

《十问美国的真格总统》

作者：陈平博士

我非常震惊地看到，2012年2月10日，就在中国国家副主席习近平即将访美的前夜，《纽约时报》发表【特邀评论员社论】：《十问中国的假定储君》，作者沈大伟(David Shambaugh)是美国乔治-华盛顿大学中国政策研究室的主任。

作为一个中国问题专家，沈大伟教授肯定懂得高层外交的基本礼仪。不过现在不是和纽约时报编辑部纠缠这个问题的时候。中国有句古话：“来而不往非礼也。”

我且模仿沈大伟的口气，也向美国真格的总统提十个问题。如果这些问题在一些美国读者看来挑衅味十足，那么我事先道歉。

自二大以来，美国媒体总是教导全世界，说美国总统的合法性来自于选举。但世界各地的民众颇为怀疑的却是：美国领袖是否具备处理世界事务和地区和平的勇气和智慧，尽管他们自封为世界警察和道德裁判。

这将是一个让中国人民了解美国，也让美国人民了解中国的好机会。美国政策的朝三暮四在本国众所周知，但是中国和其他亚洲国家并不清楚。

这里是观察美国的人们想要知道的十个问题，提给美国下任的总统，包括奥巴马和他的挑战者：

1. 美国领导人会让美国重归政治改革之路吗？

自2008年金融危机，世界经济深陷萧条。正如国际货币基金组织前首席经济学家、现麻省理工学院教授的西蒙-约翰逊(Simon Johnson)所指出，危机之源在于金融寡头绑架了美国政府。拯救美国经济的唯一出路是拆分金融寡头。美联储前主席、奥巴马前经济顾问保罗-沃尔克(Paul Volcker)也建议拆分金融寡头。但是我们只见到奥巴马政府给金融巨头们注资一万多亿美元，却未见任何对危机制造者的惩罚措施。

美国领导人敢挺直腰板面对阻碍金融与政治改革的强大利益集团吗？他们包括金融寡头、军火工业集团、和跨国公司游说集团。还是像小布什那样，因为受过这些利益集团的好处而感激涕零？民主党和共和党的改革派们能在今年11月的党内选举中脱颖而出吗？

2. 美国领导人能实现“纠正预算失衡”之类的豪言壮语吗？

过去两年里，很多官方讲话都在号召把赤字财政的重心从社会福利和军事冒险开支向支持国内经济结构转型，以便为美国新的可持续经济增长奠定基础。但迄今为止，预算改革的现实和豪言壮语相去甚远。

3. 美国领导人能否为美国的印第安土著安排一套采取更为人性化的政策吗？

他们的人口从西方殖民者入侵北美之前的几千万持续锐减，如今已从美国的政治舞台上销声匿迹。

美国政府确实有勇气向二战时被投入集中营的日裔美国人道歉。但是美国政府还没有给华裔美国人更严重的损害以道歉和赔偿。然而对于修建了三分之二横贯北美大陆铁路的华工 – 不同于修建了三分之一铁路的爱尔兰籍劳工，1882年到1965年的种族主义排华法案还排斥华工向美国移民 – 美国政府迟迟没有道歉。加拿大政府已经显示出了政治勇气，向华裔加拿大人道歉和赔偿。美国政府是否也有勇气面对他们在历史上欠下的人权债务？

4. 美国领导人真能管住那些好战势力吗？

他们正在中国周边部署军事力量，把美国的霸权推向战争边缘。他们的意图是统治世界，在国际上横行霸道。

5. 美国领导人是否有足够自信，来放松对世界互联网基础系统和国际现金流的控制？

须知美国情报机构正是利用它们，来干预任何国家、甚至他们的盟国的信息系统。

6. 美国人民能驾驭他们的领袖领导人吗？

这些领导人从冷战时代起就显示出令人担忧的倾向：他们总是绕开联合国和国际法，在全世界发动入侵。

7. 美国领导人能否少推行一些言过其实的外交政策？

在需要华盛顿采取切实行动的地方，我们只听到老生常谈的外交辞令。在这个危险的世界里，美国的辞令已经越来越不可信。尚能给人一线希望的是，奥巴马总统在2009年12月10日接受诺贝尔和平奖时做的演说。但问题是对他减少美国发动的战争和入侵，究竟做出了哪些历史性贡献？

