

# 評論 劉曉波

“士”的精神

2010年，劉曉波無法出席諾貝爾和平獎的頒獎儀式，乃由挪威著名女演員莉芙厄爾曼朗讀他的一篇文章，文章題目是《我沒有敵人—我的最後陳述》。他說：“

我沒有敵人，也沒有仇恨。所有監控過我，捉捕過我、審訊過我的警察，起訴過我的檢察官，判決過我的法官，都不是我的敵人。雖然我無法接受你們的監控、逮捕、起訴和判決，但我尊重你的職業與人格，包括現在代表控方起訴我的張榮華和潘雪晴兩位檢察官。”

他認為他在被捕，監控和審訊過程中受到尊重，認為中國的司法制度在進步，並且對中國進一步發展具有信心。他給我們的印象並不如許多外界輿論所描述的，好像中共的司法制度是一片黑暗，殘暴，無人性。這是我始料所未及的。

劉曉波表現出的是儒家的“士”的精神：執善固執之，雖千萬人吾往矣，寧為玉碎，不為瓦全，威武不能屈…等等。但是，另一方面，他又有許多幾近胡說八道的言論，如中國最好被殖民三百年，台灣，西藏，新疆都可以獨立等等…所以，對於劉曉波，我們需要作兩方面的評價：第一，他的“士”的執著精神的確很了不起；第二：他的許多言論非常幼稚和跟事實脫節。

民運的標杆

儘管如此，由於他大力推崇西方的自由主義思想，擁護絕對言論自由，提倡個人主義，使他成為西方自由主義陣營的寵兒，獲得了充滿政治鬥爭意味和最具宣傳價值的諾貝爾和平獎。因此，在未來寫八零年代的這一段民運歷史的時候，他將會成為標杆人物，把早年民主牆的一批人，如魏京生，王軍濤，劉青等，把後來的方勵之以及六四時期的吾爾開希，柴玲，王丹，和在海外發起革命運動的王炳章等人，都擠到邊邊上去了。雖然，有點諷刺的是，他是在1989年6月才加入六四民運的行列的後來者。（六四民運是悼念四月十五日胡耀邦逝世借題發揮的結果）

這就使我們在評價劉曉波的時候必須評價六四。民運中有一部分人後來反思，認為他們最大的錯誤就是絕食和走向極端（我已記不得這些人的名字了，或許網上可以查到）。因為，在民運的前一段時期，趙紫陽是非常同情民運的，設法跟學生妥協。老實說，民運初期參與者的確有許多清華北大的學生，政府對他們也特別重視和不忍下手。後來，許多外地學生和非學生加入了運動的行列，運動走向極端，少數人發起絕食，這就把局勢搞糟了。等到五月十九號，趙紫陽含淚勸說學生退出天安門，而遭到

◎水秉和

學生拒絕的時候，運動乃走向你死我活的拼命階段，世界的主要媒體都參與其中，向全世界廣播，而學生們雖然餓著肚子，可是自我感覺特別良好，覺得政府不取敢動武。其實，那時運動已走入絕境。

我們注意到，劉曉波是在6月2號加入絕食的行列的。所以，如果我們把六四分為兩段，把絕食前的一段視為愛國運動，後一段視為革命運動，那麼他加入的是革命運動。革命運動是錯的，所以劉曉波是錯的。

為什麼革命是錯的呢？那是很明顯的事。1989年時，改革開放才只有十年的過程，從百廢待興到初具規模，經濟發展非常迅速，解決了轉型所出現的一部分難題，絕對沒有必須根本改變政治制度的理由。事後的發展，包括在2010年成為世界第二大經濟體，更證明，先發展經濟，逐步完善政治制度是正確的策略。

民運值得翻案嗎？

民運其實不是從1989年開始的。它的起點是1978年的民主牆運動。當時，鄧小平曾經對民主牆運動給予肯定，有人說這是因為它有助於鄧奪權。平實而論，當時左派勢力遠大於改革派，所以他利用民主牆運動來壓壓左派也是說的過去的。但是，接下來，民主牆的大字報越來越受歡迎，到處傳抄（幸好那時沒有微信和微博，否則後果難測），乃帶來了鎮壓。接下來，由計劃經濟轉型到市場經濟的雙軌制引發了全國的倒風，大規模腐化由此開始。學生運動大概從八零年代中期就在全國許多大學中展開，反貪腐是其重點，民主的訴求也是其中一部分。胡耀邦同情學生，不肯鎮壓，乃導致他被左派元老們逼迫免職。胡耀邦的逝世為學運帶來了新的動力，乃醞釀成天安門事件。

