

# 美國華山隱者逝世二年祭 追思許家屯先生



網址 <http://www.us-chinaforum.org>  
<http://www.us-chinaforum.com> 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 陳惠中  
馬在莊 佟秉宇 高志雲 范湘濤 張文基 兼社長

刊頭設計 劉學武

每星期六出刊  
第258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

## 統一也可是民進黨選項

◎楊雨亭

以中國近代史的眼光來看，台灣的民進黨是個相當獨特的政治團體，她的前身固然是1980年代反對國民黨威權體制的黨外，但是其根源來自於三條主線：一是，1895年《馬關條約》清政府割讓台灣予日本，其中產生的劇烈震撼以及帶給台灣人民被遺棄的傷痕，至今在台灣百姓的心靈深處還未完全地消除，這段時間曾經有短暫存在的台灣民主國。

二是，日據時代，台灣人的次等公民的恥辱感持續存在，以至有林獻堂等人以議會政治尋求台灣人高度自治的努力，也有反抗日本殖民主治的蔣渭水及霧社事變中幾乎滅族的原住民。

三是，國民政府播遷來台前的228事件以及之後的白色恐怖時期帶給許多台灣人相當嚴重的恐懼與不滿。

也就是說，民進黨與台灣獨立的團體，在經歷長期歷史傷痕的思維與心靈下，代表著百年來台灣這塊土地上許多百姓尋求自由與自主的深切期望。

從更大的層面來看，有兩方面的思考，第一，是近代中國戰亂迭起，自鴉片戰爭、甲午戰爭以來，中華民族不斷地面臨外侮以及文化本身轉化的困難，到文化大革命，直接間接於戰亂與飢饉中死亡的中國人民超過1億人，這在人類歷史上都是非常驚人的悲劇。第二，大陸在六四以後銳意革新，造成近年來中國在國際社會中的地位愈趨重要，以及帶給大陸人民在經濟生活的大幅進步。從歷史的眼光看，目前在大陸的中國，有一些方面已經超越過去漢唐盛世的格局。

由以上的思考，許多台灣人的尋求自由與自主的期望，其實是自鴉片戰爭170年以來的整個中國人在現

代化中尋求自由與自主的夢想的一部分，這兩個曾經部分平行的歷史，近年來漸漸形成中國人與台灣人的兩個範疇，其實其間可以調和矛盾，從而相互效力與融合。

目前，雙方有一個實質性的障礙需要共同思考與超越，那就是許多人理解與不認同的馬克思主義思想與體制，在中國大陸短時間內不會消失。在台灣，不論是國民黨還是民進黨，面對統一後在台灣的政治思想與體制的可能變動感到憂慮，因此，許多反對或抵制統一。雖然在大陸上，中國傳統文化和馬克思主義中國化之間的整合與融合仍處在一個過渡的時期，可是未來的發展必然是正面的，以中國數千年來的文化演變史，說明當外來文化的優質被吸納入中國文化，就是一個良好時代的開始，縱然在起初可能發生嚴重的動亂。

統一與獨立本身不具有最高價值，最重要的是人民如何能夠在安全與溫飽的保障下有更好的發展。人類史上，最佳的帝國時期都是擁有廣大疆域與良好思想與體制的帝國，如漢唐、羅馬、近世的英帝國和近代來的美國。過於狹小的地理與人口的國家，皆難以長期發展。

因此，在台灣的民進黨，雖然其發軔於台灣百姓追求自由與自主的渴望，但是當歷史中國的負面因素在逐漸消除時，民進黨應該考慮她的視野，如何在歷經台灣百姓艱難困苦歷史後，思考保持自己的政治體制和思想的優點下，重新回到中國人的世界裡，貢獻自己的特質，共同努力走向新路。

## 中美論壇稿約

評論時政的利弊得失，伸張世界的正義公平，良心知識分子的園地，歡迎來稿投書和回響，作者文責自負，請留真實姓名，地址，電話，不改稿，不退稿，不付稿酬，所有稿件及信函，請email至 [uschinaforum138@gmail.com](mailto:uschinaforum138@gmail.com)