8. 美国领导人如何应对日益增长的来自非洲、中东、和拉美国家的不满？

须知这些不满源于美国在能源、安全、和贸易上帝国主义贪婪政策。

我们都知道美国和其他西方强国人口只占世界人口的 10%，但是却控制了世界上将近 90% 的资源，并且消耗世界上将近一半的能源。相比之下，中国人口比整个发达国家总和的两倍还多，却只消耗世界 10% 的石油。今天，既然美国很有钱又深陷债务危机。为什么美国不按市场惯例出售资产偿还债务？或者与债权国达成债转股的协议？如此可以发展国际合作、处理金融危机，和平发展难道不比打贸易战好吗？

9. 美国领导人能否在全球治理中扮演更积极而不是更消极、更难缠的角色？

美国的虚拟经济大约是美国实体经济的 50 倍，是世界 GDP 的 10 倍，从美国流出的热钱引发了拉美、东亚、俄国、南欧以及美国自身的金融危机。美国是否要继续站在金融寡头一边，对抗 20 国首脑峰会上多数国家的要求？这些要求包括：全球变暖、国际金融监管以及制裁国际寡头的反垄断法。

美国的军事开支几乎占世界总军事开支的一半，比仅次于美国的前 20 强国军事开支的总和还多。美国还是世界上第一个，而且至今是唯一一个，使用原子弹的国家。在中东、非洲、亚洲、和拉美的战争与军备竞赛中，美国扮演的角色究竟是矛盾化解者还是问题制造者？

10. 美国领导人是否具有推动中美关系的战略远见？

当今世界，再没有比这两个国家更重要的国际关系，可惜当下的两国关系中弥漫着战略不信任。要改善两国关系就需要中国领导人 – 以及美国领导人信守诺言，推动两个大国间的战略互信。

历史上，中美两国并无地缘政治的冲突，唯一的问题是台湾。要消除中美之间的不信任，有一个简单的方案：就是废止“台湾关系法”，以此换取两国在太平洋地区和其他世界事务上的合作。美国在内战期间并没有要求法国来做仲裁者。同理，台湾海峡两岸的中国人也不需要美国来监管中国的和平统一。美国现行政策为中国的和平发展与统一，制造的麻烦远多与化解。

我相信多数美国商人和州长们都想抓住中国开放的市场机遇，并与中国人民成为朋友。只有少数冷战老兵还在犹豫着要不要睁开眼面对急剧变化的世界。

这样也无所谓。中国人一向有耐心。我们用 109 年的时间才从西方强权手中赢回国家独立。人民共和国用了 21 年时间重返联合国的合法席位；用 15 年的时间谈判加入 WTO。已有 2200 年统一历史的中国，有足够的信心等待美国领袖最终接受一个简单的现实：即美国需要中国、就和中国需要美国一样，谁让我们同住在一个小小的地球村！

习的访问不可能为这十个问题给出所有答案。而时间也会证明美国是否能最终出现一个在其内政外交上都赞成并推动积极变化的“改革型”领道人，还是不过又选出一个在政策上碌碌无为的政治秀客？

陈平博士，北京大学国家发展研究院教授，复旦大学新政治经济学中心高级研究员，春秋综合研究院研究员。美国德克萨斯大学奥斯汀校区物理学博士，研究题目是经济波动与经济混沌。他的代表著是：Economic Complexity and Equilibrium Illusion: Essays on Market Instability and Macro Vitality, Routledge, London (2010)。邮箱是：pchen@ccer.pku.edu.cn

陈平于美国东部时间 2012 年 2 月 12 日上午 4:31 用电子邮件投书《纽约时报舆论部》，包括实名的地址电话等联系方式。等了两天没有回音后，于北京时间 2012 年 2 月 14 日上午 9:42 用电子邮件发给国内诸多学友。首先见到《观察者》网站刊登于当天的头版头条，见：

