



# 湯家驊悲憤割席 「泛民」內亂已難收

中英社評

立法會議員、「公民黨」創黨成員之一的大律師湯家驊，昨日宣布退出公民黨，並由10月1日起辭任立法會議席。

在政改方案被否決僅三天之後，便發生湯家驊請辭事件，對公民黨、對「泛民」陣營來說，可說都是一個不小的打擊，儘管湯家驊與「公民黨」掌權的梁家傑、余若薇「不咬弦」，在很多重大問題上「愈行愈遠」，在政圈內早已不是什麼秘密。但在全體「泛民」議員按下政改否決之後湯家驊宣布退黨辭職，在社會上無論如何也是一個令人關注以至驚愕的新聞。

從個人而言，湯家驊之與「公民黨」割席，已是早晚之事。同是法律專業出身並貴為「大狀」，湯家驊自從政以來一直表現得比較客觀、克制和冷靜，沒有余、梁二人及其他幾名「民主大狀」般趾高氣揚，誇誇其談，他們動輒用英、美一套西方法律觀點來月旦「一國兩制」與基本法，以至否定內地的司法制度和法制改革，開口民主、閉口人權，似乎「治外法權」今日仍然存在，而另一方面，收受黎智英數十萬、上百萬的「黑金」卻面不改容。相比之下，除非湯家驊也丟掉自己的良心和民族自豪感，否則折夥已是必然之事。

而就在剛結束的政改之爭中，儘管湯家驊最終仍是投下反對票，但他一直主張包容共濟、溝通對話，公開反對及不參與「佔中」，表現是有目共睹的。

湯家驊雖是一人退黨辭職，卻預示着整個「泛民」陣營已陷入嚴重失焦、觀念混淆以至分崩離析的困境，進一步的分裂和對立就在眼前。

事實是，「泛民」陣營今次否決了



▲從個人而言，湯家驊之與「公民黨」割席，已是早晚之事 資料圖片

政改，確實只可以用「慘勝」二字來形容，他們已經失去或即將失去的將遠比在表決機器上贏回來的多，其中，將令他們背上一輩子而無法擺脫的「包袱」，就是斷送普選。

回歸18年來，以至如一些「泛民」口中所說的由「前朝」港英殖民管治年代算起，他們爭民主少說也爭了個三、四十年，而爭取民主道路的「最後一站」，必然就是「一人一票」的普選。

但眼前事實是，為了要在政治上「博一鋪」，為了要乘政改之機挑戰「一國兩制」、削弱中央對港的管治權力，他們從一開始就擺出不妥協的姿態，不賣人大常委會8.31決定的帳，「企硬」非要「公民提名」不可。結果，28人在表決機器上按下了否決，他們打敗了2017政改方案，但同時也打敗了他們自己，今後沒了普選、沒了「一人一票」，他們還為選民爭取些什

麼？2017繼續由1200人選特首，他們還能說些什麼？「2017選委會得」，不是由他們「爭取」回來的麼？

而在失掉「普選」這塊民主「肥豬肉」的同時，「泛民」內部，有人是不甘心、不情願被「綁」上表決機器前的，他們日後還要面對選民、更不想失去和特區政府、中央溝通的機會，他們必然要想辦法「將功補過」、另謀出路；但也有一些人，是連投反對票也嫌「不夠激」和「沒立場」的，他們要「修改基本法」、要推翻中央和全國人大常委會的憲制權力、要在港實現「本土自決」以至「獨立」，未來區議會和立法會選舉，28名投反對票的「泛民」都是他們的攻擊目標。

多行不義必自斃，「泛民」自絕於中央、自絕於選民和普選，是沒有什麼路可以行的了，湯家驊不走還待何時？

2015-06-23

## Ronny Tong breaking away with grief and indignation: a harbinger of disorders breaking out inside the pan-democratic camp

Lawmaker Ronny Tong Ka-wah, a Senior Counsel (SC) co-founder of the Civic Party, yesterday quit the Civic Party and announced his resignation from the Legislative Council (Legco), effective from 1 October.

The incident of Ronny Tong's double resignation happened just three days after the political reform package was voted down.

