

率真與任性 - 論柯文哲

率真的極致是不失赤子之心 任性的極致是衝鋒直前不計後果

率真誠於中，才能自返而縮，雖千萬人吾往已 任性形於外，不耐謀定後動，往往是虎頭蛇尾

率真而有治事之能則為濟世之才 任性而大權在握則禍及天下蒼生 台灣是一個奇怪的地方，六十五年來由專制極權走向民主法治，由貧窮落後走向舒適安康。前半段由蔣介石走到蔣經國，國家幸甚。後半段出了李登輝，陳水扁，國家何其不幸。然後出了馬英九，把一盤好棋下成敗局。然後出了柯文哲……

幾十年來得之不易的成果，非但沒有幫助台灣的民主法治與時俱進，而且每況愈下，早已不配稱為亞洲民主的典範。

柯P自選上台台北市長，紅的發紫，他的言論每每語出驚人，連帶寫的文章也洛陽紙貴，傳頌不已。這對台灣的政治現狀是好現象，終於出了一個有話直說，出手果決的人。我們衷心希望他能夠劍及履及，一本初衷，把台北市治好，把台灣從沉淪中向上提升。

然而，以兩個月的時間來評判一個現象，言之過早，來談論一個人更應該觀其後效。我們議論柯P，只能說是聽其言，讀其書，參考其過去經歷的一種期望。在兩個月裏，我們確實看到柯P突出的「率真」與「任性」，就此，且說說讀者所見：

有幸讀到柯P寫的兩篇文章：「回家的路太遠」，「生死之間」，柯P是醫生，是名醫，他的文筆也不錯，文辭簡潔，言之有物，而且邏輯嚴密，理性與感性兼具，更有超出專業以外的人文思想，果真是多才多藝，有我們期望的風範。

「回家的路太遠」細膩動人，但舒發個人情感，讀者不便議論。

「生死之間」則是行醫感觸，歷經生死境界，超脫個人之外，說悲天憫人故事。讀者感佩之餘，卻也有一些意見：

政是眾人之事，醫生從政，其服務焦點，便從個人擴及社會，其影響也不只是個人健康，而是大眾甚至全民福祉。自此，便該如王國維所說「眼界始大，感慨遂深」，誠於不服務之忱，更要汪洋深濶，百折不回，不能短視任性，自我標榜。

如果任性過頭，盲目自信，進而

飛揚拔扈，則是狂妄。我的朋友，是醫生也是醫學教授的周P（周固猷兄），評論柯文哲，「發言狂妄，思想混亂，緣由病態使然」，真是一針見血，直接了當。（中美論壇 79期）

醫道與政治是不同的路，醫道精深但永遠遵循自然與科學的法則，政治則是千頭萬緒，攬盡人性的善惡。但是，立志走這兩條道路的人，醫生和政治人物，所需要的胸襟和勇氣，誠於中的服務信念，必竟是相通的。

柯P走過醫生的道路，由苦讀到行醫，由滿腔熱忱到摳心瀝血，由意氣風發到相對無言，一直到看盡生死，他才了悟，王國維所說，古今之成大學問，大業者者，必經三種之境界：「昨夜西風凋碧樹，獨上高樓，望盡天涯路」、「衣帶漸寬終不悔，為伊消得人憔悴」、「眾裏尋他千百度，驀然回首，那人卻在燈火闌珊處」。他在行醫的道路上，終於跨過終極的關卡，從困惑中解脫了。現在，我們要問：「你在獨上高樓，望盡天涯路時所堅持，濟世的理想還在嗎？」

由醫從政，柯P顯然想過他的服務理想，只不過，政治的境界比醫道更廣闊，更艱難，而且，一入江湖永無止境，褒貶隨之，沒有解脫。從政所需要的道德和勇氣，抗拒誘惑（權力，驕橫，腐化，挫折，等等）的力量十以倍之。

柯P以清新之姿，躍入政壇，沒有歷史和政黨的包袱，盡可放手去幹，他的境界，應該是追求濟世理想，自我人格的提升，和中華民族民主法治的歷史定位。

柯P是西醫，我不知道他是否讀過中國唐代名醫「藥王」孫思邈寫下的『大醫精誠』。這是千年來中醫奉為「醫德」的準繩，孫思邈說：

「……凡大醫治病，必當安神定志，無欲無求，先發大慈惻隱之心，誓願普救含靈之苦。若有疾厄來求救者，不得問其貴賤貧富，長幼妍媸，怨親善友，華夷愚智，普同一等，皆如至親之想，亦不得瞻前顧後，自慮吉凶，護惜身命。見彼苦惱，若己有之，深心凄愴，勿避險巇、晝夜、寒暑、飢渴、疲勞，一心赴

