

租用暴民 聚眾滋事 美國智庫認清了民進黨面目

本刊綜合報導

蔡英文訪美後一再吹噓受到高規格接待，訪問如何成功！但由最近美國許多重量級研究員撰文對蔡英文兩岸政策表示高度憂慮可以看出，經過一段時間美國政府情蒐與研判，美國已經對蔡英文當選總統後維持兩岸穩定表現出高度憂慮，其說法是一次比一次嚴厲，所有人都知道，美國是國家利益遠高於一切，歷史上出賣他國或干預他國內政案例比比皆是，現在甚至認為民進黨目前做法是放棄民主，準備走向中東IS極端手段，台灣人如果眼睛瞎這法西斯政黨得逞，將是中美間的特大危害。

美國國防政策規劃人士質疑蔡英文，在許多最重要的議題上特別是美國著名刊物《外交家》(The Diplomat) 刊登專文指出，據報導，台灣的民主進步黨擁抱中東暴民路線，花錢資助極端份子攻擊官署，根本放棄了民主。文章並指出，民進黨的總統候選人蔡英文如果當政，可能因為主張台獨而把美國拖入危機，故美國必須通盤檢討對台灣的安全承諾。

台海議題專家、密蘇里州立大學教授兼國際事務研究主任郝志堅(Dennis V. Hickey) 在最新一期《外交家》(The Diplomat) 雜誌撰文指出，美國的國防政策規劃人士質疑，民進黨為了實現台獨夢想，會把美國捲入台海危機，但蔡英文卻沒有做多少工作來化解美國疑慮；且「在許多最重要的議題上，特別是她打算如何處理與北京間的關係」，態度模糊不清。文章並指出，儘管蔡英文在民調中領先，但很多人擔心民進黨已經放棄民主，因為有報導稱，民進黨採行中東的聚眾滋事作法(rent a mob)，「並資助極端份子攻擊台灣的政府部門，使得美國愈來愈難認為台灣是民主模範。文章以「rent a mob」形容民進黨的作法。這個詞彙直譯是「租用暴民」或「租用群眾」，係描繪非理性或不真誠的抗議行為，包括花錢雇人抗議等。這種雇用的「好處」，是使「群眾」累積經驗，不需再加訓練，而且「群眾」久經戰陣，行為顯得很逼真。

美國一篇文章寫道，這種雇用演變為暴力抗爭等技倆，往往出現在較落後的國家，「在巴黎和倫敦的街頭是看不到的」。一些文章討論埃及、敘利亞等國的群眾運動時，用了這個字，例如寫道「敘利亞 rent-a-mob 聖戰士凌虐居少數的基督

蔡英文若2016年勝選

兩岸關係上會馬規蔡隨嗎？

蔡英文說，她2016年大選一旦勝選後，在施政上，尤其是兩岸關係上將會維持現狀。亦即對馬政府的大政方針，將會做到蕭規曹隨。然則她所領導的民進黨為何又屢屢在立法院中，或社會上杯葛國民黨的各項重要政策呢？例如服貿協定、貨貿協定、核能政策等。這些重大政策都直接關係到臺灣的經濟發展，國計民生。他們不但反對這些利國利民的政策，甚至連對之進行討論表決的機會都予以剝奪。世界上何曾有過這麼霸道的反對黨呢？他們不但左右有關國計民生的經貿政策，甚至對教育、司法、警政等各個方面亦無不處處干涉，處處插手。令人不禁要問，在臺灣究竟哪個黨才是真正的執政黨呢？在許多人心目中，民進黨早已是執政黨了。

我曾多次著文提出，蔡英文的所謂「維持現狀」，語焉不詳，言辭閃爍，內容空洞，不知所云，至今都不肯對此做一清楚具體的說明。難怪別人要把她比作「空心菜」了。根據她過去的經歷與表現，尤其是作為李登輝「兩國論」的起草者與策劃者，我們不能不懷疑她的

所謂「維持現狀」極可能是李登輝的所謂「特殊的國與國」，或陳水扁「一邊一國」關係下的現狀，而不是「九二共識」下的現狀了。習近平說，臺灣一旦脫離了「九二共識」，將會「地動山搖」。我不認為這是一句玩笑話，更不是一句恐嚇的話。習近平一向說話行事嚴謹，不會做，或做不到的事，不會輕易出口。他這種行事為人的風格，已為他在國際上樹立了極大的威信，給人有一種一言九鼎的印象。他在九月下旬的美國之行中，已把這種特質表露無遺了。中國人民能有這麼一位有氣魄的政治領袖，前途必將光明無限。

