

英文

英國還以為現在是十九世紀？

Does Great Britain think the present time were still in the 19th century?

黎智英涉嫌勾結外國勢力破壞國家安全，正面臨法庭的審訊。但在審訊還未正式開始之前，外國勢力已千方百計地試圖影響法庭判決。日前英國首相蘇納克甚至聲稱，英國「有權介入香港事務」云云，一副殖民統治者的傲慢嘴臉。必須指出，香港已經回歸祖國四分之一世紀之久，英國在香港既無主權、無治權，也無監督權，沒有任何權力干預香港事務。如果英國以為用這種方式可以替黎智英脫罪，無異於痴心妄想，實際上也是進一步加重黎智英勾連外力的客觀罪證。

涉嫌違反香港國安法而被捕者不只一人，但沒有任何人能像黎智英這樣獲得如此多外國勢力的「關照」。自前年黎智英被捕後，美英當局不斷以各種方式插手干預，既有所謂的「半年報告」，也有各種「聽證會」，還有發聲明等等，千方百計抹黑香港。日前黎智英的國際律師團隊，以所謂的「黎智英擁有英國國籍」為由，要求英國當局「確保其獲釋」。英國外交部一名官員還會見了黎智英的兒子。顯而易見，為「撈人」，外國勢力是怪招百出。

然而，這種明目張膽插手香港事務、赤裸裸地向法庭施壓的做法，實際上起到的是完全相反的作用。這既撕下了美英所謂的「法治至上」的虛偽面紗，也進一步說明了黎智英勾連外國勢力違反國家安全的控罪，具有無可辯駁的事實基礎，試問：若不是具有重大的價值，外國勢力何以獨獨青睞黎智英？這也再次說明，黎智英案涉及重大的國家安全風險，全國人大常委會對國安法的解釋，完全必要必須，也十分及時，有效地堵住了國安風險漏洞。

英國當局或許看到「英國國籍」這張牌起不了任何作用，於是又改打「承諾牌」，其首相在國會發言時聲稱，根據《中英聯合聲明》，「英國有權介入香港事務」云云，好一個殖民統治者的「氣派」，大概在蘇納克眼中，現在還是十九世紀、日不落帝國還能橫行霸道、肆意入侵他國的年代。

香港是中國的香港，任何外部勢力無權干涉。1984年簽署的《中英聯合聲明》核心要義是確定中國收回香港，整份聲明共1137個字、8個條款、3個附件，沒有任何一個字、任何一個條款賦予英國在香港回歸後對香港承擔任何責任。英國對香港沒有任何主權、治權、監督權，也根本不存在所謂的「承諾」。事實上，英國當局對此心知肚明，由始至終也拿不出任何一條具體條款來證明自己有此權力，只能是不斷拿一些似是而非的套話來誑騙世人。

不論從基本的國際關係準則角度，還是從客觀事實而言，英國當局都沒有任何權力、任何藉口干預任何香港事務。英方一再拿《中英聯合聲明》說事，只會再次暴露他們陰暗、過時的殖民主義心態，和打着人權旗號抹黑香港形象的險惡用心。

美英當局無視自身嚴苛的國安法律，反而指責他國維護國家安全，「雙標」得令人可笑。中國政府維護國家主權、貫徹「一國兩制」方針、反對任何外部勢力干涉香港事務的決心堅定不移。黎智英涉嫌違反國安法，事實清楚，證據確鑿，相信特區法庭會作出公正判決。外國勢力為了標榜自己所謂「民主自由」的形象，不斷借黎智英案「抽水」。不過，外力越是「撈」黎智英，實際上越是將他往死裏推。

Jimmy Lai Chee-ying, charged with collusion with foreign forces to endanger national security, is to be tried in court. Yet before the formal commencement of the trial, foreign forces are trying to influence the court ruling in every possible way. Just days ago, Rishi Sunak, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom (UK), even made such a claim that Great Britain has the "right to get involved in" Hong Kong affairs and so on and so forth, showing the arrogance of a colonial ruler. It must be pointed out that Hong Kong has returned to its Motherland for a quarter of a century already. The UK has neither sovereignty over Hong Kong, nor the right to govern Hong Kong, nor the right to supervise on Hong Kong. It has no right whatsoever to get involved in Hong Kong affairs. If Britain thinks it could have Jimmy Lai exonerated in this way, then it simply tries to **chase a rainbow**. It in fact serves as further evidence to aggravate the criminal charge against Jimmy Lai for collusion with foreign forces.