◎王敬之

即穩拿勝算，實在是五體投地。偶爾閑談時，在下讚嘆道：“您這居處遠超過當年香港的英國總督府啊！”公揚聲大笑，又使人想起當年香港媒體常稱這位地下總督的“招牌笑”。

此公“招牌笑”之所以頗博人好感與稱道，是因其出於真誠，善與人同，也不吝直言彼此的異同。一個例子：新聞界廣為人呼“陸大哥”者，由於係第一位在機場迎接此公蒞美“旅遊休息”者，儘管陸大哥已作古多年而公一直對其懷念不已，但原則上仍大義凜然，不時會冒出這樣的話來：“你們這些反共分子呵，都是逢共必反如何如何，”不言而喻，“你們”涵蓋了在下和陸大哥之流，當然另外還有許多人也遭一網打盡。顯露出公除了“招牌笑”這苦薩心腸外，同時也不改“本子風波”“怒目金剛”的一面。

公當年把本子往桌上一摔，對中外記者們疾言厲色怒喝“大家按本子辦事嘛！”這幕戲曾經蜚聲國際，彰顯了他刻板教條等行奉此之風的一面，也是其安身立命的本色。近年致力的《回憶錄》一仍舊貫，津津樂道“列寧和斯大林兩把刀子不能丟”云云，在下魯莽地脫口而出“此兩名字在今日世界臭不可聞了，還提它則甚？”公勃然大怒：“誰講的！都是你們這些反共分子講的！”在下唯唯受責，繼續讀，直到赫魯曉夫、戈爾巴喬夫等的“父子黨”“貓鼠黨”作風乃葬送蘇共之禍首云云，在下本性難改，忍不住低聲問道：“整個蘇聯歷史上幾曾真正有過什麼兄弟黨的情誼？幾曾懂得真正的平等相待？共產黨跟它開翻之前好長一段時期還不是一直對它誠惶誠恐低聲下氣的？”公一愣，久不出聲，沉思後，微嘆一口氣，低咕道：“再往下讀吧。”這就是公頑固的可愛處，這代表他在“旅遊休息”以來獨創的“和平演進”。

這本回憶錄其實早已完稿，由他對着錄音帶口述，寄交別人打成文字，再由人讀、他改，一遍又一遍，不知改過多少遍了，這次在下通讀的早已是製成品，在下誠懇勸公：“可以照此付印了，不必再搗騰了。”公又是報以招牌笑：“我還要繼續改！要大改特改！”公還一再念叨：“要對歷史負責”“要把道理說清楚。”根據在下幾十年吃出版飯的經驗，這類稿子修改到這程度可以拋出了，再修下去，無非就是磨了。磨，跟“旅遊休息”一樣，短可立地煞車，長期曠日持久地磨下去，永遠沒個底。

其時已近春節，在下過年未能免俗，總要與家人團聚一起迎春，所以必須告辭，公笑道：“我還要另找人幫忙。”公要另找別人，確實不難，因為公之群眾關係極佳。在下

與他同上館子時，常會碰到人來向他打招呼，公一概答禮如儀，但多數情況是人家認識他而他並不認識其人，但餐畢付賬時餐館會說已經結清了，剛才與您招呼的那位自動來付的款，公每每跌足道：“我根本不知他姓甚名誰呀！”在下認為，民對選官已無趨炎附勢的考量，“去後思”恰恰意味着昔日子民對離職父母官的最佳禮贊，可貴的是念舊之心，不必在乎是否仍憶姓名；對在下這個奇談怪論，公不置可否。

公一生積功甚多，有時贏得榮耀，有時吃了啞巴虧，何哉？就是因為在公一秉至誠鞠躬盡瘁的同時，那冥冥之中的偉大主宰根本不講人性，推出了花裡胡哨的這個主義、那個主義，左一個論、右一個論，把芸芸眾生搞得七顛八倒，所以公殫精竭慮的結果，只落得在夷國它鄉“旅遊休息”！幾年前偶然閑聊到崑曲，公興緻勃勃，講述當年那位很紅火的名坤旦如何如何，在下詫異：“您也認識她？”公隨便咕嚕一句：“她是我培養的。”不便多問，但內心疑惑：“你充其量是跟我一樣的崑曲愛好者罷了，談何培養呢？”

