

拜登大叔出了什麼問題？



網址 <http://www.us-chinaforum.org> 投稿信箱: uschinaforum138@gmail.com

中美元壇 主編 刊頭設計 劉學武
社務委員: 張紹遷 周友道 水秉和 張一飛 陳立家 陳憲中 馬在莊
佟秉宇 高志雲 陳耀華 傅 中 范湘濤 張文基 兼社長 每星期六出刊 第427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

也談孟晚舟

◎彭文逸

程度的妥協，拜登終於被迫否定了川普的流氓行徑。為了維護顏面，美國要孟晚舟簽個字，可是不需要認罪，也不必付罰款，案子到明年年底撤銷。

三年來懸掛在億萬中國人心中，終於化解了。人民日報說，感謝國家的不懈努力，這句話沒說錯，如果沒有用國家的力量，立刻加倍逮捕了加拿大白人，那麼，孟晚舟和華為就祇有任人宰割了。川普要流氓，扣留人質，絕對是痞子行爲。他是標準的土豪惡霸型人物，可是不瞭解，共產黨是靠農民革命起家的，最拿手的本領，就是跟土豪惡霸進行尖銳的鬥爭，直到取得最後勝利。

其實，這也是中國對付澳洲，對付歐盟某些議員和香港的親美叛徒們的手段：你們受美國教唆，或者向美國表忠，錯誤地以爲美國會替你們撐腰，侵害中國的利益，那我就打狗給主人看。多打幾個，看看以後還有多少人甘願做狗。

如果我們不用外交辭令，事實就是如此，非常低級。不要以爲穿上筆挺的西裝，出現在世界上最高尚的舞臺就不低級。其實，小惡會在陰暗的巷子裏發生，大惡時常發生在陽光底下，萬眾矚目的世界舞臺上發生。

在溫哥華的華僑，集結在法院前面高舉標語牌，熱情地支持孟晚舟。深圳的機場內外，擠滿了一般百姓，同唱愛國歌曲，歡迎孟晚舟回家，場面令人感動。你會意識到，不管孟晚舟是否享受著遠超過一般人的舒適生活，或者她是否擁有幾本護照，大家把她當作自己人，在國外受到欺負了，最後能夠凱旋歸來，就值得大家慶賀，爲她高興。這種發自內心的感情告訴我們，川普，或者說美國，做錯了一件大事：它使得中國人更加團結，愛國。

孟晚舟事件充滿了象徵意義：它告訴世界，對付美國，要用實力說話，而中國是有實力的。它告訴美國的盟邦，你們要討好美國，跟中國作對，到頭來喫虧的就是你們自己。它也告訴美國，你要來硬的，中國會奉陪到底，絕不退讓。所以，這是中美關係的一個轉點，中美會繼續鬥爭下去，可是要想拉幫結派來壓制中國，那注定會失敗的。

我們需要瞭解孟晚舟事件的深層意義，或者說底層意義。什麼是它的底層意義呢？那就是：你川普若要流氓，那麼習近平就跟你耍流氓。加拿大要做流氓的小跟班，或者走狗，那麼中國就必須打狗給主人看。你抓我一個人，我就抓你兩個特工，還加上一個毒販子。你要引渡嗎？那我就判毒販子死刑，看你引渡不引渡，引渡的話，我就殺一個給你看看。你如果判孟晚舟十年，那麼另外兩位這一輩子就不要想再回加拿大了。

爲什麼說這是底層意義呢？因爲國際關係表面看很高尚，可是它有非常低級，非常醜惡的一面。碰到醜惡的一面，對付它的手段一定也要跟它一樣低級。例如，堂堂一位美國的國務卿，在安全理事會上，居然拿了一小管白色的粉末，就控告伊拉克發展大規模毀滅性武器，這是在全世界人面前，在一個能夠決定一個命運的場合，公然捏造事實，扯了漫天大謊呀！你說這低級不低級。結果，安理會拒絕美國的要求，可是美國仍然找了它的小跟班英國和北約的一些國家，把人家的一個國家給毀了！這就是強權政治。對付這種醜惡的行爲，沒有別的辦法，必須是以實力對實力。

