

平分秋色 豈不快哉

評抗日勝利戰功爭論

全國軍民同胞們：
(且容兄弟套用當年蔣委員長致辭時所用的稱呼。並非自抬身價，卻是先讓大眾喚起對「中國抗日戰爭」的回憶)。
公元1931年日本軍閥發動918事變，入侵中國東北，不旋踵間，建立「偽滿洲國」作為進一步侵華的基地。轉眼84年過去，國仇家恨並未因日本投降而得償。相反地，當年由於國際利害而被迫實行的「以德報怨」竟變成了日本忘恩負義的張本。至今，日本仍然不認為當年是因「敗於中國」而投降，因此加倍輕視炎黃子孫。在美國政客卵翼之下，肆其狂妄無知，意圖收回臺灣再度控制西太平洋。
而現在，是什麼時候了？東京和紐約的政客財閥們，狼狽為奸意圖消除炎黃子孫們在亞洲的生存空間。而我們還把自己侷限在「內鬥內行 外鬥外行」的笑話裡？還在「是誰領導了8年抗戰」的舊夢裡喋喋不休？我知道，人人會說，「事實是越辯越明的」，來給「為了不同目的的嘵嘵爭辯」下注腳。那我告訴你，「歷史是人寫的」！不是「日升於東 落於西」，也不是「豬油對健康是益是害」那麼不能辯或可辯。寫歷史，永遠是「誰胳膊粗力氣大」就是誰來寫。太史簡／董狐筆5000年來能有幾個？留下了甚麼正氣長存的遺產？
國共內鬥，早已變成了「老太太的被窩鬥 王大娘的裹腳」。不用再爭了。既然歷史由人寫，何妨「中國人的歷史，中國人寫」？
「8年抗戰」，1937—1945 不錯是國民政府領導為主戰。但是共軍的貢獻，主要在敵後，當然功不可沒。而且從1931—1937（九一八到盧溝橋）的6年間風起雲湧的抗日行動裡，「共產黨，西北軍和東北地方武力」發揮了不少抵禦，阻撓和牽制的功能，更不能容許治史者抹煞。簡言之，1931—37，共產黨和地方武力是抗日的主導（儘管不是第一線正面作戰）。1937—1945，則是國民政府居功厥偉 領導有方。（連戰說的「國民黨領導抗戰於敵前；共產黨領導抗戰於敵後」云云，我認為可圈可點，是顧全大局，開創合作的話。）
整整14年裡，國共互相詆毀，

抹黑的行為造成了無窮後患。千百倍加劇了國際上認為「中國人是一盤散沙」的譏嘲。國軍罵共軍扯後腿，卻不能為「剿滅新四軍」辯解。共黨罵國府濫殺無辜，卻無法為處決監禁為數不可勝計的「國特」（國民黨特務）澄清。這還不過是在千萬個悲劇中的小例子。多年以來，彼此拒絕原諒，容納對方。而隨著中國日見強大，「抗日神話」竟在中國勢如燎原地流傳，嚴重影響了人們對真實情況的認知。
兄弟並非史學家或「御用治史者」。但是兄弟深知：大歷史遠比小歷史影響大。所以我們何妨擴大「中國抗日史」，從《8年抗戰》擴充為《14年抗戰》？不必在小節斤斤計較，就讓國民黨和共產黨在整個《抗日戰爭史》上，平分秋色，豈不快哉？

