

美中合作開創東亞新格局

兩岸關係小英須向川普學習

川習會後的一周川普政府的對朝政策有了可喜的改變：1.宣示美國的目的是朝鮮半島的無核化而非以往美國政府的"更換朝鮮政權"。2.強調與中國合作和平解決朝核危機，而戰爭手段只是最後選擇。至此美中有關朝核的政策已經相當一致，這是川習會的顯著成果，也為美中合作開創東亞和平新格局奠定了有力的基礎，對未來的兩岸關係將有深遠的正面影響。

四月的第一個星期是川普就任以來最成功的七天，一舉扭轉上任後因企圖大改革而遭到的挫折。七天內完成三件里程碑的大事：1.最高法院大法官的提名人 Gorsuch 得到參院的同意成為最年青的大法官，維持了保守派在最高法院的5:4優勢，對美國的未來發展將有長遠的影響。2.命令軍方對敘利亞空軍基地實施導彈精確打擊，一舉贏得了兩黨鷹派的支持，暫時擺脫了因為對俄羅斯干預總統選舉的指控所帶來的被動局面。3.成功的完成和習近平的峰會。蔡政府應該從這些事件中學習川習的領導和妥協藝術為臺灣人民謀求最好的未來。

川普的改變顯示了他的靈活

性，在革命激進和施政現實，在傳統價值和現實需要中找到妥協，這和鄧小平，甚至習近平都有相似處因而他和習有英雄相惜的感覺，也給此次峰會的成功提供有力的因素。也許，正如國務卿蒂勒森所希望的美中兩國能建立以不衝突、不對抗，相互尊重，互利共贏的新型大國關係來開展今後50年的兩國合作。成功與否就看今後一年能否合作順利解決朝核危機，和更長遠的能否透過美中合作建立東亞的和平發展格局。

為了臺灣人民的福祉，蔡英文和民進黨必須在激情和現實中找到妥協，給臺灣奠定一個安定和諧的內部環境，同時瞭解世界和東亞大勢，主動改善兩岸關係。蔡就職近一年以來，島內紛爭層出不窮，最近甚至發展到無聊人士砍蔣銅像頭，就如柯P所言"這樣子做，臺灣社會有更團結、更和諧嗎？"

而兩岸官方關係更是呈現危險的零交集，這絕非台灣之福！

國運興衰就像生命一樣經歷生，長，興，衰，亡的週期。二戰後每隔20多年就有一個大變化。1951年中蘇關係鼎盛，世界是兩極爭霸，1972年尼克森訪華開啟美中合作，導致1991年蘇聯與東歐共產政權的

◎張文基

最終解體，此時是美國所主導的西方獨領風騷，2008年金融危機爆發顯示西方價值的衰落，此後世界進入世界結構重組期，英國脫歐及川普當選就是重新思考重組的過程。

從中華文明的興衰大週期看，過去兩百年是從衰亡走向復興的期間，現在正在復興的初階段。中山先生名言"天下大勢，浩浩蕩蕩，順之者昌，逆之者亡"是極具哲理的。

為與大陸抗衡，許多臺灣人用西方普世價值來去中國化。正如本社何平先生文章所言蔡英文不可迷信美日價值同盟與大陸為敵（2016年7月28日中時觀點），殊不知世界正在構築新價值觀，而中華文明正是改進過程中的重要力量。島內部分極端人士甚至妄圖和日本軍國主義者合作，這更是死路一條，因為在美中大國博弈中日本永遠是次要的！

本省人一直是中華文明的最好傳承者，中華紐帶是改善兩岸關係的最好最草根的資產，豈可自毀之（中時2016年4月10日何平文）！蔡須學習川習在歷史和現實中找到平衡！

◎佟秉宇

為歐洲難民。美國國內製造業流失，中產階級變小、貧富差距拉大，方方面面形勢的變化似乎到了一個臨界點。在這樣情況之下，一個政治素人的川普居然又能及時的抓住了選民對現狀不滿以及求變的心理，大大出乎建制派的預料，當選為美國第45任總統。這時建制派才如夢初醒的意識到原有的策略及做法無法繼續，改變"一中政策"勢在必行。

