

# 中日博弈菲律賓 “兩邊收錢是硬道理”

一月12號和13號，日本首相安倍訪問菲律賓。他不但到首都馬尼拉會見杜特爾特，並且飛到杜的老家納卯市(Davao)，參觀了杜的廚房臥室，並在杜的家裏吃了早飯。杜稱安倍跟他“親如兄弟”。杜擔任納卯市市長超過20年(當了總統後，市長乃由他的女兒當，兒子則為副市長)，不過住的不是豪宅。根據我的親戚說，杜的住宅就在他家附近，房子不大。

安倍在該次訪問中承諾為菲律賓提供近90億美元的經濟援助(減讓性貸款和無償援助)，幫助菲律賓修築鐵路、公路等基礎設施，以及為癮君子提供戒毒設施等。此外，還會幫助菲律賓加強海防。安倍是杜上任以來第一位訪問菲律賓的國家元首。

去年十月間，杜當選總統後先到北京會見習近平，然後訪問了日本。在北京期間，他率領超過250人的龐大商務隊伍跟中國13項合作協議，主要是優惠貸款，總額高達240億美元，包括所謂PPP項目(公私合夥項目)，簽署了四十個項目的意向書。其中包括一些大規模的基建項目。中方要求菲方列出一個優先項目表，以便首先落實。二月24和25兩天，中國方面將派一個訪問團到菲律賓，進一步商談15個項目的落實問題。(由於菲律賓作為今年東盟東道國，它的外交部長瓦賽說，東盟對中國在南海建築導彈設施“嚴重關切”。這可能引起北京的不快，所以突然宣佈延遲代表團的行程。後來瓦賽在參院答復詢問時說，南海問題不是這一代能夠解決的。我們要看它的

◎水秉和

進一步發展。)

一月份安倍來送錢，二月份中國代表團來討論怎麼樣送錢。這說明什麼呢？這說明，杜比他前面幾位一面倒向美國的總統聰明多了。美國吝嗇的緊，為了教訓杜掃毒侵害人權，它威脅要停止給菲律賓4億3千萬的援助。杜對之嗤之以鼻，說菲律賓沒這筆錢也照樣能活下去。祇要看看中日兩國比賽送錢的熱烈情況，你就應該瞭解，杜特爾特對美國不假辭色是完全合乎菲律賓利益的。把鄧小平總設計師的話改幾個字：兩邊拿錢是硬道理。

同時，杜特爾特仍然沒有放過美國。五角大廈在一月底宣佈，它預備在菲短期租用的軍事基地建築儲存武器的倉庫。消息一出來，立刻挨罵。杜說，在短期租用的基地建築永久性倉庫，明明是打算長期把武器，甚至核武器，留在菲律賓，他絕不答應，并再次威脅要廢止跟美國簽訂的《加強軍事合作協定》(美國後來解釋，倉庫是用來存放人道援助設備，杜才點頭認可)。

由於杜大規模禁毒措施遭到奧巴馬批評，去年他曾多次公開罵奧巴馬和當時駐菲的美國大使。一直到今天，在缺席半年之後，杜仍然不肯任命菲律賓的駐美大使。這些都說明，杜的反美發自內心。杜是民族主義者，他一再說，他不願意被美國利用來對抗中國，他要發展經濟。他還說，如果菲律賓跟中國起了衝突，美國絕不會為菲律賓跟中國打仗。在南海，在國際仲裁法庭作出不利於中國的判決之前，美國的兩個航母戰鬥群走了過場之後就悄悄地離去，並沒有對中國在黃

岩島的艦艇或幾個人造島採取行動。這頗令菲律賓人失望。所以杜不像馬尼拉的精英層，充滿戀美情結，他敢跟美國公開叫陣。他最近還公開邀請中國巡航菲律賓南部海域，打擊相當猖獗的海盜行動。特朗普上臺之後，對杜特爾特掃毒的激烈措施表示認可，所以杜對特朗普也表示友善。但是，這並不意味他會甘願作美國對抗中國的馬前卒。

我們知道，特朗普上臺後立刻宣佈退出TPP(泛太平洋夥伴關係)，這對日本產生重大衝擊。安倍顯然感到美國這個靠山可能出問題，而這正值日本致力於恢復為正常國家的時候，所以他立刻四面出擊，擺出了要跟中國爭亞洲老大的姿態。非常自然的是，兩邊爭取的對象就是東南亞和南亞國家。也恰好在這個時候，杜要擺脫美國，聲稱要搞獨立外交，於是乎菲律賓就成為中日兩國必須爭取的對象。