股市震蕩 人幣貶值

中國經濟需要樹立第四根支柱

由於中國股市猛升暴跌、出口大幅度下降以及人民幣貶值，全球股市為之震動，各種悲觀言論乃在報章雜誌上氾濫成災。對此，我們也來談談，或許能有助於對中國經濟的了解。
過去三十多年來，中國經濟有三大支柱。第一根支柱是外貿。自從鄧小平說，中國必需趕上最後一班車，接受了習仲勛的建議，開放四個經濟特區，邀請香港與海外華僑投資，並解放農民，准許他們進城打工，中國在很短的時間內構建了「世界工廠」，出口賺匯，為貧窮落後的中國經濟打開了一條廣闊的生路。這是有效利用來自農村的龐大勞動力所帶來的紅利。他們的辛勞配合了國際市場的需求，使中國趕上了「最後一班車」。當然，幾乎所有國內外的評論都告訴我們，現在中國出現了勞動力短缺的現象，工資逐步升高，低端產品已競爭不過晚來的新興國家。加上2008年以後發達國家需求疲軟，所以出口創匯這根支柱頂多只能維穩了。
第二大支柱就是房地產。在建國後的頭三十年裡，中國基本上沒有為居民建造住房，有的也絕大多數是簡陋的員工宿舍，有些還需要用公共廁所。改革開放的划時代功勞就是打開了一道阻擋了人民急迫需求的政治閘門，帶來了房地產的狂飆式增長。這個增長帶動了整個社會各種各樣的經濟活動，改變了都市地貌，也大大地改善了民生。據《中國能贏》一書作者宋魯鄭估計，中國老百姓擁有自己房產的家庭已超過85%。
可是，房地產大約在五、六年前

就出現了超建。那時內蒙鄂爾多斯的「鬼城」被一位賣空專家Chnos 作為預言中國經濟即將崩盤的證據。為了抵制全球金融風暴的襲擊，政府撥出了四萬億人民幣救市，加上地方政府依靠賣地來發展經濟，以達到預訂的GDP目標，以至於即使房屋空置，新項目仍然不斷上馬。據西方一家財經公司Mckinsey & Co. 估計，中國救市的整個規模超過17萬億，使總債務高達GDP的282%。雖然最近房地產市場稍有起色，但是當年的雄風已經不復存在了。
第三大支柱就是基礎設施的全面建設。只要到中國大陸旅行，第一眼看到的就是超過西方國家標準的現代化機場，然後是無遠弗屆的高級公路，再就是大城市裡一片一片的高樓大廈。當然，中國還有高鐵——未來經濟發展的本錢。中國修建的高鐵數量已占全球高鐵的一半以上。可是，基礎設施投資的經濟效益已經越來越低，而且產能嚴重過剩。西方專家說，中國依靠投資來抬高GDP的發展模式已經失靈了。
上面只是對目前情況最簡單的描述。如果想要進一步瞭解中國經濟的問題，不妨去網上購買一本由經濟學家 John Mauldin 和 Worth Wray 編寫的新書：A Great Leap Forward? 該書收集了十幾位專家對中國經濟狀況的分析。這些專家中有好幾位是曾經或者仍然居住在大陸的資金管理人，所以他們的意見不是從書本上得來的，而是從實際

跟中國經濟打交道得來的。儘管他們多數對中國的經濟前景表示悲觀，但是少數仍然持著審慎的樂觀。一般來說，他們認為，中國應當不再強調要讓GDP達到百分之幾，而應當減少貨幣流動量，逐步去槓桿化（減債），同時進行進一步的改革開放，這樣，中國仍然可以達到4%到5%的增速。如果硬要達到更高的成長目標，那麼泡沫會越滾越大，終於會帶來爆破的後果。
其實，李克強在他的《政府工作報告》中非常清楚地，也非常詳盡地討論到中國目前的經濟狀況和其中所涉問題，他深切知道中國的經濟需要改革和轉型，需要以增加消費來刺激經濟，需要創新和創業、需要工業升級、需要對國營企業嚴加管束，給中小企業更大的發展空間、需要讓市場具有決定性的影響、同時也需要擴大對外開放，等等。
可以這麼說，經過了三十七年史無前例的高速增長，中國的經濟有必要作出一大相當規模的轉變。在轉變期間，如果增速放緩，那也絕對不是壞事。在上述三大支柱中，外銷和房地產這兩大支柱雖然說仍然重要，但是已經不能作為下一階段經濟發展的主力。下一階段最重要是增加國內消費的力度。這也就是許多專家所說的「再平衡」：讓消費佔到的經濟份額的比例增加，讓靠投資來支撐經濟的份額減少。國內消費力的增長將是中國經濟發展的第四根支柱。與此平行的就是減少貧富差距與打擊貪腐。加上這根支柱，中國的經濟就會另有一股新生力量投入。這個再平衡的成功與否將是習李領導班子的巨大挑戰。
另外必需提到的就是上面說的第三大支柱：基礎設施建設。西方專家普遍認為，中國在這方面已經過頭了。可是，這是他們錯誤的地方。中國在基礎建設方面所累積的經驗和知識極為寶貴，而中國的工程團隊在這方面的競爭能力也絕對勝過發達國家。例如，《紐約時報》的商業版9月6日報導，剛剛合併不久的中國鐵路公司將在美國麻州設廠，為波斯頓的地鐵建造車廂。十月間，中泰鐵路將要開工。所以說，在習近平提出了「一帶一路」的宏偉計劃時，我們都為之浩歎，為之驚喜。因為一帶一路是把中國發展的最強項向外輸出，把在國內做的差不多的工作和取得的經驗向廣大的、缺乏這種能力的國家輸出，或者以較低的成本在發達國家競標。所以，當中國倡議建立亞洲基礎設施投資銀行和絲路基金時，除了美國和日本之外，它獲得了幾乎是全世界的支持。歐洲國家不願美國的阻撓，紛紛加入。我們相信，在今後十年或者更長的時間裡，連接歐亞大陸的一帶一路將為中國經濟的繼續挺進帶來新的動力。因此，我們大可不必為中國的經濟前景擔憂，雖然今後的一兩年難免會出現一些轉型的陣疼。

