

## 蔡英文應「展現高度」促進藍綠合解

陳水扁主政台灣八年大肆全面貪腐,貪污賄賂,洗錢,軍中賣官案件層出不窮,罄竹難書,轟動全球。三審定讞的重大案件有:龍潭購地收受台泥辜家賄款三億案,101董事長陳繁黨人事賄案,南港展覽館工程賄案,元大合併復華案等。更有國務機要費案,二次金改國泰合併華案,教唆偽證案等仍在司法機關審理之中。而瑞士最高法院已裁定阿扁家族不法所得應歸還台灣。扁家在美某些產業也被美國政府充公沒收。現在當民進黨大選勝利還沒多久,綠營人士就迫不急待的對馬英九施壓,要求他特赦阿扁以「展現高度」和促進「藍綠和解」。如果說特赦阿扁代表了藍綠和解,那就是說綠營人士堅信阿扁是無辜的,而他人獄完全是被藍軍操縱司法,政治迫害的結果。這種說法會被絕大多數,有能力明辨是非的人士接受嗎?恐怕就連大多數綠營人士自己也不會相信阿扁是清白和無辜的。如果馬英九在像落水狗一樣被打壓的情形下屈辱的特赦了阿扁,相反的就會使未來的藍綠對立更為加劇。而民進黨在「特赦陳水扁」議題上的操作卻讓台灣人民看清楚民進黨

黨沒有是非的道德的品質。如果綠營真正認為阿扁是被國民黨污陷和迫害而入獄,為了維護司法正義,他們就應該在新政府和國會上台後,在人民和媒體監督下,讓獨立的司法機關重新全面審理所有扁案,並發動調查,追究上屆政府的偵查人員,檢查官和法官等有無違法失職,誣陷忠良。同時也讓年輕一代的選民看清楚阿扁有無貪腐?國民黨有無政治迫害阿扁?和民進黨自己的政治操守準則。如果蔡英文真想做一個「全民總統」,真想讓「藍綠和解」,就應該「展現高度」,呼籲所有台灣人民,包括對中華民族,華夏祖先有著深厚情感的深藍民眾和對舊日殖民政權,日本,有著難捨情懷的深綠民眾,暫時拋開民族認同意識的差異,為了未來長遠的繁榮,福祉和安危,大家坐在一起,認真考慮是否應該廢除台獨黨綱,是否應該放棄「去中國化」,是否應該認同九二共識去追求和平統一和高度自治。而不應該像其他綠營人士一樣,把特赦貪腐的陳水扁和修法廢除國父視為當務之急,以推進他們所謂的「轉形正義」。

## 21世紀王道和霸權的博奕

中美的政治制度的分歧,不只是資本主義和社會主義的理念迥異,而難於合作共贏,最重要的分歧就是中國推行的王道崛起,以建立人類命運共同體為號召,爭取到世界大部份國家的支持,而美國以霸權來推行的普世價值觀,經過在伊拉克,利比亞,埃及,阿富汗等國家實踐,證明只是帶來更大動蕩和災難,兩者相比好壞明顯易見。王道的彰顯直接威脅到霸權國家政治和經濟的影響力,那一國領導人不希望國家繁榮安定,可以平穩管治?跟隨霸權國家,時刻軍演,謀打殺,只會弄到國庫空虛,經濟崩潰,民心思變,政權不穩,得不到任何實質利益。反觀中國崛起,向世界推行王道,以經濟推動互利共贏,和各國平等合作,不附帶任何條件,不干預別國內政,更受各國歡迎。基於共同發展是持續發展的重要基礎,打造各國命運共同體,發起「一帶一路」倡議,共同發展,是互利共贏合作典範。亞洲基礎設施投資銀行,金磚國家新開發銀行,開創了發展中國家組建多邊金融機構的先河。上合組織,二十國集團,亞太經合組織,金磚國家等多邊平台上,就加強全球經濟治理,使國際經濟秩序朝著平等公正,合作共贏的方向發展,促進國際貨幣

體系和國際金融監管改革。人民幣納入國際貨幣基金組織特別提款權貨幣籃子,提升了發展中國家貨幣的國際地位。一系列、勢不可擋加速發展的大戰略,是為崛起互利共贏的原動力,為人類創造一個和諧、和平,美好的新世界,不只可圓中國夢,亦是世界和平之夢。現今中美兩大國的外交、經濟,軍事政策,都足以影響著全人類未來發展的福祉。而近期中美之間的博奕,表面上是意識形態之差異,美元和人民幣在國際貨幣地位的爭奪,而最難妥協的就是王道和霸權主義國策的博奕。王道的順利推動,正如古人所說,以德服人者王,以力服人者霸,當各國嘗到王道的甜頭時,亦是霸權反叛親離的時刻,歷史潮流無法抗拒,霸權主義沒落是無可避免。霸權主義國家應有所反省,圍堵別人,達不到目的時反而害己,此時此刻,理應回頭是岸,才不致自我孤獨和給歷史淘汰。過去數百年,人類歷經殖民主義,帝國主義,軍國主義,法西斯主義,資本主義,共產主義,社會主義和霸權主義的洗禮和探索,戰火不斷,生靈塗炭,21世紀、如果王道能彰顯,各國成為地球命運共同體時,將為人類啓托永久和平,真正建立到一個互助互利,和平共贏的地球。