氣候變遷和溫室氣體效應 - 博學慎思明辯後才可篤行

2015年一月二十八日

這兩天美國東北部正面臨強烈暴風雪的襲擊，按照氣象部門原來的預估，這將是史上最強的暴風雪。因此學校、商店、政府機構，甚至聯合國都為了應對暴風雪的預警而暫時關門，數千飛機航班被取消，紐約市地鐵星期一晚上7點後開始限制服務，許多公路也對一般民眾關閉。所幸實際降雪程度遠低於氣象部門的估計，所造成的損害也非常有限。然而，這次風暴至少造成三個效應：1. 加大了人們對於全球氣候到底是變暖還是變冷的爭議。2. 促成美國不同政治勢力和利益團體圍繞「溫室氣體如二氧化碳對全球氣溫和氣候的影響」的進一步辯論。3. 使人們認識到氣象學家對氣候預估能力的局限性，如果對相對簡單的短期和局部氣候的預估都會犯大錯誤，人們又如何能夠對他們的長期和全球性氣候的預測有信心？

地球的氣溫隨地理位置和季節而不同，因此地球的年平均溫度是不同地區的測量站長期觀測數值的平均數。取樣點的不同，測量方法的不同，和平均方法的差異都會影響最終的平均值。隨著科學的進步，一些權威機構的資料還是為大多數人所接受的。按照美國海洋和大氣管理局(NOAA)的資料，地球的年平均溫度雖然逐年會有上下波動，然而從1978到1998卻大體呈現迅速上升的態勢，20年間約上升了華氏0.8度。因此引起了許多科學家，政治團體和環保人士的關注和焦慮。然而，NOAA的資料也基本顯示從1998到2014年地球的平均溫度基本上沒有變化，這也引起不同意見人士和團體對於「溫室氣體理論」和基於此理論所建立的「環保和能源政策」展開批評和挑戰。

下面我們回顧「氣候暖化和溫室氣體效應」的發展歷史。1980年代當西德綠黨取得國會許多議席後，西德成為最早採取措施以控制溫室氣體排放的國家。之後，許多歐洲其他國家也在1990年以前採取類似措施。在經歷過1984-1985煤礦工人罷工後，英國前首相柴契爾夫人希望發展核能工業來取代煤礦能源，因此她於1988年在英國皇家學會發表演講鼓吹採取行動遏制因人類行

救，無作功夫形跡之心。如此可為蒼生大醫，反此則是含靈巨賊。……

「夫大醫之體，欲得澄神內視，望之儼然，寬裕汪汪，不皎不昧。省病診疾，至意深心，詳察形候，纖毫勿失，處判針藥，無得參差。雖曰病宜速救，要須臨事不惑，唯當審諦思慮，不得於性命之上，率爾自逞俊快，邀射名譽，甚不仁矣！」

在這裡，我們期望柯P，能把行醫濟世所累積的智慧升華為政治智慧，更堅守率真的初衷，在成大業的道路上，走過三種境界，百折不撓，帶領全民走向未來。

~張文基~

為導致的氣候變化，從此英國的態度發生了巨大變化。同年美國遭遇到歷史上最大的旱災，美國開始了對全球氣候暖化的投入。此後這個議題在世界各地得到越來越多的關注，1997年聯合國成員在日本京都達成聯合國氣候變化框架公約的議定。主張採取有力措施限制溫室氣體排放的政治力量和利益團體的影響力在2007年12月達到最高峰，他們的領軍人物，美國前副總統戈爾和聯合國政府間氣候變化專業委員會(IPCC)獲得了當年的諾貝爾和平獎。

我對氣候暖化問題的興趣源於讀到2007年IPCC第四次評估報告(AR4)的一個大膽預測：喜馬拉雅山脈的所有冰川很可能將在2035年前完全消失。這將嚴重威脅到中國、南亞及東南亞諸國的飲水，甚至生存及安定。我決定將此作為學期論文的一個題目讓學生查文獻找出導致這個結論的根據。他們發現AR4是援引1999年印度科學家，也是喜馬拉雅山脈冰川學工作組主席，Syed Hasnain的一篇訪問。學生找到他所根據的原始論文，發現如果依照原始資料作外插估計，應該是2350年，不知是什麼原因，誤說成2035年。聯合國這麼多的專家經過層層審議竟然不能發現這樣缺乏常識的錯誤，這令我非常震驚。學生們也仔細研讀了一些電腦模式，不出所料它們都包含太多的假設和可調節的參數，因此有足夠的彈性來表述過往的資料，但一定不能夠準確預測將來。從1998到2014年空氣中二氧化碳量是持續的上升，而氣溫並沒有顯著的上升，這是溫室氣體理論所沒有預估的。