如果玩的轉，小國可以在大國之間左右逢源。菲律賓的經濟目前雖然以6%到7%的速度增長，但是它的基礎設施極端落後，人均年收入不到3,000美元，在東盟諸國中算是窮國(官方資料顯示，它平均每年的成人失業率高達20%)。這跟它腐化的精英階層長期無作為和阻擋政府在他們掌控的地盤內有所作為有極大的關係，也跟美國過去支持極端腐化的馬可斯專制政權有關。現在杜特爾特在國內雷厲風行地掃毒與反腐，在國際關係上採取獨立的外交政策，加上中日兩國爭相為它發展基礎設施，前途看好。看來，杜特爾特帶給世界的信息是：小國不要選邊站，不要當大國的小卒，要走自己的道路。

的產品的競爭力也會減弱。近幾年美國和歐洲都在指控中國鋼鐵傾銷，試想，如果有這種稅來保護本國的鋼鐵業，則傾銷就變得不可能了。外國的廉價產品的成本提高了，價格自然上漲，從而降低了國內低收入群體的消費能力，等於是向他們多收了一筆稅，不過同時也增加了他們的就業機會和待遇。兩相抵消，可能是得失互見。它還會增加通貨膨脹和美元增值的壓力。但是，由於美國是全世界進口最多而出口較少的國家，總體來說，這應當是對美國很有利的。

共和黨基本上支持這個調整稅，所以它獲得參眾兩院通過的機會是非常高的。這會衝擊所有出口大國和區域，包括大陸，臺灣，日本，韓國，新加坡以及其他東南亞國家。關鍵是，它們中間誰能夠迅速作出調整，尋找新的市場，誰就能避免長期受害。



網址 <http://www.us-chinaforum.org> 投稿信箱: [uschinaforum138@gmail.com](mailto:uschinaforum138@gmail.com)

中美論壇社 主編  
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 范湘濤 張文基 蔡社長

刊例設計 劉學武  
每星期六出刊  
第187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

## 那裏有那麼多黑天鵝呀？

如果你看大陸對2016年的各種評論，你就會看到左一個“黑天鵝”，右一個“黑天鵝”：特朗普當選是黑天鵝，英國脫歐是黑天鵝，意大和菲律賓的選舉結果也是黑天鵝，滿天飛的都是黑天鵝。這真是亂套外國名詞而自以為為時髦。其實，所有這些都是正常選舉的結果，它們雖然令人感到意外，但絕不反常，絕不是千萬件事中出現的一件偶發事件，所以不能算黑天鵝。

它們祇不過是由於主流媒體和民調出現嚴重誤差，誤導了大家的視聽罷了。正確地說，它們應當被稱為常態。或者，新常態。什麼是新常態呢？新常態就是物極必反，就是民粹主義擡頭，就是白人，特別是歐美社會中中下層的白人，感到他們的生活方式受到其他族群的威脅，又憤恨精英們祇顧自肥而拿他們作犧牲品，因而發出了最後的嘶吼。他們非常清楚，這個威脅不是其他族群使用暴力手段造成的，而是他們各自社會中的精英份子，這包括政治領袖，主流媒體，工商界的上層幹部，專業人士，娛樂界的歌星，影星，以及高級知識分子，他們中間的大部分，為了他們自己的利益，或者基於他們的信仰，出賣了他們自己的原始族群。所謂原始族群，當然，就是種族，宗教和國家認同了。

記得是《紐約時報》的專欄作家湯姆·弗里曼曾經說過，在當今的世界上，大多數國家的上層精英之間所存在的共識，遠多於他們與他們本國中下層人之間的共識。可是，到底精英階層的共識是什麼呢？

英國的一位哲學家Craig Calhoun創造了一個名詞，叫做大都會自由主義(cosmopolitan liberalism)，或者為這種共識作了很好的說明。“大都會”指的是一種個人品味(多指高級人士)，譬如喜歡吃有機食物，跑步或做瑜伽，看網上的評語選擇餐館，喜歡旅遊，注重住宅的擺飾與格調等。“自由主義”呢，