蔡英文適合做臺灣的最高領導人嗎？若僅就學、經歷而言，似乎可以。但鑒於臺灣所處的特殊政治環境與地位，顯然不能僅就學經歷一項，作為考量的標準。心胸、氣度、眼光，尤其是對兩岸未來關係發展的洞察力，更為重要；我認為這些方面，蔡英文遠遠不如洪秀柱、我幾次在電視上聽洪秀柱演講，令我印象深刻和敬佩的是，她能預見到兩岸未來關係的發展，必將形成越來越緊密的命運共同體。

~謝芷生~

因此她勇敢地提出了，必須與對岸簽訂「和平協定」，以結束兩岸長期對峙的敵我關係。甚至她在黨內第一次發表競選政見時，還曾欲提出，要以「一中同表」取代「一中各表」。然而她這種超前的政治理解，不但無法獲得一般民眾所理解，連黨內的保守勢力也極力反對。於是這本屬十分有見地，有前瞻性的主張卻被硬生生地壓制了下去，最後還被逼退選，實屬可憾！可悲！可歎！

臺灣正走到了一個時代的轉折點。因此2016年大選的結果，將攸關臺灣兩千三百萬人的命運。我對臺灣人民的智慧與理性有充分信心，唯獨擔心的是我們年輕的一代。他們長期受獨派顛倒是非黑白的宣傳，連自己是誰都認識不清，在選舉中還能做出正確的抉擇嗎？青年人是我們社會的希望所在，臺灣前途的興衰榮枯，也與他們有著最密切的關係。希望做父母長輩的，能與他們多溝通，多切磋，務必引導他們走上正確的道路。我們今日所奮鬥的一切，固然是為著自己，但更是為著下一代的他們。

誰主浮沉-中國的反圍堵策略

~中偉~

歐洲盟國為經濟利益而紛紛擁抱中國，加入亞洲基礎建設投資銀行，[一帶一路]等相關合作，包括最近建立中英全球全戰略夥伴關係，德國總理及法國總統訪華，都在想要力強和中國合作，連帶美國重反亞太馬前卒日本，亦於近日在韓國召開的中日韓會議中，重申將進一步努力加速三國自貿區談判，最終締結全面、高水準和互惠的自貿協定，中國的反圍堵策略，取得空前成功。

由此可見美國重返亞太圍堵中國的戰略，包括TPP，已經全面崩潰，而更可憐的是在經濟上還被中國反圍堵，使由美國主導的TPP計劃，無法發揮經濟孤立中國的作用。而在軍事上重返亞太，本來釋放日本自衛權的原意，就是想利用日本作馬前卒來挑釁中國，本身站在幕後推動，即可達到遏制中國的崛起及在亞洲日益增加的影響力，

但因近日中日韓三國會議，有關自貿區談判，最終會締結全面、互惠的自貿協定，在這大經濟利益考慮下，要想日本做挑釁中國的馬前卒，相信不會很給力。

美國在經濟方面，反而被中國完成反圍堵，所有大的美國盟國，都加入了中國經濟發展的火車頭，隨著[一帶一路]的未來世界經濟發展的大戰略，將會為各參與國帶來無限商機，為未來世界建立和平、平等、互利、新氣象。

美國在眾叛親離下，如果要繼續想遏制中國崛起，經濟上已經是不可行，而軍事上又因日本這一隻馬前卒，已經不再可靠，為要繼續未來一百年霸權地位，唯一選擇，只有走到前台，親自動手挑釁中國，但在挑釁前必要三思，否則自食惡果。

台獨已死！

~阿修伯~

自甲午戰爭清國戰敗，割讓台灣給日本，台灣人不肯做日本奴隸奮起抗日，成立「台灣民主國」，這是最早的台獨，終因強弱懸殊，僅維持了百餘日就被日本摧毀。

其後20年，台灣人仍然不斷武力反抗日本，皆被屠殺鎮壓，死亡40至60萬人。接下去台灣人再也無力武力反抗了，做了30年日本人順民奴隸，於是偽皇民台灣人說台灣人沒有抗日甘願為奴。

