

# 明修棧道 暗渡陳倉 莫把雞毛當令箭

美國總統的一言一行都會引起世人關注，川普總統上任後有幾項重大決定，更引起全球矚目；筆者站在一個美國公民的立場來評論幾句，湊湊熱鬧：

◎范湘濤

1.川普下令禁止外國公司(如博通Broadcom)收購美國高科技產業(如高通QUALCOMM)，軟硬兼施迫使一些美國大企業回流，以優惠條件吸引外資來美投資(如孫正義的軟銀、郭台銘的鴻海)，準備大力修建基礎建設，宣稱要增加關稅，不惜以打貿易戰來尋求降低貿易赤字的嚴重問題；川普想讓「美國再次強大」的目的不容置疑，但有些地方手段似乎粗糙了一些。站在一個美國公民的立場，我們沒有任何理由反對他以上的這些決策，只能建議他要多方諮詢，老謀深算之後才行動，能夠使對手心甘情願讓利，在一團和氣之下贏得雙邊貿易談判，才是上上策。

2.川普下令在美墨邊界線上修圍牆，防止外國人非法偷渡；對少數動亂國家人民不發給來美簽證以防恐怖分子的入境，對所有新移民申請要更嚴格審核其背景以保障國土安全。許多人認為他的做法有些不入道，想在他臉上貼上種族主義標籤；然而他的這些政策，的確確確保障了美國的安全，君不見，他上任後美國從未遭到過恐怖分子突擊，站在一個美國公民的立場，對他的這些做法不能不給他點讚。

3.川普決定親自與朝鮮的金小胖舉行高峰會，很多人譬喻這次的川金會有如當年的尼克森訪中，筆者認為這種譬喻是把「東施」看成了「西施」，把蘿蔔當成了山藥，太高估了川金會的實質；本人預料這次高峰會頂多只是一場鬧劇，肯定不會有什麼結果，因為美國想要朝鮮自宮(廢除核武器)，而朝鮮卻必須保住自己的命根子(核武器)，這是美朝間的死結，沒有任何辦法可解決。但美朝兩國能夠雙方坐下來談總比互相叫囂好，站在一個美國公民的立場，我們要祝願這一老一小，能夠合演一場我們意想不到的好戲來。

4.川普前幾天簽署了國會「臺灣旅遊法」議案，這是一個非常危險的決定，站在一個美國公民的立場，必須出來指出這個法案可能帶來的災害。近半個世紀以來，美國一直奉行一個中國政策，與臺灣只有民間往來，禁止美國和臺灣方面的高層官員互訪；美國既給足了中國大陸面子，又可向臺灣賣掉一些行將報廢的武器，給自己添上了一層不錯的襪子，同時保持了臺海地區的和平，臺灣也蒙受其利；美國如果改變這種做法，讓美國和臺灣高層互相「旅遊」，形式上造成一中一臺，破壞美中建交公報，踐踏中國紅線，損傷中國核心利

益，是可忍孰不可忍，逼得中國政府非翻臉不可。美國如果不給中國面子，中國絕不會給美國裡子；中國對美國的旅遊法可能沒法阻止，但絕對有能力對臺灣展開武統，先拿掉這個美國軍火商的老客戶(臺灣)；到了那個時候，美國真願出兵干預嗎？川普敢違反百分之八十反對任何戰爭的民意嗎？偷雞不著蝕把米的買賣川普真願幹嗎？川普總統要好好深思。

國會通過的臺灣旅遊法內容中，開宗明義指出此法純屬國會意見(Sense of congress)，已經表明法案不具約束力；法案中鼓勵高層互訪用的原文是(should encourage)沒有用(shall)，更突顯法案本身的鬆弛性，說得白話一點，川普可以把這個法案當「令箭」也可以把這個法案當「雞毛」，完全看川普行使法案的智慧。如果川普總統把這個旅遊法當成「明修棧道」的手段，和中國在貿易談判中爭取對方讓利，要求中方降低美中貿易的逆差，以達到「暗渡陳倉」的目的，一定有很多人會佩服川普的高明戰略思維。美中貿易，中國佔了些便宜，在好聲好氣商量下，作出一些讓步是絕對有可能的。

