國共合作的遺訓。如此不但國民黨可起死回生，而對中華民族的偉大復興也是有利的。

The Final Presidential Debate and Election Outcome Analysis

The U.S. Final 2016 presidential debate took place on October 19 at the University of Nevada (UNLV) in Las Vegas, Nevada. As usual, the debate was 90 minutes. The debate was conducted by Chris Wallace of Fox News as the moderator. The format is ten minutes of open discussion following a two minute Q & A for each question asked by Mr. Wallace. The simplest conclusion can be made about this debate is that Mr. Wallace did a better job in moderating the debate session. He had asked fair and penetrating questions, shown no bias against any party and controlled the debate process. Comments from viewers of both parties and independents claimed that Mr. Wallace had conducted the best presidential debate among all three debates.

Before the final debate, the media survey and opinion poll overwhelmingly giving Hillary Clinton a lead over Donald Trump as much as ten points or more. According to the American Presidency Project, compiled by John Wooley (UCSB) and Gerhard Peters (Citrus College) with a history dated back to 1999, there were 45 major newspapers with 10,306,701 circulations endorsing Hillary and zero for Donald Trump as of October 18. The list included the largest newspapers, USA Today, Wall Street Journal, NY Times, LA Times and NY Post. This is unprecedented and the effect or impression that the American media had made in the 2016 election was that they wanted so badly to influence the outcome of this election - Defeat Trump - to the point to be willing to sacrifice the sacred 'neutrality' of the media. As a voter, you must wonder why? Is it just because Trump with his free speaking mouth has angered the media or Trump's macho and anti-establishment behavior broke the ethics of the American society or as Trump has said that the media was biased for not so honorable reasons? Media's preference on reporting more on negative news to catch more eyeballs is well known, but why prefer Trump's negative news to Clinton's does raise a big question.

During the debate, the following main topics were asked and

Mainstream and Organic Views Dr. Wordman

debated mostly with expected opposing positions (my comments are put in brackets): Supreme Court Justice Appointment, Gun Control and 2nd Amendment, Abortion and Roe vs. Wade, Building Wall and Immigration, WikiLeaks on Hillary's 'Open Border' (Hillary blamed on Russia's espionage that had led to the leak. Wallace subsequently followed with a no-punch question: Do you condemn foreign interference on US elections?), Economy and Candidate's Plan to Induce Growth (candidates debated around reducing versus increasing taxes, smart policies/negotiations versus more funds for stimulation), Trump's and Clinton's Conduct towards Women brought up in the last debate and now more women came out to accuse Trump (A tough question for Trump, Trump claimed that the new charges were false and brought on by dirty campaign tactics like the violence disrupting campaign rallies instigated by Hillary's campaign and Hillary never touched Bill Clinton's women issue nor on campaign violence other than enumerated Trump's character faults), Conflict of Interest and Clinton Foundation (A tough question for Hillary, Hillary defended Foundation's charity work and deflected to Trump Foundation; chose not to respond to Trump's suggestion that Clinton Foundation should return the huge donations made by foreign countries with unacceptable positions on woman; Question on This Presidential Race Being Rigged and Whether Both Candidates Would Accept the Election Result (Trump said he had to look at the result and kept Wallace's Question in suspense. This has become the headlines of the media immediately after the end of the debate), Middle East and Placing US Troop Issue, and the final question on National Debt, Entitlement and Social Security' (cutting taxes to grow economy versus taxing the wealthy to fund the Social Security benefits and the Medicare services).

After viewing the entire debate and C-SPAN's call-in comments, I was

surprised how diverse the issues were considered to be important by the voters. Hence, it is very difficult for anyone to predict how this debate has changed the voters' minds. However, the media did not hesitate at all to come out with surveys and poll numbers right after the debate to indicate that Hillary had won and gained supports in significant percentage points. In this debate, Hillary appeared to be refreshed, dressed in a smart white outfit with broad smiles delivering the rehearsed script lines (sometimes reading), whereas Donald appeared more tired than his previous debates with lips zipped most of the time restrained from taking his usual aggressive stand. Overall, Trump tried to focus on substance and being consistent and Hillary was trying to emphasize experience and pleading for votes. After the debate, one particular 'independent' caller stroke a resonant cord with the following remarks: For the first time, he had to do his own research on the candidates since he cannot get truth and facts from the media. The media was so biased that it was scary to him. So for this election much credit must be given to C-SPAN for covering the debates without commentators. Not the same credit can be given to the major TV networks and newspapers syndicates.

Although the final outcome of this election cannot be predicted for certainty, the following scenarios are plausible enough for readers to keep in mind and to reflect on them after the election:

- 1.No national landslide victory for the 2016 Presidential Election, in fact, there may be quite a few opposing landslides won on States and Cities reflecting a divided country.
- 2.A contest of the election result may actually take place more serious than the 2000 Bush-Gore Presidential Election. The fact that the media raised the 'acceptance' question in the debate may signal that the media may know more than they let the public know.
- 3.More embarrassing leaks may come before even after the election with the purpose of warning and correcting the American Democracy (a good intention) or exposing the corruption in the American election process (an evil intention).

If you had read to this far in this article before the election, I plead you to pay more attention to the Organic media and speak out wherever and whenever possible to demand a fair democracy then cast your vote. If you read this article after the election, then you would have witnessed enough and you should have more time to right the wrongs!