

掛羊頭 賣狗肉 從 G7 高峰會說起

~范湘濤~

美國的裏子 + 中國的面子 猴年馬月臺灣獨立 看520小英[總統]就職大典

剛才和幾個閒得無聊的哥兒們，看了台灣蔡女士的就職大典，都覺得很「另類」，府內是禮儀如儀，照方抓藥，府外倒是很像北港媽祖繞境，或是北京地壇公園廟會似的雜耍集會，龍套過場，雖然經過大力烘焙，仍嫌氣味迥異於國典，熱鬧遠不如嘉年華會。這都是民主進步黨對大典獨特的認知和不同的表達方式，這些全都不重要。幾個哥們最關注的是：「蔡小姐對統獨、九二的表白和態度，很高興她沒有提到台灣獨立，而要保持兩岸和平現狀。」。我聽過了他們的意見和釋懷以後，笑罵他們是「麵湯鍋裡煮皮球」——說你們是混蛋還有一肚子氣。在他們反彈罵娘以後，聽完我解釋如下以後，個個陷入默然！

1) 獨立有兩種：檯面上的和檯面下的。台灣現在要獨立的對象是誰？是自中國版圖獨立出去嗎？錯了！錯了！台灣早在1949年就另起爐灶啦，你們看，除了有非官方的海協、海基交往以外，可有任何地方，（包括政府、制度、政策、國防、外交……等等）表現出來「兩岸是一個國家」的格式？台灣在檯面下，已經獨立了六十七年啦！誰敢否認！只是上不了台面，不能也不敢公開化罷了。

2) 台灣如果宣布獨立，中國將會真正的丟掉了台灣，國土豈能在我手中喪失？所以中國表明，基於國土完整，民族大義，以及核心利益的基本原則，雖然目前尚未統一成功，如果台獨，就必須堅決反對，不惜翻臉動武。

3) 那美國又為什麼也反對台灣獨立呢？因為台灣目前雖然沒有和美國有官方往來，但實際上是美國嘴裏的一塊肉，是屬於美國的，君不見「台灣關係法」是美國的國內法嗎？這種觀點是基於「二戰末期，美國打敗日本，佔領了「日本的領土--台灣」，而交給蔣介石政府管理」這種思維模式來看待台灣現狀。雖然是國內法，但是台灣還不是美國的一個州，連波多黎各的地位都不如，聯邦不必負擔任何經費，但是每年的軍費，就有大把銀子入帳，所以，美國把台灣當成小妾、提款機、看門狗、予取予奪，毫無牽掛和責任，但是一旦台灣脫

離美國控制而獨立，非但一切利益成泡影，更麻煩的是，有立即戰爭的危險，非但破財尚且會死人，所以台灣絕對不可以脫離美國去獨立。在2007年和2016年，美國兩次公開聲明反對台獨，那不是好心的替中國反對，而確確實實的為美國自己利益著想而反對台灣獨立。

4) 那麼在2008年，小馬哥粉墨上台，美國為啥不聲明反台獨，不吭一聲呢？玄機單門就在這裡啦！因為2007年，阿扁總統要施行「入聯公投」，一旦民意公投建國、入聯成功，攪和壞了老美的如意算盤，賠錢又打仗，那還得了？台灣不是像在俄國手裡的克里米亞，台灣十足是被握在美國手心裏的一塊五花肉，煎烹煮炸，都要聽美國主子的，不許公投就是不許，所以「麻煩製造者--阿扁」俯首聽命，入聯公投就胎死腹中了。2008年馬總統的「不獨不統不武」宣示，就是美國擬的原稿，所以照本宣科，主僕同喜。今年看到民進黨又上台，生怕基本教義派頑冥不靈，不能體會到台灣獨立對美國的傷害，所以才又鞭策一番，「台灣不可以叛美獨立」，Period！所以，只要美國不亡國，台灣永遠獨立不起來！有朝一日，中國強大到可以踩死美國了，那非但台獨無望，還要昇五星旗，唱東方紅呢！所以無論中美誰強，台灣獨立是綠營的烏托邦，盼到猴年馬月去吧！