從八零年代初開始，大陸留學生開始到美國留學。這些學生跟劉曉波是同時期的，都是文革後進大學的。我當時住在紐約，接觸到其中一部分憂心國事的留學生，對他們有一定的了解。他們充滿激情，飢渴地設法了解民主理論和美國的民主制度。他們的思想模式很簡單：從五四開始，中國只有兩個選擇，一個是社會主義，效法蘇聯；另一個就是西方民主制，而美國是最佳範本；文革結束時，社會主義在中國走到了絕境，所以只剩下一條路：向美國學習，民主救國。

在這一時期，中國共產黨其

實也摸不清到底應當怎麼走，鄧小平有一度曾經傾向於更大的民主化，提出或者短暫接受了黨政分家的主張，可是後來覺得不對，還是堅持以共產黨為核心，由它領導改革開放，所謂四個堅持其實是一個堅持：堅持共產黨的領導。根據他老人家幾十年革命的經驗，他知道一個最重要的規律，那就是“實踐是檢驗真理的唯一標準”。中國的改革道路只有從實踐中尋求。我們必須強調地指出，學習蘇聯是錯的，學習美國也是錯的，從行動中尋求真理才是正確的道路，也是前人從書本中沒有發現的第三條道路。他老人家是對的。他拯救了中國。

西方的民主經驗是凝聚了希臘的民主制度，羅馬的法律規範，英國的人權憲章和經歷了文藝復興和啟蒙兩個大時代的思想結晶，是一個博大精深思想與幾百年的實踐結合的體系。它既不容易讓我們讀通，更不容易讓任何其他的體制照搬。這是我們必須具備的最關鍵的認識。可惜的是，不論是西方專家或者中國知識分子，都不了解這一點。中國有中國的文化背景，也有中國自己的演進過程，所以，中國的前途從來就不在於熟讀馬列或西方經典，然後照方抓藥，所以既不是蘇聯的社會主義，也不是西方的民主主義，而是在於自我實踐。所以，鄧小平是對的，民運是錯的。

因此，劉曉波也是錯的。這就是說，六四，從愛國運動轉變為革命運動是走錯路了，加上現在許多民運份子依靠美國政府通過不同渠道給錢，維持生活，替美國從事反華活動，有些跑到台灣去替台獨說話。請問，他們有什麼權利要求翻案？

個人主義與集體主義的搏鬥

直到今天還有某些西方學者認為，中國必然崩潰，因為中國不民主，而民主是世界的趨勢。我們不必跟他們糾纏，因為這是他們的信仰。這其實跟宗教一樣的，你有你的教堂，我有我的寺廟，你拜你的聖母和耶穌，我拜我的釋迦摩尼或老莊。其差別在於西方的民主體制是建立在個人主義的基礎上，而中國幾千年的文化是建立在集體主義的磐石上，兩者具有根本性差別。經過實踐，兩者有可能在某一個中間點磨合，但是我們既不能期望西方世界改變它的基礎，也不可能讓中國搬掉它的磐石。

劉曉波的要求其實是要中國變成一個以個人主義為基礎的國家。從言論自由的角度，或許可以讓他發言。可是，沒有任何社會的言論是絕對自由的，每個國家都有權制定它的言論尺度。對許多知識份子而言，中國目前的言論尺度可能過於狹窄。他願意作犧牲打，以身殉，我們有何權利去怪罪他呢？只不過可以指出，他的訴求是不現實的。

集體主義曾經是全世界的歷史常態，而個人主義作為建國的基本信念應當算是啟蒙思潮為世界帶來的巨大變革。上世紀曾經發生了兩次



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 陳惠中  
馬在莊 佟秉宇 高志雲 范湘濤 張文基 董社長

刊例設計 劉學武  
每星期六出刊  
第207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

## 狗吠火車的劉曉波

◎張子濤

劉曉波走了，走的轟轟烈烈，西方國家總統、總理們都出面致詞哀悼，連臺灣的蔡英文也跟著湊熱鬧，趁機出來修理大陸，只有中共本身若有若無的輕處理，相信國內的媒體根本不會報導此事，我曾經在大陸友人之間作過一個民調，大陸民衆 90% 的人沒有聽過劉的名字，其在國內的影響力大約也就可想而知了。