# 是廟不是和尚 我看美國的大選

今年美國的大選年,共和黨內出現了一位遙遙領先的極右派川普,民主黨內出現了一位急起直追的極左派桑德斯,讓選情更有看頭。美國的政治制度完善,是廟不是和尚,不管是媽祖還是濟公,擺到神壇上都變得一模一樣,出不了什麼大差錯,這個大家可以放心。筆者註冊的是民主黨,在歷屆總統選舉中,除了投過尼克森和老布希各一次外,其他每次都是投民主黨的候選人,但今年我可能投共和黨,因為民主黨的兩位候選人我的票都投不下去。先說喜萊莉,並不是因為她是女人而歧視她,而是她比男人更男人而討厭她,再說她的那張臉孔已看了近二十年,實在看夠了;桑德斯以高道德口號競選,但有些主張似乎是天馬行空,不切實際。有些人說美國的選舉,是在一堆爛蘋果當中選一個比較不爛的,這一次我的選擇是共和黨的川普;看官一定奇怪,我怎麼會對大家認為是「種族歧視者」,「性別歧視者」的川普有好感?我要反問,他真的是「種族歧視者」嗎?如果是,退出共和黨總統初選的黑人醫生卡森怎麼會轉而支持他呢?如果

是,為什麼他在佛羅里達那個拉美移民大州,會贏得共和黨初選的巨大勝利呢?再說,他結婚離婚幾次,見到女人就垂涎三尺,他會歧視女性嗎?他反對穆斯林,是因為穆斯林最近在世界各地發動的恐怖突擊造成人心惶惶才主張不接收穆斯林難民,不是正合乎美國廣大人民的心情嗎?以上談的都是雞毛蒜皮的小事,其實,筆者欣賞的是他提出的內政外交主張。他認為美國財力不如從前,而且是個負債國,應大幅降低對北大西洋公約組織的參與,他更質疑美國駐軍亞洲的價值,他認為美國不應該花那麼多錢去保護那些地區。川普的競選口號「讓美國再次偉大」,顯然不是指外交舞臺,而是指國內建設,要把資源用於重建美國老舊的基礎建設,他說:「我們必須要先照顧好自己」引起了廣大共鳴,也許是他為什麼能異軍突起的原因吧!半個多世紀以來,美國以世界警察自居,到處滅火又到處點火,大小戰爭打個不停,卻沒弄到一點由戰勝帶來的利益,如今川普提出要照顧好自

本文完稿後,寄給一些朋友,選了幾篇他們的迴響,各吹各的號,頗為熱鬧:

艾美:一如以往,讀來過癮,請再接再厲!  
寒雲:寫得好,舉雙手贊成!  
程士齡:川普:他代表中下層老美心聲如老范所云壞不到那裡,反正美國底子厚制度訂死總統權力被國會扣押所以不妨試試放他一馬吧!  
天佑美國!天佑中國!天佑台灣!  
陳大安:眼看美國共和黨總統候選人川普在媒體上連連被轟,身為共和黨人且是川普支持者,今天看到湘濤的文章,除了贊同他的論點,還是有幾句話想說。  
川普並非我理想中的總統候選人,可是又有誰是呢?其實當總統並不需要什麼特別條件,只要頭腦清楚,知人善用也就夠了。美國政壇,智庫和學術界滿是聽隨隨到的智囊型人才,還怕川普找不到人出主意?  
對川普缺乏好感的人一般都是不滿他在競選期間的一些言行,這當然無可厚非,不少人的確是光憑印象好壞來決定投票給誰的。川普講話幾乎不草稿,想到那裡就說到那裡,而且是該怎麼說就怎麼說,這種直言作風在一切講求包裝的政壇無疑是個異數,閣下可以說他不按牌理出牌,但是不能批評他這種直言作風不對,更不該因而對他產生反感。我看不起希拉蕾就是她見人說人話見鬼說鬼話,到處為選票添屁股的醜態。  
川普的競選諾言最得我心的對非法入境者的處置和固守南疆的做法。我當然不完全贊成他的諾言,特別是針對中國的,不過我並不擔心,我同意湘濤的看法,川普是個精明生意人,豈會看不準利之所在?我看讓他當總統要比牛仔小布希強上千百倍。  
文逸:我也很討厭希拉蕊,但是看來她的勝算很大。川普如果當選可能是好事,因為他傾向孤立主義,主張自掃門前雪。  
周友道:我同意你的看法與意見,但我不認為川普會是共和黨的代表,我是共和黨,我也不希望他來代表黨選總統。其原因很簡單,他不可能做到所有他講的話,我怕他會把鍋都砸碎了。喜萊利當選是勢在必行,不要忘了,今年是女人當選年,我們只好說:天意也。  
齊武:我不可能支持Hillary,因為我覺得她是一個標準人前講人話,人後講鬼話的,不值得信任的人。我聽到太多有機會近距離觀察她的人們的私下