◎彭文逸

當然，指的是個人自由，人權，民主等。兩者加在一起可以相當形象地描繪我們當前世界上的精英階層。他們的特點是一方面具有強烈的個人意識，另一方面思想非常開放。這個思想開放應當說是好幾代逐漸演變下來的，也是隨著現代化和城市化而越來越開放的。

舉例言之，墮胎(人工流產)在美國是經過長期鬥爭而於1973年依最高法院判決才成為合法的，雖然爭議至今不絕。

其他如黑白通婚，同性結婚，男人可以變性為女人(並且可以主持非常受歡迎的電視脫口秀節目)，不結婚也可以養孩子，動物也有不受虐待的權利，國界不再阻擋異國人，異教人或者異族人自由遷徙(歐洲27國間的申根安排)，等等，都是在近幾十年間逐漸被西方人士接受的。能夠接受這種大都會自由主義當前的實質內容的人多屬於受過高等教育，收入較高和年齡較輕的人。

對於仍然持有傳統習俗和信仰的人而言，這種大都會自由主義的內容擴大到這個地步，就變得越來越難接受了，而這些人通常是教育程度較低，收入較低，並且是生活在大都市以外地區的人。當然，你可以說他們落後，跟不上時代，可是，另一方面，他們是一批愛自己的家鄉，愛自己的族群，宗教，傳統，和國家的人。換言之，他們是民粹主義者。

由於2008年的金融風暴對發達國家的中產階級造成的沉重打擊，和美國摧毀中東社會導致數以百萬計的難民硬闖歐洲的大門，民粹主義者終於忍無可忍，發動了一次大規模的反擊。這個反擊在菲律賓(它的性質有些不同，主要是毒品氾濫)，意大利，英國和美國已經初步成功，而今年會在荷蘭，法國和德國繼續攻勢。它們是否能夠造成歐洲分裂仍然是未知數。這是一場不流血的但可能扭轉世界格局的鬥爭，特朗普2月18號向聚集了9000名擁護者的群眾發出豪語：“這將是一個劃時代的變化！”。

## 邊境調整稅

為什麼特朗普上任後爭議不斷，可是股市卻屢創新高？無他，華爾街認為他的經濟政策會對美國有利，而其中的一個亮點就是所謂的邊境調整稅(Border adjustment tax)。

什麼是邊境調整稅？公共電視臺二月十號晚間新聞節目訪問了它的發明人，加州大學教授Alan Auerbach，由他對此作出說明。最根本地說，它就是對美國出口的產品在外國賺到的錢不抽稅，對從外國賣到美國的產品，不管是外國公司還是美國公司出產，都抽稅。這是鼓勵美國企業和其他國家的企業在美國生產製造的一個相當有吸引力的辦法。

◎艾花奇

大家都聽說，由於避稅，許多跨國公司，如蘋果，谷歌，GM，GE等，留在外國，不肯把在外國賺到的錢匯回國，總數據稱在三萬億以上。如果特朗普減免所涉稅款，那麼今後所有這些錢都能夠回流，幫助美國國內的投資和就業。如果他能對今後美國輸出的產品免徵稅，那麼他就徹底避免了目前所存在的問題，對美國的經濟應當很有幫助。另一方面，從中國，墨西哥以及所有其他國家進口到美國的產品都要交這個調整稅，所以它們的成本就增加了，它們在美國的銷售量多半會減少，它們跟美國本土製造

## Represent the U.S. - Not to Represent the World

President Donald Trump's first speech to the joint Congress session on February 28, 2017, will be a historical one no matter how the people, media and political analysts reacted and opposition party (Democrats) and critics responded. By historical one, I do mean Trump's speech has a great historical significance not just an event in history. Overall the first Trump's Congressional speech received far more positive reactions than criticism for both substance and delivery. His "Unity and Strength" message struck a chord the United States needed to listen to. He reiterated many of his campaign promises with rational follow-throughs and actual initiatives. President Trump told Fox News before the speech that he would speak from his heart; most people listened to President Trump's first Congressional speech felt so.

However, the very reason, I believe, that Trump's speech is a historically significant one is beyond the above positive comments. Trump's speech is important and significant owing to the very statement in his speech: "My job is not to represent the world. My job is to represent the U.S. of America." These two sentences by itself may not be so significant, but coupled with other declarations and his reiteration of many of his campaign promises, these words become the most significant statement in his speech. It takes courage and honesty for an American President to make such a statement in view of the past century of American history and her legacy foreign policies. The U.S. has been conducting a self-appointed world leader's role practicing an almost completely unilaterally defined 'world police' responsibilities. The American Exceptionalism and neo-right political philosophy have dominated the US foreign policy and national security strategy since the WW II, which led the U.S. to behave like a world police. Both the Republican and Democratic Parties have adhered to such a philosophy with increasing intensity up to the Obama Administration.

