

一國兩制問題的探討 (上)

最近一陣，和台灣一位林姓朋友（現在是某大學的教授）電郵往來時談到許多關於台灣，大陸社會制度，經濟體制的一些問題，經過一番整理，記錄如下，從林教授的言談中，我們可以發現台灣當地人民所關切的一些問題。

林教授：有些人常常將中國的統一當成一個神聖的使命，到底台灣應該與中國統一還是獨立？回答這個問題之前須先將一切觀念回歸到原始的面貌：什麼叫做國家？國家是一群人組成的，沒有這一群人，國家就是個空洞的概念。因此，統一或獨立都只是手段，最終的目的還在人民的福祉是上升還是下跌。台灣的人民與中國統一之後，台灣人民的福祉是上升嗎？除了種族主義者之外，台灣社會從民主自由的社會再度回到獨裁政治體制，絕對是個大災難！在經濟利益上，台灣對中國投資了將近20多年，台灣人民的薪資也倒退的20年。在20多年前我已分析過，台灣這個高薪資的小經濟體與中國這個低薪資的大經濟體整合，一定是台灣的工作者薪資下跌，中國的工作者薪資上升，這是一個簡單的國際經濟學原理——生產要素價格均等化學說。所以，不論從政治和經濟統一角度來看台灣的人民都是輸家！

作者：很多人一談到統一就立刻想到台灣和大陸之間變得完全沒有任何屏障，像兩個水位不同的容器，一旦底部接通，水位立刻變成相同。實際上不可能如此，大陸方面一再強調“一國兩制”，而非“一國一制”。台灣將會保留一切現有制度，唯一須要改變的大概是領導人的頭銜以及“國號”。

在過去若干年，台灣工作者的薪資不斷下跌不是一個特例，美國工作者也是一樣，中產階層薪資比25年前還差。原因大概不外乎兩個：1. 競爭全球化，資金與產品的流向似乎無視國界的存在；2. 在資本主義的經濟體系裏（或雖號稱社會主義但在近年來卻有很多資本主義遊戲規則運作的體系裏）兩極分化是必然的，法國經濟學家Thomas Piketty在他的新書《Capital in the 21st Century》中已用大量的數據證明了這個結論。要改變（改善）台灣工作者未來的命運，只有逐漸改變現存系統的遊戲規則才有可能。如果把台灣到目前為止的發

展歷史簡單的畫個延長線，的確，台灣的人民會是輸家。

自由或民主不是抽象的，必須從一個國家或地方的具體情況來分析。大陸沒有西方民主的形式，但三十多年來絕大多數的人民生活水平大幅度提高了，言論自由比我八十年代末期開始去大陸經商時多的多了，這些都不需要我多說。兩種制度的優劣比較文章很多，教授可略為瀏覽。

再提一點，大陸並非在不受干擾的情況下自己慢悠悠的改變現行的制度。西方不斷的進行兩方面的干擾，政治上從來不曾斷過逼你個顏色革命的嘗試（看看香港的佔中）；金融上美國也不斷的將華爾街那套運行方式向大陸輸送。不管這兩方面那一個搞成了，都是大陸人民的災難。

林教授：台灣可以投票命令共產黨下台嗎？

作者：如果是一國兩制的話，共產黨在很長一段時間裏不會到台灣去參政，台灣人民也無需投票讓共產黨下台。將來看情勢的發展也許民進黨和國民黨可先去大陸參政，慢慢的雙方會增加相互了解。

林教授：如果是一國一制，兩岸都回歸民主制度，由人民當家作主，我就支持台灣與中共合併為一國。中共的一國兩制是對中國人民的污辱，中共一直認為中國人民知識水準低或者智商低，所以中國人民不能當家作主，只適合由中共來統治。

作者：在民主的進程上台灣與大陸有前後之分，硬性的拉到一起是不科學的。一國兩制是一過渡期的做法，以目前兩岸變化的速度來看，估計大約二十年兩邊的民主進程應該差不多了。如果十年後實現一國兩制，那麼這過渡期相信也就十年到十五年便可自然而然變為一國一制。請問現在台灣人民當家作主了嗎？也許程度上比大陸為高，但遠遠不理想，否則也就不會出現工作者薪資每況愈下的情況。人民當家作主是大家的理想，要想達到這理想人民必須不間斷的監督政府，不斷微調法規，以確保不斷接近此目的（approaching it asymptotically）。

林教授：請將這位法國經濟學家的推論詳細說明，讓我們明瞭他的

亞投行的成立 中美博弈的新拐點

亞投行（亞洲基礎設施投資銀行，AIIB）的成立是世界金融體系七十年來最大的突破，因為它將成為一個不是由美國控制的金融機構。亞投行的建立也是中國在三十年來中美博弈中第一次漂亮的勝利。所以，雖然關於亞投行的言論已經很多，它仍然值得我們多說幾句。

