

萬里河山當指引 五千年史作硯臺 為鄭麗文訪陸點贊



網址 <http://www.us-chinaforum.org> 投稿信箱 uschinaforum@ca.rr.com

中美論壇社 主編 刊頭設計 劉學武
社務委員：張紹濤 周友道 水秉和 張一飛 陳憲中 馬在莊
佟秉宇 高志雲 盛嘉麟 梅強英 范湘濤 張文基 蔡長

每週六出刊 第647期
推進中美相互瞭解合作 促成海峽兩岸和平統一 倡導和諧平等多元世界

2026年四月七日至四月十二日，中國國民黨主席鄭麗文率團踏上大陸土地，為兩岸關係的寒冬劈開一道春的縫隙。這一步，是對歷史的呼應，是對民心的擔當，更是一位政治人物以民族大義為帆，駛向和平彼岸的堅定抉擇。

二十一年前，她以國民黨發言人的身份隨連戰主席開啟“破冰之旅”，見證了兩岸隔絕半世紀後握手的歷史性瞬間；二十一年後，她以掌舵者的身份再度啟程，從南京中山陵的蒼松翠柏，到上海浦江兩岸的繁華生機，再到北京中南海的鄭重會晤，每一步都踩在兩岸同胞渴望和平的心跳上。她自豪地說：“我是中國人”，這句擲地有聲的話語，刺破了民進黨當局操弄意識形態的迷霧，道出了兩岸同根同源的歷史真相。在“台獨”勢力不斷升高對立、外部勢力頻頻干涉的當下，她不懼威脅、逆流而上，用行動詮釋了“兩岸不是終極一戰，而是可以憑著中國人自己的智慧走出兩岸和平大道”的信念。

對於鄭麗文，她當選國民黨主席

◎范湘濤

之初，我本以為又來了一個可憐的洪秀柱；沒想到在國民黨這種藏污納垢的醬缸中竟然還藏有她這樣一把鋒利的寶劍，實在令人驚喜！首先是她的勇往直前，不怕對抗，喊出“怕熱，就不要進廚房”！在一片不敢認同中華民族的政治氣氛下，高聲歡呼自己是中國人，顯示她“雖千萬人吾往矣”的道德勇氣！在“愛新覺羅小刀”想拿著“馬毛”當令箭去毀滅她任命的國民黨副主席蕭道生時，她挺身而前為蕭擋子彈，痛斥“小刀”的卑劣行徑，我們不能不佩服她作為領導人的霸氣風格！對於趙少康視自己不以為意，還稱呼趙是恩人，不但化解了戰鬥藍的敵意，還從中挖來尹乃菁為國民黨發言人，可見鄭麗文的能屈能伸的政治家風範；在台中市的初選過程中，江啟臣借著許多大加的助力，想要改變初選規則，要求黨中央徵召自己，但鄭不所動，把該走的過程完全走完，最後以民調方式決定，江不但出了線，還獲得楊瓊瓊的大力支持，皆

大歡喜，鄭表現出堅定維持黨規，不讓大加一起搞小動作的惡習繼續下去，讓底層黨員們服氣；當盧秀燕訪問美國時，高調談論台灣向美國軍購的必要性，鄭麗文卻指出她到美國只是“城市外交”，不傷感情地暗批盧的出格言行，足見鄭有作為黨主席的不怒自威的氣質。

4月12日，鄭麗文一行結束大陸訪問的第二天，中共中央台辦發佈了十項促進兩岸交流合作的政策措施，涵蓋政治對話、青年交流、民生互通、經貿融合及文化連接五大領域，旨在回應島內民意並推動兩岸關係和平發展。政策具體措施：

航空恢復：推動全面恢復兩岸空中客運直航，支持烏魯木齊、西安等城市複航。農業便利：為臺灣農產品輸入大陸提供檢驗檢疫便利，支持參與大陸展銷會。基建聯通：推動福建沿海與金門、馬祖通水通電氣通橋。

惠台政策宣佈以後，島內輿論一片叫好，國民黨內的一些地方諸侯都出來力挺鄭的大陸之行，連一向與鄭若即若離的柯志恩都站出來稱贊鄭：“和平溝通，兩岸互惠，是

大家所需要的！”