評論,更何況她對外政策對美國造成的巨大傷害。所以今年我是一個ABC, Anybody But Clinton。  
我還須要觀察川普,現在也難難支持他,但是今年選舉還有很多變數,有可能美國兩黨都會重新組合。  
好處是加州人民終於找回存在感,他們的選票可能對兩黨的提名有實質的影響。  
關宇: For one thing, I can't tolerate Hillary. I have been a Democrat for decades and voted mostly democratic presidential candidates, except the senior Bush in 1992. I put up Bernie Sanders yard signs in front and on the side of my home, probably the only household doing so in a 2-mile radius. (BTW, I don't see any sign for Trump or Hillary in our neighborhood.) His platform might be a bit ahead of his time in today's America. But that is a future this country needs.  
I can't possibly vote for Hillary in November. She is too cozy with Wall Street and too "loyal" to Israel. As to Trump I will have to see how he campaigns in the coming months to see if he can win over my vote. However, his foreign policy principles do seem more palatable to me.  
語人: Agree with your points. Glad to know you are going to vote for Trump.  
C C LO: Very well said! If one has to vote, Trump probably is a better bet than any of the others!  
A bet is not a sure thing as the word implied.  
李偉宗: Thanks for sharing your Donald Trump related thoughts, with which, I'm sorry to say, I happen to disagree.  
Being myself oriented a little bit more toward the liberal side and a little bit more sympathetic with the Democratic Party, I tend to dislike the Republican Party and US conservatism. The US presidential election is to me a matter of selecting the less bad and Trump happens to be, to me, the worst among all, with whom I disagree in most issues. He is to me a super-jerk and I have never disliked or distrusted a person as much as I dislike and distrust Trump, who is to me like a Hitler in Germany during the period from the end of World I to the beginning of World War II.  
Here is the way I see it and my humble opinion: Trump seems unstoppable at the moment, but I feel that the US in the end will have a female president next Feb, whom I don't necessarily like. And regardless of who gets elected and becomes the next US president, she or he will not necessarily be friendly toward China, my mother country.  
Just my 2 cents and sorry that I disagree with your thoughts on Trump.

## Liberalism and Conservatism and Proper Balance

Recently, I came across a Chinese article by Xue Zong Zhang (張雪忠), Why is Hu Shi (a famous Chinese intellect and author in 20<sup>th</sup> century; he is regarded as a promoter of liberalism not only in his time but beyond through his writings) a Half Baked Liberal?, on the "Baodia Forum" (an intellectual forum devoted to discussions on Chinese governance and Chinese Sovereignty issues such as the Chinese sovereignty over the Diaoyu Islands). Mr. Zhang criticized Hu Shi not really understanding liberalism, but the article written in a Q&A format did not leave a clear description of liberalism and how it should be promoted. Personally, I find myself constantly swinging between liberalism and conservatism when facing different issues. The above article with its fuzzy arguments on true liberalism has triggered my long time desire to define liberalism and its workability in real world. This desire is confined to define liberalism from basic philosophical principles and how it may be practiced under different real world conditions and political systems. The following is my attempt of doing an intellectual exercise to define liberalism and the constraints the real world will bring to limit liberalism. These constraints working against liberalism, for convenience, may be characterized by the term, conservatism, which often restricts and works against liberalism.  
From dictionaries, liberalism has the following definitions:  
1. quality or state of being liberal.  
2. belief in the value of social and political change in order to achieve progress.  
3. a movement in modern Protestantism emphasizing intellectual liberty and the spiritual and ethical content of Christianity.  
4. a theory in economics emphasizing individual freedom from restraint and usually based on free competition, the self-regulating market, and the gold standard.  
5. a political philosophy based on belief in progress, the essential goodness of the human race, and the autonomy of the individual and standing for the protection of political and civil liberties.  
6. Liberalism is a political philosophy or worldview founded on ideas of liberty and equality. Whereas classical liberalism and European liberalism prioritize liberty, American liberalism and social liberalism stress equality.  
The above definitions seem to be fine but they do not touch on the essential aspect of how liberalism can be easily understood and how it works when constraints are applied. Therefore,  
I prefer to take the approach of starting with broad acceptable principles to define liberalism and then to add layers of descriptions from real world constraints to arrive at the workable (practical and conditional) liberalism. Let's begin with the following principles I assume that are generally acceptable:  
1. Human is the most intelligent species on earth. Human desires physical and intellectual liberty.

