

天津會議後的美中關係：鬥而不能破處理台灣問題



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

社務委員：張紹週 周友道 水秉和 張一飛 陳立家 陳惠中 馬在莊 佟秉宇 高志雲 陳耀華 傅中 范湘濤 張文基 蔡社長

每星期六出刊 第418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

7月26日美常務副國務卿謝爾曼終於完成她的訪華之行，在天津先後與中國外交部主管中美關係的副部長謝峰和部長王毅分別進行了總共六小時的會議。會後雙方沒有發佈共同的公告或協議，雙方對會談表述的唯一共同點就是會談是坦誠的表達了各自的觀點。然而，之後事態的發展似乎顯示出美中兩國都希望降低緊張關係，朝著邁向建立一個基於尊重彼此根本利益的，以實力為基礎的，充滿競爭的，但是確保和平的新的平衡。然而，這種努力能否成功？

◎張文基

天津會議前後的一些影響雙邊關係事件

6月17日白宮國家安全助理沙利文公開發出拜登希望與習近平進行峰會，之後，美國及其盟友卻一連串的做出諸多挑戰大陸底線的做法：1. 美國宣布對於新疆、香港的產品和有關官員的制裁行動。2. 日本於7月13日公佈2021年版《防衛白皮書》，鼓噪起所謂“中國威脅”，並首次將“臺灣”部分從“中國”章節抽離，列入新增的“中美關係”部分專門介紹。3. 7月15日上午，台北 C-146A 美軍行政專機降落在台北空軍松山基地，聲稱為負責運送即將離任的“美國在台協會”會長鄧英傑交接使用的物品。

美方這種兩面手法引起中方的強烈不滿，因此，中方遲遲不確認謝爾曼的訪問並刻意明示此次會議是應美方的要求而舉行，選擇天津而非北京做為地點，並以外交部第五位的謝峰副部長代表中國主談，之後王毅才接待謝爾曼。會後中方公佈謝峰向美方提出兩份清單，一份是要求美方糾正其錯誤對華政策和言行的清單，一份是中方關切的重點個案清單。在糾錯清單里，中方敦促美方無條件撤銷對中共黨員及家屬的簽證限制，撤銷對中方領導人、官員、政府部門的制裁，取消對中國留學生的簽證限制，停止打壓中國企業，停止滋擾中國留學生，停止打壓孔子學院，撤銷對中國媒體登記為“外國代理人”或“外國使團”，撤銷對孟晚舟的引渡等等。

會談中王毅就如何防止中美關係失控提出三條底線：第一，美國不得挑戰、詆毀甚至試圖顛覆中國特色社會主義道路和制度。第二，美國不得試圖阻撓甚至打斷中國的發展進程。中方敦促美方儘快取消對華實施的所有單邊制裁、高額關稅、長臂管轄以及科技封鎖。第三，美國不得侵犯中國國家主權，更不能破壞中國領土完整。

然而，美國國務院的會議新聞稿中，沒有提及謝爾曼和謝峰的會談，更未提及中方的具體清單和立場，這也直接打臉美方所謂的公開透明！

紐約時報總結的好，這次會議顯示中國不接受拜登政府企圖用頭一天合作，第二天就對抗的對中策略。一時間，許多人認為這是一個失敗的會議。

但是，之後的發展是：1. 美國國防部長奧斯汀27日在新加坡演講時

說：“美中雖然是競爭的關係但是我們並不尋求對抗。我致力於尋求與中國保持建設性、穩定的關係，包括加強與人民解放軍的危機溝通。”奧斯汀還說：“正如李顯龍總理所建議的，我們不要區域內國家在中美間選邊站”。

2. 7月25日，英國海軍“伊莉莎白女王”號航母打擊群進入南海，之前，英國防衛大臣華萊士叫艦航母打擊群將通過“南海爭議水域”。《華盛頓觀察家報》網站23日發文稱，英國和美國之間的“特殊關係”是否真的“特殊”，在很大程度上取決於一個問題：英國首相喬森森是否會派遣英國軍艦進入中國領海12海浬範圍內。針對英國的挑釁，中國國防部新聞發言人吳謙大校在7月29日表示，中方尊重各國艦船依據國際法在南海享有的航行自由，但中國軍隊將採取一切必要手段，堅決有效應對任何挑釁。不到24小時後，英國表示，沒有計劃在南海與中國進行海上對抗，其目標是派遣航母戰鬥群，以最直接的路線穿越南海，從新加坡抵達菲律賓海，將與中國南沙群島和西沙群島保持“數十英里的距離”。根據英國航母打擊群官方推特8月1日發佈的最新消息，該航母打擊群已經航經呂宋海峽進入菲律賓海。