依筆者多年觀察，中國政府除了堅持有中國特色的社會主義外，許多方面都以美國為學習目標，中國人民對美國人民也特別有好感，但如果美國硬是要步步相逼，中國也決不是省油的燈，必然會作出回應，韓戰就是一個血淋淋的歷史借鏡，美國人民尤其是我們美籍華人絕對不願見到那種場景重現。

臺灣旅遊法可能為美中關係帶來一場大火，需要一位有大智慧的人來防止這場可能發生的火災，中國方面傳來消息，國家副主席王岐山可能會負責解決外交難題的重任，王岐山素有救火隊長的美名，希望他真能大展長才，平熄這場美中間的外交大火.....。



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: 劉冰 張紹濤 周友道 傅建烈  
陳憲中 馬在莊 佟秉宇 張文基 范湘濤 兼社長

刊頭設計 劉學武  
每星期六出刊  
第245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

## 中美貿易大戰淺論贏輸

◎袁國英

這是一場全球矚目大戲，可能是已有劇本，雙方入戲演出，結果應是美方小贏，中方大贏。

先談美方，欲謀中方600億美金關稅，可謂大慰美國人心，兌現選舉支票，更有別過去歷任總統，有膽識，有魄力，更有利川普本人，及共和黨期中選舉。相信川普本人及經濟顧問都知道，美國向中方買的都是生活用品，美國不生產，一旦關稅提高，價格提高，勢必立即影響物價，或降低生活水準，零售業大量失業。美國賣的是農產品，中國很容易可從加拿大，阿根廷，巴西，或澳洲取得，而美農業州慘矣。不需再談中方對美國債的制衡力量。

再從中方觀察，貿易對中國GDP比率不高，美國制裁項目不過是貿易總額中，中美貿易項下的一部份，影響不大，只要略增內需及對新興市場國家增加輸出，就可補回。

以上形勢，路人皆知，雙方領導及財經專家更是清楚，但貿易大戲，刀磨霍霍，所謂何來？美方面的上面已交待過，中方配合演出，獲利大矣！其利並非在實質經濟上的利益，而是從雙方交手過程中，中方向各國展示，未在全球貿易規則，金融秩序，等等方面的發言地位及主導權，新的生態將成型。

2025中國製造的國家策略，隨著科技創新領先，資本雄厚，市場廣大，及對全球人才的吸引力，中國製造貨品更將銳不可擋，此番中美貿易大戰，不必過於在意，川普一向雷聲大，雨點小，以賭博策略玩國際政治，中方只要略施小惠，稍加讓步，即偃旗息鼓，小贏到手。反之中方大人器，戲後穩居全球經貿一哥，華人萬幸，大家拭目以待。

## 川普對華貿易戰

美國目前是一個分裂的國家，瘋狂反華咒中對抗美國傳統理性。

美國目前是第二次走入了麥卡錫黑暗時代，瘋狂反華咒中。

川普連連開除了

前美國最大石油公司CEO，傳統理性的國務卿 Tillerson，開除了貢獻卓越的白宮安全顧問戰略家 McMaster，反對川普貿易保護主義的國家經濟顧問經濟學家 Cohn 請辭，一口氣去除了分別擔任外交，國防，經濟的三位重量級的重臣。

川普請來了

極端反華咒中的國務卿 Pompeo，極端反華咒中的白宮安全顧問 Boltens，極端反華咒中的白宮經濟顧問 Kudlow，一口氣請來三位極端反華咒中的，並無聲名成就的政客，分別擔任外交，國防，經濟的要職。

看起來川普要對中國從外交，經貿，軍事.....各方面同時發起挑釁，因為中國全方位的崛起對美國是前所未見的難纏的對手，尤其是政治上文化上的異軍突起，直接衝擊西方破綻百出的自由民主人權選舉制度，使得美國有一種新的十字軍東征消滅儒家文化的想法，因而心急如焚的發起修昔底德陷阱的戰爭，不顧國際規範的祭出粗糙不堪的貿易戰爭手段，希望最終讓中國崩潰。