戈爾在接受2007年諾貝爾和平獎的演說裡曾大膽的預測北極冰帽將在七年內消失(附注1)。如今七年已過，按照國家雪冰資料中心的資料，2014年12月北極冰帽的面積是1252萬平方公里比2007年還稍微小一些(附注2)。戈爾這種輕率，不嚴謹，嘩眾取寵的預言是美國政治人物的通病，也是對「溫室氣體」理論的最大傷害。

過去二十多年的歷史告訴我們，

當太多的政治和經濟利益介入時，人們良好的意願往往被誤導而結了壞的果。當2001年戈爾離開副總統職位時，他的淨資產少於二百萬美元，如今已超過一億美元。這樣的快速成長幾乎完全靠投資於一些為了防止全球暖化的「綠色科技公司」，而這些公司接受了超過25億美元的政府撥款，貸款或減稅優待，這是典型的美式權錢交易。然而真正的最大受益者是華爾街的大亨們，他們直接投資「綠色科技公司」或為這些公司融資服務。利用他們的政治關係為這些公司爭取到政府的優惠待遇，然後用1%或更少的利潤捐款扶持特定的政治人物，構成完整的關係網。不論企業成功與否，華爾街的大亨們永遠是贏家。他們更厲害的是透過美國英國的全球影響力，居然搞出了一個「碳排放量交易市場」，創造了一個全球性的無中生利的營生。

影響地球最大的就是太陽，隨著天體運動的關係，太陽與地球的位置發生變化，太陽對地球的輻射總量也改變，所以地球發生過多次的冰川時期和小冰川時期，而這些時期地球溫度的變化都超過過去百年的變化。John Casey研究太陽黑子和地球溫度的歷史關係，在2008年發表一個驚人的預測：地球正進入一個溫度下降的時期，將在2031到2044年間進入最冷時期，屆時溫度將比1998年下降攝氏1到1.5度(附注3)。

氣候問題是一個影響國民生活的大問題，必須用長遠的視角，嚴謹的科學方法來追求事物的真相。在追求真相的過程中我們必須盡可能的避免政治和利益團體的介入，避免倉促作出不理性的決策。我們必須博學審問慎思避免不合理的篤行。

附注1: [HTTP://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/peace/laureates/2007/gore-lecture.html](http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/peace/laureates/2007/gore-lecture.html)

附注2: [HTTP://nsidc.org/arcticseaicenews/](http://nsidc.org/arcticseaicenews/)

附注3: [HTTP://spaceandscience.net/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/ssrcresearchreport1-2008thertheory.pdf](http://spaceandscience.net/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/ssrcresearchreport1-2008thertheory.pdf)



欲蓋彌彰 - 美國十九名歷史學者聯名信,呼籲安倍正視日本二戰中的罪行。

Work Ethics, Style and Stress in the U.S. and China

One of the 'transforming' American magazines, Business Week now renamed Bloomberg Business Week (purchased by the Bloomberg News Corp to transform it into a more general, less rigorous and technical business magazine), has published an article a few months ago, entitled "In China, Office Work Can Be Deadly" with a bottom line, "according to official Chinese media, about 600,000 Chinese die every year from working too hard". From this sensational quote from China Youth Daily, it means that the death toll due to overwork is 1644 a day, an astonishing figure. However, this article did acknowledge that the link between deaths and work-related stress may not always be clear. It also stated, in the U.S., people don't die from overwork, since the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) only claims that heart disease as the leading cause of death, no number for death due to overwork. This report also quoted from the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), "Americans work an average of 45 hours a year more than the Japanese. In 2012, the Japanese government compensated 813 families who showed a link between overwork, illness and death." (93 suicides included).