加拿大敢不敢跟中國硬來？當然不敢。可是，帶有娘炮氣質的特魯多又不敢得罪美國，所以他就拖，一拖就是三年。他是等哪個流氓川普下臺，希望拜登替他解套。拜登呢？老了。做事非常不乾脆，所以又拖了8個月。據《紐約時報》說，跟中國談判談了一年，條件是要孟晚舟認罪，並且要付巨額罰款。這豈不是自己幹了見不得人的事，不肯認錯，還要占對方的便宜？中國不喫這一套！所以，孟晚舟拒絕認罪。

可是，加拿大能再拖下去嗎？美國能繼續拖下去嗎？9月9號，拜登第二次約談習近平，兩個人談了90分鐘，扣除翻譯，大概就是實際對話時間不超過半小時。看來，談話內容相當空洞，習近平說，兩個大國要相向而行，不應該搞對抗；拜登說，競爭歸競爭，可是美國并不想跟中國打仗。據報導，兩人談到孟晚舟。顯然，習近平的意思是，謝峰已經提出了兩份清單，其中就提到要美國放人，王毅還提出了三道底線，你美國想要跟中國談，那就看著辦吧。9月24日，美國放棄了引渡孟晚舟，加拿大立刻放人。所以，爲了跟中國取得某種

儘管如此，應該說，在內政方面，他們的心放對了地方，所以，且讓我們爲他向衆神祈禱，祝福他渡過難關。

絕對不讓中國超越美國

在外交方面，那就是另外一回事了。接掌白宮之後，拜登大叔立馬在議會山莊的演說中嚴肅地向全世界宣告，在他任內，他絕對不容許中國超越美國。爲此，九個月以來，一方面他不放棄川普對中國各種打壓措施，另一方面他拉攏盟邦，加強在南海和臺海的軍事活動，另立全球芯片生產鏈，和退出阿富汗和中東，一切行動都是爲了向中國施加極限壓力，逼迫中國低頭。

在這裏，可能是由於時代錯覺，他對美國的國力和世界的走向做了一個判斷錯誤。事實證明，不論敵友，絕大多數國家都報著一個期冀，就是期望他不要繼承川普「美國第一」的外交政策，都希望他回到川普之前的美國。拜登之所以令大家失望，其主要原因就是他不跟川普在美國國內掀起的民粹主義對著幹。他一方面迎合這種國粹主義，繼續把中俄當作對手，仍然保留川普的各種制裁和關稅，另一方面又回到巴黎氣候協定和其他國際機構，證明美國重新加入了國際社會。

不幸的是，這種半吊子的做法使他兩頭落空。在國內，共和黨和川普的支持者繼續批評他軟弱，而在國際上，歐洲盟邦都不肯跟著他反俄反中。德國拒絕放棄北溪2號天然氣項目，而德法意等許多歐洲國家仍然堅持要跟中國保持貿易關係。同時，習近平也沒有對他的極限打壓作出絲毫讓步。

大叔讓步了！

在他極限施壓之下，中國給他來了個不理不睬。反倒是他，在國內的債務，通脹和疫情的夾攻之下，覺得必須跟中國談。他採取了主動，三番四次想要跟中國談。他想談，而習近平不想談，那麼，他就不得不讓步了。

我們看到，美國最初並沒有表現誠意，僅僅不痛不癢地解禁微信和TikTok，以爲這樣中國就肯談了。中國當然不予理睬，拜登才開始做出實質性讓步，認真對待謝峰的兩份清單和王毅的三條紅線：重申堅守一個中國的原則，無意打壓中國的發展，無意激化衝突，准許高通賣非最高端芯片給華爲，放棄對孟晚舟的引渡要求，聲明不是要與中國貿易脫鉤，準備選擇性地取消對中國加徵的關稅，等等。

經歷了9個月的折騰，美中關係透露出一線曙光，曙光顯然是來自拜登讓步。可是，他肯不肯作出更多的讓步？不肯的話，習近平是否肯談？這是基本問題。因爲習大可耐心等待事態進一步發展。明年，美國經濟滯脹很可能趨於嚴重，民主黨在期中選舉非常可能失利，導致拜登執政能力進一步減弱。總之，如大陸多個評論所說，時間在中國這一邊。越往後，拜登大叔的日子將越不好過。根本的理由是，他上臺之初做了一個錯誤的判斷。