二戰日本失敗，中華民國接收台

灣，其統治難以令台灣人滿意，乃有台灣獨立建國運動興起。台灣人不願被日本統治也不願被中華民國統治，要做自己的主人。經過李登輝、陳水扁20年的策劃經營去中化頗著成效。今日大部份台灣人已經不承認他是中國人，但是另一種思維也跟著興起。台灣人對艱苦危險的獨立建國也沒有興趣了，何不偽滿洲國一樣，何不乾脆投入興旺先進的舊主人日本懷抱，一切由日本安排。

台灣，其統治難以令台灣人滿意，乃有台灣獨立建國運動興起。台灣人不願被日本統治也不願被中華民國統治，要做自己的主人。經過李登輝、陳水扁20年的策劃經營去中化頗著成效。今日大部份台灣人已經不承認他是中國人，但是另一種思維也跟著興起。台灣人對艱苦危險的獨立建國也沒有興趣了，何不偽滿洲國一樣，何不乾脆投入興旺先進的舊主人日本懷抱，一切由日本安排。

台灣人已有被日本統治50年的淵源，快樂的經驗。再皇民化台灣人變成日本人順理成章省了許多麻煩。于是乃有近日「我爸爸是日本人」我「不能抗日(鄭弘儀)」、「台灣的祖國是日本」和「日本同國怎麼會抗日(李登輝)」、「走尋日本母親」祭拜靖國神社和天皇祖墓(台灣民政府)等發自台灣人的聲音。

前述的台灣人心態，怀念被殖民被奴役，為舉世所罕見。這是違背台灣建國運動的理想，放棄台灣人的尊嚴，除了阿修伯之外，卻不見有台灣人士出面譴責，反而抱著樂觀其成的態度。台灣人經日中兩大惡勢力的摧殘，早已有体無魂成為行屍走肉稻草人了。哀哉！台獨已死！

其實台灣人始終是抗日的，前20年「武抗」犧牲慘重，后30年「文抗」運用策略法理爭取台灣人的權益，仍然可歌可泣令人感動。說台灣人已經日化皇民化，認日本為爹為媽為母親是對台灣人的莫大侮辱！

70餘年來為台灣人的權益尊嚴而奮鬥的台獨人士，竟然對此可恥現象不發一言欣然默認，原來自始自終台灣獨立運動就是一個大騙局，全權是假，為舉世人類所詛笑。

郭弘斌牧師所著「日据時期偉大的台灣人」詳細敘述台灣人勇敢抗日50年之壯烈，犧牲之慘重，相形之下，日本侵占東北(滿洲)時，東北人張學良之不抵抗甘願為奴，東北人差台灣人遠矣！

Tough Talk of U.S. Presidential Candidates on China

Mainstream and Organic Views
Dr. Wordman

Foreign Policy is an important subject for US Presidential candidates. They have to demonstrate to the American voters that they are qualified to manage not only the U.S. domestic economy which is of the most concern but also able to deal with the foreign affairs. In terms of protecting US national security and interest. The candidates often make tough talks to arouse patriotism during campaign, but once elected, they soon face the reality and must adopt the ongoing foreign policy or make an adjustment if they know what to do. History bears this out, for example, candidate Obama made strong statements regarding the Middle East affairs, but President Obama, soon made revisions to his campaign promises as the reality dictated his decisions. Foreign affairs often change with time, a national leader must be able to make sound judgment as affected by events and advice.

As China is rising to be a great power, the U.S.-China relation becomes one of the most important foreign relations to the U.S. The importance of the 2016 U.S. Presidential election from the stand point of leadership transition of the two nations is critical. The U.S. Presidency is four or eight year terms whereas the Chinese Presidency is five or ten year terms, hence the leadership or power transition of the two nations would occur at 2016 (US), 2022(China), 2024 (US), and 2032 (US and China). Any steady foreign relation has its inertia, leaders tend to follow the steady course and react to its course outcome. President Xi assumed power in 2012 and adopted an aggressive reform course to sustain China's rapid growth. Xi has successfully promoted China's diplomatic influence on the global stage and offered olive branch to the world especially to the U.S., whereas the U.S. in the past 2-3 years under Obama and a Clinton-Kerry transition has conducted a fuzzy (inconsistent and self-contradictory) China Policy. On the one hand, the U.S. cultivates military alliances with China's neighbors to contain China and on the other hand increases interactions with China on all levels (even military) to derive stable trade and investment opportunities and economic benefits. The 2016 U.S. President-elect will be mandated to crystallize a clear China policy dealing with Xi. If a hostile relation were maintained, a bad Domino effect would take place through the subsequent leadership transitions (2016-2032) likely to produce a tic-fortac foreign policy. Such a downhill undesirable relation may not be easily reversed until the Year 2032 when both nations have a new leader to take

the opportunity to reconsider. Wouldn't it be too late then?