5) 美國難道無視於中美建交，及三個公報的承諾嗎？咱們再來仔細看看：這些文件的精髓在於英文詞彙的使用：

(A) 1972-2-28 的上海公報中，美國認識到 "Acknowledged"，兩岸雙方主張一個中國，台灣是中國的一部份，美國沒有異議 "not to challenge"（沒有寫出來的是：我注意到，我聽到、我承認您兩位是有如此的主張，可是我美國並沒有相同的主張。所謂一人一把號，各吹各的調，我絕對沒有寫下「美國也承認台灣是中國的一部份」。）

(B) 1979-01-01 的中美建交公報裡，用了 "recognize" 一詞（美國注意到、認識到、認可、承認你們兩岸雙方對一個中國的立場，可是我

上星期，安倍費了九牛二虎的力氣在日本舉辦了G7高峰會。所謂G7，是指美日德英法加意七國等經濟發達國家，為了應付當時的美元危機，石油危機，協調經濟政策，重振西方經濟，在1975年由法國倡議而成立的。七大工業國在當年，GDP的總量幾乎佔了世界一半，因此被稱為「富國俱樂部」，財大氣粗，難免對世界各地的經濟指指點點，說東說西；四十年過去了，世界發生了巨大變化，G7再也沒有以前那麼風光，雖然高峰會照常開，行禮如儀，只不過是抱團取暖而已，沒有人真把G7當一回事了。現當今，G7後頭五個國家合起來的GDP總量還不及中國一個國家的GDP；加上各成員國，個個家裡又都有本難唸的經；意大利財政前兩年幾乎破產，今天法國有罷工問題，德國有難民問題，英國有脫歐問題，日本有國債問題……，國不治而想平天下，豈不難哉？G7成立的宗旨是處理世界經濟問題，可是最近兩次G7高峰會在日本的暗地運作下，居然發表關心南海航行自由的聲明，針對中國的意圖十分明顯，G7掛起的是羊頭賣的卻是狗肉，難怪中國會嗤之以鼻。

安倍這小鬼子，不但千方百計讓G7賣了狗肉，而且還把奧巴馬總統騙到廣島原子彈爆炸紀念公園去獻花哀哀，奧巴馬的作法引起許多美國二戰老兵的憤怒和抗議。日本是二戰的發動者，是侵略者，是加害者不是受害者，以原子彈轟炸日

本，才制止了侵略者征服世界的野心，為世界帶來半個多世紀的繁榮與和平，杜魯門總統當年的決策絕對是最正確的選擇。但在電視新聞上看到奧巴馬在廣島獻花致哀的鏡頭，好像看到一個在法庭聆聽宣判的罪犯，給人一種後悔認錯的感覺，奧巴馬廣告，他要怎樣向歷史交待。奧巴馬上一次訪問日本時曾向日本天皇深度鞠躬，根本忘記了二戰勝利時麥克阿瑟對天皇那種趾高氣揚的光彩歷史畫面，也曾引起美國國內許多人講，奧巴馬為了拉攏小日本如此低聲下氣，難道不覺得自己有失國格？奧巴馬的對日外交政策還不僅是有失國格這等小錯，更糟糕的是他鼓勵日本解禁集體自衛權，使日本軍國主義復活，讓日本可以拿著美日同盟的令旗到各處生事惹禍，最後美國可能被拖下水，為日本再次成為侵略者買單。美國鼓勵日本武器輸出更是大不智之舉，要知道美國的軍工產業佔有世界廣大市場，如果讓日本進來分一杯羹，以日本在這方面的根基和牠的研發能力，日本將是美國搶佔軍火市場最可怕的對手；日本的汽車工業曾打跨過美國的汽車工業，我們不願看到美國的軍火工業再次敗倒在日本手下，我們不願看到美國的未來會是今天底特律城的縮影。

看到奧巴馬不斷被安倍小鬼子玩耍，心中確實發急，筆者要建議與

目前美國顯然佔得上風，因為台灣在山姆大叔的嘴裏，又看門，又供銀兩，這種無本生意，美國是不會輕易吐出來的！另一邊，中國是暫居下風，現在拳頭尚弱，眼睜睜看著老美使喚台灣，猶如黑幫老大對跟班小弟，只有乾瞪眼的份，加上美日延展第一島鍊到南中國海，耀武揚威欺人太甚，恨的只有咬牙切

齒，所以目前對蔡女士含糊其詞演講的反應，一定又是「聽其言，觀其行」一番。孤立台灣，打擊經濟等手段，且暫緩執行，反正老美替中國卡死台灣，不許獨立。中國迫近眉睫的問題，是應付美日的凌辱，蔡英文？在美日共眼裡，小菜一碟，不夠看。

