

我的身份認同 由我自己決定

做堂堂正正的中國人而驕傲!

反對對豬說教

收到好友老曹寄來的這首打油詩(見附件),詩是好詩,但我認為他是對豬說教,白費心力。試想:你會在豬圈裡說教天祥的"天地有正氣,雜然賦流-----"?再者,目前綠營的"棟樑"和時代力量的"精英"們,有誰知道張宗昌?一條和一餅?誰又在乎漁民的死活?誰的內心壓縮著炎黃之血,而又哭爹喊娘的向東北方向叩請天皇聖安?天生我才必有用,豬有其榮登餐桌之功,對豬亦必有一定之處理方式,期待豬群克己復禮,深明大義,謬矣!謬矣!日本人尊敬拚命之對手,臣服於強大的壓力,匍伏於兇狠之惡魔,但絕不會憐恤屈膝之豬

~周固猷~
群;替張自忠抬棺材的日本軍官,絕非作秀。2003年,安倍晉三在台北圓山忠烈祠,祭拜"中國"抗日將士時,所說的話,"所有為自己國家犧牲奉獻的,都應該受到尊重和紀念",相信綠營的上上下下,包括年輕的精英,都該言猶在耳,不知有何感受?受異族統治五十年,罹患了斯德哥而摩症,而又期望得到日本人的尊重和青睞?我看是上錯了墳,拜錯了廟,抱錯了腿!吃錯了藥!能不能請蔡英文女士代表豬群表白自辯!

打油一首 諷立法院

我有一首打油詩,不忍埋沒報君知。海外同胞相距遠,趁早了解莫待遲。

昔日軍閥張宗昌,么雞吃餅打麻將。他家么雞能吃餅,別家不許也學樣。今有立委黃國昌,全靠民粹進殿堂。自稱法學大教授,國際公法莫宰羊。肯亞騙案吼主權,錯不知改反猖狂。臺灣漁民逢倭寇,舉國痛罵幹伊娘。獨有立院甘寂寞,伏首帖耳莫聲張。反對課綱媚日本,藍營湧上要協商。么雞怎能再吃餅,綠雞吃餅藍雞望。惟恐東洋乾爺怒,力竭聲嘶護主忙。但求天皇肯俯允,再當皇民好商量。只盼重作殖民地,那管漁民拉空網。國會議員竟如是,時代安能有力量?

◎老曹

一個做賤自己的社會

台灣兩天內又連續發生三起突發殺人案,被害人甚至包括四歲孩童和警員。人神共憤之餘大家仍然只把問題焦點放在社會治安的防治上,卻沒有針對人性惡化和社會風氣敗壞的檢討!更諷刺的是平日鼓吹暴力抗爭、破壞政府法制的一些媒體,現在居然搖身一變以正義凜然的姿態來批判政府能做些什麼?如果這個社會還是繼續是非不分、黑白顛倒,恐怕類似的案件仍然會層出不窮甚至變本加厲。
美國總統甘迺迪的名言"不要問國家能給我什麼,而是要問我能國家什麼?"而今天台灣社會卻恰恰相反,在反對派的刻意操弄下踐踏道德良知,年輕人凡事只怪政府無能而不怪自己無能!多年來積非成

~孫大衛~
是、目中無人把自己的問題都變成理所當然是社會欠他的,養成了只要不爽就可以發洩、報復的濫自由氛圍!
反對派利用年輕人的叛逆和一蹴可成的心理,多年來凡事製造和政府對立擷取社會焦點、爭取出頭的機會,反死刑、反兵役、反課綱、女學生反只能穿裙子.....那將來男學生也要反只能穿褲子,好一個自己決定自己的未來,當社會真的翻轉後可要面臨的是覆巢之下無完卵,不僅害死了別人也害死了自己!
無獨有偶的是年輕人「害命」而學者「謀財」,利用國家資源頂著