賊心未改，焉得入常？

安倍政府恬不知恥

今年是二戰反法西斯勝利70週年，全世界都在舉行紀念活動。安倍晉三在數月前接到中國邀請參加北京紀念活動包括閱兵後，一直沒有做出是否應邀的決定，直到閱兵慶典前夕，日本官方才以「國會審議狀況」為由，決定缺席。
然而當聯合國秘書長潘基文和韓國總統朴槿惠決定應邀前往北京時，日本政府突然轉身，指責潘基文「決定草率」和沒有在政治上保持「中立」。日本右翼媒體產經新聞也發表文章將朴槿惠比喻為被日本暗殺的朝鮮末代皇后明成皇后。潘基文駁斥日本說在當前全世界都在紀念二戰反法西斯勝利70週年之際，他參加多次國際紀念活動，記取歷史教訓，創造光明未來，是他做為聯合國秘書長應有之義。韓國也向日本政府提出嚴正抗議。
在所有被北京邀請的國家中，只有日本和菲律賓沒有派代表前往。雖然美國和西方各國元首們沒有

參加慶典，但也都派了特使前往，也沒有批評中國閱兵紀念活動。不知日本是否認為只有菲律賓在政治上保持「中立」而與不知悔悔的日本站在同一邊？難道日本有識之士不認為日本政府所做出荒腔走板，自暴其丑的決定，去指責聯合國密書長才是真正的草率？
在各方壓力下，安倍最近發表了「反省和道歉」的談話。在他的談話中，沒有直接使用『侵略』字眼，而把當年向鄰國赤裸裸的侵略說成是「誤判國際情勢」，也表示將來日本不會再使用武力作為「解決國際紛爭的手段」。很顯然他在狡辯說日本於二戰時揮兵入侵鄰國，戮殺了幾千萬生靈的罪行只是「解決國際紛爭」的手段。
可是就在安倍發表上述談話的同時，為何日本政府不顧大多數民眾的反對，強行通過「安保法條例」，使日本在本土沒受攻擊情形下，可以派軍隊到海外進行軍事攻擊活動？為何日本又不停的在進行武力奪島