八十年代中期，劉在香港的明報月刊上登了一篇有關人生哲學的文章，我看完後感覺意猶未盡，想要向他請教一二，當時他任北師大的講師，我又有一位棋友也在那裡任教，經過介紹，我們就通信成了筆友。六四之後，幾經周折，大約是1993年劉經過澳洲來美，到洛杉磯和我相會，在我家住了三天兩夜，我介紹論壇報和圍棋協會的一些老友們和他聚會，還跟我一起去打了一次籃球，大夥對這位六四的風雲人物深感興趣，他也侃侃而談，印象最深刻的是他說，他是在六四之前兩周才由美返國，加入天安門的抗議活動，每天早上就有一批號稱是香港的人權哥們，提著一袋一袋的人民幣，三百、五百的發給學生們，一再強調絕對不要退縮，有我們支援作後盾，劉自己估計可能是老美CIA玩的把

集體主義的反撲，一次是德國的納粹主義，另一次是蘇聯的社會主義，兩次都失敗了。這也是為什麼許多學者專家一直不看好中國的根本原因。可是，中國與前兩次不同的地方在於，它不再以某種集體主義的意識形態為操作原則，而是以實事求是的精神來導引這個集體。它比較像當前巨大的跨國公司。

它有統一的指揮，有執行的效率，有嚴格的升遷制度，還具備高度的靈活性。這使得它能夠集

中力量辦大事，也使它不至於僵化。應該說，這是一種新型的集體主義制度。這種制度需要新型的理論家。它需要的不是用舊標準來攻擊它的理論家。非常遺憾地，劉曉波雖然說他非常愛國，但是他並沒有去實際了解這個新體制，而是用舊的，跟它完全無法相容的理論去攻擊它。這成為他的個人悲劇。不過，他到底是不惜以死相諫，所以由他來代表八零年代的民運，或許是恰得其份。

又過了幾年，他從北京來電話提及生活困難，我正好有位朋友要由美返國，就託他帶了 \$300 資助劉，聊表心意，結果這位朋友有事就誤晚了兩周，劉還特地打電話來追問，可見其情況拮据。這樣廿多年來沒有再聯絡，回顧此君一生狗吠火車，火車不理會，倒是諾貝爾回應，成全了他人生謝幕，轟轟烈烈作烈士的心願，算是求仁得仁吧！

## Can Trumponomics - Fair-trade, Tax-cut and Deregulation Make America Great Again?

Trump won the 2016 US presidency election based on the slogan, 'make America great again', which had resonated with a grassroots movement. Trump's victory gave him a mandate to deliver his campaign promises despite of his battle with the mainstream media during and after his presidential campaign. The media and the left have been critical to Trump's Administration since his inauguration. Negative reports about his transition team, cabinet appointees, executive orders and policy initiatives appeared daily. Trump's impulsive tweets, protocol defiant manners, eagerness in exercising executive authority and accusation about biased media created lots of sensational news and mutual hostility. To this day, Trump is still using the term, fake news media, to fight a continuous assault from the media on his Administration and his policies as if his presidential campaign is still going on.

In this column, we have objectively discussed the Trump phenomenon, correctly hinted Trump's victory over Hillary Clinton, made detailed observations on Trump's first one hundred days in the White House and we shall continue to monitor and offer suggestions from a patriotic citizen's point of view. Today, Trump faces a 'Russian Gate' and a 'Comey Firing' investigation while confronted by the nuclear threat from North Korea and the deployment of military actions in Syria. Even though defending his actions and credibility and handling foreign affairs are important daily activities on Trump's agenda, the key domestic issues are much more on American citizens' mind especially on those who put Trump in the White House.

Thus we entitled today's column, Can Trumponomics - Fair Trade, Tax Cut and De-Regulation Make America Great Again? A question may remain for years to come. However, it is timely to start the discussion on the title subject since The Economist (TE) has just conducted a 'free flow' interview with Trump (with Mnuchin, Secretary of Treasury and Ms Hope Hicks, Strategic Communications Director, present) at the White House on May 4, 2017 on economic issues. The interview was a candid and open Q&A on several issues which deserve our comments. Our comments are far more positive than the post-interview editorial article (Why Trumponomics Won't Make America Great Again, May 13, 2017, in the Leader section of the print edition of TE). This post-interview article seized the opportunity to trash Trumponomics by saying that it is wrong, it won't work, it creates dangers, and it is a poor recipe for

Mainstream and Organic Views  
Dr. Wordman

long-term prosperity, producing more deficits, more inequality and more anger in Americans as if one interview would cast the fate of American economy.