父親長眠五指山國軍公墓,每回來探望他,總是百感交集。從河南農村隻身離家投入黃埔,在戰火中顛沛流離;隨部隊到台灣後,因為調防頻繁,我的童年記憶中,父親的形象是模糊的,印象最深的是父親掛在嘴邊的那句話:「我們上無片瓦,下無寸土,要出頭,只有唸書。」
中階軍官的薪水,要養活七口之家,讓每個孩子都能上學,是多麼艱難的挑戰!少女織夢愛美的年紀,我身上的制服,包辦了上學、過年、喜宴、比賽...;開學後我是學生,放暑假我是女工;母親用糧票換代金,買肉給哥們們補營養,標會、起會、做家庭代工,東牆補西牆,那時候,眷村裡幾乎戶戶如此。
當我燒煤球煮飯的時候,竹籬笆外已經有瓦斯爐了,我們的生活離所謂的「高級外省人」很遠很遠。
父親一生廉潔,一介不取,在役時,保衛國家,退役後,守護家庭,人生中最精華的歲月都給了台灣。
開放探親後,父親回老家,在爺爺奶奶墳前痛哭一場,回來後,再

~李艷秋~
也不提家鄉事,他鄉已成故鄉,台灣承載著他生命的軌跡,居住著他摯愛的家人與袍澤,這裡-也是他的埋骨地。
記得他第一次聽到「外省豬滾回去」的聲音時,問我:「台灣人不是外省人嗎?」我聽出他的不安、疑惑和憤怒。我安慰他這是政客刻意挑起的仇恨,台灣社會已趨理性,我選跟他開玩笑說:「沒有這批外省豬,我們就是中華人民共和國台灣省,我就是紅衛兵了。」
父親和我都沒有料到,政客挑起的族群仇恨,在這塊土地上像癌細胞般蔓延開來,我被冠上外省第二代的稱呼,這個頭銜標示著我的政治不正確,明示我先天基因就不愛台灣,所以即便是工作上為所當為,批評台灣人總統,甚或揭發台灣總統貪污,你的心意都是不純正的,因為你是外省人,你親中,你沒資格。
我很慶幸父親沒有看到我在揭發陳水扁貪腐時,是如何被糟蹋,但我也遺憾他沒有看到他的

女兒如何堅定的做該做的事。
社會獵巫的氛圍,讓所謂外省族群,必須以高十倍的音量呼喊愛台灣,以激烈十倍的動作強調愛台灣,以求得認同。每每看到政界或傳播界朋友,比激進更激進,比極端更極端,都讓我不勝唏噓。
在墳前陪父親喝一杯高粱,杜鵑開得正茂,山間雲霧蒸騰,一位女性蒼老的聲音傳來:「OO啊,我老了,以後不一定能經常來看你了。」頓時淚如雨下。
下山時經過土官區,荒塚孤墳處處,袍澤凋零,後繼無人,生前死後,一世孤獨。
裡,如果他在世,我想跟他說,你這個外省人,一點都沒有愧對這塊土地,你不需要無恥無良的政客來裁定你是哪裡人。
五指山的勒石上刻有一句話:「有幸身為軍人後,祖德留芳萬世名」,我以老兵之女為榮,以身為第二代為傲,我的身份認同,由我自己決定。
編者按:朋友自臺灣傳來這篇網路文章,署名李艷秋,不管作者是否是李女士,文章的確是好文章,特此轉載。

從善如流 活力似水

中華民族的生存力

美國蘭德智庫公司,論未來2020年中國將成為世界上最貧窮國家。
http://www.360doc.com/content/10/12/29/144551962_82307165.shtml
文中指出的目前中國人的素質,將會在2020年中國將成為世界上最貧窮國家。的確目前中國有很多毛病是極需要改進,但以西方人的文化及眼光來衡量中國人,2020年將成為世界上最貧窮國家,就未免太過武斷了。五千多年文化的民族,命運就如此的不堪嗎?
以才立國二百多年的國家,來批評五千多年文化的國家,似乎有認識不足之處,不了解這民族的生命力。中國五千多年的文化,歷經多少朝代興衰,曾被蒙、滿外族共滅亡兩次,近百多年來更給列強瓜分國土、財富,二戰時受日寇侵略等恥辱,變成了長期積弱,由一個富甲世界的國家,變成了一窮二白,社會、文化、人性都受到極大的破壞和衝擊,誰令中華民族受此磨