恰巧這位名旦所屬的江蘇省崑曲團來洛杉磯公演，在下遂邀公去看戲，公欣然同意，我購票時提出“近百高齡老者來看，故需好位置”，他們如我所願給了我最佳票，及至獲悉打算來看戲的老人即他們的前省長，群皆雀躍，感念公的大力培養，紛云此公使江蘇省崑曲團設施成為全國第一流。我喜滋滋把他們至今不忘舊恩告訴了公，謂他們皆盼大駕光臨，想不到反而引起公變卦：“阿呀，我不好去看戲了，我出來旅遊休息前給鄧小平的信中曾經保證不在公開場合拋頭露面的。”終於沒去。該團一位傑出的後起之秀，堅持要造府拜訪，按此女芳齡及公之經歷來推算，他倆根本不可能觀過面，但公居然慨諾，歡迎來訪，而且見面之後交談甚歡。

由此可知我倆思想分歧的根本所在：究竟是把烏紗帽看得重如泰山，而輕萬民傘如鴻毛？還是以萬民傘為寶而視烏紗帽若草芥？作為百歲老人的此公，似乎一直未從其青少年時期的惡夢醒來過，也始終擺脫不掉宦途騰達時期深陷於“老革命碰上新問題”的污泥濁沼。不能站在百年以後的角度，回顧過去的百年經歷，當然不能撥開迷霧重見青天。公此次發病，在下恰在中國，不能像以往他住院時參加輪班服侍，但能夠推想其瀰留之際正是在下返美的歸途中。雖然在下未能目睹公瀟然謝世之狀，僅據其念念不忘的所思所想，不難推定公闔眼嚙氣時，來接引公的不是中華的仙靈神佛，而是那個作古已踰越百年之久的德國大鬍子。（再見戊戌之暑期焚香敬撰）

# Economic Development, Income Inequality and Wealth Gap

The most challenging problem in economics is not in the understanding of the theory or the model of economic development which is evidenced by the fact that many nations' GDPs have been steadily increasing as various economic development models are applied. The real challenge lies in the finding of a solution to limit the wealth gap created by the economic development. The wealth gap in a society is invariably the consequence of economic growth. All economic development models based on the principle of getting uniform return across all the society members seem to be fruitless. A few as practiced by the communist countries have proven to be a failure when compared with other economic development models based on capitalism.

There seem to be two fundamental factors producing the above outcome. First, capital is a necessary ingredient for economic development and it must be applied strategically, selectively and timely to development projects to yield optimum return. Second, Human Resources are necessary for economic development but they must be selected based on human intelligence and talents, trained with right skills and knowledge and motivated by a driving force to devote energy and time in economic development projects. The above first condition also depends on talented humans to manage the capital under a management system ranging from a totally free capital system to a totally government controlled capital system with varying degree of man-made regulations. The second condition usually can be met by a competitive education system and a talent selection scheme. The motivation, however, is rooted in human nature, that is human's desire for material or asset possession and a self-defined life style, which ultimately leads to wealth accumulation. We might term this model as 'capital-talent' model for later reference. Under this model, wealth has become the most effective and consequential motivation factor for talented humans to engage in productive economic projects. Even in the charity organizations and religious institutions, this materialistic motivation factor cannot be ignored. That is why successful charity organizations pay their executives millions of dollars in salary and all successful churches pay their pastors with full range of amenities including housing, cars, phones, salaries above average parishioners' income and cushy retirement benefits.