This may be said to have dealt quite heavy a blow to the Civic Party and pan-democratic camp, despite the open secret in political circles that Ronny Tong has become increasingly at odds with party leaders Alan Leong Kah-kit and Audrey Eu Yuet-mee over many major issues. Ronny Tong's announcement of his double resignation after all pan-democratic lawmakers pressed down the button against the political reform package is also astonishing news drawing attention in society.

Given his personality, it is just a matter of time for Ronny Tong to break away from the Civic Party. With the same professional background and the same title of SC, Ronny Tong has acted more objectively, with restraint and cool-mindedly during his years of political career, in contrast to Audrey Eu, Alan Leong and several other "democratic barristers" who are swollen with arrogance and full of hot air, easily and readily criticising "one country two systems" and the Basic Law from Western legal point of view and even denying the Mainland's judicial system and judicial reforms. They cannot open their mouth without talking about "democracy" or "human rights", as if "extraterritoriality" still existed nowadays. On the other hand, however, they could have accepted "black gold" from Jimmy Lai Chee-ying in tens of thousands or millions of dollars with their faces remaining untroubled. Given the contrast, unless Ronny Tong also gives away his own conscience and sense of national pride, it is inevitable for him to break away.

In the just-concluded controversy over the political reform, although Ronny Tong eventually cast his vote against the reform proposal, his constant advocate for tolerance and mutual accommodation, communication and dialogue, as well as his known opposition and refusal to participate in the Occupy movement, are all there for everyone to see.

Although Ronny Tong's double resignation is an individual's behaviour, it is a harbinger of the pan-democratic camp falling into the predicament of becoming seriously unfocused, conceptually confused and even falling apart, with its further split and [internal] confrontation imminent.

As a matter of fact, the pan-democratic camp's veto of the political reform package this time can only be described as having won "a Pyrrhic victory". What they have lost or are about to lose is far more than they have won from the voting machine. Among others, strangling the universal suffrage is the "burden" which they have to carry on their backs in their lifetime and can never get rid of.

They have been striving for democracy at least for 30 or 40 years, dating back - as some of them claim - to the British colonial rule in addition to the 18 years since Hong Kong's return to the Motherland. And the "last stop" on the road to pursue democracy certainly is universal suffrage with "one person one vote".

But the fact before our eyes is that, in order to take a political gamble, in order to take the opportunity of the political reform to challenge "one country two systems" and weaken the Central Government's power of governance over Hong Kong, they had assumed a non-compromising position, giving no heed to the August 31 Decision by the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress (NPC) and standing firm on their demand for "nomination by petition". As a result, the 28 lawmakers pressed the veto button on the voting machine to defeat the proposal for the 2017 political reform, but at the same time also to defeat themselves. Now gone is the universal suffrage or "one person one vote", what else can they still pursue for voters from now on? In 2017, the Chief Executive will continue to be elected by 1,200 people, so what can they still say about it? Isn't the "2017 Election Committee" is what they have "striven for"?

Having lost such a piece of "fat meat" of democracy as universal suffrage, some members of the pan-democratic camp are not resigned or willing to be "tied" onto the voting machine. In future, they still have to face the voters, not to mention that they do not want to lose the opportunity of communicating with the SAR and Central Governments. Hence they are bound to rack their brains trying to "make amends for their fault by good deeds" and find a way out. But there are also some other members who regard voting down the political reform package as "not radical enough" and "without a standpoint". They want to "revise the Basic Law", to overthrow the constitutional powers of the Central Government and the NPC Standing Committee, to strive for "indigenous autonomy" and even "independence". In the upcoming district council and Legco elections, the 28 pan-democratic lawmakers vetoing the political reform proposal will become the target of attack of these radicals.

"Give a thief enough rope and he'll hang himself." Having cut themselves off from the Central Government, from voters and from universal suffrage, pan-democrats now are in a blind alley. So it's the right time for Ronny Tong to break away from them.

23 June 2015

### WORDS AND USAGE

**At odds** (with sb or over sth) (idiom) - In disagreement. (與...不合, 與...意見不一致, 與...相矛盾)  
Examples: 1. Tom and his father are always at odds over what to watch on TV.  
2. Her version of events was at odds with the police report.