島內民眾對於鄭麗文訪問大陸好感度大幅攀升，對自然引起賴政府的驚恐不安，除了對鄭本人沐紅打壓之外，還把大陸的惠台政策定調是“糖衣毒藥”，簡直就是撒村罵街，盡顯其癡愚本質，連台獨教父林濁水都看不下去了，林濁水強調，民進黨不應因意識形態而全面否定所有惠台措施，尤其對於有利於臺灣基層、觀光、農漁等行業的項目，應採取更理性、務實的立場。他認為民進黨阻撓“四通”等涉及大陸資源進入臺灣的項目，是出於對兩岸和平交流的恐懼，擔心一旦民眾享受紅利，“台獨”敘事將失去市場。

如今，鄭麗文已確定了其在黨內的“一尊”地位，朱立倫對她的“釜底抽薪”，另立中央的暗算，計劃中偷樑換“柱”二點零版已經壽終正寢了。鄭麗文本身，充滿了活力自信，有很多台灣基層民眾欣

賞的那種“阿沙力”草根性；行事乾脆俐落，決不拖泥帶水；她當選國民黨主席以來，便不斷高喊要“下架民進黨，下架賴 德”！筆者預料她在今年年底縣市長選舉中，所造成“正（鄭）流”的影響，絕不會輸給當年的“寒（韓）流”，可以打下光輝戰績。

對於鄭麗文這位女中豪傑，筆者欽佩之餘，還特意在網路上找到一首“鄭麗文”為名的一首歌曲，借花獻佛，送給鄭麗文：

四月春風吹滿懷 姹紫嫣紅為誰開
山河萬里換新才 咱家女兒回家來
誰言弱水隔蓬萊 寶島天晴烏雲開
天生麗質有文采 中華兒女誰不愛
麗文來 麗文來
左手連血脈 右手接未來
莫等待 莫徘徊

大事滾滾來 讓這凡事如塵埃
麗文來 麗文來 兩岸和平傳天籟
萬里河山當指引 五千年史作硯臺
指向青史留大愛 只為人間無離哀
海峽能夠終到岸 明日蒼穹任剪裁

高市的吧女心態 暴漏日本外交窘境

◎張文基

高市與川普的峰會已於美國時間3月19日完成了。仔細觀察有關資訊後，不由得讓我聯想起七十多年前常見的，為了金錢和求得保護，日本酒吧女拉客美軍的場景。然而，這次高市遇到的是一個久經風月歷練的老兵川普，而他的表態就是：投懷送抱，歡迎！為妳打架，不一定！

為什麼會得到這樣的結果？一方面是高市本人所展現的格調，其次是日本外交和記者團隊的素質，但是更重要的是在世界巨變的大格局下，高市的“拖著美國對抗中國”的國策不符合美國的最大利益！今天川普希望的是確保中美的穩定關係。

吧女投懷 川普笑納 防中可以打架不行

面對美國逐步退出第一島鏈的明顯趨勢，高市的政策是日本必須加速提高軍事實力，修改二戰後美國強加給日本的和平憲法，擺脫美國的束縛成為一個“正常國家”。而最大的障礙是美國的態度，所以高市要使出渾身解數彰顯日本對維繫東亞現狀的重要性，來表達對美國的效忠。她的切入點是上任後公開表示：“如果中國大陸對臺灣動武，可能構成日本的“存亡危機事態。”（11月7日，日本眾議院預算委員會現場）。高市訪美的核心議題就是“強化日美的反中聯盟”！

美國對日本的小心思是瞭若指掌，共同防範中國是美國樂見的，但是卻並不樂見日本的完全脫離美國的掌控，更不希望為了日本在北海的挑釁被日本拖入與中國的戰爭！而高市11月7日的台海發言觸發了中國對日本的一系列反制措施，引發了中日緊張關係，所以川普必須在高市訪美時敲打一下日本！

3月18日晚，日首相高市早苗的專機降落華盛頓，她前腳剛到，美

國情報機構就發佈了《2026年度威脅評估報告》，報告稱，高市早苗剛上台時所炒作的“臺灣有事即日本存亡危機”的言論，表明日本在臺灣問題上的立場出現了“重大轉變”。3月19日，日本內閣官房長官木原稔在記者會上急忙地澄清：美方的說法“不符合事實”，日本在臺灣問題上的立場是“一貫的”。

川普對高市的訪問也給予了相當的尊重，3月19日川普從早到晚花了一天的時間接待高市，但是高市的表現不像一個國家領導人，更像一個日本酒吧女對美軍的諂媚。當早苗抵達白宮時，車門剛打開，她就快步奔向川普，直接“撲”進川普張開的雙臂，之後彼此互攬走入白宮的畫面傳遍全球。而且，在記者招待會及晚上的國宴上，口口聲聲用蹩腳的英語呼喚“Donald”，用仰視的、卑微的眼光看著川普，著實令人噁心。川普從頭到尾連名帶姓叫“高市早苗”，沒有給出對等的呢稱。