當美國最忠實的戰略夥伴——英國（雖然英國與“忠實”一詞是自相矛盾的）——事先沒有跟美國商量，甚至沒有跟美國打招呼，於3月12號宣佈，它決定參加亞投行為創始成員國，全世界所有關心國際事務的人都難免同聲驚呼：“Wow! That's Big!” 因為，如果英國都可以不顧美國頭頭的意志而一意孤行，那麼其他歐盟國家還有什麼顧忌呢？果然，歐洲的發達國家立刻響應，甚至連美國在亞洲的兩大支柱——澳洲和韓國——也不肯後人，都在限期之內加入了亞投行。就在短短三周裏，美國被它的盟友孤立了，拋棄了。目前57國已加入為創始國。這個驚人的數目肯定是中美兩國做夢都得不到的。

毫無疑問，中國贏了一場，但這絕非最後的篇章。美日兩國肯定不會善罷甘休。從今天到6月，中國在制定章程工作上必須不容許它們攪局。必須把握兩個基本原則。第一，人民幣和歐元必須是亞投行的主要或唯二的結算貨幣。要知道，美國依靠其對貨幣基金組織與世界銀行的掌控，它可以借人權或恐怖主義等理由制裁任何國家，而這些國家基本上失去國際融資的能力。亞投行需要成為一個獨立於這個霸權的組織。第二，亞投行是為了打通亞洲與歐洲的基礎設施而設，是歐亞兩塊大陸的事，美日是兩個海島國家（想一想，美國有兩大洋隔離，遠離文化中心。澳洲是另一個島國），所以它們的資金和話語權必須予以限制，尤其是因為它們已經掌控了世界銀行，國際貨幣基金和亞洲發展銀行。

為什麼歐盟或北約國家敢於這麼做？第一當然是利益當頭。如果亞投行的運作方式跟貨幣基金

結論是什麼？

作者：他的研究結論主要是：在資本主義系統裏，投資回報率總是比經濟增長率高，而投資者主要是高收入高資產人群，因此社會的財富會逐漸轉移到富人手裡。詳細內容可在網上查找。

林教授：投資報酬率為何總是比經濟成長率高？

作者：這是Piketty先生觀察分析了大量經濟數據所得到的結論。

林教授：投資者是指在金融投資還是實質生產投資者？

作者：都包括。

~水秉和~

組織相似，那麼提供資金的國家所能提供的技術和設備也會得到優先考慮。在歐洲普遍陷入通縮的今天，亞投行是絕好的商機，豈能錯過？再說，不單單是歐洲國家，俄國和中亞各國都可以預見，打通歐亞的大陸塊就是把全世界約三分之二的人口和經濟力量整合起來，其潛力之大，無與倫比。第二顯然是歐洲各國對美國的反感。別人或許不知道，但是歐洲的政治領袖們知道，烏克蘭的政變跟中情局的介入有不可分割的關聯，而到後來施行制裁的時候，受到打擊的是俄國與歐洲的經濟。這就是為什麼年初的烏克蘭談判是由德國和法國主導，不讓美國介入。他們很可能覺察到，美國顛覆烏克蘭的目的是蓄意破壞俄國跟歐洲搞歐亞一體化。

我的親戚朋友中有許多是熱愛和崇拜美國的。他們根本聽不進任何對美國的批評。他們也沒有注意到美國在911事件和侵略伊拉克之後所產生的重大變化。中國的崛起，在他們的腦中，仍然非常朦朧，不但心理上不能接受，在理性思考中，仍然覺得非常不踏實。因此，在中美博弈中，他們也堅信美國一定會贏。為什麼呢？因為美國有優越的民主制度。我不敢說這次亞投行的勝利會使他們認識到中國當前制度的優越性（雖然仍有許多缺點），但是，至少讓我們欣賞一下，為什麼中國在策略上和政策執行上會取得成功。

許多年來，中國在國際關係上

的口號一直是“和平發展，互利共贏”。但是，在提出“一帶一路”的具體構想之前，這個口號似乎並沒有獲得各方面的積極反應。自從一帶一路的倡議提出後，我們明顯地覺察到，它很快就受到國際上的注意，而亞投行，絲路基金等籌資機制的提出，更使得大家都看到了它的可行性，而一帶一路所觸及的國家都可以看得見，摸得到它們可能得到的好處。這就厲害了。