◎水秉和

工會的堅定支持者。可是，他又喜歡和稀泥，曾經支持共和黨提名的保守黑人法官湯馬斯爲最高法院法官，儘管在聽證會上該人被女下屬指控被他性侵。拜登又是愛爾蘭後裔，具有固執的個性，契而不捨，終於在第四次參選時以79歲高齡當選了總統。問題是，他的身體和腦子還管用嗎？

大便失禁？

在聯合國大會開會之初，各國元首紛紛來紐約刷存在感，英國的約翰遜來了，並且到白宮向拜登報到。兩人在招待記者會上，大叔出了情況，安保人員立刻把記者們趕走，結束了招待會。有人說，會場冒出了一股「異味」，是大叔失禁了沒？不敢確定，因爲那可是國家機密啊！但是，可以想象，大叔的身體可能有點問題。

當然，關於他說錯話或突然失憶的事件也屢見不鮮，如稱副總統哈里斯爲總統，稱他的國防部長爲「哪個人」。

身體有問題也沒關係，因爲民主理論家說，總統可以不做事，政府機器可以照常運轉，這就是民主制度的優越性。川普就是最好的證明，他一天到晚推特，有時一天一百多條，看電視，罵人，周末打高爾夫球，四年不也過去了嗎？

但是，拜登不一樣，他要做一位有所作爲的總統。他要控制疫情，要搞環保，要拉攏盟友對抗中俄，要抽富人的個人所得稅和企業的盈利稅，分攤給低收入人群，要減少貧富差距。大家都知道他的志向是做羅斯福第二，重新推動美國的福利社會。這就需要身體健康，精力充沛了。

在雷厲風行地應付了疫情之後，他分兩條路來進行社會改造，一條是硬基建，包括公路，橋梁，機場等，預計預算1萬億元；另一條是軟基建，內容包括環保，免費幼兒園教育，免費社區大學，擴大社保等，預計預算3.5萬億。

一盤大棋

四十年前，雷根進主白宮，他的一句名言是「餓死政府！」也就是說，減稅，讓政府出現赤字，這樣可以逼迫政府少花錢。接下來的這些年，不論是共和黨或者是民主黨當政，在雷根主義的籠罩下，政府都不敢有大作爲。奧巴馬在位時，趁民主黨在兩院都穩占多數，乃通過了健保法案，向數千萬無法取得私營保險公司健保的人提供健保，算是哪段期間的重大成就。現在輪到拜登來扭轉雷根主義。

拜登大叔面對的是：預算赤字觸及上限，必須提高上限以免經濟崩盤；通脹達到2008年以來的新高；疫情再度肆虐；兩套基建計劃受到民主黨內部兩名參議員的杯葛，同時又受到共和黨的抵制。此外，國債高達28.5萬億，政府赤字將超過8萬億。在這種四面楚歌的大環境下，他想扭轉美國的政治生態？看來他面對的是一個不可能完成的任務。

拜登讓大家失望了！

去年選舉前，我捐錢給拜登。數目不多，可是因爲不斷收到要錢的信息，並且從拜登選舉委員會擴大到哈里斯，佩洛西，以至於州長，參議員等，所以陸陸續續又捐了多次，後來又捐錢給喬治亞州的兩位民主黨參議員候選人。總之，過去很少捐錢的我，爲了打敗川普，這次算是盡到了選民的義務。

今年雖然沒有選舉，可是要錢的信息就沒有斷過。對這些，我一律不予理睬。原因是，對拜登大叔的表現，我失望了。許多當初對他寄予厚望的人跟我一樣，也失望了。據民意調查，他的支持率在每一個選民類別中都出現相當幅度的下滑：女性的支持率從57%降到48%；男性從45%降到42%；年輕人從60%到45%。就是在非洲裔和西班牙語系的選民中，他的支持率也減少了約10%。

究其原因，毫無疑問，最主要的就是從阿富汗撤軍的狼狽情況：堂堂世界超強居然搞到撤軍時需要在敵人塔利班虎視眈眈的監督和協助下進行，並且被炸死和炸傷了一批人。爲什麼不先撤出非軍事人員再撤出軍隊？這是何等無能的表現，讓每個美國人都感到屈辱。可是，大叔拜登居然說，這是「出奇的成功！」(Exceptional success!)「把黑說成白。拜登大叔，你是另一個川普？」

