

# America against America (USA)

*Author: Wang Huning*

*Release date: 1991*

*Note: As a reminder to [issues6](#), **ainst is** much more appropriate than [Oppose](#) in the original project name, so I will use America against America as its English translation in the future.*

## Preface

From late August 1988, I was invited to the United States for a six-month academic visit. During that time, I visited more than thirty cities and nearly twenty universities, did research in dozens of government and private sectors, and discussed the United States with a wide range of Americans and foreigners. I documented my daily discussions, visits, and observations, and this book was born.

Obviously, I studied and viewed the United States as a society as an observer rather than an investigator, and I can say that my visit in the United States had a purpose, which was to get to know this number one capitalist country in more detail and in a more realistic way. We should look at it as a history, a culture, a people, a set of institutions, and not as a few abstract dogmatic concepts. In my book *Comparative Political Analysis*, published in 1987, I proposed a design for analyzing socio-political movements using a historically-socially-culturally conditioned landscape. In that book, it was by and large only a macro-framework design. This time, too, an attempt is made to use this approach to analyze a political community, the United States, specifically.

The fundamental purpose of this book, therefore, is not to explore the diverse dimensions, the colorful landscapes, and the intricate movements it depicts, but to explore the political and social management processes of American society, and although the book

attempts to cover as many dimensions and topics as possible, its analysis remains consistent with these themes. The development and flux of a society is inseparable from its politics and the way it is managed. It can be said that what kind of politics and social management there is, is what kind of social development there is. It is difficult to analyze and understand the United States without this logic. I just want to answer a simple H0 question by dissecting the multiple dimensions of society: "Why is there an America?" This question is simple, but it is far beyond my ability to do so, and I know it well.

The approach of this book is to analyze American society using a framework of historical-social-cultural conditions without considering any of these factors in isolation. Human social life, political life, and cultural life are infinitely intricate and intertwined networks. It would be difficult to analyze and view one of these issues in isolation or simply.

Since it is a concrete application of the above method, it requires careful and vivid observation, documentation, and analysis of all aspects of a society. That is why this book is more about concrete portrayal and factual recording than abstract reasoning. Any abstract reasoning can only be derived from observation and analysis of facts, and for abstract reasoning to be convincing, it is important that there are no convincing facts to lay the foundation. Sometimes one needs to do a kind of work, which is to provide the opportunity to think, rather than the conclusion of thinking. Of course, the various real-life accounts in this book follow my thinking and conclusions, but I have also tried to make it possible to provide opportunities for others to think.

This book takes the United States as the object of analysis, because the United States, like China, constitutes a special phenomenon of humanity in the twentieth century, which can be called the "American phenomenon". The "Chinese phenomenon" is why this ancient civilization with a long history of more than 2,000 years has declined in the modern era. Why is it lagging behind the modern nations of the world? This has caused generations of scholars and scholars to think hard. The "American phenomenon" has a different dimension, and people wonder why this nation, with a short history of only two hundred years, has become the world's leading developed country today. I believe that scholars living in the twentieth century have a responsibility to study these

two phenomena. As a Chinese scholar, he has a dual responsibility to study both the "Chinese phenomenon" and the "American phenomenon. In this way, he can better understand himself and the world, and better explore the path to China's strength.

America Against America is probably a strange and rather puzzling title for a book. My intention with this title is to show that America is not a simple homogeneous whole that can be dismissed with a single sentence. In the old days, when people started from a dogmatic view of America as a mere "exploitation of surplus value," a "dictatorship of the bourgeoisie," and nothing more, then the reality of America would oppose this ominous "America ", the rigid conception of the United States. Now there is another extreme, some people imagine the United States as a rich paradise, perfect, then the reality of the United States is also opposed to such "America", idealized America. Including American society itself, it has its affirmative and negative forces, and wherever affirmative forces can be found, negative forces can be found. This is the basic meaning of America Against America.

America Against America, shows the basic movement of society. But wherever there is a human doohickey, it cannot be ironclad, and it is not and cannot be possible to subsume a society all under one established concept. America Against America, indicates the book's attempt to reveal what factors in American society constitute each of these two relative quantities of for. We cannot say in one sentence what America is, to say, but only: "America against America".

The more one delves into the study of America, the more one gets rid of the sketchy picture, the easier it is to discover this inherent contradiction in American society. As a scholar who studies a society as an object of scientific research, one should not paint one's object with a rose color, and certainly not with a coal gray color. Rather, one should objectively identify the pros and cons of the society. In general, scholars should be critical of what exists, which is the most important motivation for social development. In the case of the United States, I hold such a critical attitude. It is worth noting that the mechanisms that exist in American society, both good and bad, are the product of the historical-social-cultural conditions of that society, and they exist only in that environment, and cannot simply be applied to other societies. In this regard, it is not possible to simply imitate them between different countries.

The United States is a large country. In this big country, cite one image of America to cite an image of America in opposition to it. As is generally believed, the United States is a rich country, indeed, many people living in this place are very rich, rich enough to own a private jet airliner is not uncommon. The majority of the population can also be said to be living in "peace and happiness", ordinary people generally have a small car and other equipment. But if this is America, then one can immediately paint a different picture of America. At the University of California, Berkeley, there is a place called "People's Park". The so-called "People's Park" was originally an empty lot on Berkeley's campus, but it was later occupied by homeless people. When I was there, there were hundreds of homeless people dressed in rags who spent the night there every day, some with small tents made of rags, others with newspapers on the ground, sleeping on the ground. The dirty, filthy, listless appearance of these Americans did not fit the concept of America in any way. Church charities came to give out breakfast each morning, and the university swimming pool was regularly opened for them to wash their bodies. On the night Bush was inaugurated as the 41st president, I saw homeless people sleeping in the doorways of the buildings lining Bush Street in San Francisco. Isn't this America? Is this America? I'm afraid I can't answer that with a single word.

The United States is also generally considered to be a Western democracy, and a typical Western democracy at that, and Americans are proud of it. The Constitution, election campaigns, separation of powers, citizen participation in politics, and so on and so forth show one side of this system, but on the other side, can each commoner really dominate the politics of this country? My analysis in this book shows that the powerful groups that dominate politics are above the common people. The constraints of private property on political democracy in the capitalist system of the United States cannot be ignored. Even American scholars have said that a political democracy cannot function properly where the differences in economic power are so great that one group can use non-political means to determine the woes of another group. A true political democracy must therefore involve the right of the governed to control economic policy through their representatives." (Sydney Hooker, Reason, Social Myths, and Democracy, p. 286) Economic decision-making in the United States is largely controlled by private consortia. Is this democratic? Is it undemocratic? I'm afraid it can't be answered in a single word.

Paradoxes like these abound. It can be said that the United States is a rich country, but it can also be said that the United States is a country full of poor people; it can be said that the United States is a typical Western democracy, but it can also be said that the United States is a not so democratic country; it can be said that the United States is a country with advanced education, but it can also be said that the United States has a lot of education problems; it can be said that the United States is a country where equality is paramount, but it can also be said that the United States is not so equal; it can be said that the United States is a stable We can say that the United States is a stable and developing society, but we can also say that the United States is a crisis-ridden society. My idea is to oppose the imaginary America with the factual America.

The United States is only one capitalist country, and it does not represent all Western capitalist societies. I simply want to use the case study of the United States to promote our understanding of capitalism and, indirectly, socialism as well.

One hundred and fifty years ago, Marx and Engels declared in the Communist Manifesto: "With the development of big industry, the very basis on which the bourgeoisie produces and appropriates its products is itself dug out from under its feet. It produces first of all its own gravediggers." (Marx and Engels, vol. 1, p. 263) Lenin declared imperialism "dying" and "decaying" at the beginning of this century. After all these years, it should be said that capitalism is still developing and cannot be underestimated. The judgments and analyses of historical materialism are correct in terms of historical development. However, the law of the development of human society as indicated by historical materialism needs the maturity of historical conditions. When these conditions are not ripe, any subjective judgment is rather inconsistent with the logic of historical materialism. For a long time, driven by the reinforcement of ideology, once there was a total rejection of capitalism, which was influenced by dogmatism, which prevented people from judging capitalist society objectively and scientifically, and the influence of "left" ideology, which took class struggle as the outline, which disturbed our perspective of the whole world and prevented people from learning from advanced experience of other countries. It also prevents people from learning from the advanced experience of other countries. This not only hinders this, but actually also prevents people from correctly understanding and grasping the shortcomings of capitalism.

As human societies, no matter what the system is, there will be conflicts, conflicts, and needs. It should be useful to understand what methods different human societies use to resolve contradictions, mitigate conflicts, and meet needs. If my analysis of these issues contributes to the development and progress of Chinese society, then I will have achieved my original intention.

I think that the first thing to know about anything is to know and grasp it accurately or precisely, and then to analyze and evaluate it. This book is based on such logic.

There are eleven chapters in this book, and I would like to briefly point out here: (1) the uneven development of society and its various features; (2) the values that dominate political life and their flux; (3) the diverse character of the nation and its social efficacy; (4) the formal and informal mechanisms that regulate people's social activities; (5) the political forces active in society and their relations; (6) the democratic and non-democratic elements in election campaigns; (7) top-down political operations and their characteristics; (8) non-political coordination mechanisms and socialized regulation; (9) the reproduction of culture, values and even institutions and the connection with education; (10) the role of ideas in the development and management of society; (11) the various undercurrents that threaten future development.

Although these eleven chapters contain quite a few aspects, the object is a large country, so the facets actually covered are only a limited aspect of American society. From this perspective, I think the book falls short on two counts.

First: The book is limited in its coverage and cannot possibly cover all aspects of the American forest, so it should be said that there are limitations. It cannot be said that these aspects adequately reflect the subject matter of this book. I wanted to do a "peek-a-boo" thing, but the question is whether the "peek-a-boo" was found. I think we have found some, but not many. The good thing is that we can find a lot of other literature that can make up for the shortcomings of this book.

Second, I analyze American society as an observer rather than a researcher. Some of the data and materials, though sourced, do not meet the standards of rigorous statistics. I am afraid that some of the issues discussed may be subjective, or even erroneous. Therefore, I

hope that people will read this book from a macro-sociological point of view, rather than treating it as microbiology.

Also, in this book, I do not want to torture the reader with too much thoughtful analysis and theoretical quotations, which is not the purpose of this book.

Finally, I would like to thank the many institutions and friends who have been instrumental in bringing this book to fruition and without whom it could not have been written.

The CSCPRC, which invited me to be a visiting scholar in the United States for three months after the delegation's visit, provided all the expenses; Fudan University, which arranged such a long period of time for me to leave my teaching job so that I could have time to study this topic; The University of Iowa's political science department, which hosted me for three months and provided me with all the research and office facilities; the Chinese Cultural Studies Center at the University of Michigan, the political science department at Miami University in Ohio, which provided me with the opportunity to study this topic. The Center for Chinese Cultural Studies at the University of Michigan, the Department of Political Science at Miami University in Ohio, and the School of International Relations at the University of California, San Diego, all of which arranged short visits for me; and the Institute of East Asian Studies at the University of California, Berkeley, where I spent three weeks as a visiting scholar and was warmly received. Finally, I would like to thank the Faculty of Law at Keio University in Japan, where I spent a week gaining insight into the "Empire of the Sun" section.

On a personal note, that would be too much, and I would like to thank: Ms. Vergena Yen of the U.S.-China Academic Exchange Council, who carefully arranged the planning of my visit; Professor Steeves and family at the University of Iowa, who facilitated my visit for three months in a way that no one else could; Professor Douglas Madsen, Chair of the Department of Political Science at the University of Iowa, and the entire faculty and staff. who helped me overcome many difficulties, and others such as Professor Lucine Pye, President of the American Political Science Association, Professor Arnold of the University of Miami, Professors Oxenberg and Kanru Lee of the University of Michigan, Professor Rosenblum of the University of Syracuse, Professor Mal Kahler of the University of California, San Diego, Professor Robert Scalavano

of the University of California, Berkeley Professors Robert Scalavano and Giorgos; Professor Ryosei Kokubu of Keio University, Japan, and others. They have given me invaluable help.

I would like to thank my Chinese friends in the U.S. who have been living in the U.S. for many years and have enlightened me with many insights: Zheng Shiping, Shen Yi, Chen Feng, Gong Ting, Zhou Xueguang, Yu Xu, Wang Manpower, Wu Danli, Lin Zhimin, Xu Huahua, Jin Ping, Gai Zheyu, He Yufan, Yang Rijun, Huang Geng, Zhu Sheng, and many others. They live in different parts of the United States and all received the most typical Chinese hospitality when I arrived at their places.

I would like to thank Associate Professor Ni Shixiong, with whom I spent a lot of time at Berkeley, for his sincere help. I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Ren Xiao, Qiu Kaiming, Yao Qin, Guo Dingping, and Ding Chunfang for their help in putting together the drafts of this book during the final finishing stages, and to Ding Chunfang for her careful proofreading of the entire manuscript. I am also grateful to all the staff in our departmental reference room and office, who are always so helpful.

I would also like to thank my wife, Qi Zhou, who has helped me in a way that no one can replace.

Wang Huning

April 1, 1989

Department of International Politics, Fudan University

## **I. Uneven land**

### **1. Doubt of American manufacturing**

CA985 arrived in San Francisco via Tokyo, Japan, and then a long flight over the rough Pacific Ocean. Due to a delayed flight, it was crowded with flights arriving from Europe and Japan. The normally spacious baggage claim and customs hall was crowded and full of people. People from all over the world were excited to arrive in the United States. There was one plane, probably from France, and many people spoke French. The line to get through customs was over an hour long and



people were complaining as they do in China that the wait was too long. Many people thought that the queue should not be in the West, but I did not expect to have to wait for such a long time once I arrived in the United States. The customs counters at the San Francisco airport immigration office are divided into three categories: one for U.S. citizens, two for non-U.S. citizens, and three for new immigrants. The first two entrances on the left are for U.S. citizens, which are sparsely populated and show the superiority of being a U.S. citizen. Non-U.S. citizens, who have the largest number of people at the entrance, feel inferior.

At the entry point, there are hordes of Japanese people. Nowadays, Japanese people are traveling and doing business everywhere in the world in hordes, showing the strength of a rich country and a rich people. Although many foreigners find the Japanese unlovable, this economic strength makes one impressed. It is said that because there are so many Japanese, the U.S. government is considering giving Japanese people a kind of treatment: visa-free. Statistically, this would speed up the processing of customs at the U.S. customs entrance by one-third. But diplomacy requires equal treatment, and the Japanese seem reluctant to waive visas for Americans. From the development of the Japanese nation, one can draw at least two conclusions: first, economic strength is the basic force that determines the international status and international image of a nation; second, the international status and international image of a nation does not depend only on economic strength.

The United States is a society that is quite developed in many ways, and anyone who arrives in the United States will feel a "future shock. As a result, people think about how they want to enjoy America, while others think about why America exists. To the latter question, different people have different answers. I asked a friend. One friend replied that one is the extraordinary abundance of resources, and the other is that competition for talent is encouraged. Another friend added that at least that was the case when people first arrived in the United States. I asked G, a friend who is pursuing a Ph.D. at Stanford, the answer: tradition. I found this to be one of the most abstract, yet valuable, explanations. The development of any society is not the result of purely economic forces, nor is it the result of short-term behavioral adjustments. The development of a society to such a degree of "wealth" is not the result of artificial force. What are the forces that dominate the struggle of people in this society for generations?

One can come up with many specific concepts, such as innovation, struggle, thrift, and so on. The most important thing is whether these things can become a cultural gene, a tradition. No matter what factors are conducive to social development, if they do not constitute a tradition, they cannot be deeply rooted. For any good factor to have an effect, it must be the work of several generations. Americans talk about innovation all day long, but in reality tradition is very strong. The Chinese also talk about innovation all day long, but the result is that tradition is repeatedly rising and falling. It has been said that Americans speak of innovation, not in opposition to tradition. The American tradition and innovation are the same thing, and today's tradition is only the innovation of 30 or 50 years ago. The Chinese speak of innovation as being anti-tradition. However, it is not easy to counter the traditions of one or two thousand years.

Today, we cannot help but think long and hard about the influx of people into the United States. A few days ago, there was a lively discussion in domestic theoretical circles about the re-conceptualization of socialism and capitalism. The basic reason why this issue is currently being discussed in China is that after decades of socialism, it is not as good as capitalism in economic terms. Is the social development program that Marx argued a hundred and fifty years ago consistent with the course of human historical development? Can socialism eventually overcome capitalism? This is the doubt of the people of the day. I think of the movie "Hong Hu Red Guard" that was shown on a Boeing 747 flight to the United States. The Chinese have overthrown the three great mountains that have been weighing them down for so long, but has this ensured the direction of China's social development? What impact would a revolution such as the Chinese Revolution, with the rural population as the main force surrounding the cities, have on the development of a society? It is indeed worth thinking about.

The development of the United States today, with its economic prosperity, its political process, its way of life, and its international status, has created a great deal of doubt in the world today. People in the developed world carry this deep-rooted doubt: Has the development of human technology and material life reached this point? Is it against the nature of man? Will it lead to the depletion of the earth's resources? Will it eventually lead to the destruction of mankind? Our colleagues in the Club of Rome are worried about this, and they are crying out for a long time. Those in developing countries have

a different question: What is the force that has created such a dazzling material civilization? What system has created the right conditions for such development in terms of management and intellect? Is such a state of affairs accidental or inevitable? People began to doubt the system, and people began to doubt their own system. In any case, the United States has created a kind of doubt.

When you walk into the United States, you walk into this kind of doubt. Not into the United States, will also fall into this kind of doubt. A strange phenomenon is: into the doubt is easy, out of the doubt is difficult.

## **2. Manhattan and Chinatown**

The plane arrived over New York. Got off and picked up my luggage. I was nervous when everyone was gone and there was no sign of my friend who had agreed to pick me up. I heard from my friend that once you arrive in New York, you will feel a sense of terror and the crime rate here is extremely high. I was afraid of encountering a mugger, because I was quite apprehensive. Half an hour later, my friend came and I was relieved. After leaving the airport, I went straight to the United Nations building. The UN building is a magnificent building. We went to the Security Council and had our pictures taken. Then we went to the UN General Assembly and found a seat for the Chinese delegation and took a picture of it. We also took a picture of each person giving a speech at the UN podium. While visiting the UN, I saw beautiful and valuable gifts from various countries, such as an ivory sculpture from China, a royal boat from Thailand, and a picture from the Soviet Union. This shows that the citizens of this world want a reputation at the UN, but how many countries in real life believe in the principles of the UN? It seems to be the same as a group of people, where everyone wants to join it and show their love for it, but in reality goes against it everywhere. In today's world of pluralistic interests, ideological barriers and conflicts, it is true that the UN does not play the role it should. However, the UN has also played a role that cannot be underestimated, especially in socio-economic and cultural development. The Iran-Iraq ceasefire is also an outstanding example of conflict resolution. The world today is still a world that needs to be controlled by human beings. Looking at the statue of a sword turned into a plow in front of the United Nations building, one wonders what

methods one can use to melt the sword. Past history has shown that many believe that warfare is also a means of turning swords into plowshares, and the result is that swords are always turned into plowshares. New York's Chinatown feels quite familiar in style. It seems slightly dirtier than other places. It is said that Chinatown is a complex area, where all the phenomena unique to the Chinese are present. It reminds me of Poplar's "The Ugly Chinese". I didn't walk much in Chinatown, but from the outside, there are many small businesses. In this bustling area, looking at the signs full of Chinese characters, it reminds me of the distant China. This area is in stark contrast to other parts of Manhattan. One evokes Chinese culture, the other tells of Western culture. Talking about America and China is a constant topic for almost all Chinese scholars and international students in the United States. Within this eternal topic are two more eternal centers: economic development and political democracy. The economic success and technological progress achieved by the United States in this century are there for all to see, and no country in the world today has yet surpassed it. Although the Japanese are aggressive, coming to the forefront, and coming later, they still cannot match the United States in areas such as military, culture, and resources, in addition to their competitive economic strength. What needs to be analyzed is what role the economic development of the United States has played in its political development. In both areas, the U.S. is the world's most visible country. China owes too much in these two areas. Thus, both aspects have become a constant topic in the modernization process. How can China's economic modernization be achieved? The fundamental question is whether the process of economic modernization can be completed under public ownership. Most of the developed countries in the world today are not under public ownership. This reality is the biggest challenge to people's thinking. The next question is how does political democracy develop? In tandem with the economy, or not in tandem? These two major topics have become hot topics of discussion this year. One argument is that economic modernization cannot be achieved without political democracy; one thing that counters this is that Hong Kong, Taiwan, Singapore, and South Korea did not have political democracy during their economic take-off stage; Hong Kong was under colonial rule, Taiwan was under one-party dictatorship, and South Korea was under military intervention. Another argument is that when the economy developed, conditions for political democracy became available, examples being the democratization movements in newly industrialized regions and countries; the counter-argument is also

strong: the developed Western countries were not really economically developed after the bourgeois revolution, far from the economic strength of some developing countries today, but the institutions of a democratic republic were basically established. This is a question that Chinese theorists must think about for a long time. Economic development is only a phenomenon, and either centralization or democracy may promote or inhibit economic development, but what needs to be concerned is what changes in society will be conducive to the development of political democracy after economic development. Since the economy does not develop, developing countries cannot be economically dependent on developed countries. This is mainly in terms of high technology, equipment, precision instruments, etc. But it also depends on the stage of development of each country, for example, African countries, for example, need mainly food to maintain basic living conditions. Whatever is needed, a special exchange mechanism is formed: developing countries have to offer the best things in exchange with developed countries. Thus, people in developing countries cannot enjoy the best products produced in their own countries, not even the second-class products. This is because the second-class products are intended for consumption by foreigners who come to these countries. Products from all countries and regions are available in the U.S. market: China, Taiwan, South Korea, Japan, Jamaica, Mexico, etc. The best products from all countries and regions of the world flock to the U.S. market in exchange for U.S. dollars. As everyone wanted to obtain dollars, strong competition was formed, and the products were of high quality but low price. This situation caused an unprecedented boom in the U.S. market. This was the result of the market mechanism and the benefit to the U.S. of the world status of the U.S. dollar as determined by the Bretton Woods Conference after World War II. Of course, the mass entry of foreign products into the United States, the impact of the United States itself industry, resulting in factory closures, increased unemployment, which can not be ignored, so the two forces of free trade and protectionism have always fought.

### **3. four C more**

After living in the United States for a short time, it became clear that there are several things that are particularly abundant in this society. Through the surface phenomenon of these things, some basic

conditions of the dynamic organization of society can be found. Let's start with these four more things.

There are a lot of cars (Car) running in bunches in cities of all sizes, on highways and country roads at all times. Cars come in all shapes and sizes, and there are all kinds of models. When I was in Washington, Antony King, vice chancellor of Essex University in England, pointed out to me the variety of cars on the street and said, "Ten years ago, most of the cars I saw in the United States were made in the United States, but today there are all kinds of cars, especially Japanese cars." The auto war between the U.S. and Japan is already well known. One important reason why Japanese cars have been able to break into the U.S. market is that the U.S. car market is just too big and cars are just too important to individuals. Not having a car in America is like not having legs. The highway system is very well developed, with generally three lanes on the left and right. Divided into high, medium and slow three, some places have seven lanes of cars. All kinds of cars are running on it day and night. The average family has a car, and many families have more than one. I went to a professor's house at Stanford University and there were three cars. The total number of privately owned cars in the United States is one of the largest in the world.

Phones are plentiful (Call) Everywhere you go in the United States, you can see a telephone. All offices and homes have telephones. Home phones also have one to several extensions. In public places, there are automatic telephones, and you can call by putting in a certain number of coins. Now there is another kind of telephone card telephone, when you call, you just put the card into the telephone and you can call. In airports, there are rows of these automatic telephones. There are also many such phones in hotels. When I stayed at the Sheraton and Hilton hotels in Washington, D.C., there were rows of automated phones in the lobby downstairs. In universities, there are also such phones in public places, such as libraries, dining halls, conference halls, computer centers, language centers, etc. Not only are there many phones, but they are also convenient. Not only are there many phones, but they are also quick and easy to use. No matter where you call, it is very quick. For domestic long-distance calls, you can pick up the phone and dial the number and be connected in half a minute at most. It is also easy to make calls to other parts of the world, just pick up the phone and dial. One of the main characteristics of people's work is to use the phone, and many things are solved by phone, including love. Many

parents have told me that their children call for two hours to fall in love, and other calls do not come in, which is very expensive. Naturally, the developed social function of the telephone system is not here, you can talk about love, but also about other things.

The number of computers (Computer) is also a big feature. Wherever you go, you can see the people you deal with to use computers. When I visited the National Security Council, I found that people inside use computers. University professors have computers in their offices or homes. Staying at a hotel, the whole management is computerized. At the Department of Transportation version of a driver's license, it is all entered into a computer. Shopping in stores and canteens, paying the bill is computerized. Searching in libraries, the information retrieval is computerized. When you go to a bank to deposit money, its system is computerized. Computers are used extensively in factory production, government offices, military operations, aircraft in the sky, and so on. Computers make everything fast, accurate, and easy to find. Computers can also be integrated into national or worldwide networks. When I visited the library at Yale University, their head of East Asia, Mr. Ma, immediately typed in my name and within seconds found out that my books National Sovereignty and Comparative Political Analysis were available at two other universities. Computers can also talk to each other, and as long as they know each other's computer numbers (Bignet ID), they can enter what they want to tell each other.

Card" here is not the Chinese concept of "card", there are some cards in China, such as briquette card, egg card, daily necessities card, vegetable card, etc., which are all made of paper. The card we are talking about here is a plastic card with a magnetic tape on the back to store information. Such cards, too many to mention, are credit cards, money cards, library cards, phone cards, and ID cards .....Each of these cards has different kinds. New cards are still emerging, and the newspapers once carried a story about a new service by an airline that offers free first-class treatment with the purchase of a certain number of tickets, with the voucher being one such card. I flew United Airlines from San Francisco to Iowa, and the ticket was actually a card similar to this. The card and the computer are linked together, as long as the card is inserted into a certain computer, you can do the relevant things, such as: withdrawing money, saving money, checking the number of their savings, can be used to solve the card and the computer, without having to find a bank clerk. Almost everyone who has a job takes out a wallet, which has a large number of cards. Because of

the card, the wallet also changed, there are several bags inside specifically for the card. I am afraid that the leather wallets made in China now cannot be exported to the United States or other western countries because there is no place to put the cards.

These are the "four C's". What is important is the role they play in social organization and social management.

The number of cars makes the whole society constitute a dynamic whole, with vehicles moving not only people and goods, but also ideas, concepts and spirit.

The abundance of telephones, so that the whole society constitutes a well-connected information system, and the transmission of language is accompanied by the transmission of emotions and information.

The multiplicity of computers, which allows for a high degree of integration of the management of the entire society, and computerized information is a fair management.

Cardo, which symbolizes the management of the whole society, frees people from the management of physical objects (people and things) into symbolic management.

The development of these four aspects is crucial to a society, where they are a driving force and a channel for political socialization and political communication. The progress of these aspects makes the institutions, principles and spirit of a society more and more deeply rooted, materialized and consolidated.

The "four C's" have brought about many problems, and modernization has come at a cost to human society and nature.

More cars - more pollution, more traffic accidents, more waste.

More phone calls - more interference, eavesdropping.

More computers - social communication systems have become vulnerable, and if a machine breaks down or a "virus" invades a computer, a large area is immediately affected, and sometimes a large amount of data is lost.

Cardo - more theft, more reported theft, more forgery crimes.



How a society consolidates its institutions is the major issue. It is rare to have a solid system when you start with the system alone; the only real consolidation is when the system is actually infused into the lives of the people.

## **4. Highly commercialized**

Another major characteristic of American society or American culture is its high degree of commodification. It can be said that this is a typical capitalist "flowery world". In this typical capitalist society, almost anything can become a commodity, from human flesh, air, abstract ideas to all kinds of concrete objects, all are commodified. This is why Marx's analysis of capitalist society, in which he regarded commodities as the cells of this mode of production, was a true insight. In today's capitalist society, this feature is more fully developed, although there are many differences in the form of expression.

Commodity, which remains the basic factor of this society, has its most typical manifestation in that people become commodities. This large-scale and comprehensive commodification is the basic tendency of the capitalist mode of production, which is not dominated by people's subjective will.

The question that needs to be asked is not how this high degree of commoditization arises and to what extent it reaches. What we need to examine in the study of a society's management process is: what does high commodification do to the intricate management process of a society?

The development of modern human society, the increase in the demands of all aspects of modern human life, the complex intertwining of modern society, politics, economics, culture, entertainment, health, art, transportation and other fields, have posed a serious challenge to the management system of society. Can a political and administrative system bear all the burdens of modern society? This is a difficult question for all countries. From both theoretical and practical aspects, I am afraid that no political and administrative system has the capacity to directly manage and assume all the responsibilities. If the political and administrative system has to assume it due to structural and functional constraints, it will inevitably lead to a situation where

the whip is too long to reach. Because the energy of any political and administrative system is limited, for small societies, the government has the possibility to hold its own, as in Singapore, Hong Kong, South Korea, etc. For large societies, especially those with hundreds of millions of people, it is unlikely that the government can directly and comprehensively manage all levels and areas of society. History has shown that societies that have embarked on this path by institutional design have often had political and administrative systems that do not address many of the basic needs of society very well, and have accumulated piles of problems. Striving to give the various spheres of social life their own organization and dynamics to meet the needs of society on their own, so that the political or administrative system plays only an indirect regulatory role, is an effective way to win in this area.

A prerequisite for the realization of this structure is to enable the various spheres of social life to form a self-organizing system that decouples these specific and complex spheres of activity from political activity. Commodification is the catalyst for this transformation process. The problems of housing, food, transportation, employment, and education are the basic dilemmas that plague every society. Many governments are plagued by these problems and cannot get out of them. The desire to retreat is not an option, and the desire to advance is not an option. The high degree of commodification has created a more particular structure in American society in these areas.

We can look at how commoditization has made these fields self-organizing systems and how they function.

Housing is a headache in many developing countries. The governments of some developing countries have worked hard to make "home ownership" a reality. But in the United States, the housing problem is better solved. Although the streets in the big cities are full of homeless people wandering around, but most people have spacious housing. Each family has a housing block is the general level. Many houses, with seven or eight rooms, are actually occupied by only one or two people. New housing is still being built. Housing management is completely commoditized. Everyone who wants to have his own house, or wants to rent one, has to pay for it or rent it. Real estate becomes an important pillar in the economy, regulated by economic levers. In different areas, prices vary. What you can buy for about \$100,000 in a small central city, you may not be able to buy for \$200,000 in San

Francisco or New York. A house that might cost \$400-\$500 to rent in Manhattan, New York, might only cost \$200-\$300 in a smaller town. The housing industry has always had an incentive to build homes because of the lucrative nature of property after commodification. Over the years, housing has accumulated and more and more has been built. What the government did was to regulate these activities and keep them within the realm of legality, without directly creating housing, distributing housing, or maintaining housing. The government builds a very small percentage of housing for the poor.

Food, is another problem that plagues many countries today, some of which have not even solved the problem of subsistence. Some countries have passed this hurdle, but are far from meeting the needs of society in terms of the availability and fancy variety of non-staple foods. The government is exhausted by these conflicts and shortage of commodities. But in this society, the abundance and variety of food is amazing, even to the point of being wasteful. The system of supplying food is completely commoditized. As producers, people produce what the market wants, and then the market system sells it to consumers. In between, the producer, the seller, and all other parts of the system receive a profit. Commoditization brings profit, which is the main motivation. Of course, it cannot be said that commercialization can solve all problems, and the full development of science and technology and means of production is an indispensable factor.

Transportation is a challenge that modern society is bound to face. In modern society, human development, economic development, cultural development, and social development all mean increased mobility. If this mobility is not opened up, society will face an untold pressure, and the political, economic and cultural development of society will be hindered. The problem of transportation is precisely what many countries find difficult. Transportation means are mostly commoditized. Air traffic, which is handled by private airlines, such as United, Delta, Northwest, TWA, etc., is a completely self-sustaining enterprise. The development of the airline industry is one of the major determinants of economic development. Land transportation, the famous coach "Greyhound", connects the four corners of the country. And so on. Commoditization stimulates people to operate, in order to make profits and increase profits, each business unit must find ways to improve services and expand the scope of business.

Employment, a major logical paradox of modern society: on the one hand, the development of science and technology is crowding out more and more people, and on the other hand, more and more people need to find work and earn a living. In this society, labor is commodified. The government does not directly place people in jobs; it directs employment and creates jobs through the political system. Every business can hire its own people, and everyone can go to any business to find a job. (Of course, in theory, this is not the same as everyone who wants a particular job will find that job.) However, where commoditization is highly developed, it is not the nature of the job that matters, but the exchange value received. With the right pay, people will be willing to exchange it. With money, one can then enter a commoditized society and get anything anyone else wants. After commodification, employment is not specifically managed by the government, but by individual companies and individuals coordinating among themselves.

The development of the commodity economy has led to a dual structure of governance in society: the social self-organized system is responsible for all kinds of specific matters, and the political system is responsible for coordinating the various self-organized systems. This is a major characteristic of macro-management in this society. These are just a few examples, but it should not be assumed that commodification necessarily makes things perfect. It simply means that commodification offers the possibility of making government lighter. It is impossible for government to function efficiently if it is involved in a thousand and one things in society. But after government is lightly loaded, it still has to regulate activities in various fields, only now it has changed from direct to indirect.

Commoditization has the amazing power to push people to every lucrative place. The most typical ones like Kentucky Fried Chicken, hamburgers, Coca-Cola, Pepsi, Crest toothpaste, Marlboro cigarettes, United Parcel Post, etc. are everywhere, even in very remote places. One could say that wherever there is a copper plate to be made, people will deliver goods and services to it. Commoditization not only promotes the circulation of goods in geographical breadth, thus contributing to the balanced development of society, but also drives goods to diversification and to every unexplored area. This is true in everyday small commodities, but also in high technology.

Everything has a dual nature, and the glamour of high commodification abounds. Human flesh, sex, knowledge, politics, power, and law can all become the target of commodification. The yellow culture on New York's Forty-second Street is probably an important product of commodification. Commodification, in many ways, corrupts society and leads to a number of serious social problems. These problems, in turn, can increase the pressure on the political and administrative system.

Therefore, commodification can reduce the burden of the political and administrative system, but there is an important premise, which is that the political and administrative system must regulate commodification. The real essence of commoditization is not that everything becomes a commodity, but that the commodity is in a rational mechanism of operation. The economic levers coordinate this mechanism, and so must the political and administrative systems. When many basic areas of society have become self-organizing systems, the political and administrative systems will have the conditions to separate from them, to move from direct to indirect management. The process of commodification is the process of these spheres becoming self-organized systems. This process does not take shape in a short time, and even after a considerable period of development, contradictions, conflicts, obstacles and confusion are still inevitable. However, the political and administrative system will be more powerful and effective than managing dozens of large self-organized systems than managing thousands of specific activities.

## **5. Remote areas**

The term "remote areas" here is just a borrowing of the concept. In fact, these areas are neither remote nor far away. They are right next to the modern cities. When I say "remote areas", I mean the Armenian settlements. Armenians are a very peculiar group of people. Their main characteristic is their refusal to modernize, their incompatibility with the highly developed and advanced science and technology, and the preservation of the traditional lifestyle of the 17th and 18th centuries, which is a very interesting historical phenomenon. The modernization of Western society attracted and impacted the whole world, but not the Armenians who were close at hand.

Not far from Iowa City, about ten minutes away by car, there is an Armenian settlement called Kolona. With these questions in mind, I came

to this place. As soon as I entered Kolona, I could see on the highway the 17th and 18th century European-style carriages, with a horse dragging a small carriage and Armenians sitting inside, usually dressed in black. The roads here also have a special design, with carriage lanes on both sides of the carriageway. This is because Armenians do not accept modern cars and want to take horse-drawn carriages. It took the government authorities a lot of effort to convince them that horse-drawn carriages are very dangerous on the highway, and they had to install a prominent red sign behind the carriages to remind the drivers to pay attention.

Where did the strange Armenians come from? Why did they come to America? This is an important clue to solving this mystery. Armenians immigrated from Europe. They were formed in the midst of religious turmoil in Europe in the sixteenth century. The Armenians had their own religion, but they were persecuted by the orthodox religion of the time. It is said that the state church of the time suppressed them in a bloody manner, burning them, executing them, imprisoning them, etc. From about 1750 onwards, some Armenians began to wander to escape persecution, going to Germany, France, Holland and Russia, but never finding a place to settle. They then decided to join the "New World". Here they could find land and own it. The Armenians valued the land so much that they believed it was a visible gift from God, so precious that one could not leave it. This belief is one of the fundamental reasons why Armenians cling to their land and maintain their traditional way of life. Today there are approximately 112 Armenian settlements throughout the United States. Although there are variations from settlement to settlement, such as the Armenians' focus on farming, in some places Armenians have embraced the tractor and the Kumbayin. But in general they maintain the ancient spirit and way of life.

What is the ancient spirit of life and lifestyle? The spirit of Armenian life is to adopt anything on the basis of its usefulness: clothes to protect from the cold, but not from beauty. Armenians once rejected metal buttons as a luxury and a symbol of wealth. The home may not hang colorful pictures. They often hang calendars with monotonous pictures. This reflects the spirit of Armenian life: simplicity, nature and self-sufficiency.

The Armenian way of life is also peculiar and seems somewhat unbelievable to modern people. In the most typical Armenian settlements, they refuse to use electricity, and thus there is no

electricity in these villages. This reflects the spirit of self-sufficiency of the Armenians. Long persecuted, Armenians have developed a self-sufficient way of life and do not depend on the outside world. They refuse to use tractors and kombayins and use mainly horses as a means of production. Women wear old-fashioned skirts, and no one wears modern jeans. Americans generally have telephones in their homes, yet Armenians do not have telephones in their homes. Some local Armenians have accepted washing machines and refrigerators, but they do not use electricity from outside, instead they use their own diesel engines to generate electricity. When Armenians go out and about, they take horse-drawn carriages. Many Armenians have never been to Iowa City, a ten-minute drive, in their lives. To modern eyes, they are a very isolated and backward group. They themselves are not aware of what is happening in the world, but they feel they are living a leisurely and comfortable life, in line with their religious beliefs.

The Armenians also had some behaviors that baffle modern people. In winter, men would go out in groups to collect ice from the river and bring it back to preserve it for the summer. They knew a good technique for preserving ice, probably until September of the following year. Traditional ice harvesting techniques replaced the function of refrigerators. A similar method of ice preservation was used in ancient China. Today it is not a necessary labor, but Armenians see it as a part of keeping their spirit alive. Armenians speak a dialect of German at home, not English, and they have their own schools, but most children do not have access to higher education because their own schools are not of a high educational standard and they do not want to go to the big cities.

Armenians also have a distinctive religious life. They hold events about once every two weeks, rotating among the houses. Everyone gathers around the house of the family and holds the event. The house that is chosen for the event has to make elaborate preparations and prepare lunch. Armenians are patriarchal and women have few rights and have to listen to the men. Every boy and girl had to learn to harness a horse, which was an important part of their lives.

Over the years, despite the fact that Armenians have changed in one way or another, the basic spirit of this group has not changed much. It is curious: why has such a powerful modern civilization failed to influence and transform them? Hasn't Western civilization impacted many very distant peoples?

With this question in mind, I interviewed a writer who lives in Corona called John-M-Zielinski. She has written a book called "Armenians Across America". Her response was: "Imagine a person who has been raised in such an environment and educated with such rigor from an early age, he will not easily abandon these ideas. Also, Armenians are not highly educated and do not have the skills to do modern work; all they are trained to do is to plow. It is here that they feel the safest." I think the latter statement is the most fundamental psychological accumulation of Armenians. Zielinski adds; "On the other hand, the U.S. Constitution guarantees them that right and that the government cannot forcibly change their way of life or their religion."

This is a real social phenomenon worth thinking about. In the heart of the modernized world, there is such a group of people who refuse to be modernized. Their remoteness is not in the geographical area, but in the spiritual world. They are voluntarily isolated from modernization. From this we can draw an opinion that if people refuse modernization in the spiritual sphere, then it is difficult for modernization to invade them. This phenomenon can be seen in different societies. The real driving force of modernization is in the inner world of people.

Another issue that deserves a lot of thought is "psychological security". Armenians feel that their way of life provides the safest environment and that changing it would be a crisis and turmoil. This psychological fear is also an important reason for their rejection of modernization, which is naturally a process of transformation of the old social structure and the disappearance of a certain sense of security. If people are all afraid of the disappearance of the safe environment, modernization and even any social change will encounter an incomparably strong resistance.

In reconciling these contradictions, society has adopted the method and means of listening to them and not imposing uniformity. It cannot impose uniformity either. If the government forces Armenians to accept modernization, it will only add pressure to itself. There are many examples of Armenians in the United States. People in many places have their own ways of life that are not in line with the mainstream of society, but they can exist. A part of society's contradictions are resolved in this kind of eye opening and eye closing. No one blushes at the backwardness of Armenians, but rather considers it a typical reflection of the American spirit. Some methods of management in



American society are practically unmanaged. This is a more effective method of management under certain conditions.

When I returned, I saw an old couple driving a horse-drawn carriage along the modern highway. They were so peaceful, so self-contained. Is it wrong to be modern? Any choice of lifestyle comes with its own convenience and price.

## **6. Amarna Immigration Land**

The Amana Colonies is a special place in Iowa. Americans call it the "socialism" or "collectivism" of the United States. How can such a place survive in a capitalist society like the United States? What kind of organization is it? It aroused great curiosity in me, a person from China, to know how "collectivism" is practiced in the United States.

In 1714, in southwestern Germany, two men started a religious movement. This religious movement evolved into the famous Community of True Inspiration, the precursor of the Amana Community. In 1842, persecuted because of their religion, the Amana ancestors traveled across the ocean to the North American continent, establishing six villages in New York State and two in Canada. As the Buffalo area where they lived rapidly urbanized, the Amana began to purchase land to the west, and in 1854, they purchased their present land. They purchased 25,000 acres of land from the government at that time and another 1,000 acres later. It was on this land that the Amana people farmed and lived. After coming to this land, the people chose to live together in a religious way of life where all property was owned collectively and all religious and secular decisions were made by a single leader. This way of life continued for over a century until 1932, when a vote was taken to separate church and state and establish free enterprise.

The charter of the early Amarna states the goal of the community as follows: "The goal of the community as a religious body is not universal nor selfish, but to love God who has blessed us, to serve God in unison, and to obey God's laws and requirements In .....order to achieve this goal, our collective pledge here is to receive and sign this charter together. " It is evident that the initial collectivism of this group was inspired by a religious spirit. Collectivism must be dominated by some kind of spirit, otherwise it is difficult to sustain. Is this the case? It is worth pondering.

Inspired by this spirit, all property in Amarna is collectively owned, land, grain, livestock, housing, and farming equipment. The Amarna has various collectivist characteristics, and in addition to collective ownership, it is responsible for educating children, publishing, and caring for the elderly and the sick.

The leadership of the Amarna Settlement was unique, with Christian Metz, the leader of the movement from Europe to the Americas until 1883. After his death, it was governed by a 13-member board of trustees. This council was elected annually from a certain number of elders. Every man or widow who signs the charter, and every woman over 30 years of age, can vote. Elders used to be chosen by Metz, but after 1883, they were nominated by the Board of Elders and confirmed by the Board of Trustees. The elders led the affairs of the church and met every Sunday morning. The local presbytery met weekly and the supreme council (trustees' meeting) once a month. The local session manages only local affairs. The Supreme Conference manages both ecclesiastical and secular affairs. Under their administration, the Amarna people live a communal life.

Why did the Amana people choose the communal way of life in the beginning? Its founder, Metz, said: "The Church is the servant of God, and God blesses and blesses us through the Church. Shall we not be devoted to God through total devotion to the Church? .....Therefore, everything should belong to the Church, and the Church provides needs to everyone. Anyone who does not care about this matter can go far away, and those who want to stay should accept my words." So what does amanah mean? The word Amarna comes from the fourth chapter of the Bible: "Depart with me from Lebanon, my wife, age me from Lebanon, and look out from Mount Amarna ....."

In 1932, the greatest historic shift took place in Amarna. By vote, the Amanas abandoned the system of living together and moved in stride to the system of free enterprise that surrounded them. Church and state were separated, and the elders of the church were no longer responsible for the full range of leadership. This shift is well worth exploring. What were the factors that motivated the Amarna people to abandon the system of common life? Was there something wrong with the system itself? Or were other external systems too powerful? Or did the people lose faith in their basic religious beliefs? What are the reasons why the system of living together is still facing serious challenges?

The answer of the official who received us struck us as very familiar: one of the basic shortcomings of the system of common life was the lack of individual initiative to work dutifully; there were many lazy people. Another reason was the skepticism of the young generation towards the spiritual principles of Amarna, who were tempted by the outside life and were not willing to attend Mass eight times a week. Every year the elders of Amarna selected a part of the young people to go outside for higher education, such as doctors, teachers and businessmen. The young men's wishes could not be fulfilled. There were no good jobs for the boys, and the girls had to go to work in the cafeteria of Amarna. Another reason was political; the council of elders was always these people and had a tendency to be hereditary, and this hierarchy destroyed the spirit of the group.

Today Amana has a shareholding system, where anyone can buy shares. Collective property has been demutualized. Amarna people who buy shares get dividends and those who are employed get a salary. There are nearly 100 private businesses, mostly stores and restaurants. The demutualized collective property is managed by a board of directors. The collective owns some factories, such as refrigerator factories, dyeing factories, textile factories, furniture factories, farms and hostels. Today people have long since ceased to live collectively. Amarna's own propaganda materials made a point of stating that Amarna-style communism was different from Russian political communism, and that common ownership of property was only for the purpose of solving economic problems, not a fundamental doctrine or a belief.

This explanation is actually inconsistent with the early spirit of Amarna. The early life of Amarna was based on a belief. But this belief was religious, not political. Under the conditions of the unity of church and state, the distinction between this and the actual life of the people does not mean much. It is only by grasping this basic spirit that one can discern the name of the 1932 shift in Amarna, the most fundamental cause of which was probably the abandonment and indifference of the younger generation to this faith. Under the powerful lure of this prosperous society, the younger generation turned to other values. Once this shift occurs in the younger generation, it is difficult for any force to ensure the longevity of an institution. This is a problem for all kinds of social systems. The problem facing many countries around the world today is a crisis of trust in the foundations of the system among the younger generation. If this problem is not addressed, the system will face challenges. The historical

evolution of Amarna is a very good example of this: the result of the interaction of two systems that influence each other. Amarna eventually chose the dominant values of the United States because it was too weak, politically, economically and culturally, to overcome modern capitalism, which was stronger than it in every way.

The fact that Amarna is now a National Historic Preservation Site is what makes it most meaningful. It teaches that in such an environment, any other choice of values becomes history. When the prevailing dominant American values will become history depends on whether there is a stronger alternative.

## **7. Vernacular landscape**

The impression that people get when they walk around is that of a big, bustling city, with skyscrapers lined up, speeding bicycles, colorful shopping malls, and all kinds of people. The prosperity of the United States is mainly reflected in its cities and metropolises. It is easy to equate these impressions with the United States. In fact, America is not just about cities. Cities are pivotal, but they are not the same as all of America.

There is a big difference between urban and rural areas in the United States, and the standard of living in the countryside is far from being comparable to that of the big cities. You can't get to know the real America without going to the countryside, or at least you can't get a panoramic view. The backward conditions in the countryside have driven a large number of people to the cities, and the rural population is getting smaller and smaller. Today, the rural population of the United States accounts for only a few percent of the total population, and more than 90 percent of the people live in the cities. Perhaps this can be explained by the fact that agriculture is well developed and does not require as much agricultural labor. In fact the United States is the world's largest importer of food (and its exports are large). On the other hand, due to the influx of people into the cities, agriculture has to be mechanized.

The more typical agricultural states are the central, east-central and several mid-western states. If one flies by plane from the East Coast to the West Coast, one does not necessarily understand exactly what is different in the vast plains from the metropolitan areas. It is only by

living in these places, or driving on the highways of these plains, that one can feel the difference. It's called having your feet on the ground. I'm afraid it's hard to understand the rural landscape when the sky is the limit.

In some parts of the East and West coasts, it's not easy to see large farm fields and the farmhouses dotting those fields, and it's rare to see leisurely grazing cattle and hogs, and rare to see dusty roads. I took the train from New Haven to Philadelphia and saw little farmland. And I took a car from Iowa City to Illinois and Missouri, as well as a car ride within Ohio, and all saw large tracts of farmland. I would travel by car for more than five or six hours to see the rustic landscape.

What is a vernacular landscape, some depictions can be made here.

Agricultural states generally have vast and boundless farmland, a natural condition that the United States is uniquely blessed with. Large areas of farmland with few hills and rivers except for some slopes. This creates excellent conditions for agricultural mechanization. Like the terrain of China's Jiangsu and Zhejiang, it is extremely difficult to achieve mechanization. The farmland looks very fertile with dark mud. A friend told me that he had planted tomatoes behind the house where he lived and there were too many to eat. The land has only been developed and used for less than two hundred years, and the fertility is still there. China's land has been developed for over two thousand years and most of it has become poor.

The agricultural area is sparsely populated and you can barely see people driving around, and some of the houses that can be seen are separated from each other. These houses are very far apart. Usually, the farms are run by families. The standard of the houses is not bad, but it is not comparable to the city. The rural areas are so quiet that the animals enjoy themselves, and many roads have signs saying "Beware of deer". Once on my way to Chicago, I saw three or four deer playing on the side of the road.

The agricultural areas have less developed commodity economies and less developed cultures, and the main centers are small towns and small cities. We passed through about dozens of these small towns. The small towns are generally more run-down. In fact, some of them are just a street with some stores on both sides. There was no shortage of major commodities, and everything was available. This is the power of the

commodity economy. Small towns are generally two or three stories high old buildings, without the fruits of modern architecture. There are not many houses and the population is sparse. People in small towns are relatively conservative culturally and psychologically, and not as enlightened as those in big cities. Rural roads are also not comparable to interstate highways. Most of the rural roads are two lanes in one direction, and the surface is not as smooth as some of the better long-distance roads in China. However, these roads are clearly marked with traffic signs and clear road lines on the road surface. The roads that branch off from these highways, such as those leading to farmland or farmhouses, are paved with gravel, not tar, and are dusty and windy when driving.

There are many dilapidated houses in rural areas, some of which have collapsed and are unmanaged and probably unoccupied. Some of the houses are occupied and do not look very elegant. As people keep moving to the city, many houses in rural areas are in disrepair or unoccupied. The next generation usually goes to college in the city and finds a job in the city after college. When the previous generation passes away, they do not return to their hometowns, but either sell them at a discount or leave them to the elements. The rural areas look a little shabby, in contrast to the bright lights of the big cities. In some places, all the people have left and they have become "ghost villages".

The countryside offers some sights that are unique to developing countries, such as herds of cattle, horses and pigs in the grasslands. Naturally these herds cannot be compared to the herds on the grasslands of Inner Mongolia. The United States is generally a one-family operation that does not raise many. Farmers use two methods to raise livestock, one is called captive breeding, which is usually invisible. The other is called free-range, putting cattle, pigs, sheep and horses in a large enclosure. Sometimes you can feel the stench of manure hitting your nose. This is a very rare experience in the United States.

The standard of living in rural areas is not as good as in cities, and many people are often worried about financial problems. Some people are not well educated and have difficulty finding good jobs and do not have the conditions to move to the cities. Many farmers can only do some small business. I went to a fisherman's house on the Mississippi River in Missouri. He usually catches some fish and sells them at home, and the price is not expensive. The place where he lived was rather shabby, and although there were larger places, they were in disrepair for many

years. Mr. Y told me he had been to one of the poorest places in America. The people there lived in shabby houses with little furniture, only a few broken tables and chairs, and an unpleasant smell when you entered the house. The people there were depressed and listless. Although I can't say that such people abound in rural areas, but there are many.