演習？為什麼在兩個日本投降日，先後將兩艘潛艇下水，並沿用當年侵華戰爭戰艦的舊名，出雲號和加賀號？為什麼有著和平憲法，身為二戰戰敗國，日本海空軍實力排名於全世界前四名之內？
當年日本軍國主義武裝侵略整個亞洲，還喪心病狂，掙掙的號稱是為了從西方殖民主義手中解放亞洲和建立東亞共榮圈。今天安倍政權要通過安保法條例，廢除和平憲法，為武力爭奪東海、南海和太平洋資源以及介入中國台海爭端做準備，並又如出一轍的美其名曰「極積和平主義」。
聯合國是在二戰擊敗日德法西斯軸心國後由中美英蘇法所推動建立的。聯合國憲章中的人權宣言就是針對二戰中日本和納粹所犯下的慘無人寰的暴行而建立的。
在二戰勝利70年後，德國可以說是徹底悔過自新了。但手上沾滿亞洲人民特別是中國人鮮血的日本，卻一直沒有誠心的懺悔，同時還巧言為當年侵略屠殺找尋藉口。意圖廢除和平憲法，整軍備武，準備東山再起，重新恢復往日大日本帝國的光輝。
這樣的一個恬不知恥，賊心未死的日本，怎麼可以讓它成為安理會的常任理事國呢？

Obama's China Policy and Looking Beyond 2016

The U.S. has been the world's promoter of democracy, freedom and capitalism since the end of WW II. For the past 70 years, the U.S. has conducted her foreign policies under such a banner (DFC) with varying degree of rigor ranging from modest soft power influence to militant 'regime change' strategy. The end of Cold War, the collapse of Soviet Union, could be considered a major victory, but the DFC banner seems to be tarnished by various events such as 'color movements' taking place along the way. First of all, democracy has not been an assurance to a stable prosperous nation. Many examples of South American countries, EU and the Asian nations including even the U.S., have shown that limitations of making progress for a 'democratic society' and its inability in reducing wealth gap in the society. As for capitalism, many nations in the world, communist countries included, have adopted capitalism but with serious reservations and necessary dosages of socialistic modifications, practiced by the U.S. herself. As for freedom, the principal element is really the freedom of speech and mobility; all human rights, religious rights etc are visible and measurable via freedom of mobility and communication. The migration to cities from rural areas and immigration issues involving people moving to countries with better economic conditions indicate that mobility is more a social problem rather than a political freedom issue. With the advent of Internet, the freedom of communication has soared tremendously in the world, in China, particularly, with voices of hundreds of millions expressed daily, barring those concerning sensitive national security or anti-government opinions. On the other hand, the U.S. has found necessary to monitor citizens' communication (in violation of privacy rights) for security concerns caused by international terrorism.
The U.S. is still the most liberal country in media freedom; she has more publications than any other country in the world especially in the domain of national security and foreign policies, although many not be as independent as they claimed. Information overload has become a serious burden to citizens; however having more is still better than having less provided people are willing to digest the different views to avoid being brain washed. Foreign Affairs, a prestigious magazine, recently published a special issue, entitled Obama's World - Judging His Foreign Policy Record. In this September/October 2015 issue, it contains an essay, Obama and Asia - Confronting the China Challenge, authored by Thomas J. Christensen, a Princeton professor and the author of The China Challenge: Shaping the Choices of a Rising Power (Norton, 2015). Prof. Christensen had served as the U.S. Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, a valuable experience for him to write a review on Obama's China Policy record. As American citizens are going to elect a new President in 2016, it is timely for us to discuss the important U.S. China policy topic with reference to Christensen's review article. Let's first summarize Prof. Christensen's main points with check marks in mind, right, wrong or debatable, then we will offer additional analyses and comments if appropriate.