另一方面，拜登上台依然延續川普的錯誤外交政策，也令人失望。川普的貿易戰，資料證明，是傷敵100，自損900的愚蠢行爲，可是爲了擔心共和黨說他軟弱，拜登遲遲不敢觸動它，而這是造成美國通脹的原因之一。

拜登「大叔」的由來

大家之所以稱拜登爲大叔(Uncle Joe),主要當然是因爲他親民。他接近群衆(close to the people),喜歡抱抱嬰兒，親親小女孩，摟摟老太太。從他極力推動的福利政策也可以看出，他的心是放對了地方的(His heart is in the right place)。可是，從另一個角度來看，大叔通常要討別人喜歡，因而缺乏威嚴：沒有人怕他。這跟川普恰恰相反。

這並不是說川普有威嚴。川普也沒有，可是他下流，搞霸凌，對誰都敢罵(除了普京)，威逼恐嚇是他的拿手好戲，尤其對他的下屬和共和黨黨內的政客，所以每個人都怕他。由於沒有受過太多教育的選民特別吃他這一套，他的霸凌獲得一大群粉絲支持，這些人連他扯的瞞天大謊言也盲從附和。尤其令人吐血的是，他的大謊，即他贏了選舉，可是被拜登偷走了，居然也有一大批傻瓜相信，還拿了牌子示威，真是匪夷所思。

去年大選完畢，記者問選民：「你爲什麼投票給拜登？」許多選民的答復是：「他不是川普！」這當然是說，拜登不下流，不霸凌，是位好好先生。也由於此，他缺乏威嚴，以至於號令難行。

這位大叔，出身於低收入家庭，父親曾經是售貨員，當過校工，屬於低中產階級。這個背景使他成爲

Cold War Analogy to Pork Trade Implication

Professor Jessica Chen Weiss (JCW) published her interview with Ryan Hass (RH) a senior fellow at the Brookings Institute and Michael H. Armacost Chair in Foreign Policies Studies) on the Washington Post Monkey Cage Analysis, entitled 'The Cold War Is a Poor Analogy for Today's U.S.-China Tensions'. RH served as the director for China, Taiwan and Mongolia at the National Security Council during the Obama administration. JCW is a political scientist and professor of government at Cornell University, as well as an editor at the Washington Post Monkey Cage blog and a non-resident senior associate at the Center for Strategic and International Studies. JCW posted five questions to RH referencing his 2021 book: 1. Where do you see China headed? 2. Assessment of U.S. sanction efforts to China tech giants such as Huawei's? 3. Where and what successes the U.S. influenced (pushed) China? 4. Referring to G7 'Build Back Better World' (BBBW), how effective is the U.S. led competition against China's BRI? 5. Differences and similarities between Cold War and today's U.S.-China situation? This paper will review the JCW-RH interview and offer an opinion on each Q and A.

RH has given to the-point answers to the five questions however with arguments understandably influenced by his political background. On Q1, RH cited ballooning debt, aging population, shrinking productivity and vulnerability in food and fuel supply making China's continued economic ascent less guaranteed. Further, he stated that with her political system less dynamic and international image declining, China will be constrained globally but will remain an enduring competitor because of the strength in her innovative ecosystem, 800 million citizens lifted above poverty, and a clear vision of rejuvenating the nation. In this author's opinion, the above arguments and conclusion might be plausible but not comforting if the U.S. was assessed on the same balance by the same factors, debt, aging, productivity, dysfunctional political system, deficits in trade, diminishing reputation on the world stage, etc. This may be the fundamental reason that 'China Threat' and 'Fear China' are being inflated on the foreign policy dialogue. Furthermore, the U.S. has unnecessarily put too much attention and energy on China rather than focus inward on flaws of the American political system and economic problems. Solving the U.S. domestic issues such as infrastructure, industry revitalization, healthcare, homeless, wealth gap and competitive productivity is more beneficial to the U.S. than targeting China to wish her demise.

On Q2, RH stated that "limits on Huawei's access to computer chips made with U.S. inputs, have pushed the company to consider moving away from smartphones and 5G technology toward less chip-intensive technologies." China in response is intensifying her drive toward self-

Mainstream Media and Organic Views Dr. Wordman

reliance. RH's view is that "the more China turns toward indigenous innovation, effectively limiting its ability to draw on the talent and ingenuity of the rest of the world, the more it could slow itself down. That would be China's choice." This author felt that RH should have noted the fact that the U.S. policy change of restricting Chinese scientists and students to come to the U.S. to participate in technology research will slow the U.S. as well, perhaps more severely since China produces many more STEM graduates than the U.S. does each year.