美國的經貿態勢

美國的進出口貿易數值佔GDP的比重是出口12.2%，進口15.1%

中國在美國的對外貿易總額所佔比例是出口的8%，進口的21%

中國的進出口貿易數值佔GDP的比重是出口19.6%，進口17.7%

美國在中國的對外貿易總額所佔

◎盛嘉麟

比例是出口的18%，進口的8%

可見中國美國都是大國，從這個態勢看，所有各項對外貿易的數據都不算大，即使兩國開打毀滅性的貿易核戰，終止了兩國之間所有的貿易，出口占12.2%，進口的15.1%，出口的8%，進口的21%，出口的19.6%，進口17.7%，出口的18%，進口的8%.....這些數值都摧毀不了兩個大國的經濟，所以只會互有損失，但是誰都不怕誰。

看看韓國進出口貿易數值佔GDP的比重是出口43.9%，進口36.7%

看看台灣進出口貿易數值佔GDP的比重是出口64.8%，進口52.7%

這樣依賴對外貿易的小國家是經不起貿易戰爭的。

而且中國美國之間的經貿關係錯綜複雜，中國對美國的出口表面上是佔到18%，實際上這18%有美國企業的在華投資，有東南亞台灣三國的上游材料及半製品，有中外的合資企業.....川普用加稅限制手段打擊這18%，到底中國損失多少，美國損失多少，東南亞損失多少，台灣損失多少，一時還難以計算。

例如中國對美國出口8%的報復手段集中在食品及農產品，農產品固然比較簡單屬於直接的打擊，但是美國食品工業的知名大公司 Smithfield 卻是中國投資的公司，將受到沉重打擊，中美雙方各損失多少一時還難以計算。

由於國際的產業分工，國際投資

資金的自由流通，現代的保護主義貿易戰，已經不同於1930年代的保護主義貿易戰，川普以30年代的心態進行對華貿易戰爭，或許是知識的愚蠢或許是政客的好巧，美國的經濟學界企業界華爾街政府部門75%的意見都不看好，因此一批有識之士紛紛從川普團隊離去，現在的川普團隊只能聚集了一批反華咒中意識形態，想做大官的蠢貨。中國方面怎麼看這場貿易戰，請看附帶的 youtube 檔案。

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bL\\_S2ZwFzB0](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bL_S2ZwFzB0)

我的看法有兩項：

我不擔心川普團隊欠缺知識的貿易戰，目前美國目前是一個分裂的國家，強大的反川普的勢力正在看川普團隊的笑話，等待對華貿易戰爭的失敗，國際威望的快速跌落，將來美國可能物價上漲(加重了關稅，減少了物美價廉的中國製造日用品)，鑄鐵帶經濟依然欲振乏力毫無改善，軍事依然嚇阻不了中國，政府赤字瘋狂的以幾何級數擴大，反川普的勢力會一舉推翻川普團隊，結束美國第二次麥卡錫黑暗時代。反川普的勢力，請看附帶的 youtube 檔案。

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=57jRBI4h6ks>

我最擔心的是貿易戰背後的新十字軍東征的亡華心態及意圖，美國是抱定決心要發起修昔底德陷阱的戰爭，會從經貿，政治，軍事全方位的發起亡華戰爭。雖然目前的中國已經是不可征服的國家，立於不敗之地，然而中國最大的軟肋來自內部。中國有捧着西方自由民主人

## 貿易戰--中美再一次交鋒

◎中偉

韓戰後中美再一次交鋒，上一次是熱戰，而這一次是經濟實力的消耗戰，在雙方都不退讓情況下，貿易戰肯定要打下去，最終都沒有贏家。

這次貿易戰，有如韓戰的重演，只有打打談談，到雙方都覺得損害太大時，才能坐下來妥協，表面上看來沒有勝負，但作為挑起貿易戰的美國，如果贏不到，就變成了輸家，顏面盡失，國際大哥地位不保，中國更因貿易戰後，國際地位因而提高，加快崛起速度。