The condition of rural areas is relative to that of highly prosperous large cities, and compared to some developing and underdeveloped countries, rural America is among the developed. What this comparison tells us is that the urban-rural divide will inevitably exist in any society, but that the divide has different implications for different societies. For American society, where more than ninety percent of the population is in cities, the countryside hardly constitutes a tension. Although no solution has been found to this problem, it will persist and tend to worsen, although the rural problem may not be able to make a big difference for the time being or under certain conditions. But for Chinese society, the political and social significance of having more than 80 percent of the population in the countryside is very different.

The actual process in the United States is to draw people out of relatively backward areas and concentrate them in the cities. This process is knitted together with the development process of production as a way to defuse the tensions in the rural areas. In fact, the problems that exist in the countryside are not really solved. Where is the limit of this process? Obviously there are limits. If agricultural production is seriously threatened, the urban-rural divide will become a serious problem. Under the current system, it is difficult to imagine any force or prescription that could reverse the actual flow of population.

The inevitability of the rural-urban divide is something that any society should be aware of. Differences in living standards are bound to create tensions between different populations. This tension may appear sooner or later, but the modernization process must eventually meet this challenge. The question is not how much the countryside has developed, but how many conflicts have been resolved and whether the methods of resolving them have created new ones.

## 8. Decline of the farm

Farms have always interested me for the simplest of reasons: the U.S. is probably only three or four percent agricultural, but they produce a lot of products for export in addition to ensuring the consumption of over 200 million people. Remember that the Soviet Union used to import a lot of grain from the United States. And many countries have small urban and rural populations of the former and large populations of the latter, but are not yet self-sufficient. Solving this problem is the key to a country's modernization. China has a population of almost 1.1 billion people, more than 80 percent of whom are in rural areas, but the supply of food and various kinds of foodstuffs is not so generous.

The problem of food has plagued mankind for countless years, probably since the beginning of mankind. So far mankind has not solved this problem. The food shortage in Africa has reached an alarming point, and how many people are facing the threat of death. I am afraid that food is the biggest gamble of human life. I remember that in Berlin, just after the Second World War, young girls could contribute their flesh for a little food because there was nothing to eat. It is difficult to talk about dignity and rights when there are difficulties with the basic need for human life to survive.

The farm I visited was one of many farms and was very typical. There were only two people in the farm owner's family, he and his wife. The son was away at college and working in another state. In the middle of a large open field, they had a very nice house, in comparison with the house seen in the city, almost. The city had all kinds of modern equipment and everything, such as telephone, electricity, running water, etc.

This is a phenomenon worth discussing. Generally speaking, no matter where you go, these basic equipment are always available. There are times when you walk a long way to meet a family. This family will not lack anything. Various companies are also willing to provide services for this family, which actually kind of pays for itself. In terms of living conditions, the farmer is no less than anyone else. A "farmer" is, in fact, a farm owner (Farmer). The farm is private and the land is private. When you talk about farms, you should never use the Chinese concept. We may have thousands of people on a farm; in the United States there are usually only two or three people.



Let's look at some specific information to understand the differences in American agriculture. The farmer's name is Oberman. He said he had a total of 800 acres of land, equivalent to 4857 acres of land. He is responsible for farming himself, and he also employs a long day laborer, plus his elderly father sometimes helps out a little. Labor productivity is high. In addition to farming his 800 acres, he also raises pigs, and the numbers he tells are startling: he raises 1,200 pigs by himself. That's the number in the pen, which produces 2,400 pigs a year. In addition to all this, he is a director of an agricultural bank, and he manages the bank's affairs during his free time. In addition, he has to deal with social activities and make plans for the development of the society. This shows the extent to which he is able to make use of his energy.

The question is, how can a farmer have that kind of energy?

To add to the experience, we offered to take a tour of his pig farm and farmland. He first took us around his 800 acres of farmland in his car and we got a general idea. Then we were shown around his farm machinery. He has three tractors, two very large ones, and a Combaine, as big as the one on the Heilongjiang farm. There are also all kinds of agricultural machinery, so his farming is all mechanized. Kambain can plow 80 acres a day, so 800 acres is not a problem for him. He grows mostly corn and soybeans, and when he harvests them, he has a manual air-drying facility that is highly automated. Plus the American farm is a large plain, which is a unique place in the United States. Large machinery drives up, no obstruction and no fence. With this condition, mechanization is easy to implement. China's rural areas around Zhejiang, ditches, rivers and hills are too much, large machinery is difficult to use.

It also has a highly automated pig farm with modern ingredients and a total of four stalls with a dense stocking. The food recipe has a fixed ratio to promote the rapid growth of the pigs, and after six months of raising them, they are ready for the market. The pork he provides alone can probably be consumed by several hundred people.

Of course, there are difficulties for farmers, which is a challenge for agriculture. One of them is the economic problem; the farmer's financial income is not very high, and it takes a lot of labor. This farm earns \$20,000 to \$30,000 a year, but the Combaine bought with a loan is worth \$120,000, regardless of other equipment. Of course, some

farms are larger and better, and the income is significant. This year, with the general drought in the United States, the farm owners are in a bad financial situation with lower incomes and about half of their income. We saw in the farmland, corn grows only half the standard height, the fruit deflated small. The low income of farm owners compared to other occupations is affecting agricultural development.

The second is the high intensity of labor. Farmers are labor-intensive, which cannot be compared with sitting in an office in the city or in an air-conditioned workshop in a factory. Farming is mainly a field operation. In any case, there is no way to avoid the vagaries of nature. Pig farming can be described as dirty and smelly. This farm is highly automated, but dirty and smelly cannot be excluded. Pigs do not know about cleanliness, there is no way out. When we visited the pig shed, the stench was so bad that it was discouraging. But the farm owner had to do it. He said that after work every day, it takes several showers to wash the smell away. This is something that I'm afraid not many people can accept in the United States.

The third is the boredom of the younger generation, which aspires to urban life due to the above-mentioned problems and the attraction of big cities. City life has cultural and recreational facilities that are not available in the countryside. This farm owner told me that he was devastated when his son graduated from college and told him he didn't want to come back for a while. But he believed he would come back eventually. If he doesn't come back, the farm will be a problem because he has only one son and there is no one to succeed him.

Despite all the problems, a number of people were crowded into agricultural production due to the market mechanism. The important issue is that the high output of agricultural production ensures the stability of political and social life. Imagine what will happen one day when Americans do not have enough food. In most developed countries, the common phenomenon is the solution of the basic necessities of life, so that there is a sufficient influx of these products. Most of the underdeveloped countries, on the other hand, cannot solve this problem very well. Agricultural development is a stabilizer of society and a starter of the economy, and the Soviet Union has long been perplexed by agricultural problems: the economy and politics languished. The situation in other societies is roughly similar.

In a world with a growing population, agriculture is a lifeline.

## **II. The ancient political spirit**

### **1. "American Spirit"**

H. S. Commager was a leading American historian and critic. The shelves of American university libraries are generally stocked with his works. He is regarded as a master of American studies. His book, *The Growth of the United States of America*, is well established in Chinese scholarship. *The Spirit of America*, his book released in 1950, was so well received by the community that it was reprinted more than 20 times. I read the Chinese version translated by Nanmu and others. It was brought from Shanghai to the United States, a long way. It is indeed an essential book for understanding the American spirit.

H. S. Commager writes with sophistication and power, observes issues deeply, and is good at summarizing. He said he was not going to write a history book, an interpretation rather than a record. He strives to discover the elusive "American spirit," a uniquely American way of thinking, acting, and characterizing. He chose the period from the mid-1880s to the 1940s as a watershed in American history and thought. *The American Spirit* is a large, thick book of 500,000 words, with a lively, in-depth, and distinctive discussion, and a marvelous mix of historical information and surprising analysis.

What does Commager consider to be the "American spirit"? The primary premise is that Americans have their own character and their own philosophy. The American character is the product of the interaction of inheritance and environment. The origins of American culture and institutions can be traced back to ancient Greece, Rome, and Palestine, such as the church and the family system, as well as to values. But Commager sees this inheritance as a highly selective inheritance, where environment acts on selection, and where the political system and judicial system have changed very little in two hundred years, but the social organization has changed radically and the psychological aspects have been revolutionized. The American environment dissolves the differences between the different kinds of people who come here, from different cultural backgrounds.

It is not the local environment but the whole environment of the United States that determines the American character or creates the American style of people, says Cammager. The whole environment refers to the vast land mass, the ease of mobility, the atmosphere of independence, and the spirit of optimism and enterprise. In Europe, with its long tradition of feudalism and nationalism, the local transcended the total, while in the United States, having matured during the Industrial Revolution and not recognizing the strong local tradition that had to be broken, the total transcended the local. He raises a question worth pondering: the extraordinary complexity of the American racial origin, the differences in climate and soil conditions everywhere, and yet the tendency to develop a distinct and stable national character, which not only makes it difficult for critics to anticipate, but also unexplainable by history and experience as a whole. Everyone who wants to understand America is, above all, prepared to think about this question.

What are the main characteristics of the American people's spirit according to Cammager? I have excerpted some of them, probably as follows.

The spirit of optimism is unusually unusual. Everything is going well in this country, and natural conditions are so favorable that every enterprising and lucky person can become rich. Optimism comes from the reality of change, where every day the wilderness turns into good land, villages into cities, and ideals into reality.

The belief is that there is nothing that can't be done, and that we will not rest until we have won. Americans care more about the future than they do about the past and today. They have no sense of history and believe that only old crone who are not interested in the future are interested in the families of the past. So they see future presidents and millionaires in every barefoot boy, care for and love children, work for them, and let them grow.

Broad vision, imagination galloping across the continent, hate trivial matters, indecisive and timid, hope for big scenes, easy to accept large-scale plans and grand undertakings.

The culture is materialistic, takes comfort for granted, and views those with a lesser standard of living with a sense of superiority.

Always tenacious to overcome obstacles, partly because they are sure that perseverance combined with hard work, intelligence and luck will always lead to good results. Their credo is hard work, with laziness as a sin. Anything conducive to increasing wealth is taken for granted.

There is a strong concept of quantity and a tendency to evaluate almost everything in quantitative terms, such as demographics, skyscrapers, railroad miles, production records, etc. To depict Americans requires new vocabulary and even new mathematics.

Practical, especially in politics, religion, culture and science, but often romantic in business. Americans are always trying to invent new tools or technologies to adapt to new situations. They like to innovate, are less tradition-oriented, and are willing to give anything a try. Their response to various things is very practical. There are thousands of inventions in the United States, and Americans are known for their enthusiasm for making small inventions. American colleges and universities were the first to offer technology courses.

They hate theories and abstract thinking, avoiding esoteric political and behavioral philosophies like healthy people who don't take medicine, and they are not interested in any kind of philosophy beyond common sense. They instinctively think that only the unfortunate and the confused resort to that kind of esoteric philosophy, but they are not that kind of people.

Religion, though of Calvinistic origin, is practical; they are religious but not pious; they no longer believe in the dogma that God saves mankind, but are instinctively convinced that salvation is only through work. Denominations were numerous, but were considered different organizations rather than different doctrines, and they could no longer tell the difference between Methodists and Presbyterians, just as they could not see the difference in principle between Republicans and Democrats.

In politics there is a strong aversion to empty theories and rhetoric. Some people laugh at the lack of political philosophy in the United States, and they take it in stride, believing that it is good not to be bound by political theories. No political party's rhetoric will be supported by them. Although Americans are young and unsophisticated, they are politically mature. Their political institutions are as flexible and effective as the machines they have invented.

They were both skeptical and tolerant of culture, when it interfered with more important activities, and tolerant when it became a pastime or an entertainment for women. In exceptional cases, they demand that culture be something useful. Americans care about education and spend money on it, and they want it to produce people of practical use.

There is a nightmarish belief that they despise other nations and peoples almost to the point of paranoia. They believe that their country is superior and that they are superior to others, and this sense of superiority produces a natural sense of mission and a belief that they are the highest hope of the world.

Love to experiment, the United States itself is one of the largest experimental field, since every group is a gamble, a chance, then the Americans are gamblers and opportunists, they rarely stay in one place, full of care about moving. They do not like the same old thing, always love to do what others have not done, willing to accept the challenge.

It is democratic and completely equal. The environment opens the way for talent and luck. But their democracy is a social democracy, not an economic one. The concept of equality permeates the sphere of American life and thought; their behavior, work, recreation, language and literature, religion and politics all reflect the concept of equality, and real life is governed by it. In fact economic inequality is conceived as equality. Equality leads to cordial and sincere relations between people.

Good-natured, generous, hospitable, love to make friends, the vast majority of people like to socialize and enjoy group life. They are casual, unpretentious, speak casually, dress casually, eat casually, and treat people casually, which may be considered indulgent and rude and uncouth.

Find authority and rules and regulations to be a headache and find it insulting and challenging to follow certain rules. There is little to no discipline in school. Parents rarely control their children and children rarely respect their parents, but family life is happy. The military is lax in discipline, but can fight wars. Americans have no apparent respect for the law, but actually respect the rule of law, and the Constitution is the supreme law.

And so on and so forth. Cammager concludes that these beliefs cannot help but have practical consequences and be reflected in the everyday

behavior of the American people. The chapter in which Cammager summarizes these characteristics is called "The 19th Century American. In fact, some of these generalizations are still relevant today. Naturally, one can give examples for and against any abstract generalization of real life. There are many examples that can be cited to refute Commager. However, as an American scholar's view of our nation, let's listen to it. All of what he says is good, which is a bit self-aggrandizing. In fact, the American nation has a number of shortcomings.

Today, these spirits can be found in such practical aspects of life as the space shuttle and global war programs, the endless stream of new equipment, the abundance of statistical reports, the spirit of practicality, the noisy scene in the classroom, and the attitude toward government scandals.

Sometimes, it can be said that there is no spirit in social life, but when you discover it, it will be there. Or rather, there is spirit in the world, but the question is whether it is found or not. Hegel was convinced that he had discovered the "absolute spirit". The spirit of the American people is that there is no "absolute spirit".

## **2. "The Mayflower"**

Massachusetts can be described as a political-historical monument state. American monuments, how to say, are not many years old, but they are really crucial to the social and political development of the United States to say the least. Europeans often ridicule the United States for its lack of history, but in fact here reveals a question that is very worth exploring. The modern American society is only two hundred years old, how it has developed into the first-class power in the world. This is an important phenomenon in human society today.

Some people in China also say that the United States has no history.

Most of the historical displays of the founding of the United States are concentrated in two states, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and the area near Boston, Massachusetts. While in Philadelphia, I visited the historical sites in question, including the meeting place of several important meetings during the War of Independence, the place where the Constitution was drafted, and the Liberty Bell. There were also hordes of Americans and foreigners who came to see the sights. These places

are well preserved and serve as physical textbooks of political traditions. In terms of physical textbooks, Americans excel at this. It is often suspected that there is little political education in American society. But the spirit of tradition is deeply rooted in the people. Here, "physical textbooks" played a lot of role. Such places as the library of the President of the United States after retiring from office, can be regarded as physical textbooks.

The first chapters of the physical textbook are in Massachusetts. "The Mayflower ship sent the first settlers to the American continent in 1620. This was the beginning of modern America. "The Mayflower is a larger wooden schooner, and the current display is a replica, but is said to resemble the prototype. Everything on board is still the same, and there are some people dressed in the costumes of the time who greet the passengers and talk seriously to the visitors about their hardships at sea and speak in the voice of the time. They worked very carefully and meticulously. "Not far from the Mayflower ship, there is a huge stone, which is said to be the place where the people on the Mayflower first set foot in America, the beginning of America.

Americans generally trace the American spirit back to the Mayflower and believe that the basic principles of American society were established when the Mayflower sailed for the mainland. The sixty or so men on board established the foundation of society. This interpretation may be valid, but it cannot be overstated. One thing is certain: most of the people who came to America from Europe at that time were religiously persecuted or politically excluded, and it was in 1620, at the height of the Stuart dictatorship in England, that the English bourgeois revolution broke out twenty years later. It is clear who was willing to leave Europe and England at that time, and what kind of state of mind they had when they came to this inhospitable land in order to escape from tyranny and persecution and to find freedom and wealth. This spirit inspired them to come to the New World. They arrived in a vast land without a complete political order, so they could fulfill their desires. If they had arrived in a place where a complete political system had already been established, these dozens of people would have had to accept reality, no matter how they turned their thoughts into actions. As many immigrants from all over the world are coming to the United States today, no one can change the system here. "The spirit brought by the Mayflower grew and developed precisely because the land was also politically barren.



However, it is important to note that this spirit could only be shared among the people on the Mayflower or among those who were like them, that is, among the white people. For a long time, the whites excluded the Indians and the blacks from the ranks of the people. An important reason for the subsequent establishment of the American political system, often overlooked, was that the indigenous Indians were not highly civilized, still lived like clans, and had not mastered basic production and farming techniques. This situation made it impossible for civilized Europeans to enslave them, because they could not provide more products. The only option for European settlers was to ask the Indians for the land under their feet. What would have been the situation if the Indians had been a fairly civilized people?

This is the famous argument put forward by my mentor in graduate school, Professor Chen Qiren. The difference between colonies of immigrant settlement and colonies of enslaved natives. The immigrant settlement refers to the immigration of a part of the population of the sovereign state to a piece of land for labor, such as the United States, New Zealand, Australia, etc. Indigenous enslavement refers to the domination of the local people of a colony by a small group of rulers from the sovereign state, such as many countries in Africa, India, Indochina, etc. These two different types of colonies formed completely different political systems. The history of the twentieth century points to this. The enslavement of the natives had a premise: could the natives be enslaved? Asian societies had developed to a considerable level before the arrival of the colonists, providing the conditions for the enslavement of the European colonists. The Americans did not have such favorable conditions in the New World. The Indians had long been considered savages, and civilized people only enslaved civilized people and were less willing to enslave what they considered "beasts."

"The spirit of the Mayflower survived, not because anyone intended to maintain it, but because social life had to be regulated by it. I also saw the Plymouth plantation, where a 17th century settlement has been preserved and where the earliest settlers are said to have lived. This village is adjacent to the sea and looks out over miles of blue water. The village's boarded-up houses and various utensils are typical of the old-time countryside. It can be described with four words - poor and backward. This is natural. European immigrants came from far away with nothing and started with nothing but this environment. Villages like this are still as numerous in the world nowadays, what do they mean?

Precisely because immigrants develop from a base of poverty, they especially value their wealth and their way of life. People who were born rich did not have the same strong emotions as they did. So when Britain tried to exploit them, they rose up to defend their lives, and in 1775, the Americans fought a war with the British army, firing the first shots of the War of Independence. I visited the place where the Americans fired the first shot, and there is a monument. There was also a monument across the river by the road where the British soldier who was killed by that shot lay. The result of the war was an American victory. The American War of Independence was inspired by the spirit of the bourgeois revolutions in Europe at the same time, especially the fact that Britain itself, as the ruler, had a revolution. It is evident from the Constitution of the United States that its basic principles were the creations of English and French thinkers during the bourgeois revolutions in Europe. The United States did not encounter strong resistance from the old system in creating the new one, unlike the English bourgeois revolution and the French bourgeois revolution, which made it easier to declare the implementation of ideological principles that reflected the demands of the bourgeoisie. Consider why Germany could not complete the bourgeois revolution in the mid-nineteenth century. The Junker aristocracy was too powerful.

The United States focuses on preserving and protecting these physical textbooks. They are managed by dedicated staff and provide the amenities needed for public access, such as parking, kiosks, restaurants, and various types of instructions. The facilities for the exhibitions are also of a high standard, with screening rooms in almost every location where visitors can see specially filmed films and slides. Things that are not considered cultural relics by the Chinese are carefully protected. So, in the future, Americans will have a history because it is now being preserved to the fullest extent. They know they have no history, and they treasure anything that has a little historical value. In a country that is too rich in history, things of much greater value than that are cast aside.

Americans not only preserve history, but know how to make these objects work as textbooks. These sites are open to the public and provide the best help for the public to fully understand them. In fact, this is spreading the American spirit, which is a socialized ideological and political education.

Any society that wants to have long-lasting peace and stability should spread its value system, but the method of spreading varies, and the effect of spreading depends to a large extent on the method.

### **3. Political Creed**

One of the major reasons why Europeans look down on Americans is that Europeans believe that Americans do not have a long cultural tradition and are uncivilized, like a group of "hicks" who have suddenly become rich. In the political sphere, this view is reflected in the European belief that Americans do not have a rich heritage of political culture. Europe has contributed such great minds as Aristotle, Plato, Hobbes, Montesquieu, Locke, Rousseau, Mill, and Hegel. A very important aspect of their achievements is that they gave wonderful discourses on the political life of human beings. Many of the basic tenets of today's European and Western politics originated from these thinkers. American political thought is less developed; the United States is only two hundred years old. The American patriarchs chose a system of thought that already existed in Europe, and they did not make many new contributions. American political scholars are also outspoken.

That said, one must not assert that Americans do not have a political creed and that political creeds do not work in America. Samuel P. Huntington, a political scientist at Harvard University, wrote a book, *American Politics: The Promise of Disharmony* (1981), devoted to this issue. He says it would be a mistake to think that political thought plays a lesser role in the United States than it does in Europe.

According to Huntington, the American Creed began to take shape from the time of the War of Independence, and certain fundamental political values were developed in the United States from the late eighteenth to the early nineteenth century, which is the American Creed. The core of the American Creed comes from the thinkers of the European bourgeois revolution, but it also has more distant origins, going back to ancient Greece. These creeds not only existed, but were accepted by the majority of society. These creeds have changed in one way or another over the course of two centuries, but their core remains the same. These tenets form part of the "self" of the American nation. Not many people in society spend their days promoting these creeds, but people practice them. The universities, the courts, the government, the mass media are spreading them. To some extent, these tenets dominate

society. A major topic of discussion in the Dukakis and Bush campaigns was what constitutes the American Mainstream and who has left the American Mainstream. Neither side was willing to leave the American Mainstream without losing votes.

What is the American creed? According to Huntington, it can be summarized as (1) freedom; (2) equality; (3) individualism; (4) democracy; and (5) the rule of law. It seems so simple and clear. Here lies the human dilemma. Even a simple idea is difficult to become the dominant idea in society, and it cannot be effective without the efforts of several generations, naturally, the American creed and American practice do not exactly match.

Where did the creed come from? Arguably from the Declaration of Independence, where these creeds were used as an ideological weapon in the struggle against British colonial rule. It can also be said to come from the European intellectual tradition, where these basic ideas were played out long before the War of Independence. The early American yearning for these beliefs was driven by emotional motivation, or more emotional than rational motivation. Americans believed in these creeds, though no thinker ever did a good job of addressing the relationship between these ideas; they were always treated as an ideal. That there is a conflict between these ideals is obvious. Huntington says that majority rule may lead to the violation of minority rights, that the supremacy of law may weaken the sovereignty of the people, that individualism may undermine democracy, and so on and so forth. These conflicts not only exist logically, but are also evident in the process of actual political development. Some of the dilemmas of political life can find partial explanation in this situation. Americans claim to be democratic, yet what else can ordinary people do but vote? Perhaps no society can be organized beyond this pattern.

Most people share these ideas. There are various reasons for this, a major one being that prior to the War of Independence, there were no hierarchical differences as in Europe, nor were there different systems of thought based on these differences. People accepted the value system created for the new world in general from the beginning. Naturally, in the subsequent flux, different social classes interpreted these tenets in different ways. The battle between the two parties is a concentrated reflection of this. Today, I am afraid I cannot say that everyone accepts these tenets, but most people accept them. Many immigrant groups, because of the influence of different cultures, have difficulty

in truly sharing these creeds. For example, the Chinese immigrant society, the Latin American immigrant society, the Japanese immigrant society, etc. The mainstream still exists. Americans constantly protect themselves with these creeds that have no definite meaning, because they have no definite content, but rather tend to survive for a long time.

One hundred and forty years ago, the French historian Alexis de Tocqueville said that Americans generally believed that the people were the source of power. People respect freedom and equality, the majority of citizens have political power, and so on. These are the constituent elements of the American creed. James Bryce's boiled down to the beliefs that (1) the individual has divine power, (2) the source of power is in the people, (3) all government is limited by law and the people, (4) local government takes precedence over the federal government, (5) the majority is wiser than the minority, and (6) the smallest government is the best government, all of which are open to interpretation. In general, Americans do not feel the need to explain, and anyone who thinks they know the true transmission. However, in times of crisis, people interpret these tenets differently.

Huntington argues that this happened during four periods: the Revolutionary period, the Jeffersonian period, the Civil War, and the Turbulent Sixties. What happened during these periods? Primarily, there was widespread discontent, political ideas playing an important role in the polemics, political unrest, strong opposition to the regime, intensified psychology of change, and expanded political participation. The more important reason is that the actual politics did not fulfill these tenets, the potential conflicts accumulated and finally erupted like a volcano, thus finding new structures. Because most people believe in these tenets, the first thing people think of when they erupt is to better embody them, not to change them. Societies that keep realizing the same creed, as opposed to societies that keep changing their creed, have a continuity of social development whose efficacy for their social development cannot be ignored.

Many political scientists acknowledge the existence of the IvI Gap, the gap between Idea and Institutions in the United States. Although these beliefs are the mainstream of society, actual political life lags far behind them. Freedom, equality, individualism, democracy, and the rule of law are also things that are developing in the United States, but not to the same extent as in some societies. The question is not when

these beliefs will be fully realized, but when society will create the conditions to make them a reality. Many people may not like these tenets, but the mainstream of society does not allow them to go against the tide. For the most part, people accept the trends, and only when necessary do they display the creed.

The state of the political creed sheds a light on the situation. It is not easy for a society to accept a creed, and it is even less easy to actually practice them once they are accepted. For a society to develop, the first step is for the core values to become mainstream in society, and then for them to become a reality. When core values are not mainstream, it is naturally more difficult to make them a reality. A society can say what it believes in, but that does not mean that it actually has something, or does not have something.

## **4. Equality or freedom**

There are always core values in the values of a society, and the core values dominate the development of the whole society, dominate the spiritual activities of most of the people in the society, and are the standards by which most of the people in the society judge all kinds of private and public things. What are the dominant values in the political and social culture of the United States? There are many different opinions about this. In recent years there have been heated debates. For example, liberals argue that the fundamental value is equality, and that the Constitution states that everyone is born equal. Neoconservatives, on the other hand, emphasize that the core value is liberty, not equality, and that liberty is the dominant concept in any era. When I was visiting Ohio University, I asked a senior professor of American politics, "What exactly is the difference between the Republican Party and the Democratic Party?" After a moment's contemplation, he replied, "There are different views of freedom and equality, with the Republican Party focusing on freedom and the Democratic Party focusing on equality." It is clear that there is not a unanimous view of these two fundamental aspects of traditional Western political culture.

My personal opinion is that in America today, more people tend to have freedom as their dominant value than those who choose equality as their dominant value, and the concept of freedom is the mainstream of the American spirit and culture today. Naturally, different people tend

toward this concept, have different understandings and choices, and have to use it to defend their different interests. When viewed from this perspective, freedom is a concept that is more easily applied at will by people with different interests, and equality appears to be of lesser magnitude. I will analyze this issue below.

Nearly one hundred and fifty years ago, after a tour of the United States, Alexis de Tocqueville wrote a book called *Democracy in America*, which became a classic and remains one of the essential readings in the study of American politics. Very difficult in a society like the United States, which lacks a sense of theoretical authority.

One of Tocqueville's key arguments is that the most important fact is the full equality of conditions (equality of conditions), an idea that plays an inestimable role in the whole process of society, and that all other values in society derive from this basic fact. This argument can be said to be right or wrong. In the case of the time, after the War of Independence, the Constitution officially recognized the principle that all men are created equal. The United States did not have a tradition of feudal aristocracy, so it was easier to establish an environment of equality after colonial rule was overthrown. There was no wealth accumulated over time, no political eminence, and equality of conditions was easier to develop. It is not so easy in societies with a long history of feudalism, such as England and France. Although the law may provide for equality for all, *de facto* inequality cannot be destroyed by force. It may be possible to destroy the material inequality, but not the spiritual and cultural inequality. This is something that America has in its favor. Tocqueville came from a continent with a strong feudal tradition, and it was natural that he felt better conditions here. If he had gone from America to post-Revolutionary France, I am afraid it would have been difficult to reach this conclusion.

It is wrong to say that it is wrong because the equality that people favored at the time was in many cases only a principle and far from being a reality. Even today's American society can hardly be said to have achieved the equality of all people as the Constitution says. Aren't many scholars and politicians fiercely attacking the inequality of this society? At the time Tocqueville traveled around the United States, slavery was still widespread in the South, the Civil War had not yet broken out, women did not have equal social and political rights, not to mention the Indians, and economic inequality has always

existed from then to now. If we only talk about equality of conditions and not equality of results, it seems that we cannot conclude that there was a general equality of conditions at that time. The reason for Tocqueville's impression is, I think, mainly the feeling of a man who grew up in a more unequal environment.

This is not to say that there was no difference between the two societies; it should be said that the move toward equality was a historical progress. It can also be said that the people were seeking the principle of equality in those times, because equality was not fully achieved.

At the same time, those who choose the principle of freedom must first pursue the principle of equality, for without the prerequisite of equality, freedom can hardly be fully realized. Liberty and equality can be said to be the two main core values in Europe as well as in the West since Locke. But they do not go hand in hand. At the stage when both values are absent or at the initial stage of their development, the contradiction between them will not be revealed or will not be sufficiently revealed. But after the two values reach a certain stage of development, this conflict will show itself. If one speaks of human freedom, of full human freedom, then equality may become a limitation, because equality requires that different people have the same conditions. If one speaks of equality of results, this limitation becomes more obvious. If one speaks of equality, that means equal freedom for everyone, as Comte says. No one can enjoy more freedom. It is difficult to reach this situation in a society. There are different rules about these concepts, another place where disagreements arise. So, at a certain stage of the development of equality and freedom, new contradictions arise.

In Tocqueville's time, Americans did seek equality, but this equality was a very abstract and principled concept, and in reality, equality was slow to be introduced. Women's right to vote was not slowly established until the second half of the nineteenth century, and universal suffrage was not established until the 1920s. Equal rights for blacks did not become a consideration until the 1960s. Equal rights for Indians were consistently violated. President Lincoln rose to the call for the emancipation of black slaves. But his basic spirit was not to give blacks equal status with whites. He pledged: I never said anything about putting Negroes in government offices; I never said that Negroes were united with whites in marriage. I only said that there was



a tension between blacks and whites. It's not conducive to the two peoples living together. So the contemporary neoconservative notion is that Lincoln only gave freedom to blacks, not equality.

In fact, in the hearts of Americans, most of them are inclined to freedom. Speaking of equality is only when freedom is restricted. Once that constraint is removed, the value or expectation of freedom is often greater than equality.

Why is this so? Because the equality guaranteed by the Western system is only formal political equality, not social or economic equality. This has been recognized by Western scholars. After formal political equality is established, further demands for equality involve the interests of many people. History has determined that it is easy to provide for formal political equality, but difficult to achieve economic equality.

Political equality means equal implementation of laws, equal voting rights and other political rights, etc. Once this premise was established, people began their own social, economic, and cultural activities. The United States was founded more than two hundred years ago, and during this relatively short period of flux, the economy developed to a high degree, and accordingly, the division of interests in society was inevitably pronounced, with an increasing disparity between the rich and the poor. To this day, the rich-poor divide constitutes the main interest structure of society. In affluent societies, there are few truly poor people and few truly rich people, but the majority of the middle class considers itself to be rich or would be rich. This part of the population believes that past wealth or possible future wealth depends on free activity in the economic sphere, and to restrict this freedom and create equality would be detrimental to their interests. The economic sphere is not part of the political sphere, and equality cannot be imposed. People should enjoy full freedom in this sphere. One cannot take someone else's money and give it to another person to spend because of the emphasis on equality. Those who have money or have some of it think this way. In essence, this argument reflects the desire of the rich to not limit the freedom of capital and to share a deeper level of equality with society at large.

One hundred and fifty years later, or at least that number of years, the situation in the United States is very different from that of

Tocqueville's time. The issue of political equality has been greatly improved, though not resolved, by the postwar black civil rights movement and the women's rights movement. The issue of economic equality, however, has never been substantially advanced. The United States once engaged in poverty eradication, welfare policies, and progressive taxation to promote equality, but later ended up with a lot of public discontent. The Keynesian welfare policy resulted in stagflation. Since then Keynesianism has fallen flat on its face. Large-scale social welfare programs are repugnant. The Democratic Party's repeated electoral defeats also tell a story.

Welfare policies must extract higher taxes. To support the government budget. High taxes don't make people happy or happy anywhere. Americans aspire to equality, but now that equality is associated with high taxes, they are turned off. If there are still strong advocates of such equality, most people will shift to an emphasis on freedom, seeing such equality as an infringement of liberty. There are profound socio-economic reasons why freedom has become mainstream, and in fact it reflects a polarization of conflicting interests between different groups in society.

In fact, from a historical perspective, Americans see freedom more than equality, and sometimes the pursuit of freedom manifests itself in the form of the pursuit of equality. After the end is achieved, what is preserved is often freedom. It cannot be said that some people do not aspire to equality, but they only aspire to political equality, and it would be difficult to accept it if they went further.

The War of Independence pushed equality to a new level, and subsequent developments have continued to advance political equality. But equality in the economic and social spheres has been slow to advance because it is considered to be in the realm of liberty, and freedom is inviolable, especially the right to freedom of private property. Americans accept only equality of conditions, not equality of results. Once equality of conditions is established, then comes the realm of liberty. Many Americans affirm that conditional equality has been achieved and that any further talk of equality can only be about equality of results, which is an important reason why freedom has become the dominant value today.

In today's world of individualism, equality can hardly be the dominant value.

## 5. Two hundred years of the Constitution

There is a historical connection between the cities of Philadelphia and Washington. Philadelphia was an important site during the American Revolutionary War, and in 1787, a convention was held in Philadelphia to write the Constitution. This constitution has survived to this day and can be called the oldest written constitution in the world. In 1988, the bicentennial of the Constitution was celebrated under the Statue of Liberty and Reagan was there to speak. Americans are most proud of their Constitution. When I was in Philadelphia, I visited the building where the Constitution was written, but I only looked outside because it was so crowded. When I was in Annapolis, I saw a handwritten copy of the U.S. Constitution, a few sheets of yellow paper, but how could it play such a big role? The foundation is definitely beyond these yellow papers.

The Constitution of the United States is a product of the War of Independence. The arresting evolution was about twenty years in the making: 1770–1790, when the United States had thirteen separate colonies under the British government. 1774, the first Continental Congress was held, and 55 delegates from the thirteen colonies met in Philadelphia to discuss issues of common concern. 1775, the war between the colonies and Britain, the fierce battle in what is now Massachusetts, took place. In 1776, the American political thinker Thomas Paine published his book *Common Sense*, calling for independence. 1782, nearing the end of the War of Independence, peace talks were held in Paris and an agreement was signed. 1787, the Constitution was drafted. 1788, a sufficient number of states ratified the draft constitution and it took effect. 1789, George Washington was elected president of the United States. In 1791, the Declaration of the Rights of Man was added to the Constitution. This was the main milestone in the political development of the time. It is clear from this that the American Constitution was born out of the struggle for independence, and its basic provisions were certainly designed to safeguard certain interests.

This was the intent of the framers of the Constitution. At that time, 13 states sent 55 delegates to Philadelphia. Drafting the Constitution was a difficult task, but they did it in one summer. Perhaps it was because political, social, and cultural relations were not as developed as they have been since. If it were done today, I am afraid that it

would not have been possible to create a constitution without two years. Washington, Hamilton, Madison, and Franklin were all involved in this work. These men were deeply influenced by European Enlightenment thinkers, and they were familiar with Locke's Treatise on Government, Harrington's Oceania, and Montesquieu's On the Spirit of the Laws. At the same time, they also had a great deal of practical experience. Twenty of them are said to have participated in the drafting of state constitutions and to be well versed in the subject. Thirty of them have been involved in the legislatures of the states. They were familiar with the advantages and disadvantages of officialdom, and they also laid the foundation for the constitution.

One historical condition that is worth noting when formulating the Constitution is that it is a continuation of the same system, but with a different form of organization. At the time of the American War of Independence, England had completed the "Glorious Revolution" for 100 years, and the British rulers were no longer the traditional feudal aristocracy. Therefore, for the United States, it was basically a new system modeled after the British political principles. In other words, the ruled wanted to live as the rulers did. And the problem facing revolutions in many countries was to change the political principles, which was much more difficult because no one knew the practice of the new principles, there was a void, such as the English bourgeois revolution, the French bourgeois revolution, the Russian revolution and the Chinese revolution. Of course, in countries like England, France, Russia and China, the influence of the old system was so strong that it also created difficulties in establishing a new system.

Out of their own experience, the primary concerns of Americans in framing the Constitution were the authority of government and the freedom of the individual.

The separation of the colonies by the British also created the conditions for the formation of a political system. This separation made it impossible for one state to dominate another, political matters had to be negotiated, and those who made the constitution had the backing of the states and had a great deal of bargaining power. None of the states wanted one state to have power over them. Thus care would be taken to create a mechanism in the Constitution to guard against one state gaining such power. Kenneth Prewitt and Sidney Verba, in their book An Introduction to American Government, point out that the

Constitution reflects a philosophical view. They cite a quote from John Adams.

Human desires, passions, prejudices and self-love are never conquered by love and knowledge, and .....you say that "the love of freedom is rooted in the soul of man". Then it is also in the soul of a wolf. I doubt that one man is more rational, more tolerant, more sociable than another. ....Therefore, we should not rely solely on the love of freedom in the souls of men. Some political system must be prepared to help the love of freedom to rebel against its enemies.

Plevite and Wolbach's interpretation is that without political limits, people cannot be trusted. Thus the Constitution reflects a pessimistic, not an optimistic, view of human nature. This is a major difference between Western culture and Eastern culture. Perhaps this can explain the difference in political development between East and West in some way.

With these ideas in mind, the Constitution establishes the following three basic principles.

The introduction of representative government, including the abolition of noble titles and the devolution of official positions, with regular elections and representative politics.

Decentralized governance (decentralization includes both vertical and horizontal aspects, with vertical referring to federalism, with the states retaining greater power. This was the only viable option at the time. Horizontal refers to what is commonly referred to as the "separation of powers").

Limited government, i.e., what the government cannot do, such as not interfering with the rights of religion, speech, writing, assembly, etc. It also establishes the principle of "Government of laws, not of men" and, as a result of this principle, the Constitution establishes a court system.

It must not be thought that those who framed the Constitution had all the toiling masses in mind and were framing the Constitution for them. What they had in mind at that time was first of all to maintain their interests, a new ruling group. The popularization of the spirit of the Constitution was a long time in coming. As late as the 1960s, black Americans were still fighting for their rights. To this day, blacks are still fighting, though not often in blood.

A question that has attracted worldwide attention is why the Constitution has survived for two hundred years when other countries have no such record. Prewitt and Wolbach offer one explanation: (1) the Constitution is a political document, and the political conflicts that existed in 1780 still exist today, but in different forms, such as central-local relations; (2) the constitutionally guaranteed representative, decentralized, and limited government had sufficient appeal then and remains so today.

Another important reason is the Constitution's own changes. If the Constitution had remained unchanged for two hundred years, it is hard to imagine that it would have lasted until today. The changes in the Constitution are characterized by changes in content but not in form. The Constitution has changed in many ways, such as the universality of its provisions, the new interpretation of the Constitution by the Supreme Court, the rights not listed in the Constitution, and the amendments to the Constitution. The key is that the basis and procedure for constitutional change is still this Constitution, and nothing else. There are no unchanging things in the world. Americans today have long interpreted the Constitution much differently than they did two hundred years ago, but people would rather say that is what it was two hundred years ago. Because it's not easy to call attention to what people say today; it's easier, sometimes much easier, to call attention to what the ancients said.

The key problem is that no one actually has the power to change this constitution, and maintaining it and interpreting it is the only way forward. Perhaps it is a general rule that if there is still some power to change the constitution and the political system, then the society has not reached a steady state politically and socially in terms of governance.

## **6. Political genes**

There is a quiet town next to Boston, and the name of this town is Belmont (Belmont) town. It is said that the political system of early America has been preserved relatively intact here. The town's administration is strongly self-governing and is the source of the American political system, or a reflection of the political tradition. Let's call it "political genes". Professor Lucian Pye, who was the

president of the American Political Science Association in 1988, also recommended this town, and we visited this special town in his company.

Belmont is a small town, about half an hour away from Boston by car, with a total of 26,000 inhabitants. The first person to come out and greet us was the secretary. She is the selectman. The first thing she said was that Belmont is governed by an organization of friends and neighbors who govern themselves, a kind of self-governing organization. Her second sentence was that this organization and the spirit of this organization originated in England. When the first settlers arrived on the American continent, they brought with them this tradition, which has been preserved until now. In the East, especially in Massachusetts, a number of places still maintain this political character, which has become a very noteworthy phenomenon in political life.

A brief look at the town's organizational structure is in order. The town has a fundamental law, called the General by-laws, which in effect is the equivalent of the town's constitution. According to the town's organic law, the supreme authority is vested in the citizens, and all adult citizens who reside in the town have the right to vote. The town is organized into two parts, one for the elected officials and the other for the appointed officials. Elected officials are elected by all citizens. The head of the administration is called the Electman, which is not an official title, but only a proof of his status. There are three electors, with equal powers, who form the Council of Electors and are responsible for the day-to-day administration. The electors are re-elected every year and can be re-elected. In addition to the head of administration being elected, there are several other administrators who are elected rather than appointed by the head of administration, such as the Electricity Commission, the Health Commission, the Moderator, the Town Treasurer, the members of the School Committee, the Water Commission, etc. This mechanism guarantees that all of the executive departments are accountable to the voters and not dominated by the head of administration. There is also an elective town meeting, similar to a deliberative body, but it is the general assembly of all citizens that really has the power to decide. Under the elective town meeting, there is an executive secretary, an advisory board, and a town committee that helps or assists the electors in the day-to-day management of their affairs. The Executive Secretary and others are all appointed officials. Under the Executive Secretary are a number of Specialized Secretaries who are responsible for various matters such as community development, senior affairs, finance, fire, highway, police,

veterans services, etc. Under the Moderator (Moderator), there are the Legal Committee, the Authorization Committee, the Budget Committee, etc., all of which are appointed officials. This is the general state of political organization in Belmont Township. As you can see, it has the premise that the administrative officials of important departments are elected to ensure that citizens can effectively monitor and control the administrative process.

Although it is a small town, the annual budget is in the tens of millions of dollars. For example, in the 1986-1987 fiscal year, the expenditure was \$31,709,621. How such a large sum of money is spent is the biggest political issue for the town. The town's system effectively ensures the proper use of its finances and strongly precludes corruption because the finances must be open and approved by the town meeting. The town-wide meeting is generally held once a year to decide on major town matters. Let's look at the 1987 town meeting, which took place on April 27 in the high school auditorium because it was the largest venue in town. Prior to the town meeting, the matters to be voted on were issued. Matters were studied by the authorized committee and opinions were given.

The 1987 meeting had 47 items to vote on. Most of them concerned how to spend money, how to expand public facilities, and how to improve living standards. There were also political ones, such as item 2, which dealt with the delegation of authority to elected people to resolve conflicts, and items 35 and 37, which dealt with amending the Basic Law. These items are fewer in number and are more about specific living matters, such as raising the salaries of officials, expanding water pipes, providing travel expenses to officials, purchasing parking meters, building roads, and purchasing large snow plows, large trucks, photocopiers, etc. As you can see, quite a few very detailed items have to be approved by the citizens' assembly. Administrative officials are not allowed to spend money without permission. All finances have to be made public. At the town-wide meeting, the report of the Finance Committee and the report of the Authorized Committee are discussed. These reports list the salaries and allowances of the various officials and committee members in a clear manner. This would put an end to the practice of corruption. Under this system, it is extremely difficult to commit fraud. Naturally, this possibility cannot be ruled out.

This system is very similar to the citizen's assembly in ancient Rome, and indeed vividly reflects the basic essence of the Western political



system. The town of Belmont, however, is not independent. It has a unique set of mechanisms for conducting town affairs, but it is subject to state and federal laws. One characteristic of the American political system is that its local governments are not uniform, especially at the sub-county level. Most local governments have preserved their traditional colors. And it has never occurred to Americans to unify these local governments, but rather to let them develop. This way of looking at things is also rare in the world. In terms of organizational structure, the nation is integrated, but the specific ways of functioning are different. In fact, each local government adapts to local traditions, local perceptions and local needs. Any political system can function well only if it does so. To a large extent, the adaptation of the American political system to historical-social-cultural conditions is not reflected in federal and state governments, but in governments below the county level. This is a mechanism that is not found in a number of countries. History tends to show that the more delineated the political system is, the less adaptable the political system is. How to coordinate between macro political institutions and specific institutions is a major challenge in political development.

By saying that Belmont's organization was "in the genes" of the political system, I mean that the later political system developed on the basis of the political rules of such small groups. The people who first came to America, having been subjected to religious and political persecution in England, had the strongest desire for political security, the deepest awareness of their rights, and the greatest wariness of political power. On the other hand, they were imbued with Western culture, they aspired in persecution to the democratic traditions of the ancient (ancient Greek) or medieval communes of the West, and they came to the New World from far away, mainly to escape one political life and establish another. This is why early Americans had a democratic outlook. Of course, similar to the democracy of the slaveholders in ancient Rome, this could only be a democracy among themselves, not among the Indians or later the blacks, but any political rights prepared for their own use had to be prepared to be shared with others, or they themselves would lose them. Not only does the history of many countries prove this, but the development of modern Chinese history also shows it. By the time of the War of Independence, it was this basic spirit that the Americans wanted to consolidate. The ease with which this spirit was institutionalized in America had to do with the nature of the earliest immigrants. Imagine what America would

have been like if all the British princes and nobles had come to the New World.

Latin American countries and African countries have contributed a number of examples.

## **7. Political rules**

January 20, 1989, was the inauguration day for Bush's election as the forty-first president. On this day, Bush and Vice President-elect Quayle were to be sworn in on Capitol Hill. All political dignitaries, leaders of the White House, the House and Senate of Congress, and the Supreme Court are expected to attend the swearing-in ceremony. This ceremony will indicate that Bush officially becomes the president and Reagan officially leaves office. This is a major event in political life and a political rule. This rule actually serves as a constraint on the outgoing and incoming presidents, and also indicates to the nation the basic way in which the political system works. The new president has to give a speech at the inauguration ceremony, stating his basic policy ideas, which is also a sign to the nation.

The transfer of political power is one of the most difficult things to solve in human political life. Many societies have not developed a sound procedure on this issue, which has become a cause of political instability. The important thing about the oath of office of the president is not that the new president has power, but that the old president thus loses power and is relieved of his duties and becomes a man of the cloth. The Constitution does not specify how the transition between the old and new presidents should take place, but the oath of office ceremony has such a long history that it has now become a fixed political rule, and the whole process is very programmed.

On the morning of Jan. 20, the swearing-in area was prepared in front of the Capitol. VIPs and dignitaries entered the venue one after another. The venue was open to the public, with a raised platform as a podium for the oath of office. At about the same time, Reagan and the dignitaries left the White House in their cars and went to the Capitol. Before the oath of office began, all parties entered the podium according to a ritual. Behind the podium was a door connected to the Capitol, decorated with a large red curtain and a red carpet leading to the front of the podium, where there was a microphone and a podium.

First, the judges of the Supreme Court enter and are introduced to the podium by an usher. Then the women entered, including the respective wives of Reagan, Bush and Quayle, and were ushered out through another corridor. Then Reagan entered. Reagan was followed by Quayle. Finally, Bush was seated. Each person or group was guided by a special person 1-2 minutes apart.

The oath of office was administered by the chairmen of the joint session of both houses of Congress. A chaplain was first asked to say a prayer for God's blessing on America, on President Bush and his family, and on Quayle and his family. Then a children's choir sang hymns of praise to God. Then a black singer sang praise songs. Quayle began with the Pledge of Allegiance, which was led by Supreme Court Justice O'Connor, who read one sentence and Quayle repeated it. Mrs. Quayle held a family Bible, and Quayle placed his left hand on top of this Bible. After Quayle was sworn in, Bush was sworn in. The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, William H. Rehnquist, led the reading. Mrs. Bush held two Bibles, one for family use and one used by the first president, George Washington, when he took the oath of office. Bush placed his hand on it and followed the Justice's reading.

After the Pledge of Allegiance, the black singer sang the National Anthem, and the entire audience sang it. After the anthem, Bush gave a speech announcing his basic national policy.

praised Reagan, saying:-"This man has earned an important place in our hearts and in our history. President Reagan, in the name of our nation, I thank you for all the outstanding things you have done for America."

Pray to God, saying, "Strengthen us for Your cause, and we are willing to obey Your will and write the following in our hearts: Use power to help the people. For we have been given power, not to pursue our own goals, and there is only one right use of power, and that is to serve the people."

called for a revitalization of the American spirit, saying, "We can't just hope to leave our children and grandchildren bigger cars and bigger bank accounts. We should want to give them a sense of what it means to be a loyal friend, what it means to be a loving parent, what it means to be a good citizen. America is not really America unless it has noble moral goals. We have that goal today, and that is to make the nation look more lovable and the world look better."

Calling for a fight against drug addiction, he said that "crimes such as drug addiction should be eliminated."

Asking Congress to cooperate, he said, "We need new action....., we need compromise....., we need harmony....., and I extend my hand to you."

Expressing his determination, he said: I don't doubt the future, and I don't fear what lies ahead. Our problems are great, but our will is greater, our challenges are great, but our will is greater. If there is no end to our imperfections, God's love is indeed vast and boundless."

After Bush finished his speech, he said goodbye to the Reagans. The Reagans were then to leave Washington, D.C., which meant leaving the White House. A helicopter will take the Reagans directly to Andrews Air Force Base, where they will be flown directly to their home in Los Angeles. The Bushes and the Quayles see the Reagans to their plane: the Reagan era is over.

Bush then returned to the Capitol, where in an office he signed his first documents as president, including appointments to his Cabinet. After attending a luncheon in Congress, the return to the White House, sometimes on foot, was about 1.6 miles and marked the beginning of the Bush era.

The process, which is highly programmed, is incredibly expensive. The approximate statistic is that the entire inauguration (almost a week) costs \$30 million, including state expenses and private expenses. Tickets for the full event (including the various banquets, ceremonies, etc.) were \$25,000 a piece. In 1981, Reagan spent \$16 million on the inauguration. All of this money was privately donated. The government also spent a lot of money, with Congress budgeting \$775,000 for the inauguration. The city of Washington allocated \$2.3 million to provide police, fire prevention, medical care and other services. The Department of Defense spent approximately \$2.5 million to provide troops, honor guards and more. The cost of the entire event was staggering, which is a hallmark of the American system. Most of the spending came from civilian sources, and while this suggests that there was no political obligation, it is difficult to say whether this was the case. However, as an established procedure for the transfer of power, the cost is not much compared to the chaos and even bloodshed of the transfer of power.

The entire event was highly public, with extensive television and newspaper coverage of the entire event. The inauguration ceremony was broadcasted live on TV and radio. To a certain extent, the political openness also ensured that the change of power was carried out properly. This process, in fact, also tells the people that the change of power is done according to the procedure.

One of the most fundamental problems of any political system is how to carry out the alternation of power. Without solving this problem, it is difficult for society to have a sustainable and stable political order. The United States has formed a set of political rules during its long history of development. Everyone must abide by this set of political rules, contrary to this set of political rules, it is impossible to be recognized, it is impossible to have legitimacy. It is unthinkable that any outgoing president would not leave the White House. The day Bush was sworn in, Reagan moved out of the White House. The Oval Office was empty. The New York Times ran a photo of Reagan casting his last glance at the empty office. After the swearing-in ceremony, Bush will be in office here. Reagan's team will also have to move out of the White House. When Reagan left the Self-Residential Palace for the ceremony, the moving truck drove into the White House. After the swearing-in, Reagan flew straight to Los Angeles and became a man of the cloth. Although the outgoing president has played a far greater role in American politics than the common man, his time is over after all.

