

柯文哲旋風效應 隨風而去還是潤物生根

臺灣九合一選舉創造了一個政治明星:柯文哲。他在國民黨的堡壘臺北市以85萬對61萬大勝連勝文,顯示出他的選舉號召符合大多數選民的訴求。但是,歷史告訴我們,可以“馬上”得天下,不能“馬上”治天下,柯文哲旋風效應將會步馬英九六年執政的後塵,隨風而去,還是能帶來雨露,滋潤大地,改變地貌?

柯P的成功是他的草根性,他瞭解中下階層百姓,特別是年輕人,對貧富差距擴大的不滿,和對將來的彷徨,所以在競選之初,就以超越藍綠、結束政黨惡鬥為宣傳主軸,專注社會民生問題,契合了民眾的心理,也成為勝利的關鍵。

接任市長後,他不改快人快語雷厲風行的草莽性格,很多事不經三思就放炮,往往造成不得不隨後更正的局面。他的這種不科學的決策模式和不尊重公務員系統的專業知識的態度,如不改正將成為他失

~齊武~

敗的最大原因。柯文哲在兩岸關係立場上是接近李登輝和台聯的,和民進黨是友軍但有距離的。他在競選時曾大膽表示,過去,臺灣政壇只是“喊口號、耍嘴皮、辯輸贏”的“律師世代”應該結束了,劍鋒直指民進黨高層元老。所以,我認為今後兩年他和蔡英文是競爭多於合作的關係。

經濟發展是柯文哲滿足選民訴求的必要條件,若沒有穩定和平的兩岸關係,臺灣就不可能有經濟發展。柯P如果未能更正最近提出的“兩國一制”,他的政治前途將是充滿荊棘的,因為在經歷對台政策的挫折後,中國大陸必將修正過去對泛綠人士又搞台獨又撈經濟利益的錯誤政策。正確的兩岸關係,對日和對美關係將是柯P政治前途成敗的指標。

發言狂妄 思想混亂 緣由病態使然

根據柯大人上任前後兩個月中的言行舉止,對人處事,率真是嚴重不足而任性則是驚人,有餘,攻其緣由,則是個性及病態使然。看了他的兩篇文章,“回家的路太遠”和“生死之間”,其中理性與感性俱備,然而這二者能否被運用於施政之中,則端視京兆尹之智慧與眼光,判斷與拿捏了。以最新之資料顯示,其發言之狂妄,思想之混亂,使人拍案驚奇。言而總之:此斯乃醫界出身,既無撈過疆界之能耐,又缺

~周固猷~

精研兵法之造詣,不識形勢已然於己不利,進而竟不聞自身之份量,扇風點火,誇誇其談於前,修補道歉,無動於衷在後,長此以往,焉有不敗之理?試看其:頌殖民論、一洞論、兩國一制論、破銅爛鐵論、等等奇談怪論,可有任何一論屬率真而非任性耶?將台灣首善之市,付予此類貨色之手,其途惟艱,其果也苦。

中美論壇稿約

評論時政的利弊得失,伸張世界的正義公平,良心知識分子的園地,歡迎來稿投書和回響,作者文責自負,請留真實姓名,地址,電話,不改稿,不退稿,不付稿酬,所有稿件及信函,請email至 uschinaforum138@gmail.com

聽其言 觀其行 評政治菜鳥柯文哲

柯文哲自上任台北市長以來,成了“當紅炸子雞”,各大報紙新聞的頭條,柯P佔了百分之六十五,為了趕時髦,筆者也來發表一點個人對柯文哲的看法。

據網上人物介紹,他患有亞斯伯格症,而且有嚴重的自閉症,所以他臉上常有斜眼歪嘴的表情,你看到就不要見怪了。他有很高的智商,臺灣醫師考試,他得了全省第一名,但別忘了,他是曾經幾次重考才進了臺大醫學院的。

如果臺灣沒有光復,柯文哲現在應該被稱呼為:青山文哲,因為日據時代,他們家改成了日本姓,也算得上是皇民家庭;他祖父在二二八動亂中曾被捕入獄,出獄三年後才去世,但柯家卻被陳水扁列為二二八受害者家屬,柯P把陳水扁發給他的受害者家屬證書高掛家中,他可能認為祖父是位“烈士”而引以為榮吧?