美國打貿易戰，只有羊毛出在羊身上，首先受害的、是大眾常用的日用品漲價，在入口貨品中、加15%的稅款，意味著消費者、將要多付出、在目前貨品價錢上增加15%或更多，零售商如果不作大幅度加價，為減低運作成本，只有使大量服務性行業的職位流失，到11月、美國中期選舉後，就可知到貿易戰、是否能繼續打下去了。

美國提出對中國600億貨品加15%關稅，對中國總體外貿額來說、只是極少的部份，傷不了中國，就算不做這些生意，只要增加

內需、和一帶一路的倍增商機、將可抵消有餘。

中國經濟是以製造業，實體經濟為主，減少生產，開發更多新市場，憑著高超，高效的基建技術，資金，及互利共贏誠意，對當今世界各國缺乏資金，技術，和老化的基礎設施，中國的投資吸引力，將會為中國創造無限商機。

反觀美國經濟以資訊，金融，房地產投資為主，高科技，高增值產品的客戶有限，或受出品限制而不能發揮更大經濟效能。打貿易戰將會重創資訊，金融，房地產，川普對中國一些貨品，徵收入口稅15%當天，道指就大跌700多點，次日再跌，可見影響美國前景多大。

美國電影在中國市場收益更多創佳績，受歡迎的電影收益都是以億元計，其他如蘋果等美國企業在中國市場的得益，美國更不應該忽視。和中國打貿易戰，中國再不會買美國國債，日本或其他國家有能力接這麼多嗎？中國如果大幅減持美債，美國經濟受得起嗎？中國加速人民幣買油和國際化，美元強勢能保得住嗎？這些都是美國要深思的後遺問題。

美國打貿易戰，是平衡不到外貿赤字的下下之策，不符合兩國和全球利益，只有雙方坐下來，好好商討長遠合作方案，互保長短，才能達至互利共贏目的，貿易戰是不合時宜。

## Fuzzy Party Ideologies Make 2020 Presidential Election Fuzzy

The 2016 election was a 'crazy' one which had produced a dark horse winner, Donald Trump, and surprised the Party bosses and politic elites of both Democrats and Republicans and most astonishingly, the mass media. Trump won the election but not that many friends. The new President's behavior and performance and his Administration Team's fast turnover have prompted many people to look to 2020 Presidential election already, particularly the tarnished angry journalists in the media, the discredited pros in American party politics and the big presidential election influencers on both the winner side and the loser side. Therefore, it is not too early for this column to talk about the next Presidential election in 2020.

Trump was the winner in 2016 but the Republican Party could not claim the credit for it. Trump never represented the Republican Party machinery. In fact, the Party machine was against Trump from the start until he won the primary. The feud between Trump and the party hierarchy continued even after Trump was inaugurated into the White House. The Republican Party Chairman Reince Priebus only served 189 days as Trump's Chief of staff in the White House. Priebus left White House with his used roller-deck of Republican names. This of course does not mean Trump now has the Republican Party in his control nor the other way around leaving the Republican Party in a fuzzy state.

Trump won on his slogan, Make America Great Again. But to some extent (to some Trump supporters and some Trump haters) this was interpreted as 'Make White America Great Again'. There was the 'flirting' relationship between the white supremacists groups such as the KKK and Trump during the campaign. The recent racial incident in Charlottesville had highlighted that vague relationship. The President took a neutral position of slapping hands of both sides and the white supremacists seemed to want to take credit for Trump's 'right leaning' immigration policy even his repeal of Obama's executive order expanding Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA), a policy concerning allowing about 1.7 million illegal immigrant children to stay in this country. The Charlottesville racial incident may have cost Steve Bannon's job, but the mass liberal media seem to want us to believe that the 'flirting' relationship is really a 'love' relationship. How true is it?