**A matter of time** (idiom) - Sure to happen at some time. (遲早要發生, 早晚的事, 只是時間問題)  
Examples: 1. It's just a matter of time before prices for the newest computer come down.  
2. It's only a matter of time before he's forced to resign.

**Full of hot air** (idiom) - Talking a lot, especially without saying anything of value or meaning. (吹牛, 誇誇其談)  
Examples: 1. My English teacher is full of hot air.  
2. Did the salesman tell you anything new, or was he just full of hot air?

**Harbinger** (noun) - Something that shows what is coming. (預示, 前兆)  
Examples: 1. The cuckoo is the harbinger of spring.  
2. Her father's successful job interview was seen as a harbinger of better times to come.

**A Pyrrhic victory** (idiom) - A victory or goal achieved at too great a cost. (皮洛士式勝利, 代價慘重的勝利, 慘勝) [皮洛士 (前319年至前272年) 是伊庇魯斯國王, 曾兩次打敗羅馬軍隊, 但犧牲極大, 為他日後失敗埋下了隱患。因此, 當有人向皮洛士祝賀時, 他不無傷心地說: 「再來這樣一次勝利, 我自己也完了。」]  
Examples: 1. She won the court case, but it was a Pyrrhic victory because she had to pay so much in legal fees.  
2. He proved his point by exposing malpractices by the directors but it was a pyrrhic victory because they made him redundant immediately afterwards.



時事英語

## 禁用反式脂肪又如何？

美國食品及藥物管理局 (U.S. Food and Drug Administration) 月中宣布，以三年為過渡期，全面禁止食品製造商在食物中添加「部分氫化油」(partially hydrogenated oils, PHOs)，因為PHOs是加工食品 (processed foods) 中人造「反式脂肪」的最主要來源 (primary dietary source)。

反式脂肪 (Trans fats)，又稱為反式脂肪酸 (Trans fatty acids) 或不飽和脂肪酸 (trans-unsaturated fatty acids)。這些化學物質的名稱說起來拗口、聽起來難懂，但實際上卻是我們每天都在接觸和攝食的。

反式脂肪有天然的 (natural) 和人造的 (artificial)。天然反式脂肪存在於牛羊肉和牛羊奶中，但含量很低；人造反式脂肪包括有意和無意製造出來的。我們烹調的時候加熱液態油脂，比如油炸、油煎等過程中，都會在「無意」中 (unintentionally) 產生反式脂肪。加熱的時間愈長，產生的反式脂肪就愈多。所以煎炸食物的油不應反覆使用。「有意」(intentionally) 生產反式脂肪始於上世紀初氫化技術 (hydrogenation) 的應用，液體的植物油經氫化可以變成像豬油或黃油一樣硬，而且這些「部分氫化油」可以與其他配料調配在一起，做成各種口味迷人的加工食品原料，比如焙烤業離不開的起酥油 (Shortening) 等。

現在一般認為，反式脂肪不是人體所需要的營養素 (nutrient substance)，而且對健康有害——食用反式脂肪會提高罹患心臟病的機率，因為它會增加「壞」膽固醇 (bad cholesterol) 而使「好」膽固醇下降。FDA估計禁用PHOs後，美國每年可預防兩萬人心臟病發及7000宗心臟病死亡個案。

諷刺的是反式脂肪當初廣為使用，就是以為有益健康為名。現在禁用就可保證加工食物變得健康？加工食品業界肯定會用其他替代品，誰能保證新的原料有益健康？說到底，還是少吃加工食品多吃新鮮食物才是保持「進口」安全的正道。

亦然



走出校園

## 日本外交官談獨島、北方四島

《日本的國境問題：釣魚臺、獨島、北方四島》是日本資深外交官孫崎亨的新著，主要討論日本與中韓俄三國的領土爭議。上週談到孫崎氏對中日釣魚臺問題的看法，本周一窺他對日韓獨島和日俄北方四島問題的看法。

有關獨島 (日本稱竹島) 的歸屬，孫崎氏從日韓古代文獻歸納了雙方的觀點，各自成理，但韓國的理據較多。二戰後的發展更傾向韓國，因為1946年1月的盟軍最高司令部訓令已將「鬱陵島、獨島、濟州島」視為「從日本範圍排除的地區」。雖然1951年美國助理國務卿改稱「獨島從未看作朝鮮的一部分」，但在韓國外交部和學者的努力下，美國地名委員會已把獨島寫作韓國領土。日韓獨島之爭，韓國佔上風。