柯P講話很接地氣,讓人很容易聽懂,譬如有人問他當年為什麼選擇外科,他說他不喜歡和礦工一樣挖洞洞,人身體除了眼耳鼻五個洞

~范湘濤~

之外,剩下只有在女人大腿中討生活,非他所好,所以選擇了外科(此話雖然引來衛道女權人士的抗議,但沒有引來大風大浪,因為市井小民喜歡他這個調調);柯P也很有眼光,最早在臺灣從國外引進葉克膜(他自己卻不會裝),在急診手術上發揮了非常大的功能,但你千萬不要把他當成神醫,因為他曾經把愛滋病患的器官移植到了好人身上,大擺烏龍之後,居然能平安無事,繼續在醫學界打滾,不能不說是國家法律,社會道德對他的網開一面。

柯P上檯後人氣如此之高,有他值得稱讚的一面,譬如他反對官商勾結,反對公器私用,反對官僚作風等等,有一張他微服出行,獨自一人搭地鐵的照片,被大陸網友瘋傳,認為是官場奇蹟;寫到這裡,覺得大陸政府應該要好好檢討現在的官場現象,趁現今在除腐打貪的勢頭上,要把官僚主義一併打下去,要不然網絡上再出現那種芝麻小官有隨從打傘擋雨,小鎮領導人出差回

被殖民愈久愈進步

臺北市市長柯文哲接受美國“外交政策”(FOREIGN POLICY)雜誌專訪說:香港、臺灣、新加坡華人區都被異族殖民統治過,新加坡比香港好,香港比臺灣好,臺灣比大陸好。他又主張臺灣與大陸“兩國一制”,因為臺灣民主自由,許多方面都比大陸優越,值得大陸學習效法。

其實是臺灣與大陸各有所長,當前互相交往磨合,靠共同深厚的歷史文化淵源,有利於未來的統一。臺灣先良性獨立維持和平現狀,不急在一時,避免互相敵對刺激才是上上之策。

臺北市政府發言人林鶴明一月卅一日表示:“柯市長說華人受殖民愈久愈進步,是歷史研究學說被多方討論過的<殖民現代性>,是指

~阿修伯~

開放門戶勢必有傷痕。這些地區有留下不好記憶,但也有正面評價影響。殖民者在殖民地所留下來的制度和建設,客觀來說也有不可否認的正面成效,不過殖民者所留下的歷史傷痕也必須被正視。此言還算是持平之論。

“九合一”國民黨敗選,2016臺灣政權極可能再輪替。民進黨執政之後惡性台獨勢必更加猖狂,國民黨辛苦營造的兩岸和解局勢有破局之慮。

兩岸關係之所以持續緊張,其根本原因在於“惡獨”對中華故國的卑視藐視,對臺灣殖民者日本的欽佩、仰慕、懷念、崇拜,也就是柯

來要下屬夾道相迎的畫面,大陸同胞看了敢怒不敢言,我們海外朋友看了,更感到十分噁心。

柯P集臺灣社會寵愛於一身,免不了被勝利沖昏了頭,常常胡言亂語,把外國客人送的懷錶說成破銅爛鐵,公開發言說,被殖民愈久的地方愈進步文明,這些傻言傻語終於引來了一些民眾的不滿和批評,(民調也開始走低)。

柯P上任後,拜訪李登輝登門求教,仍繼續擔任陳水扁的主治醫師,他的墨綠色彩表露無遺,他已經開始清算前朝,對國民黨黨刀霍霍,遲早會卡擦一聲,國民黨千萬要小心他重施胡亂轉發“愛滋病毒”的故技,被他活生生搞倒在地。柯P在接受外國記者訪問時,向大陸叫板,喊出“兩國一制”,柯P和陳水扁一前一後叫出兩國論,將來有一天會不會受到中國“反分裂法”的審判呢?(李登輝不必擔心,因為老李決不會活到那一天)。雖然如此,筆者認為柯P比蔡英文及其他的民進黨頭頭要好多,至少他對大陸非常瞭解,他曾經到大陸十八次,還去過延安老毛故居朝聖,他說他去延安是要研究為什麼老共能從那裡發展壯大;筆者很難想像,一個對老共如此有興趣的人,會跟老共對著幹;何況,柯P的父親還曾對人說過,他的兒子決不會搞台灣獨立的。

總之,柯P這個政治菜鳥,已經在台灣造成一股政治旋風,會不會引起什麼政治風暴,誰都沒法估算,讓我們一起來拭目以待,聽其言!觀其行.....