<http://www.guancha.cn/html/49646/2012/02/14/65828.shtml>

参考《观察者》网对中文稿又作了少许文字修改。订正版置于作者所在的北京大学国家发展研究院网页：<http://pchen.ccer.edu.cn/>

【附录：纽约时报特邀社论】

十问中国假设的储君

作者：沈大伟，2012年2月10日发表于纽约时报社论版。

华盛顿消息 — 下周来华盛顿访问的中国副主席习近平，可能是中国未来十年的领导人。他的来访提供了美国近距离检测他的绝佳机会。许多美国人甚至一些中国人都认为：习近平和中国一样，高深莫测令人好奇。美国的许多学者专家也试图通过习近平的到访，来瞭解他的内政外交理念。

虽然 2007 年成为被神化的胡锦涛的预定接班人以来，习近平已经在世界各地旅行。他在这个化妆般的预备期，至今还没有访问过美国（他早先作为省级官员访美过）。

这将是习近平的一个好机会让他了解美国，也让美国了解他。习近平在中国之外不为人知，即使在国内也是个谜。观察家将审视习近平在国内外政策上的取向。

下面是中国观察家们想要了解习近平的十个问题：

1. 习近平是否会率领中国共产党重返政治体制改革之路？自 2009 年末开始，共产党从改革开放中倒退，停止和彻底扭转了由习近平前任曾庆红所领导的改革。

习近平是否敢对抗阻扰改革的保守体制？包括国家安全机构、军队、宣传机构、和大国企；还是像胡锦涛那样受惠于这些机构？改革派人士如李源潮、汪洋、薄熙来、王沪宁、刘延东等，能否在今年 10 月党的十八大上，和习近平一起升入政治局的高位？

2. 习近平和下任总理（目前的候选人可能是副总理李克强或王岐山）能否把经济“恢复平衡”的豪言壮语变为现实？

过去两年的官方讲话公开号召：经济从出口导向转向内需消费，投资从沿海转向内陆，作为中国新的可持续发展的模式。时至今日，投资的现实和豪言壮语不相匹配。

3. 习近平是否能制定更加人性化的西藏与新疆政策？这些地区的种族骚乱自 2008 年以来逐渐上升，最近几周达到高潮。国家安全部队采取的强硬办法，导致人命损失和不稳定性的加剧。这需要一个新的更温和的途径来处理。习近平是否有政治能力约束镇压机器，为焦虑的少数民族与汉族政权的稳定共存创造条件？
4. 在国内的民族主义问题上，习近平和党的机构能否掌握局势？须知民族主义情绪正在迫使政府与邻国的领土争端上採取极端立场。他们要求对美国“挺直腰板”，并在国际社会中表现出咄咄逼人的态势。
5. 主流媒体、社交媒体、互联网和教育机构受到的严格控制，习近平是否有充分自信全面松绑？
6. 习近平是不是有能力驾驭军方？近年来中国军方的焦虑不断增加，表现在挑衅中国的邻国。似乎中国军队试图摆脱党的控制？
7. 习近平是否能主导务实的外交政策，而不仅仅使用口头上的外交辞令？中国外交的陈词滥调越来越令人起疑，在变乱纷呈的世界，需要北京投入实际的行动。

习近平 2009 年底在中央党校讲话，明确批评在国内和外交政策空喊口号没有用，要以实际的行动取代空话。这让外界寄予希望。

8. 非洲、中东、和拉美国家对中国在能源、国际援助和贸易政策上贪婪的重商主义日益不满，习近平如何因应？
9. 习近平和中国政府是否将在全球治理问题上，多扮演更积极、更赞的角色，少来些被动和阻碍的花招？中国会不会继续在联合国跟俄罗斯站在一起，反对安理会多数国家对叙利亚跟伊朗的制裁？还是改弦易辙，成为解答而非问题的一部分？

