



訪客 於 2022/06/20 22:21

#1

請問版主預估這波美股崩盤會到什麼時候才回升

崩至新冠疫情前，Standard & Poor約3300點，Dow Jones 約28000點，Nasdaq約9500點，可以分批買進。不炒短線、懂得市場趨勢的人，去年3-6月就會出清持股，保留現金等下一次低點。

[wleemc](#) 於 2022/06/20 23:08 回覆



訪客 於 2022/06/20 23:43

#2

希望中國央行能看準這個機會讓美元霸權削弱，2008救了一次，結果美國全然認為是自己的功勞，毫不反省，這一次要給他一個嚴重的教訓，昂薩作惡多端太久了，希望中國當斷則斷，不要在幻想甚麼中美夫妻論了，美國就是要中國的命，習大大一定要有這個覺悟，就怕中國央行不像俄國央行行長烏琳娜般果斷，這一次中俄能在戰略上聯手，亞州這裡即使有野心家，也不太敢冒險，畢竟中國手上的真理，就足夠分量了，更別說俄國的戰略支持，就怕台獨那幫人腦子燒壞，以及日本又幻想引發戰爭來解決自身經濟困境，主要是這兩個可能引爆的點



訪客 於 2022/06/21 00:26

#3

道瓊2萬8還是高吧？中國日本等國持續拋售美債，美債都快有市場危機了，會不會引爆另一次全球金融風暴？

美聯儲 "縮表" 收回美元，收到新冠疫情前就差不多了，能再收下去嗎？看起來好像不行，總要鬆手一下，否則許多公司會撐不下去。

[wleemc](#) 於 2022/06/21 13:46 回覆



訪客 於 2022/06/21 09:55

#4

網路看了N年，不少人從5年前看空到現在呢！  
（今年總算有像樣的跌幅）



訪客 於 2022/06/21 10:07

#5

我認為經濟跟拳頭是綁在一起的。一國之所以可以無限借債，正因為全世界都敵不過它的武力。國際間向來是不講紳士風度或是論理說道，這種虛無的扮家家酒。拳頭大的毀約＝仍然信守。它怎麼說就怎麼算。

如果是川普，他的方向向來是不去挑釁俄國，普丁也十分讚賞川普。即便美債高築，他也會找別的方法處理。美國的民意非常的討厭拜登，認為他竊選。但政治如颶風，民主黨弄了個俄烏戰爭，給了拜登一個炒作民族主義提高自己聲望的機會。

其實三國（以及任何其他國家，包括台獨份子認為的台灣國）不管你站在哪一邊，都只是韭菜跪頌主子而已。不管哪國贏了，真的都不必高潮。錢、地盤實際上都是流進拜登、普丁、習近平跟他們的黨羽幕僚還有關聯政商的手上，大多數的奴隸們還以為他們也有份，只因為「民族主義」這種東西讓這些奴隸幻覺與有榮焉，回到現實生活中依舊是替老闆做牛做馬，政商貴族們則繼續吃香喝辣住豪宅開遊艇。這只是這三個人的鬥爭，而不是這三國人的鬥爭。除非你恰恰是他們貴族階層的成員之一。



訪客 於 2022/06/21 10:29

#6

台股高點曾估18800  
目前估低點破14000  
反彈..  
腰斬..



訪客 於 2022/06/21 13:03

#7

版主覺得是否要將台幣換成美元持有 感覺台幣不升息之後會貶  
可以換一些

[wleemc](#) 於 2022/06/21 13:28 回覆



訪客 於 2022/06/21 18:30

#8

有意思，拭目以待，看誰是鐮刀？誰是韭菜？



訪客 於 2022/06/21 22:35

#9

美國多行不義，就如王孟源所說，天下苦美久矣~~差不多也該得到報應了~~



訪客 於 2022/06/22 22:03

#10

Tribunal Judge Alison McKenna rules the London School of Economics violated Freedom of Information Act in Tsai Ing-wen thesis case

Author: richardsonreports

Author of FRAMED: J. Edgar Hoover, COINTELPRO & the Omaha Two Story.

<https://richardsonreports.wordpress.com/2022/06/21/tribunal-judge-alison-mckenna-rules-the-london-school-of-economics-violated-freedom-of-information-act-in-tsai-ing-wen-thesis-case/>

In a stunning reversal, Information Review Tribunal Judge Alison McKenna overturned the Information Commissioner and found that the London School of Economics violated the Freedom of Information Act. Judge McKenna found the Information Commissioner ignored a submission from Taiwanese newsman Dennis Peng and issued an erroneous decision in the case involving Republic of China in-exile President Tsai Ing-wen.

President Tsai has been embroiled in an academic fraud controversy over her 1984 PhD degree issued by the University of London on behalf of the London School of Economics. Tsai triggered an academic firestorm in June 2019, when she submitted her 1983 thesis entitled Unfair Trade Practices and Safeguard Actions to the LSE Library, thirty-five years late. The tardy thesis, in draft format, contained pagination problems, footnote issues, and handwritten notations, including a question mark.