記者招待會中高市首先就給川普戴高帽，說只有川普才能給世界帶來和平（雖然川普正對伊朗實施地緣性轟炸）。記者提問環節開始後都是美國記者提問，川普提出給一個日本記者發問的機會。日本朝日電視臺的記者千千岩森森問：“為何美國在對伊朗採取軍事行動未提前通知包括日本在內的盟友？”對此，川普回應稱：“我們沒告訴任何人，就是要出其不意。說到出其不意，還有誰比日本更懂偷襲？對吧？珍珠港事件，你們怎麼沒提前告訴我們？”

這一回應引發現場一片笑聲，但高市早苗雙手交疊放在腿上，臉繃得緊緊的，表情明顯尷尬，睜大雙眼、深吸一口氣，努力保持僵硬的微笑。

川普的回答反映出他，做為1946年出生的人，對於軍國主義日本的根深蒂固的反感。也反映出高市的危機反應能力比遭遇類似處境時的烏克蘭總統連斯基（雖然我不認同他）和韓國總統李在明差太多。

川普可能覺得場面有些僵，就臨時再給日本記者一個機會，日本時事通信社女記者提問，大意是說日本最大的顧慮就是中國，現在中國對日本實施出口管制，還在國際上批評日本，搞得日本很緊張。然後話鋒一轉，直接問川普：“總統先生，您馬上要訪華了，會不會跟中國提及中日問題？”

川普很有智慧的化解挑戰，說想從高市的口中瞭解中日關係的近況。高市表示日本願意和中國對話，希望冷靜處理問題，也希望川普訪華有助於區域和平和國際產業鏈的穩定。川普回答說他相信他的中國之行一定是成功的，並表示會為日本說好話。

高峰會後兩國發佈聯合公報：1. 承認美日同盟作為印太地區和平與安全基石的重要性。2. 承諾加強防務與安全合作，包括共同生產與開發軍事能力。3. 討論影響安全與穩定的全球事件，強調建立全球夥伴關係以應對相互關聯的挑戰。顯然，高市並沒有達到所期望的發表明顯地共同對付中國的宣言。

訪美前日本透過蘭德公司的造勢會議

為了給高市訪美營造“美日聯盟共同對抗中國”的勢頭，日本花了大力氣，透過蘭德公司出面，蘭德日本國家安全研究部負責人 Jeffrey W. Hornung 博士主持，於2月17日在洛杉磯 Japan House 舉行“美日同盟系列，第十二年：今日與未來”專題討論會（The U.S.-Japan Alliance Series, Year XII: Today and Beyond）。該系列第一次會議是

2015年。

上午第一場的主題是“印太安全挑戰”，三個講員分別是：布魯金斯學會高級研究員 Mira Rapp-Hooper 博士，蘭德公司高級政策研究員 Nathan Beauchamp-Mustafaga 先生，美國企業研究所研究員 Ryan Fedasiuk 先生。

下午第二場的主題是“聯盟在應對區域挑戰中的角色”，三個講員分別是：新美國安全中心（CNAS）的印太安全計畫主任 Lisa Curtiss 女士，戰略與國際研究中心（CSIS）地緣政治與外交政策部副總裁 Nick Szechenyi 先生，哈德遜研究所日本講座高級研究員村野正志先生。

會議的焦點是從不同角度強調：中國在亞洲的崛起，美日需加強合作，組織區域國家對抗中國的影響力，如何幫助臺灣維持現狀，現在是日本承擔領導角色的時候…。

JAPAN HOUSE 是一個由日本外務省構思創建的組織，擁有倫敦、洛杉磯和聖保羅三個樞紐，旨在促進國際社會對日本的更深理解。JAPAN HOUSE 洛杉磯分會社長，也是2016年1月創會的社長，是海藤優子女士。她曾擔任日本皇后、外務大臣及日本首相等的官方口譯員。2001年，她是駐洛杉磯日本總領事館，擔任政治事務及社區關係領事。2007年，她離開政府。

午餐主題演講人是 穀內正太郎，題目是：聯盟持久價值。2013年12月，安倍晉三首任任命他為第一任日本國家安全保障局局長（相當於美國的國家安全顧問），任期至2019年，貫穿安倍第二次首相任期，可見是安倍最信任的助手之一。