建制派的離任總統奧巴馬在2016年12月簽署"2017會計年度國防授權法案"，由此，未來美台雙方軍方高層互訪將更趨面化與制度化，這對"一中政策"是進一步的蠶食。其實美國自簽署美中三個聯合公報之始，就在"一中"議題上玩弄文字，留有模糊空間。在英文版的公報文件上，談及中國大陸與台灣同屬一個中國時，用的是"acknowledge"一詞，既可解釋為"承認"，亦可解釋為"知道了"，並未明確表示同意或支持。

1982年中美簽訂的第三個公報也就是八一七公報，內容裏明確表明美國對台軍售雖有歷史由來，但在往後的軍售數量及質量上均不會超過1979年中美建交時的水平。然則美國卻沒有遵守公報的條例執行，對台軍售有增無減：1979年軍

售總額為2.65億美元，在小布什任內八年增至118億美元，奧巴馬任內七年（資料僅至2015年底）已增至141億美元。除去通脹因素，增幅亦在三至四倍以上。種種跡象顯示美國建制派對"一中政策"一直是陽奉陰違，並且不斷用實際行動將一中空洞化。

川普上台口號便是AmericaFirst"美國優先"，言外之意為了美國本身的利益國際信義必要時可以暫放一邊。於是拿"一中政策"作為與中國大陸的談判籌碼也就不足為奇。川普說"美國不會繼續當世界警察"、"北約已過時"、看著英國脫歐有掩飾不了的竊喜、對歐盟主力德法二國嚴厲批評的同時，卻又大量增加國防預算，計畫將海軍艦艇由270艘增加到350艘，大量採購F-35戰機，除了照顧他所代表的軍工利益集團外，明顯是為對付中國大陸，為"一中政策"的談判、南海的挑釁做好軍事恐嚇準備。

在東亞川普選計畫在日本、南韓佈置薩德導彈防禦系統，加劇與中國大陸的敵對態勢。在貿易上大有對中國大陸、墨西哥、台灣等對美國有貿易出超的國家與地區橫加進口關稅，冒著兩敗俱傷的風險似乎也不惜打一場貿易戰。

現在的中國大陸是世界第二大經濟體，進出口貿易世界第一，對美



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

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194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

弱國未必稍遜於強國

多數的意見必須尊重，此係民主的理智。但群體之夢想，未必一定要悉遵照做，因為夢屬於感性的意願，未經理性思考；即使夢者眾多，亦無約定俗成之功能與權力。當然，如果眾人同此一夢，則夢之大旨諒必其來有致，應該認真考慮，但夢中細節亦不能照搬，畢竟夢不是理性的思維，豈可當作治國大綱？

中華自遜清中葉以降，迭遭列強欺侮，而且愈演愈烈，這是國家積弱，有以致之。所以民眾當時亟思圖強，紛夢強國，這種情懷無可厚非。益以侵我之列強個個船堅炮利，科學發明琳瑯滿目，導致我國有志之士誤以為夷之長項即在於此，忽略了夷之所以強是在其思維方法，以民意為重，特別是其主要的致強之術在於摒棄了政權之私相授受。先知先覺們捧住人家的新奇玩意兒當作法寶，等於不識珠之貴，卻爭相珍藏木積，於是"科學救國""實業救國""富國強兵"等口號甚囂塵上。此情此志可以理解，其實並不盡然。