There are ample successful examples of nations as well as

## Mainstream and Organic Views

Dr. Wordman

private corporations applying the capital-talent economic development model. Just following post WW II world economic development, the U.S., Germany, Japan, and the four little dragons in Asia all can offer solid 'case' examples to support the above conclusions. China, after switching from an unsuccessful socialistic economic model to a 'capital-talent' model, albeit knowing the wealth gap issue and willingly letting a small group of smart people to drive their economy and getting rich, has shown us an non-debatable success story of economic development. So did many other nations and global corporations succeed in building their enterprises under the above principle. China's rapid rise in economy or her GDP growth is accomplished with the consequence of the above capital and human driven economic development model producing the wealth gap phenomenon, a small number of people possess a large portion of the national wealth.

The U. S. is the wealthiest nation on earth as far as her national GDP and total assets is concerned. The U.S. is a capitalist country and is a beacon for the world coming to pursuing capitalistic economic development. However, the wealth gap problem in the U.S. is likely the most severe case. The wealth gap of course is produced and compounded yearly by income inequality (income gap). In 2015, the bottom 90% of people in the U.S. had an average income of \$34K and the top 10% had an average income of \$312K, nearly ten-fold difference. What is more shocking is that the top 1% average income was \$1.36M and top 0.1% was \$6.75M, 200 times greater than the average income of 90% of population. It is clear that income inequality will produce a larger wealth gap, since the majority of U.S. citizens are not making enough money to save or build assets. Based on the data from Internal Revenue Service and Congressional Budget Office, since 1979, the before-tax incomes of the top 1% of America's households have increased four times more than the bottom 20% population's income. The after-tax incomes of top 1% has increased on average 192.2% since 1979 to 2013 whereas the corresponding before-tax income of top 1% has increased on average 186.8%. This shows that the tax system does not cure the income inequality problem and its consequential wealth gap issue. The U.S. has used welfare program to boost the income of the bottom 0-40% of the population, but the above data indicates that so long as the economic development operates under the 'capital-talent' model and its principles

derived from human nature, the income inequality and wealth gap will persist. Even in the top income population, the same problem exists; the highest 0.1% income earners have seen their income rise much faster than the rest of top 1%. (The top 400 earners doubled their earning from 1992 to 2002) The seriousness of the wealth gap can be illustrated by the following statistics: In 2013, the top 10% of family holdings held 76% of the national wealth whereas the bottom 50% of the families held 1%, a rapid worsening from 1989 to 2013.

China has adopted the 'capital-talent' model thus naturally we expect the same consequence - creation of wealth gap in the nation, although no detailed statistics on household income and household holdings over the past five decades are available. China currently is applying a harsh anti-corruption measure to breakdown illegally created wealth but that is not the same wealth accumulated through the 'capital-talent' model. China has seen an amazing progress of economic development. The speed of economic development is naturally correlated with the amount of capital and talented Human Resources available. China's GDP was less than \$100 billion in 1971 to \$12.8 trillion in 2017, an increase of 129X signifying a rapid rise. From available data (1952-2017 six and half decades), China's GDP was \$30.55B to \$113.69B(1952-1972), an increase of 3.72X for two decades, \$113.69B to \$493.14B(1972-1992), an increase of 4.34X, and \$493.14B to \$12840.39B(1992-2017), an increase of 26X. These data support the 'capital-talent' model; from 1992 to 2017, China has the fastest growth of capital, educated talents and the impetus of Internet revolution making China the manufacturer of the world. Unfortunately, the higher the speed of economic growth is, the bigger the wealth gap will occur. Big wealth gap will produce social instability in any governance system. Something must be done to reduce the wealth gap, otherwise social unrest will take place. The tax system and welfare program (including minimum wage) practiced in the U.S. can not cure the income inequality and wealth gap problem without destroying people's incentive to take on productive work. Perhaps, one suggestion to redistribute wealth is to encourage wealthy people to make large tax deductible donations to (1) Public infrastructure funds, funds for constructing roads from city to rural regions, airports, train stations, ports, bridges, museums, parks, and public transportation and utilities allowing donors names to be put on them and (2) Innovation funds, funds for supporting science and technology research benefiting the public and the nation. Government can establish these funds with low yields to let wealthy people to invest their wealth but benefit the less wealthy more.