日俄北方四島 (國後島、擇捉島、色丹島、齒舞群島) 之爭始於二戰後，從前蘇聯時代延續到今天，長期窒礙兩國的正常發展。日本對四島的主權雖有理據，但日本戰敗後，理據便在盟國一方。1945年7月的《波茨坦公告》規定：「日本之主權必將限於本州、北海道、九州、四國及吾人所決定之其他小島之內。」戰後的盟軍最高司令部訓令更明確指出「獨島、千島群島、齒舞群島、色丹島等島嶼不在其內」。

一般的說法是蘇聯曾答應向日本歸還其中兩島，但日本拒絕，因為它希望一次完整收回四島。看了本書，才知道日本試圖要蘇聯先「無條件歸還」齒舞、色丹兩島，以後再「盡可能歸還」其餘兩島，蘇聯已同意前者。但美國不願見到日蘇關係改善，於是威脅日本，說如果日本讓國後、擇捉兩島歸屬蘇聯，美國就會「合併沖繩」，結果日本先收回齒舞、色丹兩島的願望落空。

《日本的國境問題：釣魚臺、獨島、北方四島》由中國近代史學者戴東陽翻譯，中文大學出版社出版。作者論點簡明扼要，觀點中肯，值得一讀。

(《日本的國境問題：釣魚臺、獨島、北方四島》·下) 嶺大社區學院高級講師 梁勇



科技生活

## 城大生能源轉化裝置奪冠

香港城市大學學生在香港工程師學會大專聯賽中勇奪冠軍及季軍。

比賽由香港工程師學會學生分部主辦，主題為「綠色生活在香港」。冠軍組設計的能源轉化裝置，最高可以將冷氣系統排放的八成熱能轉化成電能。另一組亦以噪音轉化成電能的裝置，勇奪季軍。

冠軍組由建築學及土木工程學系學生甘俊穎、楊杰、蔡嘉鵬及電子工程學系學生黎俊德、嚴文滔組成。

團隊發現，在多種電力裝置中，冷氣最為耗電，比例多達一半總用電量，遂以冷氣系統作為主要研究對象。現時大部分中央冷氣排氣系統，都會同時配備水塔，以冷水散熱；此舉不但浪費熱能及大量食水，而且儲存的水一旦處理不當，有機會被退伍軍人症等細菌污染，成為疾病源頭。

團隊利用冷熱對流的原理設計摩打，以溫差啟動裝置，從而將冷氣系統所排放的熱能轉成電能；溫差愈大，裝置的效能將發揮得愈理想，最多可以將八成的熱能轉化成可使用的電能。

而且，裝置所轉化的電源可以選擇即時直接使用，例如為大廈走廊照明系統供電，又或儲存至蓄電池作其他用途。裝置另一好處是設計輕巧，佔用空間不多，幾乎所有設置中央冷氣系統的大廈，包括商業大廈、住宅、學校等，都可以應用。

團隊結合了建築及電子工程學的知識，將原有水塔運作原理改良。黎俊德表示：「我曾在城大修讀屋宇裝備課程，對大廈設計有一定認識，所以在眾多設施中，選定了消耗能源最多的冷氣，作為主要研究對象。」

黎俊德表示，團隊合作是成功的關鍵。「配合組員專長的建築、電子等工程學知識，成功改善裝置的能源傳送、運作架構等，大大提升能源轉化比例及可用性。」

建築學及土木工程學系學生梁偉聰、霍巧晴及盧芷君組成的季軍組，設計的裝置可緩解市民所受的噪音困擾；因為香港超過600條高速公路的噪音高達70分貝。

他們設計出圓拱型的吸音裝置，再配備壓電板，將噪音折射並轉化成電能。團隊亦善用裝置頂部的平面空間，栽種各種植物，配合太陽能板、排污系統、日光採集及管道，使用者可以將採集及轉化的能源支援自動澆水系統，灌溉植物，不但可進一步吸音，更可以綠化環境。