國弱必定受欺侮嗎？國家一定需要兵戈纔得保平安嗎？展視古今中外的史實，即知不然。春秋

貿易在川普課35%進口關稅的情況下，也只減少8%（英國金融時報估算）。軍事武器近年來也不斷更新，殲20戰機性能與美國F22不相上下，殲25則較F22更勝一籌，東風21D導彈是航母殺手，等等，不一而足。然而台灣則不然，TPP沒希望了，對美出口銳減將會給台灣經濟嚴重的打擊。台灣的執政者應為台灣的未來以及台灣老百姓的幸福著想，別讓他人拿著兩岸的分離現狀作籌碼，回頭是岸，承認"九二共識"，才是明智的作法。

川普在進入白宮後比較明白了美國在外交、內政上的各種制約，知道了中國大陸在經濟、軍事方面的實力，意識到和中國大陸談判"一中政策"必將踢到一塊堅實的鐵板，再加上國家安全顧問弗林"私通"俄羅斯駐美大使事件仍在繼續發酵，而解決朝核問題又必須有中國的合作，因此"一中政策"暫時放一放。但以川普的善變，各方仍須提防事態的再度轉變！

◎王敬之

戰國時期許多弱小之國，處身強國之間而生存下來，今天世界上有些小國，非但自解武備，而且連軍隊也沒有，不必一天到晚擔心別國"亡我之心不死"，卻民生樂利，一年四季桃紅柳綠鶯歌燕舞。反之，兵強馬壯就能保住江山嗎？古代強秦和元蒙都在鼎盛中灰飛煙滅，就是恰當的反面回答。且不談古事，單說近世吧，納粹德國以及另一個罪惡帝國，在它們化為烏有時依然擁有不少精良的先進武器，而那凶猛囂張的東鄰島國，即使到了投降之際，其士氣並不衰弱，痴望恢復舊觀的勇士還是代代不絕。兵者，握在有道者手中是保家衛國的神器，落到無道者手中可能是亡國滅種的凶器。可見邦國不在於強弱大小，端在有道無道。

談到"邦有道""邦無道"，仿佛很抽象、很玄。其實，用平常心說平常理，一點不神秘。邦國對內對人生講來，並非與生俱來的血肉關係，初生嬰兒最先只意識到自身，繼而意識父母兄弟等骨肉至親，社稷邦國這些倫理道德已在意識圈的外圍。因此，人對於社會國家僅有助成其好的願望--產生感情後自可身殉--並沒有先天的義務，即使在交通閉塞、人們通常習慣聚居一起的古代，碰到實在呆不下去的無道邦國、昏庸官府，也理所當然可以拋而棄之，離而去之，更可以誅而殺之。革命屬於神聖的事業，不能等同於稀裡糊塗的造反。

基於人性的根本道理，只應該計較邦國的有道無道，至於兵是否強、馬是否壯、武器軍備都是等而次之，甚至可說是無關緊要的東西。何謂邦有道、何謂邦無道，有什麼具體的標準呢？有，中華聖賢有非常明白而簡單的標準，那就是："養生送死無憾，王道之始也。"這句話概括了人世之最需，從出生到死亡都沒有任何憾事，當然就是合格的政治、體明的政治。這道理古今中外一體通用，凡屬人類誰能免此？治國之道，又何能外此？今之高談政治者，東拉西扯胡吹一大套，花裡胡哨堆砌了動聽的主義和口號，往往都不切實際，何如"養生送死無憾"這六個字乾淨利落。

美國"一中政策"的本質

從十二月二日川習會與蔡英文的電話到四月七日川習會的成功結束，川普對於"一個中國"的政策算是有了一個讓人稍感安心的結局。但是川習或是反對他的美國國內勢力會在"一個中國"問題上就此罷休嗎？我們不妨回顧一下這段歷史。

從十二月初與蔡英文通過電話後，美國總統當選人川普面對建制派鋪天蓋地的譴責，中國大陸嚴正的抗議，不但沒有絲毫退讓，反而進一步說美國奉行了近四十年的"一中政策"不是不可以放在談判桌上談的。看起來好像是美國的建制派要力保"一中政策"，而川普要打破這成規。是怎麼回事嗎？這台戲你信嗎？其實這只是建制派為了反對川普個人的表面做法。