President Tsai has refused to release the viva report of her oral examination, while both the LSE and the UL refuse to even name Tsai's thesis examiners. At one point, the UL tried to blame librarians at the Senate House Library for losing the UL's copy of the thesis during restructuring, but backed away after a Tribunal judge found there was no record of the thesis submission.

In a Freedom of Information request, the LSE was asked for the names of President Tsai's examiners, however, the school claimed that it lacked the identities of the thesis examiners. At the same time, Kevin Haynes, the "Head of Legal Team" at LSE, volunteered to the ROC Ministry of Justice the names of purported examiners. The Ministry was investigating a charge of criminal defamation that Tsai lodged against newsman Dennis Peng for his coverage of the controversy. Peng has a daily YouTube broadcast entitled "True Voice of Taiwan" that has riled Tsai. Haynes' subordinate, Rachael Maguire, has since suggested that Haynes gave incorrect information to Tsai's prosecutors because of a "hurried view" of Tsai's student record.

While the LSE was busy denying information requests about President Tsai, the ROC prosecutors obtained an arrest warrant for Peng, who is presently in the United States. Because Tsai's exiled Chinese government has no extradition treaty with the United States, Peng is able to avoid imprisonment and continues to hammer away at the PhD thesis controversy.

Judge McKenna tells the rest of the story in her decision, after finding the LSE did not pass the "gateway" of compliance with the law.

"LSE declined to be joined as a party to this appeal but made submissions and provided evidence. Its submission to the Tribunal dated 14 March 2022 it stated that "...the information we hold on file is only there accidentally...we cannot be certain that this information is accurate".

“LSE confirmed to the Tribunal that it holds President Tsai’s student file, comprising 278 pages. It stated that there is a letter on this file in which a person appears to self-identify as one of the Viva examiners, but that it has no official notification from University of London whether this information was correct, and it holds no information on the identity of the co-examiner.”

“The 16 December 2020 email [Kevin Haynes to ROC] was provided by the Appellant to the Information Commissioner’s Office during its investigation, but it did not ask LSE about it, apparently being uncertain of its provenance. The Appellant provided the Tribunal with a further copy of the email, exhibited to an affidavit dated 24 January 2022 signed by journalist Dennis Peng, who states he obtained it via disclosure during defamation proceedings brought against him by President Tsai and that the addressee of the email is “the inquiry of the Taiwanese Judiciary Institution” which is investigating President Tsai’s PhD.”

“The Appellant produced an email dated 14 June 2019 from a member of staff at LSE to President Tsai’s office in which there is a reference to “fending off” enquiries about President Tsai’s PhD. The Appellant relies on this as evidence that LSE is reluctant to comply with its duties under FOIA.”

“The Tribunal considered the following evidence, provided by LSE with its submissions of 14 March 2022: An internal email dated 31 March 2021, addressed to the member of staff who sent the 16 December 2020 email, as follows: Looking at it again, I was wondering where in the student file you got the information that she had two internal examiners – [XX] and [YY] – and one external examiner – [ZZ]. As far as I can see the only examiners referred to in the file are: -[ZZ], named as external examiner in a letter from Pres Tsai to ... Sec of Graduate School at LSE, 5 December 1983 -[XX], who refers to ‘my co-examiner and myself’ in a memo ...dated 16/1/1983. This also suggests there were only two examiners, [XX] and one other. I see [YY] is mentioned in the file but couldn’t find him specifically named as an examiner.”

“We conclude on the basis of all the evidence before us and on the balance of probabilities that information within the scope of the request is held by LSE in President Tsai’s student file. That information has been referred to in email correspondence between LSE and others (including apparently being supplied to a judicial inquiry) and is also referred to in its submission to the Tribunal. We understand that LSE doubts the accuracy of this information, but we conclude that this is not a basis for stating that information is not held under FOIA.”

“It may be that exemptions will be claimed, but we conclude that LSE must now issue a fresh response in which that issue is addressed. As we have concluded that information is held, the correct course is for LSE to issue a fresh response on the basis that information within the scope of the request is held, and at that stage either disclose the requested information (with contextual commentary, if necessary) or claim any exemptions to disclosure that it considers apply.”

“We allow this appeal on the basis of the Appellant’s first ground of appeal, that the Decision Notice was erroneous in its conclusion that information was not held.”

Judge McKeena ordered the London School of Economics to respond within 28 days.

---



訪客 於 2022/06/23 21:27

#11

覺得要反彈一陣子了，油價下降、十年公債下降，  
代表cpi十之八九會下降，  
反彈一陣子才有可能繼續跌。

美聯儲目前加息>>縮表，11月期中選舉後才會加速縮表。保留現金到11月以後抄底。

[wleemc](#) 於 2022/06/24 07:50 回覆