3. 7月28日晚中國新任駐美大使秦剛抵達美國華盛頓，結束了自前任駐美大使崔天凱於6月23日卸任後的空窗時期，也發出了中方希望穩定兩國關係的強烈企圖。秦大使說：“中美作為不同歷史文化、不同社會制度、不同發展階段的兩個大國，正在進入新一輪相互發現、認知和調適中，尋求新時代彼此相處之道。”“明確的點出中美差異的根源和因應之道。

未來美中關係的展望

上述的重要發展都顯示出美中兩國都希望建立一個穩定的雙邊關係，然而危險的變數不在中國而是美國，因為今天的中國，不論是國家的長期發展方向還是對美外交，都有了相當清楚和一致的重新定位，但是美國內部卻面臨著嚴重的分歧，很難建立一個長期穩定的內外政策。然而，從短期利益看，拜登急需中國的合作以便應付眼前嚴重的經濟和金融危機（詳細分析請見*1）。

自從今年3月18日阿拉斯加會議，楊潔篪高調明確的宣示美國沒有資格居高臨下同中國說話。與中國打交道，就要在相互尊重的基礎上進行。中方主張和平、發展、公平、正義、民主、自由的全人類共同價值，主張維護以聯合國為核心的國際體系，世界上絕大部分國家並不承認美國的價值就是國際價值，不承認美國說的就是國際輿論，不承認少數國家制定的規則就是國際規則。

以聯合國憲章為基礎的國際關係規範原則原本就是小（佛蘭克林）羅斯福總統的政治遺產，也是唯一為全球國家所接受的國際準則，它尊重採取不同制度的主權國家間的

和平競爭，並透過競爭為人類探索更好的道路，而在今天美式制度曝露眾多問題時，更具現實意義。但是殘酷的事實是，在小羅斯福總統過世後，金融寡頭集團逐漸掌控了美國的政權，所以不接受聯合國憲章的規定，並以宗教性的愚民政策鼓吹美式的民主價值觀是唯一的正確道路。因此，拜登不可能會接受中方基於聯合國憲章所要求的雙邊關係準則，雖然中方的立場是受到大多數國家的支持。

因此，拜登政權定位美中主要是競爭者的關係，但是希望透過在利益交集領域的合作，避免激化成為敵我的勢不兩立的關係。過去四年的經驗也讓中國政府及人民拋棄一廂情願的對美友好政策，逐漸認識到在政治模式、制度、科技、經濟、金融、軍事領域不可避免的競爭關係。美中的這種共識對於建立長期的穩定平衡是有利的必要條件。

所以，兩國能做的就是儘管競爭激烈，但是避免分歧變成大規模衝突。而從地緣政治角度看，隨著台灣獨思想在島內的高漲和中國軍力及整體國力的迅速接近甚至超越美國，幾年後最可能爆發衝突的地區就是台灣海峽。美國的對台政策是基本上充滿矛盾的：一方面提供軍事支持避免台灣被武力統一，另一方面又繼續一個中國政策。這個矛盾將在不久的將來隨時間面臨災難性的後果。唯一能根本走出困局就是美國一改過去鼓勵或製造兩岸矛盾的短視策略，改採支持兩岸，特別是台灣，在有限的時間內朝著和平漸進的最終統一前進，這是唯一能夠造福美國、台灣及大陸的途徑！

*1 張文基，"美國的癩癩承受不起小英的擁抱，美國必將對中國妥協的根本原因"，US-Chinaforum.com, 轉載自海峽評論368期，pp15-19, 2021/08/01.

台獨？下民易欺 漫無天理

邱義仁接受陳水扁電台專訪，坦白承認：台灣要宣布獨立「不是台灣人民自己可以決定」，要考慮國際情勢，因為「美國人根本不贊成」。國民黨主席江啟臣因此質問蔡英文：「為什麼要欺騙台灣人民？」

台灣人民無法決定是否台獨，其實並不是新聞。陳水扁早就說過，台灣的正統統治者是「美國的軍政府」，說穿了就是CTA。至於「為什麼要欺騙台灣人民？」這個問題的答案想起來並不簡單。

美國著名結構主義語言心理學家喬姆斯基，一九九八年便出版過一本書「見利忘義：新自由主義與全球秩序」（Profit over people: Neoliberalism and global order），詳細說明從一九八〇年代起，雷根政府在「市場原教旨主義」原則下，如何以「自由經濟」為名，排除政府干預，並推動私有化、企業化、全球化，打造出以維護美國霸權作為核心的新型國際秩序。