實質上建制派也一樣感覺到如今世界局勢已與上世紀七、八十年代大不相同了，當時為聯中抗蘇、減緩越戰壓力而緩和了中美關係，建立兩國正式邦交，簽訂了中美三個聯合公報。從九零年代初蘇聯解體到現在這四分之一個世紀裏世界局勢變化巨大。美國戰事未曾停過，小布什任內消耗巨額軍費打阿富汗與伊拉克兩場戰爭，奧巴馬任內的"政權更替"策略更是打得中東北非滿目蒼夷，大量人民傷亡、逃離家園成

為歐洲難民。美國國內製造業流失，中產階級變小、貧富差距拉大，方方面面形勢的變化似乎到了一個臨界點。在這樣情況之下，一個政治素人的川普居然又能及時的抓住了選民對現狀不滿以及求變的心理，大大出乎建制派的預料，當選為美國第45任總統。這時建制派才如夢初醒的意識到原有的策略及做法無法繼續，改變"一中政策"勢在必行。

建制派的離任總統奧巴馬在2016年12月簽署"2017會計年度國防授權法案"，由此，未來美台雙方軍方高層互訪將更趨面化與制度化，這對"一中政策"是進一步的蠶食。其實美國自簽署美中三個聯合公報之始，就在"一中"議題上玩弄文字，留有模糊空間。在英文版的公報文件上，談及中國大陸與台灣同屬一個中國時，用的是"acknowledge"一詞，既可解釋為"承認"，亦可解釋為"知道了"，並未明確表示同意或支持。

1982年中美簽訂的第三個公報也就是八一七公報，內容裏明確表明美國對台軍售雖有歷史由來，但在往後的軍售數量及質量上均不會超過1979年中美建交時的水平。然則美國卻沒有遵守公報的條例執行，對台軍售有增無減：1979年軍

How to Democratize the Formation Process of Foreign Policy?

In Foreign Affairs (April 5, 2017) Snapshot, Dr. Daniel Bessner and Dr. Stephen Wertheim published a paper, "Democratizing the U.S. Foreign Policy: Bring Experts and the Public back to Foreign Policy". The title of this paper not only caught my attention but also struck a chord that resonated in my mind ever since I started writing the Column of Mainstream and Organic Views. Although Bessner and Wertheim are young (comparing to Kissinger and Brzezinski) in their career as emerging 'expert' in foreign policy (FP), security and international affairs, they must have felt the frustration in watching the current events and the uncertainties of the U.S. foreign policies to write the above paper.

Bessner earned his PhD from Duke and completed two post-doc studies at Dartmouth (International Security and U.S. Foreign Policy, John Sloan Dickey Center for International Understanding) and earlier as a Foreign Policy, Security Studies, and Diplomatic History Postdoctoral Fellow at Cornell University's Mario Einaudi Center for International Studies. He is currently an Assistant Professor at University of Washington (Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies). Wertheim earned his PhD from Columbia University and completed a post-doc study at Princeton University (University Center for Human Values and Niehaus Center of Globalization and Governance of the Wilson School). He is currently a Junior Research Fellow at King's College and the Lauterpacht Centre for International Law. Wertheim has published a book, "Tomorrow: The World", a book about the Birth of US Global Supremacy in WW II. Their credentials would suggest that they could emerge into real experts in international affairs and foreign policies should they persist in their academic pursue and/or land some foreign affairs job experiences (government or government supported think tanks).

Bessner and Wertheim's essay is well intentioned. They did offer some prudent and penetrating observations on how elite FP experts had lost the confidence of American public and suggested five points to restore public trust by democratizing US Foreign policy. Their article deserves to be analyzed for readers in the public domain beyond experts of Foreign Affairs audience and their paper also deserves to be augmented with common citizens' opinions and comments as we will do in what follows.