市長所肯定的,臺灣被日本殖民帶來進步的說法。其實不只臺灣人,許多中國大陸民運異議反共人士,如劉曉波等就主張中國人應該請異族殖民統治三十年來帶起進步。這固然是進步的速成法門,但實際實行起來卻不是那麼簡單方便幸福快樂,被殖民者要付出多麼大的痛苦代價也必須考慮,你甘願接受那樣的屈辱奴役嗎?

林鶴明發言人說“殖民者所留下的歷史傷痕,也必須被正視。”卻都被惡性台獨臺灣人偽皇民故意忘記。新加坡人、香港人被英國人殖民統治,並不像臺灣人被日本人武裝暴力鎮壓,50年內屠殺40萬人(前臺大法學院院長新竹人許介鱗教授根據臺灣總督府公報、憲兵沿革志、員警沿革志統計),228比起來根本就微不足道。今年228又到了,不知惡性台獨還有什麼花樣演出,馬英九還要表演道歉嗎?已經沒有人要看了。

日本人對臺灣人的欺壓、剝削、歧視、侮辱真是罄竹難書,今日臺灣人偽皇民對日本人卻只知懷念感恩歌頌讚美,這是一種心理變態現象。更可怕的是,它配合日本同樣心理變態的軍國主義者,還妄想做日本馬前卒“三個月滅亡中國”!恰好今年是二戰抗日勝利70周年紀念,中國大陸民族主義勃發,臺灣人偽皇民小心謹慎為是。

柯文哲市長快人快語,性格爽朗乾脆,我十分欣賞,但他常常口無遮攔發言,難免“白目”,小事無傷大雅也就罷了,對殖民統治的大是大非還是卡慎重細利卡好。



輕佻市長- 臺北市長柯文哲位重言佻, 非民之福

The Impact of Exporting Gasoline and Gas on the U.S. Economy and World Prosperity

I have lowered my opinion about the Business Week magazine ever since Bloomberg L.P. acquired it in 2010 and renamed it Bloomberg Business Week. Business Week was founded in 1929 before the stock market crash and I had been a subscriber ever since I was gainfully employed in the U.S., a long time ago. I lowered my opinion because BBW had gone "soft" in content in the business and economics reporting sense. It has migrated more into general business topics (such as fashion, what one wears at work etc) to catch broader readership (I should say audience), because it generates more sound bites of popular content that could be used by other Bloomberg L.P. Businesses, Bloomberg News (wire service), Bloomberg Television and Bloomberg Radio (WBRR). The shift of content in BBW is not any individual editor's fault but the company's frugal strategy of multitasking the magazine's content producers.

The BBW special issue, The Year Ahead: 2015, published as an issue for November 10, 2014 to January 6, 2015, however, is an exceptional issue which not only fulfilled its multitasking responsibility but also contained a fair amount of interesting and valuable information, despite of the sound bite format prevailed in it. The eight months work of Josh Tyrangiel and his writers produced an issue persuaded me to continue my subscription to BBW at least for another year. Judging from the number of full page ads in the issue, BBW should have made significant profit for Bloomberg L.P. just because of this issue. Even though BBW is shrinking away from essays like Economists quality, I would still consider it as one of the mainstream media on business and economy.

In this column, I would like to comment on one article in the energy section of the "Year Ahead" issue, namely "head to head debate between Larry Summers, and Ed Markey on lifting the ban on U.S. Oil export imposed by Congress in 1975". Lawrence Henry "Larry" Summers is an American economist who is President Emeritus and Charles W. Eliot University Professor of Harvard University. Larry served as the chief economist at the World Bank and later in the Clinton administration in the treasury department, eventually succeeded Robert Rubin as the Secretary of Treasury. Edward John "Ed" Markey is an American politician served as member of Massachusetts house of representative, US Congress and the U.S. Senate. Ed is a liberal who has served as the Chairman of the House Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming from 2007 to 2011. In 2013, following John Kerry's appointment as United States Secretary of State,

Mainstream and Organic Dr. Wordman

he was elected to serve out the balance of Kerry's sixth Senate term to Jan 3rd, 2015 and he recently won a six-year Senate term to 2020.