The vast number of comments appeared after the interview and the editorial in TE were understandably anti-Trump but still to my surprise, they were so one-sided, full of criticism, sarcasm and intellectual elitists' views, except one asking: why there isn't any Trump supporter. However, some criticisms were valid on Trump's poor verbal English and lack of vocabulary, adequacy in expressing comprehensive answers to the weighty questions. But the blame should be shared by the interviewer and the editor (perhaps, Ms Hicks as well) since they made no attempt to clarify Trump's words during the interview nor through the 'light edit' as if keeping a rambling dialogue is the virtue of an interview. The transcript of the interview with 'light editing' and the editorial article were available on economist.com along with references (essays negative on Trump and his policies) and many deplorable reader comments. Only one fair sensible reader comment noted was that "numbers (referring to 3% economic growth) are more important than words".

Actually, it is too early to cast judgment on Trumponomics. We will comb Trump's candid words to find clues and indication whether he is shaping a Trumponomics or just dealing with a set of proposals or business wishlist as the TE article claimed. The interviewer's first question was: What is Trumponomics and how does it differ from Republican economics? This is a broad and diffused question (the TE interviewer was not even primed adequately on Reaganomics as commented by a reader) begging for an oratorical answer. Trump is no great orator but his answer was fair. He focused on trade and wanted free trade but emphasized fair and reciprocal. He cited NAFTA, he wanted to terminate it that prompted Mexico and Canada Prime Ministers to call him 10 minutes apart. So renegotiation of NAFTA would take place if Congress would approve a fast track for the Administration to renegotiate the NAFTA treaty by a new negotiator (Robert Lighthizer). Trump delivered his answer in his usual jumpy and scattered manner and the interviewer let the interview run its rambling course, from reducing trade deficit to reciprocal taxes to China and Xi Jin Ping to illegal immigrants before getting to tax cut to get company investment back to the United States and consequences of bigger deficits and sustainability of faster growth. From the questions raised and the answers flowed, we may

conclude that the interviewer did not do his homework to prepare a more productive and informative interview.

After carefully reviewing the entire interview transcript, we may conclude a number of meaningful points from Trump's statements even though they don't necessarily support a clear thesis of Trumponomics. First, Trump is dead serious being patriotic (American First) to deal with trade issues. He is also serious believing in negotiation and his experiences with negotiation. He felt confident in getting Enrique Pena Nieto (PM of Mexico) and Justin Trudeau (PM of Canada) to call him to renegotiate NAFTA, likely reaching a more favorable compromise. In contrast to his threat to terminate NAFTA, his praise for Xi Jin Ping ("He is a great guy!" and "We like each other a lot.") and China was not entirely a psychological technique prior to trade negotiation with China or making deals with North Korea counting on China's help. More likely, Trump is showing a genuine respect for Xi as Trump proudly stated that his 10 minutes meeting with Xi alone at Mar-a-Lago turned into 3 hours long and another of his 10 minutes meeting with Xi turned into a 40 person meeting. Probably, Xi's knowledge on these issues earned Trump's respect. If Trump and Xi indeed liked each other a lot, it would be a good thing for the world economy.

Trump is equally serious about stopping corporations from going abroad and bringing companies especially manufacturing back to the U.S. using tax-cut, waiver of foreign profit repatriation tax, de-regulation or tax penalty whatever works. He coined the phrase "Prime the Pump" to stimulate economic growth and to expect a 3% GDP increase. Whether the projection for shorter fast growth or the long term \$2 trillion revenue over ten years is accurate or not, his direction is correct that perhaps explains the Wall Street's positive reaction. Everyone knows tax reform is a tough nut to crack, so does Trump and his advisors. So it is only fair to allow his Administration "contemplating", a word used in the interview. We should be more concerned about philosophies, principles and directions Trumponomics adheres to at this point than picking every proposal apart and declaring death sentence before they begin. TE's Trumponomics interview is really disappointing, wasting an opportunity to be constructive and productive. The TE Q&A process and the editorial afterwards should have been prepared to explore and construct a positive picture of Trumponomics instead of trashing it before anyone (Trump team and economists) could contemplate a clear picture of it.

So, to the title question, the answer at this point should be, Trumponomics may have a chance to make America great again, if more positive thinking and energy are applied to it.