谷內強調高市的歷史性大勝並不是依靠傳統的保守勢力，而是日本現實主義的勝利，日本人民拋棄了不合實際的泡沫內的和平主義，日本人民強烈支持日美聯盟。圍繞台海和南海的緊張態勢強化了對美日

聯盟的支持，不僅是軍事上的，條約為基礎的，而是基於共同的利益，日本願意承擔更多的代價。

他給出三個建議：1. 不要逃避問題，要面對解決。2. 讓日本發揮他的力量來強化美日聯盟。3. 日本需要加深與印度、澳洲、東盟國家、韓國…國家的關係，而不是只有美國。合作的領域是廣泛的。

穀內在回答提問時，也許因為語言的關係，可能更多是他的思維邏輯的問題，往往答非所問，詞不達意。看到高市和穀內這些日本頂尖人物的表現，中國也沒有什麼好擔心的！

此外，我的另一個印象就是蘭德新一代人物的墮落，遠不如我所認識的20年前的一代。一個例子，做為一個線上的參會者，穀內演講後，我提交了一個問題，也是唯一的線上提問者：

“從你的陳述來看，日本政府在�高市早苗領導下，似乎將中國視為日本的敵人，或至少是威脅。中國從未入侵日本；相反地，日本在過去150年中多次入侵中國。所以，我的第一個問題是：日本竟然把中國視為威脅，這不是很諷刺嗎？”

我接下來的兩個問題是：我能理解日本對海上安全的擔憂，但我想請問，將中國視為敵人能夠提升日本海上運輸的安全？還是會產生更壞的結果？中國一貫主張建立基於相互尊重、平等、和平發展和共同繁榮原則的國際關係。日本是否拒絕這些原則？如果是，為什麼？”

但是，沒想到會議主持人，居然沒有介紹線上提問者，更完全篡改了問題。這讓我非常鄙視蘭德的年輕一代，比我所認識的上一代差遠了！

會議後，我在回答蘭德的書面意見調查時，詳細敘述了事情的經過並提出下面的質問：“我的經歷讓我開始質疑這個會議的目的，它只是為了宣傳、遊說？還是要真正嚴肅的探討什麼才是對美國、日本及世界利益的最佳政策？”

我迄今沒有得到回復。如果美國的墮落已經腐蝕到智庫和學術界，美國能夠再次偉大嗎？

The Obama Problem

We have a lot to learn from both the candidate and the president Obama. A new generation of candidates is learning the wrong lessons. Corbin Trent and America's Undoing March 27, 2026

The Democratic Party has an Obama problem. Whatever do I mean? I'm glad you asked.

Zohran Mamdani was on the brink of winning the New York City mayor's race last November when he stepped off the campaign trail to handle something. He had gotten word that Chi Ossé, a Brooklyn councilman inspired by Mamdani's own insurgent campaign, was building toward a primary challenge against Hakeem Jeffries. Ossé might have expected support from the man whose movement he had been part of.

Instead, Mamdani called him the night before Election Day and told him he could not win, that a high-profile fight would undermine the left, and that if he persisted, Mamdani would ice him out completely. He also told Ossé he could be a key figure in the new administration, but only if he dropped the bid. When the call ended, an email was waiting in Ossé's inbox. His invitation to Mamdani's victory party the next day had been rescinded.

That was November. In February, Mamdani spent hours on the phone leaning on Working Families Party members to stay neutral in the governor's race and protect Kathy Hochul from a primary challenge. When he got what he wanted, he called Hochul to make sure she knew his role. In January, Jabari Brisport, his former roommate and a senator who had spent years fighting for childcare expansion, got moved out of camera range at the childcare rollout because Hochul's team asked, and Mamdani's office complied. He burned Nydia Velázquez, the first major elected official to endorse his mayoral campaign, by backing a different candidate for her congressional seat after she asked him to stay neutral. He showed up personally at the DSA meeting to kill the Ossé challenge. Ossé dropped out in December.

Last August, I wrote that the worst thing Mamdani could do after winning was stand his movement down and try to negotiate his way to change. I said you cannot get small enough to become acceptable to people whose entire operation depends on things staying as they are. I said the only leverage that works is making them afraid of what happens if they don't change. He had 50,000 volunteers, a million doors knocked, and a city that had just told him it was ready. I am not going to pretend I called this wrong.

The New York Times framed what he did as the portrait of a cunning operator. Jay Jacobs, the state party chairman who opposed Mamdani's

campaign, offered the lesson the Times seemed to endorse. Every successful political person must be a little ruthless from time to time, Jacobs said. Otherwise, you don't survive.