~中偉~
難、恥辱?是過去的殖民主義、帝國主義、和今天的霸權主義所犯的惡行是分不開的。
西方所看到中國的負面問題、只是從表面,而忽略了中華民族文化的內涵、智慧、和民族的刻苦耐勞,堅毅不屈的精神,創傷後的恢復力,才是民族的生命力,缺少了就不可能創造出過去輝煌的歷史。
今天的崛起,短短的四十多年來,從一個極度落後的國家(1970年代初連包食物的紙張都短缺),一窮二白,憑著創造力,生產力,刻苦耐勞的拼搏精神,一躍而成為今天世界第二大經濟體,這就是中華民族的生命力,真的如美國蘭德智庫所說這麼脆弱嗎?
中國文化中,對個人的道德行為,都有很高的規範標準,個人能否接受和實行,就因人而異,正如各宗教的聖經和教義都是教人忠誠,互助互愛,和諧相處,一些以宗教信仰立國的國家,在處理國際關係時,就強權霸道,採取雙重標準,完全違背其宗教聖經的教誨,這又是甚麼道德標準呢?
中國成語和俚語,都有對人的行為作出教導,例如:
對人---己所不欲,勿施於人。博愛---己立立人,己達達人。推己及人。

感恩---滴水之恩,湧泉以報。施恩莫望報。誠信---一諾千金。一言既出,駟馬難追。
孝道---二十四孝。
面對現實---樂天知命,隨遇而安。
仁義---殺生成仁,捨生取義。有殺生成仁,無求生以害人。
無畏,無懼---富貴不能淫,貧賤不能移,威武不能屈。
智,仁,勇---智者不惑,仁者無敵,勇者不懼。
因果告戒---種善因,得善果。善有善報,惡有惡報。
忍辱負重---臥薪嘗膽。留得青山在,那怕沒柴燒。
壞的方面教導,例如:
自私---各家自掃門前雪,莫管他人瓦上霜。
學問求功利---書中自有顏如玉,書中自有黃金屋。
沒做人宗旨---識時務者為俊傑。良禽擇木而棲。
取巧---投其所好。
貪腐思想---祝賀人升官發財。
賭博---人無橫財不富,馬無夜草不肥。
把握時機---順水推舟。時世造英雄。
記仇---君子報仇,十年未晚。
中華民族的性格,如流水,無孔不入,就是民族的生命力
五千多年的中華文化、歷史,憂患意識,孕育出中華民族的性格,如流水,無孔不入,憑著刻苦耐勞,樂天知命,委曲求存的韌性,無比的民族生命力,將走遍全球每一角落,落地生根,中華文化將會影響到全世界,如此未來的[中國夢]亦很可能成為[世界夢]?那麼中國2020年怎會成為世界上最貧窮國家呢?除非有些國家刻意挑釁遏制中國崛起,但歷史潮流不可抗拒,中國注定再成為世界大國,將是無可爭論的事實。

Will The Warm UK-China Relation Be A Long-term One?

In politics, diplomacy, and foreign relations, most would agree that people and nations are realists with a short-term or a long-term view. Sure, there is always ideology at play in the domains of politics and foreign affairs, but in the timeline of history, vast number of principals involved inevitably have yielded their principles and ideologies to reality, especially over a long time. In hindsight, history is a book of realist stories not a hypothetic theory. The case in point in this column is the UK-China relations, its recent development and historical evolution prompted the author to ask the title question, will the current warm UK-China relation be a long-term one? This question is of great interest and importance not only to the British and the Chinese but also to the Americans and the world citizens.
The United Kingdom had a glorious history as an empire. As a nation the U.K. is not a typical democratic system; she maintains a royal crown yet she has contributed to democracy and capitalism in a significant way. As an empire the U.K. practiced colonialism zealously enabling her flag flying in sunshine twenty four hours a day (Perhaps I should say daylight, since the Sun does not seem to favor London). The British footprint or occupation was appearing all over the world, including all five continents and numerous isles in the four oceans. The U.K. is a realist in her evolution as a nation; she embraces democracy but remains as a royal kingdom to this day. She lost the entire North America yielding to the American Revolution which claimed independence from her. The fact that the British Empire did not move her palace to New York or Toronto in the eighteenth century might be interpreted as the natural result of a Royal government with limited vision. The royal family perhaps never entertained the idea of moving away from Buckingham Palace. The political figures as subjects of the Crown thought and behaved as smart short-term realists just to satisfy the ruling Crown. They never worried the day that the British isles would be the limiting factor in sustaining the empire.
China had been a great nation over several millennia. China had been called an empire only occasionally in her five thousand years of history simply because colonialism was never in the Chinese dictionary or on her emperors' minds until she became a colonial target of the Western powers led by the British Empire. Different from the continent of North America, China has had a rich culture and strong economy despite of the fact that China had no navy. The Ming emperors, Yongle (1402-1424), Hongxi (1424-1425) and Xuande (1425-1435) were pro-commerce to enrich their treasury. Emperor Yongle (Zhu Di) sent the famous 'Ambassador' Cheng He (1371-1435)

