

# 擁抱一中才能馳騁世界 紀念臺灣光復 70周年感言

～張文基～

最近臺灣，大陸以及海外各地都在紀念光復70周年紀念日，這是臺灣同胞解除被殖民枷鎖，從此成為正常國民的偉大紀念日。然而，由於1997年以後，綠營人士在教育改革「本土化」的名義下，推出了竄改台灣抗史的台灣歷史教科書，使得臺灣年輕的一代淡化了光復的意義和祖國軍民浴血犧牲贏得抗戰勝利的歷史。這是臺灣的損失。

實事求是而言臺灣的中華民族紐帶是不可能被切斷的，這紐帶也是臺灣維護自身利益的最大資產。在世界政治經濟結構正在轉型的歷史關頭，在臺灣同胞對未來充滿不安的時刻，我以一個來自臺灣的華人身份談為什麼擁抱一中原則是維護臺灣利益的最佳出路。

今年也是臺灣被割讓給日本的兩甲子紀念，過去的120年，臺灣人民承擔了中華文明衰亡的苦痛，也參與和見證了中國復興和中華文明振衰起弊否極泰來的過程。在此，首先要向為民族復興的臺灣先烈先賢致敬。

1895年日本軍先發出動了近衛師團與第二師團兩大師團合計3萬7千餘人入侵臺灣，駐台清軍和臺灣義軍英勇抗日，在六個月期間超過兩萬人戰死沙場，受害平民最少在十萬人以上，然而也給予日軍沉重打擊，擊斃領軍的陸軍中將北白川宮能久親王及第二旅團長山根信成少將。

日軍全面佔領臺灣後，台民的武裝起義此起彼伏延續到1930年，犧牲及受株連者逾十萬。期間，非武力的抗日方式如社會運動、政治運動曾經盛極一時。許多台籍青年投身於祖國大陸的革命和抗日洪流中也做出了不朽的貢獻。

臺灣光復後由於兩岸的分治，許多熱愛祖國的臺灣人遭受迫害，不少人逃到大陸，為了鞏固政權兩蔣引進舊日本軍國主義勢力，啟用臺灣的皇民勢力如李登輝等，再加上意識形態上全面宣揚西方的價值觀，加深了兩岸的隔閡。如今大多數臺灣人的希望是獨立成一個類似星加坡的與大陸友好的國家。然而，這可能嗎？這符合臺灣的長遠利益嗎？

臺灣位於第一島鏈的核心位置，從19世紀以來都是外界強權包括美

國日本遏制中國進入大洋的必爭之地。戰略上，今日臺灣對於中國的重要性猶如燕雲十六州之對於北宋。將來中國如果不想成為富而不強，屢遭外患的北宋，豈能放棄臺灣！豈能容忍臺灣出現另一個石敬瑭？而石敬瑭的下場更可為今人鑒！

臺灣的彷徨和不安之一是暨想依賴美日勢力抵抗大陸，然而隨著中國力量的迅速上升，又怕在大國博弈間被美國出賣。彷徨和不安之二是經濟發展停滯，貧富差距上升。年輕學生和中下層百姓對被邊緣化的恐懼和對未來的彷徨，嚴重的威脅到社會的穩定。台獨人士希望將問題的矛頭指向大陸，而事實上中國的復興是解決所有彷徨的希望！

今天的世界正進入一個充滿變革的關鍵性時刻，金融危機後世界已變成為更不穩定，政治動盪已蔓延到從非洲到美洲的每一個洲。ISIS危機，歐洲難民危機，烏克蘭危機都顯示美國所主導的政治和經濟自由主義以及金錢操控下的被扭曲的西方民主制度的光環已經破產。世界大多數人都夢想要建立一個偉大和諧、平等共同繁榮的世界。

在歷經許多轉折後，中國大陸正逐漸摸索出一套不同于西方的道路，最近幾年中國所提出的「和平發展互利共贏」、「一帶一路」、「亞洲基礎建設銀行」都逐漸為世界各國接受，而最近習近平主席的成功訪英，更是具有深遠全球意義的里程碑。

臺灣的前途是非常清楚的：臺灣的成長必須靠融入世界發展的大格局中。將來世界發展的動力引擎是歐亞非美欠發達地區的復興和技術的創新，而中國將占舉足輕重的地位。臺灣與大陸的紐帶是臺灣寶貴的資產而非威脅，必須善用運用。兩岸統一需要時間，但是良性互動必須開始，臺灣朝野必須利用這次大選的機會對兩岸關係做深入的辯論。我以一個深愛臺灣的知識份子希望臺灣大選後，新政府不僅延續「九二共識」更能積極擁抱一中，為它注入更多的內涵，與大陸人民共同創造中華民族的偉大復興，這樣臺灣不僅能自保更能馳騁世界。