### Mainstream and Organic Views Dr. Wordman

The Republican Party had a large number of candidates for the 2016 Presidential election and most of the party candidates were taking a 'right' position leaning a little towards the center but Trump never followed the 'party' direction. Hence, the Republican Party's campaign position was a fuzzy one to the voters. Likewise, the Democratic Party's position also became fuzzy because Hillary Clinton started more from a central position to appease the donors associated with Wall Street and its fat cats but forced to move more to the left by the liberal Sanders movement. So in the 2016 election, the two parties both gave voters a fuzzy image and the competition became Trump versus Clinton in 'trust' issue and the result sided with Trump because he correctly recognized the Angry American sentiments and essentially he was an outsider of the American party system and Washington politics.

Looking towards 2020, even though the Democrat Party has not emerged with a definite contender for the Presidency against Trump, there is a significant undercurrent that we must recognize and track. Sanders mounted an impressive campaign with a socialistic agenda in the 2016 Presidential election to the point he threatened the expected sure-win nomination of Hillary Clinton. Sanders' messages resonated with the 'Democratic Socialists' who share a far left ideology. Will the American socialists mount a force in 2020? Joining the Democrats? Will the angry American Right who formed a movement behind Trump in 2016 regroup for him in 2020? Strengthening the Republic Party? May be, both may be a plausible scenario since both Democrat Party and Republican Party had not only lost the 2016 Presidential election but also the loyalty of their party members leaving both parties in a fuzzy state.

Recently, John Nichols, a writer and a pioneering political blogger, wrote a long article in [theNation.com](http://theNation.com), entitled, America Has a Long and Storied Socialist Tradition - DSA Is Reviving It. This article gave a brief history of American Socialism from the turn of the 20th century. He wrote about the biennial convention of the Democratic Socialists of America (DSA), held in Chicago in the first weekend of August 2017, and quoted the DSA National Director, Maria

Svart, "the DSA gathering is the largest in an era. The organization's membership has tripled. A new poll suggests that 37% of American adults prefer socialism to capitalism." Nichols, a very productive writer, is the author of a best-selling biography of former vice president Dick Cheney, *Dick: The Man Who is President* (New Press) among other books and a forthcoming book, *Horsemen of the Trumpocalypse: A Field Guide to the Most Dangerous People in America* (Nation Books this fall). His observation in the above referenced article, in my opinion, should not be casually cast away.

As Nichols described, The American democratic socialism had a history in Wisconsin and even had socialists running for the U.S. Presidency in the early 20th century. The Democrat Party stole the socialists' thunder and marginalized the American socialists through Franklin Roosevelt with the New Deal, but the American socialists never disappeared entirely. In the last Presidential election, Sanders brought the American socialism to live again. His liberal messages energized the young people throughout American colleges. His movement in 2016 built an organization, will this organization merge formally with democratic socialist Americans in 2020? A Third Party Candidate? Very likely, if one believes what the anti-Trump media are saying and plotting.

Post WW II, the Soviet style communism has made a deep dent in socialism since communism embraces socialistic principles. Thus anti-communism had often spilled over to anti-socialism. The U.S. as the world leader of anti-communism and promoter of capitalism essentially forced American socialists into hibernation. The collapse of the Soviet Union in 1989 and the rapid rise of China's economy in the past three decades gave testimony to the success of hybrid socialism and capitalism over communism or pure socialism. The movement of Sanders and the revival of DSA perhaps should not surprise anyone. The issue is that the American public is used to the two-party system and their election mechanism making the entry of a third party candidate difficult. From 2016 to 2020, we should take the lesson from how the two party systems malfunctioned in 2016 and how fuzzy their ideology had become depending on 'who was the Presidential candidate running a well-funded campaign'. Money had made party ideology fuzzy.

Although we are still two and half years away from the next Presidential election, it is not too early for American citizens to sharpen their observations and track the two undercurrents of political movement so the voters will not be fooled again by the political pundits and the lying media. We must avoid another fuzzy election in 2020. It is time for American political party members to think and vote independently to define a clear and suitable ideology or platform for 2020!