10. 习近平是否怀有战略远见，愿意投资推进中美关系？

世界上没有比中美两国更为重要的相互关系。但可惜两国之间仍弥漫着战略性的互不信任。两国之间战略互信的建立，需要中国下一代领导人及美国总统共同参与。

习近平的访问大概不会回答所有这十个问题。时间将告诉我们：他是否作为一个“转变”的领袖，敢于拥抱并参与中国在国内外的积极改变；或者他仍然是又一个规避风险的党棍？

作者：沈大伟 (David Shambaugh)，乔治-华盛顿大学艾略特国际关系学院中国政策研究室主任。社论的报纸版于 2012 年 2 月 11 日发表在《国际先驱论坛报》。

To: opinion.video@nytimes.com

From: Dr. Ping Chen

Email: pchen@ccer.pku.edu.cn

Date: 02/12/2012 05:31 PM

Ten Questions for America's Leader Presumptive

By Ping Chen

I am surprised by the New York Time Op-Ed “Ten Questions for China’s Heir Presumptive” by David Shambaugh, published on Feb.10, 2012, on the eve of China’s Vice President Xi Jinping’s visit to the United States.

As a China expert, Prof. Shambaugh certainly knows the minimum international curtsey for high level diplomatic exchanges. But it is not this time for me or even the New York Time editors to dwell on this issue. As a Chinese saying goes “It is impolite not to reciprocate (来而不往非礼也),” I would like to raise ten questions here in the similar tune of David Shambaugh. I would apologize in advance if my questions are somewhat provocative to some American readers.

American media always lecture the world since the end of WWII that the US President is legitimate through election, but people around the world are deeply skeptical about the courage and wisdom of American leaders in dealing with world affairs and regional peace about their self-appointed role as moral judges and world policeman.

This will be a good opportunity for the Chinese people to familiarize themselves with America and vice versa. As American inconsistencies in policy is well known in the United States, but not quite as clear in China and other Asian countries.

Here are 10 questions American observers would like to know about the leaders of the United States, including the President Obama and his Republican challengers:

- 1. Will American leaders return to a politically reformist path for the American political system?

Since 2008 financial crisis, the world economy had been dragged into a recession. As Simon Johnson, the former IMF Chief Economist and now a MIT professor, pointed out: the root cause was financial oligarchs who captured the American government. The only way to save American economy is to break-up financial oligarchs. Paul Volcker, the Former Chair of Federal Reserve and former economic advisor to President Obama, also suggested the breaking-up of financial oligarchs. However, we only see the Obama administration injecting 1 trillion dollars into financial giants, but without doing anything to discipline crisis creators.

Can American leaders stand up to the powerful interest groups that have blocked financial and political reforms — the financial oligarchs, the military-industry complex, the lobby groups for large multi-national enterprises — or will he be beholden to them, as George W. Bush has been? Will any reformers in both Democrat and Republican parties be elected to top leadership positions at the coming election in November?

- 2. Can the American leaders turn the rhetoric of budget “rebalancing” into reality?

Many official speeches have been made over the past two years calling for a reorientation of the deficit budget away from the

entitlement and the military adventure to domestic restructuring as the basis for a new and more sustainable growth model for the United States. To date the reality of budget reform has not matched the rhetoric.

•3. Will American leadership be able to devise a more humane policy toward Native American Indians, when their population had steadily dropped from tens of millions before Western colonists invaded the North America and now has disappeared from America's political stage?

American government did have some courage to apologize to Japanese American citizens who were interned in concentration camps during the World War II. However, American government owes an apology to Chinese Americans who built two thirds of transcontinental railway, but unlike Irish workers, Chinese immigrants were barred by the racist Chinese Exclusion Act from 1882 to 1965. As the Canadian government has political courage to offer an apology and some compensation, will American leaders have the similar courage to face their historical debt in human rights?

•4. Can American leaders reign in the hegemonies that are pushing the American power to the edge of war on China's neighbors, to "dominating" the world and behaving aggressively internationally?