More than one person has been arrested suspected of breaching the Hong Kong national security law, but no one else gets so much attention and gains so much care from foreign forces as Jimmy Lai. Since Jimmy Lai was arrested two years ago, the US and UK authorities have been doing everything possible to meddle in the case. There are so-called "six-monthly reports on Hong Kong", and there are also various kinds of "hearings" held and statements issued. They **stop at nothing** to discredit Hong Kong. Recently, Jimmy Lai's international legal team have asked the British government to "ensure his release" citing so-called reason that "Jimmy Lai owns British nationality". An official from Britain's Foreign Office even held a meeting with Jimmy Lai's son. It is easy to see that foreign forces are resorting to all sorts of weird tricks in the hope of helping Jimmy Lai evade justice.

Nevertheless, such a malpractice of interfering in Hong Kong affairs in such a **barefaced** way and exerting pressures on the court in such an undisguised way, in fact, is completely counter-productive. This has not only torn off the hypocritical veil of so-called "supremacy of the law" worn by the US and UK, but also further confirmed that the charges brought against Jimmy Lai of collusion with foreign forces to jeopardise endanger national security are based on undisputable facts. May we ask: why do foreign forces favour Jimmy Lai alone if he is not of great value for them? This once again proves that Jimmy Lai's case involves national security risks. Hence the interpretation of the Hong Kong national security law by the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress (NPC) is absolutely necessary and also very timely, which effectively plugs up the loopholes to minimise national security risks.

Maybe realising that the card of "British nationality" is of little use, UK authorities turn to play the card of "commitment" instead. Speaking in parliament, the British prime minister claimed that Britain has the "right to get involved in" Hong Kong affairs according to the Sino-British Joint Declaration, etc. What a "lordly manner" of a colonial ruler! Perhaps in Sunak's mind, the present time were still in the 19th century, a time when "the empire on which the sun never sets" could **throw its weight about** everywhere and invade other countries recklessly and without restraint.

Hong Kong is China's Hong Kong, whose affairs no foreign forces have any right to get involved in. The substantial meaning of the Sino-British Joint Declaration signed in 1984 is for China to recover Hong Kong. Of the 1,137 words, eight clauses in the text of the declaration and of its three annexes, there is no single word or clause delegating Great Britain any responsibility for Hong Kong after the city's return to China. The UK has no sovereignty over Hong Kong, no right to govern or supervise on Hong Kong. Nor is there any "commitment" at all. As a matter of fact, the UK authorities are well aware of this. They fail to

justify that they have such a right with any stipulation in the Sino-British Joint Declaration from start to finish, so that they have to resort to plausible verbalisms in an attempt to deceive the world.

Seeing it either from the perspective of the norms of international relations or from objective facts, British authorities have no right and no excuse to interfere in any Hong Kong affairs. The British side repeatedly **making an issue of** the Sino-British Joint Declaration once and again just exposes their gloomy, obsolete mentality of colonialism and their sinister intention to smear Hong Kong under the banner of human rights.

Ignoring their own tough laws governing national security, the US and UK authorities instead accuse other countries of safeguarding their national security. How laughable the way they apply "double standards" in this regard! Firm and unswerving is the Chinese government's resolve to safeguard national sovereignty, implement the "one country two systems" principle and oppose any foreign interference in Hong Kong affairs. The facts are clear and evidence irrefutable for charges brought against Jimmy Lai for breaching the Hong Kong national security law, and we believe the SAR court will make a fair judgement. To flaunt their own image of so-called upholding "democracy and freedom", foreign forces keep taking advantages of the Jimmy Lai's case. Nevertheless, the more support foreign forces lend to Jimmy Lai, the harder they push him into the abyss of death.