In this process, one can see how political rules and political traditions work. The ceremony is ancient, the oath of office is the same oath of office used by the first president two hundred years ago, and the Bible is the same Bible used by George Washington two hundred years ago. The American nation is a nation that places great value on tradition. This situation seems a bit strange: how can Americans, who are so innovative and individualistic, value tradition in such a way. In fact, the more tradition has authority where no one has the say, the greater the authority. Tradition becomes the only thing modern people can rely on, and modern people cannot come up with one thing to convince the masses. In national or state or local political life, rules and traditions are forces to be reckoned with. In the sensitive issue of power change, rules and traditions are better at binding people. In societies where modern politics is in flux and where political rules and traditions have not been developed, there is some difficulty in changing power or in finding a suitable path.

In depth, political rules and traditions are useful because they protect the power relations between different groups within the ruling class. The function of socially formed political rules and traditions is that they are appropriate for coordinating power relations between different groups in society. Such relations are rooted in the complex political, economic and cultural mechanisms of society. Political rules and traditions are the result of the long-term functioning of a social system and best reflect the fundamental characteristics of that society.

Sometimes, political rules and political traditions are more powerful than laws, because one is written in words and the other is written in people's beliefs. The path to a society's political development lies in turning political principles and beliefs into political rules and political traditions.

## **8. "Third Republic"**

The "Third Republic of the United States of America" is an unfamiliar concept to many people. I am afraid that many people have heard of the Fourth Republic of France and the Fifth Republic of France, but not of the Third Republic of the United States of America. The concept was first introduced in 1969. Of course, this concept was introduced by a scholar in a book. His name is Theodore J. Lowi. The book was called *The End of Liberalism: The Second American Republic*. In this book, Lowi analyzes the evolution of mainstream thinking in the United States and points out the trend of social development. These analyses are still valuable for understanding America.

In the war of words campaign of 1988, the Republican presidential candidate chose the key strategy of accusing the Democratic candidate of being a "liberal. The implication was that liberalism had become a pejorative term. Noted political scientist Samuel Martin Lipset has an article in the Oct. 27 issue of *The New York Times* that looks at this shift. He says that Americans have always sought and longed for liberalism, and that the War of Independence was sparked by the quest for freedom and equality back then. The tradition of Western political philosophy also has freedom and equality at its core. Now, with the change of time, liberalism has become the opposite, and it seems disgraceful to be called a "liberal. This turn of events took place mainly after World War II, and especially in the 1960s. Since the

1960s, support for liberalism has been declining. What are the reasons for this?

The demise of liberalism is linked to Keynesianism. The classical tenets of capitalism are the "invisible hand" and "laissez-faire". This is the basic rule of capitalism as proposed by Adam Smith. However, the contradictions inherent in the capitalist mode of production, or the regulatory requirements arising from socialized mass production, form the basis of some of the ills of the social structure of capitalist society. The evolution of these contradictions, which had intensified by the beginning of the twentieth century, seriously threatened Western society and the capitalist system. At this time many Western scholars realized that the traditional Western concepts should be revised to find a way out of the dilemma. As a result, the doctrine of the British economist Keynes spread, forming what later became known as Keynesianism. The core idea of Keynesianism is very different from the traditional liberalism, he emphasizes government regulation, emphasizes the government through the "visible hand" to promote "full employment, regulate the "propensity to consume" and He emphasized government regulation through the "visible hand" to promote "full employment, regulate the "propensity to consume" and "invest", and engage in public works. When the capitalist world encountered a general crisis in the 1920s and 1930s, Keynesianism became mainstream. If capitalism had not encountered such a huge crisis, Keynesianism would not have been able to take hold in the West. It is always human nature: one does not turn back until one hits the wall. The same is often true when it comes to government policy. It will soon be seen how Keynesianism itself has followed this path.

This timing coincided with the Roosevelt administration. As a result of this principle, Keynesianism was then combined with liberalism. If the Republican Party, which advocated conservatism, had been in power, I am afraid it would have chosen Keynesianism. The times make the man. Another factor that contributed to the combination of liberalism and Keynesianism was the philosophical beliefs of liberalism. The philosophical belief of liberalism is that people are rational and can control and regulate themselves as long as the necessary conditions are created for them to do so. Conservatism's belief is that people are irrational and that norms should be made for their behavior. By definition, conservatism prefers government control. Yet the desire to create good conditions and the reality of winning elections drove liberalism to combine with Keynes: to create good conditions through

government activity. One result of Roosevelt's New Deal was a dramatic expansion of government authority, extensive government intervention in the economy, full involvement in the socio-economic sphere, and an immediate expansion of government functions. This was a major departure from traditional capitalist beliefs.

Rowe argues that this change has led to two results: one is statism and the other is pluralism. Statism asserts the primacy of state action, and pluralism is more precisely Interest-Group Pluralism (IGP). Rowe sees Interest-Group Pluralism as the new philosophy of capitalism, a mishmash of statism, capitalism, and pluralism, or interest-group liberalism.

The implications of pluralism are: (1) once groups become the rules of the market, imperfect competition becomes the rule of social relations; (2) imperfect competition is not really competition but some kind of bargaining; (3) bargaining is the only alternative to violence and coercion in industrial societies; and (4) if the system is stable and peaceful, pluralism can achieve the property of self-regulation. Interest group liberalism combines pluralism to some extent.

Interest group liberalism, according to Lowe, is the Second Republic of the United States of America. He says that every Congress and every administration since 1961 has practiced this doctrine. Interest-group liberalism has led to serious consequences: government institutions have been freed from the control of the people, new privileges have been maintained and established, etc. More importantly, this new form of liberalism did not cope with the basic contradictions of capitalist society in the long term.

Rowe's explanation is that liberal government cannot plan; planning requires authoritative application of authority; planning requires law, choice. Libertarianism replaces planning with bargaining. Liberalism can expand government functions, but it cannot coordinate those functions. Keynesian policies also had serious consequences, and deficit finance became an intractable problem for government. These problems gradually erupted by the end of the 1960s with economic crises, fiscal deficits, social problems, economic depletion, and moral decay. The result of the combination of liberalism and Keynesianism was not glorious, but dim and bleak. The general chaos of the late sixties can be a good example of why liberalism is notorious today, and why Bush can throw liberalism as a pot of dirty water on Dukakis.



The First Republic, as Rowe called it, was the United States from 1787 to the 1930s and was characterized by a federal structure with limited central government power and greater state government power. The Second Republic began in the 1930s, when the powers of the central government were greatly expanded, with the primary powers being those of regulation and redistribution. The regulatory and redistributive powers made possible high wages, high benefits, high consumption, high deficits, and eventually led to social discontent. The anti-liberal sentiment is quite strong today.

The Third Republic, means how to get out of the rut that reached its peak in the 1960s and choose a new path. Interest group pluralism had corrupted the traditional concept of democracy, rendering the government impotent and unpredictable, and making it impossible for the government to function democratically anymore. The Third Republic, as Rowe called it, was called Judicial Democracy, which emphasized a sound judicial process in all areas.

In the wake of the Keynesian wave, society is indeed facing new choices. How can the social framework and governance mechanisms formed under Keynesianism be changed is a major challenge. How can the expansion of government functions be reduced? Just as it is not easy for a person to lose weight once he has gained weight. One is that the government wants to be thin, and the second is that the people want to be thin. Liberalism has "given" a lot of welfare, which many Americans hate, and is a big burden for the government. The problem is that you can't get rid of this burden, which is an important cornerstone of political stability. After the United States has suffered enough from big government, it wants to have a small government, but for American society, a small government will certainly cause a lack of blood supply for the whole society. The development of society demanded total coordination, and science and technology provided the necessary conditions, but Americans could not accept total coordination ideologically and emotionally. The memory of liberalism still grips the mind. This challenge will continue for many more years.

# Three, colorful national character

## 1. International people

Americans, may be called international people. Although most people do not have the sense to join the world voluntarily, their social and economic mechanisms have brought them to this diverse world by force. Americans' world consciousness is, on the whole, much weaker than that of those people whom Americans or Westerners regard as backward and ignorant. In recent years, American scholars have repeatedly called out the young generation's woeful lack of world knowledge, which is unbecoming of a great nation. People in developing or backward countries, on the other hand, aspire to prosperity and development, to the outside world, and instead have strong feelings about the world and possess more knowledge.

In the United States, the masses are passively cosmopolitan; social, economic, and cosmopolitan interactions have forced Americans to be cosmopolitan. The Monroe Doctrine that prevailed earlier has been difficult to reproduce, except under specific historical conditions. The straw-hatted, horseback-riding, yellow-faced Americans portrayed in Western films are now traveling the world in Boeing 747s, or on aircraft carriers and nuclear submarines. A significant number of educated people are focused on the development of the world today and on the internationalization of people. Efforts are being made in the field of education and research to promote the internationalization of the American people. Americans can be said to be pampered and the general population is not very interested in the outside world and is dead set on their own doorstep. A considerable number of Americans, recognizing this problem, have made a strong effort to develop international studies and international education to nurture talent.

The promotion of internationalization relies on two kinds of institutions: educational institutions and scientific institutions. The number of institutions that study international issues in American society is probably among the highest in the world. There are sub-national or sub-regional research institutes or research programs in universities, in addition to many independent research institutions. University education focuses more on international education and promotes international awareness among students.

To summarize, it can be found that there are some characteristics of such institutions.

Regional boundaries are clear. In universities, education about the international has a specific classification rather than a generalized one. University political science departments generally have generalized programs in international relations and comparative political studies, but at the same time have very detailed divisions. For example, Iowa State University has a China Studies Program and a Japan Studies Program; the University of Michigan is known for its China Studies Program; the University of Syracuse has an extremely strong India Studies program; and the University of Washington in Seattle has a special China Studies Program. Institutes in universities, too, have specialized classifications, such as Michigan's Institute of Contemporary Chinese Culture, which specializes in China. These specialized institutes or programs have strongly concentrated the experts in the field and strengthened it.

Educational goals are clear. The internationalization of people is important in terms of how generations of people acquire international awareness. The achievement of this goal depends on the implementation of international education programs. Universities are generally very focused on achieving this goal. When I visited several universities in central China, the professors there told me that people in central China are more conservative and backward, less open, less receptive to new knowledge and ideas from outside, and even more uncertain about the world. To promote the development of the central part of the country, we need to let the people here know more about the world, so we attach importance to international education. When visiting several universities in the East, Eastern professors believe that international education is a tradition of Eastern culture, openness, and understanding of the world, especially Europe. The East is strong in international studies. When visiting several universities in the west, professors here emphasized that the 21st century will be the Asia-Pacific century, and the west coast is remote to the Asia-Pacific region, so we should focus on Asia-Pacific studies, so Asia-Pacific studies and education in the west are especially developed.

The government focuses on promotion. The internationalization of people is involved in the development of all aspects of a country's politics, economy and culture. The development of a society ultimately depends on the quality of its people. A nation's international standing and

ability to compete in the international community ultimately depends on the quality of its people as well. Policy makers know this well. This is a federal country, and the state governments have decision-making authority over the state universities. Each state government requires its universities to develop a strong international education. Take the University of California, San Diego, for example. They have established a graduate school of international relations and Pacific studies to train people for California's development into the Asia-Pacific region. The school is using high salaries to poach famous professors from universities. One of Berkeley's leading Japanese experts has been tapped, reportedly at a very high salary, perhaps \$150,000 a year. The college is building an office tower on the Pacific Ocean waterfront, facing the Pacific Ocean waves, which will inspire the world to sit inside. The college was established by the state in 1986 as the only Pacific-centric center for international education in the University of California system (nine campuses). The college's description makes it clear: The college's primary goals are to train students interested in the countries of the Pacific, to prepare them for leadership positions in business, diplomacy, public institutions and other fields, and to make the college a center for the study of economic, political, social, technological and security issues in the region. This is just one example of the many universities in the United States. The government's intent, naturally, is not only to train students, but to chart political, economic and cultural development. But without this first step, this latter one would be difficult to achieve.

Emphasis on international exchange. Educational or research institutions dealing with international issues not only focus on promoting the study of foreign issues by their own professors, but also pay much attention to expanding academic exchanges and cooperation with scholars in the countries they study. Americans are probably most inclined to use foreign experts, and in this regard this nation is most pragmatic. As long as they are useful, they can use anyone. In many international research and educational institutions, visiting scholars from many countries can be found, sometimes in groups. At the same time, Americans tend to formally hire someone from a particular country as a professor if he is qualified. As a result, professors of Chinese, Korean, Japanese, Indian, Canadian, French, and Hungarian descent are often found in universities, a phenomenon that I am afraid is uncommon in the world. The American concept is practical, because you are from the country or the region, you speak the language, you are familiar

with the customs, and you are in a better position to study the problems of that region. Take, for example, the East Asia Institute at the University of California, Berkeley. The institute has few researchers and only administrative staff, but it has dozens of visiting scholars from China, South Korea, Japan, Nepal, and other places. Director Robert A. Scalapino's view is that with more than half of the world's population living in the Asia-Pacific region, with the world's major political and strategic powers in the region, and with its vast natural resources, the region is of world significance. The Institute is committed to promoting exchanges between U.S. scholars and Asian scholars. By attracting foreign scholars to the United States, the goal is not only attraction but also radiation. After their visits, visiting scholars return to their respective countries. They become peers with whom U.S. scholars can continue to communicate, and the entire academic engagement will continue. As for the non-academic role of this exchange, naturally, this is not the case.

The internationalization of Americans, at the popular level, is quite a bit passive; they are drawn into the world by the process of world economic integration, and the economic challenges of Europe, Japan, and Asia make it impossible for them not to become involved in international economic life. On the other hand, the policy orientation of government policies has also contributed to their involvement in international life, such as the Middle East issues, Central American issues, etc. However, from the point of view of the government and knowledgeable people, they are targeted and strategically intentioned in pursuing internationalization. Educational and scientific institutions also have long-term goals. These are conscious, organized, and planned processes. The past, present and future development of the United States cannot be distinguished from this process. What worries politicians and knowledgeable people is that the younger generation has become less and less cosmopolitan. The essence of their concern is, how long can the United States maintain its position as a world power? Do they really understand the world? Do they have the ability to compete in an international arena where there are many strong players?

For any society, nation and state, in today's world where the human community is in solidarity, the prerequisite for the development of one's own nation, society or country is to be familiar with and understand the strengths and strategies of other nations and other societies. Today's world is a world of cooperation plus competition, and in a sense it is even a world of competition. The countries of the

world are in full competition in politics, economy, culture, military, and lifestyle. To fail or lag behind in this competition will mean backwardness and poverty. Recent history has proved this. What has changed now is simply that this competition has become more intense and more unequal. The key factor to win in this competition is people. Promoting the internationalization of people will be an important aspect of improving and strengthening them. Imagine people who drive ox carts and live a leisurely country life, and people who fly in jet airliners and live a stressful city life, coming together on this world stage and facing the intricacies of various institutions, who will be more competitive?

The key here is not the geographical boundary, but the spiritual boundary. People who live in modern cities may still have a sense of country residence, and people who live in the countryside may also have a strong sense of internationalism. Education is a powerful force to break the boundaries of the mind. Only when this boundary is truly and fully broken can a people and society truly join the international community and truly and effectively compete internationally.

The breaking of this boundary is the internationalization of people.

## **2. New and different**

It can be said that Americans are still a rather conservative people in terms of values, such as sexual liberation, rock and roll, hippies, homosexuality, decadence, and racial equality, which are still not accepted by all Americans. Many people still hold old-fashioned values. This is especially true in politics, where traditional values still dominate. The consecutive Republican victories in presidential elections can also be considered a manifestation of this tendency. The people still hold very traditional standards when evaluating political leaders. Hart, the backbone of the Democratic Party, had to withdraw from the presidential race because of a peach incident, and Quayle was elected vice president because of Bush's glory. Many people shake their heads when they talk about Quayle, saying that he did not do well in school, served in the military only in the National Guard, had no experience, and relied on his rich father to become popular. Many Easterners take it for granted that in a sexually liberated country like the United States, relationships between men and women do not pose a problem, but often pose a major problem in the political arena. This

is true in the Western world. Americans follow the ideas of their founding fathers in politics and remain largely unchanged. The entire system maintains this set of ideas to the exclusion of others, and in this respect, Americans tend to be conservative.

Paradoxically, Americans are also the most innovative people in the world. There is a peculiar phenomenon in this nation: the masses embrace the oldest and most time-honored things, but also relish the most novel and bizarre things. This society has more inventions, bolder and more courageous visions than any other society. In recent years, Americans have launched the space shuttle, proposed the Star Wars program, and in late 1988 unveiled the ingenious B2 bomber. When it comes to small inventions, Americans are also quite good. When you walk into a large department store, you can find a wide variety of items for a variety of purposes.

On the one hand, it is conservative and on the other hand, it is innovative. There seems to be some contradiction here.

This contradiction manifests itself in different domains. Americans tend to be conservative in the realm of values. But in the field of technology, they seek to be new and different. The most daring ideas in the technology field are approved. Some Americans built a mock space city in a remote area, ready to recruit volunteers to live in it closed for two years, and it was completed surprisingly quickly. If tomorrow someone proposed to build a highway on the Atlantic Ocean from America to Europe, or a highway on the Pacific Ocean from America to Asia, it would not be considered crazy, but would be considered a remarkable idea.

The use of human ability to conquer nature is one of the values of the American tradition, so here innovation and tradition are not contradictory. The process of innovation is the process of following traditional values. The whimsical nature of this process is often limited to the material and technological realm. In the material and technological realm, Americans are prepared to accept anything. The historical development and technological progress of the United States have created this state of mind.

I thought about this over and over again when I visited the Gateway Arch in St. Louis, trying to find out why and how American novelty works.

The St. Louis Arch is one of the world's most impressive, standing some 630 feet tall, nearly two hundred meters, and made entirely of stainless steel. It stands tall and shines majestically in the silvery light of the sun and blue sky. The span of the arch is also more than two hundred meters away, and the whole arch is like an oversized silver rainbow appearing on the banks of the Mississippi River. Below the arch is the Jefferson Memorial for Territorial Expansion, which commemorates President Thomas Jefferson's campaign to advance the development of the West in the first half of the 19th century in the United States. Inside the arch is an elevator that takes visitors from below all the way to the top of the arch, which has a ten-meter walkway at the top with some windows that provide a bird's eye view of the city of St. Louis. The elevator rises or descends through the two legs of the arch. It's a curious idea. The designer was Fero Saarinean, an American architect of Finnish origin, whose design won a national call for proposals in 1947. Construction was later started by technical and engineering staff in 1963 and completed in 1965.

The construction process is also unique. Such a high building, and did not build any scaffolding. Built from two legs, the crane is set up on the two legs. Build a little higher, climb up a little. The two legs are built in the air according to prior calculations, and gradually come together at the top, and finally come together. The whole process, from design to construction are new and innovative. But people accepted it and built it. I also doubt: will anyone ask what is the use of building this thing? Can it generate income? Why not build a traditional monument? Who can guarantee that it will work?

Another building in Missouri that embodies the American spirit of innovation is the Fulton College Chapel, a world-famous but unassuming little place. It is famous for being the site of British Prime Minister Winston Churchill's famous speech in 1946, shortly after the smoke of World War II had cleared, saying that the "Iron Curtain" had fallen, separating East from West. The Cold War between the East and West began from then on. The "Iron Curtain" became a common Western term to describe the Soviet Union and Eastern European countries. There is a church in this place; from the outside, it is quite unassuming, nothing special compared to the countless churches in the United States. But it is a church with a distinctive flavor. The main reason for this is that the stones used to build the church were brought from England. It was originally an English church, built in the 12th century and completely remodeled in 1677. During World War II, it was severely destroyed by



artillery fire, and all that remained were the ruined walls, stones and twelve pillars. The church remained in ruins after World War II, when the Westminster College Memorial Committee proposed moving the stones to Missouri to build the college's chapel and the Winston Churchill Memorial. 1965 saw the start of the work, with seven hundred tons of stones crossing the Atlantic Ocean at a total cost of \$3 million. President Harry S. Truman laid the cornerstone of the church, which was completed in 1969. This is indeed a typical expression of the American spirit of novelty and innovation. Will anyone ask: Why not use local materials? How much more money would it have cost? Where are the stones not available, and where do we have to cross the Atlantic to transport these broken stones?

These are just two examples of American ingenuity. We can also cite many other examples: Iowa City basketball court can accommodate tens of thousands of people, but in the ground look only one floor so high, the entire gymnasium sunken in the ground below. The University of Iowa College of Law building, bare-bones steel and concrete, with a large dome and only a few small windows, is like a military fortification, which I don't think would be so easy to penetrate in a battle. The Americans could have come up with the idea of carving five presidents' giant, unmistakable heads on a big hill. The Monument to the Unknown Heroes in Washington, D.C., stands tall and bare, resembling an Egyptian-style column. The Vietnam War Memorial, a black wall with the name of each fallen man carved into it. Furniture stores sell popular water beds with mattresses that are almost a foot high with water cushions that are incredibly soft to lie on and water that heats and cools. Movies have the most bizarre imaginings, E.T., Star Wars, Superman, Third Contact, etc. The recently introduced B2 bomber, no tail, the whole is like a pair of wings, and the traditional aircraft style is very different. Costumes are even more bizarre, new clothes, very expensive, bought when they were processed to rags, it is said that the process is very complex. In the field of science and technology, the American spirit of innovation is fruitful, and so on, to name a few.

Of course, sometimes the new and innovative to the extreme, the above-mentioned new rags clothing is an example. In addition, such as some people build some ultra-luxurious cars, incredibly large, with a kitchen, swimming pool, golf course, telephone, television and other kinds of facilities. I'm afraid only a very few people can enjoy it, sometimes walking down the street, you can see some people's hair

completely erect, explosive, or shaved a yin and yang head. Some public places hang a few pieces of broken tin, called modern sculpture. For some modern art, many people are afraid to enjoy it.

In any case, the spirit of innovation in technology and in the material field is an important driving force in the development of society. Technological progress and economic development are driven by this spirit. If Americans are said to be more conservative in their values, why have they succeeded in protecting and promoting this spirit of innovation?

For one thing, there is a clear line of distinction between value and technology and materiality; value involves the moral or public sphere and should take into account the inclination of the majority of people. The latter domain belongs to the private sphere, and novelty is the weight of the private in this society. To be recognized by society, one has to be different. Political history does not provide the prerequisites that other societies have, such as aristocracy and pedigree, and all people depend on success and creativity. In fact, the conservative tendency in the sphere of values guarantees innovation in the technical and material spheres, allowing society to innovate within an orderly context.

Second, the conservatism in values did not form a particular fetter (not to say not at all) to technological and material innovation. The arrival of Americans in the New World from Europe, who had originally grown up in a land of abject poverty and struggle against nature, in victory over nature, became a fixed value in the American tradition. To recognize such innovations and to accept them is in itself to uphold the tradition. On the one hand, the American conception seems to exclude the technological and material part from the range of values, considering technology to be technology and material to be material. Technological and material innovations are something other than value innovations, and they enrich traditional values. The culture of some societies does not make such a clear distinction, and societies are unified, with all kinds of things related to values, which often tend to constrain technological and material progress. On the other hand, traditional values are abstract at their core, such as freedom, equality, and the pursuit of happiness. Thus, technological and material innovation can be considered as an expression of freedom, and the acceptance of innovation can be considered as an expression of equality.

Third, the mechanism of society forces people to innovate. The reason why I say forced, because if you want to win can not be without innovation. There are two mechanisms that force people to innovate. One is the primacy of money. Anyone or any group that wants to get money, or more money, must be different and must constantly introduce newer things to attract people and society. The second is full affluence and development. The full affluence and development of society, so that people tend to average at a higher level, no special creation will not be able to get ahead. The water rises, everyone is pursuing innovation, innovation to get money, innovation to get self, innovation to get social recognition. To win, you have to go to the next level.

Fourth, "great power vanity" drives Americans to be different. The "great power vanity" is not necessarily a good thing, but it has a certain role in promoting innovation. Since childhood, Americans have grown up in an atmosphere of "America first in the world" and most of them believe in the "America first in the world" statement. The more we go high-tech, the more people tend to pursue the world first. This mentality has indeed led Americans to make many world-renowned creations. At the same time, it also tends to create the illusion that Americans have hit a lot of walls with the idea that the old man is number one in the world. But its effectiveness in promoting innovation is there.

Fifth, the dominant individualism in society also acts indirectly on innovation. Innovation often implies some form of individualism. Any innovation is, first and foremost, a unique and distinctive design. This design requires the individual to take less account of the opinions of others and the demands of others. Novelty indicates a certain individuality. Some large creations are not the creation of one person, but can eventually be broken down into the creation of many individuals, the sum of their personalities. Individualism makes people more individualistic and prone to seek novelty. In the opposite cultural atmosphere, novelty is harder to be accepted psychologically by individuals and socially. Individualism has a negative effect on social harmony, but it also acts in some way on people and society.

Sixth, the democratic component of traditional values contributes to people's choice of innovation and acceptance of it. Americans are happy to accept innovation, to put it vulgarly, often good at coaxing, a new thing out, such as not to say good, it is possible to be considered the most undemocratic or no cultural cultivation. As if some people look at

the abstraction of the painting, dare not say bad, afraid that people laugh. However, many people genuinely agree with the new and different. They accept those who succeed and those who think differently. Those who are new and different often enjoy a special reputation and respect.

The development of a society cannot be achieved without the spirit of innovation. The promotion of the spirit of innovation requires a society that encourages and accepts new and innovative ideas. At the same time, the continuity of values is essential for any society, otherwise social stability is unsustainable. The question is how to separate value continuity from technological and material innovation, so that value continuity ensures the development of the latter, and the development of the latter strengthens value continuity and transmission. From this point of view, whether the atmosphere of novelty can be formed is, to a large extent, not a technical and material problem, but a problem of the properties of value itself.

### **3. Demystification**

American society is the least mysterious society. People grow up in this society with little mystery about any matter. Sending is an inseparable part of the American culture. Many peoples have a strong sense of mystery, such as some peoples of Africa, some peoples of Latin America, including some components of Western European culture. It is worth exploring what role mystery plays in the development of a society, or at least it can be a wall around many traditional ideas and traditional institutions. The same is true for nature. The progress of science and technology lies in the continuous conquest and victory over nature, and if one is full of mystery about nature or some aspects of nature, one cannot take a big step into the temple of nature to see what it is all about, but will linger outside and pray for divine blessing. Americans have few taboos in this regard, or rather taboos do not become taboos. On the other hand, the development of society is the development of human beings themselves, and it is difficult to develop the culture and social institutions of human society if they are full of mystery about people themselves.

We can take a look at how to demystify.

Many peoples harbor a mystical feeling of deep faith in the heavens. Americans have strong religious feelings, but such feelings have not

caused most people to mystify the heavens. The Apollo moon landing program, the space shuttle, were efforts to get out of the mystery. The Star Wars program, included, saw the heavens as part of something that people could manipulate and exploit. The heavens are in the American mind as a place where God lives, but this place has never been mystified. Star Wars, E.T., and Close Encounters of the Third Kind were more a product of non-mystery than mystery. But in America, religious preachers are extremely powerful, yet proof of the mystery of religion and God.

Nature tends to carry an air of mystery among many peoples; Americans harbor less mystery about the natural world, and they continue to recognize it and demystify it. This cultural factor is feared to be a conceptual force driving the development of American society. One of the primary conditions for the development of science and technology should be the belief that nothing is outside of man's ability to know and create.

Americans also have the least amount of mystery about man himself. Religious people know that the Bible says God made man. But society continues to break down the mystery surrounding man. It is common for doctors to open chest cavities and skulls and move around hearts and brains, and the difficulty is purely technical, with no conceptual element. Americans are most interested in transplanting artificial hearts. Americans have one of the highest number of IVFs in the world. Demystification, pushing to move Americans toward artificial people. Sex education in adolescence is also a product of non-mystification. The issue of sex is shrouded in mystery in many societies. In American society, sex became as common knowledge as oil and vinegar. Naked magazines, though opposed by some, have been taken for granted by most people who have no particular interest in reading them. This attitude toward man himself affects not only the natural sciences, but also the social sciences. If one really knows what a person is, there will be no mystery in any respect.

Politics is full of mystery in many societies, and Americans are the least mysterious about it. Sometimes one gets the impression that Americans are too practical and pragmatic. Politics is run like an economic activity and lacks a cultural element. The non-mystical aspect of culture plays an undervalued role in maintaining the political system. Political cartoons amply demonstrate this. Political stars are often the protagonists of political cartoons. In the case of the 1988

presidential campaign, political cartoonist Joe Sharpnack drew a picture of a child rolling around in bed, crying and screaming, saying, "I want to be vice president! I want it! I want it!" Another person, who looks like Bush, holds a flag and says, "Okay, okay, look, Daddy made you a new coat." This is a satire of Republican presidential candidates Bush and Quayle. The non-mystification of politics is also seen in the press, the press is very active in political coverage, such as Watergate is made by the press, Irangate, the Department of Defense bribery case, all related to journalists, politics like all other activities, there are not many people interested, a candidate for Congress, have to drive their own car around to canvass votes.

There is also no mystery about society, which is a human creation, not the other way around. It can be recreated whenever necessary. Recently a college student in computer science made a program that was fed into the Pentagon's network, and it destroyed the Pentagon's database. His program became a "computer bacteria" that keeps growing. Americans are especially not mystified by what people set up and create themselves. If you can create it the first time, you can create it a second time.

There is little mystification in children's education, which is a mechanism for non-mystical socialization. Americans have almost no idea of ghosts. Americans invent and conceive of many ghosts, probably more than any other country in the world, but do not believe in ghosts. Children have no concept of ghosts, and during Halloween, children dress up as all kinds of ghosts and move around the neighborhood. Americans grow up with the mentality that ghosts are not scary, but that people are the real scary ones. In some societies, the opposite is true: people are not scary, ghosts are scary. It will certainly be interesting to discuss what the consequences of these two different creeds will be.

Demystification has both advantages and disadvantages for social development. There are both negative and positive aspects of everything, both good and bad. This condition often constitutes a major problem in the development of human society. Demystification has undoubtedly advanced Americans' knowledge of nature, of themselves, and of society, thus advancing social progress. On the other hand, demystification constitutes a major component of the obstacles to the management of American society, and demystification makes people lack authority, neutrality, self-sufficiency, self-confidence, or the tendency to make people lack these elements. A society in which

everyone harbors the idea that everything must not be finally believed can be the greatest driving force, or the greatest destructive force. This is what I mean by the conundrum of human society: we can't have mystification and we can't have no mystery.

The question is how this non-mystical culture has been formed. This is too complex a puzzle to discuss at once, I'm afraid. But there may be some value in one point. American society developed in a land that did not have a long history of culture. The abundance of natural resources and geography made early Americans discover that anyone's practical efforts would be generously rewarded, early on mainly by land. There were no cultural mysteries to mystify, and everyday life cautioned that recognizing simple and universal truths would be rewarding. The long-standing preoccupation with pragmatism and focus on economic development also advanced demystification. One might even say that money has created demystification. Driven by money, people began by breaking out of the mystical realm of nature, and later extended to man himself and the society of which he is a part. Economic development requires demystification, and demystification can, under certain conditions, promote economic and social development. This is twofold: first, Americans like to be different and original; second, Americans are used to challenge and conquer. American culture is an aggressive culture and Chinese culture is a defensive culture.

What does mystification mean? Mystification is the belief that there are things that are beyond the ability of ordinary people to recognize and change, or matters that do not belong to ordinary people. Naturally, we are not talking about divinization here. Divinization speaks of the relationship between man and supernatural forces, and mystification speaks of the relationship between man and man.

## **4. Sanctification**

Americans tend to demystify, but they also tend to sacralize the most. Sacralization is still not deification because it involves relationships between people. Americans rarely deify anything. In some societies, a thing is often deified when it reaches beyond the capabilities of ordinary people. Such as the phenomena depicted by the author of "The Car of the Gods". Some people on the Pacific islands deified the accidental landing of a U.S. Army plane during World War II by making a realistic plane out of wood and worshiping it. In many

societies, witch doctors have a mystical feel. American society does not have such a culture, and while there have been cases of mass suicides of hundreds of people like the People's Temple Church, these are rare. The American nation does not tend to mystify or deify, but it has a special nature that I call "sacralization.

What is "sacralization"? Sanctification is first and foremost a secular domain. It is of a cultic nature, but it is not a religious cult. The process of sanctification is the elevation of an earthly phenomenon to a very high status. This process is not initiated by any one person or organization, but is a process of socialization. Let's look at specific examples of what I call sacralization before we analyze the social function of this phenomenon.

The American nation is a race that is very susceptible to emotional impulses, and a people that is very receptive to external things. Sacralization can be seen in the political arena. The National Convention of both parties is a typical manifestation of this sanctification. The enthusiasm, the excitement, the genuine emotion of the people in the room was a rare emotional resonance. The candidates of the two parties. Both candidates of the two parties will be warmly welcomed in this venue. When they come out, people can cheer for as long as ten minutes. Their speeches are constantly interrupted by applause and cheers. Throughout the campaign, candidates of both parties are greeted in this way wherever they go. As usual in such an individualistic and egalitarian culture, it is difficult for an individual to be adored in this way. One of the reasons for this is that they are sanctified, they are just a symbol, a symbol of a culture or a goal that everyone is pursuing. People are more in pursuit of a sanctified spirit.

Americans are also extremely prone to go this far with individuals. No matter what the person is, in what profession, as long as they have achieved something, they tend to become easily sanctified. Up to the President, it can be said that Washington and the Founding Fathers, Lincoln, Roosevelt, Kennedy, etc. are sacralized. In celebrating them, Americans are also celebrating a spirit. The sanctification of individuals is not only in the political sphere; in the sports world, many famous ballplayers or other athletes are included in the sanctification process, such as track and field athlete Lewis and diver Loganis. In the economic world, the possibility of being sanctified is even greater, and Iacocca was once a hot spot for such sanctification.



Iacocca achieved a glorious performance at Ford Motor Company, and after being driven out of Ford, he joined Chrysler Motors, which was again remarkable and his book became a best seller. Film stars are naturally among the sanctified, and famous directors and artists are no exception. Ueberroth, who gained fame for organizing the 23rd Olympic Games, was also sanctified. Lt. Col. North, who was recently implicated in the Iran-gate scandal, has actually been the subject of sanctification because many people feel that he is loyal to his duty and is the spirit of America. However, it seems that few professors have been the object of sanctification. The singer was naturally none other than June, Madonna was so popular, and Jackson was so popular that even President Reagan awarded him a medal of some kind. The effect that his performances achieve is amazing, and the listeners are so energetic in their worship that they hate to die. People in the technology world are also extremely easy to sanctify, such as the founder of Apple Computer and Wang An of Wang An Computer. This process of sanctification is fully open, not by a center that decides who can be the object of sanctification, but by society at large to choose.

This sanctification, naturally, manifests itself in other ways as well. Rugby matches, for example, are actually sanctified. People are not there to watch the ball, but to see what each believes in and embraces. The whole process of the game, from the playing of the national anthem, to the ceremonies, to the appearances, to the game, to the performances at the break in the stadium, goes beyond the meaning of the game itself. For example, the event under the Statue of Liberty to celebrate the bicentennial of the country was lively, big, and not a normal celebration in nature, with a certain flavor of sanctification. This is the work of the government. The government is often the promoter of sanctification, as in the case of the military, and the sanctification of the military is obvious. This is especially evident in the American attitude toward military victories and toward those who have fallen in battle. There is a curious Vietnam War Memorial in Washington, D.C., where every man who died in battle has left his name. For those killed in action, official funerals are held with pomp and circumstance. The government's attitude toward the space shuttle is also an excellent example. When the Space Shuttle Challenger exploded, the government gave the astronauts who died high praise and honor, seeing them as dedicated men who pioneered the American spirit. The successful launch of the Space Shuttle Discovery, which the government saw as a triumph

of the American spirit, had significance beyond the technological breakthroughs in astronautics.

The process of sanctification is actually the process of elevating various phenomena that people believe in and choose into the American spirit, as well as the process of people accepting the American spirit. Society cultivates this mechanism, and people have a solid psychological deposit of hero worship and achievement worship. The basic spirit depicted in the western is hero worship and achievement worship. Star Wars embodies this spirit in another way. Today's heroes are not the cowboy images of yesteryear, and today's concept of achievement is also changing. However, the character of hero worship and achievement worship within the American people still exists. The American nation lacks the cult of ghosts and gods, replacing them with the first two cults.

These two kinds of worship are hidden in people's hearts, and will be revealed when they get a strong and powerful call. The growth of egalitarianism, nihilism, and relativism in contemporary American culture has made this character deeply repressed. Under ordinary conditions, it is difficult to imagine that Americans would have such strong feelings of worship. The process of sacralization is, on the one hand, a process of social induction and, on the other hand, a process of self-release. A look at the frantic emotions of the audience at ball games, venues and concerts will show how they satisfy the two basic human needs mentioned above: a sense of worship and a sense of personal release.

This secular worship is different from deification worship. Deification worship is the worship of superhuman and supernatural powers, such as gods, immortals, ghosts, totems, etc. The emotion for God is a belief, an emotion, a conviction, and more than a worship in America. The non-mystical tendencies of the American nation make it difficult for them to produce deified worship, and the need for human worship turns to the secular. People look for worship in their own surroundings. Americans are a pragmatic people who find it difficult to worship abstract, legendary, and invisible objects, but they can worship success, bravery, adventure, and wisdom in their own surroundings. This worship is entwined with a complex of elements, rational, irrational, emotional, non-emotional, conscious, and unconscious. The process of sanctification is, in fact, not the sanctification of the individual, but the sanctification of a spirit. This spirit has constituted the

tradition of culture and has become the gene of it. The process of sanctification of society in turn constantly consolidates it. It is difficult to name what kind of spirit this is. In the abstract, presence. On this point, see the book "American Spirituality" by Cammajer.

The process of sanctification has a fundamental social function, which is to maintain and transmit the core values of society. The process of sanctification of society plays a very important role. It spreads its spirit to all levels of society on the one hand, and attracts people to join the sanctification process on the other. It is here that people's emotions, thoughts, beliefs, and pursuits come into some kind of agreement. I am reminded of Rousseau's argument that society must have a civil religion and feel that the process of social sanctification is very much like the process of creating and spreading a civil religion. In such an individualistic, self-centered society, sanctification is the best mechanism for spreading core values.

A society cannot develop in a balanced way without core values. The question is where the core values come from and how they are maintained. If they come from the extraction of things around people, and are spread and maintained by people themselves, they may be a most powerful mechanism.

## **5. Space Shuttle misdirection**

"The space shuttle Discovery was launched successfully and flew straight into the blue sky. All television networks broadcast live footage. The launch was extraordinary for the United States, which had not launched a space shuttle for more than two years after January 1986. That year, the world was rocked by the explosion of Challenger and the tragic death of its astronauts. Two and a half years later, Discovery was launched, fulfilling the dreams of many.

The space shuttle program best exemplifies the American spirit, or, as Cammajer put it, the American belief that nothing is impossible and that we will not rest until we have won it all. The exploration of space embodies this belief. The process of building, launching and controlling the space shuttle is extraordinarily complex. One need only look at the dizzying array of hundreds of computers in the control center to imagine the technological capabilities required. Since the

Challenger accident, the U.S. space sector, it took two and a half years to improve the program, a total of more than four hundred technical improvements. The American belief is as stated above, so they are confident that they can find a way and persevere. This spirit prompted them to carry out many extremely daring imaginations, such as the Star Wars program, the space shuttle, etc., and also prompted them to accept many small, insignificant inventions, such as machines for opening envelopes, cans, electric pencil sharpeners, etc. It should be said that this belief is a very important force that drives the development of society.

However, this belief can also be alienating. This belief drives Americans to come up with solutions to the problems they face, resulting in a high level of scientific and technological development, but the high level of scientific and technological development is often followed by the illusion that it is not man who ultimately solves the problem, but rather that science and technology become the ultimate power and man becomes its slave.

A professor and I were discussing this issue and felt the same way. This illusion dominates a large part of society. In the face of some intricate social and cultural problems, Americans tend to think of it as a scientific and technological problem. Or it is a matter of money (which is a result of the spirit of commercialism), rather than a matter of people, of subjectivity. This is also true in the political sphere. The approach to the growth of Soviet power was to desperately develop equipment superior to Soviet weapons systems, including the eventual proposed Star Wars program. The way to deal with terrorism is to strike the other side with advanced attack forces. The way to deal with threats in international waters is a powerful and well-equipped fleet. The way to deal with regimes you don't like is to provide the opposition with a lot of advanced weaponry. The most typical illustration of this is the equipment that disabled people get, automatically guided handwheels, bedside service equipment that can follow orders, and glasses that can be guided. People with disabilities are free to move around. But as human beings, their problems are not solved. This is also true in the field of politics and international relations.

On the one hand, people believe too much in technology, and on the other hand, technology has become political. "After Discovery's successful launch, Kennedy Space Center director Forrest McCartney

said, "Every American must have raised an eyebrow today." President Reagan watched it on television from Washington, D.C., and made a speech saying, "America is back in space." In fact, the space program has been a political weight from the beginning. In the 1960s, the Soviet Union succeeded in landing on the moon, and Americans were so enraged that President Kennedy ordered an all-out space program, followed by the Apollo moon landing, which overwhelmed the Soviet Union by a mile. There is political competition behind technological competition, and political competition needs technological competition and technological competition supports political competition.

An important direction for humanity in the twentieth century is the high integration of politics and technology. Politics without technology cannot be a strong politics, and of course, technology without politics cannot be a strong technology.

As a result of this combination of technology and politics, technology itself has been alienated. This phenomenon is particularly stark in the United States. Sometimes it is not the people who master the technology, but the technology that masters the people. If you want to overwhelm the Americans, you must do one thing: surpass them in science and technology. For many peoples it is different; having technology does not work; there must also be cultural, psychological and sociological conditions.

Americans have been in a privileged position for a long time, almost since World War I, when its privileged position was formed. In seventy years, the United States has had several generations, and those born after World War II are now in their forties. This generation of Americans is in the atmosphere of "America First", and a psychological stereotype has been formed. As a result, the United States is also a nation that can not afford to lose. Technological superiority has gradually developed into national superiority, and they cannot imagine that any nation can surpass them. Japan's rapid rise in the post-war decades has led to unusually rapid development in the field of high technology, which has surpassed the United States in some aspects, such as electronic products and automobiles. Japanese products flooded into the U.S. market, and Japanese money flooded into the United States. Some people say that a lot of Hawaii's real estate fell into the hands of the Japanese, because the Japanese have come to buy houses, so that the price of land soared. Americans are not convinced of this, often disdain for the Japanese, always talked about with a contemptuous

attitude. Americans for a long time do not want to recognize the success of Japan. Harvard professor Fu Gao-Yi spent a lot of effort to make Americans understand this point. His "Japan Ranked First" woke up Americans like a dream. A similar situation, I think Americans will encounter again.

This wonderful intersection of politics and technology also involves the space shuttle. And this high technology is a concentrated reflection of this relationship. Some scholars have recognized this and have begun to criticize this "alienation". One professor of physics, Allen, has argued that after the Challenger launch failure, NASA prioritized a successful launch in order to save face and for political motives. When I say misdirection of the space shuttle, I am speaking metaphorically, but I am actually referring to misdirection of science and technology. It may take generations for Americans to recognize this "misdirection."

## **6. Work ethics**

The attitude of Americans towards work, naturally, cannot be said to be clear-cut, there is a great difference. If we talk about the workforce in society as a whole, the difference is enormous. Many people would rather receive government handouts than get a job, and they don't do it even if they have one. This is a major problem in society, and many taxpayers are complaining: Why is the government taking money out of our pockets and giving it to those who are idle? The middle class, in particular, is angry about this.

If we're talking about people who are working, that's another story. Most people who work, work hard, diligently and actively. This can be interpreted in many ways. Work ethic is a society's most valuable asset. People's work attitude is serious and diligent, society will gain this wealth. Conversely, society loses this wealth. The economic take-off of Japan, Singapore, Hong Kong and South Korea is closely related to people's work attitude.

Naturally, in different societies, people can promote work ethic in different ways. For example, in eastern cultures like Japan, South Korea, Singapore and Hong Kong, strict management system may be an important factor. In developed capitalist countries, such as the United States, where individualism dominates the heap, it is worth analyzing

what promotes people's work attitudes. In any case, a good work attitude inspired by whatever method is used. It is the first asset of a society.

The American work ethic can be described as serious and diligent, and some of them make it difficult to do so.

In all government offices, public places, stores, airports, stations, restaurants, etc., most people have a good work attitude. They are conscientious, enthusiastic, proactive and well versed in their business. I have been to many public and private departments, some to do research, some to do business, and most of the people there can be called competent in their work. They work on their own initiative. When I did research in Congressman Negel's office, the two clerks there explained everything carefully, piece by piece, and rummaged around for reference materials. The three secretaries in the political science department where I worked sat there every day, three people who rarely spoke, minding their own business. Most of the people in the workplace, the Department is busy, idle people are almost not.

If you go to the tertiary sector, the service attitude are good. Hospitality in restaurants, warm initiative; stores, the same sales clerk, answer all questions, often take the initiative to ask, what to help. The drivers of the buses are always thinking of the passengers. I took a class of bus, because of the long time. The driver knew where I lived and took the initiative to stop at that intersection. When you fly, if there is any problem, the airline will arrange the whole process. One of my friend's parents came to the U.S. and the elderly did not speak English and the plane was delayed. The airline took care of all the arrangements, including arranging hotels and transfers. If you want to eat pizza at home, you can call the company and they will deliver it to you. The whole service industry is very convenient, and it is not strange.

When it comes to work ethic, many Americans are also extremely hardworking. One young assistant professor I know comes to the office almost every Saturday and Sunday to work. He was finishing his doctoral dissertation. Most faculty members come to the department office every day and sit in front of the computer to write books. Some are said to be less diligent once they reach the position of full professor. One professor's wife, who works with lasers, has an amazing work ethic. She worked in the lab almost every evening and Sunday. Perhaps the Japanese

work ethic is even more impressive. It is not unusual for Japanese people to work late into the night. The Japanese have a famous saying, "work until your pee is red". Many people in the United States also work hard, but there is a difference between them and the Japanese. Americans have a special word to describe this kind of people, called Workaholics, directly translated as "alcoholic workers", consisting of the words "work" and "alcoholism".

The question is what motivates Americans to work this way? What forces could motivate them to do so in such a capitalist society, in such an individualistic society? If work attitudes require huge institutions to promote them, it would be an unbearable burden on the economic management of society.

There are various interpretations, one of which is work ethic. Work ethic is the attitude towards work that is influenced by work ethic. Work ethics have also become Puritan ethics and Protestant ethics. Some believe that they encourage people to work hard. This ethos was brought to America from Europe by the early colonists and is based on the spirit that material success is a sign of God's gift and that those who achieve these successes will be God's chosen people and will enter heaven. Weber, who wrote a book analyzing the inherent relationship between the Puritan ethic and the development of capitalism, is considered a prominent theorist of this school. Today, this religious overtone has long faded considerably, but the spirit still exists in a small way. Most people can no longer be said to be influenced by this religious spirit. The development of culture has long since relegated this religious spirit to a distant place. If the older people still have this idea, the younger generation does not know what this religious belief is. So, obviously, it cannot be explained by religious feelings. Religious feelings, for the new generation, are already a very distant story.

Another explanation is that the American Dream drives people to work hard. Those who have seen the TV series "Ellis Island" can easily understand what the typical American Dream is: it is to get rich and become wealthy. It's about getting rich and getting richer. You get paid for working hard, you get richer, and you improve your social status. The explanation that immigrants come to the United States and become "rich" as a result is still valid, and most working Americans are motivated by a confluence of several factors, among which the acquisition of money is a very basic one. But it's hard to say whether



everyone wants to make a fortune. Many Americans no longer have such an interest, as long as they can live comfortably on the line.

There is also an explanation from a psychological perspective. This explanation believes that work can lead to satisfaction, such as Maslow has a systematic theoretical analysis. In fact, there are indeed a number of Americans who seek psychological satisfaction in their work. This phenomenon is evidenced by the large number of volunteer workers. Voluntary workers are not paid and are completely obligated, but they can get rid of their personal loneliness by their work, get social recognition, and find the meaning of their existence. But after all, there are not many people who consider the problem from a purely psychological point of view.

There should be some other mechanism that motivates people to work hard. I think that the most important thing is that people's desire to pursue life can be satisfied only when they work hard. There are two main principles that give rise to this mechanism: first, the improvement of living standards is determined mainly by the amount of income, the amount of money, which becomes necessary to maintain and improve life; second, most jobs are provided by the private sector, both in the public and private sectors, with full employment rights and no lifetime employment. On the one hand, people must work in order to survive or live better, and on the other hand, if they want to continue working or be better paid, they must work hard or risk losing their jobs. These two principles are the main motivation for most Americans to work hard today.

Of course, for both principles to work, other conditions are needed. Economically speaking, a sufficient influx of goods is a major condition. The full flow of goods allows everyone who has money to buy anything for sale, and status, power, and family are no longer limitations, so that everyone will go after money and nothing else. Culturally, since money is equal in front of any job, the difference between high and low in each profession is no longer important; what matters is that the money can be used to achieve the goal one is seeking. The money earned by sanitation workers does not smell bad and circulates in the society as well. When people's desire to consume is fully stimulated, as long as they have money, they can, and the difference in the nature of work is the second level of things.

It can be said that this set of mechanisms is coercive, they include all people in the capitalist way of operating and force everyone who enters this mechanism to obey their rules, or it can be said that the delivery is the coercion of private ownership. They can expel anyone who does not want to obey this mechanism. People get money here, and capital gets profit here. This mechanism is the basic one that allows capitalist society to function. At the same time, this mechanism is outside the political system, and people's work ethic is ensured by this mechanism, not by the political system. The political system appears much easier.

The above statement is a generalization that there are anti-social and anti-system forces in society. Many people prefer to stay out of the system.

Americans work hard, but they are also the best at relaxing. In American terms, it means to work hard and play hard, work hard and play hard. This is different from the Japanese, who are probably only the first half, working hard. The Japanese have recently been talking about a disease called "death by overwork," in which many people die of chronic overwork in middle age. Americans have the most ambitious plans for spending money on the weekends or during the holidays. Students are also most frantic on the weekends. Perhaps they have suffered too much coercion and repression at work and want to let off steam.

There is one prerequisite for a good work ethic in any society, and it is simple: find a way to make each person feel that they are working for themselves, not for others. For most people this is important. The way to make people feel this way can vary. This feeling is not necessarily created in the economic sphere alone, but also requires other conditions such as politics and culture. In fact, social organizations, in any way, rarely allow everyone to work for themselves, so that society would not be a society, and the key thing is to make people feel this way, this belief.

## **7. sexual liberation**

The sexual liberation of Westerners is something that is both tempting and unbelievable in the eyes of Easterners. Most Easterners have heard about Westerners' sexual freedom, casual sex, and sexual pervasiveness. In fact, this issue is not so easy to explore for a person who has just

stepped into the United States, because it is impossible to penetrate into the American life. Sightseers can see movie theaters showing X-rated movies on the streets and groups of prostitutes on the streets of New York. There is also nudity and sexuality on television shows. Bookstores and grocery stores display pornographic publications such as Playgirl, Playboy, and Penthouse. But these were all commercialized sexual liberation. The real average American's view of sexuality is not so easy to understand. What I have analyzed is more theoretical than practical, because I really haven't gotten into the minds and lives of ordinary Americans. I remember the book "Glory and Dreams" which has a very documented depiction of sexual liberation.