On Q3, RH responded with three examples: 1. Intensive U.S.-China economic coordination around the 2008-2009 global financial crisis helped avert global economic depression, China's currency appreciated, trade balance with the world lessened and Chinese demand for imports fueled global economic expansion, 2. China joined the international response to the Ebola outbreak in 2014 and helped Africa in public health, and 3. China became a key player in securing agreement at the Paris climate conference in 2015. RH further claimed that "the currently elevated tensions in the U.S.-China relationship defies unilateral solutions, whether the challenge is stopping COVID-19, strengthening global health security, building a more inclusive global economy or tackling the climate crisis. From this author's observation, the above U.S. successes in influencing (pushing) China, are actually perceived differently by international political analysts as China's success in understanding the U.S. financial turmoil (credit bubble) and world issues (virus management and climate change control). China's recent achievements in environmental protection, energy and transportation grid, COVID management, space exploration, and exporting infrastructure projects, etc. are evidences that China is capable of planning and executing programs for her and world's benefits without any nation to push her.

On Q4, RH said that "Western countries cannot compete on a cost basis for constructing roads and railways. The G7 'BBBW' initiative will likely be more effective if it avoids attempting to out-China China. Instead, focusing on building digital technology infrastructure, investing in climate resilience and supporting good governance." In this author's view, it makes more sense to cooperate rather than compete with China's BRI and to stop all smearing propaganda against China. The fact that China embraces the UN and receives more support from its members than the U.S. does should serve as a reminder to the U.S.: Condescending diplomacy days are over.

On Q5, the key question, RH remarked: "The Cold War is a poor analogy for understanding U.S.-China relations today." I fully agree with his arguments that 30 years of global war and depression then is very different from 30 years of great power peace and global economic expansion now. The Soviet Union exploited power vacuums along its periphery then and China is surrounded by capable powers in Asia today. The Soviet Union was weak and isolated in its economy then, China is deeply embedded in the global economy as the driving engine today. Thus, I agree with RH; containment is not an option for dealing with China, since no U.S. allies or partners would be eager to align with the U.S. against China. RH did point out "one similarity to the Cold War is the risk of a devastating military conflict between two nuclear-armed superpowers. Only time will tell whether U.S. and Chinese leaders would choose to prioritize risk reduction." In this author's opinion, this risk may be contained so long China adheres to her policy (never to use nuclear weapon first) and the U.S. does not provoke China to war. There are just too much to lose if the two great powers would engage in a hot war. It is surprising though that RH makes only a light remark "only time will tell" rather than offering some serious recommendations.

In this interview, JCW did not ask and RH did not comment on the current Biden's China policy. Reviewing what has happened, the U.S. busy seeking alliances, engaging military exercises in South China Sea, and arming Taiwan to confront, agitate and provoke China, all negative actions that will hurt the U.S. and the world's economic stability. The Biden Administration is clearly conducting a hostile China policy; RH (and Brookings Institute) should make explicit recommendations to turn his negative actions to positive policies. Judging from RH's another Brookings Institute article, entitled, 'Taiwan Voters Should Look Before They Leap on Pork Referendum' (7/12/2021 Order from Chaos), RH was very explicit in giving advice with a patriotic stand - warning Taiwan voters not to reverse Tsai Yin-Wen's decision of allowing import of U.S. pork containing ractopamine. This is a serious health concern, especially FOR Taiwan people Who consume a lot of pork meat, pork internal organs and many derivative food products made from pork. Taiwan also exports many pork food products to other countries. It is understandable why the pork issue has risen to the level as a referendum for the entire population to vote on but nevertheless it is just a domestic issue. This author is surprised that RH would go so far to warn Taiwan citizens that their voting may seriously affect trade relations with the U.S. He even implied that the pork referendum may affect the American commitment to Taiwan thus its security, an apparent message of threat. On the other hand, the U.S.-China tensions is a far more serious national security issue concerning both the U.S. and China, yet RH is far from explicit in advising his readers, the American people, what is wrong with the current U.S.-China policy and why it is dangerous with a real possibility of driving the U.S. into a nuclear war.