# 台灣必須再光復

～佟秉宇～

在台灣長大的過程裡，我們跟著國民黨老蔣政權所領導的整個社會，每年十月二十五日就慶祝台灣光復。當然，台灣光復是值得慶祝的，是中國人民八年浴血抗戰，付出巨大的犧牲之後所獲得的勝利果實。

抗戰勝利70年過去了，台灣真的回到祖國的懷抱了嗎？我們看看台灣今天的情況，不能不對於台灣的所謂「光復」有個重新估量。蔣經國1988年去世後台灣有李登輝、陳水扁、馬英九這三位總統，治理了台灣28年。前兩位不斷的實行他們所謂的「去中國化」，在很大的程度上扭曲了台灣的歷史，切斷了與中國大陸在歷史發展上的關聯。歷經了20年，讓台灣很多年輕人，也就是說現在40歲以下的台灣人對中國的認同已經逐漸降低到可怕的地步。

馬英九在總統大位七年多，很多藍營的人對他都有相當高的期

許，希望他能夠把李登輝、陳水扁去中國化所產生的效果給改正過來。但從今年教科書微調的事件看來，他在任期都快屆滿了才來幹這事，而且調整尺度如此之微小，是他笨嗎？是他膽小嗎？我估計都不是，是他沒這個心。這恐怕反應了他「不統、不獨、不武」的政策中「不統」的內在涵義。

據台灣電視名主持人黃智賢的分析，現在台灣主張統一的人大概也只佔總人口的5%。哈日媚日情況嚴重，據統計所謂的日本皇民在台灣有超過2,000,000之眾，在台灣公然的打著日本的軍旗遊行。

前不久蔡英文跑到日本去，和安倍秘密見面，不知道密談了什麼，黑箱操作之下是否出賣了台灣的合作？與日美達成了某種軍事上的合作？凡此種種都值得我們關

注。前兩天看一個台灣的電視節目「少康會客室」，主持人趙少康訪問了台灣新黨主席郁慕明。大家都知道郁慕明主席是主張終極統一的，他對於現在台灣的政客都在喊著中華民國，唱著中華民國的「國歌」，有個新穎的看法。他說新黨的中華民國是1912年孫中山所創立的中華民國，仍然秉持著孫中山的理想。馬英九的中華民國是1949年的中華民國，也就是偏安一隅的中華民國。李登輝的中華民國是1996年的中華民國，是兩國論的中華民國。我認同他的看法。

我估計明年如果蔡英文當選台灣領導人的話，大概也是李登輝1996年的中華民國。

在此「臺灣」光復70周年之際，我們不禁要問，台灣真的光復了嗎？真的回到祖國的懷抱了嗎？我看還沒有。所以我認為台灣還須再光復！(2015年10月24日寫於洛杉磯)

# 中美關係不會為逆風所動

編者按：這篇文章是美國卡內基和平基金會副會長包道格先生向環球時報的投書。  
作者曾擔任過美國駐臺AIT處長，他在美國智庫極具影響力。

不久前，以中國國家主席習近平對美國進行國事訪問為標誌，中美關係走向問題在國際關係學界引發又一輪熱烈討論。可是就在人們還未完全消化習近平訪美的成果和影響時，跨太平洋夥伴關係協定(TPP)的簽訂，習近平訪問英國推動中英關係進入「黃金時代」，美國軍方稱將派遣軍艦進入中國南海島礁12海里海域等一系列新的事件，仿佛又給中美關係吹來一絲「逆風」。但我認為，觀察家們對於這些事件的解讀多有偏頗。

對於美日等12國達成TPP協議，有人認為這是一個中國在經貿方面遏制和孤立中國的舉措。尤其是在美國總統奧巴馬做出「不能讓中國這樣的國家書寫全球經濟規則」的表態之後，這種猜測更是甚囂塵上。對此我想強調的是：

一方面，TPP是一項早該達成並獲得簽署的協議，但它卻因美國國內因素以及其他一些問題而被耽擱了整整六年。奧巴馬政府將其留到任期最後階段再予處理是個錯誤，因為美國馬上就要進入新的大選之年，這增加了TPP協議最終「流產」的風險。無數原因表明，TPP協議不應該被耽擱，而它恰恰是被拖延到了現在。為了該協議最終獲得通過，美國國內還將進行非常艱難的談判。有人對TPP協議在習近平結束訪美之後不久即簽署多有猜測，認為這是美國有意為之，但我認為兩者之間沒有任何關係，純屬巧合。