One thing is certain: Westerners and Americans today have a much different view of sexuality than they did in the eighteenth century, even before the two world wars. Traditional Western concepts and ethics also emphasize women's chastity and self-respect, and a strict set of behavioral rules for women. Old European culture was more concerned with this. Today it is quite different. The classic shift is that sex cannot be limited to a definition of physical pleasure, nor can it be understood only as a symbol of deep human bonding (Elizabeth Janeway). For if it is so understood, sexual activity is subject to social, religious and moral values. The religious life of the European Middle Ages was one of repression of sexual desire and advocated that man repress his devotion to God. The Decameron depicts the inner quest of people under this repression. European religious spirituality basically considered sexual activity to be within the scope of the flesh and not in the ascension of the soul. Belief in God should be pursued in the sublimation of the soul and restraint of human instincts. The traditional restraint of human desire in Western society came from these deep-rooted ideas. After World War II, these ideas changed rapidly and are not what they used to be. Americans refer to the old concept of sexuality as the "rigid Victorian standard of sexuality. The core of this standard was that sex should be restricted to marriage, that prostitution was undoubtedly a sin, that pornography was morally depraved, and that homosexuality was evil. Today these ideas have changed. Naturally, they cannot be said to have disappeared, as there are still many people who still maintain traditional ideas.

To demonstrate the change in perception, we can look at some figures. According to the Ministry of Commerce, fifteen percent of men and women lived together without being married (1980), and 660,000 children were born unmarried in 1980. In the early 1980s there were about 2 million

prostitutes, 600,000 of whom were girls 18 years old or younger. The pornography industry generated about \$4 billion a year in the early 1980s. Homosexuality was also gaining increasing social status. In some places, homosexuality was legal, and marriages could be officially registered and lived together. Homosexuals often marched for their "legal rights". Television and movies give the best example of this shift: the "sex movement" at every turn. Naturally, this is not the case with some of the best films, such as the Academy Award-winning ones.

To better understand this shift, take a look at a book by Bruno Leone and M. Teresa O'Neill, *Sexuality: Opposing Perspectives*, which presents different perspectives on the shift in approach to sexuality.

Are non-marital sexual relationships acceptable? Some people believe that the primary function of sex is to provide pleasure, so the primary question is not whether you are married or unmarried, but whether you have pleasure. Another idea is that sex is about having love, and love has a specific object, while sex has no specific object, so the two cannot be equated. Others think about the issue from a purely scientific point of view. Some think of sex as relaxation, self-propulsion, experience, advancing marriage options, reducing jealousy, saving time, ending sexual discrimination, limiting prostitutes, etc. Contrary opinions suggest that sexuality requires mutual adaptation, that personal communication is the key to sexuality, that a guilty mind can be a barrier, etc. There are also contrasting views on whether government regulation should be imposed, with some believing that government regulation infringes on the private sphere and others believing that government regulation facilitates family growth.

The popularity of sex education among underage children in the United States has also caused controversy regarding this issue. Some believe that sex education leads to sexual activity because children are unaware of these issues, and once it is made clear, everyone wants to try it, resulting in teenage pregnancy. Another idea is that sex education promotes responsible sexual behavior, and that because 10 percent of young women between the ages of 15 and 19 become pregnant each year, sex education should be provided. In fact, in such a sexually liberated social environment, teenagers are hearing and seeing from all sides, and sex education is a "forced" choice. Because of this difference in perception, a third opinion is that parents have the

right to vote on what kind of sex education their children will or will not receive.

Is homosexuality acceptable? One notion that homosexuality is harmful to society is a more conservative one. This idea is that homosexuality leads to the decline of the male principle. Female homosexuality may be harmless, but male homosexuality is very harmful because it will leave no family. The other idea is the opposite, that homosexuality is a socially responsible contribution, that it is not a pathology, and that it brings people together. Some suggest that homosexuality should be "behind closed doors" and not open. Some advocate that homosexuals have the right to live openly and that they should be allowed to live in the light of day, which is a human right.

In 1968, President Nixon organized a special commission to investigate this issue. Eight members of the commission investigated pornographic publications and films. Their report concluded that pornography was harmless. They believed that these media could increase mutual understanding among adults and that public opinion considered it unacceptable to legislate against pornography. This was the majority report. The minority report of the committee found pornographic publications harmful, arguing that they are extremely harmful to society, public morality, human values, family attitudes, and culture, and that the pornography industry is contrary to human nature. The debate on this issue is very different between the two factions, with those in favor of prohibition believing that pornography causes sexual violence, juvenile depravity, family breakdown, and other problems. Those against believe that pornography comforts the human psyche and conforms to the norms of a free society. There is also a difference of opinion as to whether pornography promotes violence or not.

Is it a crime to be a prostitute? Prostitution is generally understood by the Chinese to mean "prostitution". The debate around this issue in the United States is also clear-cut. Some argue that prostitution is a crime. Others believe that prostitution is not a crime. The two schools of thought are at odds.

These arguments are all related to sexual liberation. Once upon a time, these issues were self-evident, but today they are rather unintelligible. American culture is now a culture of tolerance for sexuality, and all five kinds can exist. This is both the strength and

the weakness of American culture. I am afraid that in America, the best can exist and the worst can exist.

"Sexual liberation" has influenced the sexuality of the younger generation. Most of the parents growing up now are the generation in the 1960s at the height of "sexual liberation". People generally have a more open attitude toward sexual liberation. It is normal for high school students to have girlfriends or boyfriends. This is especially true for middle schoolers and above. Young people think more in terms of pleasure and don't seem to associate pleasure with having a family, which is a different thing. Parents are also used to these things. Often, they instruct their children on how to have sex properly so that girls don't get pregnant. One professor told me that her children didn't need her guidance, and as soon as she spoke her children indicated that they knew three years ago. Sexual relations between college students are also more usual and casual for Easterners, who still find some concepts difficult to accept.

What is "sexual liberation"? Consider the New Charter of Sexual Rights and Responsibilities, which appeared in February 1976. The Charter says: "Physical pleasure has the same value as moral values. Traditional religious and social concepts often accuse carnal pleasure of being a "sin". These concepts are inhumane and destroy human relationships. Findings from behavioral science indicate that deprivation of physical pleasure, especially during the anthropogenic period, often leads to family disintegration, child abuse, crime, violence, alcoholism, and other inhumane behaviors. We declare that carnal pleasure within the context of human relationships is essential." This is, in effect, the leaven of sexual liberation: from the fear of carnal pleasure to the pursuit of carnal pleasure.

I'm afraid that American "sexual liberation" has reached its peak. There is nothing left for future generations to discover. Pornographic magazines have exposed everything about men and women. Any further discovery would be anatomical. Pornographic magazines often use large color photographs to render the human body, including the fine details of the genitals. In many states, these magazines are available for public sale. Pornographic films are rife with sexual acts. In such an environment, arguments can naturally be heated.

The biggest problem is the younger generation. In order to cope with such a carnal-seeking age, schools offer courses in this area. There

are countless other manuals for teenagers and parents. All kinds of libraries have such manuals. Teenage students take this class. These books generally tell young men and women clearly about their physiology, the changes in puberty, how to use contraception, etc. This type of education is very popular.

Although it is said that "sexual liberation", many people still have their own views on the issue of sex. One friend told me. Americans are not as casual as they are portrayed in movies, or at least he takes the issue seriously. In political life, having sexual relations outside of marriage is scandalous. 1988 election, Hart, who originally wanted to run for president, had to withdraw from the race because of such stories. In areas such as schools, this can sometimes be an issue. Quayle, the Republican candidate for vice president, was once involved in this kind of fiasco, but fortunately nothing happened to him. So the ethical norms that maintain the basic order of a society have not been completely breached, they are still in effect.

The question is why there was "sexual liberation" after the 1960s, but not before? Is there any logical connection between this and the high level of material production? There should be. Freud said that the development of civilized life inevitably suppressed human instincts. Marcuse called it a "necessary repression". But after the full development of material life, people do not need to use all their energy to cope with nature and maintain physical survival, human instincts will be unleashed. The development of the material level of society leads to a revolution of moral concepts. The more important issue of this process is that it raises a new issue of social management: from the management of material production to the management of human behavior. I am afraid that this is a problem that any society will encounter after reaching a certain level of material level.

Marcuse sees "sexual liberation" as a means of liberating modern man from the repression of the large capitalist machine, giving it a political meaning. So far, however, this political meaning is not so obvious. One thing that can be confirmed is that the social meaning of sexual liberation does not lie in the individual's desire for more physical pleasure, but in the change of people's perceptions, which is a factor that cannot be ignored for the management of society.

The "sexual liberation" has created new problems. When sexual activity was strictly regulated, the conflicts and contradictions arising from sexual repression often became an important aspect of family and social management. Sexual liberation removes the basis for the existence of these conflicts, and the management of the family and society is relieved of a considerable burden. Although society carries a new burden, after all, it is changed. It is a tricky job for social management to maintain the old order and old ideas. The longer it takes, the more difficult it becomes. Naturally, maintaining the new order and new ideas is also a tricky job, and the shorter the time, the more difficult it is. There seems to be a contradiction between these two, a dilemma that makes it difficult to choose. This is where the problem of American society lies. "Sexual liberation" is the most typical sample of the new problems it raises, which have emerged now and will become more apparent in the future.

## **8. The Lonely Heart**

A writer recently wrote a book called "The Lonely American" that has caused quite a stir. The main idea of the book is that in today's American society, all kinds of people have become very lonely, whether they are single, married, teenagers or elderly. Loneliness, or the deep sense of loneliness in people's hearts, has brought about a lot of difficulties and problems to society. Especially as people with emotional needs and interaction needs, they are more likely to be bitter, lost, desolate, uncertain, despondent, anxious and sad..... in this environment. These internal variations, as well as the mental pressure, largely determine people's behavior, and thus constitute a pressure in the operation of society. Human loneliness is posing an increasingly serious challenge to society and constitutes an important aspect of social management and government administration.

How are Americans lonely? Some people don't think that Americans are lonely either, or at least they may not all think so themselves. It may not be true that every American is lonely, but there are plenty who feel lonely.

It is entirely possible for children to be lonely at home. There are many reasons why children may feel lonely. Many children have only a "single parent," that is, a father or a mother. This may be due to the divorce of the parents, or the mother may be unmarried and have



children. In such a family, the child lacks the necessary family warmth, and over time, a sense of loneliness develops. The phenomenon of "single families" is extremely common, and a large proportion of children and adolescents live in such families. Even in an intact family, this situation can easily arise. If parents are busy with work, they have no time for their children. Many families use the American way of raising children, which is to encourage independence. Children are placed in separate rooms at an early age and left to their own devices. In some sense, this is good for child development. However, in a combination of certain factors, it can also lead to a sense of isolation in children. I dare not say that this type of nursing necessarily leads to loneliness in people's minds, but the imprint it puts on children's minds is hardly anti-solitude. The findings of psychologists show that the life experiences of a person in adolescence will have an indelible impact on that person's life.

We can say that teenagers do not know loneliness, born in loneliness, do not know loneliness. But older people feel this very well. Loneliness among the elderly is a major headache in American society. Most elderly people are in a state of loneliness. Children generally do not live with the elderly, each has their own things. There is little psychological comfort for the elderly. When children come back to visit on holidays, it is also a whirlwind. In their daily lives, children rarely interfere, believing that it is everyone's private domain and actually not wanting to interfere. Many elderly people live in nursing homes and move into them when they are old enough. The movie "On Golden Pond", which won an Academy Award and starred Henry Fonda, deeply portrays the inner loneliness of an elderly couple and their witty approach to the problem, which resonates strongly with people. The elderly have many organizations of their own, all designed to combat loneliness. For example, the Burial Committee, mostly composed of elderly people, is responsible for arranging the funeral affairs of the elderly after their death. The existence of this organization is probably very telling.

People in the middle of childhood and old age also feel various kinds of loneliness for various reasons. People who are working also seem to have difficulty in finding some mechanism to eliminate loneliness. Work is a purely technical or material activity, which means that there is a lack of emotional and spiritual communication. Of course, it is not true that any workplace lacks such a mechanism, but it is not easy to develop such a mechanism. The American egoism, which is often reflected

in work, develops work into the biggest obstacle to emotional and spiritual communication. The high mobility of social work also constitutes an obstacle to the development of hypertechnical relationships. Many people who work part-time tend to work for three or five days and then leave, so how can we talk about interpersonal communication? Married men and women, in general, feel less lonely, but that is not always the case. Many partners still have difficulties in communicating with each other spiritually. Divorced men and women, there is no need to talk about loneliness, and this problem has become a major social problem in the United States. The divorce rate in the United States is probably the highest in the world. After divorce, men and women are very prone to loneliness and often live in lonely situations.

American loneliness is either superficial or deep and manifests itself in different forms. It is also a disease derived from all developed societies. A friend told me a story that vividly reflects the loneliness of an American. The main character of the story is a woman of almost fifty years old. She came from a wealthy family, married to a professor, and then divorced. Her children have grown up and are living independently outside the home. She now lives alone in a house. She has no job and earns some money by working short hours. Due to her mental depression, she often drinks heavily. When she drinks, she becomes delirious, crying and screaming, which is naturally caused by her mental loneliness. But what made people feel that she was lonely was not her situation, but people's attitude toward her. The friend, who was living in her house, was often worried about the woman's condition. He called her children. Her children said that it was her business and they could not interfere with it. If she felt that she needed to go to the hospital or to the police, it was up to her to decide and they could not decide. In effect, they were saying that they couldn't control it, but just let it happen. When he called her best friend, the answer was the same, saying there was nothing he could do. Although the best friend, but also can not exceed the authority, the friend often can only watch her drunken madness, helpless. That best friend of hers said, "She is trying to treat me like a mother and pamper me." From the bottom of her heart, that friend despised her too. The question is, why was she like that? It was a deep-seated loneliness. Her loneliness was not only within herself, but also in the way society treated her on the outside. She was alone in society, and society was alone in her. This is the situation that a lonely American encounters.

How are Americans lonely? This is a question that is difficult to answer in one sentence. We can say that the American economic system has created human loneliness, and the prominence and importance of money in society has monetized human relationships, while human feelings are forced down in money relationships. A little warmth may mean money. We can say that the dominant value of America – individualism – leads to the isolation of the individual. Tocqueville says that the American Revolution led to the growth of individualism, but individualism means at the same time self-solitude. Without accepting self-solitude, the fear of dissolution also makes it difficult to truly create the conditions for individualism. The overwhelming position of individualism in society may be a good note for the lonely American. We could say that the American protection of the private domain also protects loneliness; each person does not like or want others to invade his or her own domain of life. This desire breeds solitude. Perhaps Americans like solitude, or more accurately, want a moderate amount of it. The question is whether they are prepared to deal with the greater or socially imposed loneliness. The mechanisms that people devise and build themselves to ensure moderate loneliness sum up in society to impose unbearable and unbearable loneliness on the individual. The problems that such mechanisms create for the individual become potential problems for society. Human loneliness is a product of social institutions, and it is difficult to find solutions as long as such social institutions remain intact. The most difficult thing for an institution to overcome is its own by-products.

The authors of Megatrends argue that the development of high technology has increased the pursuit of high emotion. The overly concentrated pursuit of any one thing in a society constitutes a political management problem. The isolation of people has become a major burden on the political system and will continue to do so. Analyzing many of the government's policy actions, it is easy to see that the more fundamental motivation lies in the complex and constant role of each person's loneliness.

## **9. Future World**

The American mentality is a complex synthesis that sometimes feels so contradictory. The popular view is that since James and Peirce developed the philosophy of pragmatism, the nation has become a most

pragmatic people. The idea of pragmatism and the requirement to "deliver value" permeate every corner of the American spirit.

The so-called pragmatism, embodied in the meteorological social life and human behavior, is to focus on everything to achieve useful, effective, practical goals, and reject the vague, unattainable or seemingly non-existent value standards. In the contemporary United States, this spirit is materialized as "money first", with the sight of money as the touchstone of pragmatism. Make money, in a way, has become the essence of pragmatism in the present era.

There is certainly a significant portion of society that still struggles, pursuing political, moral, ethical, religious, social or philosophical values. But most of those who work in these fields are not as idealistic. In the government sector, there are so many officials, probably not too many of them are thinking about the American ideals at all times, and they do their job because it is just a job, without any sense of responsibility like "carrying morality on iron shoulders". They do their jobs because it's just a job and there is no sense of responsibility like "a man with an iron shoulder"; in the welfare machine, people are eager to take care of the poor and the disabled, but it's hard to say that every one of them does it because they are compassionate to the lower class and the poor, but because it's a job and because someone is paying for it; university professors write books and speak impassioned in the classroom, criticizing the government and calling for change, but Most of the professors only regard this as work, and not as many of them have the sense..... of mission and responsibility of intellectuals. This is just to show how pragmatism dominates the American spirit and society, especially in a society that recognizes money but not people.

On the other hand, it is not negligible and strange that society is full of another spirit, which I will call "futurism". In this materialistic society, there is rarely any force that can override pragmatism. However, the idea of futurism has a particularly strong appeal and allure. Therefore, futurism also constitutes a fundamental core in the general spirit of this society. Other ideas are difficult to convince, but the idea of futurism is strong and powerful. By futurism we mean something that does not have a direct effect at present, but will have an effect in the future, whether it is a concrete substance, an abstract idea, or a state of affairs. Looking at it this way reveals that pragmatism and futurism are a contradictory

pair, one seeking the value of the present moment, the other the value of the future. But these two spirits do dominate this society, so it is said to be a complex synthesis.

We can look at examples of futuristic spirituality.

On the political front, look at the 1983 presidential election. A popular topic of debate between Bush and Dukakis was America in the twenty-first century, or the world and America in the twenty-first century. Can the United States maintain its current position in the world? Where will the United States go in the face of challenges from Japan and Europe, and possibly from China? How will the U.S. choose when the Soviet Union and Eastern European countries pose a challenge to the United States on all fronts? Both parties, in their efforts to win over voters, have talked about how their policy strategies will continue to make the twenty-first century the American century, which they see as the century of the United States. Now there is talk that the 21st century will be Japan's century or China's century. Bush has often said that the twenty-first century will be the American century. Such slogans are quite compelling. Nixon's 1987 book, "1999: Winning Without War," in which the recurring theme is how the United States will win in the future, what threats the United States will encounter in the future, and how the United States should choose its response, became an immediate bestseller. It is clear that this concern lies not only with politicians but also with the general public, otherwise it would not be successful as a strategy to pull voters.

On the military front, Americans also have a stronger futuristic sensibility. In terms of future warfare, strategy, and weapons research, the United States has been very concerned and invested heavily. The tens of billions of dollars spent on the Star Wars program is a futuristic dominated product. This plan, which seemed to many to be a whimsical idea, was determined to be put into practice in earnest by the Americans to deal with a possible new round of strategic weapons competition in the future. One of the factors underlying the uproar over this plan, which has caused much debate in the court and the country, is the conflict between the spirit of pragmatism and the spirit of futurism. The spirit of futurism prevails in most cases when it comes to armament development. Plus the arms industry mostly supports futurism because it is profitable. Even though they may all be authentic pragmatists themselves. The recent introduction of the B2 bomber is a typical reflection of this futurism. It is futurism, rather

than pragmatism, that dominates the development of strategic imperatives, despite appearances of pragmatism. In the conflicts and fluctuations in Nicaragua, the Philippines, and the Middle East, the attitude of the U.S. government has been, for the most part, based on futuristic strategic thinking.

When it comes to scientific and technological development, Americans are more futuristic. The idea of futurism is extremely flourishing in fundamental areas such as basic theory, astrophysics, biological sciences, and chemistry. It is often said that the sciences have the most money in American universities. All this money comes from foundations or whatever institutions outside the university. The leading idea as to why these institutions are willing to invest large sums of money is to look to the future. The recent announcement of the world's largest collider in the United States, with a total length of 80 kilometers, sounds like an amazing project. But with an eye on the future, the Americans decided to fund the construction. When it comes to computers, Americans are also looking to the future, and companies are investing large sums of money in developing the latest models. Environmental protection, which has attracted unprecedented attention in this society, has become a fundamental force in government policy, with an unprecedented public consensus on the issue. Without a futuristic spirit, such a consensus would have been difficult to develop.

In urban construction, the mark of futurism is even deeper. Whether in Iowa, a small city of a few tens of thousands of people, or in New York, a metropolis of over ten million people, futurism has a pivotal role in the design of urban construction. One of the conditions that must be kept in mind in order for an urban plan to be successful and realized is what will become of the design in the coming decades. Will it become an obstacle to further urban development? Or will it be a bridge to further urban development? In many cities, highways, subways, buildings, and homes are designed and built with the future world in mind. The International Trade Tower in New York, for example, is a majestic building standing tall above, and the world below is even more amazing, with a huge underground level with subways and trains to all parts of New York and neighboring states. The designers designed it with the needs of future urban development in mind. In many cities, much of the housing is over fifty or even a hundred years old, but it still does not look dilapidated or cramped, and a small building, renovated, is still very substantial housing. This is an incomparable

resource, if at that time are built five or twenty years to be eliminated or become uninhabitable when the house, then the housing is not possible to reach the level of today. Futurism, in the construction of the city, is expressed as a hundred-year plan.

Futurism is also evident in the education of talent. Americans understand that the world of the future is the world of today's children and young people. Can they meet the challenges of this world and the challenges of the world of tomorrow? The term "children's paradise" refers to a society where children are cared for in a holistic way so that they can meet the challenges of the future. This is also true of university education. The success and status that we have achieved today is inseparable from university education. The success of education is the most powerful force in maintaining and developing a social system. No matter what the nature of that social system is, it is difficult to maintain it without a successful education. Both the government and the university have put great effort in coping with the world of the future.

The spirit of futurism is reflected in many aspects. Therefore, it is not possible to simply dismiss this society as pragmatic. It goes without saying that pragmatism is predominant. The question is to understand why this society breeds such strong futurism. And how are these two spirits reconciled? The spirit of the American tradition has always been pragmatism. From the time the first settlers set foot in this territory and began to build homes and fight nature in this newfound land, pragmatism has had to be preached. There is not as long a cultural tradition here, not as much philosophy, not as much money and wealth for people to engage in the unthinkable. To survive, one has to be pragmatic. The spirit formed by the early immigrants has become the dominant spirit of the society as the vast territory is developed.

On the other hand, since the twentieth century, the United States has gradually become involved in the international community, and leapt to become the world's leading power. After World War II, the United States became the number one power. Decades of history have created a strong mentality among Americans: "We are number one in the world." To maintain this status, it became a consensus of the nation, to maintain the status of "boss" in today's competitive world, it is natural to choose futurism, otherwise it will lag behind. I am afraid it is difficult to draw a precise conclusion here as the "first in the world" mentality is implicit in the promotion of futurism. But if a country is

in the first position in the world and does not want to be surpassed by others and to be ahead of others in every aspect, it will naturally be eliminated.

If we look deeper into individual psychology, perhaps the fact that Americans follow futurism is related to the fact that everyone feels that the future is too insecure. Americans can hardly be said to have anything guaranteed for life in terms of employment, social life, marriage, education, etc. In the American system, it is rare for an individual to have lifetime security from the government; the only possibility is social security, and that requires a job to be covered. or not worse conditions. For every member of society, the uncertainty of the future is an important motivation for individuals to believe in futurism.

Here, pragmatism and futurism are both in conflict and in synthesis. At the moment of synthesis, it is a moment when both streams of thought find it beneficial. At the moment of conflict, it is a moment of disagreement between the two. Most of the conflicts and disputes that occur in this society on many issues are related to the similarities and differences between these two spiritualities, which is of course a deeper conflict. In many cases, people believe in futurism, often from pragmatic thinking, and in other cases, people believe in pragmatism, again from futuristic thinking.

The development of this land is inseparable from the concern of the people here for the future world. Those who are concerned about the future world may have various purposes, such as to dominate the world, to advance its development, or for personal motives, but this concern will become a concept and spirit in the development of a society, and it will bring a driving force that cannot be replaced by other forces. In general, only when any people pay attention to the future world and find out what position they will have or will fight for in the future world can they really find the way to development and a wide and broad vision.

## **10. People are always people**

It is generally believed that human relationships in American society are simpler and less complex, and people live in society based on their abilities, knowledge, and money, rather than on relationships, family,



and other factors, which constitute the biggest difference between Eastern and Western societies, and the culture of Eastern societies, especially within the Confucian cultural circle, emphasizes identity, discipline, etiquette, and blood, while Western culture emphasizes talent, law, profit, and authority. . In general, and only in general, this division is acceptable. But it must not be assumed that this is absolutely true of American and Western societies. Just as relationships are not always relied upon in Eastern societies, they are not always relied upon in Western societies.

Due to the developed economy and material abundance, there are some problems that are easier to solve in American society and do not require too complicated operational processes. A person to do the most difficult and tiring work, road repair, cleaners, porters, after taking the money can buy any goods in the store, can go to stay in any high-class hotel, can go to any restaurant to eat and drink. Most of the things that rich people can do, others with money can also do. This is what Marcuse called assimilation or integration. Marcuse was critical of this, arguing that this mechanism assimilated class divisions, and that the working class assimilated into the capitalist system and became unaware of its exploitation and oppression. This was the result of a highly developed commodity economy. The full flow of commodities harmonized social contradictions. In fact, in many societies, the cause of various social contradictions is the scarcity of commodities. Ordinary people do not think that much about high and profound problems; they think from their own food, clothing, and housing. They think in terms of their own food, clothing, and shelter. The focus of social coordination is not to explain a grand theory in a sophisticated way, but to meet the daily needs of ordinary people.

In the abstract, American relationships are less complex, but interpersonal interactions are also less deep. At the core of American life is the protection of the private sphere. So few people like it when others intrude too much, or intrude too much on others. This is different from Eastern cultures. So the American concept of friend is different from the Eastern culture. A friend can be an acquaintance, or someone you met at school, or at church, or on the sports field, or at work. But this kind of interaction is not deep, and it is rare to have a close friendship. It is not difficult for Americans to have a first friendship, but not a deep friendship, and it is not difficult for Chinese people to have a first friendship, but not a deep friendship. There is a great deal of social mobility, with one-fifth of American

families moving each year, and material abundance creates the conditions for this choice. The high mobility creates two kinds of impetus: on the one hand, people move a lot and need mechanisms to find friends quickly, and on the other hand, this mobility makes it difficult to establish truly unbreakable friendships. Non-relative interactions between people come from teenage and young adult years. With a family, it is difficult to form deep friendships. Energy, finances, and culture do not allow it. And it is easier in the teenage and young adult years. After living in one place for more than ten years, you spend your childhood and teenage years with a group of people. Things change when you get to the college years. The mechanics of college also make it difficult to form deep friendships; college students are largely solitary, with no concept of classes, taking whatever class they choose and going their separate ways the next semester. Good housing conditions isolate people, as does college and as does society. Americans live alone for long periods of time, so that they often have an introverted and passive mentality, not knowing if they should deal with a stranger. This is especially true of foreigners, who rarely take the initiative to deal with them. Although the concept of "foreigner" is foreign to Americans, they often cannot tell who is a "foreigner" and who is a "native". In fact, it is very difficult, except that foreigners often think in their minds that they are foreigners, in this case, clearly identified foreigners. But Americans are often very welcoming if the foreigner takes the initiative. So on and so forth. Some people think it is good for the development of society, because there are no complicated interpersonal relationships and everyone can eat according to their abilities. Some people think it is not good for the development of society, because there is no deep friendship between people, and human feelings are too thin, and social life is not harmonious.

The above is just a general statement, in fact, when you look at American society, human relationships are not unimportant, but vital. People are always people, and without relationships, how can society be sustainable? In many ways, human relationships are very similar to those in Eastern cultures. One professor told me that in America, people can live well without relationships, but they can live better if they have them. I am afraid this is a more objective evaluation. In fact, this is not a unique phenomenon of a nation, but only a different degree under different cultural conditions and economic development.

I can give some examples of the American mentality.

In politics, the role of relationships is clear. one of the major controversies in the 1988 presidential campaign was the Republican vice presidential candidate Quayle, who was not considered by public opinion to be a prominent figure or to have gotten ahead by his own struggle, but by his family, which earned two million dollars a year. He did not do well in school, there was some talk of the draft, and so on. The power of family is still important in America. Without a family background, a person may come out on top, and with a family background, a person is more likely to come out on top. The Kennedy family is an example. When George W. Bush became president, he had the power to appoint all political officials, and many of his old friends were given high ranking positions, even though public opinion was not favorable to some of them. I will not dwell on these phenomena in politics, as I will discuss them in detail.

One of the professors who studied African issues told me that to do good research I had to do fieldwork in various countries and regions of East Africa, and that to do so I could not attend classes in the department. He got permission from the head of the department. The other professors then became very jealous; they didn't say anything on the surface, but there was a lot of gossip behind the scenes that this professor was getting too good a deal for not teaching and going abroad and getting a salary at the same time. In contrast, they were too unprofitable. I asked him how he could get the permission of the department head. He said the department chair had a good relationship with him. He was working on a plan to get the department chair to go to a country in Africa for a scenic trip and lecture on the side. This professor is a very decent man, but he knows how to get his way.

When I was visiting a university on the East Coast, a friend told me that the interpersonal relationships among professors in the department were complicated, with professors fighting with each other and shooting each other in the dark. Sometimes there were arguments in the classroom. One professor criticized a school of thought in class for having no theory and abstract data, and another professor in the room immediately asked him to be more specific. It was actually a conflict between the two of them. Professors often see professors in the same field as competition. Of course there are harmonious relationships.

In the society of working and working, interpersonal relationship is more important, how the relationship with the boss, how the relationship with the foreman, directly affects a person's status and

future. I think this is true in higher education institutions, not to mention others.

In a university, full professors with tenure hold the power in the department, while others have little power. Full professors can decide on the promotion and retention of other personnel, and such a power relationship determines the basic relationship of professors in the department. The desire of the other faculty members to have a good relationship with the full professor is very obvious. I am not saying that this relationship is bad per se, but I am trying to illustrate the existence of interpersonal relationships.

Another noteworthy event was a situation seen at a university that illustrates very well that Americans do not disregard human relations. A delegation from the Japanese business community came to speak at a university, representing some of Japan's major corporations and important academic institutions. The Japanese are rich and already known to the world. At the reception, many Americans treated the Japanese representatives with respect and looked for things to say. One woman official from the local government held the hand of a Japanese man for several minutes, smiling all over and saying straight out that the Japanese man had a beautiful tie. I felt uncomfortable looking at her. In fact, she was trying to get some Japanese investment for the local area. Americans mostly despise Japanese, but their attitude towards Japanese and what they think inside is different.

Examples of interpersonal relationships abound. But their role and mechanisms are different and not as important as in Eastern societies. The American system offers one condition: big deal to go. Under private ownership, it is normal for people to leave one unit to seek employment in another. But in some societies where this mechanism is not available, the interpersonal determinants are much greater. Social institutions, material abundance, and cultural mentality determine that interpersonal relationships in the United States are different from those in Eastern societies. But it would be idealistic to say that human relations are not valued here and are not needed.

People are always human, and they will repay any kindness or hatred. People are always human, people have human emotions, people have human needs. The extent to which modernization can change the nature of man needs to be studied.

# IV. Multi-level social regulation

## 1. The invisible hand

Western economies and societies operate on the principle of the "invisible hand", i.e., the economic lever, the market, regulates economic movement. Since Adam Smith proposed the economic principle of liberalism, despite the rise of Keynesianism and the welfare state, the principle of liberalism has remained the basic principle of the functioning of Western economies and societies. The "invisible hand" was once transformed into the "visible hand," i.e., direct governmental control over the entire economic and social process, and now Western governments are regulating economic behavior much more than before. However, Western societies are still dominated by the coordination of the "invisible hand. Both the "invisible hand" and the "visible hand" are related to the behavior of the government. Which approach is used determines the size of the government's function and burden. Generally speaking, the "invisible hand" reduces the burden of government, while the "visible hand" increases it. In modern society, politics and economics are so intertwined that changing the way the economy is regulated means changing the structure and function of the political and administrative system.

The "invisible hand" means that the political and administrative system does indirect control of the economy and society, only in the areas of taxation, finance, law, etc. The specific economic operations of individual enterprises, however, are left to each enterprise to do its thing in the sea of the market economy. This gives rise to extensive competition.

To win in an economy, to win big, a company must be good at competing, must be good at winning markets and customers from other similar companies, or it will go down the drain. They have no government agency to rely on, and the structure of government is all different from the structure of the economy in terms of laws and determining procedures that are difficult to cut through. If they do not compete well and do not operate well, they will go out of business and go bankrupt. This type of situation can happen within a business, i.e., something goes wrong with the internal operation of the business, or outside a business, i.e., other businesses are good at business, good at

management, and the environment changes. To be invincible, any enterprise has to be unique and improve continuously. The most important competition lies in the quality of service. Whether it is products, services, tangible or intangible, ultimately can be attributed to the quality of service. Without service quality, there will be no customers, there will be no market, there will be no profit, and they will be eliminated. This is an irresistible force that drives every enterprise to continuously improve service quality and compete for the market.

In this economic model, the government is not inactive. The government uses legal, financial and taxation instruments to regulate economic behavior, however, the government is not directly involved in the economic process. Government regulates at three stages: when a business starts, when it operates, and when it closes. Regulation is not management, and it is probably fair to say that regulation determines what not to do and what not to do in this society, and management determines what can and should be done in this society. Of course, this is only a very abstract argument. The duty of the political and administrative system is not to put in hand to teach companies what to do, but to control them not to go out of their way and to guide them in the general direction of social development. This is not to say that this coordination mechanism is perfect, since the "invisible hand" plays a leading role, there are many areas where the political and administrative system cannot intervene or can hardly intervene. Sometimes, the political and administrative system can also be used to avoid responsibility and stand aside.

To illustrate the role of the "invisible hand", here is an example of competition among travel agencies in San Francisco's Chinatown. I am afraid it is difficult to say how many travel agencies there are in San Francisco's Chinatown, but there are probably dozens of them. If you walk around San Francisco's Chinatown, you will see the signs of travel agencies. When you open the local Chinese newspaper, advertisements for travel agencies abound. Most of these travel agencies are owned by ethnic Chinese, and their general services include group tours, buying air tickets, gifts and bills abroad, and China pick-up services. Since the travel agencies offer roughly the same services, there is fierce competition among them for the market and for customers.

We can casually name some travel agencies, such as Pan Wai Travel and Transport, Lida Travel, Waiya Travel, Your Travel, Soon Wind Travel,

Cathay Travel, Gold Mountain Travel, Lishan Travel Consultants, Fei Fei Travel Company, Jet Airways, Swire Express, East Wind, Seven Seas Travel, Flying Boat Travel, Reed Travel, Wing On Travel, Envoy Travel, and so on. This is only a small portion of them, and only the travel agencies in Chinatown, which basically specialize in serving the Chinese and overseas Chinese. Add the travel agencies outside of China Town, and you can imagine the fierce competition.

Such travel duo handles worldwide travel programs. Such as to Europe, Asia, Latin America, but also for domestic travel projects. Due to the competition, each of them has to have new and high level tricks in terms of services, including: special cheap air tickets, route design, hotel agency, car rental, etc. In terms of airfare, the prices vary. For example, from San Francisco International Airport to Japan and then to Shanghai, some travel agencies offer \$ 480, some offer \$ 460, some offer \$ 440. This price competition naturally prompted the travel agencies to try to set prices within a reasonable range, otherwise they will lose the market. To quote low prices, but also involves the entire business management, if the price is low, no profit, the business will naturally collapse. Therefore, the competition between them is not only the competition of price, but also the competition of management ability, human quality and business style. This competition reflects the general characteristics of enterprise competition under the control of the "invisible hand".

In terms of service, due to competition, travel agencies have to try to improve the quality of service as well. I booked a ticket from San Francisco to Shanghai with a travel agency here. After I called and asked for the price, the travel agent booked the ticket for me by computer. A few days later, I went to pick up my ticket, everything was arranged, asked if I needed to change the date and flight, and if I didn't need to change, the ticket was issued. After I picked up the tickets on the spot, the woman also told me that I had to confirm my international ticket 72 hours before, and she said that the travel agency would handle the departure from San Francisco, and that I should not forget the travel agency after I arrived in Japan. She also took out the form for a Japanese visa and gave it to me, which is a kind of incidental service. I said I did not know anything about doing a Japanese visa, she immediately called the visa office of the Consulate General of Japan in San Francisco and asked for information. After a few days, Travel Du called to tell me that the flight from Tokyo to

Shanghai was cancelled and asked me what day I would like to leave instead. Very responsible to the customer.

Another professor in our department was also outbound in San Francisco, and he was going to Japan, Hong Kong and Singapore. It was a little more trouble to buy tickets, because it was necessary to connect all these places, and also involved visa time in one place, and so on. Finally a travel agency was selected and they issued the tickets. They calculated carefully, gave the lowest price, and helped with the visa process. To get a Hong Kong visa to go to Los Angeles, it was not convenient to go on your own and given to do it on your behalf. Various travel agencies in terms of service, customers have any requirements they try to consider to meet, and often take the initiative for the sake of customers.

Why is there such service quality? The reason is very simple: high service quality is prosperous, low service quality is dead. In a society full of competition, an enterprise can only survive so long.

However, the "invisible hand" to play a powerful, but also has to have certain conditions. The abundance of resources is an important condition. If there are so many travel agencies, but not so many airlines, airline tickets can not be bought, the airlines can have a monopoly price, without asking travel agencies to help them promote. If there is also competition among airlines, then travel agencies will have a source of tickets. The same is true for the economy of society as a whole, because the whole economy is a competitive economy, all the links are in competition, the "invisible hand" can work. If the macro environment is not competitive, several enterprises will not be able to compete, the "invisible hand" is too small, the "visible hand" is too large. A competitive economy is developed gradually and cannot be achieved overnight. It took hundreds of years for American society to develop this mechanism.

The formation of this set of mechanisms has important implications for the political and administrative system. This is that it can be greatly freed from the heavy burden of specific management. The vast majority of society's transportation, transport, communication, daily commodities, real estate, and food are managed by private enterprises in competition. The role of the government is indirect management, in which the "invisible hand" reduces the burden of the government and the "visible hand" increases it.



The "invisible hand" also has its shortcomings, because "invisible", so we do not know where the hand is? Often, when things have reached a certain stage, it dawns on people that the hand is here. By this time, the economy and the functioning of society may have already developed more important problems. The development of Western societies, especially after the Second World War, can be a strong example of this cycle.

What we want to observe is not the economic behavior, but how the political and administrative systems are constrained under different economic models. In the "invisible hand" model, the political locomotive is not attached to the long train of the economy, and the economy has an economic locomotive. The advantage is that both have a lighter load and may run faster; the disadvantage is that since there are two locomotives, it is difficult to control and harmonize them with each other. Under the "visible hand" model, the political locomotive is attached to a long series of economic cars. The disadvantage is that it is heavily loaded and not easy to move quickly; the advantage is that it may be easy to move in a regular direction because it is the same locomotive. Politics is not included here. From a political point of view, the conclusion may be different again.

The politics of any society cannot be examined in isolation from its economic model. Just as no political behavior. It cannot be separated from its economic model. The structure and nature of American social politics cannot be explained outside of its economic model.

## **2. Money management society**

In a typical capitalist society like the United States. The phrase "money makes the world go round" is perfectly applicable, to which can be added: money makes the gods go round. In American society, there is indeed a tangible feeling: greenbacks (because the dollar is green) hit the world. The development of the commodity economy has made everyone equal in front of money, and money can buy anything that can be bought, with no delineated boundaries. Money is the tangible driving force behind the development of capitalist society, and the pursuit of money drives economic and social development. Americans do a lot of things with the first goal of earning money, professors teach, mostly without the inner impulse of worrying about the country and the people, which is a kind of work; politicians are hardly idealists, serving for

political party campaigns also with the purpose of money, and so on and so forth. For, in any society where money is the symbol of value, there is no livelihood without it. To some extent, American society is organized around money.

Acknowledging this fact reveals a wonderful phenomenon that I call: "Money governs society". Money becomes a fundamental medium in the management of society. People manage money, and at the same time they use money to manage people. A set of mechanisms centered on money constitutes an important mechanism in the management of American society. People serve money. Because of the importance of money, people have tried to invent mechanisms, methods and techniques to manage it. As a result, a huge management system is formed through the medium of money. It is precisely this system that capital uses for the purpose of obtaining surplus value. This system is independent of the government, independent of the political system, and does not require direct control by the political system. It undertakes a large and complex management process by itself. Marx said that under the capitalist system, the commodity economy is apparently a relationship between things, but in fact it is a relationship between people. This is the most famous saying, and it applies to any relationship between people that takes the form of material relations. When people manage money, they actually manage people. This non-governmental money mechanism regulates people's thinking, emotions, and behavior.

The process of using money in a capitalist society is extremely convenient for the individual, although not in terms of the management process.

Banks are the primary sector of management. There are many different types of banks. State banks are generally more powerful. Banks perform various social management functions. Each hiring unit pays wages and allocates them directly to each employee's account at the bank, and does not hand large bundles of money to each individual, who then goes to the bank to withdraw the money. The bank is directly escrowed.

Carrying a large sum of money on your person is not safe and inconvenient. It is obviously inconvenient to carry a purse of money to buy a color TV or a refrigerator. Checks are something that is commonly used in the United States or in Western societies. Banks have various types of checks to choose from after depositing money. The check has the name and address of the holder printed on it. All this process can

be settled within two weeks and in principle, checks are available in the United States and most places in the world. The bearer simply writes who to pay, how much, and signs and gives it to the store or hotel. The person who receives the check transfers it through the bank, which automatically takes that amount from the account of the person who wrote it. Once a month, the bank reports to the depositor in writing and sends the check that the bank received signed by the depositor. The depositor does not have to worry about the cash himself. Naturally, if a check is lost, that becomes a problem, because the check can be used by anyone but the signature. Also, there are people who have no deposits in the bank, have used them up, and are still using the checks. To be on the safe side, sometimes the party receiving the check has to see ID or take down a phone number.

In terms of travel, you can also exchange traveler's checks. Traveler's checks are useless if they are not signed. Naturally, losing them is also a problem and they have to be reported lost. Another service of the bank is the money withdrawal card. It is a plastic card with a magnetic strip on the back. With this card, you can withdraw cash from an automatic machine. Each cardholder has a PIN number that he or she enters into the machine, which is computerized, and it automatically recognizes it and gives the customer the amount of cash he or she needs. Most of these machines are local, but there are also national ones. These machines can also make deposits. Just give your password, put the amount you want to deposit into the envelope available next to the machine, and put it into the deposit slot.

In addition to these, credit cards (Credit Cards) are very popular in Western societies. With a credit card, you can use it in most countries. Many stores or hotels in China also accept credit cards. Credit cards require an application. A credit card is a plastic card with the number and name of the holder on it. To use this card anywhere, the conditional cardholder places the card on a special computerized device, and a screen shows whether the cardholder's card is acceptable, whether such a card is lost, whether there is credit, etc. Then, the card and the bill for the payment in question are placed together, pressed on a special device that prints the card number and name on the bill, and the customer is asked to sign. In this way, the customer does not have to pay cash, and each month the credit card company sends the bill to the cardholder. The cardholder has to pay the bill to the company at a certain time. There are many of these cards, the more famous ones are Visa, Master, American Express, Discover and

so on. There are also different levels of cards, mainly for the total amount of goods that can be purchased at one time, such as \$1,500 or more. Credit cards are indeed very convenient, but at the same time all credit card holders are regulated by the card issuer.

Cardholders pay their bills to the credit card company by writing a check and sending it from home, and many things are done through the post office and by check. Pay taxes to the government, send a check. To place an order, send a check. You can send a check and a film to develop a photo. You can send a check to pay back money you borrowed from someone, and the banks of the parties involved will deal with you directly.

The management of money is also reflected in borrowing. Banks lend money to businesses and individuals. Businesses borrow, as capital for investment, which also exists in socialist countries. Naturally, enterprises are private businesses, which are actually personal loans. But this part of the loan goes to the investment. There are also purely personal loans, such as to buy a house, a car, etc., which can be taken from a bank. The personal loan has to be repaid partly every month and interest is paid. The interest from the bank does not come only from the business, but also from the individual. This is different from China. As a result of the loan, the individual is connected to the bank. If the loan is not repaid, the bank has the right to take the lender's property as an offset, backed up by the police department.

There is also an organized system of management in the relationship of borrowing and owing money outside of banks. For example, if you have seen a doctor in a hospital, you spend a lot of money and have no money to pay for medical treatment. The hospital then turns this matter over to a specialized debt collection agency. The debt collection agency's duty is to collect debts and is well versed in the law and specializes in this field. It will make a plan for the debtor to pay the money every month, and if not, it will have to go to court.

Banks offer all kinds of facilities and also have a system of strict control. Anyone who wants to get this convenience has to accept this control system. If you apply for a credit card, you have to fill out an application form. On the application form, the name, date of birth, social security number, address, home telephone number, length of residence in the local area, whether the home is owned or borrowed, previous home address, length of residence, closest relatives and

friends living separately, address, mother's name when she was unmarried, name of employer or company, nature of employment, status, length of residence, address, telephone number, former employer or company must be stated within three years. The yearly salary, other income, source of other income, verification of the name used, telephone number, bank deposit number, bank name, bank address, etc. The card issuer has to verify all these information before issuing the card to the applicant, so you can see how people can start from managing money and develop to managing people. These data will become a personal file, and a very detailed one at that. Applications for loans, etc. also have to go through this process.

There are also companies that specialize in managing the creditworthiness of individuals. These companies are called Credit Reporting companies. These companies are privately owned, regulated by law, and actually collect personal credit cases, mainly in economic, not political terms. There are many of these companies, both national and local. Every person who has dealt with a bank or financial institution has a name on file. Banks and various financial institutions can ask such companies about their customers. If you apply for a loan, the bank can check the situation, such as past bill payments, credit, etc., using its own computer terminal. If the credit is bad, the bank will refuse the loan. This is a very powerful network. Banks have a partnership with such companies, where the bank proactively reports the customer's situation to them, and the credit reporting company in turn reduces the bank's charges for using the information. This mechanism powerfully manages the people who want to deal with money or cannot do without it, so to speak, all the people in the world are in the bag.

Naturally, if one has good credit, one can enjoy all the above facilities. This mechanism regulates everyone's behavior, and if one is excluded from all the above mechanisms, one will encounter all kinds of checks. What are the conveniences? Look at what American Express offers beyond money: more than 1,400 travel offices in 1,000 cities around the world to help with travel planning, emergencies, and more.

This shows how effectively and powerfully capital controls society at large, and thus society as a whole. Most of the institutions in this set are private, but in fact they manage a very large part of the affairs of the whole society. This management is not based on coercion and command, but rather on the voluntariness of each individual. People

either voluntarily, or driven by social circumstances, automatically seek to be governed. Americans like people least to be governed, but they like money most. The logic of money is to lead people to be governed. This mechanism is related to the basic survival of each person, and therefore effective management. Perhaps mobilizing the ability of a society's money to govern people is a very important aspect of reducing the pressure on the political system to manage. The amazing dynamism of money connects individuals to individuals and institutions to institutions. The government transcends this set of mechanisms and controls them indirectly by legal means. The people in this mechanism, all operating in their own interest, maintain the balance of this set of mechanisms. I am afraid that if it were only a deposit relationship, a management mechanism would not have developed. The key question is the extent to which money has developed into a set of institutions on which people must depend. Americans believe in freedom and do not rely on other institutions, but they rely on this one. A society cannot be effectively managed without a system of subject management on which everyone depends.

Societies have different subject systems at different stages of development, and in a fully developed economy, there may have to be a transition from a political to an economic system.

### **3. Standardization of people**

Standardization is a necessity in modern society. American society has reached a certain level in this regard. It can be found that there are defined criteria for all kinds of matters and all kinds of work. In particular, there are standardized evaluation procedures for the selection of personnel, or for the evaluation of people's knowledge and skills.

The U.S. is a highly mobile society where people do not have fixed accounts or work records and may have different levels of education and systems. How do you determine if a person meets certain requirements or if they can do a certain job? A very important procedure is for individuals to pass standardized exams. Employers often rely on these test scores to determine whether to hire or not hire an individual, and schools rely on these tests to determine whether to admit or not admit students. Chinese students are familiar with the TOEFL or GRE as these tests.

Such exams are often not specifically administered by the government, but by private, specialized companies. The government may commission these companies to design special exam papers or specify what exams must be passed in order to hold a position, and no one can hold the position without passing a specified exam. For example, lawyers are required to pass a specified examination. Such companies are responsible for organizing, designing, analyzing, and administering the exams. From the point of view of social management, they assume a very important function in the functioning of society.

I visited the company and spoke with Richard L. Ferguson, the general manager.

ACT is an independent, not-for-profit organization that provides a variety of services to students, parents, high schools, and colleges, as well as to professional organizations and government agencies. ACT also developed a variety of other programs in education, student admissions, vocational education, and licensure. ACT is headquartered in Iowa City and has offices in Washington, D.C., California, Denver, Atlanta, Austin, and Albany. Each office is responsible for several states, thus forming a national network.

ACT's governing body has two components: the ACT Corporation, composed of representatives elected by the states, which meets annually to review policy; and the Board of Directors, a 15-member board that meets quarterly to review the administration of ACT. The Board of Directors appoints the General Manager, who is the principal executive officer of ACT.

ACT's business includes many aspects, and we can look at several.

ACT Evaluation Program. This is a comprehensive program that serves college, high school, and college-bound students. Students take an ACT-designed test that includes educational and autobiographical questionnaires, four exams (English, mathematics, social studies, and natural science), and an interest inventory. After ACT analyzes the test papers, it prepares a report on them for use by students, high schools, and colleges. It can be used for career selection, curriculum design, student admissions, etc. Approximately one million middle and high school students take the ACT each year. Test results are used by 2,900 universities, colleges, academic institutions, or state education systems. This means that admissions tests such as the College Admissions Test are not organized by the government, but by ACT, a

private national corporation, but each institution recognizes the authority of the test.

Educational Opportunity Service (ACT) uses computers to analyze information about students who take the test, including educational plans, interests, strengths, and educational goals.

Enrollment Information Service (EIS). This service consists of two basic components, a market analysis service and a revenue analysis service. These two services are based on the data obtained from the aforementioned examinations.

The industry testing program, ACT, has more than 40 standardized exams designed to allow those with no professional training to earn a professional certificate that demonstrates they have reached a post-secondary level in practical work or independent study. The exams include the arts, sciences, business, education and nursing, among other fields. Participating institutions award certificates, design curricula, etc. based on the results of the exams.

ACT offers many other types of services, including career planning, computer analysis of data, and financial analysis. Another important activity is the provision of services to professional organizations. In society, all types of professional or vocational organizations are non-governmental. In order for professional organizations to exist in society and be trusted, they must be of high quality and at a high level, otherwise they will not be very useful. Therefore, although professional organizations are not required to conduct examinations of their members, they themselves organize examinations of their own members. ACT provides this service to about eighty such organizations, including unions and government agencies. This type of examination is primarily to evaluate a person's level and qualifications for a scholarship, certificate or license, or for admission to further professional training in a program, and one can look at which associations are associated with ACT.

American Academy of Ophthalmology.

American Academy of Otolaryngology.

American Association of Business Schools.

American Society of Teachers of German.



American Society for Microbiology.

American Council on Education.

American Dental Association.

The Association of American Medical Colleges.

Emergency Nursing Association.

Law School Admissions Committee.

National Association of Pharmacology.

U.S. Department of Defense; etc.

Companies like ACT, and several others, are large, national companies. There is also competition among these companies, and they have to survive, as well as reputation and quality. The companies put a lot of effort into researching how to improve and refine the exams and papers, how to better evaluate the test takers, and how to determine the appropriate standards. At the same time, they are responsible for maintaining confidentiality and not letting the exam questions and papers leak out, because the credibility of the company is at stake. If you falsify the test, the whole company may collapse because you will lose business. If they lose business, the company cannot survive because they are private companies. Although non-profit, salaries and administrative costs are derived from these business activities. ACT, for example, has a full-time and hourly staff of nearly 500. That is a large expense based on U.S. wages. The government is not responsible for the company's expenses because there is no connection.