• 5. Will American leaders be sufficiently confident to allow the relaxation of tightened controls on world internet infrastructure and international financial flow so that American intelligence apparatus could manipulate any country's information system at any time including their allies?

•6. Can the American people reign in their leaders, which have demonstrated a worrisome tendency since the Cold War to undertake invasions around the world, act independently of United Nations and international laws?

- 7. Will American leaders conduct a foreign policy that is more about substance than rhetoric?

America's diplomatic platitudes have become increasingly incredulous in a dangerous world where real action is needed from Washington. One hopeful indicator in this regard is a speech President Obama gave at the Nobel Peace Prize Forum on Dec. 10, 2009. Did he make any historical contribution to make less America-led wars and invasions?

- 8. How will American leaders handle the growing discontent across Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America over America's rapacious and imperialist energy, security and trade policies?

We know American and other western powers have only 10 percent of the world population, but control near 90 percent of resources, and consume near half of produced energy. In contrast, China's population is more than two times of all the developed countries combined, but consumes only 10% of oil in the world. Now, the US is rich but deep in the debt. Why could the US simply follow the market convention to sell your assets to pay the debt, or reach agreement for a debt-equity swap and international cooperation in financial crisis and peaceful development, which could be much better than a trade war?

- 9. Will the American leaders begin to take more active and less passive, more supportive and less obstructionist, roles in global governance?

American virtual economy is ten times the world GDP and near fifty times of the US real economy. The US originated hot money ignited financial crisis in Latin America, East Asia, Russia, Southern Europe and the US itself. Will US continue to stand with financial oligarchs in the G20 meeting against the majority of other nations on issues like global warming, international financial regulation, and anti-trust law against international oligarchs? American's military budget is near

half of the world and more than the next top 20 nations combined. The United States was also the first nation to use the atomic bomb. Will US become part of solution instead of part of the problem in the Middle East, Africa, Asia, and Latin America in preventing war and arm race?

- 10. Will American leaders have the strategic foresight to invest in advancing the relationship with China?

There is no more important relationship for either country in the world today, yet strategic mistrust permeates the current relationship.

Advancing the relationship requires the active engagement of China's leaders — and the American leaders — to build strategic trust between the two great nations.

Historically, China and the US have no geopolitical conflicts except the Taiwan issue. To remove the mistrust between China and United States, there is a simple solution: to abolish the Taiwan Relation Act in exchange for economic cooperation in Pacific and world affairs.

The United States did not ask France to be a broker during American Civil War. By the same token, Chinese people on the both sides of Taiwan Straits do not need American supervision for China's peaceful unification. The US policy is more a problem than a solution in China's peaceful development and unification.

I believe that most of American businessmen and state governors would love to participate in the open Chinese market and make friends with Chinese people. Only a few Cold War veterans are reluctant to open their mind to a changing world.

That is OK. The Chinese people have patience. We fought a hundred year war to regain China's independence from Western Powers. The People's Republic of China waited 21 years to return to its rightful seat in the United Nations, and joined the WTO through a 15 year negotiation. Based on the 2200 year history of a united China, we have confidence to wait until American leaders finally realize that the United States needs China as much as China needs the United States, since we all live in the same small village of the earth.

As Xi's visit is not likely to get all the answers to these 10 questions, time will tell if the United States finally has a "transformational" leader who embraces and shapes positive changes for America at home and abroad, or whether America just elect another risk-averse showman in American politics.

Dr. Ping Chen, is the Professor at National School of Development, Peking University in Beijing and Senior Fellow at Center for New Political Economy at Fudan University in Shanghai, China. He received his Ph.D. in physics at the University of Texas at Austin by his study of business cycles and economic chaos.

He is the author, *Economic Complexity and Equilibrium Illusion: Essays on Market Instability and Macro Vitality*, Routledge, London (2010).