論中

壇美

US-CHINA FORUM

中美論壇社 主編

刊頭設計 劉學武

陸紀紅

台灣人的防疫日記

I. 離開台灣(怎麼有點像逃難)?

編者按：台灣的疫情牽動著無數海內外同胞的心，本文作者以日記的方式寫了三篇系列長文，分享她的親身經歷，本期刊載她的頭幾天日記，全文請點US-Chinaforum.com。我先生在2/27出差到大陸，因為疫情要隔離之故，所以出去的時間必須比較久，否則划不來，因為兩岸各需要隔離兩週，等於啥事兒都不幹，光在旅館就得耗上一個月。他在5/2才又回到台灣，我們家其實是有符合居家自主管理的條件的(他可以有單獨的臥房+浴室)，但是怕萬一，為了維護我的安全，他還是每一次都去住兩週的防疫旅館。

5/3台灣開始有狀況發生，一開始還好，一週後開始越來越不樂觀，但我一直對台灣很有信心，不是對蔡政府有信心，而是覺得台灣上空似乎有個金鐘罩在保護著，因為從2020年新冠疫情開始以來，台灣的政府根本沒防疫，但卻能一關一關的一路平安度過，真是天佑台灣！所以我覺得這次也一定能夠安然過關。於是從一開始上各網站購物囤積糧食，因為先生要回來了，他又是一個肉食主義者，於是我訂豬肉，牛肉，雞肉，海鮮.....把大冰箱裡的冷凍庫塞得滿滿的，米，油，各種調味料...都囤

了個半年以上的用量，這下只需每週出去買些蔬菜即可。幸虧我動作快，等三四天後我訂的貨都到齊時，就開始在朋友間聽到哀鴻遍野甚麼都缺貨的抱怨聲。我這才是真正的所謂超前部署啊！

5/11又有新的確診，我家老爺就說：如果情況不對，就是不去了就再去大陸，我覺得他也就是說說罷了並沒把他的話當一回事兒。

5/12情況又有變化，開始有人在傳離開台灣的機票開始漲價。我和先生通電話，他立刻上網查，確定票價還好沒有漲，於是他就跟我說，還是去大陸避一避吧！哈，不會吧??? 你還在防疫旅館裡耶！他說：我對這個政府沒有半點信心，沒有必要留在這裡擔心受怕的，我們又不是沒處可去，於是他查了機票，但是卻沒訂，原來是手手，他說要先預約好做核酸檢測的醫院，否則訂了票找不到做檢測的醫院也上不了飛機，也就正好在那個時候，台北做檢測的人開始大量增加，好多家醫院都約不上，我還有朋友跑到新竹去做檢測呢。他費心地找了好一段時間。

潮開始席捲台灣，政府對於疫苗工廠的支持逐年下降。到了二〇一四一年，疫苗工廠終於停擺；台灣也由四條小龍時代的「疫苗大國」淪為今天的「疫苗乞丐」。今天所謂的「國」產疫苗，其實是在替美國「聯合生物製藥公司」研發進程的考量，仍然是「見利忘義」，私人企業的利益大於人民的福祉。

「宅神」朱學恒到衛福部疾管署送花籃，寫「兩俸兩祿，民膏民脂，下民易虐，上天難欺」，被民眾發覺「妨害公務」，檢察官交由警方通知到案做筆錄。其實朱學恒的過錯是用辭不當。江啟臣問蔡英文：「為什麼要欺騙台灣人民？」答案就是將這句話中的「下民易虐」，改為「下民易欺」。至於「上天難欺」一詞，也應當改為「漫無天理」。在「新自由主義」的宰制下，蔡政府接受美國在其「全球秩序」中替她安排的位置，不敢有絲毫異議。他們心中怎麼可能有什麼「天理」？

*黃光國—台灣大學心理學系創系教授、中華本土社會科學榮譽理事長。現任台灣大學心理學系終身特聘教授。

Can Biden's China Policy Prove (In)Efficacy in Democracy?

Prior to his inauguration, Biden said China was not a competitor, but after occupying the White House, Biden says China is a serious competitor. In Biden's first 100 days in the U.S. Presidency, he became more and more assertive in confronting China. He led a team to build a foreign policy centered around China. Some political analysts say that Biden has a doctrine - Competition of governance system with China. The U.S. does not spread democracy nor promote it at gun point but shows that she can deliver democracy at home and abroad (by success!). Of course, Biden's challenge is to bring his Administrative team (which may have different ideas), the entire nation (which has a broad political spectrum) and the U.S. allies (which have geopolitical differences and complex bilateral economic relations with China and with each other) together to embrace his doctrine in U.S. foreign policy - Competing with China in efficacy in governance. This competition, if conducted peacefully and gracefully, may be good for the two great nations and the world. However, if conducted ungraciously, it may bring disaster to the two nations and the world.