As you can see, the existence of such companies is related to the demand for standardization in society. If society did not require standardization, such companies would not exist. Modern society is at the same time a standardized society. In terms of standardization, such companies benefit from two things: government regulations that specify which exams must be passed by which company for which type of activity or profession, and non-governmental organizations such as schools and associations. Anyone who wants to practice a profession or enter a school or an institution cannot do so without passing the necessary exams. This approach, on the one hand, saves the government a great deal of money by eliminating the need to set up a special department to conduct such examinations, while the private sector maintains the

standardized procedures in society through fees. On the other hand, a standardized process is achieved. The government has the full freedom to require that a particular occupation pass a particular exam from a particular company, or a particular exam from another company, if it feels that the former company does not meet quality and standards. Other organizations have the same right to do so, and all have to maintain their credibility and trustworthiness, thus reaching a kind of check and balance.

Naturally, another important condition is that there is a need for general standardization in society. If such an atmosphere does not develop in society, it will be difficult for such private companies to survive. Such an atmosphere can be formed only when every cell of society is organized with a real concern for its own interests and survival. If every cell has no sense of interest, has something to rely on and depend on, and is not responsible for good or bad, there will be no such atmosphere. Only when the admission of each person is closely related to their own interests, people will pursue standardization.

Another driving force for standardization is the widespread mobility of people. Society is so mobile that everyone needs to be validated in their skills and knowledge, and every institution needs to have reliable credentials to prove each individual's skills and knowledge. Local credentials are no longer sufficient to meet this requirement. Too comprehensive a certificate, such as a university diploma, is not enough to prove competence in the profession. The wide mobility of people requires that everyone who wants to get a certain position can effectively prove their knowledge and ability. To obtain such proof, people have to meet socially accepted standards. This mutual process drives the standardization of people. Certificates are product instructions and certificates of conformity for all types of people. People buy goods in the market and shop for them according to their use, performance and size. When the development of human resources reaches a certain level. The standardization of people will then become an essential part of society.

## **4. Regulatory Culture**

Any society needs certain regulations to regulate the relationship between people. Regardless of the type of society, the system is different, the culture is different, the regulation of regulations are

essential. There can be various levels of regulations, the constitution is the highest level, the law is another level, and specific regulations are another level. Regulation is a tool that people can use to resolve conflicts and contradictions. Naturally, the status of regulations varies in different cultures, and the regulatory role they play varies, as well as the form in which they are expressed in different societies, some in the form of written laws, some in the form of traditional taboos, and some in the form of religious precepts.

American society is a regulatory society, with a plethora of regulations, and every area of social life is defined by certain regulations. It is worth exploring why such a "regulatory culture" has developed. Let us first look at specific aspects of the regulatory culture of society: a few examples to illustrate these issues.

The greatest statute in the United States is the Constitution. In this society, the Constitution is a central part of the culture, not just a central part of politics and law. I remember once a professor came to Fudan University to give a lecture, and a Chinese student asked a question: "There is no fixed ideology in the United States, what do people unify their thoughts based on?" This was a very typical Chinese question, and the professor was puzzled. After explaining, he understood what the student wanted to ask. He thought for a while and then said, "The Constitution." The answer seemed to be a windy one; the Constitution is a law, not an ideology. Ideologies do not have the force of law. But the answer does reflect the customary American response: the Constitution is culture, not just law. The Constitution profoundly embodies the dominant ideology of the West. And it turns it into law. The Constitution has been deeply imprinted on people's hearts and minds for more than two hundred years and has become the final arbiter of social disputes. Not everyone thinks of the Constitution all the time, but when a dispute arises, the only thing everyone can rely on that they feel they can trust is the Constitution. (See Chapter 2, Section 5, "Two Centuries of the Constitution.")

The Constitution is too abstract a statute, and there are thousands of specific statutes that regulate people's behavior on a daily basis. I personally feel that most people in Eastern societies and Eastern cultures may find these regulations too harsh. People who grow up in Eastern culture, if they really live in American society, sometimes do not feel so comfortable and free.

Alcohol, there are strict regulations to control. People who are underage cannot drink alcohol, and drinking alcohol is a violation of the law. Stores must obtain a government license to sell alcohol, and no store or restaurant is allowed to sell alcohol without a license. Iowa City's supermarkets do not sell alcohol on Sunday mornings before 12:00 a.m., on the grounds that people are expected to be at church for Mass at that time. Of course, this is not the intention of the government, but a religious influence and a tradition.

Food products, too, are regulated by strict regulations. For example, the maximum standards for chemical elements in fruits and vegetables, and the marketing standards for meat. If the relevant regulations are exceeded, the food cannot be marketed, and if the regulations are violated, there will be severe penalties. Large fines are imposed.

Cars, there are so many that it's amazing how many there are, basically one for every family and many families have two. How to manage cars has become a major problem for society. Strict regulations have been established to regulate "car behavior". Traffic rules were very strict. Everyone who wants to get a driver's license must pass a special test. At high speed, people must also comply with these rules, otherwise the car is not impossible to destroy people. Car line, is a headache, car can not be, is also a headache. Parking (Parking) is a big problem. On both sides of the street, there are clear signs indicating whether you can park. If you park in a place where you can't park, you will receive a fine (Ticket) and if you don't pay, you will be notified by the court to appear in court or have trouble renewing your license next time. Freeways, called highways, also have strict rules about how fast cars can drive, usually between 50-65 mph. There are police patrols or patrols on the highway, and cars found speeding are subject to fines of several dozen dollars, which is a typical amount.

Sitting or driving in a car, the person in the front must wear a seat belt. If you do not wear a seat belt, you are also in violation of the law. (In this regard, the laws of each state are not exactly the same, some stipulate that driving on the highway must wear a seat belt, and some stipulate that driving in the city streets must also wear).

In terms of taxation, I am afraid that there are the most detailed regulations, probably because it is related to the government's revenue. Government tax regulations are so detailed that the average person would have to study them for a long time. There are rules for

every detailed aspect. If you violate these rules, you can be punished very severely. Therefore, everyone has to be careful when dealing with government taxes. If you don't pay or can't pay your property taxes, the government has the right to take that part of your property and sell it against your taxes. Anyone has to report income to the government. In this respect, Americans are the least free. (See Chapter 4, Section 5, "The Tax System" and Chapter 7, Section 6, "Transparent Deliberation.")

Schooling, too, has strict rules for admission, exams, tuition, credits, jobs for teaching assistants, health insurance, and everything else. These regulations regulate the activities of the school. It is entirely possible for these regulations to keep students who violate them out of school.

Factories, government agencies, schools, military agencies, and other fields have their own detailed regulations. By human nature, people do not want to obey the rules and regulations, they want to live freely and unrestrainedly. But regulations are mandatory, and people should or must comply with them. There are special places in parking lots for people with disabilities that people don't normally use. Street-side parking places sometimes have automatic toll timing devices, and most people will automatically put coins in and keep the time. Traffic rules are also obeyed by everyone. Even if there are no cars, people will not cross the street until the light indicating that they can cross the street is on. People do not smoke in places where it is written Do Not Smoke. Buses are generally unmanned, and coins are automatically thrown into a device, and at the end of the line, when the driver is sometimes not on board, passengers generally throw in their coins. This is especially true for the law. Why does this happen?

The famous scholar H. S. Commager says that to ask an American to obey a certain rule is an insult and a challenge to him, that is, what I said about the incompatibility between the requirements of human nature and compliance. But he adds that Americans have a peculiar attitude toward the law. At first glance, it seems that Americans do not obey the law, and everyone is guilty of minor infractions, though Americans are reverent of the law. Commager's explanation is that Americans believe that the American nation thrives on contempt for tradition and authority, with regulations representing tradition and discipline representing authority. But the government and the Constitution are valid and cannot tolerate attacks and disobedience, as the development

of society proves. That's why people revere the law. And most of the exhaustive regulations of modern society are adopted by the legislature. Many of the aforementioned regulations, which have a legal form, so in a way harmonize the sense of anti-regulation and the sense of following the law.

American society can be described as a "regulatory society", although the phenomenon of lawlessness and crime is quite worrying. However, the whole process of society is regulated by various regulations. There must be a reason why the law works the way it does. Naturally, I cannot say what the reason must be, but in addition to the analysis of Kang Maji, I can think again.

It is a fact that the United States is a young society that has not historically developed a complex social class structure, unlike European and Eastern societies. European and Eastern societies have a long history of societies in which tradition and non-tradition, authority and non-authority have been personified. Some groups represent tradition and some represent authority. These groups or classes occupy a certain position in society and assume the function of coordinating interpersonal behavior when social conflicts and conflicts of interest develop. In societies with a long history and culture, the coordinating factor is the "humanization" of groups with culture, power, wealth or tradition in society. In this cultural climate, regulations cannot play a dominant role. As long as this interpersonal structure or humanized coordination mechanism does not change, it is difficult for regulations to be effective. In contrast, when the United States emerged on the stage of history as a new nation, there was no strong "humanized" coordinating mechanism. A society, in turn, must have coordination mechanisms. That is why the common set of rules and regulations had a stronger position. Everyone's interests are protected by the law, and there is no "humanized coordination". This is the basis of the "regulatory society" of the United States. Needless to say, on this basis, regulations have developed, and there are differences in interest orientation, and it is not possible to protect every member of a society equally. The role of cultural mechanisms resulting from historical development in the formation of a regulatory society is only emphasized here.

Another important reason is the rapid advancement of technology after World War II. I think this has also contributed to the regulation of society. The development of high technology, especially the results of

high technology into the homes of ordinary people, so that people must comply with the necessary rules, because no rules, not only can not enjoy high technology, but also may be dangerous. Such as the car faster and faster, without strict rules will be life threatening; highway more and more developed, do not abide by the rules may not be able to travel; television, VCR, video cameras, washing machines, rice cookers, microwave ovens, audio equipment, vacuum cleaners, weeders, egg beaters, slicers, envelope openers, can openers, massagers, electric toothbrushes, shavers, video games, etc., are required to know than the natural society Simple tools require a much more complex set of rules. In technology, modern devices such as computers, laser typewriters, faxes, and photocopiers refuse to work if they do not obey the rules. In public places, automatic telephones, newspaper machines, vending machines, vending machines, automatic cameras, automatic money changers, automatic stamp machines, automatic money deposit and withdrawal machines, all require compliance with the rules. And so on and so forth, under many different names. If the rules are not followed, they refuse to work. In the operation of society, checks, credit cards, loans, stocks, etc., there are also detailed rules. Americans grow up in such an environment, in a kind of "social coercion" to follow the rules. To enter this society, you have to follow the rules. This is not only a way of life, but has also become a culture. People get into the habit of following the rules. There is an interesting comparison. Americans cooked food, strictly according to the recipe, strict measurement of various condiments, with a variety of measuring tools, a minute do not want to differ. Chinese people cooking, rarely look at the recipe, grab a handful is. The progress of science and technology in American society, the development of more and more specialized supplies, they require each person who wants to use them must comply with the rules.

Naturally, compliance with rules may or may not be beneficial for social development, depending on the historical conditions. However, if one is in a society where there are disputes or groups living together, one always needs mechanisms to reconcile conflicts. The coordination of commonly set regulations may be imperfect, but it is the one most likely to be followed. The effectiveness of regulatory harmonization will be greatly expanded if it is combined with the rationalization principles of technology. Ordinary people do not directly accept high technological logics; they become a subtle force only after they have penetrated into the life of society.

## 5. Tax system

The U.S. tax system is an extraordinarily complex system that is not easy to figure out. Many Americans don't quite understand it either. One political science professor told me that he once couldn't understand a government tax document and called the department and said, "I have a Ph.D. in political science, but I still can't quite understand your documents."

Taxes are a major political issue. One of the main debates in the presidential election was whether to raise or lower taxes. The newspapers say Bush has successfully convinced many voters that Dukakis' policies will raise taxes, so Bush is ahead in the polls. The tax issue is about how the government spends the people's money, so voters are most concerned. In fact, taxes were the foundation of the United States, as one of the major causes of the War of Independence was the rebellion against the British government's heavy taxation of the then 13 North American states. In modern countries, taxation is never an economic issue, but a political one.

Due to the complexity of the tax system, only its main points can be summarized here.

How do people pay taxes? How much tax do people pay? It is a very important topic in social management. Some taxes are administered by the Treasury Department, which is the federal tax. Local taxes are administered by each state. In addition to these two taxes, every family has to pay property tax if they have a house. In addition to these three, there is a sales tax, which anyone who buys something in a store also has to pay on most of the goods. This part of the tax is added to the price of the goods in the calculation, ranging from about four to eight percent. This is the basic concept of paying tax.

In terms of federal taxes, at the end of each year, the federal government tax department sends tax documents and forms. Everyone must fill out the forms in detail and return them, along with the taxes due, by April 15. The documents and forms sent by the federal government are quite complicated. Citizens are required to report all their income, such as wages, stock dividends, remuneration, other income, etc.

Can a citizen not report it? Generally there is trouble and on the other hand it is illegal. Violation of tax laws can be serious enough



to go to jail. Some people are careless and omit to report their income, which results in serious consequences. Because it is not clear at this point whether it is carelessness or intentionality. The government knows all about most of the income that citizens receive, salaries, fees, stock dividends, etc. The United States has a fairly developed computer system. Citizens each have a social security number, and individual companies and organizations enter this information into the government's computers when they pay. Thus, the government can check the computer to know whether the statement is true or not. Of course, there are many people who evade taxes, and many high-ranking officials have been involved in scandals in this area.

A significant portion of federal and state taxes are already deducted directly when the typical hiring organization pays wages. This money does not meet with the citizen and goes directly to the federal and state government accounts. In addition, the employer also directly deducts the cost of social security, which is stored under the citizen's social security number for future retirement. So when citizens get their paycheck, a significant amount of taxes have already been deducted.

There are also various rules for citizens to fill out the forms, such as whether they are married or not, whether they have children, whether their parents are income dependent, etc. There are different rules for different categories. Each person has to fill in the details. There are also clear rules about what income is to be reported and what income is not to be reported, such as disabled veteran's payments, employee disability payments, child benefits, gifts or other inherited property, compassionate payments, disaster compensation payments, partial scholarships, etc., which do not have to be reported, but money received from foundations, teaching, research, etc., salary income, profits from the sale of personal property, scholarships, and money received outside the United States must be reported. Failure to do so is illegal. There are detailed rules for all yearly income, minus those that are exempt under the law, such as some income from retirement, some income from persons over 65 years of age, blind persons, children, etc. In addition, there are complex provisions concerning tax exemptions for investments, official office expenses, etc. Other than that, they are all taxable.

Since the government takes a portion of the citizen's money in advance, the citizen must calculate whether the portion taken by the government

is greater or less than the amount of tax that should be collected. In addition to the above, there are some medical and dental expenses, state and local taxes (there are agreements between governments), property taxes, interest paid by citizens, loans paid, 65% interest on personal income, grants, military payments (political contributions, societies, club fees, blood donations, etc. are not tax deductible). Some of the expenses needed for work are also tax-free, such as security facilities, gadgets, necessary clothing, protective clothing, medical examination fees, fees for professional organizations, subscription to professional publications, etc. After all of these items are clarified and calculated, the final total is the portion that is taxable by the federal government. In the handbook sent by the federal government, you can find out how much income should be taxed, and then compare it to the portion deducted in advance, and make up for the excess.

How much tax the average family pays, we can look at. After deducting the various tax exemptions, the remaining amount of income has to be taxed, and there is a difference here between the four categories: single, married filing jointly, married filing separately, and head of household. The average annual income of the average American family, after deducting all tax exemptions, is between \$30,000 and \$50,000. We can look it up (1988 standard).

\*\*\*\*

**Single**

**Marriage**

**Marriage Sub-Paper**

**Householders**

6695

4913

7386

5583

40000-40050

9863

7447

10554

8259

49950-50000

13345

10581

14210

11741

As you can see from the above, federal taxes are quite high. It is thus clear why taxation has become a major issue in politics.

In addition to federal taxes, there are state taxes, which are similar to the federal tax process. The state government sends documents and forms to each citizen, and the citizen declares the tax exemptions, including some medical and dental expenses, taxes paid, interest paid, donations, etc., which are roughly similar to those of the federal government, and then checks the table and finds that for an annual income of \$29,950–30,000, the state tax is 1,837. Because the state tax is deducted in advance, it is also more than refundable.

In addition to federal and state taxes, you also have to pay property taxes to your local government. In Iowa City, you pay about \$1,000 per house, which is set by the local authorities after assessing the value of the house and is used by the city to build roads and maintain publicly owned facilities, such as libraries.

Adding up the above three items, a married family with a taxable income of \$30,000 pays more than \$7,000 in taxes, or about a quarter of their total income.

The tax system is fairly well developed and works well. The tax laws are quite tough and tax evasion and tax evasion is punished to varying degrees depending on the severity of the situation. Americans have an important job each year, and that is dealing with taxes. People often have to keep a large number of documents and slips to prove the part that can be tax-free. There is a whole lot of paperwork about taxes in a year. Naturally, taxes are a "core secret", mainly because they reflect the true income of each family.

Taxation is one of the central issues in American politics, as well as in the politics of capitalist countries. In socialist countries, there is no regular, universal personal income tax system. Does the income tax system in Western countries have any social or political function? This is a question worth analyzing.

At least Americans have a very clear idea: the money the government spends is the money they pay in taxes, so they generally expect the government to spend it in the right places and to pay attention to government policies and actions. Without the tax system, people would not care as much about government policies and ideas because they would not be relevant to the individual, even though they actually are. The tax system is one of the foundations of the Western political system. Everyone who gives a certain amount of money to the government feels a responsibility to monitor it. Government officials often have to explain their policies just to show that they are not spending taxpayer money frivolously, and voters pay more attention to elections because they have a vested interest in who they elect. Whether it is the president, senators, representatives, governors, state senators, state representatives and local officials, all have a direct stake in the interests of individual citizens. Through taxation, officials form a "contract" with the people. The tax system fosters a sense of responsibility, however passive it may be. In a society where people do not pay taxes, the government has to spend money too, just through different channels, but the people are much less accountable to the government.

The tax system has another function, which is to organize the whole society. The tax department, through a sophisticated computer system, uses social security numbers to link individuals, organizations, and governments together in a tightly managed network. Individuals may not be controlled by anyone, but they are controlled by the tax authorities, a symbol of which is the need to report the "core secrets" of the family. That's why some say that tax officials are "tougher" than security officials.

## **6. Science and technology to rule people**

The United States is a country where everyone reveres individualism, where individualism reigns supreme, and where no power has the right to interfere with it. Ask most people and you will get that impression. There are plenty of people who worry that individualism is too prevalent. People from other cultural milieus who have spent time with Americans can find their individualism (not all of it) to be obvious and sometimes difficult to accept. Given this assertion of the sanctity of individual liberty and the private domain, what is the force that

organizes these 200 million or so people and brings them into every part of the great machinery of society so that this society can function properly? There is a paradox here: the proper functioning of society, especially large societies, requires good collaboration and joint action by its members, and the values that people pursue are the primacy of the individual and the primacy of the private domain.

There are various forces that coordinate this clock, the coordination of political systems, the coordination of laws, the coordination of stakes, the coordination of money, and so on and so forth. Among all kinds of coordination, there is one force that cannot be ignored, and that is science and technology.

The development of science and technology acts in two directions: on the one hand, the high level of scientific and technological development requires a finer division of labor, so that each person has his or her own clear task, which technically guarantees the value of individualism. Automation, electronic, allows each person to perform a specific job in his or her own specific position, without the need to depend on others or to obey human orders. Only dependence on the machine and obedience to its commands. This is precisely one of the aspects of human alienation analyzed by Marcuse. Science and technology, especially high technology, to be applied to the specific production process, must be broken down into countless links, each of which requires a person dedicated to it. Although it is a very small link, but it is difficult to replace him without training. The more high-tech, the more so. Whereas in the seventeenth century a single craftsman could manufacture a product from start to finish, today the situation has changed completely. This development of science and technology, in general, has raised the status of the individual, increased his self-awareness, and strengthened his sense of responsibility. Each individual has found a definite place in the big machine of society. In societies where technology is less developed or produced in the traditional way, the position of the individual in society is not very clear, roles are interchangeable, and the possibility of chaos and instability in social organization is higher, mainly due to the interchangeability of roles. This has not only an economic but also a political meaning. As long as a significant portion of people in a society are not clear about their roles, that society may be in structural chaos.

On the other hand, the development of science and technology also requires a tight organization. On the one hand, it is the transformation of science and technology into small links so that they can operate, and on the other hand, these links must eventually be able to link up and become a whole. This is the most powerful organizational force of a society. It is outside the political and legal forces, but it is strong and powerful. Technology uses the logic of reason to persuade people to obey a strict rule. This process constrains the notion of individualistic supremacy. Imagine how many people are needed to work on a project like the space shuttle, and how many people are needed in its tightly organized system. Imagine how IBM organized each individual to serve. This kind of order is not a political order, but a technical order, as John Kenneth Galbraith (Galbraith) said, is the imperative of Technology (process order), today's human society has a peculiar phenomenon: people to obey political orders and legal orders, than people to obey the command of technology, to be a hundred times more difficult. Everyone carefully studies the precautions and cautions before taking medicine. But far fewer people listen to politicians when it comes to abolishing racial discrimination and obeying a will.

The degree of organization of society is generally higher in societies with high-tech development, while it tends to be less organized and less rationalized in high-tech or technologically less developed places. A large part of the function of the organization of American society is carried out by large companies and corporations that realize the logic of science and technology. In some less economically developed societies, strange phenomena can often be seen, where the degree of organization is much higher than the general level of society in certain areas and places where high technology is realized.

Scholars have also studied this issue. The famous economist Galbraith, in his book *The New Industrial State* (The New Industrial State), discusses his views. He argues that the widespread implementation of technology will lead to six results: (1) the use of technology will separate the beginning of any work from its final completion; (2) the capital used for production will increase; (3) time and financial resources will be more fixed for the completion of specific work; (4) technology requires specialized manpower; (5) technology requires a high degree of organization; (6) because of the use of time and financial resources, and because of the need for large organizations, the society requires planning due to market conditions under high technology.

So Gabrres' concept is that the development and use of technology will inevitably lead to a more organized society. The economic and technological systems will be decided by professional managers who will manage the whole system. Galbraith calls this the "Technostructure". The end of technological development is that some people will automatically assume the function of managers, and they will be apolitical managers. But this management can largely reduce the burden of the political system. One of the functions of the political system is to coordinate human behavior, and society will be easy to govern if a mechanism can limit human behavior within the limits of rationalization.

Another contemporary author, John Naisbitt, in *Megatrends: The New Directions Transforming Our Lives*, depicts the same phenomenon, but more human, more psychological, more physical. It's more physical. He uses the terms High Tech and High Touch to describe this process. He depicts the powerful power of technology to rule people as Forced Technology, the application of high technology that binds people more and more firmly to the technological process and alienates them. A rebellion against this power over man arose: a rebellion against electronic transfer technology and against electronic automatic inquiry technology. Nesbitt attributes this to the fact that technology takes away the human touch and sense, so people have to rebel against it.

In fact, a further layer can be added, that is, the rapid development of technology has made its own means of governing people highly sophisticated, and may break through the general technical management, and go to the inner world of each person, invading the private domain of people. In today's America, there is probably no power that can break through the barriers of individualistic beliefs and private spheres, but technology has this power. Technology guarantees material rewards, which is another condition. The fact that people aspire to high induction is a sign of rebellion against governance, and it just shows the power of technology to rule people.

Technology to govern people is a completely unexpected result, and it can be said that the flowers are not planted intentionally, and the willow will be planted inadvertently. Whereas earlier advocates of the use of technology did not explicitly realize that they would become a means of managing people, today the application of technology has become one of society's most powerful means of managing people. To a large extent, American society is governed by technological processes.



People obey technology more than they obey politics. Technological development has broken society into tiny interconnected spheres, one for each individual. To enter a field requires special skills, and the educational system essentially operates around this goal. Thus, education is again incorporated into this governing process. Education constantly derives and develops the energy of technological governance and the culture of technological governance.

The radicals criticize this phenomenon as alienation, which can be valid from a human point of view. But no society can do without science and technology, and the logic of science and technology inevitably does. Valuing science and technology, admiring it, applying it, it is obvious that this is not just a productive, or economic or purely technical issue. Therefore, while developing science and technology, I am afraid that the problem to think about is not that simple. Everything has good and bad, the key is to make a choice under what historical conditions, and how to coordinate after the choice.

## **7. Dogs and cats are not free**

The preceding paragraph is devoted to the issue of regulations in American society (Section IV of this chapter, "The Culture of Regulations"). This is indeed a characteristic of American society. There are various reasons for the emergence of a regulatory society. As I analyzed in the section on "Regulatory Culture," the harmonization of rules of equality and the high level of scientific and technological development are important conditions for the passage of regulations.

On the other hand, in terms of national identity, I do not consider the American nation to be a moderate and uncontested people. On the surface, it is often easy to get the impression that this is the case. Most Americans are not loud and rowdy, and it is rare to see a fight on the street or in the car. It's rare to see any heated arguments in the workplace either. In fact, these phenomena are the result of coordination under the regulations. Today, all kinds of regulations are quite developed, and there are clear regulations to coordinate all kinds of interests. The main reason why there are so many regulations is that society needs them. The reason why society needs them is that there are disputes over the things in question. If there is a dispute, there will be regulations; if there is no dispute, there is no need for regulations.

Americans are by nature argumentative. Where regulations are unclear, arguments often occur. This character arises from a variety of reasons. It can be said that the development process of America shows why this nature exists, developed on a vast unowned land where everyone can claim to be the owner of something, and where there is no argument or no argument would be nothing. Westerns depict vivid stories of strife. In the light of modern developments, individualism is also prone to contention, and regulations reconcile not only conflict but also individualism. In this culture, it is natural for regulations to move toward systematization.

And the regulations are often unclear in matters of collectivism. The Japanese tend to go to court rarely, unlike the Americans who move to court.

As a result, various types of regulations have been developed to reconcile disputes. Most activities have regulations. There are regulations for building land, parking cars, plowing snow, raising children, and supporting the elderly.

To illustrate the fineness of the regulations, let's look at a regulation governing domesticated animals (this regulation is in effect in one municipality).

The statute begins by saying, "The law protects people, and the law protects domesticated animals. While it is considered a personal right to keep domestic animals, some animals cause problems and must be regulated. Regulations are designed to make the public healthier and safer. Citizens should read these regulations and understand why you and your domesticated animals must comply with these laws. "

Here, animals seem to have equal rights with people. Many people keep animals in their homes, are regarded as equal members of the family. So when the law is made, this feeling of the owner must be respected and not harmed. The following is a breakdown of this legislation.

Rabies. All livestock, including cats, over six months old must be immunized against rabies because wild animals can transmit this incurable disease to domestic animals. Rabies can be transmitted to humans, so the law protects both humans and domestic animals from this disease. Animal breeders must keep immunization certificates.

Tethering animals. All livestock, regardless of size, must be tethered, except in the owner's own house and property. If the animal is outside

without a leash, it is a violation of the law. If the animal is lost, the owner will be fined and the animal will be impounded.

License. All livestock, six months or older, must be licensed by the municipality and must have a rabies vaccination certificate to apply for a license. License fees vary. Licenses must be applied for annually, and after March 1 of each year, those who do not apply will pay an additional \$15. All licenses expire on December 31 of each year.

Fines. The animal control officer has the authority to confine and fine a stray animal for \$10 for the first offense, \$20 for the second, \$30 for the third, \$40 for the fourth, and so on for dogs; \$5 for the first, \$10 for the second, \$15 for the third, \$20 for the fourth, and so on for cats. If the owner does not come to claim the dog within 24 hours, an additional \$8 per day for dogs and \$5 for cats will be added. The owner must have a vaccination certificate and a license at the time of claiming. After four days, the owner loses all rights to the animal and the animal is given up for adoption or euthanized. Every citizen has the right to claim a lost animal, and if anyone complains, the owner will have to go to court, where fines and penalties will be determined by a judge. If there is a case, one can always call the reporting line to expose the wrongdoing of a particular foster animal.

Other violations. This includes abandoning a breeding animal in the city, allowing a breeding animal to bark and disturb others, tethering a breeding animal to a public facility in a public place, confining or tethering a breeding animal in a place without suitable food or water, keeping a breeding animal in a place that affects their health, allowing a breeding animal to disturb others, etc.

That's just the gist of this legislation. This legislation is much more detailed. The reason for such a statute to coordinate dogs and cats is also because of the different interests that exist. Americans, some love dogs and cats to death, and some hate them to death. So, in order to reconcile the two, there must be regulations. I witnessed a family whose dog ran onto a neighbor's lawn to play, and the owner came out and yelled at them. The owner of the dog ran out and took the dog home. In this case, there is no regulation to coordinate the conflict.

We can see that the law is very detailed, each possible dispute is included, if there is a dispute, you can follow the rules. If there is no detailed legislation, I am afraid that the public say that the public has a reason, the mother says that the mother has a reason, the

daughter-in-law says that the daughter-in-law has a reason, the son says that the son has a reason.

With a little more discussion, one can feel that American society is not so "free" and not as free as one might think to do whatever one wants. Even dogs and cats are not free, and those who have cats and dogs are bound by them, and in my opinion, by choice. Although some people love dogs like life, and the dog and cat industry is thriving, dog houses, dog cars, dog clothes, dog food, everything. But dogs and cats are very restricted. If dogs and cats had any sense, they would have gone to Washington to demonstrate and demand "dog rights" and "cat rights".

The more contentious a society is, the more coordination is often needed. Different coordination mechanisms can be chosen for different cultural climates. Regardless of the mechanism chosen, one thing that should always be kept in mind is the constant identification of potential areas of contention and the continuous development of coordination mechanisms. The various types of coordination can be broadly divided into two categories: "humanized coordination" and "regulatory coordination. Regardless of the type of coordination, the important thing is to have the appropriate coordination mechanism for each type of potential dispute and to make it procedural. In each place where a dispute occurs, not only the specific dispute is resolved, but also a general coordination procedure is developed. In this way, society can increasingly move toward the development of orderly dispute resolution. A modern society is also a society that is free from disorderly dispute resolution.

## **V. Interwoven political forces**

### **1. Donkey and elephant rule the country**

The donkey is the symbol of the Democratic Party and the elephant is the symbol of the Republican Party. Some people have imaginatively described the election campaign in the United States as "the battle of the donkey and the elephant". In fact, both parties represent the ruling class of society and control politics, so it can also be said that "the donkey and the elephant rule the country". When analyzing the U.S. elections, it is important to understand the pivotal position of

both parties. It is impossible to understand American politics and how it is run without understanding bipartisan politics. American politics is run by both parties, but neither party is really a political party, just an "aggregated mass". Compared to most Western and Eastern political parties, they are even "rabble". We can look at why American political parties are rather like a "rabble".

For one thing, neither party has a set system of membership (some registration procedures); in fact, they don't have members in the strict sense of the word, and voters can self-identify with whichever party they want. Voters can self-identify with whichever party they vote for in the election. No one recognizes them as "party members," and they don't need to be recognized to say, "I'm a Republican" or "I'm a Democrat. Even senior party leaders probably had no concept of "party membership" from the beginning. The doors of both parties were wide open, and access was free, like a temple.

Second, neither party has a systematic theory, and there are differences between the two parties on many issues. But there are also various views among the two parties, from the left to the right, and from the center, etc. Among the members of both parties, all ideas can be heard. Senators or Representatives nominated and elected by both parties are also free to decide what to do, and can even oppose their own party's proposals.

Third, neither party has a complete platform, and if you want to find a copy of the Democratic or Republican party platform, you will never find one. Political parties generally have only two kinds of documents that indicate their positions and propositions, one is the platform formed at the nominating convention, but it cannot bind anyone. The other is the president's speech about it. So neither party can tell people clearly what they really want. They only propose some reform ideas on domestic and foreign affairs at election time, not their basic line.

Fourth, neither party has a tight organization, and it is rare to hear which party holds branch or membership meetings in general. American political parties are electoral parties, that is, they are active only at election time, and it is not clear who is a member of the party itself during weekdays. It is like a person who is in a market and does not know what he should do until then. The federal system, too, prevents both parties from becoming well-organized parties. Each state

has its own independent power, and the boundaries between the federal and state parties are well understood, with each state actually having its own Democratic and Republican parties. What the local party organizations do at election time is not known to the national organization. Regardless of this, what people are talking about is whether or not a candidate with their party's logo can be elected.

This shows that the concept of two parties is very different from that of a normal political party. But such loose organizations should not be underestimated; sometimes their strength lies in such looseness. Of course, it is not that the two parties are not organized, it is just that these organizations are not very effective outside of elections.

There are two types of political party organizations in the United States, one permanent and one ad hoc. The lowest level is called a Precinct Committee (Precinct Committee), which usually has only one person in charge. At the same level are town committees and other committees. At the top is the county commission, whose committee is made up of precinct members (usually), with the county commission being the more important layer. Between the county and state committees, there is a congressional district committee that puts forward candidates for Congress. Further up the ladder is the state committee. Because state legislation varies from state to state, the mechanism for creating state committees varies greatly and is not uniform. The state committee is the permanent body of the party in the state and is responsible for promoting the party and consolidating it. The chairman of the committee is a prominent figure in politics. Finally, there is the National Committee. The National Committee is composed of representatives from each state. The National Committee is loose, has little power, and cannot do much. Both parties do not have a formal central committee or standing committee, and there is no concept of a "U.S. Standing Committee. The chairman of the national committee is responsible for leading the campaign headquarters, promoting the candidates, fundraising and other matters, and has little power, but only a steward role.

In addition to this, both parties will have Headquarter for election services, from national headquarters, state headquarters to county headquarters.

It may seem that the two parties still have a more decent top-down, or bottom-up, organization, but in reality there is very little connection

between the organizations, because there is no theory, no party platform, no fixed membership, and no idea how to connect. There was some connection between the national committee and the state committees, and little connection further down. The national headquarters also had no control over the local headquarters, which went about their business under the banner of the national headquarters. Because the main goal of the local headquarters is to win elections, there are no other benefits to be gained, such as a bigger share of the house, buying some cheap goods and riding in a nice little car. The people who come to work understand what they are doing before they come, so it works fine. As long as you can win the election, you can use whatever tricks you have. The National Committee doesn't bother to control either.

The two parties are the most willing to have others fight under their banner. You can do whatever you want as long as you play under my banner and negotiate certain terms. National Union stores, such as McDonald's, Hardee's, and Kentucky Fried Chicken, are available nationwide. The total number has no idea what they are doing other than selling the same goods. Americans implement the same ideas in politics and economics. The two parties are like a national union, with each branch doing its own thing to sell its products.

In fact, not only the two parties, there are also many small parties, such as the Socialist Workers Party, the American Party, the People's Party, the Communist Party of America, etc. But they have never become a major party that can compete with the Republican and Democratic parties. But they have never become a big party that can confront the Republican Party and the Democratic Party, one of the important reasons is that the two parties do not have clear boundaries, including a lot of "dissidents", they do not need to be ostracized and join others or occupy their own mountain.

It is sometimes unbelievable that two major parties that can dominate politics are so loosely organized. In fact the energy of the two parties lies in the looseness.

For one thing, it's hard for American culture to accept a well-organized political party and to understand a party platform that is ready to be used for twenty years. Americans are pragmatic and it's not even that easy for them to come up with the idea. They want to solve the specific problems they encounter in society. The individualism that

people are raised with makes it difficult for them to become so deeply involved in a political organization that they can disregard their own interests. People choose political parties for their own benefit.

Second, both parties are open doors, anyone can enter and exit, the grassroots party members can not talk about discipline. The U.S. political parties are ugly "hodgepodge", well known for their inclusiveness. In fact, this is an important condition for the long-term existence of the two parties. The two parties have no mechanism to exclude those who are willing to support them, but have a mechanism to absorb different people. Because there are no clear boundaries, anyone who wants to can come in and anyone who wants to can go out, and there is no real point in opposing them. The general public could only raise hell, and the main power of the party was in the hands of a small group of party leaders, which the general public could not ask for.

Third, both parties are electoral parties whose main purpose is to win elections and do not have a fixed political goal. They do whatever will help them win the election. This mechanism motivates them to cater to voters' aspirations as much as possible and to unite themselves with their voters. The policy ideas that both parties talk about actually summarize and summarize voters' problems, and then propose solutions. This ability to adapt is also important for both parties to maintain their position. In this process, party leaders add the idea of representing the interests of big money and specific classes to the mix. Of course, after winning an election, they may disregard all their campaign promises and do something else. Voters have little control at this point.

## **2. Political party fertilization**

The system of political party sharing has been theoretically very limited. Since the introduction of the civil service at the end of the nineteenth century, public sector officials and employees have been divided into two categories, one elected and the other permanent civil service, with most officials coming from the latter system. They are elected through an open and competitive mechanism (see Chapter 7, "Selecting Officials"), independent of whether a party wins or loses an election, and do not work with the party. In practice, however, the party that wins the election is still well-funded, and the system of fat-sharing still exists among political officials, and not in small



numbers. According to the New York Times, the number of presidential appointees of all kinds, full-time or part-time, substantive or honorary, adds up to about 8,000. The article estimates that there are about two million federal officials (some estimates are much higher), so 8,000 is really an insignificant number, but it is not. These 8,000 positions are all important positions, one is important, and the other is a lot of money. Once a party wins, it will get the piece of meat, in the election of people who have made meritorious work, on the merit of the reward, seal the official and increase the salary. Soon after Bush was elected as the forty-first president, Reagan asked all such officials to resign in general, so that the president-elect to organize a new team.

Why is this a fat piece of meat, let's look at what is included in this meat.

14 cabinet ministers with an annual salary of \$99,800.

Their deputies earn between \$75,500 and \$89,500 per year.

134 ambassadors abroad, with an annual salary of \$75,500.

Head of the various control committees, with an annual salary of \$82,500.

White House attorney and physician at \$89,500 per year

And so on, 8,000 positions is a lot of money. When you compare the salaries of university professors, you can get an idea. Very famous professors, especially those in science and medicine, can earn upwards of \$200,000 per year, while professors in the liberal arts generally earn less, with full professors earning \$40,000 to \$60,000, associate professors less than \$40,000, and assistant professors even less, despite having a doctorate. Naturally, not all of the 8,000 people have such high salaries. Some also don't bother with politics, because these salaries can be pathetically small compared to the corporate world. Chrysler Motors general manager Iacocca's annual salary in 1987 was seven million. One professor commented, "No one is worth that much." Public sector salaries are relatively lower than those of the corporate world, but these positions have the additional attribute of political significance - the right to rule.

After winning the presidential election, the political parties have to consider how to divide the fat. This is a sensitive and complex

project: on the one hand, it is necessary to satisfy all those who have contributed in the election, and on the other hand, it is necessary to form an effective team. If the same party is re-elected, this also involves how to treat the existing team. Let's take a look at the two key figures Bush has already chosen.

Secretary of State James Baker, 58, is a lawyer in Houston. He was chairman of all four Bush campaigns and made his mark. He was Reagan's chief of staff and served as Secretary of the Treasury. Close to Bush, can be said to be the most beloved family friend.

Chief of Staff John Sununu, 49, governor of New Hampshire and a doctor of engineering from MIT, is credited with saving Bush in the New Hampshire primary. Bush was nearly defeated by another Republican candidate, Dole, and Sununu, as governor, fired up the machine and saved Bush's life. Bush chose him as chief of staff, replacing incumbent Chief of Staff Clegg Fuller. Craig Fuller had been Bush's chief of staff since 1985 and was loyal, but Sununu was simply too meritorious for Bush to pass up.

Bush keeps announcing his choices and appointments. Before the election, the rich contribute money, the powerful contribute, and after the election is won, you can pop the crown and get an official position for all those who have merit. The winner is the king, the loser is the enemy. The defeated party candidates in the election and many campaign assistants, have to look at these fat vacancies.

This process is not without checks and balances, because it is a fat job, and in a society like the United States, a mechanism is bound to develop. Of the official positions that the president can appoint, 700 require Senate confirmation, such as ambassadors and the like. The White House team and the advisory team do not need to be approved by the Senate. This mechanism controls the president's appointment power and makes him consider the feasibility of appointing some officials.

In theory, the U.S. officer system has significantly weakened the party fattening system, but the party fattening system still exists in practice. This mechanism is not only found in presidential elections, but also in the elections of congressmen and senators. If you are elected to the House of Representatives or the Senate, you can organize a class, and the people who have horsed around in the election will be rewarded. This is the official official position. Official positions imply power, and power implies decision-making. These important

official positions often have the power to determine the direction of government finances, and so far more people than just the official appointees may benefit from a party's electoral victory. In addition, once you are in high office, you have a secure future. If the party loses the next election or is itself dismissed, or wants to leave, major companies or institutions will be eager to hire them at high salaries. Many former key government officials are now working for major companies. They have been in the White House or Washington and are an important resource.

The question is what role has this system played in the management of society? Why has this part of the political party fattening system been preserved?

One of the main reasons for changing the party fattening system in the late nineteenth century was that it led to selfishness, inefficiency, corruption, and at the same time led to an unstable system of governance for the whole society. Every official was appointed and might have to walk in the next term, so they had to grab a tight buck. Because government officials change in a walking pattern, government management is not consistent and coherent. But the fat-sharing system at the top is still preserved. The fat-sharing system ensures that the elected political party builds an effective team. Although there are various drawbacks in it. However, from the management point of view, the president appoints friends and relatives of the same party to hold each key point of the political system, which is easy to form a highly integrated and convenient political chain of command. This system can do all kinds of things, good and bad, but from the political command, without such a system will be difficult to walk. Imagine the president does not have the power to organize the team, all the members of the team have to be decided by others, how can the whole government function? It will certainly form mutual constraints and conflicts. This scope of the fertilization system is preserved because the social management and political rule of the necessary. Anyone elected to the presidency would want to hold such power, so it has not been changed.

Second, this power is unrestricted to a certain extent, and the president can use it to his heart's content, but at the same time there are limits, the House and Senate of Congress have some oversight of government officials, including the president himself. Nixon had to resign because of the Watergate scandal. Many administrators have had to resign in the course of their administration. The biggest constraint

is the quadrennial presidential election. After a new president is elected, especially if a candidate from the other party is elected, all appointed officials have to be reappointed, or if they are not appointed, they are free to go. Generally speaking, when the other party's candidate is in the White House, all appointees will have to roll up. A team that fails to win hearts and minds and loses elections loses office. Despite this or that limitation, once elected president, you can share the fat with the same party and form a "one-party dictatorship" in the federal government. In fact, the federal government is also a "one-party dictatorship," except that it is subject to the test of elections, time constraints, and the constraints of Congress. The successor is king, the loser is the enemy, in American politics is the unbreakable truth.

Third, while the implementation of the fat-sharing system is beneficial to the winning party, it also poses a challenge to those who enjoy fat jobs. If the party loses, they will have to lose their posts, and then where will they find a job? There is no such problem for officials, as they can retire to their homes and work in a retirement system. But not for political officials, who will have to prepare for their future if the wind changes. Senior government officials naturally do not have too many problems, but many lower level government officials have such problems. It should be said that the social mechanism of the United States has created certain conditions for the implementation of the fat-sharing system, without which the fat-sharing system could not be realized. Where does a person who is a minister or the head of a department go when he suddenly has no job? American society is a society where everyone has to go to work and no one arranges jobs. This mechanism, which consists mostly of private companies and departments, is also practiced by schools and other sectors. If one is highly competitive, one can find a job. People who have held senior positions in Washington have a stronger competitive edge than the average person, some of whom originally had their own businesses, and some of whom returned to their former workplaces. Society provides the mechanism to absorb these people so that it does not constitute a serious social problem. Administrative officials are first prepared for this mentality when they become officials. Preparing to say goodbye to Washington after a few years, they have long started looking for a way out. There is no tenure system for government officials, and those who wish to do so will take the bait. Otherwise, every government shift, change down so many important people, does not constitute a major social problem.

政党分肥有弊，问题是如何找到监督和控制的机制。同时并非任何社会都能实行这一体制，要看社会环境有没有相应的机制。政党分肥，很大程度上保障了行政班子的统一和效率，保证了统治阶级集团内部的步调一致，这是一个基本的机制。

### 3.利益集团

利益集团，又称压力集团，为美国政治和社会的一个重要现象。理解利益集团和压力集团，不仅是理解美国政治的重要一环。而且是理解美国社会运行过程的重要一环。

何谓压力集团？一般而论，就是想用共同力量来影响政治过程的团体。这个团体往往有自己的特殊利益，它们向政治过程施加影响，以保护自己的利益或得到更大的利益。只有少部分利益集团是理想主义的。促进利益集团活动的基本动力是自身利益。政治体系的决策在很大程度上影响着社会利益的格局，影响社会利益的分配。凡是想保护或扩大自己的利益的人们，都应首先影响政治决策。利益集团活动的基础就在这里。

利益集团也被认为是多元主义的基础。利益集团可以影响决策的过程，政治就是多元的。如果社会上没有任何力量可以影响政府决策过程，政治就是一元的。利益集团影响政治过程的手段有多种，其中 Lobby（游说）是基本手段。华盛顿活跃的乐辩士有不少都是利益集团的代表。

利益集团是资本主义社会的特征之一，也是一些发展中国家的社会特征。利益集团往往起着一些奇特的作用。把政治和经济联系起来。在资本主义制度下，政府并不直接管理经济。经济利益矛盾表面上由政府政策和法律加以协调。各类利益集团通过自己的活动影响政策和法律的制定，使它们最大程度地反映自身的利益。这个过程，其实把经济集团与政治集团联结起来，或者说是把一部分经济集团与政治集团联结起来。其他类型的集团也可如是行事。

利益集团为资本主义的必然产物。在财产私有的条件下，个人的利益十分明确，界限也明确，追逐更大利益的动力和机制都强而有力地存在，个别利益汇成集团利益以争取更大权力，是自然而然的。利益集团类别纷杂，经济的、语言的、文化的、宗教的、种族的、职业的等等，应有尽有。资本主义制度的一大特点是政府为被动政府（传统的特征，最小的政府为最好的政府），要运用政府手段来保护和扩大自己的利益，个人的力量显然不行，只有团体的力量才能奏效。社会存在着组成集团才能有所作为的传统和文化，这是其社会组织的一个特点。

据有的学者统计，美国成年人每十人中有六人隶属于某个组织。利益集团有政治性和非政治性之分，政治性的包括共和党和民主党的俱乐部，政治活动团体等。其他利益集团就五花八门了，如学校服务组织、青年组织、退伍军人组织、农民组织、种族组织、教会组织、博爱组织、职业组织、工会组织、体育组织等。它

们均是独立的“群众性”组织，与政府没有领导与被领导的关系，因此它们就得想办法影响政治过程。

名列前茅的利益集团要属企业组织、劳工组织和农场主组织。企业组织腰缠万贯，可以雇佣专门人才为其游说，以影响政治过程，如全国企业家协会（National Association of manufacturers）和美国商会（U.S. Chamber of Commerce）。工会能量非凡，因为拥有会员众多，人多势众。不同的利益集团有不同的影响力。自然，小的利益集团与大的利益集团相比是小巫见大巫，不能相提并论。真正能起作用的，或常起作用的是大型利益集团，小的利益集团有活动自由，但往往成效不大。话说回来，一个社会的政治过程不可能让每个人都插一杠子，如此这般，社会的政治过程会失去统一性。这种制度自然进化的结果是：大型利益集团，经济的也罢，政治的也罢，拥有统治权力。

利益集团的这种不平等，可以从利益集团影响政治过程的手段来看。所有的利益集团均没有权力走到总统办公室或议员办公室里命令他们做什么。它们必须影响他们。要达到这类目的：

第一要有财源，以养活专门为利益集团工作的人，这就是乐辩士，他们需活动于联邦，州和地方各级政府。

第二要有成员，众人拾柴火焰高，只有十几个人七八条枪，显然不能成事；不过有一种观点认为，由于“公共产品”（Public Good）的性质以及“自由乘车”（Free Ride）的问题，大型团体反而不如小、中型团体那么组织有序，行动有效。

第三要有专长，这种制度下，没有人可以自说自话地采取对某个利益集团有利的政策和法律，必须经过立法和表决，这就要求利益集团运用合理的、充分的、科学的论据来说服人们。肮脏的交易自然有，但受政治过程的排斥，每个利益集团都会监督其他的利益集团如何活动，在这种情势下，利益集团必须拥有有关的专门、系统知识，并运用他们来达到目的。

第四要有门路，朝里有人好做官，认识与不认识，大有差别。从这些条件看，大规模利益集团自然要活络和有实力得多。所以，如果说美国政治是多元主义的，也并非多元到哪里去，这一点在研究美国政治时，务必注意。

大型利益集团或有权有势的利益集团，往往有实权在手，这是他们构成大型利益集团的条件。有人称这种利益集团为“半政府”（Quasi-Governments）。它们可以控制从事某种职业，这主要限于职业组织；它们可以制定标准和规则；它们可以分配公共基金，政府提供的很多种类基金，最后由私人团体来分配，尽管政府定有规则，但县官不如现管，负责这类事务的私人团体自然高人一等；他们拥有强大的实力，可以左右经济或经济的某一部门，这就使政府在活动时须三思而后行，如此等等。

利益集团的产生有各种原因。经济的私有化也是利益集团产生的基础，资本主义生产方式要求政府不干预经济过程，要取得合作和引导经济，或者说管制经济和

其他社会活动，政府不能一厢情愿，必须看看各大利益集团的脸色。反之，利益集团在法律 and 政策的协调之下，不能为非作歹，也得看政府的脸色。这种相互作用的机制，为社会政治和管理过程的一大特点。

至于利益集团的互动，可以说它们把各种要求输进政治系统，起到了沟通的作用，起到了使政治系统与社会广泛联结的作用；也可以说利益集团代表一部分人的利益，而无权无势的大众都无法组成强大的利益集团。这两种现象均存在。从社会管理的角度看，前一种功能客观上存在，尽管不少利益集团主观上并无此图。但后一现象是社会管理中的问题之一，如果组织完备，资源充分的利益集团最能影响政治过程，那么平民百姓的利益由谁代表？美国的民主是否民主够了？这是可以打一个问号的。利益集团的存在，我已经分析过，是美国社会制度、政治制度和文化的必然产物。在这种三重结构中，不可能找出其他协调政治和社会的途径。问题是这种机制的内在缺点和优点在什么时候会失去平衡，以致产生危机。

在社会管理和政治过程中，有一些团体来收集、综合、归纳、输送社会的利益要求，是政治系统得以满足最大利益要求的重要条件。每个政治系统拥有的资源有限，往往只能满足一部分利益要求。最好的政策并不是满足所有社会利益要求的政策（这是不可能的），而是用同样的资源满足了最多利益要求的政策。要做到这一点，政治系统就必须通过各种渠道来尽量了解社会上存在的各种利益要求。

## 4. 乐辩士

乐辩士，是我对 Lobbyist 一词的翻译，音译加意译。很多人将其译成走廊议员或说客。乐辩士是美国政治生活中非常重要的现象，理解美国政治，不能忽略了 this 重要的领域。

什么叫 Lobby？什么人 is 乐辩士？根据卡伦·萨格斯特（Karen Sagstetter）的书《乐辩》说，乐辩士是专门说服人的人，他们在市议会，州议会和联邦各机构中活动。哪里有政府活动，他们就往哪里活动，他们试图影响政府的政策和立法，他们代表着特殊的私人或公共利益集团。他们到处游说，就是要政府或立法机关有所为或有所不为。

乐辩士的概念没有什么贬意，也没有什么不名誉，并非偷偷摸摸、见不得人。乐辩士们，均抛头露面，甚至有权有势。弗兰克·古明斯（Frank Cummings）写的书叫《国会山手册》（Capitol Hill Manual）。这本书中作者谆谆教导国会人：虽然很多历史故事含有“乐辩”是一个肮脏的字眼的意义，但这里没有什么罪恶。乐辩是必不可少的。古明斯提出的理由是，没有一位众议员或参议员可以成为任何问题的专家，连国会中的专家也不能对任何事情都了如指掌；立法者也无法知道一个特殊的集团对一些特殊的问题有何想法，因此从立法和治理社会的角度来说，乐辩士的功能实际上是信息传递和利益表达的功能。