In my previous articles about Trump's presidential election, I had pointed out that Trump had recognized a quiet movement or phenomenon in the nation and through the fierce competitive campaign, the 'quiet rebellion' became a 'loud chorus'

Mainstream and Organic Media  
Dr. Wordman

and grown to become an 'earthquake' as President Trump uttered the above words in his Congressional speech. Trump's new chapter of American greatness is based on "new international pride, optimism and renewal of American spirit", "not let mistakes of the recent past to define the future".

Trump's focus is obviously domestic first, "to restart the engine of American economy". He blamed spending on global projects for neglecting America inner cities and defending other nation's borders for opening American borders for illegal immigrants and drug traffic. He did say that the U.S. will continue to support NATO but expecting EU to pay more for expenses, same applicable to the US allies in the M.E. and Asia Pacific. His proposed tax cuts to corporations to stimulate the economy and to create jobs and reduce unemployment and \$1T investment into US domestic infrastructure guided by "buy American and hire American" received standing ovation. Trump's message of "learn from the past, return home and rebuild" and "to find new friends and new partners (even with former enemies) to "want harmony and stability not war and conflict" make his statement, "My job is not to represent the world. My job is to represent the U.S.A." more meaningful and more significant reflecting a major commitment and shift of US foreign and domestic policies. This shift is carefully analyzed and gingerly welcomed in view of the fact that China, Russia, India, etc. are becoming more assertive in participating in world affairs, especially in terms of economic development.

Of course, history tells us, not every political leader always conducts himself or herself strictly following his or her political speeches, even a major speech to the Congress or to the nation. Trump is only in office less than two months and the February 28 speech was his very first big speech, it is still early to make firm judgment on Trump's policies especially on foreign policies. America is still divided with nearly equal Trump supporters and opponents. Philosophically, people like former presidential candidate, Bernie Sanders, responded to Trump's speech by itemizing on what Trump

did not talk about, emphasizing mostly Sanders' liberal views such as reducing wealth gap, more benefits for the socially deprived and free college tuition for everyone. There are also politicians like Chuck Schumer who simply denounced Trump's speech with a bipartisan opposition. Trump's Administrative team is still being formed. Although the team consists of more conservative even right-leaning people on foreign issues such as China policy and trade issues such as renegotiation of trade deals, it is fair to project at this point that Trump is a fairly firm leader who has spoken mostly from his heart in his first major speech. The media even reported that Trump will likely to add a critic on foreign affairs to his Administration. This is great news if it indeed happens.

Trump concluded in his speech that the U.S. shall soon celebrate her 250 years anniversary of independence, civil rights movement, and democracy. He has faith for a better world and he is hopeful that the U.S. will be a "more peaceful, more just and more free" nation. The critics of his speech did point out that Trump has proposed to increase the defense budget by \$54B and a reduction of the budget of the State department. These proposals may or may not be inconsistent from Trump's basic theme of making America great again and they may or may not be contradictory to the spirit of his speech. If the increase of the military spending is causing more arms race or instability in the world, then it is a bad use of the funds. An article written before Trump's speech (Boston Globe 2-5-2017) by Jeffrey D. Sachs (a professor at Columbia University), Donald Trump's Dangerous China Illusion, is a cautionary essay on this very subject questioning Trump's Foreign policy. China's growing role on the world stage should not be considered as a threat to the U.S. if the U.S. did not want to be the lone sheriff of the world. A collaborative relationship with China would be more consistent with the new chapter of American greatness.

What we American citizens must do is to watch President Trump's actions closely to judge on his sincerity in keeping his promises in speeches and his ability to lead his Administration in a transparent manner to serve the entire American people. What is not productive is that Americans protest against Trump for the sake of protesting without following his words or deeds. The Trump Administration has a low opinion of the media and vice versa for various reasons. After Trump's Congressional speech, there seems to be a possibility that the Trump-media relation may turn normal since the majority of people seem to be demanding that and more people are rallying behind Trump now than before his inauguration. Let us citizens demand more meaningful White House and government press conferences and unbiased media reporting on them.