WORDS AND USAGE

• Chase rainbows/a rainbow (idiom) –

To pursue some goal or accomplishment that is utterly unrealistic or unlikely to happen. (做白日夢，異想天開)

Examples:

1. You can't chase rainbows your whole life – you need to pick a stable career and start being an adult.
2. It feels like the government is chasing a rainbow in its efforts to overhaul the tax legislation.

• Stop at nothing (idiom) –

Used to say that someone will do anything to achieve a goal or purpose, even if it is very bad. (不擇手段，無所不用其極)

Examples:

1. They will stop at nothing to get him elected.
2. 'I assure you, ma'am, we will stop at nothing to catch that thief,' the police officer said.

• Barefaced (adverb) –

Not show any shame about, or does not try to hide, bad behaviour. (露骨的，厚顏無恥的)

Examples:

1. How does he make so barefaced a lie appear to be a truth?
2. This is one of the most barefaced acts of historical rewriting ever.

• Throw one's weight about/around (idiom) –

If someone throws their weight around/about, they act aggressively and use their power over other people more than they need to. (耀武揚威，專橫跋扈)

Examples:

1. The boss came in, yelling and generally throwing his weight about.
2. The PE teacher was a tyrant who threw his weight around when it came to punishing his students.

• Make an issue (out) of sth (idiom) –

To argue about something or insist that something be treated as an important problem even it is not. (拿...說事，拿...做文章)

Examples:

1. There's nothing wrong with your hair, so stop making an issue out of it.
2. I knew they'd made a mistake, but I was too tired to make an issue of it.

But vs Except

On summer holiday I do nothing {but} sunbathing and swimming.

暑假我只是曬太陽及游泳，什麼都沒有做。

但 "But for" 有着不同意思；看似有一點像條件句，一般帶出事情沒有發生的原因。例如：

The renovation would have been completed, **but** for the tile's supplier problem.

如果不是瓷磚供應商的問題，裝修已經完成。

But for the global outbreak of the pandemic, our wedding would have been in Hong Kong City Hall in 2020.

如果不是全球疫情爆發，我們在2020年的婚禮應該在香港大會堂舉辦。

EXCEPT

"Except"用法可以是介紹主題或帶出上下文，或者表示正式聲明的例外。"Except"可以是介詞 (Prepositions) 或連接詞 (Conjunctions)。作為介詞，"except"意思跟 "but"相同。例如：

I would have left the party earlier, **except** I bumped into my old friends.

本來我可以早一點離開派對的，就是因為碰到我的老朋友。

He has not talked to anybody **except** Miley.

除了Miley，他沒有跟任何人說話。

except for意思是指不包括 (apart from)，一般之後會用單個名詞，名詞短語 (noun phrase) 或者狀語短語 (adverbial phrase) 或一個wh-子句。也是在法律條文或正式文件會用到的字眼。例如：

Mary did not take away anything, **except for** a fountain pen.

瑪莉沒有拿走任何東西，除了一支鋼筆。

作為一個連接詞，"except"通常後面跟着that，它的意思是「只有」或「除了」。例如：

Little John knows nothing about Switzerland **except that** it is full of snowy mountains and scrumptious chocolate.

小約翰對瑞士一無所知，只知道有雪山及美味的朱古力。

下集繼續討論容易混淆的日常用語。

Abc

續FUN英語

學生經常混淆這兩個單字的用法。

BUT

我們一般使用"but"作為linking verbs，用來連接對比的想法。

I love spicy food, **but** my stomach does not like it.

"But"有時候也可以是"except"的意思。一般也是在all/anything/everything/nothing/nobody等等字眼之後。例如：

Nobody **but** the Principal was left in the classroom.
只有校長一人留在班房。

Miss Carol

資深英語老師、國際英文考試主考官；前大專院校導師及企業培訓導師。