当然，乐辩士都是心怀意图的，而且大部分乐辩士均不是为普遍利益乐辩，而是为某种特殊利益乐辩。如果乐辩成功，往往某个特殊的利益集团能从中渔利。我们可以举一个例子（假设的）。中国的纺织品成本低，每套西装卖五十美元，而美国的劳动力价格高，成本价格高，每套西装卖一百美元，那么消费者就会选择中国产的西装。这样美国的厂商就无法赢利。于是美国纺织业的乐辩士就会在国会游说，通过立法，或是加税，或是限制进口。如果国会通过立法，那么这部分利益集团便大获其利。

乐辩士有各种各样，形形色色。有些乐辩士为私人集团服务，这部分人不少。有些乐辩士为一些社会组织服务，如为工会，环境保护组织，公共福利组织等。有的乐辩士为外国政府效劳，这部分人也不少，不少外国政府都想从国会立法中获得利益或捞取油水，都用重金雇用乐辩士为自己服务，不少国家政府派了精兵强将在华府四处奔忙。如 1969-1970 年，南朝鲜为争取五千万美元的附加援助，派出大批人员在华府活动了七个月。有的乐辩士为美国总统服务，因为美国是权力分立的体制，总统也得想法取得国会的支持。总统的乐辩士大半由总统属下的行政官员承担，有时也专门组建与国会打交道的班子。乐辩士名堂很多，但其基本功能是一样的，即影响立法机构的立法活动或行政机构的决策。

乐辩士各显神通，运用各种手段展开活动，他们要与议员会谈，要准备文件，或者共进午餐。乐辩士的活也不那么好做。要成为乐辩士，也得具备一定的条件。乐辩士的主要工作包括：（1）研究，对一项专门问题和专门法案进行详细的研究；（2）在听证会上作证；（3）与议员进行合作，起草发言稿，准备报告，起草法案，回信等。除了直接的乐辩之外，还有其他的战术，如基层乐辩，从影响选民、影响议员本选区的选民入手；跨越乐辩（Cross-Lobbying）即几个不同的利益集团或

同乐辩士共同协作，发表投票记录，通过选票记录或民意对议员施加压力，如此等等。

从另一个方面来说，议员们也需要乐辩士。他们在对一项法案发表意见时，需要知道有关的信息和材料。所以议员往往不是坐等乐辩士上门，而是主动去找他们。当然，对待乐辩士，各人的态度有不同，有的反对，有的赞成。有一条是确定无疑的，这就是每位乐辩士都有自己的目标。他们在为议员提供方便时，总怀有自己的意图。所以《国会山手册》说：“这里有危险”。

乐辩士活动的正常化体现在一定程度的制度化上。乐辩士的活动要接受一定的法律管制。1946 年，美国通过了主要的管制乐辩士的法律。每个想影响立法过程的人都须登记，如果有人付钱给他们的话。这样个人、协会、公司都属于这个范围。登记时，要写明活动范围和领域、姓名、公司地址、雇主的姓名，从事乐辩士的年限、工资、谁支付工资和日常开支，对哪些立法感兴趣，谁接受资金，有什么用途。从法律来说，自然不错。但其实漏洞极大，如许多人在影响立法过程，但他们可以声称自己不是乐辩士，对立法程序没有兴趣。华盛顿共有 20,000 名左右的乐辩士在忙忙碌碌。



乐辩士的活动往往卓有成效，举足轻重。例如，以色列的乐辩士就十分强大并卓有成效。犹太人在美国大概有六百万，他们受教育水平、社会地位和政治活动水平平均高于平均数。他们一个主要乐辩组织 AIPAC，1985 年有成员 75 人，经费预算 570 万美元。自然，阿拉伯的乐辩组织也很有实力。《Washington Lobby》一书举了不少实例，来证明乐辩士活动的效果。不用说，平民百姓很少有自己的乐辩士。

美国社会的一大特点，就是把政治舞台变成了一个大的商品市场，政治成了一种象经济市场一样的交易市场。可以在里面推销自己的“产品”，或者购买别人的产品。政客们在里面讨价还价，你争我夺。

这个过程受法律管制，但法律首先承认这种政治模式，这样做有利有弊，利处在政治竞争中一般优质产品较容易卖出去，这就迫使要参与竞争的人拿出好货来。另一个方面，大的公司可以垄断市场，推销自己的产品或推销劣质产品，取得“垄断利润”。尽管政治舞台不易于被谁所垄断，但财大气粗的集团自然占有优势。这种政治精神是美国政治文化中十分重要的成分，实际上易受其高度发达的商品经济精神的熏陶。商品经济的要求就是在市场上找到最好的主顾，推销产品，取得最好的技术、最佳条件，获得最大利益。这点原则把乐辩士和议员、政府官员联系起来。他们总是处在卖方或者买方的位置上。

这里面反映出来的另一个文化因素，便是政治的世俗化。宗教有世俗化的问题，政治也有世俗化的问题。人们搞政治就象做其他任何事情一样，如做买卖，搞科研，赚钱等，很少有政治具有特殊地位的感觉。政治成为普通的日常事务，虽然政治大权由社会上层所掌握，但他们必得世俗化地来搞政治，否则行不通。

## 5.激进组织

路过市中心，有一位姑娘在热闹的地方摆了一个书摊。没有什么人光顾。我正好从旁边走过，看了一眼她贩卖的书，反倒被吸引住了。停下来稍微多看了几眼，书摊上摆的书有《共产党宣言》，还有卡斯特罗的言论集，托洛茨基的言论集。不难看出，她属于一个左派激进组织。据说在美国这样的小型组织或者说微型组织有几百个。他们活动很积极，但没有什么政治影响，大部分民众不关心它们。

那姑娘还在出售他们这个组织的报纸，叫《战斗者》（The Militant），报头下写着：为工人群众利益而发表的社会主义的新闻周刊。《战斗报》象上海《新民晚报》那样开本，16 版，卖一美元一份，比一般的报纸要贵一些。

浏览了一下这份《战斗报》，可以看到一点有趣的令人深思的消息。

最大的篇幅用于为一名叫马克·卡蒂斯（Mark Curtis）的人辩护。此人是该组织的积极分子，被控有性侵犯行为。事情来龙去脉为：1988 年 3 月 4 日，指认他的那位叫莫丽丝的姑娘，正在家里看电视，大约晚上 8 点以后，有人打电话找她

父母，她说父母不在家。十分钟后有人敲门，她打开门后，这个男人就对她进行了性侵犯并打了她，《战斗报》刊登了那天晚上卡蒂斯的活动，以证明卡蒂斯没有时间做此事，报纸呼吁民众声援卡蒂斯。

另外的消息还有：批评撒切尔首相驱逐古巴驻英大使和古巴使馆的三等秘书。古巴驻英大使奥斯卡·菲尔南德兹·麦尔（Oscar Fern'andez Mell）是古巴共产党的创始人之一，曾当选为古巴共产党第一届中央委员会委员，曾与切·格瓦拉一起援助过扎伊尔的反帝斗争。那个卖报纸的姑娘曾说，世界上恐怕只有古巴是唯一剩下的社会主义国家了。关于缅甸政治动向的报道有一大篇。有一篇报道津巴布韦 250 人集会讨论切·格瓦拉和古巴革命。一篇文章写宾夕法尼亚矿工罢工的体会。

有篇文章值得一提，这样大概可以把握这个激进组织的基本想法，这篇文章题目叫《一个加勒比海、一个命运》，讲的是在纽约开的一次会议。会议讨论的主题是，反帝斗争的前景。会议是由加勒比海统一联盟组织的。这个组织由来自 23 个国家的 38 个政治组织组成。主要发言人是格林纳达前总理的新闻秘书。他的发言值得一读。他说：“我们要讨论的是用我们的联盟反对他们的联盟。我们的联盟，指的是工人、农民、渔民、年轻人、学生、受苦受难的人的联盟。他们的联盟指的是有权有势、有特权、有资本、有财富的人。”在今天的世界上，讲这样的话的人还是不少的。不少与会者谴责美国干涉古巴和尼加拉瓜，说那是侵略，是人类得到住房、教育、面包和其他基本生活品的主要障碍。

更有意思的是，报纸还登了这个党——社会主义工人党（Socialist Workers），参加 1988 年总统大选的告示。总统候选人叫沃伦（Warren），副总统候选人叫米盖尔斯（Mickells），还有一个竞选委员会。这样的候选人自然不会有太大声响，可能会完全淹没在布什和杜卡基斯吵吵闹闹的竞选活动中。

《战斗报》号召民众订阅，广告上说：《战斗报》告诉真相，报道美国发动的反对世界各族人民的战争的事实和真相，如果只靠主要的大众传播获得真相，我们就会对美国发动的反对萨尔瓦多、危地马拉和尼加拉瓜的人民的战争一无所知。

从以上报道可以看出，这是一个激进组织，美国和西方社会这样的激进组织数不胜数。但大多没有什么影响。这些组织谈论的一些问题有些是事实，他们的一些主张对社会进步也不是无益的。这些自称社会主义的组织地位，在美国尤其低。对于这些现象，恐怕不能就事论事，仅仅从这些组织的纲领和活动去看，实际上这反映了当今世界两大意识形态之间的关系。由于战后社会主义国家都遇到这样和那样的曲折，经济发展均远远落后于资本主义国家，所以总体的吸引力不够。而资本主义国家的经济发展，却产生了压倒一切的吸引力。一般而言，大众不从制度、结构、观念、精神、人的本质等角度判断社会优劣，而是从自己的日常生活出发，或者说从肠胃由发，而不是大脑出发。由于经济和社会发展的巨大差距，主张改革资本主义制度的组织和观念在西方社会不会有什么大的影响。所以，美国社会也让它们自生自灭。如果有一天东西方之间的经济水平倒转过来，恐怕就要对它们进行管制了。其实不用超越，只要拉平，意识形态之争可能就会东山再

起。有个朋友说，此话不错，甚至只要再有几次严重的经济衰退，激进分子就会有市场。

## 6.多元抑或英才

有不少人把美国视为一个多元主义的社会，把美国政治制度描绘成多元主义的。较早提出这个论点的是戴维·杜鲁门（David Truman），他在《政府过程》一书中描绘了多元主义政治的基本机制。其二是罗伯特·达尔（Robert Dahl），他在《谁统治》一书中描绘了当代美国政治过程的基本机制。

我译过达尔的《现代政治分析》，较了解他的想法。他的概念，严格地讲是多头主义（Polyachism），而非多元主义（Pluralism）。然而不论概念上有何种差别，他们的基本思路是一致的：在美国社会中，权力是分享的，有许多相互竞争的利益争取权力，其中没有一个单独的利益可以独揽大权，也没有哪一部分人完全被排除在权力之外。权力通过这样的机制在不同的社会团体中分享。可见，多元主义要以利益集团理论为基础。

多元主义的基本立论是不同的社会集团均可以影响权力种运转过程。问题是有没有这样的可能性，主张多元主义的学者认为，有。

一是美国是一个移民国家，社会充满各种种族、语言、宗教团体，不同行业之间的差异依然明显存在。也就是奈斯比特所说，美国是一个“melting pot society”（大熔炉社会）。

二是美国人有组成团体来追求自身利益的天性，这倒是事实。各种各样团体多如牛毛，因为政府是管得越少越好，所以想要有人管有些事，一是自己组织起来，二是组织起来影响政府。选举制也促进了这种机制，美国人在选举中得到的经验是，只要达到一定人数，就可构成一定的力量。

其三是政府的分权结构也为多元主义打下了基础，权力分立使任何政府部门都不能独掌大权，所以美国的权力由各种相互竞争的力量争夺着。社会各种利益集团通过竞争、谈判、妥协来分享权力，政府是调节人，政府也有自己的特殊利益。

另一派人反对多元主义政治的观念，认为美国社会是“英才民主”。大部分人谈不上享受政治权力。能够参与竞争的，是组织起来的大型团体，小团体就难说有什么作用了。大集团操纵权远远大于小集团。而且参与团体的人并不能包罗这一领域中的所有的人。集团带有一定的利益倾向。此外，最有权力的政府并非听从摆布，它能够有力地运用自己的权力，推行自己的政策，达成自己的意图。

英才派认为大众、选举的代表和利益集团均没有权力。权力在一小撮“权力英才”手中。主张这种观念的有格兰特·麦克科内尔（Grant McConnell），他写的著作叫《私人权力和美国民主》（1970），西奥多·罗威（Theodore Lowi）《自

由主义的终结》（1969），赖特·米尔斯（Wright Mills）《权力英才》（1956），拉尔夫·米里班德（Ralph Miliband）《资本主义社会中的国家》（1969）等。米尔斯颇有权威，他说权力英才指挥着现代社会主要的等级结构和组织。他们管理国家机器，领导军事组织，占据社会结构的战略指挥位置。他认为美国社会的权力主要来自三个方面：大公司、军事组织和政治领袖。美国的经济掌握在几百家大公司手中，它们决定着社会经济走向。政治权力日益集中于联邦政府，总统的权力日益扩大。军队成为政府开支最大、机构最庞大的机构。这三个领域的领袖构成权力英才阶层，他们决定生死攸关的问题。公众只能望权兴叹，无所事事。

不仅如此，米尔斯还认为这三个领域的权力相互联结，相互配合。退休的将军应聘去一家国防工厂中做经理；落选的总统候选人到大公司当顾问；大公司的董事长或经理出任政府官员。托马斯·戴伊（Thomas R. Dye）有本书，叫《谁统治美国》，书里的观念是：美国由五千名大亨统治着。

托马斯·戴伊的另一部著作，也很有意思，叫 *The Irony of Democracy: An Uncommon Introduction to American Politics*（《民主的讽刺：美国政治议论》）。他的主要观点就是断定美国社会是由英才统治的。他说美国从建国起就是英才统治，一直延续至今。英才统治的结果是，民众异化，英才掌权，社会抗议，这构成美国政治的困境。民主的含义是民治、民享、民有，而实际政治的运行却是英才统治的不可避免。所谓英才统治，就是权力由一小撮人执掌。

所以，社会的管理权，最后是掌握在一部分英才手中的，不论这个数目是五千还是五万，他们绝对是社会少数。英才统治是资本主义制度下的社会的共同特征。因此这就给人类社会的发展提出一个问题：严格意义上的民主是否符合大规模人类社会的发展规律或称内在要求。美国人一方面在理论上维护制度的民主和宪法的民主，另一方面从心理上和文化上崇拜英才。很少有哪个民族象美国人这样崇拜英才。虽然看上去不少美国人对许多事情都满不在乎的样子，其实美国文化中英雄崇拜的心理很强烈。这也许和美国历史和民族的成长有关。这种心理和文化价值，是英才统治在美国通行的基础。美国人在观念上主张大众民主，在实际上接受英才统治（见第三章第四节“神圣化”）。

这既是美国社会制度奇特的一面，也是它难言的一面，不少学者均认识到英才统治的现象违背大众民主原则。但它是产生于大众民主，有人利用它，无法强制取消和限制，那样反倒破坏了民主原则。这个两难困境，在美国社会制度今后运转中会有所突破，但走向哪一个方向，目前尚不能预料。

## 7. 参与民主？

近些年来，一些学者纷纷谈论资本主义共和制的最新发展——参与民主制，誉之为“二十一世纪的民主”。阿尔温·托夫勒的《第三次浪潮》和约翰·奈斯比特

的《大趋势》是这一理论的集大成者，他们断言，参与民主制正在引起“革命性变化”。明尼苏达大学赫伯特·汉弗莱公共事务研究所所长哈伦·克利夫兰撰文指出，“在信息社会里”，参与民主制“也许是民主的最新定义”。

美国的政权组织形式，是共和制的典型。美国民主共和制的建立是历史运动的产物，其形成的历史原因是当时十三个殖民地资本主义的迅速发展。十三个殖民地建立不久，自由资本主义经济就出现了，当时工业中最发达的为毛纺工业和冶金工业，冶金工业甚至可与英国本土竞争。英国统治阶级对殖民地经济的和政治的限制，引起了十三个殖民地与殖民地统治者之间的矛盾激化。十三个殖民地强烈要求建立自己的政权，以保护和促进殖民地资本主义经济的发展，这样就在政治上产生了建立民主共和制的历史要求。

资本主义经济在十三个殖民地的确立，意味着商品生产和商品交换取得了统治地位。而从商品生产和商品交换中必然会产生民主共和的要求，这是因为商品价值的实体是无差别的抽象劳动，有了这种质的等同性，商品与商品才能交换。商品按价值量等量交换，决定价值量的社会必要劳动时间是在社会正常生产条件、平均熟练程度、平均劳动强度等条件之下由社会自发计算的，这些条件本身就意味着平等，意味着商品生产者没有高低贵贱之分。民主共和制是“商品是天生的平等派”这项经济原则在政治上的制度化和法律化。

近二十年来，随着社会生产力、科学技术和社会矛盾的发展，民主共和制出现了一些新的现象：公民参与政治决策或立法的活动比比皆是，民主形式在深度和广度上急剧发展，一些学者认为工业时代的政治体制已陈腐腐败，现已进入“参与民主制”或“半直接民主制”阶段。托夫勒在《第三次浪潮》中宣称第三次浪潮对过时的第二次浪潮机构提出了革命性的挑战……这种挑战也不是只靠修改规章条例应付得了的。因为它打击的是第二次浪潮政治理论的最基本设想、即代议制观念。”奈斯比特断定美国已发生了“从代议民主制到共同参与民主制的转变”。美国学者关于“参与民主制”的论述形形色色，概括起来有下述三个方面：

第一，国家权力的实际执掌者即行政首脑，应由最广泛的民众直接选举产生。所谓直接选举，是相对于以往的间接选举而言。例如一些学者认为，总统的选举就是从选举人团制度向实际上的直接选举过渡，总统选举人形同虚设，甚至连政党都可有可无。

第二，全体公民和地方各州、各城镇广泛参与政治决策或立法活动，这一条比前一条更为重要。美国的开国原则十分强调个人的解放，包括言论自由和把政府对个人的影响压到最低限度。但由于通讯等设备的限制，这一原则的实施是打了大折扣的。现在有了先进通讯设备，公民可以自由参与政治决策或立法，甚至可以呆在家里揪揪按钮表达自己的意愿。俄亥俄州哥伦布市的“电子市政府”就是通过电视系统讨论政治问题的一个典型。奈斯比特运用数据证明，七十年代的美国是创制和复决的高潮期，由此推断目前美国法律的大部分由公民或各州直接制订。

第三，由于前两条的存在，其逻辑的结果就是政治上的“分权”趋势。由于公民可以自由参与政治决策和立法，可以自己解决自己的问题，因而谁出任总统无关紧要，公民和各州也不在乎谁当选议员，他们不再需要代表了。但目前，我们仍在选举代表，这主要有两个原因：（一）我们以前一直是这样做的；（二）这样做在政治上比较方便。我们并不想对无论什么事都投票，我们只想对那些真正影响我们生活的事情投票”。由此可见，“权力的集中化再也不起作用了”，中央集权的民主制变成了“分权”的民主制。

“参与民主制”确实扩大了形式上的民主，但也强化了事实上的集中。这是一个作用力和反作用力相互影响、错综复杂的运动过程。

随着科学技术特别是电子、信息、能源、计算机等技术的重大突破和广泛应用，生产得到了迅猛的发展，它导致了对生产过程管理的进一步民主化和对人管理的进一步集中化。在这种变化中，股份分散和中小企业增多起了十分重要的作用。

当代美国企业股份极为分散，一个大企业往往有几千几万个股份持有者。工人也掌握了一定的股票。尽管工人拥有的股份数相当少，但多少也成了企业所有者之一，于是这些股东们也要求有权参与企业决策。另外，由于垄断资本主义企业的垄断利润不能来源于本身，它就需要保留能为其提供垄断利润的中小企业。垄断企业越是发展，中小企业的数量也就越多。这些中小企业参与社会范围的经济管理使之有利于它们本身发展的活动也与日俱增。在这些条件下，商品生产的平等原则发展成以民主为核心的观念。这种观念要求社会政治制度在形式上能与之相适应。

这项要求首先表现在公共事务管理的民主化上。社会公共事务与社会生产密切相关。当代公共事务的内容和规模在不断扩大和变化，它对生产的发展有着十分重要的作用。它可以阻碍，也可以保护和促进生产的发展。正因如此，参与了经济管理的各界人士或者中小企业，也就必然要求在上层建筑范畴内参与公共事务的管理，使之有利于他们各自生产的发展。

但是，工人的股票对企业没有决定权，他们的这些资金恰恰是被大股份持有者控制着。由于股份极为分散，现在大资本甚至可以用百分之二、三的比例控制整个企业的百万小股份。这样大资本无形之中动用了社会资金，使集中达到更高的程度。同样，由于中小企业只是作为利润的吮吸对象而存在，因此，中小企业参与公共事务决策的各种努力，在促使其自身发展的同时，也在扩展着利润的源泉，也在促进资本主义生产的集中。这样就必然会造成形式上民主、实质上集权的状况。

这种状况的必然结果是，从形式上看，人们享有更多的民主权利，可以参与生产过程和公共事务的管理活动；但从实质分析，他们所有民主活动，只能是“自觉”地按着资本进一步集中的要求而进行，他们的行动统一于一个意志之下。法兰克福学派的马尔库塞分析了美国社会的经济政治结构，得出了一个颇值得深思的观点：“私人的空间已经被技术世界的现实所侵犯和削减。大规模生产和大规

模分配要求对个人的全部占有”。这个过程必然会波及政治过程，引起政治上的高度统一，这种统一是任何能工巧匠和乐队指挥都无法想象的。

奈斯比特把“参与民主制”的指导原则确定为：凡生活受到某项决策影响的人，就应该参与那些决策的制订过程，我们已经分析过，这种要求有其深刻的经济原因。然而，这种参与民主的活动是十分有限的。奈斯比特在分析美国政治时，首先把它限于“地方政治”。“新的民主的工具”——创制和复决也仅限于地方事务，而对国家的活动无所作用。再则，创制和复决牵涉到的只是一些具体的社会事务，如禁止从飞机上喷洒除草剂、开辟非吸烟区、回收啤酒瓶，路灯的颜色等问题，在一些实质性的问题上是没有效用的。七十年代末，美国曾因加利福尼亚州通过了减税的第十三号提案而掀起了一场减税运动，各州都提出自己的方案，但一年之后就不了了之。

实际上，政治权力却是日益集中的，现代化的技术手段也为这种集中提供了良好的物质条件。许多美国思想家看到了这一点，连托夫勒自己在分析第三次浪潮时，也敏感地意识到了这个方向，说第三次浪潮政府的第一个异端的原则是少数派权力，第二次浪潮时代的极其重要合法的原则，即多数派统治，已经日益过时了，现在不是多数派说了算，政治制度必须更多地反映这一事实。从美国政治制度看。在“参与民主制”的表象的背后，集权的过程正在急剧加速。几乎每六个工作的美国人中就有一个受雇于联邦政府或它的“附属机构”。自 1930 年以来，联邦政府人员扩大了百分之五百。1976 年，联邦及地方政府有 1500 万名以上的雇员，工资总额达 1670 亿美元，罗柏特·J·林格无可奈何地写道：“你发现世界正在一个人造怪物——政府——的手里挣扎着，它越来越庞大，越来越无法控制。这头无法驯服的巨兽，把它的触角慢慢地伸到我们生活的每个领域里，习以为常地践踏人权。”

哈佛大学著名教授丹尼尔·贝尔在 1976 年时说过：在西方政治制度中，轴心的问题是广泛参与的愿望和官僚政治这两者的关系。现在在“参与民主制”之下，这一矛盾得到了暂时的解决。国家职能通过发展它的一极，即扩大形式上的民主参与，来发展它的另一极，即加强统治。这是一种更为间接而有效的统治方式，它更符合商品生产的平等原则。普选制在现代美国加入了创制和复决等内容，使普选制这种形式部分地从间接形式转变到直接形式，原先由普选官吏管理的一些事务，现在由普选直接干预。科学技术的发展也使这种形式上的扩大成为可能，这些形式上的变化并没有改变美国政治制度的基本特性。

## 六、不完全竞选

### 1. 争夺白宫

1988 年是大选年。四年一次的总统竞选空前热闹，是政治生活中最精彩也最生动的部分。在每次大选中，两党都要展开一场殊死搏斗，以争夺白宫、入主白宫。这次总统大选民主党推出了马萨诸塞州州长杜卡基斯，共和党推出现任副总统布什。两位候选人及他们的副总统候选人都忙于四处发表竞选演说，拉选票。

竞选有一个强大的机制，这就是选民的选票。如果得不到选民的选票，一切都无从谈起。只有得到了多数选民的选票，才能掌握大权，入主白宫。受这种机制的吸引，大选中，候选人首先必须对公众关心的问题发表见解。其实两党之间没有什么意识形态的分歧，有的只是在同一意识形态下对基本政策和具体政策的分歧。可以说，它们之间的分歧在于对一些共同认同的问题持什么态度。

我们可以比较一下杜卡基斯和布什在一些主要问题上的看法（根据美国报纸）：

杜卡基斯

外交政策

反对援助尼加拉瓜反政府武装力量

想加强对南非的经济制裁，寻求更全面的禁运

要求加强与以色列的战略关系，反对任何可能损害以色列安全的军火买卖，鼓励以色列和约旦直接谈判

主张对波斯湾进行国际武器禁运，国际海军保护海域自由权利

预算

同意增加所得税，但只作为最后的办法

反对减少资本赢利税

支持“单项否决”权

愿意削减赤字，但没有论述，说将维持现有军费

健康保护

支持普遍健康保护计划，要求雇主为工人提供保障费用



想增加艾滋病研究基金；支持对军事部门以及对来自艾滋病发病率高的国家的移民实行指令性检查

## 环境

要求建立国家标准，以减少酸雨的主要成分二氧化硫和二氧化氮的传播

反对在重要的环境保护地区和产鱼区采油

反对建立新的商业核反应站，先解决安全问题

## 就业

称全面就业为第一目标

想把最低工资提到每小时 4.25 美元

## 军备控制

反对星球大战计划

要求谈判达成全面禁止核试验

主张谈判结束试验和发展反卫星武器

## 社会问题

反对死刑

支持 25 亿法案，分给州政府基金以帮助穷人和中等收入的家庭

反对修改宪法以使流产合法化，支持联邦基金

支持拥有武器的权利

## 毒品

主张成立内阁级委员会领导全部禁毒计划

将给予外国更多援助以帮助它们禁止毒品生产；将援助愿意阻止毒品进入美国的政府

答应更多支持地方禁毒和康复计划

## 教育

主张建立国家基金，以招募教师

将鼓励企业让雇员到教学单位工作三至五年

支持返聘有专长的退休人员

将建立教育投资计划，使大学生能偿还学费借款

将建立高校机会基金，如果家长提供子女教育的资金，政府将保障学费

布什

外交政策

同意向尼加拉瓜反政府武装力量提供军事和人道援助

反对进一步制裁南非

美国应成为中东的经纪人，促进谈判。但又强加条件，要求永不抛弃以色列

预算

答应在任何情况下都不增加所得税

想减少资本赢利税 15%~28%

同意“单项否决”权

要求灵活冻结，但拒绝说明将削减什么计划

健康保护

想消灭转变生命保险的活动，IRA 实行长期保障计划

想推进购买团体保险计划的创议

赞成地方控制艾滋病教育；赞成对囚徒、移民进行艾滋病检查

环境

想发展洗煤工艺以减少酸雨

支持建造核反应站

就业

要求在八年内创造三千万个就业机会；后认为这个要求太乐观

反对增加最低工资

军备控制

支持星球大战研究，支持空间实验

反对全面禁止核试验条约

支持试验和发展反卫星武器

社会问题

赞成死刑

反对联邦政府提供救济；赞成对每年收入低于二万美元的家庭的每一个子女建立新的一千万税务贷款

反对联邦枪支登记和发持枪证，赞成放松枪支控制法律

毒品

主张建立内阁级委员会领导反毒品行动

主张对毒品致死罪实行死刑

主张开拉美国会议，谈如何结束经济对毒品的依赖

主张立法，没收屡犯者驾驶执照和联邦学生借款

教育

计划设立五亿美元的基金修整推进学生教育的中学

要求对学生作更多测验，对教师作更多的能力测验

将建立高校储蓄公债计划，如果利润用于高校，可以免税

从以上对比可以看出，两党候选人关心的、讨论的都是社会大众关心的问题。围绕这些问题谈，恰恰是为了争取选民。以上九个方面的问题都是学术界、新闻界、政界和公众日常讨论的问题。预算、健康、环境、就业、毒品、教育等均为令人头痛的问题。哪个党的总统候选人要当选，就必须想法解决这些问题。其实，每个候选人也不知道能否解决，为了当选，就必须提供方案。其实这些方案社会早就有之，而且有多种方案。两党的工作只是选择可能最受人支持或同情的方案，列为自己的方案。也可以说，“选择”不是一个很准确的字眼，从政党来讲，这是，把商品——候选人，投入市场；从选民来讲，这是在市场上现有的商品中选购。

因此，选举形成一种很奇怪的逻辑：究竟是政党选择选民，还是选民选择政党，在许多情况下，大概是政党选择选民。结果是，政党并无统一的纲领，党员也可朝三暮四，选民也可今左明右。这就是选举的力量（见第五章第 1 节“驴象治国”）。

其实，政党在当选后能否实现它的纲领，愿不愿意实现其纲领，在竞选时是无法检查的。等到可以检查时，已经当选，又无法控制了。最多是等到下一轮再说，下一轮又可能发生上述现象。在竞选中需要“说得好听”。

对此现象，学者研究甚多，有两种观点比较流行：一是把选举胜利看作是对总统候选人的“授权”——“mandate”，即授权此人实现其竞选纲领；二是把选举看作是上届政府绩的“总结”，以便决定是否要换人。这里意在换人，而不在于新人上来后如何干。反正不论怎样，怎么做能争到白宫，夺到总统宝座，就怎么做。这种逻辑，要求政治高度灵活，高度敏捷，成为社会要求的晴雨表，不然不可能入主白宫。

## 2. 总统之路

1988年10月下旬，总统的选举正在紧锣密鼓地进行。电视里民主党和共和党的正副总统候选人已经做了三次辩论，各种民意测验结果充斥电视屏幕。总统候选人在各州巡回演说，再过几个星期就要选举总统了。

美国总统可算是世界上权力最大的政府首脑和国家元首。他以美国强大的实力做后盾，往往可以产生扭转乾坤的念头。一听总统候选人的发言就可以感觉到，每个人都在声称他将如何使美国保持世界第一的地位。尼克松的新作风靡一时，题目叫《1999：不战而胜》，他有一番话足以说明在总统宝座上坐过的人的心态：“如果美国不在国际社会起中心作用，和平与自由就不能存在。这是一个简单的事实，正象安德烈·马尔罗曾对我说的那样，‘美国是历史上第一个不刻意追求世界强国地位而成为世界强国的国家’。然而，如果我们不能领导自由世界，那就不会有可以被领导的自由世界。”此番宏论，没有特别好的自我感觉，怕是说不出的。

总统是从哪里来的呢？看上去这是一个奇怪的问题。在美国这种政治制度下，总统是选民投票选出来的，任何人只要获得选民的选票，都可以走进白宫的椭圆形办公室。事实上，选民也货真价实地投票，在民主党和共和党的候选人中进行选择。没有得到多数选票的人成不了总统。

不过，如果从这里推论出人人都有可能成为总统这样的结论，那就大错特错了。抽象地说，每一个公民只要符合条件都有可能成为总统。具体地说，建国两百年来，只有四十几个人有这个运气。其他人可以有做总统的梦想，但也仅此而已。

总统的产生机制，等到全国正式投票这一天，早已走过了漫长的道路。这套机制虽然是非正式的，但却是政治生活中的核心部分。

事实上，小党的候选人往往名落孙山，没人知晓。吵吵闹闹一阵之后，恐怕只增加一点“知名度”，或有益于体魄健康，其他的可能不会有什么。唯有共和党和

民主党的候选人才具有最后一搏的条件，因而要做总统首先要取得两党的提名。这就把一大批人排除在外了，在两个党内，能够有权提名的是少数人。

两党之中，一小部分人组成核心会议（Caucuses）。核心会议提名候选人竞选各种公职，如州长、州官职和总统职位，不过核心会议有不同层次，州级官职一般由州立法机关的骨干组成核心会议提名。全国一级的核心会议提名总统候选人。核心会议至关重要。1988 年选举的核心会议在爱荷华州举行。

核心会议之后，要进行初选（Primary）。初选实际上是党内选举，在党的大会上进行。大会代表由州和地方的党组织选派代表参加，代表性大于核心会议。核心会议确定一定数目的候选人，都是同一党的。党的大会再在这些候选人中选出最合适的人，作为该党参加正式选举的候选人。

看一下这个过程就可明白，一般人不可能得到提名。只有两党的意中人才有这份福气。不过，这里需要知道的是另一个问题，即选举过程中，对候选人的管理和组织实际上由两党承担了，而非由政府承担。两党把候选人限制到可能的数目，这是任何民主选举必须有的机制。这项工作是一种棘手工作，如果社会上没有组织来做，政府是无法做的。政府做这件事必然会违背民主原则。对于一个民主社会来说，应当考虑建立什么样的机制来实现这种功能。

两党的代表大会是政治生活中的大事。成百上千的活跃分子集聚一堂，电视台现场直播。党的代表大会做两件事：一是提出党纲（Party Platform）；二是选择总统提名人。其他选民只能在他们选择的基础上进行选择，或者不选择。参加代表大会的代表至关重要。他们产生的方式在各州不一样：有的州选举代表；有的州的代表有一定的自由裁量权；有的州的代表不受限制，可以自我决断；有的州选民选举产生一定代表，郡和州的党组织又任命一些代表。

如果想获得提名，首先得影响提名大会代表的产生。代表产生机制的多样性与政治制度的多样性相符，这是美国的一大特色。

代表也不是任何人都可以当的，代表一般是官员、国会议员、州长、市长、州立法机关成员，总而言之，是党政要人。平民百姓也只能望代表兴叹。代表的职责是，决定拿出什么货色来供选民选。两党的代表大会共确定两个人，每党一人。选民们将来实际上是在这两个人中择其一，当然在不同的地方，会有一些非党的候选人，然而他们无法登上全国之堂。

在两党选定候选人后，总统竞选战役开始。这个过程体现了美国式的民主，不过是两个人，最多是四个人的民主竞选。所以说是“不完全竞选”，正象经济学上有不完全竞争的概念一样。如果没有两党的前番不那么民主的活动，后面这一层民主恐怕也无法实施。试想一下，如果几百名候选人参与全国竞选，会有什么局面？两党候选人四处奔走，发表演说，争取民心。这一环非常重要，因为他们能不能当选，要看选民的投票。这一环的确货真价实。选民们没有过多的选择，但对这两个人来说，只消选择另一个就够受了。

选民在投票时并不直接选举总统，而是选举选举团（Electoral College）。每个州都有一定的选票，与该州在国会的代表数相等，如加州有 47 人，爱荷华州有 8 人。哪一个总统候选人在一州获得多数，该州的选票就都属于他。

而大州尤为重要，人口多的州也重要。因此 1988 年布什和杜卡基斯的第二场辩论便在加州洛杉矶举行，目的是对着那里的 47 张选票。加州加上纽约州有 83 张选票，而得 270 张选票就可以当选。各州的选民选举选举团成员，选举团成员由各州党大会、党委员会、或其他方式选举产生。这些选举人必须支持党的正式总统候选人。选民在选举那天不是选总统，而是选这些选举人。只有多数选举人代表的选民才有表达意志的机会，其他选民的意志统统由多数选举人“强行”代表了。

在 12 月第二个星期三后的第一个星期一，获胜的选举人在各州首府（State Capital）开会，交选举证书、登记。实际上已经是“走过场”，因为选举人产生之后，局势就明朗了，谁当选为下任总统已心照不宣。

普通人要成为总统候选人的另一个困难是竞选费用问题。竞选费用已经达到惊人的数字。1972 年时，竞选费用正式公布的是 1000 万美元，非正式的不去谈了。1988 年的费用是多少，其时尚未公布。金钱超过了一定的限额，对普通人来说是同样的：无法弄到。总统候选人的费用来源通常是捐款和赠送。当然送的人有自己的意图，接受的人也明白。洛克菲勒一人用于竞选的各项费用达 300 多万。普通人如何能享受这种民主？

我在这里的分析，意图不在于谈政治制度运转不灵，而在于指出：对管理一个大型社会来说，如果最后要形成一个政治领袖，民主究竟能展开到多大幅度。我们对美国民主的分析表明了这个难题。政治管理和社会管理要求有一个集中的过程。如果完全彻底的民主，美国恐怕连总统也选不出来。美国政党起的作用是在正式体制以外的集中作用。它们实际上是在不那么民主地集中意见。选民们的选择在这个集中过程之后，是“二道手”。为什么这样一个过程仍然表现为一个民主的外观呢？我想有两条：

其一，美国政党活动的方式和组织在政治体系之外。它们无法运用国家或政府机关来实现自己的计划。但它们在政治体系之外这一事实，使其活动不能正式计在政治体系的份内。这一部分比较集权的政治活动，在非正式过程中，在社会活动中完成。政党控制政治的手段在于促使总统候选人和各种候选人当选。当选之后，他们可以利用合法程序实现自己的意志。每个社会都需要两个方面的政治活动，一是比较集权以产生政治领导的过程，一是比较民主以领导政治的过程。美国政治体制应付的，是后一个活动。前一个活动由政党决定。

其二，美国政党内部也形成较为程式化的运作过程（民主、共和两党不完全一样）。各类代表大会和会议，虽然有党内核心人物加以控制，但有一定的余地。党的代表大会上，有同党的不同人选之争。这个过程不仅有效地掩饰了集权的最

后表现——最后决断权，而且找到了解决党内矛盾的方法。对于美国政党，我还要另作分析。

美国的政治体制有一个妙处：你不能说它不民主，你也不能说它民主。所以我说美国的选举是“不完全竞选”。

### 3.第三县民主党聚餐会

分析了政党在整个选举中的宏观活动，对政党在政治生活中的作用有了概念，其实政党的活动离不开其基层组织，没有下属各级组织积极有效的活动，一个政党便会成为空壳。

周末，休假两天，星期六和星期日无人上班，星期五已经流行说一句：“周末愉快”。这是一种生活方式在人际关系中的反映。大概原始人在见面和分手时，说的是：“打一只兔子。”

1988年9月16日，在爱荷华大学活动中心，碰到几位大学生在为民主党候选人杜卡基斯和地方的候选人作选举宣传。食堂前摆一张小桌子，两位姑娘，一位小伙子。两位姑娘似乎很腼腆，根本不是干政治的人物。而小伙子很活跃，一听到我是政治学教授，想了解地方政治运作的情况，高兴极了。立即邀请我参加周末举行的第三县民主党聚餐会，或者叫 picnic（野餐会）。说是邀请，当然不是免费，而是“征费”，因为这类聚会的主要目的是为候选人搞钱。

下午5点左右，我们来到设在爱荷华市郊外的会场。会场设在一个较为冷静的地方，不是农场就是公园。会场的设置较简陋，有一间大房子，有点象我在干校劳动时的礼堂，只是铺了地板，外面有一个大木板棚子。有两个小伙子在棚子里卖饮料，因为这种会议本身的目的就是集资，不可能提供大量免费饮料。旁边有几位年轻的姑娘在卖印有竞选口号或候选人名字的T恤，这是一种宣传手段。还有一架“拍立得”照相机，民主党总统候选人杜卡基斯的像立在那里，与真人一模一样。可以上去站在旁边拍一张照，颇有逼真感。募捐的主要方法是靠交“伙食费”。“伙食费”价格较高，单个人是8美元，一家子是24美元，儿童是6美元。这反正是“姜太公钓鱼，愿者上钩”。来的人大都是民主党的积极分子，故对捐钱在所不惜。其实，这些积极分子也与民主党有依赖关系。其中包括国会议员、参议员、州议员、州参议员及各种地方显赫人物。他们当选这些职位，离不开民主党的支持，所以对民主党的活动自然十分热情，恐怕也不能不热情。这成为一种“人际关系”或称“关系网”。没有这个“关系网”，一个人就会失去很多资源。按理说在这样一个崇尚个人主义和私域的社会中，人们会对此满不在乎。其实不然，我发现人们很在乎。没有加入这些关系网的人，削尖脑袋想钻进去，人们怀着叵测的心理来到这里。

本地民主党的重要人物都到场了。这种聚会，对这些人物本身也很重要。这里面有一种奇怪的相互作用：一方面是这种聚会需要这些人来壮声势；另一方面这些

人也必须在这种会上亮相，作为“义务”，也作为自己建立“公众形象”的一部分。

来的人，高位的有国会议员，叫 Nagel，他穿了一件苹果绿的 T 恤，到处与人打招呼，显得随和，潇洒。还有一位是爱荷华州长候选人，民主党推出的，高高的个子，戴着眼镜，颇有学者风度，叫 Christal，走来走去的。我过去与他交谈，他很随和，问我对戈尔巴乔夫改革的命运有何看法。我说，戈尔巴乔夫面临许多困难。他说，苏联的体制很牢固，不易改。作为地方人士，对国际问题如此关切，在美国实为不易。美国地方人士的国际观念较为薄弱，与美国这个大国的地位不相符合。

这样一谈，我对他有了兴趣。正好有人来送宣传品，我就拿了一份看起来。John Christal 是爱荷华州一个农场主的儿子，1949 年从爱荷华大学得到经济学学位。1949-1959 年经营农场，1959 年转向银行，1960——1984 年任爱荷华州储蓄银行的董事长，1973 年做过州银行主协会主席。宣传品上介绍他说，他的金融技巧使他得以拯救许多小农场主和农业银行免于崩溃。1987 年，他还被提名为“爱荷华本年农场领袖”。自 1956 年起，他就积极投身于民主党的政治活动。宣传品上还说，他在二十五年中一直是最受尊敬的苏联问题顾问。他怎么会有最后这种能力，我没有搞清楚。从他的经历来看，完全是以经营为主，政治为辅的。

许多政治家都不是职业政治家，大多是在必要时出任政治职务。大到总统，象卡特是种花生的，里根曾是演员；小到市镇的公职人员，都一样。这恐怕也是政治的一个特点。

这种格式，使大多数公职人员有退路，不需作出特殊的安排。可能更为重要的是，这些人把他们长年累月的经营思维方式和社会技巧带进了政府，使政府特别善于处理经济问题和社会发展的问題。地方政府不是那么政治化的，反倒象个大公司处理各种社会事务。实际上，选民们也是根据得到的实际的好处来投票的，政治原则的作用不那么大。Christal 有很好的经济经验，这是从政的必要条件。

还遇到了州参议员 Jane，我 1987 年曾经就州参议院的地位和功能访问过她。她在分发扇子，上面印有她的名字，也是一种公共关系。这种场合，当然是重要而且是关键的，应该到场亮相。还见到了民主党在本县的一些头目。

Nagel 在本县的代表 Kerry Bowen 对我开玩笑，说如果去共和党的聚餐会，不要把这里的情况告诉他们，因为两党在竞选。

因此，我们可以发现，两党组织和纪律虽然那样松散，但共和党 and 民主党均有较好的从上至下的活动方式。尽管下层组织的活动与上层几乎没有“思想路线”的指导关系，完全是为了在本选区拉选票，而且可能只是为了本选区中的同党人士竞选州或地方政府的议员或官员，而不完全是为了全国性的总统候选人。但这种活动强化了众人对一个党的认同，无论是民主党也好，共和党也好。政党的地位更多地是树立在人们的心中，因此可以说政党的概念是政治的，也是文化的和心



理的。两党的全国性系统之所以能显得卓有成效，很关键的一点就在于它们有十分庞大而活跃的基层系统。

维系这一整套系统的是利益结构。其实各党没有十分明确的全国性利益，各党在总统选举中提出的纲领，之所以得到各州拥护，倒的确是出自信念和价值选择，而并非因为体现了各州的具体利益。各州及各政党组织均有各自的利益和价值选择，有的甚至很不相同，它们打着两党的旗号维护和实现自己的利益，全国性的政党组织也乐得让它们这样做，这可以保证某种形式的向心力。州及地方各级党组织通过自己的活动，实现了当地权势人物的意图和利益。这个过程呈现出一种奇特的效果，虽然当地党组织多数只关注自己的利益，但它们实际上强化了党的全国性联盟。此乃政党体制的一大特征。

## 4.电视辩论

1988 年的总统大选，与过去一样，紧锣密鼓，十分热闹。民主党总统候选人杜卡基斯，共和党候选人乔治·布什，两位对手到处作竞选演说和活动。每天都有新花样，打一枪换一个地方，以争取选民。他们的纲领性争论我已在前面描述过（见第六章第 1 节“争夺白宫”）。实际上这种活动重要的不是让选民懂得他们的政治纲领。美国有足够发达的大众传播媒介，任何人想了解它们的政治观点并非难事。这种活动的根本目的在于扩大影响，树立形象，联络感情，壮大产势。选民发展到今天，已不太注重从政治纲领考虑问题，不少人很看重总统候选人个人的性格、能力和形象。有一位大学教授对我说不喜欢布什，我说为什么，他答道：“布什的脸看上去不可靠，杜卡基斯要可靠得多。”这算是什么标准？

1988 年大选的一个高潮是 9 月 25 日晚上举行的布什和杜卡基斯的电视辩论，将通过电视向全国观众直播，时间为 90 分钟。不少人对这场辩论很关心。爱荷华大学政治学系的教授早就在谈论此事，也许是因为职业的缘故。当然也有不少人之置之不理。事后，电视播了一些镜头，记者在大街上采访了几位行人，都说没有留神，没有看。政治学习教授们当天下午有一个野餐会。时间差不多的时候，大家都驱车回家，等候辩论。

我在一位教授家看电视转播。他夫人是搞激光的，也坐在那里静气以候。他的儿子是一位小学生，似乎也兴味盎然，并且一直看到了最后。7 点钟，辩论开始。会场上有两个对置的讲台，布什和杜卡基斯一人一个，在他们前方，坐着电视节目主持人四位，当然是资深的记者，负责提问。后面是一个很大的会场，大约有几百人坐在下面。在播音员桌子的前面，有红灯和绿灯，以指示发言人时间。播音员背对观众，与发言人命对面。他们坐着，两位显赫的人选却站着。

发言的程序大致如下，一位记者先提一个问题给其中一位候选人，然后候选人回答，回答完毕后，由另一位候选人评论，其实就是反驳。双方得到问题的数目大致相等。

辩论应当说是激烈的。布什曾在辩论中说：“我希望这是一个不那么友好的夜晚。”双方就税收、赤字、教育、毒品、流产、军备和国际关系展开了辩论。内容大致上是重申他们在各种场合就这些问题发表的见解，因为是现场交锋，总要显示一点机智和幽默。一上来，杜卡基斯就说：“如果他能做到，他就成了美国政治的 Joe Isuzu。”影射布什象电视广告商那棒卖狗皮膏药，引得全场哄堂大笑。不久，布什也说了一句精彩的话，说：“这个回答就象波士顿港那样清楚。”波士顿是麻萨诸塞州的州府，污染严重，杜卡基斯是那里的州长，布什意指杜卡基斯说不清楚。双方还有一些针锋相对的交锋。杜说：“我想保证决不巴拿马的独裁者打交道。”这里指的是诺列加，布什说：“七届政府都与诺列加打交道，但里根——布什政府使他走向正义。”杜卡基斯说：“对大多数人说来，奎尔总统的概念令人惶惶不安。”奎尔是布什的副总统候选人。布什说：“他干得十分出色。”杜卡基斯说：“显然副总统是怀疑我的爱国主义。我爱这个国家，我信仰它，”布什说：“我并没有怀疑您的爱国主义，而是我们能让国家变得那么左吗？他离开了这一点，离开了美国的主流。”整个辩论持续了90分钟，会场上时有掌声和笑声。

由于紧张，两位候选人也犯了错误。布什有一次称自己为“总统”而非“副总统”。杜卡基斯也有一次讲错引起哄堂大笑。布什老练，讲到一半想不起一个防务系统的名字，就说：“只有冰人才永远不会犯错误。”过了一会儿，主持人算错了时间，时间未到就让布什停止发言，布什声辩后，主持人说：“对不起，我搞错了，您说过人人都会犯错误。”

在辩论中双方是动足了脑筋。布什称杜卡基斯为麻萨诸塞州州长，想给人造成一个印象，杜只是“地方官员”。而杜卡基斯则称布什为布什先生或乔治，避而不提副总统的头衔。

在辩论中这些方面都重于实质性的内容，这在很大程度上决定候选人能否在心理上征服选民。除此以外，双方还特别注意形象。报纸评论说，两位候选人语言、音色、风格都很成功。两位都是久经沙场的政客，自然能说会道。在美国做政客的第一条件是要会说话。服装也经过精心筹划。杜卡基斯的竞选顾问弗兰克·格里尔说，为了保证形象优雅，杜卡基斯带了好几件衬衫和好几条领带，以便上镜头。杜卡基斯穿的蓝灰色西装，白衬衫，红领带，布什也一样。美国人的观念是，政治家的形象不是个人问题，而是老百姓对他们有没有信心的问题，所以都十分注重形象。

辩论完毕之后，各界纷纷发表评论。有人说布什赢了，有人说杜卡基斯赢了。人们发表评论时感情色彩很浓，支持谁就说谁好。记者当场采访了各位候选人竞选班子的成员，都说自己好。我们看一下几家电视台主持人的评论。NBC：“难说谁输谁赢。”ABC：“两人都很出色，不过杜卡基斯略好，也许他赢了。”CBS：“没有新的东西。如果有赢家，杜卡基斯稍好一点。”CNN：“乔治·布什胜了。”另外，马上就有人做民意调查，看看谁得分多。我的印象是，两人差不多，但布什更老练，有国际政治的经验，有全国性政治的见识，杜卡基斯在这方面稍差一点，

但杜卡基斯有有利的一面，因为公众对布什的期望值高，他只要能应付布什，并不需要占明显的上风，就可以交待了。

这种程序十分有意思，其公开性程度很高。此种辩论就是一例。最高一级行政首脑的选举可以公开辩论，使其成为一种真正的公众事务，尽管候选人有强大的党派背景，平民百姓无从问津。当然平民百姓可以加入该党，可以志愿为该党候选人做工作：助选、拉票，也可以捐款等等，但如果要获胜，就得搞公共关系。美国政治制度的特性促使各种政治团体和党派追求这种公开性，不然的话，无法当选。

在扩大公开性方面，社会有两种动力：一是来自要想取胜的党派，另一是来自公众。在不少社会中，提高公开性的要求往往来自后者。社会物质生活的丰裕，使大多数人不再理会抽象的政治原则或什么方案，而要对一个政治家有感性认识。体制又从另一方面促使人们这样去做。任何人想当这官职，必须获得选票、没有选票，便无从谈起。选票的力量推动他们去想方设法尽量公开。各位候选人到处游说，做姿态、上电视，目的也在于此。奎尔之所以令人不放心，部分原因在他太年轻，也可能太嫩。把公众事务交给这样的人，有些人心里总有点不踏实，不少人是这么想的。其实美国人对政治兴趣不大，兴趣大的是这个人怎么样，这叫做“政治的非政治化”。

这种辩论形式，也为公众更好地认识候选人提供了条件。很长一段时间，成年公民也有投票权，但选民从来不知道选的是谁，怎么样，有什么特点，有什么特长，有什么主张，选票是投了，但没有民主。民主的一项重要标准是：充分了解下的选择。当然，要做到这一点难乎其难，美国也没有百分之百地做到。