如果成功落實，一帶一路是今後二十年以上的，幾十個國家參與的複雜方案。因此有人將其與二戰後美國的馬歇爾計劃對比。它可以促進全球合作，抵制或消解國與國之間的衝突。對這樣一個長期規劃的策略，急功近利的政客，僅僅著眼於選舉勝利，是想也想不到的。即使想到，下一屆選出的領袖很可能加以全盤否定，就像威爾遜總統的國聯倡議一樣。

所以，當前世界上的對立面是：經濟擴張對軍事圍堵，和平發展對武力衝突，製造就業機會對製造難民，歐亞大陸整合對北約軍事聯盟。非常根本的另一個對立面就是：一黨治國，“團結一致幹大事”，對上了民主政治的黨派鬥爭，利益集團阻擋社會改革和短期的急功近利。兩種道路，利弊難分，有待未來分解。

亞投行是一個歷史性的拐點。美國的智者知道，美國不能再自我感覺良好地蠻橫下去了。但是，它內部的黨派鬥爭和大企業掌控的愚民傳媒系統，以至於軍事工業綜合體，數以百計的游說公司所代表的各式各樣的利益集團，加上各種落後的宗教信仰，糾結無解的種族矛盾和移民問題，使它改革開放之困難不亞於1978年的中國。

阿帕契的邊際效用

~周固猷~

看了最近台灣鬧的熙熙攘攘，雞飛狗跳的阿帕契新聞，想說點自己的感想。一：當你不懂別人，更不知道自己的時候，那才是件悲哀的事。譬如，你的鄰居在家裡研究如何安排他幾億元的投資計劃，而你則提心吊膽的，防備他來謀圖你家二十五塊錢的買菜錢，豈不是不合邏輯？二：至於控訴會洩露阿帕契攻擊直升機的軍事機密罪，那就更匪夷所思了。那個小歌星和直昇機合照的留念相片，只不過是幾張外型照，大家去網絡上看看阿帕契公司公佈的製造過程，以及如何躲避追蹤導彈，如何安排武器配置，二者相較，何者洩密？太多慮，也太看重自己，更太自抬身價了吧！三：那些軍官和歌星唯一可以被控訴的罪名，除了違反軍紀，亂闖軍營外，還會有啥罪名？四：台灣目前沒有軍法系統，我倒要看看，依照民法，找出洩露軍事機密的判決條款，去

定罪？找不到就要自打嘴吧，馬上放人！記得民國四十四年四月三號，成舍我在立法院十五次會議上，質詢行政院長俞鴻鈞，政府對被抓五年的龔德柏，是“不審、不判、下殺、不放”，抓龔大砲於法無據，立碼出牢。現在全世界都在瞪着眼，看看臺灣政府用民法條文去“審、判、殺、放”這些“洩密”的軍官，整出啥戲。五：台灣用天價買下這些攻擊直升機（拆除了重點裝備，才賣給凱子的綉花枕頭），前提是去打誰？共匪？飛得過台灣海峽，共匪坐着等挨揍嗎？老美允許你飛過去嗎？不然買它幹啥？總之：這幾架繡花枕頭，既無杖可打，又不能殺，看來供人參觀、照相、上媒體、炒新聞，搞八卦，倒是還剩點邊際效用，否則，當電風扇使喚，又嫌太吵，煩人吶！

Global Competitiveness Ranking and No Free Ride in the World

Annually, there are two competitiveness ranking reports which always capture a global attention. One is the Global Competitiveness Report issued by the non-profit organization, World Economic Forum (WEF) and the other is the World Competitiveness Rankings published by the IMD World Competitive Center, an academic organization in the International Institute of Management Development. WEF defines competitiveness of 148 economies based on the government policies, its institutions and a number of economic factors that influence the level of productivity of a region whereas IMD assesses competitiveness of 60 economies based on a set of indicators related to economic performance, government effectiveness, business efficiency and infrastructure. These two ranking lists do not necessarily match one another, however, their year over year assessment on each economy do provide a valid indication of improvement or decline over time in a region's competitiveness.

Based on these two reports published in 2013, we can make a few observations. I will focus on the competitiveness ranking on the United States, Hong Kong, Taiwan and Mainland China in our discussion below. I will also address the question: Can anyone be a free rider in the world system.