Mainstream and Organic
Dr. Wordman
Christensen rightly pointed out that China poses challenges to the U.S.; and China is powerful enough to be influential in the stability of East Asia and important enough to be relevant in solving global problems. Christensen acknowledged that President Bush ended his term heading the China policy to a right direction and President Obama made some progress with a mixed record. Obama was effective in placing US presence in Asia and managed tension but made mistake in rhetoric and in diplomacy with flip-flop languages from 'pivot' to 'rebalance', from agreeing to respect each other's 'core interest' (China's stability and territorial integrity and U.S. Anti-terror and world security concern) to selling arms to Taiwan and meeting Dalai Lama and from reassuring security to criticizing China's Internet and blaming each other on hacking. In Christensen's view, the tensions are up in the East and South China Sea but not manufactured by the U.S. even though she held military exercises in those regions. On global governance, Obama's record is also mixed: On the nuclear issue with North Korea and Iran, China is getting warmer to South Korea which may indicate China's inability to control North Korea. China's increasing investment in North Korea certainly weakens the US sanction (Note: perhaps the U.S. needs to understand China's strategy better in the Korean Peninsula). In conclusion, Christensen remarked that anytime the U.S. engaged in a regime change, China stopped supporting the U.S. in international affairs (e.g. nuclear, Qaddafi, Kim, ...) which should be noted. A bright spot in U.S.-China relation is on climate change with quantitative expectation as a result of mutual internal pressure (Note: Common interests between the U.S. and China, particularly on issues the people of two nations care about do exist. Leaders and politicians should stay away from rhetoric but listen to what people say!)
After reading the Foreign Affairs' issue and Christensen's review on China Policy, I could not help raising some fundamental questions. First, is it correct for the U.S. to assume that the China challenge is a national security issue as we did on Russia? Is China really the destabilizing element in Asia or as the U.S. making her to be? For decades, there were no serious confrontations in the East and South China seas. It was in 2010 Japan first arrested a Chinese fishing boat that evolved into a series of drama including Japan's comic move of purchasing those non-inhabitable rocks historically belonged to China. The U.S. is fully aware of this yet cowardly or shrewdly declares taking no position on this sovereignty issue, essentially encouraging Japan to take more provocative actions, and further condoning Japan by applying the article 5 of the US-Japan Defense treaty to those rocks. On this issue, leaders should listen to the people

than follow the legacy think tank touting a fictitious enemy to drum up arms race and military alliances leading to tension rather than solving world problems. If one asks why is China making a big effort to conduct a parade to commemorate the 70th anniversary of the ending of WW II? The answer is simple, China is feeling insecure - the only nation was invaded and victimized by so many countries, from the West and the East, for so many years causing the world's biggest economy to become the poorest population on earth for decades. Now China is rising, what do the Chinese people see, they now have a dream but they see their country being targeted as the enemy by the U.S., worse by Japan even threatened by North Korea. Chinese people are no more belligerent and warmongering than the American people, why should they be targeted as the enemy? More than sarcastic is China being targeted as enemy by Abe Shinzo, a bloodline descendent of a Japanese war criminal.
Another fundamental question is that why is China accused of being reluctant to pay economic and political cost to deal with world problems and to contribute to the global prosperity? This is puzzling to the Chinese and American people alike. The Chinese believe more in the United Nations than the U.S. does. China's grand strategy of constructing a 'One Belt and One Route' connecting Asia to Europe has every element for stimulating economic development of half the world. China's foreign policy has been leaning far more towards economic development than military alliances. Why should the U.S. urge Japan to assume a larger role in global affairs in the direction of escalating her military strength? To add more pressure on an insecure China or to depend on Japanese troops to defend the U.S., a ludicrous logic in view of the historic facts how US-Japan fought during WW II and how Japanese textbooks describes Pearl Harbor, Nanking Massacre and the atomic bomb.
Finally, one questions why is the U.S. as the greatest power in the world not willing or unable to manage the U.S.-China security issue bilaterally without involving other nations? The U.S. has always been assertive in conducting her foreign affairs. China has become more assertive in a reactionary manner to provocation. In fact, China openly regards the U.S. as the greatest nation and wishes to have a friendly relation to avoid to be targeted as the enemy. Is it that difficult for the U.S. leader to deal with the Chinese leader in a frank and direct manner? It can't be the language, since the Japanese language and culture are probably more mystic than Chinese to Americans. This Fall, when Chinese leader, Xi Jinping, who had studied in the U.S. with fond memory and gratitude towards his American host family, visits President Obama, we hope they will open a new page of China policy to guide the U.S.-China relation onto a positive course. As 2016 is approaching, the U.S. presidential campaign is warming up. The China Policy should rank high on the candidates' minds. It is so important for the candidates to leaf through the legacy pages of China policy and cultivate a new constructive dialogue rather than blindly iterating China bashing. The future of the U.S., China and the world depends critically on the outcome of the 2016 election as I have discussed in this column previously.