Mainstream and Organic Views
Dr. Wordman
sailing the world seven times with a fleet consisting of ships over 400 feet long dwarfing any ship in the world at that time. Cheng's disappointing report to the Emperors, that the rest of the world were culturally backward, had made the Ming Court angry which made an edict to forbid ocean exploration to foreign land as a waste of the emperor's treasury. Most political figures in the Chinese dynasties behaved like realists with short-term views. All the maps and records of Ming Dynasty's ocean exploration were ordered to be burnt except a few were hidden and eventually passed on to the hands of foreigners. (reference Matteo Ricci, 1552-1610 and Michele Ruggieri, 1543-1607 and their writings)
The U.K.-China relation in the late 19th to early 20th century was a sad story for the Chinese. The British started the infamous Opium War forcing China to accept opium trade and to open her ports to the British merchants. As the victor of the Sino-British wars, the British Empire demanded not only huge amount of silver as reparation but also forced China to cede the Hong Kong island in perpetuity to her. Perpetuity was a very long time compared to Russia's 25 years of rights in control of Da Lian, a Chinese freeze free northern port (Port Arthur). This right was signed over to Japan (the Portsmouth Treaty, Russia also evacuated from China's Manchuria and recognized Korea to be Japan's territory of influence not China's protectorate) after Russia lost in the 1905 Russo-Japanese war. The 26th U.S. President, Theodore Roosevelt was the mediator for the Portsmouth Treaty and won the Nobel Peace Prize for balancing the Russian and Japanese powers in Asia at the expense of China. Roosevelt made a realist decision far from justice and fairness. China was too weak to alter any of the unequal treaties infringed on her sovereignty. Given Hong Kong to the U.K. was just one case demonstrating that in foreign relations strong nations are realists (never idealists) and weak nations have no voices nor rights. Fortunately, China survived the invasions and WW II, the U.K. made a realist decision to return Hong Kong back to China on July 1, 1997.
The U.K. is a declining empire ever since WW I and further damaged after WW II, but by her clever and realistic foreign policy allying with the rising superpower, the U.S., she remains on

the center stage of the world. As a realist, the U.K. recognizes that the U.S. is the dominating player in world affairs. She acted as the strongest ally of the U.S., of course, without harming her own national interests. Being the ruler of Hong Kong over 150 years, the U.K. could not help but recognized the change of the Mainland China, especially over the recent three decades. China had struggled to build the nation avoiding the control of the Soviet Union. She had experimented with communism and learned bitter lessons. She had embraced capitalism in planned steps and had risen to be the second largest economy in the world. It is clear to the U.K. that China is no longer an "Asian Patient" and China has grown mature enough to take a proper place on the world stage. The U.K. may not be the first (nor the only) West nation to appreciate China's transformation and continuous reform but she certainly appears to be the first to take a realist step to embrace China's rise. In contrast, the U.S. seems to wish away China's rise.
When China advocated a plan of stimulating the economic development for the entire world by proposing "the one belt and one road" (OBOR) vision, a collaborative infrastructure development program bridging Asia, Europe and Africa in joint commerce development, the U.K., despite of the U.S. displeasure, took the initiative to join the China created Asia Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB) to support the OBOR program. Observing the current activities between the two nations, it seems that the U.K. is forming a close bond with China. One wonders whether that is a short-term foreign policy or a long-term diplomatic relation? China's President Xi Jinping visited the U.K. and received a royal "Royal Treatment" arousing the attention and envy of many heads of states. China has promised to invest \$10B in U.K. and most recently the People's Bank of China announced plan to issue Chinese government sovereign debt in RMB in London. Do all these signal the beginning of a long-term warm relationship between China and UK forgetting the Opium Wars and colonization of Hong Kong? So far, the U.K. seems to be the beneficiary of that warm relationship. However, no one can say that the current warm UK-China relation will definitely last long but we can say that as realists both China and the U.K. currently seem to desire their warm relation to last long. The increased activities between UK and China (likewise between Germany and China) do beg the question why is the U.S. holding out a hostile policy towards China? The U.S. has always been a realist just like the U.K., must she choreograph an anti-China play to maintain her supreme position in the world? No, it does not look like a good realist play!