Republicans will be challenging the Democrats in 2016 to take back the White House. It may likely happen. While Hilary Clinton, the Democrat front runner, with her Obama legacy, questionable performance (Banghazi etc) and style (email, arrogance and hostility towards China) may not be a good choice, but the large number of the Republican candidates give American voters tough choices with their 'tough talks' with little beef. Since most of them had no foreign policy experience, American voters must pay attention to what they say in their campaign speeches and among debates, especially on China Policy. Here, I will start with a collection of news reports from Chinafile and other mainstream and organic media on candidates' view on China and add with my comments for you to ponder on the China issue and think about which candidate can best steer the U.S.-China relation to a positive and fruitful course, in view of the fact the American public has lowered their favorable view of China over the past decade due to a biased mainstream media reporting.

Donald Trump, the leading Republican Presidential candidate, on November 10, 2015, in Milwaukee, commented on TPP: "It's a deal that was designed for China to come in, as they always do, through the back door and totally take advantage of everyone." This remark shows his knowledge as a businessman in understanding the importance of TPP but obviously not factual about China's strategy on trade and investment via bilateral agreements and her visionary scheme of 'one road and one route' (trade routes) to promote world- beneficial development. The new U.S. President should seek this collaborative opportunity rather than ignoring it.

Chris Christie, the New Jersey Governor, said: "The Chinese don't take us seriously. If the Chinese commit cyber-warfare against us, they are going to see cyber-warfare like they have never seen before. ... On South China Sea, I will tell you this, the first thing I'll do is I will fly Air Force One over those islands, then they will know we mean business." It may be heroic when a candidate talks tough, but it is silly to say that the Chinese don't take us seriously.

We see repeatedly that the Chinese not only take the U.S. seriously, she also tries very hard to get the U.S. to believe that China desires to rise peacefully. To ensure China to rise peacefully does not equate to instigate conflicts escalating to war.

It is amazing that on a serious issue of China policy, we merely hear meaningless rhetorics such as, Xi should be disinvented and taken to a woodshed (Scott Walker, Governor of Wisconsin), I would offer Xi a Big Mac rather give him a pomp dinner (Donald Trump) and I would downgrade Xi's State visit to a working visit (Marco Rubio). No concrete idea or a new plan to work with a rising China came from a Republican candidate. No one seriously reflected whether it is China who does not keep her words to rise peacefully or the U.S. who keep instigating conflicts between China and her neighbors. South China Sea had no single incidence not even sea pirating obstructing maritime traffic. Historically China's sovereignty included large portion of South China Sea and the U.S. maintained neutrality or silent position for decades. The Philippines and Vietnam had begun squatting some islands and started constructions several years ago. China's recent landfill construction appear to be a counter action to the 'squatting' very different from the camp Schwab military base the U.S. is building at Okinawa. Sending naval ships to South China Sea and urging other nations to strengthen naval force simply force China's hand to turn those island constructions for military use. This kind of China Policy is neither productive nor honorable if world peace is kept in mind.

Regarding Chinese economy and China's recent stock market drop affecting the U.S. stock market, the candidates had a lot to blame, Carly Fiona on Federal Reserve, Chris Christie on Obama and Huckabee on Wall Street elites. "Because China's going bad it's going to bring us down too, because we're so heavily coupled with China," real-estate mogul Trump said on Fox News, "I'm the one that says you better start uncoupling from China because China's got problems." It seems that a special debate just focused on China issue may be in order. Should the U.S. target China as an enemy? What concrete steps, should an elected U.S. president take to guide the U.S.-China relation to a productive and mutually beneficial path? Since a hawkish position is likely to increase tension, arms race leads to war, perhaps, all candidates need to think through the rationale and the consequence of a hawkish statement before addressing the public.

William Pesek in a recent article for BloombergView had said that "there's a time warp quality to this sort of China bashing." I wholeheartedly agree with him. As American voters, shouldn't we ask the above questions and assess our Presidential candidates accordingly?!