Mainstream and Organic Media Dr. Wordman

Bessner and Wertheim cited the 50 Republican national security officials' public letter opposing Trump to be the 2016 Presidential Candidate and how the public ignored the letter and Fox News denounced them as people of "no trust". The authors further quoted Tom Nichols' article, "How America Lost Faith in Expertise", Foreign Affairs, March/April, 2017) and then presented their own view how that happened. The first reason they gave was that the experts supported the Iraq War had caused FP expertise facing discredit. The authors claimed that Trump in his campaign further discredited the experts. This is certainly valid concerning pro-war FP experts but Trump's action was really induced by his reading the 'non-vocal' public's opinion correctly - It was the experts who initiated the long and fruitless war. The authors then suggested that the experts had isolated themselves from the public. This phenomenon is certainly true but the culprit as well as an accomplice is the American mass media which have violated the principles of journalism. Journalism supposes to offer unbiased reporting and multiple choices rather than take sides creating polarized media camps. Polarized media polarizes the public by not presenting multiple options in the same presentation.

The two authors presented a credible historical account of elitist versus democratic FP formation process back from the 1920's through the two world wars, represented by Walter Lippmann (ordinary public is too ignorant), John Dewey (public can assist the experts) and public political institutions (Foreign Policy Association, FPA, the like). Lippmann might be right in 1920's but certainly wrong today as knowledge gap on FP has been shrunk by the availability of clicks in the Internet search engines. Dewey advocated that democracy needs demo but today physical demonstration is hardly necessary as citizens are empowered by the Internet to demo with words. It is the mainstream media, often bought or controlled by money that has denied the public the right to opine.

Bessner and Wertheim credited Cold War for making Lippmann's view to triumph. The fight against communism and its success helped establish elitists' faith and get their view institutionalized (NSC, CIA, IDA, RAND, and etc.). Even Vietnam War was managed to be legitimized and the two

authors concluded that, at the end of Cold War, the experts and the public lost a shared rationale for the U.S. FP. In reality, communism has changed significantly even has been transformed to converge with democracy supported capitalism in some countries. The elitist approach to FP inherited from legacy is definitely outdated and the public has begun to realize that.

The authors credited today's think tanks for their concerted effort to engage the public by offering online public dialogues, etc. But they pointed out that the American FP has become structurally undemocratic, by merely asking the public to receive and assent instead of empowering them to choose and direct. We agree with their assertion but we blame the media being the accomplice. The media has not been open to common citizens as half or one century ago. A 91 year-old veteran friend of mine proudly showed me his comments published in NY Times post Korean and during Vietnam War but complained that his opinions had never been accepted for media publication for the past four decades - a telling story of today's media.

Bessner and Wertheim were concerned with the new elites that Trump had hired into his National Security and FP team thus calling for 'democratizing FP'. They laid out five points for doing that: 1 facilitate democratic deliberation, 2. Interact with citizens, 3. Frequent the non-traditional media outside of CNN, NYTimes, WSJ, the like, 4 empower stronger role for Congress on FP, and 5. FP experts to build a culture that individual expert is accountable for contributing to any disastrous FP. These points are positive, but one missing point they missed is a trustable media!

The American public must demand the mass media to be unbiased, open and fair in soliciting public opinions not just presenting the elitists' views and to present multiple choices of FP instead of prejudiced on a single thesis. Today, citizens live a busier and faster-paced life than half or one century ago. Today, the world has become more complicated by globalization and multinational interactions. Certainly, having expertise (and experts) in FP is still a necessity, but more importantly we must shrink the gap of FP knowledge and provide easy means of dissenting on FP to the public. The Internet offers technological tools but the experts and citizens must learn how to use them collaboratively to formulate FP. Trump's habit of twitting to communicate with citizens worried experts, but on a deeper thought, this might be just one of the effective tools to democratize FP. When the public, the experts, the think tanks, the media, the State Department, the Congress and the White House can work together to exchange opinions and to debate issues in plain language, then we will have succeeded in democratizing FP!