There are plenty of essays published warning both the U.S. and China not to engage in a hostile confrontation, a new Cold War or worst in a Hot War. This author makes a bold assumption that the two nuclear-powered nations with plenty of experience in wars and strategic exercises in war prevention will refrain from engaging in any Hot War. Based on what has been happening lately, we may not rule out a Cold War being stimulated between the two nations. Again, there are plenty of analyses of the previous Cold War between the U.S. (and NATO) and the Soviet Union (and Warsaw). Even though the Soviet Union collapsed (out of its own economic failure) but there was no true winner judging on the U.S. current well-being and Russia's struggling economy. What the Cold War taught us was that arms race led to nowhere but mutual destruction if the Cold War turned into a Hot War. Cold War is just a broad competition included all aspects, economy, trade, technology and military. Since military competition can only lead to mutual destruction, it is logical to conclude that any serious competition between two great nations, such as the U.S. and China, should exclude military competition simply because it is a purposeless and disastrous competition. An easy to understand analogy would be an Olympic competition allowing two contestants using any deadly defensive and offensive weapons to battle each other. Such a suicidal competition is meaningless.

If the above logic is incorporated in Biden's China policy or foreign policy doctrine - Competition with China in governance efficacy, there may be very good reasons to welcome such a competition as a Cool War

Mainstream Media and Organic Views Dr. Wordman

(not Cold War), a competition without arms race for the purpose of proving whether or not a democracy system can be successful, superior to all other political systems and suitable as a universal governance system. Under such a condition, a serious competition between the U.S. and China can be a productive one. The title question, Can Biden's China Policy prove (in)efficacy in democracy, becomes the most intellectually interesting debatable political question. The author cannot claim as a political scientist with expertise in government system, however, from a common-sense point of view, any citizen can pick facts and make analytical arguments to answer the title twin questions. The facts may include history and current events and the analytical arguments can be based on case studies on any existing political system including the U.S. government and the Chinese government. In the following, the author attempts to answer the above twin questions by comparing China with democracy in terms of the efficacy and inefficacy issue.

Efficacy in Democracy

Using China (her government system) to prove efficacy in democracy is an upstream exercise against time. Historically, when People's Republic of China was established in 1949, it adopted the Stalin's Communist System which didn't work well at all for China. The great philosopher and revolutionary Mao Zedong tried very hard but failed to lift China's economy except united the nation with a strong one-party (CCP) tightly controlling the government system. Economically based on a citizen's welfare standard (prior to 1980), China was in no comparison with democratic country big or small, such as the U.S., Japan and the four little dragons in SE Asia. The West eagerly attributed China's poor GDP per capita to the CCP governance, however without seriously differentiating its governing system versus policies nor carefully excluding the sanctioning effect the West imposed on China. It was too convenient to use China (prior to 1979) to prove efficacy in democracy before China's inclusion into the West economic system. When China was finally admitted to the UN and recognized by the U.S., she opened up to the West learning nearly everything except accepting the one-person-one-vote democracy. China began to improve in her economy with her rigorous five-year economic development plans continuously for several decades till today being the world's second largest economy and

world's largest purchasing power. This achievement was all under the governance of the CCP. Of course, CCP has been evolving and adapting but it has remained as the only dominant party in the Chinese government system.

Inefficacy in Democracy

China's rapid rise was a surprise to many people around the world but it had dawned on many politico-economists and a few political analysts that it deserved to be studied. Many China watchers including the author have tracked the progress that China has made across many areas, agriculture, manufacturing, trade, technology, even financial system. The conclusion is clearly leaning towards not just her correct economic development policies but also, to a very significant extent, her efficient government system. For example, China has 15,500 miles of high speed railroads and 100,000 miles super highway crisscross in a grid system, whereas California could not, in ten years, get a single high-speed railroad built from Sacramento to Los Angeles mainly due to civil protests and activists sabotage condoned and abused under a democracy system. China made a national mandate to lift her people from poverty and indeed 900 million extremely poor people were lifted above poverty level so the CCP could claim on its 100th anniversary that China is lifted from poverty. China is the principal trade partner of 130 nations enjoying a surplus to finance the U.S. national debt. The U.S. has gradually descended from a 'can do anything' pedestal to 'nothing gets done' bickering bipartisan government.

There are numerous examples demonstrating the rise of efficacy in the CCP system (over the past half century) versus the inefficacy of democracy caused by partisan split (the more democratic the worst the government efficacy, India is an example). In defense of democracy, politicians resort to rhetoric to smear the ever evolving Chinese governance system, using job stealing, human rights abuse even genocide to discredit her efficacy. This tactic may convince a certain number of people for a short time, it eventually will peter out. Biden is an experienced politician with fifty years of political career, the author sincerely hope that he is able to honestly accept the facts in formulating his China policy. If he truly believes that democracy can be improved and can deliver domestically and abroad, then targeting China as a serious competitor may be the right thing to do to motivate Americans to reform. Biden is certainly aware that Hot War and Cold War are out of the question between China and the U.S. In a Cool War, however, Americans must remain cool, must revive their can-do spirit and evolve the current democratic system so that the U.S. will have a democracy with better efficacy than her competitor's governance system. Biden must steer his China policy in this direction.