## 5. 议员之梦

众议院议员选举与总统选举同时举行。在选举日（1988 年是 11 月 8 日），选民们将同时选举众议院议员和总统，因此，国会议员的选举在总统选举进行的同时也在加紧进行。我与共和党在爱荷华市所在县的总部取得联系，要求观察国会议员的竞选，总部的人员十分热情，让我跟随共和党候选人唐·莱德弗（Redfern），观看他在爱荷华市的竞选活动。

国会的选举按选区进行。选区根据人口总数划分，每个选区的人口相等。每个选区选举一名众议员，因此每位众议员代表的人口数目相等。每个选区大约包括一个或几个县。大城市情况有所不同。爱荷华州是农业州，人口不多，所以选区地理幅度较大。两党都在各选区设有竞选总部。爱荷华市所在的选区为第三选区。区总部下又有县总部。所谓总部，实际上是两党租借一个场所，有一、两位工作人员。共和党在爱荷华市的总部在两层楼上，地方不小，有一块地方放了二十几张椅子，可以做演讲。有两、三位工作人员，一位姑娘是常任人员，其他是志愿来工作的。总部负责安排本党候选人在本县的活动。

莱德弗先生的一项活动是与本县企业家共进早餐。本县企业家为当地之精英，或称“乡绅”。他们有一个自己活动的俱乐部。每个周二早晨在一起吃早饭，一般是交流信息，谈谈生意，请人来做演讲。这是当地的权势集团。一个人想要在当地选举获胜，首先要争取这股力量。

早餐早晨 7 点开始，吃了几分钟后，由莱德弗发表演讲，涉及他对美国内政、外交的看法，基本上是他的“老生常谈”。他为共和党的候选人，所以很多观点与共和党总统候选人布什很相象。他讲完后，由出席早餐的人士提问，莱德弗一一回答。然后，企业家们做一个游戏、每人发一张小纸片，请各位模拟投票，结果是布什 18 票，杜卡基斯 2 票。自然，因为莱德弗是共和党人，如果来一位民主党人做演讲，可能情况就大不一样了。快到 8 点时，企业家们陆续离席，到 8 点时，只剩四人。早餐结束了。

企业家有企业家的组织，任何人想要在选举中获胜，不能不拉拢这个集团。

作为候选人，十分辛苦。一天里面东奔西走，做很多事。中午莱德弗从 250 英里远的地方开车到爱荷华市，以便参加下午的活动。

第一项活动是去爱荷华大学的教学医院。爱荷华大学的教学医院全美闻名，是一个设备精良，医术高明的医院。莱德弗自己开车去那里，我和一位美国教授坐在他的车上，没有任何人前呼后拥。到了医院后，被引到一个会场，共有 16-18 个人，其中 5 人是随他去的（包括我们），7 人是新闻界的，剩下的是医院里的人。人之少，出乎意料，不过，莱德弗似乎不在乎，照样发表生动的演说，讲他对美国国内国外政策的基本看法，然后提问、结束。留下二十分钟，他一一接待到场的记者，每人可以提几个问题。

所以人少并不要紧，重要的是通过报纸、电视和电台，让成千上万的人都知道他。在美国，最难的事是找到听众。教授们到大学里来做讲演，也不易找到听众。一位国会议员候选人，似乎没有多大吸引力。这是美国政治中很有趣的现象。任何人想从政，均有求于选民，而非选民有求于他们。

出了医院之后，同车去一个学生宿舍，准备在那里见见学生。到了那里之后，莱德弗的主要活动应该是站在学生食堂门口与学生握手，寒暄。他在门口站了一会儿，见了学生就说：“你好，我是康·莱德弗，国会议员候选人。”然后问一下学生是否去投票之类的话，纯属联络感情。这种工作极其难做，学生们似乎对此没有兴趣，一般只说一声“Hi”就过去了，很少有人愿意多说几句话，有的人极为冷淡。我在旁边看看，做一个国会议员候选人真不容易。也没有人前呼后拥，我们一共三人，他，他的助手和我。这就是美国的政治。他的竞争对手是内格尔（Nagel）。内格尔目前是本选区的国会议员，还在争取连任。内格尔也在校园中活动过多次，发表演说之类。莱德弗似乎对这项活动不甚感兴趣，做一会儿就赴下一站，他心情沮丧地对他的助手说：“走吧！我的感觉不良。”的确如此。

下一站也是一个学生宿舍楼，叫“五月花”。在中国闻名的国际笔会中心就在那座楼上。我们自己开车去，有一位女学生在那里接待，引到会议室中，有近二十

位学生。莱德弗讲了四十分钟，全是他对内政外交的看法，不过侧重讲了教育问题。讲完之后，学生提问，涉及社会保险，教育等问题。问题完毕，结束，前后一小时，这里的人数也不多。在会场外是学生活动室，有不少人在玩电子游戏机，台球和乒乓球，也有人在看电视。他们都没被一个国会议员候选人的演讲所吸引，自己干自己的事。

一天的活动到此结束。莱德弗开车送我回学校。在车上，我们讨论了国会议员候选人的产生过程。国会议员候选人按选区产生。自己觉得有能力竞选的话，就可以参加，但须征得一定人数的人的赞同。首先要经过初选，经过初选之后才能成为候选人。初选在党内的各位有志选举的人士中进行。莱德弗赢得了初选，成为共和党候选人。共和党支持他的竞选，包括给他法律允许的经费，以及其他方面的支持。他说政党的支持是非常重要的，没有政党的支持，竞选难以取胜。其实在美国政治中，候选人在初选中有真正的竞争。不过各党的初选已经排除了其他人。初选之后，只有两大党的候选人具备被当选的可能性，实际上是他们两人之间的竞争。

两党制有效地使候选人变得“干干净净”，这种功能，政府没有办法承担。由于政党中有竞争，所以可以容异，不至于内部分裂，不同意见的人由投票淘汰，也不至于牢骚满腹，对谁怀恨在心。这种机制，作为社会管理体制的一部分，显得较为有利。

另外一点值得注意的是，象国会议员这样的“高级选举”，并不那样吸引人和激励人心，大部分人似乎无动于衷。这是民主的一项重要条件，虽然并不是理想条件。如果人人对政治怀着强烈的兴趣，民主是不会成熟地运转的。有人说，民主的最大敌人恐怕不是专制，而是民主本身。美国的政治很少能直接影响到选民的日常生活，除了税收之外，所以选民抱无所谓的态度不难理解。这种状况迫使每个候选人使出浑身解数来奔走、演说、号召，让选民认识自己。这种机制迫使两党拿出像样的候选人来，候选人在仪表、性格、口才、知识、为人、交际等方面，都要能拿得出手，上得了台面，否则无从感召选民。

拿莱德弗来说，本人是一位律师，有丰富的经验，仪表堂堂，口才极佳，富于幽默感，善于与人打交道。内格尔大概也具有同样的素质。选举制度加上政党制度，使候选人具有较高的素质。这两者，少了哪一方面，都可能产生令人啼笑皆非的结果。

莱德弗的竞选活动由他自己负责，并无多少人为他做事。他谈的均是老百姓关心的具体问题，这倒并非候选人愿意谈，而是选举机制的力量。自然，还有一种力量更为重要，这就是政党。平民百姓，没有政党背景，很难在选举中获胜。

## 6.选举日

11月9日为1988年大选年的选举日，进行了将近一年的激烈的竞选即将结束，选民将通过选票决定谁是总统，另外还涉及众议员、部分参议员和部分州的州长。包括一些县的官员的选举，均在同一天举行。这样可以不必为各种选举花费更多的时间。

在选举日之前，每个选民都要登记。在选举前一定时期内没有登记的，便不能投票。登记时可以注明登记为共和党或民主党的选民，也可以不注明。选举由县政府的专门机构管理，所有选民的名单都输入电脑，按选区（precinct）分好。输入的数据有姓名，社会保险号码，地址等。拉选民登记为本党选民的活动，早就开始了。学校中常有亲某个党派的学生设一个摊子，请各位登记。当然也可以去总部登记，或去选举机构登记。

每个党的总部也都有登记为本党选民的花名册。在选举日即将到来之钱，便开始忙碌，清查名单。选区的党的工作者也要联络本党选民。过去是到各家去，现在一般采用打电话的方法。自愿为各党总部活动的人员也得开始活动，如散发宣传材料等。

选举日这天，各选区设有投票站。选民们自己开车去投票，我在一个投票站作了观察。选民来者不少，似乎有一种责任感。要自己开十几分钟的车，还要排队，然后投票，没有一定的观念支配是不可能的。这种观念构成政治制度运转和二百年不变的重要条件。如果人人都对投票没有兴趣，也就是对维持一种体制没有兴趣，这种体制如何能存在下去呢？自然，物质条件的发展在某种程度上也是公民参与的一项条件。家庭都有车，来去方便，尤其是在乡村。

但是与有些西欧国家相比，美国选举有些不便之处（如事先登记，不在公假日选举，居住时间限制）。选民的投票率低常被认为与此有关。

投票站里，选民要填写一份小的表格，写上姓名，住址和社会保险的号码。然后到另一个工作人员那里，他在电脑打出来的花名册上找到选民事先登记的记录。签到，表明选民已经来投票，然后到第三个人那里领取选票。

选票是一张长条纸，大概有40公分长，15公分宽（各州的选票也不相同）。上面印着各位候选人的姓名，最前一栏，是民主党或共和党人的。如果选民对所有的候选人都想选民主党或共和党的，只要在民主党和共和党后面的空格里做记号就完了，表示这位选民投所有这个党的候选人的选票。如果要具体投每个人的选票，下面有各位候选人的姓名，包括一些小党的总统候选人、参议员、众议员、县官等。那可以一一区分，可以做花样选择，既投共和党的几个候选人，又投民主党的候选人，实际状况也是如此，因为最后的结果是共和党赢得了总统宝座，民主党赢得了众院的大多数木座。虽然是木座，加起来也不可忽视。

选民填完选票之后，用一个封皮遮着选票，然后送入选票箱子。这个选票箱有自动计数器，计算选票数目。待到投票结束，晚上 9 点，所有选票送往县政府负责选举的部门，进行计算。计算过程是电脑化的。从 9 点开始，电视台就不断向观众报告各州的统计结果。

在选举日，投票站的工作人员不少是志愿人员。选举站也有“站规”，如不许在选举站进行竞选，不许把选票给其他人看之类，这类规则贴在墙上，以示公告。

选举日，各党的总部有何公干？各党总部积极分子不能到投票站去宣传，但各党都派一位监督投票的人在每个投票站。他们都有一本花名册。每个选民进来登记时，工作人员就会告诉他们。他们便在自己的花名册上做记号。这有两种功能，一是监督防止有人投两次票，各党都得防止他党选民作弊；二是看看本党选民是否都前来投票。如果有人没有来，他们就会打电话去，以示关心，如果有什么困难，各党总部想办法提供方便，如看小孩之类的。这叫拉选票（Pull Poll）。

在防止作弊这件事上，美国人对他人怀有戒心，不那么大大咧咧。从基层党的初选开始就采取措施，如规定两党初选必须在同一时间举行，使一个人不可能参加两个党的初选。在选举日，也都会向各选举站派观察员。

9 点之后开始点票，由于美国本土有几个时区，所以东部各州最先点票，电视台马上就一点一点公布结果，各州的选票数不断变化，观众们随时可以看得一清二楚。这次总统选举，在差不多中部时间 11 点时，已经见分晓，布什当选。这时加利福尼亚等西部各州刚刚结束投票，刚刚点票，所以西部的人大发牢骚，认为这不公正。因为不等他们的意见表达出来，总统已经决定，他们投的票毫无用处。这也是美国选举制度的一大弊病，现有人建议立法规定全国投票站同意关闭的时间。

当然，这是在中、东部各州的选票倒向比较明显的条件下，如果中东部的投票结果难分胜负，西部的票就举足轻重了。尤其是加利福尼亚的选票，因为加州的选举人人数很多，砝码很大。

总统选举，讲起来恐怕有些问题。总统选举，实行的是选举人制度。各州按人数划分选举人的名额。大州多，小州少。选民数对总统选举没有直接的影响，他们直接影响选举人的投票方向，如共和党在某州得了多数，哪怕多一个人，这个州所有选举人票都属共和党，言下之意，投民主党的选票全部没有用。从最后数字讲，布什得了 4700 万张选票，占总数的 54%，杜卡基斯得了 4100 万张选票，占总数的 46%，差距不算太大。但看选举人的票数，差别悬殊。布什得了 426 票，占总数的 79%，杜卡基斯得了 112 票，占 21%。选举是多数统治，多一个人也是多数，其他均为少数。这个政治难题，至今难以解决。一千万人就一定得服从一千万零一个人吗？但是要选择民主制度，就得接受这个现实。这一次失败了，下一次争取多这一个人或者更多。

选举结果知道后，两位总统候选人均发表演说。杜卡基斯说：“我几分钟前打电话给布什副总统，祝贺他取得胜利。”布什说：“几分钟之前我接到了杜卡基斯

州长的电话，是真诚的，这是美国政治的一大传统……对于那些没有投我的票的选民，我也希望成为你们的总统。”双方都感谢一番为选举做出贡献的各总部的人，感谢一番各自的家庭和各自的竞选伙伴。失利的候选人和支持者也承认对方为总统，并无二话，不能说不接受选举结果，另拉山头。

这套制度运转的有序程度，就表现在这里。虽然总统候选人产生的整个机制并非人人可以参与，而是掌握在各党手中，但其最后结果是货真价实的。失败的党不能说不接受现实，或另有他图。即便有人想，恐怕也没人会响应。

一般而论，制度运转成熟的特点，在于社会每个人都认为制度合乎程序运行的任何结果都不能用非程序的方法来解决，而只能靠这套程序本身。如果想改变结果，就得从头再走一遍程序。什么时候重新再来，由法律规定。人们相信一种程序，并不是为了约束自己，而是为了防范别人。一些人可以用来损害他人的程序，他人也可以用来损害这些人。制度趋向成熟，就在于这种心理和认识不断发生作用，同时社会提供了足够的各项条件保证制度的形成和存在。

## 7.谁主沉浮？

布什身经百战，当选为第四十一任总统。杜卡基斯也身经百战，但惨遭败北。布什为什么会胜利？杜卡基斯为什么失败？这不仅是两位总统候选人的问题，也是选举机制的反映。可以通过对布什当选总统和杜卡基斯的失利，分析美国政治过程的运作，颇有启发。

理查德·斯滕格尔在《时代》杂志选举特刊号（1988.11.21.）上撰文说，1988年的总统竞选有九个关键时刻，这九个关键时刻决定了布什的胜利和杜卡基斯的失败。我们以这篇文章为基础，来分析总统选举这样一个重要的政治过程。

在初选阶段，布什在新罕布什尔州竞选，一开始他落后于共和党参议员多尔和罗伯特逊。布什立即紧急行动，召来里根最喜欢的演讲稿撰写人佩基·诺南，乘空军二号专机随布什返回新罕布什尔州。诺南连夜奋战，起草了一份演讲稿，显示了布什的新形象。同时大众传播顾问罗杰·艾尔斯主张批评多尔，而另两位广告顾问反对，认为不宜揭露自家人——共和党人的缺点。布什开始时同意。这时黑格站在多尔一边，离选举还有三天。民意测验显示布什不能在初选中取胜，只有发表攻击多尔的广告。布什仍在犹豫，州长索努奴认为可以发表，布什夫人也认为没有什么大问题。于是布什决定发表。他们买下了星期四的所有广告时间。多尔的班子星期三也在开会，决定不用反面广告。民意测验表明多尔领先，所以他们没有立即制作新的广告。当他们想用旧的竞选广告时，他们被告知所有的时间都满了，结果布什胜了。如果布什在州的初选中输了，哪有今日？

杜卡基斯在初选中情况看好，他还遇到了两位强而有力的竞争对手，一是阿尔格尔，一是杰西·杰克逊，杜卡基斯认为他需要得到纽约市长科什的支持。他打电话给科什。科什关心杜卡基斯对杰克逊的态度，杜卡基斯态度不明朗。科什反对



杰克逊，所以对杜卡基斯的态度不太满意。反过来高尔态度谦恭，与科什趣味相投，科什选择了高尔。但科什对杰克逊态度太激烈，在表示支持高尔的仪式上，大骂杰克逊，反而使高尔失分，杜卡基斯得胜。

两党候选人确定之后，便是布什和杜卡基斯之间的较量。开始的民意测验表明，杜卡基斯领先 10 至 12 个百分点。这时助手建议布什攻击杜卡基斯的缺点。索努奴建议攻击杜卡基斯的下述弱点：富卢希计划，波士顿港口污染，监狱人满为患。但布什有点犹豫，他想等到共和党全国大会。但调查表明如果等到共和党大会，杜卡基斯可能会领先 20 个百分点。布什当机立断，采取进攻姿态。

在选择竞选伙伴——副总统候选人时，杜卡基斯的助手建议此人最好来自南方，以与肯尼迪的竞选相媲美。杜卡基斯有不少人选，但杜卡基斯选择了参议员本森，认为他是一位老练的政治家。

在民主党内部，也存在竞争。杜卡基斯须得到党内各方大员的支持。杰西·杰克逊就是一位。杰克逊想当副总统候选人，但杜卡基斯没有这方面的考虑。此后，杰克逊一直想与杜卡基斯私下谋之，但杜卡基斯一直佯装不知。杰克逊便从中作梗。杜卡基斯的竞选主席保罗·布隆塔斯打电话给杰克逊，杰克逊发牢骚说杜卡基斯从不征询他的意见。布隆塔斯说：问题是你从未明确支持杜卡基斯。杰克逊很惊奇，这是责怪他做得太少了。他的助手建议他去讨价还价，说得含含糊糊。杜卡基斯一下子愣住了，挂完电话后甚感沮丧。五天后，他们再次见面。杰克逊很兴奋，但为时已晚。

布什选择副总统候选人时，也有很多人选，如杰克·肯普、克·肯普、彼得·多梅尼奇、多尔等人。布什想运用这个选择来表明他是有独立想法的人。他与高级助手詹姆斯·贝克等人多次商谈，但没有决定。他最后选择了奎尔。这完全是布什个人的选择，他的助手们也不清楚如何对待这个奎尔，如何把他介绍给新闻界。他们根本没有准备有关的材料。助手们都觉得手足无措。

杜卡基斯的竞选组织缺少章法。原来的竞选得力干将萨索因故被他打发走，他们也很少交谈。在民主党大会期间，两人住在一个旅馆，但没有见面。后来杜卡基斯眼见不行，打电话给萨索，萨索谈了自己的想法：确定竞选主题，做电视宣传，加强竞选班子。但杜卡基斯又拿不定主意，直到 8 月份，他的百分点开始下降之后，才不得不重新起用萨索。萨索使出浑身解数，但拖的时间已太久了。

第二场电视辩论，为最关键的一场辩论。第一场电视辩论，杜卡基斯表现不俗，但第二场更为重要，它的助手们均劝他象《第一滴血》中的兰博那样去打，但他有所保留，最后杜卡基斯同意了助手们的选择，准备在下述问题上向布什发动进攻：奎尔、伊朗门、流产、爱国主义、毒品和波士顿港口。在辩论这天，杜卡基斯感觉不好，身体也不舒服，上午的三小时辩论训练取消；下午依然疲倦，睡觉，直到 5 点钟才起来，离辩论只有一个小时了！辩论前半小时，又有人打电话来，杜卡基斯讲了二十分钟。助手认为这个电话使杜卡基斯不能集中精力。辩论开始

不到一分钟，提问人就提到一桩谋杀案，杜卡基斯从未准备过这个题目，只谈了准备的六个问题中的一个。辩论结束，局势明朗。

布什在第一次辩论完之后，感觉不良。第二天，布什要求每天给他送一份有关一个问题的备忘录，以备再战。他摩拳擦掌。第一场辩论时，他请了十多个教练，这场他想自己干，有一天，备忘录没有送来，他要求助手在一个小时内搞来。有一次在空军二号飞机上，他自己大声地自言自语，与想象中的杜卡基斯辩论。辩论之前，布什的辩论教练与他一起聊天，引他发笑，以减轻思想负担。布什一上场看到杜卡基斯十分紧张，便心中有数了。

这是一个人的分析，可能不全面，可能是浮光掠影的。但向我们揭示了总统选举中几个关键的环节。人事关系至关重要，任何候选人，如果没有处好这些关系，不可能在选举中获胜。竞选战略也十分重要，没有有效的竞选战略，不可能获胜，每一步每一环都可能是千钧一发。候选人个人的性格和能力在选举中也有举足轻重的地位，不少选民不太考虑太复杂的政治问题，而只根据直观评价候选人。从这个过程看，选举在两党内部的初选和两党各自的候选人之间，是真枪真刀，必须全力以赴。

在总统选举中，谁主沉浮？是个复杂的问题。以上的材料表明，不同的人，在不同的时刻和不同的层次上，均有不同的作用。当然，只有在统治集团支持下爬到这一层的人，才会有这样的问题。平民百姓对总统选举无门而入，也无可奈何。两党的总统候选人取得提名之后，面临的是汪洋大海，谁能最终到达彼岸，是一场你死我活的争斗。谁在渡海的旅程中沉下去，谁能渡过大海，取决于各种因素。

## 七、政治金字塔

### 1.国会山

国会一向被视为美国政治权力的中心，国会原则上拥有最高的权力。我不想过多分析国会的组织和权限，用政治学的术语来说，结构与功能。这些数据可以在任何一本教科书中找到。我想谈一些具体的、生动的东西。

1988年9月的一天，差不多中午时刻，我们驱车来到国会大厦前面。这是座宏伟的白色大厦。一下车，就看到通往大厦门前的路上放了许多混凝土的三角桩，布置得弯弯扭扭，车辆是无法直接冲进去的。据说是为了防范中东的恐怖分子。有些恐怖主义分子扬言要炸国会大厦，警方不得不小心从事。国会大厦入口处，站了许多全副武装的警察。

进入大厦的门，又遇到一些安全警察，检查过程与机场的安全检查一样。国会是可以自由出入的地方，每个游客都可以进去参观。在不开会时，游客也可以坐到座位上尝一下议员的感觉。

进去之后，先找到国会问题的著名专家辛克莱尔。她原是加利福尼亚大学伯克莱分校政治学系的一名教授，现暂时在国会做研究，好象兼做众议院议长的助手。辛克莱尔教授简单介绍了一下国会的组织，然后参观国会。先看了所谓的“走廊”，就是“乐辩士”活动的地方，“乐辩士”称 Lobbists。他们专门负责游说，以通过某项法案，影响立法过程（见第五章第 4 节“乐辩士”）。

走廊上有许多椅子，提供了较好的“乐辩”条件，这或许是美国政治文化中最令人难以理解的部分。政治是十分严肃的涉及大众利益的事情，“乐辩士”总是为某种特殊利益而游说的，有点“见不得人”。但在美国，这种活动是公开的，合法的。而且政府在议会里开辟舒服的场地，提供服务。这里体现的是某种企业精神，或称为商业精神。企业做生意都有自己的利益，可以公开地讨价还价，这是合法的。带我们去的美国政治学会的国会研究计划负责人开玩笑说，中国应多派些人到这里来。

进入众议院会场，会场是传统的，从装潢到设计都没有达到现代的审美标准，也许是有意保持这种古朴的风格吧。浅咖啡色的椅子，显得粗糙。现代化的设备在技术上体现出来。议员投票是电子化的。每个议员都有一张卡，这张卡上有一短磁带，磁带上有个议员的编码，投票表决时，议员先将这张卡插入设在每排座位后面的一个设备，然后按键。议员的选择马上就会显示在挂在前方的巨大的电子显示屏上。任何人都可以看到。

一般在议会辩论时，有电视直播。设有一个专门的电视频道来报道政治活动，如总统候选人的活动，参议院的辩论，众议院的投票等。所以选民们也可以知道自己选的人投了什么票。这是一种很好的监督方式。会场上设有几个话筒，要发言的议员走到前面发言。议员发言时，常常有许多人不在场内。参议院开会时更甚。参议员们对一个问题的讨论不感兴趣，就离开会场。在外面喝咖啡聊天，或回到办公室去。他们从电视里观看会场的情况发展，到要投票时才匆匆跑去投一票。如果这个时候到参议员办公室做客，他很可能谈到一半，突然说，“对不起，要去投票”，拔腿就跑。这可以说是美国政治中的一个奇怪现象。它是一个最高的立法机构，但并不要求每个人都正襟危坐。人们对这个问题的看法很实际：重要的是它能立法，而不在于它怎样立法。对每一个成员来说也一样：重要的是我有没有货真价实的一票，而不在于坐不坐在那里。不在场不用担心发生什么意外。如果不是这样，谁也不敢远走或者高飞。

参观完大厦，我们去会见一位众议员，他叫 P，来自北卡罗莱纳州。议员有自己的办公室。参院有自己的楼，众院也有，进入议员办公楼，也要享受一下上飞机的待遇，严加检查。每个议员都有一大间办公室，门口挂着这个议员来自的州的州徽。在一大间房子里，一般隔成两间，里间是议员办公，外面门口有一位秘书，另外还有几位助手。房间里堆满了各种文件。我们走到 P 门前，向女秘书做了通

报。女秘书打电话进去，说让稍等片刻。女秘书热情的拿出一袋袋花生给我们吃。一问，原来这位议员的家乡盛产花生，在这里做广告。

不一会儿，P 走出来，寒暄，然后进里屋坐下。大家议论了一番。发现他为人随和，善于交谈，而且能顺来访者的话题。这恐怕是一位议员必须具备的素质。选举是真正的利刀，绝不会客气。对要想当选的人来说，十分重要的就是怎样争取选民，怎样使选民相信你。

每个众议员和参议员为了做好这种沟通，都有许多助手，众议员十名去右，参议员二十至三十名左右。他们不仅在华盛顿有办公室，在各州或自己的选区也有办公室。众议员按选区选出，因此在选区里都设有办公室，在县一级有代表，以便全面联络选民。议员们还定期印刷小报，寄给选民，报告自己干了些什么事情。P 给我们看了一份小报，上面写着他的“业绩”。小报的名称叫“戴维·P 的华盛顿报告”。上面写着：他着手促进通过一项立法来减轻房屋所有者的负担；他的消费和借款法案得到众院赞同；两所大学得到联邦资助以发展医学和空间研究；农业问题得到重视；国会服务项目帮助第四区公民。

美国人不怕自吹自擂。早就听说议员的邮件惊人。这部分是免费的，所以议员们可以大寄特寄，以联络感情。参观时就看到一位员工开着电瓶车，挨门挨户地送邮件。在一个议员的门口，堆了十九箱纸箱子，走过去一看，上面写着：Envelope（信封）。大概有几千只吧。他们之所以要这样做，并非愿意，没事找事，而是一种机制，要当选就必须做，必须代表选民。其实他们不仅要写信、发通报，还得在各种场合与选民见面，拉家常，交心。

另一点值得一提的是学者与国会的关系。国会成员一般都有助手或顾问，以便能对一些专门问题发表意见。助手一般都是年轻学生，如大学政治学系和法律系的学生。。这有利于这些学生了解政治过程。想起当年一位参议员来复旦大学访问，下来一车都是毛头小伙子，令人惊诧。其实，这正是政治生活中一个值得注意的现象。这种做法使政治充满年轻的朝气，同时也培养了年轻人，是一个重要的政治社会化过程。

政治学者很多都做过高级顾问，不少人会告诉你他曾做过哪一位总统或总统候选人的某个专门问题的顾问。政治学者也较容易进入政治系统进行观察和研究。我在去议员办公楼的路上问辛克莱尔教授这种现象是否普遍。她说很普遍，政治学会有专门的计划推进这种研究。学术界与政界的这种交往，反映了一种实用主义的精神。政治家也乐于寻找学者做顾问，如基辛格、布热津斯基等等。实际上，一方面可以使政策问题更科学，另一方面也强化了公众对一项政策的心理感受，因为是专家参与的。

美国的政治精神与其企业精神是一样的，取市场上最好的货物。政治在许多层面是专门化的，剩下的是解决矛盾的政治、解决问题的政治。谁能解决矛盾和困难，谁就受欢迎。当然，欢迎中有选择。同样的肉有各种烧法，不是每一种烧法都能得到欢迎的。

## 2.五十国集团

美国是实行联邦制的国家，五十个州有相对独立的权力。州的存在在联邦政府之前，这种历史决定了州权的地位。其实美国人在建立国家时的一个基本思路就是，保持州权，限制联邦政府的权力。制定宪法的均是来自各州的代表，他们的倾向性很明显。

托马斯·戴伊（Thomas Dye）说联邦制的结构是：（1）全国政府的权力由宪法赋予；（2）州得到宪法保障；（3）宪法确定全国政府与州政府的权力；（4）宪法条文规定州组成联邦政府；（5）法院解释宪法条文。

州政府名义上并非地方政府，它们有较大的独立性，各州均有自己的宪法和法律。州的英文是 State，译成“国”更合原义，州只是一种约定俗成的译法，因为国内不能有国。从各方面看，政治格局很象一个“五十国集团”。尽管战后四十多年来，联邦政府的权力迅速扩大，但州的地位不易改变。所以，州政治在政治中极为重要。在很多事务上，联邦政府无权干涉，无能为力。州政治的领袖主宰着州级事务。

州府有相对独立性，可能是社会经济文化迅速发展的条件之一。联邦制将美国分成五十个“国中之国”，美国全称是“United States”，合众国，其实应译为“联合国”。一个社会的政府只能管理一定的幅度，超过一定的幅度就会鞭长莫及，就会造成行政上的供血不足。这并非一个政治体制有问题，而是政治生理学的问题。一个人的体力有极限，超过了极限就是再健壮的人也承受不了。政府也一样，历史和现实都给了我们许多这方面的实例。

对于大国来说，找到一种合适的体制，比什么都有益。联邦制在美国恰恰不知不觉地起了这种功能。联邦政府差不多是自成一体的，管理自己领域中的事务。美国不小，但州不大，这使各级政府活动都显得鞭长可及。当然，并非任何国家都具备实行联邦制的条件。

州政府各有不同。一种称作“弱州长”（Weak-Governor）体制。在这种体制下存在诸多相互独立的行政官员，州宪法对州政府体制有详尽的规定。委员会的机构控制各级机构。委员会的成员，州长无权任免。州长的行政权微弱。行政官员（文官）不属州长管辖。目前，不少州依然实行这种体制。

另一种正好相反，称作“强州长”（Strong-Governor）体制。这种体制产生于在政府行政中贯彻企业原则的改革。强州长对全州行政享有权力，减少委员会和机构的行政责任，建立州长的内阁班子，州长准备并监督预算。戴伊认为州长是州政治的中心人物，人们也认为州长须对本州发展的事务负责。州长在州里的权力相当于总统在全国的权力，州长是主要行政者，主要立法者，党的领袖等。州长负责协调州的机构，准备预算，监督州政府的主要纲领。州长的职位一般被认为是通往总统或副总统的台阶，如里根曾是加利福尼亚的州长，1988 年竞选总统的

民主党候选人杜卡基斯是马萨诸塞州的州长。因此州长职位成为政治家们必争之职，两党在州级选举上往往展开激烈的交锋。

一个州的行政机构大体上分为财政、公共福利、高速公路、税收、农业、工业、保护、保险、银行、教育、预算、伤残服务这样一些部门。在“弱州长”体制下，这些机构有相对独立的地位，与州长并列的财政部长（Treasurer）、检察长（attorney General）、州务卿（Secretary of State）、审计官（Auditor）等官员也由选民直接选举产生，直接对选民负责，不受州长过多制约。这种体制保证各个专门部门的官员有独立的权限，更好地适应社会需要，同时他们也受选民的直接监督。在强州长体制下，这种官员不存在，或者隶属于州长。在今日的政治生活中，可以想象，不论是强州长还是弱州长，州长都可以运用各种方法来影响各个机构，扩大权能。

在行政机构的旁边，是立法机构。州立法机构的主要职责是制定法律。各州也都有众议院和参议院两套机构。名称各州也不统一，大多数称 General Assembly，有的称 General Court。参院的人数从 19 名到 67 名不等，众院人数从 39 名到 400 名不等。州立法机构的组织和立法程序与联邦立法机构总体相同，均有明确的法律规定。

州政治的重要性也显示在其它政治活动上。一是利益集团在州政治一层活动积极，乐辩士在州一级活动频繁。更为明确的标志是，政党在州一级的活动是政党活动的重点。两党从最基层的 Precinct 逐级上升，到州级是一个关键层次。

在州一级有州党委员会，还有州执行委员会。美国政党组织的一大特点就是非中央集权。全国性的政党机构实际上没有大权，州级党组织往往决定自己的事务。在有的州内，县和市的党组织也有自己的独立性。州党委会负责组织选举州长，联邦参议员和众议员。县和市委员会负责组织选举县市官职和州立法机关成员。全国委员会其实只是每四年起一次作用，召开全国代表大会，确定本党总统候选人。

各州的党组织各自为政，所以有人说两党都是五十个政党或更多政党的联盟，全国委员会只是各州党组织的会议，而非领导机构，也不能控制州党组织。各州都有详尽的法律管制政党的活动，政党的组织、提名、初选、政党的干部、人数、职责、会议等均由州法加以确定，而非由各党自己确定。各州之所以制定详尽的法律管制政党活动，与政党活动可能带来的消极现象有关，也与没有一种全国性的力量可以调节各州政党组织的现状有关，与各党活动的基地在州有关。

州政府的重要还在于州政府在很大程度上可以通过资助金影响县政府和市政府。反之，联邦政府也可以通过资助金影响州政府。不过，这种影响有一定的限度。州政府的预算主体与联邦政府没有太大关系。联邦政府和州政府之间有资助和收入分享（Revenue Sharing）两种主要资金补助方式。州政府可以征收的税有收入税、销售税、汽油税、烟酒税等，还有各种收费或公共企业的收入。税收制度异常复杂，普通美国人也丈二和尚摸不着头脑（见第四章第 5 节“税收制度”）。

联邦制度赋予州政府相当大的活动余地。这在当今各国政治制度中并不多见。州的权力之大，地位之独立，甚至令人担心会造成运转不灵。不过，总的来说，这套体制运转得不错。这里面有多层社会——历史——文化的原因。

从经济上来说，美国是一个高度统一的市场，一个完整的整体，汉堡包、ibm 公司、汽车加油站、肯德基、“灰狗”长途汽车等都是全国性的组织，但又是非政府的组织。租车公司便是很好的一例，顾客在旧金山租的车，开到纽约后可还给这家公司的分行，全国都有这样的服务。希尔顿等大系统的饭店，遍布全国。加之信息统一、运输统一，社会的一体化有坚韧的筋。经济的高度发展发挥了维护全国统一的重要功能。在这种情况下，政治系统反倒不必多做努力，南北战争那样的状况难以再生。

其次，美国政治历史告诉人们，州政府先于联邦政府，各州本就有较正常的运转机制，建立联邦政府只是为了维护各州的原有地位，使之不至被破坏和削弱。反之，如果先有中央政府，后有地方政府，情况就大为不同。在不同国家的政治发展中，有的是地方政府为中央政府的前提，有的是中央政府为地方政府的前提。这两种模式会导致不同的结果，恐怕毋庸多言。

美国社会制度长期运转形成了一种文化，这种文化接受目前的政治格局——“五十国集团”，也是维持它的主要力量。维护一种体制、实际上就是维护自身。联邦政府在某种意义上只是“五十国集团”派出人马进行协调和管理的一种机构。

### 3.县政治

县是地方政府，州政府并非地方政府。县的地位举足轻重，它直接与民众打交道。州政府隔了县这一层，联邦政府又隔了州这一层。美国大约有三千多个县，包括一些州由于历史的原因不称县而用其他名称，如路易斯安那州的 Parishes，阿拉斯加州的 Boroughs。全国所有的土地均划分在这三千多个县的范围内，除了弗吉尼亚的 34 个市、密苏里州的圣路易市、巴尔的摩市、华盛顿特区、黄石国家公园和阿拉斯加州的 19 个选举区。由此可见县的管理功能的重要性。

每个县都有县政府。不过，有一个不同的情况，这就是各个县的政府结构和功能有较大差别，并不划一。这种状况在列国政治制度中并不多见。大多数的国家的同级政府具有相同的构造。联邦制下差别大一些。并非所有的县都有政府，大约 31 个县没有县政府，通过其他行政单位管辖。少数县由县市合一的政府管理，有些县直接由大都市管理。各州的县数也有不同，特拉华州只有三个县，得克萨斯州有 254 个县。县的大小也极不相同，加利福尼亚的圣贝纳迪诺（San Bernardino）县有两万多平方英里，差不多有两个荷兰那么大，相当于麻萨诸塞、康涅狄格、罗德岛和特拉华四个州曲面积之和。相反，弗吉尼亚的阿灵顿（Arlington）县只有 24 平方英里。

从经济角度看，县一般以农业为主。以县内的城市为主要市场。有些县以工业经济为基础。各县的经济活动和组织差别很大，各有千秋。

县政值得注意。县政是政治的基础。县是政党组织的基础。县政治是政治中最有实质性内容之一。《美国县政府》一书的作者赫伯特·悉尼·迪贡布（Herbert Sidney Ducombe）说，县的政党主席往往是地方政治组织的关键人物。县的选举和县政府的职务是走向州政府和联邦政府的台阶，县也是收集资金的地方，选区划分常常以县为单位。政治组织都有县级组织。县官员往往负责确定县以下的选区，指定选区负责人等。

县以下的基本单位是 Precinct（小区）。小区在农村可能只有十几个选民，在城市可能有二千位选民。小区中就存在政党组织。各个小区不同，有的小区有选举产生的小区负责人（Committeeman），有的小区由委员会领导。这不是政府组织，而是民间组织。选举时，小区负责人的任务是组织本党活动分子，联络可能的选民，散发竞选文献，出席会议。两党争取选民的活动主要在这个层次展开。

在人口较多的县，小区和县之间还有一些中间的政治组织。县级政治组织一般由该组织的委员会或主席领导。这些政治组织对政府没有直接的权力，只有间接影响政府决策的可能性。政治组织必须自己解决活动经费、场地、人员等一切问题，不能取纳税人的一分钱。

县的政府组织千姿百态，这是美国政治的一大特色，有传统模式、准经理模式、选举模式、行政助理模式、县管理员模式等，迪贡布将其分为两大类：

传统的多人执行模式，85%至 90%的县政府具有某种传统的选举产生的多人执政委员会，一般称为 Board of Commissioners。有时也称 County Court, Board of Supervisors 或其他。有的县的行政设有其他职能，有的县的行政官员还兼任镇的 Supervisor、法官或其他职务。县管理机构主要是行政机构，它可以任命某些职员，批准财务文件。他们一般有权通过县预算，并通过州法律允许的法规。县的不少其他官员也由选举产生，如司库等。这是这种体制的一大特点。

执行和行政体制。这种体制下有一人有较大的监督权，他对县行政有一定的发言权。在这种形态下，还有变异，如县经理体制，县委员会只是决策团体，同时雇用一名经理负责大部分行政职能。经理是专业人员，完全根据经验和学识选择，不看派别倾向。经理不管决策，决策者不管日常行政。经理有权任命大部分行政官员，并准备县预算，执行预算。准经理体制、行政官员体制、行政助理体制均为上述体制的变奏，均由县委员会任命一名专业人员负责行政，但被任命者没有充分的任命官员的权力和行政权力。另一种体制是选举行政官体制，主要行政官由选举产生，全县的选民都参加选举。县委员会没有什么行政权，相当于县议事机构。县政府机构各有不同，与美国殖民地的早期历史有关。

县政府通常的事务包括：估价财产（供收地方税时用，地方税根据财产价值抽取）、征收财产税、记录财产文件、维修乡村公路、救济穷人、执行法律、管理选举和某些司法职能。这些职能由州法律规定。除此之外，县政府还旅行一些县



自己确定的职能，以满足本县居民需要，如防火、供水、停车场、机场、公共学校、图书馆、保健、福利、治安、交通等。

县政府的另一项权利在于它有征收财产税的权利，县政府征收了财产税之后分配给市、学校区或其他地方单位。县的财政收入主要有两个来源：财产税和州援助金及其他资金。各县收税情况不同，有的县主要依靠财产税，有的县主要依靠州税再分配，有的县还另外征税。

县在政治生活中举足轻重，它的活动和职能与选民最近。政治制度一大部分体现在县政上。县经济都发展到相当的水平，生活水平和生活设施与大都市没有多大差别，年轻人大部分可以接受高等教育，信贷和交通十分发达。一般农业地区的县也没有明显的落后和愚昧的感觉。这是县级政治得以运转的一项重要条件。

在很大程度上，县级政治是美国政治的基础。县级政治的过程决定了人们能够接受什么样的政治，不能接受什么样的政治。在县的层次上，更多具有管理的色彩。阶级利益较直接地体现在联邦政府和州政府。县级政府更多地考虑居民的实际利益，更间接地体现阶级利益，实际上也是选举制度使然。县的范围不大，人人都能看见县官们在干什么。如果他们觉得不满意，下一次就会不投他们的票。任何人想要争取到更多的选票，都必须干实事。这是政治世俗化的基础。

县政中通行的经理体制及其他各种体制，反映了县政世俗化的程度。很多人把县政视为技术问题，而非政治问题。当然县政中有政治，只是更需要以实事作垫子。

实际上，美国政治制度的程式化，更多地体现在它的三千多个县的有效运转上。任何社会要想有任何形式的成熟的政治体制，首先应使地方和基层政府有效运转。地方政府与选民和民众直接交往，不象联邦政府和州政府隔得那样遥远。民众们评价政治的功绩与败绩，往往从最靠近自己利益的地方着眼。地方政治运转的成功与否，其政治价值就在这里。社会经过二百多年的运转，加之选举制度的强制，县政治已经运转得相当顺当。言其顺当，只是说它们整个政治统治的稳定奠定了良好的基础。在现实生活中，美国人也较为看重县政治或更下一层的政治，对于联邦政治，他们会觉得索然无味，因为那太遥远。美国民族是讲实用主义的民族，政治上的实用主义，就是盯住眼前的政治不放。这种态度，反过来也促进了包括县政治在内的地方政治的发展。

## 4.都市里的政治

城市是美国社会和政治管理中的一个基本单位。美国的成功，在很大程度上是城市的成功。根据 1970 年的统计，大城市（Large city），人口超过 25 万，有 56 座，全部人口总和是 4000 多万。另外还有 200 多个“中心城市”（Central city）。此外，象爱荷华市这样的小城市更是多如牛毛，星罗棋布。

美国是城市化程度很高的社会，百分之九十五以上的人口不从事农业生产。这样，大部分人口便集中在城市，于是市政有没有搞好，成了一个非常关键的问题，中国的人口百分之八十在农村，农村有没有管理好，就是中国社会是否成功发展的关键所在。

任何社会管理和政治管理，都是对人的管理，因此，社会要发展，经济要腾飞，文化要弘扬，首先应当找到管理一个社会最大部分人口的合适方法，包括文化的、地理的、经济的、宗教的、政治的等。只有最大多数的人口管理得当，社会才能均衡发展。

市政府管什么？大概世界上大多数的城市政府都得管相同的事务，因为人的最终需要相同。这整个基础上，各国又因文化的不同而管理一些不同的事务。《市政府和市政问题》的作者德梅特里奥斯·卡莱里（Demetrios Caraley）把市政的功能分为三类：

福利，包括防火、供水、维修街道和高速公路、公共保健等事务。

管制，市政负责管制食品卫生、企业漏税、房屋维修、城市建筑、日常服务、交通运输、空气污染、水源污染、种族歧视、城市发展等。

抽税，以支持前两项功能。市政府征税的类别一是财产税，二是销售税。

市政另外还有些收入。在美国买东西，往往加上地方税。总之，谁买东西，就付了税。有些市政府还向有关部门征收“nuisance taxes”，麻烦税，或按国内通行的说法，译为“好处费”。如银行、香烟、剧场门票、汽油、股票买卖、旅馆、汽车、商业财产的租用等，市政府还可以征收“使用税”，即它所提供的便利和服务，如动物园、娱乐设施、博物馆、桥梁、隧道、公共汽车和地铁费用、公共房屋出租、医院服务。市政府在发放各种执照时也可以收取费用。最后是罚款。

市政府的预算巨大。各级政府官员思考问题的方法很简单：钱。政府解决任何问题的基本手段是：做预算。在中国，光做预算就显然不行，还得协调人际关系和疏通物资渠道。美国经济的高度发达，使美国人产生那种思路，也能实现那种思路。

市政府的组织在宪法中并没有规定。理论上说，市政府由州政府设立，完成州政府指定的功能。市政府的权限一般由市宪章（The City Charter）规定，市宪章如同组织法，各个城市不同。州政府影响市政府的方法有多种，一是州宪法赋予的权力；二是立法委托权；三是州资助，这部分资金占市政府开支的三分之一左右；四是行政监督；五是专项调查。

市政府的组织结构互不相同，由各地的宪法和法律确定。因此很少有两个政府组织一模一样的市政府。一般市均有某种形式的市长和市议会。市长单独选举产生，为市的主要行政官员，监督和执行法律。市长为市首脑，代表市参与各种活动。同时有一个市议会，可以制定地方法律，建立计划，征税等。市议会的主席一般

由市议会选举，有的城市由选民直接选举产生，如芝加哥和亚特兰大。有的城市有两个立法机构，以相互制约，如纽约。市长的权限也不同，有“强市长”和“弱市长”之分。“强市长”权限较大，“弱市长”权限较小，受市议会限制，主要体现在行政官员的任命、计划制定、立法等方面。

另一种形式称市议会——经理形式，这主要在一百万人口以下的城市中实行，50万人口以下的城市有一半实行这种体制。在这种体制下，市议会任命一位市经理作为主要行政官员，没有单独的行政市长选举。经理服务于市议会，不愿意干可以辞职。经理任命行政部门的首脑。市议会一般不能直接干涉各行政部门，须得先与经理交涉。市经理准备预算、市议会通过。在经理——议会体制下，也有市长，市长由选民选出或由市议会选定，他只是市的代表，不是主要行政官员，他的职责是荣誉性的，包括出席仪式、签署法律等。

第三种形式为委员会体制，在 50 万人口以下的几个城市中存在。在这种体制下，一切权力属于委员会，委员会成员有五名至七名。委员会共同组成市议会，行使立法权。单个的委员均为某个行政部门的负责人。有的城市是先分开选举，然后组成委员会。有的城市是先选举委员会，然后分工。这种形式下没有市长，只有一位委员享有市长的头衔，主持会议，并作为城市的代表出席各种仪式，但没有任何特权，与其他委员平起平坐。他有时由选民直接选出，有时由委员会选定。有的城市中，得票最多的委员同时为市长。

从选举制度来说，各个城市也迥然不同。如任职期限有二年至四年不等；有的市划分选区，有的市不划分；有的市的选举要注明候选人的党派，有的不要，在需要注明党派的城市，各党的候选人一般由各党的初选产生。凡是想参加竞选的，须得到本党选民一定数量的签名。其他形式的选举，也需要有人签名，达到一定数量，有的城市还要求想参加选举的交一定的保证金。

市政府与其他各类地方政府有着各种各样的关系。大多数大城市都在县的领土内，县有县的政府。另外还有特区、镇、卫星城等地方政府。这些政府与市政府没有直接的关系，但它们的活动可以影响市政。其中一项主要的关系是与县政府的关系。

县和市的概念不同于中国。中国的县一般仅指乡村，不包括大中城市。美国的县既是行政概念，也是地理概念。大中城市一般均在县的地理范围内，而不在行政范围内。县有自己单独的政府，大多数设在大城市内。县管理某些地方法院、登记结婚、监督选举，有的还参与福利计划，有的城市中县管医院和公共保健计划等。有的县设有分开的政府，体制也不同，有的市里有县的一些官员，但作为市政府功能的一部分，如纽约、费城、波士顿、新奥尔良等。有的地方就称“市县”，如旧金山，只有一个政府组织，以市为主。

大部分县组织早就形成了，而城市是随着经济发展后才逐渐形成的。在漫长的发展过程中，力量相互消长，有的市县合一，有的市县分离。市在县内，是美国行

政区划的特色。市县分开，是中国行政区划的特色。市在县内，对促进乡村地区的发展有益。

城市也是政治的中心。大城市中的政党活动十分活跃。政党领袖一般是占有重要政府职位的人或在党内有领导职务的人。每个城市都由法律划分为小选区，每个小选区平均有 600-900 人，少的有 200，多的也有 2000 的。小选区的意义是在这个小选区内设一个投票站。每个小选区的某党拥护者通过初选产生一名委员（Committeeman），或几名。他们为政党的基层干部，是党的工作者（Party Workers），而非党的领袖（Party leader）。再往上，是选区会议（Ward 或 assembly）。一般在这个选举单位中产生一名市政会议员或州议员。每个选区会议选举自己的领袖，他们是市内基层的政党领袖。领袖由本党成员直接初选，或由小区代表会议选举产生。选区领袖一般有权任命小区“队长”（Captain）。通常，小区的“队长”与小区的委员是合一的。所有的选区领袖组成党的市或县的中央或执行委员会，委员会再指定一名县或市的主席，他是市党部的领袖。

在自然，与其他政治组织一样，这里存在许多变异。纽约市由五个县组成，每个县都有自己的党组织，但没有市委员会和市主席。市和县的党的干部名义上是州和全国党组织的一部分，实际上独立性很大，特别在市官员的选举上，十九世纪时，政党领袖对政治过程有举足轻重的影响，如今已大为改观，初选的作用限制了政党领袖的权力。不过，这恰恰是两党制度得以长期存在的前提。两党都允许观点不同，若不如此，组织分裂势在难免。城市为政治的战略要地，虽然政党今不如昔，但城市中的政党活动依然是政党政治的大头。

市政治理着百分之九十五以上的人口，城市未来的趋向如何，决定社会的发展。大中城市，正面临越来越严峻的挑战，犯罪率上升、生活指数上升、城市设施老化、税收高涨。我去过旧金山、华盛顿、纽约、费城、芝加哥、波士顿、亚特兰大、西雅图、圣地亚哥等大城市。纽约的犯罪率令人提心吊胆，芝加哥市中心有不少荒凉之地，如此等等。

当然，平心而论，与世界上不少国家相比，美国的城市管理是第一流的，现代化程度也是第一流的。美国市政有一项有利的条件，它只需要管制经济，而不需要管理经济，经济领域是私人管理的，市政只制定法规。地方政府的首要功能是管理城市发展，促进城市生活水平的提高，改善城市设施。与中国相比，市府的职责小得多。可以集中力量管市政建设。

社会的发展总是不断指出新的问题，不断向人类的管理能力提出挑战。面对这些挑战，人们可以有两种选择：一是限制问题；二是寻找对策。限制问题不能最终解决问题，只有寻找对策才能化解问题。

## 5.草根政治

政治学中的术语 Grass-roots Politics, 可以译为基层政治, 如果原本不动地译, 即为草根政治。在县政府以下, 政治怎样展开, 是社会管理体制中的一个环节, 县政府作为州政府的下一级, 从县政府到民众, 有的州还有一级更低的政府, 这就是镇政府 (Town Government) 或乡政府 (Township Government)。不过, 在这一层建制上再一次反映了美国文化的特点, 并非所有的州都设有镇政府或乡政府, 而是在有这种传统的方才设立, 如东部、中东部和其他一些地方。镇政府较为典型的为新英格兰地区。托马斯·杰佛逊等思想家都曾高度评价镇政府, 认为它是直接民主的一种理想形式。

镇政府起源于殖民地时期, 由于严冬和印第安人的存在, 早期殖民者在小的村庄以及环绕着它的土地上设立了这种建制。区域内往往设有一个教堂, 包括农村和城镇。镇政府的政治较为简单, 由所有合格选民的会议决策, 选民选择镇官。每年举行一次会议, 如需要还可以召开会议。全镇会议决策之后, 由选举的镇官 (三至九名) 执政。