The US economy was ranked no. 1 and no. 5 in 2013 IMD and WEF reports respectively. The US ranking was improved from no. 2 and no. 7 in the 2012 IMD and WEF reports. Looking at China, she was ranked no. 21 (2013) improved from no. 23 (2012) in the IMD reports and remained unchanged at no. 29 in the WEF reports. Hong Kong's ranking was improved from no. 9 (2012) to no. 7 (2013) in the WEF reports but declined significantly from no. 1 (2012) to no. 3 (2013) in the IMD reports. Taiwan's ranking was no. 13 (2012) and no. 12 (2013) by the WEF assessment but was dropped significantly from no. 7 (2012) to no. 11 (2013) in the IMD evaluation. Notably, this drop was second time in a roll (no.6 in 2011). Looking a little deeper into this decline per IMD assessment, we find that Taiwan has fallen from 5th place (2012) to 8th in government efficiency, from 4th (2012) to 10th (2013) in business efficiency, from 13th (2012) to 16th (2013) in economic performance and from 12th (2012) to 16th (2013) in infrastructure. Furthermore, Taiwan has dropped in international investment and in health and environment.

Mainstream and Organic Dr. Wordman

Comparing the above statistics to Singapore, a small 'quasi' democratic but extremely stable country, whose ranking swapped places with Sweden from 4th (2012) to 5th (2013) by IMD assessment but remained 2nd place unchanged in the WEF reports, it is fair to say that the people in Taiwan and Hong Kong should be concerned with the decline of their competitiveness. Witnessing, in the recent couple of years, the political unrest in Taiwan and Hong Kong, one might correlate the drop of their competitiveness to their declining political stability. In Taiwan, the dysfunction of the government was evidenced by the students' occupation of Taiwan's Legislative Yuan (Recall how the US quashed the Occupy Wall Street!) and numerous demonstrations against the administration wantonly, particularly critical on Taiwan's negotiating a trade agreement with Mainland China for the service industry. This agreement obviously will enhance Taiwan's trade and economy and yet was obstructed by a political agenda maneuvered by the opposition party and external (foreign) influences.

In Hong Kong, demonstrations against the government seem to become a way of life. Even an accidental death of a dog in the railroad station would raise an outcry and a confrontation between citizens and railroad workers. The central sentiments causing unrest likewise is politically motivated under the issue of 'democracy'. Hong Kong citizens fail to understand democracy is only a tool having various forms. The ideology of a free prosperous and respectable Hong Kong is the real matter. Hong Kong earned her competitiveness under a stable governing system under British as a colony before and after her return to China. She has enjoyed far more freedom, respect and prosperity as a Special Political Zone of China. One cannot help but blame the decline of competitiveness in Hong Kong on the political instability during the past couple of years. For whatever reasons, the changes of rankings of China are modest, no. 29 in WEF and no. 23 (2012) to no. 21 (2013) in IMD. It is obvious her economy has grown steadily and has contributed to the recovery of the world economy, including that of the United States. In a recent interview

with Thomas Friedman of New York Times, President Obama was asked: Should he tell China to be a stakeholder of the [world] system and not a free rider? President Obama responded: "They are free riders and they have been free riders for the last 30 years and it's worked really well for them." Obama's remark is referring to the Iraq situation. However, it is an unsubstantiated statement. The Chinese press has responded with the following comment: "The United States started the war in Iraq which China opposed. (-omitted-) China had always believed in 'non-interference' foreign policy. When Iraq was in a state of war, no one, especially the United States or the United Kingdom, was willing to take the risk of investing in Iraq's energy industry but China. It turned out; the investment was not a total loss." The Chinese press essentially said: "To say China shied away from the world system and took a free ride is a 'sour grape' statement revealing nothing but an admission of a failed US foreign policy towards the Middle East and Iraq." China's rise in economy, without argument, is due to her successful domestic and foreign policies and the Chinese people's hard work under a stable political environment. There is no free ride just like there is no free lunch in this world.

Going back to the WEF and IMD reports, we see many regions drop in their competitiveness when they are unstable and their competitiveness improves when they become more stable. There is no free rider, you do the right thing for your economy and you gain competitiveness and vice versa. Among countries assessed, a direct correlation is seen between the competitiveness of a region with the effectiveness of her government and her political stability. This is true in Asia, in Europe, in Middle East, in Americas and in Africa. It also applies to the number one economy in the world, that of the United States. The competitiveness is vulnerable to the dysfunction of the government and destructive behavior of the citizens. Therefore, citizens of Taiwan and Hong Kong must wise up to help their governments rather than sabotage them in order to sustain their competitiveness and economic well-being.

As for Chinese and Americans, they must realize as the two biggest economies in the world, their stability means world stability and a stable world economy. Hence, they must pay attention to how their governments are functioning, how they are executing their domestic and foreign policies. For instance, are we investing appropriately in our domestic infrastructure? Are we educating our young people with competitive skills? Do we have the right immigration laws? Is our foreign policy based on win-win logic? Are we engaging in non-productive or destructive rhetoric? Do the United States and China have the correct foreign policy towards each other? In this forum, we urge our fellow American and Chinese readers to raise these questions so we may help create a win-win US-China relationship.