The above statements and a few Internet blogs on death seemed to be randomly put together by Shai Oster to support his sensational title without any in-depth analysis about the work ethics and work style in either China or the United States. Since the work ethics and work style are serious issues and vital to a nation's economic competitiveness, we devote this column space to discuss these topics and hope to induce more thorough and technical discussions to come forward. First of all, the statistics on average working hours (such as Americans vs Japanese working hours cited above) is meaningless if one does not qualify the work ethics and work style in various industries and understand their differences in each country. Work ethics is influenced by culture, ideology, traditions, labor laws and regulations. Work style is dictated not only by prevailing work ethics in terms of the above influencing factors but also by the infrastructure and environmental elements in the 'work places'. Technology advances compound and affect the definition of 'work place', just like our world is being transformed from manual labor to mechanic to electronic (computer) and ultimately to a digital driven one. If you felt that the above sentences contained too many words to chew on, you were absolutely right.

The work ethics and work style have indeed become extremely complex topics.

Mainstream and Organic Dr. Wordman

American traditional work ethics was great; it was responsible for her agricultural advances and industrialization, principally under the ideology of capitalism. The influence of the liberal socialism came gradually after WW II. The minimum wage law, the farm subsidy bills, the factory worker unions and the Labor laws (such as federal statutes, Wagner Act, guaranteeing rights to unionize, collective bargaining and rights to strike, and NY State Taylor law and its Triborough amendment limiting strike and protecting existing benefits in working hours, vacation and various benefits etc) have become a prescription to the American work ethics and work style. The effect of this prescription can be seen in the service, farming, and manufacturing industries as well as public and education sectors. Through the efforts of their unions, the prescription socialistically guaranteed a better living standard for the workers; however, it hampered American workers' competitiveness from a pure capitalistic measurement. The public employees and the teachers unions by far had the most impact on their workers' work ethics and work style but also had influence on the society. Directly or indirectly, the public employees affected the people they served and the teachers affected the students they taught who witnessed the work ethics and work style changes and followed them. These changes, unfortunately trending ever increasing benefits (e.g. reduced working hours) and diminishing productivity (e.g. negative incentives), are not sustainable and making Americans less competitive. The American steel and automobile industries were the first victims lost in global competition due to their changes in work ethics and work style.

The United States led the technology revolution, being the first beneficiary of the digital technology. Virtual work offices and flex-hours as well as tele-working (for example, teleconference, telemedicine, distanceless learning, etc) with mobile and remote infrastructure support (corroborating, remote printing, Internet emailing, web and mobile apps) have uprooted many traditional work environments and industries. These technology changes have more direct impact on work styles perhaps than work ethics. A 7/24 work environment is enabled by the technologies which inevitably changed many industries' work style, for example in banking industry and many global corporations having business across

multiple continents. These technology induced changes in private industries do place pressure on public employees and large unions but not without resistance. Some traditional government services, for example, the postal services, still hangs on its old business model including work ethics and style. The technology induced changes tend to add work stress as a natural consequence because the human work environment (farm, office, factory, etc) is elevated in efficiency by automation and machine intelligence, which put ever more challenge on the human intelligence and skills.

In China, the traditional work ethics was also commendable. (as Shai cited Korea, China and Japan as the Confucian belt where total dedication, any job worth doing is worth doing excessively, is believed) China has enjoyed the largest GDP for centuries till the western powers invaded her. The Chinese work ethics was damaged severely by communism during the Mao years. The poor work ethics and low productivity were clearly responsible for the failures in China's economy. Recognizing the failure of communism, China began a transformation and experimentation with capitalism starting from her coastal regions. China's transformation not only revitalized her economy but changed her work ethics and work style for the better. Due to the adoption of capitalism in China's state run industries and companies, the competitive element in work ethics and work style rapidly returned and took root in Chinese public institutions and governments making cities and provinces competing fiercely against each other in economical development.

China is a large country still with deep poverty in the West and North regions. The rapid growth in China is sweeping from the East and South China westward and northbound and the changing work ethics and work style followed. Lost, of course, is the easy going leisurely life in the West and North as they ushering in economic development. Not a doubt, the Chinese people's hard working style and work ethics (despite of some corruption) are responsible for her becoming the world's second largest economy, but equally no doubt, the highly competitive process did generate work stress and took toll in physical and mental illness exhibited by the mortality statistics, which was not foreign to western developed countries including the United States. The complaints in China's Internet blogs should be no surprise at all.

Therefore, the issue is not comparing statistics between two countries but discussing the factors contributing to work stress in a fast paced digital world and what are the healthy sustainable work ethics and style suitable to each society? The U.S. and China do share a common problem (addiction to email, messaging and 7/24 work alert mentality, etc), but their social fabrics dealing with work stress are different. In China, the family structure and cross-generation support are helpful, whereas in the United States, the religious institutions and civil organizations are more useful, in dealing with work stress. We urge the mainstream media to devote more attention to this issue!