目前美國顯然佔得上風，因為台灣在山姆大叔的嘴裏，又看門，又供銀兩，這種無本生意，美國是不會輕易吐出來的！另一邊，中國是暫居下風，現在拳頭尚弱，眼睜睜看著老美使喚台灣，猶如黑幫老大對跟班小弟，只有乾瞪眼的份，加上美日延展第一島鍊到南中國海，耀武揚威欺人太甚，恨的只有咬牙切

齒，所以目前對蔡女士含糊其詞演講的反應，一定又是「聽其言，觀其行」一番。孤立台灣，打擊經濟等手段，且暫緩執行，反正老美替中國卡死台灣，不許獨立。中國迫近眉睫的問題，是應付美日的凌辱，蔡英文？在美日共眼裡，小菜一碟，不夠看。

目前美國顯然佔得上風，因為台灣在山姆大叔的嘴裏，又看門，又供銀兩，這種無本生意，美國是不會輕易吐出來的！另一邊，中國是暫居下風，現在拳頭尚弱，眼睜睜看著老美使喚台灣，猶如黑幫老大對跟班小弟，只有乾瞪眼的份，加上美日延展第一島鍊到南中國海，耀武揚威欺人太甚，恨的只有咬牙切

齒，所以目前對蔡女士含糊其詞演講的反應，一定又是「聽其言，觀其行」一番。孤立台灣，打擊經濟等手段，且暫緩執行，反正老美替中國卡死台灣，不許獨立。中國迫近眉睫的問題，是應付美日的凌辱，蔡英文？在美日共眼裡，小菜一碟，不夠看。

目前美國顯然佔得上風，因為台灣在山姆大叔的嘴裏，又看門，又供銀兩，這種無本生意，美國是不會輕易吐出來的！另一邊，中國是暫居下風，現在拳頭尚弱，眼睜睜看著老美使喚台灣，猶如黑幫老大對跟班小弟，只有乾瞪眼的份，加上美日延展第一島鍊到南中國海，耀武揚威欺人太甚，恨的只有咬牙切

齒，所以目前對蔡女士含糊其詞演講的反應，一定又是「聽其言，觀其行」一番。孤立台灣，打擊經濟等手段，且暫緩執行，反正老美替中國卡死台灣，不許獨立。中國迫近眉睫的問題，是應付美日的凌辱，蔡英文？在美日共眼裡，小菜一碟，不夠看。

目前美國顯然佔得上風，因為台灣在山姆大叔的嘴裏，又看門，又供銀兩，這種無本生意，美國是不會輕易吐出來的！另一邊，中國是暫居下風，現在拳頭尚弱，眼睜睜看著老美使喚台灣，猶如黑幫老大對跟班小弟，只有乾瞪眼的份，加上美日延展第一島鍊到南中國海，耀武揚威欺人太甚，恨的只有咬牙切

齒，所以目前對蔡女士含糊其詞演講的反應，一定又是「聽其言，觀其行」一番。孤立台灣，打擊經濟等手段，且暫緩執行，反正老美替中國卡死台灣，不許獨立。中國迫近眉睫的問題，是應付美日的凌辱，蔡英文？在美日共眼裡，小菜一碟，不夠看。

Leadership Transition Must Occur on the World Stage

Mainstream and Organic Views
Dr. Wordman

As human civilization is slowly formulating a globalized community, the world order is slowly changing accordingly. This transformation however slow must be led by the visionary world leaders and among them a leader of the leaders. Structurally, there is a United Nation with 193 member states, but the UN has been organized as an administrative body with its executive leadership guided by the UN Security Council, a body of fifteen members with five permanent members, China, France, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, the United States with veto power. Under this structure, the de facto leadership for the world is essentially falling into one or two great nations of the UN permanent security council member states.

A leader nation in the UN body or on the world stage not only has to be a great nation with strength having both economic and military power. This leader state must have statesman leadership capable of not only leading a strong and powerful nation but also moving the world toward a peaceful and prosperous global community. The U.N. was established on October 24, 1945 after the ending of WW II. Since then, the United States and the Soviet Union have emerged as the two strongest nations, respectively pursuing a capitalistic and socialistic society polarizing the world with constant confrontations, a prolonged Cold War. Even though the two leading nations have embraced socialism and capitalism to a different degree, the rivalry persisted. In the end, the Soviet Union collapsed in 1990 under the burden of arms race and failed economic development.