Appendix.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2012/02/11/opinion/ten-questions-for-chinas-heir-presumptive.html>

Op-Ed Contributor

Ten Questions for China's Heir Presumptive

By DAVID SHAMBAUGH

Published: February 10, 2012

WASHINGTON — The visit by China's vice president, Xi Jinping, to Washington this coming week offers a unique opportunity to take the measure of the man who will lead China for the next decade.

While Xi has traveled the world since being anointed Hu Jintao's designated successor in 2007, he has not been to the United States during this grooming period (he did visit earlier as a provincial official).

This will be a good opportunity for Xi to familiarize himself with America and vice versa. As he is not well known outside of China and enigmatic even inside the country, observers will be looking for clues to Xi's domestic and international orientation.

Here are 10 questions China watchers would like to know about Xi Jinping:

- 1. Will Xi return to a politically reformist path for the Chinese Communist Party?

Since late 2009, the party has retrenched significantly — halting and rolling back reforms by Xi's predecessor, Zeng Qinghong. Can Xi stand up to the powerful conservative institutions that have blocked reforms — the state security apparatus, the military, the party propaganda

system and large state-owned enterprises — or will he be beholden to them, as Hu Jintao has been? Will reformers such as Li Yuanchao, Wang Yang, Bo Xilai, Wang Huning and Liu Yandong be promoted to top Politburo positions along with Xi at the 18th Party Congress in October?

- 2. Can Xi and the next prime minister (the contenders are reportedly Vice Prime Ministers Li Keqiang and Wang Qishan) turn the rhetoric of economic “rebalancing” into reality?

Many official speeches have been made over the past two years calling for a reorientation of the economy away from the export sector and the coastal regions to domestic consumption and the interior as the basis for a new and more sustainable growth model for China. To date the reality of investment has not matched the rhetoric.

- 3. Will Xi be able to devise a more humane policy toward Tibet and Xinjiang, where ethnic unrest has steadily risen since 2008 and has spiked in recent weeks?

Government security forces have responded with a heavy hand, resulting in loss of life and heightened instability. A new, softer approach is needed. But will Xi have the political strength to stand up to the repressive apparatus and put in place conditions for a more stable coexistence between restive ethnic groups and the Chinese state?

- 4. Can Xi and the party apparatus reign in the nationalism that is pushing the government to take extreme positions on territorial disputes with China’s neighbors, to “stand up” to the United States and behave aggressively internationally?

- 5. Will Xi be sufficiently confident to all the relaxation of tightened controls on mainstream media, social media, the Internet and educational institutions?

- 6. Can Xi reign in the military, which has demonstrated a worrisome tendency in recent years to undertake actions that provoke China’s neighbors and, seemingly, act independently of civilian party control?

- 7. Will Xi authorize a foreign policy that is more about substance than rhetoric?

China's diplomatic platitudes have become increasingly incredulous in a dangerous world where real action is needed from Beijing. One hopeful indicator in this regard is a speech Xi gave at the Central Party School in late 2009, in which he explicitly criticized the pervasive tendency toward sloganeering in domestic and foreign policy, arguing that slogans needed to be replaced by substance and hard work.

- 8. How will Xi handle the growing discontent across Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America over China's rapacious and mercantilist energy, aid and trade policies?
- 9. Will Xi and the Chinese government begin to take more active and less passive, more supportive and less obstructionist, roles in global governance? Will China continue to stand with Russia in the United Nations Security Council against the will of the majority of other nations on issues like Syria and Iran — and become part of the solution instead of part of the problem?
- 10. Will Xi have the strategic foresight to invest in advancing the relationship with the United States?

There is no more important relationship for either country in the world today, yet strategic mistrust permeates the current relationship. Advancing the relationship requires the active engagement of China's next leader — and the American president — to build strategic trust between the two great nations.

As Xi's visit is not likely to provide answers to these 10 questions, time will tell if he is a "transformational" leader who embraces and shapes positive changes for China at home and abroad, or whether he is another risk-averse apparatchik.

David Shambaugh is director of the China Policy Program in the Elliott School of International Affairs at George Washington University.

A version of this op-ed appeared in print on February 11, 2012, in The International Herald Tribune.