另一方面，我覺得奧巴馬總統在談到TPP協議時，不應該說「不讓中

國書寫規則」這樣的話，這說明他根本還沒真正理解TPP協議的長期重要意義。事實是我們在世貿組織框架內推動多哈回合談判的努力已經流於失敗。作為替代之選，下一個機遇便是推動建立跨太平洋和跨大西洋夥伴關係，使其成為世貿組織框架下新一輪協議的核心。就像中國的圍棋一樣，你必須要在不同地方落子，然後才能逐漸形成大的布局。奧巴馬總統可能認為，如果他在涉及中國時說些類似的「狠話」，可能會有助於TPP協議在美國國會獲得通過，畢竟國會相對而言對中國比較挑剔。但奧巴馬這樣做無疑太過短視，不甚得當。

除了TPP協議，最近的另一熱門話題是英國與中國進一步走近，很多人在想美國是否會為此而吃醋。你的看法是美國對此並不十分感冒。事實上，英中兩國之間存在加深合作的現實基礎。中國在英國進行了卓有成效的投資，並且試圖借助英國在全球金融領域的優勢地位打開人民幣離岸交易的局面，這些舉措意義重大。英國國內一些民眾批評政府對中國太過熱情和讓步，但英國政府特別重視與中國的關係顯然有其道理。不過無論如何，這與美英之間沒有任何關係。英國雖是美國盟友，但有根據自身國家利益進行決策的自主權利。美國也並未感覺到英國因為發展對華關係而背叛了我們，無論在經濟、政治方面還是戰略領域，美國都是這種感覺。

對於「美國軍艦進入中國南海島礁12海里海域」，這個問題是否存在都還存疑，可能根本就是個偽命題。如果中國南海島礁12海里領海邊界確定無疑，那麼美國軍方必須予以尊重。如果那個界限並不存在，美國海軍則可履行航行自由權利。這裡的關鍵問題，是要根據《聯合國海洋法公約》中的「低潮高地」原則，對中國南海島礁領海邊界進行明確的技術界定。但在此問題上，中美雙方目前還未形成共識。因為情況複雜，美國海軍對此可能還需進一步的研究，而在形成定論之前，還談不上「派遣軍艦進入中國南海島礁12海里」問題。

在此我想說明一點，那就是無論如何中美之間都不會因此發生軍事衝突。中國足夠聰明，絕對不會輕易打軍事牌，美國也不會輕易做出真正威脅中國的舉動。現在我們看到的是政治對話、媒體對話，而非可能使用武力的錯誤戰略思維。雖然南海問題構成了中美關係中不太合拍的節奏，但它更多的是一種官方層面的博弈，目的在於給對方的決策過程施加壓力。中美關係太過重要，為了那些島礁而動用軍事力量對雙方來說都不值得，這個問題可以得到管控。

在不久前習近平主席訪美期間，中方再次提出構建「新型大國關係」構想，美方對此表述雖未明確贊同但也沒有表示任何異議。與此同時，美方在其表述中明確提出「大國尤其是美中之間更要盡量避免衝突」。對於中美關係而言，雙方在表述上的這種互動是一種相當「微妙」的積極進展。它說明了什麼？說明在構建雙邊關係問題上，美中雙方總體而言是在相向而行，只是在對這種關係如何加以描述方面，雙方還未完全達成一致。

# China's Security: Who Is Targeting China?

Observing current events would likely lead you to an apparent picture showing stressful relations among the U.S., Japan and China.

Presently the U.S. and Japan are formulating a strong tie as allies against the rising China. It also appears that China is struggling to convince the U.S. that China is not an archenemy of the U.S. China is also diligently reminding herself and the world about the WW II history for being worried of Japan returning to her militarism. China seems to be under pressure to develop a viable strategic plan to deal with the U.S. and Japan guided by the following two assumptions:

1. If China could work successfully with the U.S. to manage conflicts and resolve issues to maintain a good U.S.-China relation, then the Japan-China relation would improve by default. This places the U.S.-China relation as China's first priority.
2. If China would face up the permanent threat from Japan and develop a clear strategy to deal with Japan and make the U.S. understand China's real worry then the U.S.-China relation would improve. This forces China to deal with the Japan issue more openly.

However, current events are the consequences of past actions. It is necessary to bring the historical background into the picture to analyze the current situation and to discuss all possible scenarios of future course of foreign relations. In this column, we do not pretend that anyone has a crystal ball to predict the future, but we do believe that any rational analysis brought to the open may be helpful to the foreign policy makers. From historical and geopolitical perspectives, we believe that China is facing a central question - 'Who is really targeting China? Is Japan or the U.S. targeting China as an enemy?' China must understand this question thoroughly then she may formulate a viable strategic plan and a foreign policy to deal with the U.S. and Japan. To find answer to this question it is essential to peel off the surface of the current 'apparent' US-Japan-China relations and analyze their intrinsic issues between US-China and Japan-China, separately, from a broad historical and geopolitical perspective. Is Japan's national interest regarding Asia Pacific really coinciding with that of the U.S.? If so or not so, is it based on a short-term view or long-term objective? Perhaps the long-term objective is far more critical since near-term foreign policies should be driven by the long-term objectives. Then, what are the fundamental issues between the U.S. and China that will dictate a long term objective in their relationship? The same question must be asked regarding Japan and China? A nation to nation relationship will be ultimately good in the long run if there is no fundamental (long-term)

Mainstream and Organic Views  
Dr. Wordman

conflict between the two nations. For example, Canada is a close neighbor of the U.S. but no fundamental problem between them. Hence they have excellent relation. Same cannot be said about China's neighbors.