Post Cold War, the United States has become the sole superpower, a de facto world leader. However, in the past quarter of century under the U.S. leadership, the world has not advanced toward a peaceful and prosperous path; contrarily, the world witnessed continuous wars and unrests in the Middle East and elsewhere, spreading worldwide threat of terrorism and recently the rising tension in the Asia Pacific as the United States initiated a 'Pivot to Asia Pacific' policy. Some international political analysts interpreted the current situation as the consequence of the rising China challenging the world leadership of the United States, but many more attributed the world problem to the poor leadership of the U.S. In reality, as the world is undergoing globalization, a world leadership transformation and transition is necessary. In this process, the challenges

lie in the fact that the leader must recognize that the member states in the world community have different governance systems adopting different ideology. It is a good thing that democracy as a method for reaching decisions has been gradually accepted by the world but democracy is not an ideology and cannot be promoted as a tool to target or replace any government or governance. Democracy has been accepted and practiced in large and small kingdoms (such as the United Kingdom, Sweden, Bhutan, etc. in various degree and form) as well as in post WWII reformed nations (such as Germany, Japan, South Korea, etc). Democracy as a method has also been practiced differently in different systems and institutions, for example, in business corporations, international non-government organizations and in the institutions established under the UN charter. The leadership for the world cannot be defined by neither military power nor economic power alone or created by one nation one vote election process. It has to be transformed and transitioned gradually to be effective in leading the world and to be accepted by the world.

The U.S. is the world leader at present but she must recognize the changing world is expecting an effective leader. The United States has the pre-requisites of a world leader, that is, a developed nation, a strong economy and a powerful military; however, the pre-requisites are necessary but not sufficient conditions to be an effective world leader. To lead the world, we need a statesman (or a team of statesmen) who not only can lead the United States to sustain her in the above mentioned pre-requisite conditions to be a world leading nation, but also can lead the world with convincing leadership, demonstrating the ability of understanding the world and providing a visionary blue print for the world development.

Unfortunately, the political system in the United States, although being stable for centuries and seasoned in practicing democracy, somewhat successfully, for many decades, but the leader the electoral system selects may not be able to deliver a right statesman fit to lead the world. Take the two presumptive presidential nominees,

Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton, as examples, the former is a righteous and smart individual, who may be perfectly suited for getting the U.S. to be great again businesswise, but he may not have learned enough to understand and lead the world. The latter may be a well-experienced politician in the U.S. familiar with her political system but her motivation for power and lack of empathy for the developing world may not be fit to be a world leader either. Based on her adherence to the U.S. legacy in foreign policy, especially her China policy based on a biased view of China makes her a questionable world leader.

China is still considered a developing country even though the size of her economy is about to surpass that of the United States. The fact that China has risen both economically and diplomatically, amply indicates that the current Chinese leader (and his predecessors) has a clear grasp of the world from a developing country's point of view as well as from a great nation point of view. China started as the weakest UN permanent security council nation state on 1971 but she has earned her credits to become a respected and effective UN member. (The U.S. leadership should reflect on this!) China has openly declared that she desires to rise peacefully as a great nation and the facts are not far from that desire and the truth. However, the U.S. seems to be targeting China's rise as a threat and launches policies basically aimed to deter China's rise. This approach (out of either insecurity or hegemony thoughts) itself is not what a true world leader should take. It is so obvious that if the U.S. would work with the fast developing China, it could be more productive for mutual benefits and for the World economy and development.

As the world is globalizing and transforming, the world leader must transform and prepare to accept a leadership transition. Military or nuclear power was never the effective deterrent tool or a slug hammer to control the world order. A genuine world leadership must have a broad and deep understanding of the developing world. An effective world leader must be able to offer a sincere win-win visionary development plan for the world. A true world leader must be able to rally the world and implement a solution to lead the world out of poverty and into peace and prosperity. Observing what the Chinese leader Xi Jinping has proposed, the 'One Route and One Road' international development plan linking Asia, Africa and Europe, one has to give him credit for playing a world leadership role. It is time for the U.S. think tanks to study the world leadership issue so that a sound advice can be developed to help our elected President to transition to a true and effective world leader.