Mr. Summers claims that allowing oil export will increase U.S. producers' import price, hence stimulating employment and investment, actually will reduce gasoline price. Exports will require infrastructure which will create jobs pumping as much as 1% GDP and will mean lowering trade deficit helping U.S. Debt. A lower trade deficit will mean stronger dollar (Americans having more buying power or lower import prices). By producing more and exporting oil, we put pressure on prices and gain leverage in sanction with response to Russia and the Middle East.

Mr. Markey states that we still imports a third of oil we consume as much as 40 years ago when the ban was in place. That vulnerability influences our foreign policy, economy and national security, hence, oil cannot be treated like other commodity; we need to mitigate that vulnerability rather than exporting oil so producers can make more money. Exporting oil will raise domestic oil price with no guarantee of lowering international oil price but causing higher U.S. Gasoline prices. If we export oil we also export U.S. oil refining jobs. Lifting the ban will hurt our chance to be energy-independent.

After reading the "head to head" article, it is like going to a wine tasting event limiting the taste to one sip. On this topic, deeper thoughts must be offered especially comments from experts. Although I am not an expert, I would venture into a discussion to draw other experts' comments, perhaps, through such a dialogue, a sound policy could emerge.

Suppose the U.S. decides to encourage exporting gasoline and gas rather than crude oil (as Summers suggested) and impose an export tax for the government to collect (improving trade deficit and helping national debt). Under this policy, more refinery investment and jobs will be created (eliminating Markey's concern), it will also stimulate the U.S. crude oil and gas discovery and production including advancing the technologies such as horizontal drilling etc. keeping the U.S. technology lead (reducing the vulnerability Markey mentioned). This policy will encourage the U.S. oil industry to pay attention not only to domestic as well as international refined product needs, what U.S. consumers want, and what products matches U.S. auto industry needs offering a combined

competitive advantage, etc. This policy, making the U.S. an energy exporting country serving the world's needs, will not only give the U.S. leverage in the international market but also increase other countries' dependency on the U.S. energy end products.

Exporting gasoline and gas as finished products may put pressure on domestic consumer prices, however, the government can lower the domestic gasoline taxes and raise the export taxes to regulate the domestic consumer prices and total consumption. After all, fossil fuel is ultimately limited, this policy should be and can be managed to stimulate the alternative energy technology development to establish a long-term viable energy solution and to create a lead in all necessary technologies, manufacturing, transport, distribution... If the U.S. becomes the largest and most efficient refined energy products supplier (lots of jobs would be created), the other crude oil exporting countries would have no choice but sell the crude to the U.S. or accept the price dictated by her. The present gasoline exporting countries will think twice to compete with the U.S. by importing crude and exporting gasoline since there would not be a speculating and fluctuating crude oil prices in the international market.

The U.S. is still the largest gasoline consumer; hence, the above policy is feasible, provided the government can effectively control the flow of gasoline, gas and crude oil with advanced technologies (manufacturing, transport and distribution as well as environmental impact technologies) and administer an efficient taxing mechanism to regulate consumer prices as well as financing a long-term energy research for alternative energy. The American people may have to accept some inconveniences or even sacrifices accepting this policy and taxing system in their early phase, however, it will be worthwhile to accept it for the cause of finding a long-term energy solution before the earth ultimately runs out of fossil fuel as well as for the cause of maintaining world order and prosperity.

China is a far more vulnerable country comes to gasoline or oil or gas, hence, she is making a push and creating a lead in solar energy. China's needs for gasoline and gas rise rapidly with her standard of living; striking an energy alliance with China will have huge benefit for the U.S. Russia is an energy rich nation and she is already putting EU in a dependent position on Russia's natural gas. However, Russia is far lacking in energy technologies from the U.S. to be a strong competitor or alternate provider, if the U.S. pursues the above discussed energy/foreign policy. In reality, natural resources are limited and unfairly distributed in the world, but every country can fairly exploit technology in both seeking new energy and reducing total energy consumption. The United States is fortunate to be blessed with rich energy resources; it would make sense for the United States to maintain a peaceful world order by forming energy alliances with other nations and exporting energy products than forming military alliances and exporting weapons.