China-Japan has had a treacherous relation since many centuries ago, even though China has strongly influenced Japan in her culture and nation development, including writing system, architecture, customs, religion, philosophy, governmental and legal systems. As early as the third century, Wu people (Today's Jiangsu and Zhejiang area) was reported as ancestry of inhabitants in Japan. In Qin dynasty (221-206 BC), Emperor Qin Shi Huang had sent several hundred young people to Japan to search for medicines of immortality but they never returned. The major Chinese influence to Japan occurred during Sui and Tang Dynasties when Japan had sent many students to China to learn the establishment of sovereignty and they brought back philosophical and religious teachings, Chinese customs and culture, including clothing, political system, architecture and city planning. Tang Dynasty was a "flowering dynasty" in Chinese history with prosperity, rich culture and strong national military. Japan involved in her first battle with China when one of the three Korea kingdoms, Silla, allied with Tang to dominate the entire Korean Peninsula. Japan (Yamato) supported Baekje and Koguryo (the other two Korea kingdoms) but was defeated by Silla-Tang forces with 300 vessels destroyed. This history laid an intrigue background of the China-Japan-Korea relationship. Silla later united the Korean Peninsula and forced Japan (Yamato) to seek ties with Tang against a hostile Silla. Japan had a prosperous trade with China from Qin to Ming dynasty nearly over 1000 years.

Ming designated Ningbo as the trading port for Japan hence many Japanese emissaries were set up there with rivalry between them. In 1523, while Japan was in a civil war period, one Japanese emissary in Ningbo involved in a disagreement with a rival Japanese trade representative led to the Ningbo Incidence where the Japanese looted and robbed the vicinity of Ningbo. The Ming dynasty then closed the Ningbo port to Japan. The China-Japan relationship became more treacherous as some of the Japanese islanders turned into sea

pirates, robbing the ships and looting the towns and villages on the Chinese seashore. This situation lasted from Ming Dynasty to Qing Dynasty. The Chinese emperors were annoyed by this type of hit and run terror but could not rid them off completely.

In 1868, Japan finally became one sovereign nation under Meiji Emperor who consolidated the feudal factions, in the mean time, Qing dynasty was weakening due to incompetency of the court and the government corruption. The West made contact to China and took advantage of a weak dynasty. On contrast, Japan went through the Meiji restoration period (1868-1912) had made Japan learn and copy the West and became industrialized. Japan then set her eyes on China with the ambition to conquer China. Japan became an imperialistic nation practicing colonialism with the ultimate goal to rule the conquered regions. Japan's ambition eventually resulted in WW II, however, even though Japan was defeated on 1945, but the Japanese Imperialistic spirit never died as evidenced by the current Japanese administration's effort in revising Japan's peace constitution to permit Japan to enhance armament and take initiative to engage in war. This is the fundamental issue between China and Japan. Japan historically had been aggressive towards China openly expressing that they were a superior race but dealt with poor land resources in contrast to the vast mainland China. China learned from her history that she must be strong to fend off her aggressive neighbors.

The China-US relation is an entirely different set of stories. True, the U.S. had joined the Western powers in invading China but she was sympathetic to the Chinese revolution. The U.S. revolution, Monroe doctrine and her constitution inspired the founding father of modern China Sun Yat Sen, who was educated in the U.S. The Chinese people admired the Americans especially during the WW II period. There was no fundamental conflict between the U.S. and China. The two nations are far apart on two separate hemi-sphere with no territorial dispute. There is economic competition but that is universal between all nations, existing between Japan and the U.S. and between Japan and China as well.

From the above historical perspective, one may conclude that the current US-China problems are not rooted in any fundamental issue between the two nations. Hence they are solvable problems. On the other hand, the Japan-China relation was clearly hinged on a fundamental issue that Japan has always been targeting China like a prey. There is no good (honorable) reason for the U.S. to side with Japan to solve any problem in the US-China relation and there is no reason for China to hide her concern on the fundamental issue with Japan. To put this issue in the open is beneficial to the foreign policy makers in the U.S., Japan and China to develop their future foreign policies.