That is not the wrong lesson because ruthlessness is bad. It is the wrong lesson because Mamdani is being ruthless in exactly the right direction for the wrong goal. He has power. He is using it. He is just using it to protect the people who stand between us and the change he ran on. Protecting Hochul and Jeffries is a choice. That million-door machine could have been aimed somewhere else.

The trap is not a charm, and it is not a strategy. Both are tools, and you need them. The trap is believing they are enough on their own, that if you are careful enough about managing your relationships with the people who currently have power, you can eventually get them to share it. That is not how power works. Power does not get shared. It gets built, or it gets taken. A real supermajority, the kind that passes something, has never been built through accommodation. It gets built through aggressive political infighting, through primarizing the members of your own party who are blocking your agenda, through making it more dangerous for someone to oppose you than to support you.

Democratic Senator Max Baucus had taken \$3.2 million from the health care industry by the time he was handed the pen to write the Affordable Care Act. Obama let him write it. He wanted a seat at the table with the people who had spent decades building the table to keep people like him out. What he got was a health care bill that left the insurance industry intact, a stimulus too small to do the job, and a financial reform that left Wall Street standing after Wall Street burned the economy to the ground. Each of those got called a win. Each left the machinery in place. Last year, I watched Democrats travel the country warning that the ACA subsidies expiring would be a healthcare catastrophe. What they were describing was Obamacare. The law they spent fifteen years calling a triumph. They passed something they knew was not good enough, called it a win, and watched it become the floor that everything else fell through.

FDR understood something about change that Obama and Mamdani have not. In the summer of 1938, after conservative Democrats in his own party started blocking New Deal legislation, Roosevelt campaigned across the country against his own incumbents. Reporters called it a purge. He mostly lost. But he understood that the fight for his agenda ran straight through his own party, and he was willing to say so out loud and pay the price. Trump understood the same thing from the other direction. In 2022, he backed challengers against Republican incumbents who crossed him, knocked out four of the ten who voted to impeach him, and remade the party in his image. Their vision is a list of enemies to hate. But both men proved the same thing. A party is not a sacred institution. It is a vehicle. And the people inside it blocking your agenda are the first fight, not the last. The progressive movement today operates as if it believes the opposite, and it keeps producing leaders who win elections and then protect the people standing in the way of everything they ran on.

What I have come to believe, from watching this up close for years, is that the most important thing about a candidate is not their policy positions. Policies can change. You can pressure someone into supporting a good idea. What you cannot inject into someone is a willingness to fight. Not willing to fight Republicans on television, which costs nothing. Willingness to walk into a room where someone you thought was on your side is selling you out, say it out loud, and make them pay for it. Willingness to prioritize the colleague blocking the agenda you ran on. Willingness to point the movement at the people inside your own party who are protecting the system, because those are always the harder fights. You used to think those people were on your side.

Either they have that core, or they do not. And almost none of them do.

Once they have the office, they decide they know better. They have a seat at the table. They think their job is to keep things running smoothly, not just for their constituents but for the movement. They worry that if they fail, it will reflect badly on all of us. And that worry becomes what makes them fail.

The people who knocked a million doors for Zohran Mamdani deserved to have that energy pointed at something after he won. They deserved to be the reason Jeffries had to think twice, not the force Mamdani used to make sure Jeffries never had to think at all. Chi Ossé deserved a mayor who understood that one more democratic socialist in Congress is worth more than a comfortable relationship with the House Democratic leader.

We have been living off the work of previous generations for a long time. The New Deal built the public infrastructure that made markets possible. The GI Bill built a middle class. NYCHA, at its peak, housed 600,000 people with dignity. Those generations understood that government had to build things, own things, and make long bets. They sewed. We reaped. And somewhere along the way, the Democratic Party forgot that you cannot keep harvesting from a field you stopped planting.

The leadership we have now does not have a vision for planting. When Trump froze two billion dollars in Harvard's federal funding, Chuck Schumer announced that Democrats had sent a very strong letter asking eight very strong questions. When Trump deployed the military to Washington, Hakeem Jeffries praised a strongly worded letter from the DC Attorney General. Those are not opposition tactics. Those are the gestures of people who have made their peace with not having power.

Power is not winning. Winning is the beginning of the fight for power. The work does not stop on election night. It starts there.

I am not interested in being hard on Mamdani or Obama or any of the others. These are not bad people. They are people who believed that being in the room was the same thing as having power. It is not. Power is what determines what happens when you leave the room. And you build it before you sit down at the table, not by making yourself agreeable once you get there.