Mainstream and Organic Views  
Dr. Wordman  
2. Human beings are born as unique individuals with one's own intrinsic ability and one's acquired ability through one's own will.  
3. Human beings with intelligence deserve to have intellectual liberty that is to freely exercise one's intellectual capability.  
4. Following principles 1, 2 and 3, unconditional or unconstrained liberalism can be defined as individuals have rights to think, say and do anything according to one's desire and to one's ability. (Any individual has liberal rights to think, say and do anything or whatever one wants. For example, an individual living by oneself in one's own universe)  
The above definition of unconstrained liberalism cannot work. Since no two individuals are completely (100%) alike, unconditional liberalism will have intrinsic limitations due to one's ability. Furthermore, human beings live in a society (not practical to live by oneself totally cut off from any society), then they face other limitations due to one's environment, such as natural and physical living condition and other man-made conditions imposed by marriage, family, society, nation and world organizations in terms of ethics, laws and regulations. If we add constraints to liberalism, we shall have the following definitions:  
5. Come with the above discussed intrinsic limitations and other constraints are liberal rights infringement. Thus conditional liberalism can be defined as individual's unconditional liberal rights being reduced to avoid liberal rights infringement. For example, an individual lives with a family will have to reduce one's unconditional liberal rights (singing loudly at two o'clock in the morning) to avoid infringing liberal rights of other family member (sleep undisturbed under quietness).  
6. Conditional liberalism can also be defined as individual's unconditional liberal rights being reduced to tolerate liberal rights infringement caused by one's environment one's in. For example, an individual lives with a family will have to reduce one's unconditional liberal rights (sleep undisturbed at any time) to tolerate liberal rights being infringed by other family member (practicing singing for audition) So conditional liberalism must have 'give and take' conditions.  
7. Unconditional liberalism cannot be accepted in an environment where family, society or nation exists simply because an individual's unconditional liberalism will infringe on other individual's unconditional liberal rights. Therefore, unconditional liberalism is not a workable liberalism.

8. Avoidance and tolerance of liberal right infringement really define the degree of constraints placed on unconditional liberalism.  
9. Conditional liberalism is thus defined as unconditional liberalism with proper constraints applied in an environment, family, society and nation. 'Proper Constraints' of course can be subjective.  
10. Within a family, conditional liberalism is constrained by family structure, hierarchy, generation, and sibling relationship. These relationships define responsibilities, range of liberal rights limited by constraints. Voluntary constraints are guided by human nature (good versus evil both exist), human knowledge (more or less by education) and infringing and tolerance trade-off (give and take). Involuntary constraints are defined by moral principles and laws.  
11. Going beyond family to community, society and nation, more individuals are involved and more constraints will apply. These constraints will be guided by community/society rules, laws and constitutions depending on the social structure, political system and economic condition.  
12. The constraints applicable to the liberal rights can be created, regulated and altered by political system, for example, a communist system tends to restrict individual's liberal rights more, thus limiting individuals to achieve their full capability and capacity; a socialist system tends to make trade-offs in individual liberal rights with a bias to side with the poor and disadvantaged population. A liberal society tends to maximize tolerance (reduce avoidance) to enhance individual liberalism.  
13. The methods employed in the political system to apply constraints to individual liberalism is democracy with a variety of practicing methods, from one person one vote to various hierarchical representation systems to only one person decides. (dictatorship, one supreme individual above everyone) The various representation systems define various degrees of democracy. How well does a political system work depend on how liberalism is practiced and what constraints are properly applied, which are dependent on economic condition.  
Ideally, human liberalism should be promoted with minimal constraints and maximal tolerance. Unfortunately, human beings have faulty traits such as selfishness, greed, laziness and intolerance, therefore, ideal liberalism (minimum constraints and maximum tolerance) does not work. For example, under a democratic system, voters tend to vote for getting the maximum benefits (take more from the government than give to the government) until the system (government) breaks down (Greece is an example) Therefore, there must be a proper balance to limit or constrain liberalism. To achieve this proper balance, conservatism comes to play. So liberalism must be counter-balanced by conservatism. I hope this column offered you some useful information to understand and interpret the dictionary definitions of liberalism and its necessary constraints. Hopefully this information can help voters calibrating, comparing and judging the workability of the liberal (versus conservative) ideas made by political candidates in their campaign statements.