另外, 选民还选举其他一些官员。镇官须执行全体会议制定的基本政策。不过, 有的学者指出, 随着政治生活的发展, 前来开会的人数越来越少, 愿意做镇官的人也越来越少。有的镇发展出代表会议, 选民选举一百名或更多的人开会, 代表他们。卢梭说过, 公意不能代表, 如果人们宁愿选举代表代表他们的意志, 政治制度就变质了。镇政府的发展趋势是什么? 现在不好说。不过, 镇政府在不少地方, 还起着举足轻重的作用 (关于镇政府, 见第二章第 6 节“政治基因”一节, 那里记录了对一个镇政府的实地考察)。

除镇政府之外, 在大西洋中部各州和中东部各州, 农村还设有乡政府。乡政府通常管辖 36 平方英里的幅度。在不少州, 乡政府仍相当活跃, 如伊利诺伊、印第安那、堪萨斯、密歇根、明尼苏达、威斯康辛等。密苏里、华盛顿州还有少量的乡政府。爱荷华和俄克拉荷马州曾有过乡政府, 如今已经不运转了。

乡政府负责照料公路、处理一些不大的法律案件, 管理选举。乡政府也管估价财产价值、抽税。在一些州的大乡里可以拥有警察、消防、供水等机构。乡政府负责满足农村人口的需要。乡政府的管理与镇政府差不多, 由选民每年的会议制定政策。但来开会的人很少, 除非事关重大。乡政府目前正在衰落, 因为乡村地区的人口越来越少, 交通发达, 信息网络、经济沟通使农村地区与城市紧紧联系在一起。这些功能为乡政府难以承担; 另一方面, 愿意做“乡官”的人越来越少。人往高处走, 人们纷纷到乡外去谋求高职了。

不过, 在一些城市化程度较高的地方, 乡政府的作用略见长进。这是因为它们城市化了, 人口密度高, 矛盾和利益要求多, 管理自然不可或缺。

再有一种形式，就是特区（Special districts）。这种政府形式所知人不多。特区是一个独立于其他政府机构的政府组织，它有自己的征税权和其他权力，有自己的政府组织。特区因不同的需要组织起来，如机场、计划、停车场，等等。特区与其他政府组织（如市政府和县政府）之间有边界，也可能与其他政府交错。城市有，乡村也有，百分之六十的特区集中在十个州，如加利福尼亚、伊利诺伊等。

设立特区的原因一般有：（1）方便或支持某种特殊的功能；（2）执行某些单项功能的机构在一个地区内至关重要。

特区的类型很多：（1）学校特区，为数最多，由一个委员会领导，向他们属下的人们提供一套教育制度；（2）卫生特区，以使污水处理更为有效；（3）电力特区；（4）供水特区，由供水系统供应水源；（5）其他类别，图书馆特区、消防特区、森林特区等。五、六十年代特区发展最快。特区的总数大约相当于全国城市的总数。

特区的设立由州法律决定。特区内的人们为特定目标组成一个政府。一般选举一个委员会，委员会有权征税，设立必要的组织，购买必要的设备，满足民众的需要。特区用来满足人们的特殊需要，并针对特殊地区的人征税。设立特区，是因为其他地方政府不能提供这种特殊的服务。特区的政治功能往往不强，只为提供某种专项服务而活动。

自然，对于特区，也有争论。有人认为它的设立使那些从事专门设备生产的厂商渔翁得利，因为特区均是为专门的目标而设立的。另外，特区虽然不是为政治目的而设立的，但它们也不能游离于政治之外。利益集团、政客照样在特区活动，影响特区管理。

无论如何，特区是一种较为灵活的管理形式，哪里有特殊需要，设立特区加以解决是一种行之有效的管理方法。在州政府和其他地方政府不能满足需要时，设立以特殊需要为目的的纯管理性的特区组织，是一种合理的选择。对地广人多，文化差别大，需要繁杂的社会，尤其适合。

在社会的管理体制和形式上，宜活不宜死。体制太死，往往限制社会生动活泼的发展。当然，事物不能走极端，如果太活，社会管理活动又会失去章法，没有一体化的结构。在两个极端之间找到合适的方位，是一个社会管理优化的先决条件。

最后，还存在村政府（Villages）。村的概念在这里相当于镇而非乡，有城市的含义而非农村的含义。从法律上说，村与市有相等地位。村的地位由州法律规定。有的村只是邮局或商店周围的一些人家，“鸡犬之声相闻”；有的比较大。这里的人们需要修路、路灯、供水等服务，组成市又太小，可以称为村。各州都有法律，人们可以通过一定的程序申请组建村。村政府一般较为简单，类似于弱市长体制。立法机构为一小的委员会，有三至九人组成。主席或其他头衔的人主持委员会。另选举一些其他官员，少而精。村政府可以与乡政府分开，向县政府派出自己的代表，也可以隶属于乡政府，各有不同。

美国政治在草根政治这一层，放得很开，主要职能在于为辖内的人们提供服务和便利，其他职能相对不那么明显。官员依靠人们缴纳的税行政，他们由选举产生。草根政治的组织简朴，便于监督。在政治生活中，老百姓对于全国政治或者州政治，无话可言。但对草根政治却有实际发言权，因为这些活动就发生在他们身边，他们眼前，与他们的日常生活交织在一起。实际上，在这一层更多是社会性的和福利性的。草根福利，草根非政治，对老百姓来说，足矣。

## 6.透明议事

政治过程中有一个有趣的现象，许多决策过程是公开的。联邦的参议院和众议院开会和辩论过程是公开的，电视现场转播，闲人可入，坐在指定席位上旁听。所有议员投票的结果也是公开的，电子显示屏将自动显示每个人的投票立场，一目了然。州政府的开会和辩论情况与联邦议会一样。我在马里兰州的议会会场观察过，有旁听席和电子显示屏。地方政府一级，公开办公也是惯例。开门办公一般是在议事性机构里。县一级政府，由于设置有所不同，不敢说全美一样。我参加了一次爱荷华州约翰逊县的县委员会召开的开门议事会议。

会场设在县行政大楼内。县行政大楼是一幢四层高的楼，大小相当于一个电影院。与中国县政府的规模相比是小巫见大巫。县政府里两个最大的办事机构，一是选民登记处，二是驾驶执照申请处。会场大概有 50-60 平方米那么大，前排摆着固定的桌子，有五个固定的位置，给五个选举产生的委员坐。每个人前面有一块牌子，写着名字。右边坐着检察官和审计。涉及财政和法律问题时他们参与意见。左边坐着书记员，有一录音设备。在主席台对面，放一个小桌子和椅子，供有关人员发表意见。在这个桌子后面，有二十多张椅子，公众可以坐在这里观察他们的决策，聆听他们的讨论。一般的人也无此兴趣，主要是与当日会议决策有关的人士愿意出席会议。出席观察的人可以看，而且可以发言和发表评论，只要事先征得主席的同意。

这天的议事日程很多。9 点钟开始。地方报纸的记者也到场。非正式议程的讨论项目有好几项。一是重新装修县的一个机构的办公室。会议讨论得很细，如地毯、窗帘、空调，以及州政府给多少钱，县政府给多少钱。提出要求的这个机构发言人陈述理由，县委员们提出问题，很细致，很认真。连建筑师都被请到现场。最后决定由建筑师先出草案，然后由县委员会再议。

其二是讨论修建公路的问题，开辟和连接两条公路，以便给这个地区提供更多的方便。每个项目的提出人都得陈述理由、回答问题、出示材料。他们带来了书面材料以及设计图纸。开会时还要围拢来讨论图纸，然后做出决定。

非正式议程是准备和讨论问题，不需投票。县的这种决策机构，相当于立法机构，要以投票做最后决定，投票也是公开的。

10 点正式议程开始，主席用一个小木槌子敲了一下。第一项是审议出售财产的问题。共三件，两件很快通过。第三件争论激烈。大致情况如此：根据法律规定，每个拥有地产和房产的人都必须付财产税，如果不付税，政府有权没收财产、并出售。出售得来的钱抵财产税。这是一条非常厉害的法律，人们不能不交纳财产税。当日审议的问题就是在这个范围内。有一个人建造一所房子，造到一半大概没有资金造不下去了。但他得为这所房子付财产税，他也付不出。政府没收了他的这所房子，公开出售。他的一位老朋友准备出二千美元买下这所房子，然后还给他，以解决这个问题。另外一对青年夫妇住在这所未建成的房子的旁边，认为这所房子太不安全，小孩子到那里去玩，容易出危险，想买下这所房子并拆毁它。他们答应出一千美元。争论就在这几个人中间进行。

房产所有者发言解释他的情况，他的朋友为好友的立场辩护；青年妇女则为自己的立场辩护。各自还有一二个邻居为其讲话。经过较长时间的辩论，委员们表决。由审计员依次叫每个委员打的名字，同意的说“yes”，不同意的说“no”。表决结果由审计员记录在案。投票结果，青年夫妇胜。县委员会会议宁要一千美元不要两千元，可能是觉得房产所有者十一年不付财产税，不能让他拥有这份财产。如果选择两千元，结果是房产拥有人拥有房子，又不出十一年中欠下的房产税。

第二项审议“人类服务”机构的计划，他们要求扩大办公场所和建立一个少年基地。县人类服务机构的负责人陈述理由，提交草案和图纸。表决结果：通过。

第三项讨论给州经济发展部的一封信，涉及为县争取更大利益的问题，没有什么争论，迅速通过。

然后再议县审计的几个事项，发放售酒的执照。在美国，销售酒要有执照，没有执照售酒是违法行为。我在一家朝鲜饭店吃饭时，他们就没有啤酒，因为没有执照。对于发放的执照，没有异议。然后议论检察官提出的 1988 年学校选举的议案，他早有准备好的文件，通过。

其中还讨论一个人的申请。他计划将 11 英亩的农田改造成居住区，准备造新房。没有异议，通过。在美国，拥有土地的人并不能随心所欲地处置这些土地，须受政府有关法律的管制，有关土地的计划需得到政府的认可，否则不可破土动工。

然后迅速讨论了几项议程，均通过。

最后一项讨论时间较长的是关于冬天扫雪的问题。美国汽车甚多，冬天公路扫雪是一个大问题。要购买设备，制定预算，招募人员。如果花了很多的钱，没有下多大的雪，钱的效益就没有发挥出来。如果省钱，结果大雪纷飞，无法应付，选民们又要提意见，因而扫雪问题成为政府冬季的一项重要议程。

议程完毕后，几位县委员和检察官以及审计员相互交流意见。各自有什么问题可以提出来备案。



最后，主席问听众有什么意见。此时只剩下两名听众，其他二十几人在自己的事项讨论完毕后都相继离开了。有一个人说有意见。他问县委员在赞同“人类服务”机构的计划时（即建造一个新的办公楼），有没有考虑到去租或买一座现成的建筑，为什么一定要去建新的，这样开支大得多。此人是一位与此计划无关的人，只是关心这件事。有一位县委员负责调查过此事，作了回答。会议结束，主席拿木槌子敲了一下。

这整个过程，完全公开，任何人都可以旁听，发表意见。县委员均由选举产生。会议结束后，有一位县委员告诉我，在县委员会会议上，任何事情都必须公开投票。没有公开投票，他们不能作出决定。

政治的运转，很大一部分在地方政治。地方政治的正常运转，是整个制度运转的基础。每个普通公民对政治系统的看法往往首先来自于离他最近的政治机构的运转。县政的议事过程，使人觉得透明度很高。自然，他们也有自己的办法来通过他们想通过或不想让听众知道的事项。表决必须是公开的，但他们可以讲非常专门的语言，以非常快的速度进行表决。人们称为“Railroad”（铁路），意即“开快车”，人们还没有反应过来，就已经通过了。

县议会的主要职责实际上是讨论预算如何使用，很多事项牵涉到钱，没有太多纯政治性的事务，也没有直接管理经济的事务。地方政治有非政治化的倾向，多半是福利、修路、税收、房产等方面的问题。约翰逊县 1987 年的全部收入为二千一百万美元，其中财产税占二分之一左右，政府间转让税收为二百多万美元。县议会主要是决定这些钱如何用。

当然，县级也有政党之争，政党的基础在县。不过，县本身的活动十分具体，一般均涉及县计民生。

对于地方政府来说，在任何社会中，应当贯彻两个目标：一是地方政府有效满足当地居民的直接需要；二是地方政府议事过程高度公开。地方政府乃中央政府之足，无足，中央政府寸步难行；地方政府又为中央政府之手，无手，中央政府难以成事。中央政府应当采取最有效的措施和政策，来促进地方政府达到这两个目标。有了行之有效的地方政府，中央政府便如虎添翼，如鱼得水。

## 7.选择仕官

美国实行常任文官制度，事务官一律要经过公开的考试录取。据说，这套制度从中国古代的科举制度发展而来，由英国人最先采纳这一体制。但中国古代的八股考试和科举与现代文官制度大相径庭。

美国大约在十九世纪末开始推行文官制度。在这之前，实行政党分赃制，或曰政党分肥制，即哪一个政党的候选人当选总统之后，其同党便可鸡犬升天，有功者都弹冠相庆。这套制度有不少弊病，造成官场中的贪污腐化、结党营私，效率低

下。有一则故事就说，那个时代，有一位想到华盛顿当官的人，没有如愿以偿，结果一枪打死了当时的总统。此事被认为是美国实行文官制度的一块重要里程碑。其实际问题不在一个人的不满，而在于一套制度能否适应社会发展的需要，文官制度的基本特点在于政务官和事务官分开。事务官不由选举产生，政务官由选举产生，与政党共进退。事务官由公开的考试选拔，有竞争、在政治上保持中立。其实，很多人并不是官，而是普通职员。任何人要进入公共部门工作，或是通过选举，或是通过考试，以此保证合格的人员进入公共部门，堵塞营私舞弊之路。同时也为了平衡各派政治力量。

这套制度具体如何运转呢？我在爱荷华市的市政府做了调查。爱荷华市是实行经理制的城市。市最高权力机关为市议会（City Council），有七名成员，其中一位为市长，实际上是名誉性的职位。市长叫约翰·麦克唐纳（John McDonald），就在学校对面的街上开眼镜店，常坐在里面为顾客修眼镜。他只在市议会开会或办公时才去市政府。

负责日常事务的是市经理。市经理下面有财政部门、房管部门、公共场所管理部门、消防部门、合作部门、计划部门、公共工程部门、交通部门、人事部门、警察局。另外，图书馆馆长、市 Clerk、市司法首长等不归市经理管。市经理雇有近 500 名常任职员，包括消防队、警察、图书馆职员在内。凡在公共部门工作的人都包括在内。另外，市政府还需要临时工作人员，每年大约在三、四百人左右，如冬天扫雪、夏天修整道路、修整草坪等。无论是官员还是职员、工人，凡在公共部门工作，都被列入文官名册。那么，这些人从哪里招募？怎么招募？

市政府人事部门的一位助理告诉我，所有的职位必须公开，向全社会任何人开放。对于妇女，少数民族和残疾人，政府不但不可以歧视，而且要采取比对待一般人更有效的措施，称为“肯定性行为”（Affirmative Action）。任何愿意承担这些公共职位的人都可以申请。

市政府如何使公众知道需要招募人员呢？市政府要通过各种手段，如在当地的报纸上发通告，通过专门的工作简报、登广告，在市政府办公楼布告栏里张贴广告，利用市的有线电视等。我在市政府人事部门的门口看到一些这样的通告，名称叫“爱荷华市市政府备忘录”。内容有：招募负责招呼学生穿越马路的人员，招募预备人员（顶替可能生病的职员）、招募计划人员、还有水利、滑雪、科学、学前艺术等方面的教员，图书馆助理和警察局长。招募通告和广告启事发送的范围，视该职位的高低而定；普通职位在市内发，重要一点的发至各州，更重要的，如市经理、警察局长，则将发至全国。

通告上要写明想招募人员来担任的官职的工作性质、工作职责、工作内容、工作时间、工作要求、工作报酬、开始工作时间、申请时间。我们来看一下两份具体通告：

社区发展基金计划助理：协助管理社区发展基金计划，克服困难，准备基金申请、写报告、起草文件，负责调查研究，包括程序设计、数据收集、结果分析等。要

求申请人员得到过政治学、社区研究、市区研究或与这些领域密切相关的硕士学位，在计划管理和发展、或城市住房和共同体发展部门工作三年以上。公共行政的硕士学位可以代替一年实际工作经验。要求具备出色的口才和书写能力，行政能力，能与公民有效沟通，懂得联邦、州和地方法律。申请者要具有爱荷华市的驾驶执照。

警察局长每年负责三百万美元的预算，管理 53 个人。爱荷华市有 5 万人，还有其他小城镇。候选人要求：具有在警务方面的各类能力，如预算、制定计划、长期规划、警务领导实践、尊重不同的看法和意见；懂得如何达到目标，预计问题；可以成为一位领导者，能协调全体成员；可以向市经理、市议会提出建议；有应付公众的能力；可以与受过高等教育的公众打交道；能与其他政府机构和谐相处；能与大学积极配合等，待遇：市政府提供 100% 的医疗保险、牙医保险、生命保险，每月一天假期，每月一天病假，工龄工资 5 年后每年 200 美金，工资在 39,936 至 57,429 之间，配备一辆汽车，可能的选择程序：申请终止日期 1989 年 1 月 31 日，申请人要准备其他有关材料，最后的候选人由市政府出钱前来面试，查检有关材料，面试包括一组警务专家和其它有关方面人士的评价，还包括由爱荷华大学负责的一次考试。初选之后，还要对选中的人再作面试。

广而告之之后，应试者会将材料寄来，人事部门将所有的申请集中在一起。待到规定时间，进行考试。考试有面试、笔试和实践考试等种类。面试主要是由一组人对应试者进行评价、当场提问题，面试者回答问题，然后进行选择。笔试较为复杂，要针对每一个职位设计考卷。这种考试如果笼而统之，结果会是无效。所以考试均针对专门的职位设计。考试包括知识、能力、应变等方面。不同的职位还有特殊要求，如警察局长，可能需要做神经和体力方面的检查，以保证精神状态正常和体力能够胜任这个职位。如果是一些具体工作的职粒，如打字员、电脑操纵、铲雪车驾驶员之类，只要求应试者当场操作，以作评定。通过这样的过程选择最佳者。

我看了一份考消防队负责人的考卷，记得有下述这样一些问题：

怎样理解政策发展？政策制定意味着什么？

能否制定长远规划？你怎样理解长远规划？

如果你领导的部门出现财政赤字，你将怎么办？

你能否训练消防队员？如何训练？

你认为最困难的问题是什么？你将如何处理？

你怎样看待妇女和少数民族在工作中的作用？

如此等等，大约有 30 个问题。每个应试人均得考试，当然是对担负一定责任的人而言的。然后评价这些考试结果，择优录用。

为了防范营私舞弊，所有的职位必须公开，不能由哪个人指定，市长和市经理也没有这种权利。市政府与工会有协议，即在向社会公开招收人员之前，须先向已被雇用的人公开招募，如果没有合适人选，再向社会公开招募。但这个过程也必须是公开的。任何部门领导，包括市经理、市长都无权直接任命。如果众多应试者觉得最后的选择不公平，可以采取两种方法有所动作，一是去法院，法院将审理这类案件；二是投诉联邦机构——公平机会委员会。同时工会也起一定作用。通过这样的机制保证选人过程公正。

由于公共部门依靠纳税人的钱而存在，所以他们得受纳税人的监督，同时纳税人也应有平等的地位来竞争公职。在对应试人进行选择时，规定不得检察婚姻状况、子女状况、宗教信仰、种族归类以及个人历史。只能检察与申请有关职位相关的东西。不得因上述原因而排斥任何人竞争公职。

自然，理论上说是这样，在实际运转过程中，总有不正之风。做官样文章的为数不少。任何制度和法规都会面临这类挑战，文官制度更是如此。

这里不必详细分析这套规定究竟在多大的百分比上实现了。从理论上说，这套体制有其利处：

它保证了行政体制的相对稳定。文官成为技术工种，与政党竞争没有关系，政党换班不影响他们，他们可以一以贯之地管理社会各个环节；

它保证了政党竞争可以顺利进行。行政体制的运转，是冰山在水下的部分，政党竞争只是冰山露出水面的部分。如果政党竞争引起社会紊乱，便不能有效展开。文官制度这套机器，是美国政治体制的基石；

它保证了社会管理过程的技术化，现代社会的管理需要越来越精、越来越专门的技术人员，他们的能力不能低于工厂中的工程师和技术员，大量的问题都是工程技术问题，如果全体官员都卷入政治旋涡，便不可能组成稳定有效的技术干部队伍；

它保证了各个职位得到较有能力的人。不一定是最有能力的人，最有能力的人不一定愿意担任公职，因为报酬低于企业。但由于有竞争、考试和选择，选择的人员一般可以胜任。

一个社会管理或治理的成功，在于这个社会怎样有效地使极大一部分人员技术化，专业化，使他们能长期稳定地研究和发展自己所管理的部门。同时，开放这些职位，让社会上有意者前来竞争，这样才能择优汰劣。开放的幅度越大，收罗的面就越大。象雷达一样，三百六十度扫描总比一百八十度扫描能发现更多的目标。要做到有关公职的充分开放，关键在于这些职位技术化的程度。这两者是相辅相成、密切相关的，美国政治的两重性在于，一方面是广泛收罗人才进入文官制度，另一方面又将他们置入政治势力的统治之下，这就有效保障了统治阶级的统治。

## 8.国会人联络处

美国的政治金字塔，自上至下，庞大而复杂。我们看到，这座金字塔，结构并不那么紧凑，但运转得平稳。而且各级之间并无特别大的冲突，整个体制得以维持。其实，在这座金字塔中，有条条线索把各个部分联结起来。我们可以看看国会如何与选民联结起来。

国会议员按选区产生，每个选区一名。爱荷华州第三选区现任的国会众议员（Congressman，直译为“国会人”）叫内格尔。国会议员的职责是联络选民，倾听本选区选民的意見，以各种方式帮助本选区解决各种实际困难，包括通过立法手段。

国会议员的主要职责并不在于全国性事务。当然，如果国会表决此类法案，他们也得有态度。他们的主要注意力在自己的选区。本选区的选民对他是否满意，是他能否当选或再次当选的前提。选举制度的功能在这方面是货真价实的。尽管人们只能在有限的人中进行选择，但无论是谁，要想进入国会大厦，必须有多数选票。这种机制迫使国会议员多多考虑本选区。

国会人在华盛顿特区有办公室，一般有 10 名以下的办公室职员帮助处理各项事务。每个职员有分工，有的管外交，全国性政治，有的管各种福利事项，有的管经济领域的事务，农业、工业之类。不过，华盛顿的办公室离本选区太远，无法联络本选区选民。所以国会人在本选区要设联络处（Liaison Office）。设几个联络处视选区大小而定。爱荷华州第三选区幅度较大，内格尔设了四个联络处。联络处的规模视所管的幅度大小而定。爱荷华市有一个联络处，主管约翰逊县。由于爱荷华大学地位重要，所以内格尔专在此县设一联络处。

何谓联络处？我去了爱荷华市的这个联络处。联络处设在一家银行的楼上，地处市中心。有两、三间办公室，地方很宽敞。联络处共有两名工作人员。整个第三选区的所有联络处的工作人员总共在十名左右。加上华盛顿的工作人员，一名国会人平均有二十名左右的工作人员。联络处以国会人的名义活动，他们发出的大部分信件都署国会人的名字，尽管他们可能是自己做的决定。

联络处主要干什么？实际上是一个帮选民解决问题的机构。选民如有什么抱怨、困难、问题均可以找联络处。联络处虽然不是行政机构，但它们可以协调行政机构，以国会人的名义影响不同机构做出决定。联络处的主要活动包括社会保险方面的事务，退伍军人的待遇、丧失能力的儿童的抚养问题、移民问题、农业发展问题等。它们的任务就是帮助选民排忧解难。

一方面这是一种社会工作，另一方面也是国会人争取民心。接受访谈的工作人员告诉我，她怎样通过各种方法从联邦基金、州政府和其他基金中争取到钱来资助儿童，又怎样帮助想留下的外国人解决移民问题，说她正在处理一位波兰团结工

会成员移民的事务。联络处利用国会人的声望，协调和游说，往往能解决不少问题。从功能上说，有点象中国的“上访处”。

国会人联络处，均由国会付工资，财政预算均在国会，因此，对行政机构有一定的独立性。领导联络处的是国会人。国会人每周往返于华盛顿和本选区之间，很多时间在本选区活动。如果一位国会人落选，他的联络处就会撤销，里面的工作人员需另谋新职。新当选的国会议员重新组建联络处，自然会起用在选举中出过大力的人。

在政治和社会生活中，国会人的联络处最一个十分重要的网络，它们将所有的选民联结在一块，国会人的功能并不仅仅是每年去华盛顿讨论一次国家大事，而是每天要处理各家小事。这套机制，从化解和缓和社会矛盾来说，有一定的功效。它们不是行政机构，在人们与行政机构打不通交道时，还可以找立法机构的联络处，联络处负责与行政机构打交道。自然，联络处的工作也是在法律范围内，不能逾越法律，除非国会人通过自己的努力制定了新的法律。

更为值得注意的是，国会人联络处的网络，实际上构成一个完整的信息系统。一个国家的立法机关如何立法？这是实际政治中至关重要的一个问题。立法机关只有得到充分的信息后才能制定出适应性较大的法律，同时能正确判断各项事务的轻重缓急，制定法律。如果没有一个完整的信息系统，每个国会人和国会如何能做出准确的判断？国会人联络处制度，加以现代化的通讯和交通手段，使这个信息网络有效地运转起来。此为政治和社会组织中的一个重要方面。

国会人依靠这套体制，同时也受它的制约。因为这套机制既在为国会人服务，也在检验国会人的活动。国会人是否胜任？是否尽了职责？是否有成绩？这套机制会告诉选民。有许多东西开始时是人们为了一个目标建立起来的，后来往往成为达到另一目标的工具。联络处既可收集民意，也受民意制约。

## 八、软性治理

### 1. 驾驶执照

管理或治理一个社会，有两种基本的方法，一曰政治的治理，一曰技术化的治理，又可称之为软性治理。所谓软性治理，是指社会发展出一套有效的机制，通过经济的、文化的、习俗的、法律的手段来治理社会。政治的治理，带有较多的权力运用和强制色彩，会增加政治和行政系统的负担和责任。如果政治和行政系统能将一大部分责任卸去，又使该治理的事务得到治理，那么社会就有了较为成熟的管理体制。由政治治理引出的矛盾和冲突相应地也会减少。美国社会是一个私有制的资本主义社会，由于人们的设计和资本本身的力量，发展了一套软性治理方法，这构成这个社会稳定的一项条件。

在美国，公民没有特别颁发的身份证。美国人常用来证明自己身份的是驾驶执照。美国大部分成年人都有驾驶执照。如果没有驾驶执照，也可以去办驾驶执照的部门办一张与驾驶执照同样的证件，不能用来驾车，但可以用来证明身份。当需要证实自己的身份时（如开支票），就可以出示。所有的公私部门都约定俗成，认此物为准。

我也去申请一张“驾驶执照”，为了证明身份用。先打电话去问了一下，那边回答说可以，带护照去跑到那里一看，原来是州的运输部办事处。这类事情一般归州政府管。有不少人在那里申请。排了十分钟的队。轮到我，办事官员没有任何别的疑问，打开护照给她看，她抄下姓名，问了一下身高、体重，看一下眸子的颜色，写下生日，便完了，大概二分钟。

然后到下一个办公桌核实一下，再转下一个办公桌，输入他们的电脑，收去五美金。这个办公人员大概用了一分钟。下一位拿出一张打印好的单子，上面有我的性别、眸子颜色、体重、体高、发照日期、生日、以及地址、编号，然后再给我签字。签完字后，在旁边一张椅子上坐下拍照，也只消一、二分钟。第三位办事员让我坐着等一会儿，说要冲洗照片。等了两分钟，他拿来了执照，照片以及前面提到的数据全部印在一张纸上，密封在塑料壳里。前后五至八分钟。这张执照可以当“身份证”用，在全美都可通行。前前后后没有人问我，为什么要办这张身份证？也没有人规定说外国人不能办。

我与爱荷华大学政治学系的一位教授讨论这个现象。他说这是传统。美国人不喜欢政府管他们，绝对不能接受政府给每个人一个号码。其实，每个申请工作的美国人，甚至外国人都有一个联邦政府税务局给的社会保险号码。在不同的政治文化下，各国的做法不同。如法国政府在每个婴儿出生时就会给他一个号码。

美国人需要证件，是因为自己在生活中需要，如银行、付帐或者驾驶车辆，什么地方发这种证件呢？最多的是运输部，因为没有车很难在美国长期生活。他说美国人绝对不能接受警察局发证件，这样会给警察局太大的权力。其实电脑系统十分发达，警察局可以很方便地使用运输部乃至其他各类机构储存的有关公民的个人数据。恐怕走到任何地方警察局都有办法根据你的执照通过电脑查明情况，我想起前年有一位留美学者回国后告诉我，有一次他离开他所在的州外出访问，主人安排访问一个县的警察局，警察局给他看了电脑系统。陪同的警察局长问他要了这张“执照”，将有关号码输入电脑，马上就在电脑屏幕上显示出了他的详细情况，包括年龄、国籍、出生年月、职业、有没有犯罪记录等，使他大为惊讶。

不论怎样，“身份证”由运输部发不由警察局发是个非常有趣的政治文化现象。这说明美国人对警察局这样的强制部门的戒心。县警察机构的首脑是选举产生的，不是任命的，这里面也表明一种制约其权力的愿望。

运输部门办理此类证件不问更多的问题，只需要申请者拿出合适的证件，证明在18岁以上。18岁以下的申请，需要父母同意。办理这种“身份证”的部门，可以接受各种证件：其他州的执照，出生证明的复印件或原件、护照、移民文件、

保险文件等。他们需要这些文件只是为了看看申请者的名字和出生年月，Showing your full name and birth date（指明你的完整姓名和出生年月）。

美国人时时都在保护自己的心理安全感。从前面的分析可以看出，这只是一种“心理感觉”，因为警察局完全可以通过电脑系统查询资料。但这种“心理感觉”的永恒念头，应当被视为政治生活中的一股持久的动力。真正的问题是怎样使老百姓感到放心，又使政府管理灵便。

从这种“身份证”或“驾驶执照”的办理手续上可以看出，这里重要的不是哪个部门颁发它们，而是每个人都有一张“身份证”，政府的电脑系统中有了公民情况的数据。只要需要，政府的任何部门依然可以使用这些数据。总之，虽然表面上无人控制，其实社会自然处在政府的严格控制之下。

政府在编织这个网络时，并不刻意强调这是警察局份内的事，而是强调为民众服务。发放“驾驶执照”即可做驾驶证件，又可作“身份证”，一举两得。同时在社会生活的方方面面，时时刻刻，“身份证”是不可缺少的，因此又是政府向民众提供的一种方便，这样人们就会自觉自愿地去领“身份证”，加入这个网络，因为它的确有用。

这套做法的另一个特征是，它把各种证件系统统一起来，一卡多用。有了一张“驾驶执照”这样的“身份证”，便不需要其他的什么证件，简化了手续。“身份”证明系统形式上是非政治化的，但它和政治化的“身份”证明系统有相等的功能。

## 2.工厂的原则

对美国工厂很陌生，因而很想去走走。我知道哈佛大学教授傅高义写过一本书——《日本名列第一》，比较了美国的企业管理和日本的企业，想从中找出日本战后令人瞠目结舌的经济奇迹的成因。我们在这家工厂原经理杰克·纽曼的陪同下前往工厂。

这家工厂是 The Procter and Gamble Company 在爱荷华市的分厂。这家公司现在是一个世界性的大公司，建于 1837 年，当时只是一个很小的生产蜡烛和肥皂的工厂，总部设在俄亥俄州。如今已不需要生产蜡烛，公司主要生产洗涤用品，如著名的 Tide 洗衣粉和洗衣剂，另外还有 Crest 牙膏。我在新加坡和香港时，也看到满街都是这种牙膏。除洗涤用品外，还生产一些食品、药品。

公司全力以赴推出新产品，近些年来又在生产风行的纸尿布。公司象大多数公司一样，为了追求最大的利润，不断创新，不断推出新产品，公司在全美国设有五十多个分厂及研究和发展机构，爱荷华市的分厂只是这五十几个分厂中的一家，另外，公司还在 45 个国家和地区有业务活动。



这种跨国的组织是美国经济的典型方式，也是美国人企业精神的一部分。美国企业只要有可能就愿意在国内外开设分号，并且十分留意来自这些活动的统计数据。各跨国公司之间，也常常为这些数字展开竞争。在企业方面，美国思维不仅仅注重挣钱，还注重名望。花钱买名望在美国人中很流行，这种心态支配着美国人的许多行为。

该公司在 1850 年至 1859 年，大约有 80 名雇员，销售额达到一百万美元，到 1930 年，销售上升到两百万美元。翻一番花了差不多 70 年的时间。1956 年，销售额上升到十亿美元，可见战后发展速度之惊人。到八十年代前夕，公司已拥有五万九千名雇员，销售额达一百亿美元。这种上升速度是惊人的。实际上，所有经济发展都有一种现象：最初的发展往往是缓慢的，但达到一定规模后，便会突飞猛进。国家 and 地区的发展是这样，工厂和商业的发展也是这样。从国家和地区来说，日本是最明显的例子，新兴工业地区大部分都有这种经历。

爱荷华市的这家厂雇有五百人。在自动化程度较高的工厂中，五百人算是不小的厂，生产牙膏、漱口水、洗头膏等产品。新任经理接待了我们。这位经理在工厂工作已有二十多年，拿到硕士学位后就来工厂工作，其间转战该公司的各家工厂，以增长经验和才干，然后被派到沙特阿拉伯的分厂做经理。经过这样一个过程之后，才被提拔为这家厂的经理。在这家工厂中，成为中层管理者需要一个先决条件，就是大学的硕士文凭，而且应该是化学方面的。然后在实践过程中反复锻炼，再从中挑选有发展前途的人出任领导职务，傅高义说日本管理是缓慢的提升，美国是快速的提升。在这位经理身上却相反。这保证了升为经理的人有管理经验和才干，同时懂行。对培养一位优秀的经理来说，文凭和实践缺一不可。

这家工厂的管理方式引起了我们的兴趣。在会客室的墙上，挂着一只镜框，镜框里的内容十分有趣，抄录如下：

我们中的每一个人都是公司的所有者。我们应当遵守下述原则：

我们在任何时候都将安全操作。我们将提供安全的工作环境。

我们将诚实和正直地工作。

我们将把每个人当作个人来关心。我们将以值得尊敬和信任的方式行动。

我们将主导自己和工作，将自己追求杰出。

我们将共同为共同的目标和长期推进而工作。

我们将承认企业和个人的需要都很重要。我们将为两者而工作。

我们将理解我们的企业，不断支持它。

我们将聪明地利用人力。我们将发展和保持必要的专业知识和灵活性。

我们将提供有效的训练以推行工作。

我们将鼓励和支持个人的成长。我们将寻找激发个人成长的机会。

我们将公正报答。我们将承认个人对企业作的贡献。

我们将有效地沟通。人们将得到他们需要的信息。

决策将由对每一局势有最好信息的人作出。

我们将鼓励创新和知识，将从成功和失败中学习。

我们将成为社区中一个负责的公民团体。

爱荷华市分厂，1986. 11

这是一个非常有意思的企业宣言。它制定于 1986 年的 11 月，看上去不太符合传统的企業精神，比较强调号召，强调与企业一家，类似于日本的企业精神。但同时它又十分强调传统精神：个人的地位。从历史眼光视之，它也反应了企业家与工人之间协调矛盾达到的一个程度。这样的条文在五十年前的西方恐怕是不能想象的。今天资本主义制度产生的最新变化值得重视。

另一方面，科学技术的发展，已经使生产过程性的规定显得无足轻重，如不迟到，不早退，完成多少产品数量，保证质量等，我们姑且把这些规定称为硬规定，即用以调节生产过程的规定。在生产不发达的社会中，这是必不可少的。马克思在写《资本论》时，可以列举许多实例，原因在此。

但在生产发达的社会中，自动化、电气化、电子化使这些规定显得多余，而软规定却显得重要了。软规定主要协调人们的精神和心理状态。自动化流水线的每个环节，是强迫每个工人服从的。我们在这家工厂看到多条流水线，速度之快令人目不暇接。工人的工作量很大。这叫做“非人化的强制”。从心理上说，“非人化的强制”比“人化的强制”容易接受。马尔库塞对当代资本主义的分析很值得探究，尤其是它讲的现代化大生产在人们心理上引起的变化。怎样协调人们的心理和精神状态成为一个至关重要的问题。这份“公约”里面有不少马斯洛的心理学，看上去是一目了然的。

由于自动化，管理变得简单，加之企业有辞去职工的权利，整个管理显得较为有效。看一下这家工厂辞退的人就可以看到现代化给管理带来的便利。退休的经理告诉我们，辞退的人有的是偷别人衣物箱中的东西，有的是在自助商店中不付钱。这些都是非生产性的原因。资本主义的发展用技术解决了劳资可能在技术上发生的冲突。这既是社会矛盾缓和的条件，又是企业发展的条件。美国企业不民主的过程已经技术化了和自动化了。用马尔库塞的话来讲就是合理化了。剩下的是协调人们的内心世界。不过人们的内心世界似乎难以协调，因为不合理的东西的合理化在不断地悄悄压抑人们的心灵，这个进程随着现代科学技术的发展，还会强化。这将是西方社会在很长时期内都会面临的难题。

### 3.企业不民主

在一位朋友家做客，吃饺子。在美国这算一种高级“享受”。到了美国之后，处于“汉堡包”，“热狗”，“炸土豆”的重重包围之中，人们才会感到，吃饺子和榨菜之类属于一种高级享受。不少中国人来美国许多年，还是不习惯吃西餐。这大概也算中国人的一种“劣根性”吧。

席间谈到打工。朋友的太太在不少地方打过工。为了能够生存下去，不能不打工。她的第一句话是：“打工真的累死了，我都哭过好几次了，真的打不动。”我感兴趣的问题不在于累与不累，而在于在经济领域中怎样进行管理，怎样逼得人去工作，逼得人感到“累死了”。

她说管理得极严，在工厂、企业等部门，上司是绝对的权威。有的上司很凶，大家都怕。她现在在校园中打工，负责打扫教学楼。每天下午 5 点上班，深夜 1 点下班，因为要在学校中人少的时候打扫教室。她说监工管得非常严，并且交待每份工作应当做什么，做到什么程度。一切都有明确细致的规定。监工负责检查，如果不符合要求，就会开条子让工人重做。再不行，就打发走。

监工随时随地都会出现在工人面前。监工什么时候来，没有准，只要被他看到有人在休息，或在说话闲谈，就要被找去谈话，加以警告。再来一次，就要打发。在监工面前，绝对得服从。

在监工之上还有一层。监工之下也有一层，有一个包工的人把负责整个楼的打扫包下来，然后分给下面的人。对于分配的工作，下面的人一定要完成，如果觉得不公平，理论上说可以找上司谈话，谈得不行，可以再找上司之上司。但在这期间，分给你的工作必须完成，若不完成就可能被炒鱿鱼。因此，从整个经济活动组织来说，管得非常严。这一方面是其生产率高的原因，另一方面也是其社会生活自我组织的重要条件。

另一个值得注意的因素是现代化给管理带来的便利。这位朋友的夫人说，监工们都带着对讲机，随时与再上一层的管理者联系。监工一面巡视，一面可以接受上级的指示。另外，在有的建筑里，有摄像镜头，工人的一举一动都尽收眼底。其最强大的力量就是金钱，因为一旦涉及炒鱿鱼，找工作也十分困难。因为新的雇主主要问为何原来的工作不做了，有可能打电话给申请工作人原来的雇主。在美国这个社会，如果找不到工作，生活将会十分困难。生活的压力，金钱的魔力，管理的权力，都促使做工的人全力以赴，小心翼翼。要做就得真出力，实打实。

社会生活圈中的这种严格的管理，是社会有机运转的一个组成部分。私人企业和公司管理着社会大部分经济运行机制。公共部门基本上也是用这种方法进行管理。最重要的力量就是金钱的力量。金钱的力量是不可抗拒的，但并不是所有的金钱都会形成这样的力量。金钱只有达到一定的数量，才会产生力量。只要工作，都可以得到较高的报酬，如：洗碗每小时 3-6 美元。洗十个小时，取中线，可以挣

到 40 美元，按官价折算，差不多 160 元人民币（当然，工资的高与低，仅以收入的数额或从与他国工人的工资相比来看并不能完全说明问题，必须同支出的比例以及通货膨胀率相联系才能看得更清楚）。如果每小时只有 1 美元，可能大部分人就on不会把怎样工作当一回事了。只要工作，大部分都有份较好的工资。这样他就不愿意丢掉工作，但要不丢掉工作，就得兢兢业业。这样社会就有了强大的协调力量，而不需要政府来协调。只有在劳资冲突或社会矛盾超出一定界限之后，政府才会加以干预。

通过金钱的力量来管理社会，很少讲思想教育。当然，我们可以说这保证了资本家对工人的盘剥。实际上，资本家及企业就是为了得到利润，这套管理方法也保证他们能达到目的。其实这种管理精神不仅体现在经济领域中，政府公共部门也是采用这种管理方法的。社会的其他机构也如法炮制。这种管理造成一个机制：在社会经济事务中的严格高效的管理。应该说，这构成其政治民主的一个基本条件，因为政治统治的具体领域很有限，大部分领域被私人企业的超政治活动包罗了，动荡和波折不至牵动整个社会。而在体制和权力相对集中的国家中，政治或政策变动牵一发而动全身。

美国的管理方法与中国传统不一样。美国人的管理是死板而严格的，中国传统讲究灵活而机动，这样才显得富有人情味。美国人认为前者是天经地义，中国人认为后者是天经地义的。有一位在美国公司里做二手的台湾人告诉我，他向美国人讲清楚，他是中国人，愿意按照中国人的方法来管，如果诸位美兄不合作，他只好采取美国人的方法，何去何从，悉听尊便。这在某种意义上说明，中国人接受美国的管理方法是困难的，在心理上会感到不平衡，可能人际关系也无法协调。中国社会走什么样的路才能为政治发展创造一个较好的社会的组织机制，十分值得探讨。

## 4. 人类服务

社会服务（social service），或称人类服务（Human service），是当代西方社会福利政策中的主导内容。我始终觉得，社会福利是西方社会不可忽视的稳定机制，它化解了各种过去难以化解的矛盾。马克思、恩格斯、列宁描绘和批判的资本主义社会的非人现象，如今已经由政府出面解决。自然，这样一个结局，是在社会矛盾激化后才形成的。但是，这个机制一旦形成，就会对整个社会制度的稳定和持续产生预想不到的作用。

我去参观了一个县的人类服务机构。走进该机构，看到一些人在等待接见。看上去是些穷人，有的是怀孕的妇女，有的是带着孩子的母亲。该机构的主任 F 接待了我们。

这类人类服务组织各州都有。我们来剖析一下爱荷华州的组织结构。在州一级有一个人类服务部，州下面有八个区，每个区又分若干县。这个县属塞达·拉比斯

区。在州一级有一位专员（commissioner）负责人类服务部，专员隶属于州长，同时还存在一个人类服务委员会。州一级的机构有退伍军人之家、精神健康和社会服务三个部门，负责提出政策，组织计划和提供服务。同时还有一个社区服务处，由一位副专员负责，管难民、自愿者、区和县的办公室；组织计划处，也由一位副专员负责，管沟通、计划发展和计划协调；管理和预算处，管财务、法律事务、人事、训练、计划评估等事务。人类服务委员会制定政策，并建议人类服务部如何工作。社区服务部管理八个区的机构和 146 个地方办事机构。人类服务部的目标是什么呢？人类服务部自己的文献表明：向遇到个人、经济或社会问题的爱荷华人提供人类服务。该部的主要责任是帮助个人和家庭成为自食其力的个人和家庭，增进爱荷华人的福利。

这个目标的确定有其指导思想，我们可以来分析一下：一个良好的家庭是所有个人成长和幸福生活的基础，因此人类服务部着重促进家庭的团结和人的发展；提供服务的方式应保护私域（Privacy）、促进个人尊严，并使个人能够完全控制自己的生活。可以看出，这个目标深受美国精神的感染，当然其作用就是促进和维护美国精神的发展。

人类服务包括哪些方面呢？给没有生活自理能力的人提供服务，给精神病人提供服务，这是任何社会都会做的。值得注意的是，它更注重人为造成的社会问题，而着力化解这些矛盾。我们可以看几个方面。其服务一个主要方面就是发食品券，为那些没有工作、没有收入的人解决温饱问题。食品券可能因多种问题产生，如失业、早孕等。该机构还负责照料早孕的女青年，帮助“单身妈妈”（Single Mother），鼓励她们返回学校，完成学业。

再就是照料被虐待的儿童，尽管美国说起来是个文明程度很高的国家，但虐待儿童的事端不绝于耳。F 女士告诉我们，去年他们这里有一百起有实据的虐待儿童的事件，有两个变成终身残废。很多孩子的残废是被打出来的。再有就是照料被虐待的成年人，大部分是妇女，美国人打老婆遐迩闻名。该机构还提供医疗资助。尤其是其在社会问题方面的服务，起到缓冲器的作用，使本来可能冲击社会制度的力量，在这个环节上减弱了。其社会功能不说自明。

社会服务起到了法律调节和政治调节起不到的作用。法律调节和政治调节在理性范围内是行之有效的。而社会上濒临绝望的人往往会丧失理性，他们不会理会正常的调节手段。社会服务的作用就在于把人们保留在理性界限内，不使他们出格。

由于社会服务有这样奇妙的功能，政府的投资也很大。当然，反过来的牵制力量是，由于社会矛盾已经达到这样的程度，必须投资。我们先来看一下塞达·拉比斯区的财政报告：1987 财政年度，儿童帮助财政开支为 1.68 亿美元；食品券开支为 1.08 亿美元；医疗资助达 4.12 亿美元，这个区一共有 43 万人口，此间的比例不难算出。

还可以看得更细一些。让我们看看这个县的情况：人口约 16,000 人，与中国相比，几乎是荒凉之地了。1987 年财政年度，用于儿童资助的费用近 32 万美元；

失业家长费用，6.3 万美元；食品券，27 万美元；医疗资助，14 万多美元；州附加补助，6 万美元；临时紧急食品资助，7.6 万美元；领养服务，20 万美元；购买服务，10 万美元；儿童补助，16 万美元；行政费用及工资等，14 万美元；行政开支，9500 美元。多项费用总计达 270 万美元。而州在这方面的全部费用达 8.39 亿美元。真是惊人的数字。这从一个角度反应了社会问题积重难返。

这笔财政费用 57%来自联邦政府，43%来自州政府。由于社会服务对社会稳定具有至关重要的作用，这笔钱不能不出。试想一下，停止全社会服务计划，会是什么景象。不过，这笔开支日益成为纳税人的一个沉重负担，围绕它的争论将越演越烈。

说起来，可以将这种服务追溯到十六世纪的英国。据说 1500 年左右，英国有这样的做法，保留一部分土地，照顾穷人。这个传说也随着“五月花号”船来到美国。F 这样解释道。也许不错。但更重要的是为什么会有穷人？因为“五月花号”来到时并非无穷富的明显差别。制度产生了穷人，也就产生了否定自己的力量。统治者必须想方设法转化这种力量。看一下美国二次大战后的历史，得出这样的答案不难。

很多人强烈主张削减这笔费用。不过动起真格来，谁也不敢贸然行动。人类服务计划已成为社会制度不可分离的部分，少了它就会失衡。真正严重的问题是：美国社会没有停止制造否定力量，反而越产越多，而人类服务对此又只能转化，不能消除。长此以往，这项功能总有一天会达到极限。但对美国来说，已没有其他的选项，这项选择是防范政局可能的动荡不得不做的。

对任何社会都一样，没有一个社会有能力解决所有人的各种问题。一个社会如要追求长期稳定，这应该建成能最大限度解决社会和个人难题的机制。对很多社会来说，危机的原因并不在制度，而在一些非常普通的事情：人们能否吃饱穿暖。

## 5.可口可乐总部

可口可乐（Coca-Cola）可谓世界上数一数二的大公司。近年来，它在中国也获得了极大的市场，家喻户晓。在讨论“超前消费”时，可口可乐就被当作一个典型的例子。可能这里指的是易拉罐，而非里面的饮料。全世界的人都在接受可口可乐。想从这家举世闻名的公司来观察美国社会的组织。

可口可乐公司总部坐落在亚特兰大市。这样知名的公司，其实总部的办公室并不大。一幢旧的楼十五层高，还有一幢新造的建筑。在摩天大厦林立的城市中，可口可乐公司可算不起眼了。可是就是在这个地方，人们指挥着遍及世界的可口可乐。可口可乐公司总部 1987 年年度报告的扉页上写着：

可口可乐公司的精神就是向饥渴的世界出售饮料，每天有 5 亿多人畅饮可乐……

这里没有提到钱，其实可口可乐公司的精神就是通过销售饮料来盈利。我们来看一下 1987 年度该公司的财政情况：营业总额 76 亿多美元，大概超过不少小国家的国民总产值；营业收入总额为 13 亿多美元；净收入为 9 亿多美元。可口可乐公司从一开始的一间小作坊，发展到今天这样大规模的穿越五大洲的跨国公司，是许多大公司走过的共同道路。可口可乐如今已经遍及世界 155 个国家，该公司占世界各种“软饮料”（softdrink）销售额的 44%。该公司雇用的职员有 17,000 人。全球可口可乐系统的全日制雇员为 50 万人，非全日制雇员也有 50 万人。可口可乐公司指挥着这一百万人的大军在世界上活动。仔细想一想，有没有政治意义？或者更广大的意义？

我参观了可口可乐总部。公关女士陪同我们参观，她似乎与最早的可口可乐家族有什么关系。可口可乐办公楼里，挂着不少名贵的画，有现代派的，也有古典风格的。这是可口可乐公司的一项政策，收集艺术品，待到若干年之后，它们将更有价值。在办公室的大厅里，悬挂着 155 个国家和地区的国旗，表示可口可乐已经打进了这些地方的市场。在旁边有一块电子显示屏，自动显示纽约股票市场上可口可乐股票的价格。由于可口可乐销路大开，股票价格不断上升，势头不错。公司的职员一般也都购买自己公司的股票。

走廊里还陈列了不少三、四十年代可口可乐的广告，其中有许多是一位艳丽的姑娘各种姿态的形象，大概是当时知名的一位歌唱演员或舞蹈演员吧。石啸冲教授说，解放前上海就有这些广告。公司还将世界各地分厂赠送的礼物陈列在下面。我们看到了中国厦门可口可乐厂赠送的礼品。

导游带我们参观前董事长的办公室，据说平时是不让人参观的。在这间办公室里，其他各类礼品且不论，仅墙上挂的美国好几位总统的签名照片就足以说明可口可乐公司的地位。美国人十分注重这种荣誉。名人照片挂在墙上是一种荣耀。这一点恐怕是人的最大缺点，世界通病。

可口可乐公司发了大财后，除了扩大再生产外，还把相当一部分资金捐赠给教育和学术机构。这一点是我最感兴趣的。亚特兰大周围的一所大学——爱摩里大学就从可口可乐公司得到不少资金，这几年迅速成长了起来。我们在这所大学访问时，那里的校长曾告诉我们，由于可口可乐公司的赞助，学校这几年大有起色。的确，校园中矗立起一幢幢漂亮的新楼。学校财大气粗了，可以花重金聘请有名的教授，也可以通过颁发奖学金来吸引好的学生。大公司有这种传统，乐意向学术机构和基金会捐赠大笔的钱。当然政府税收政策上对此也有调节。我们可以看看布鲁金斯学会（见第十章第 2 节“布鲁金斯学会”）。

布鲁金斯学会 1987 年的财政中，政府拨款只占 8%，私人捐款达 39%；会费和书报收入，31%；赠款，27%。这样还不能得到数量概念，我们再来看美元数额：政府，45 万美元；私人捐款，600 万美元；会费和书报收入，485 万美元；赠款，410 万美元，总数达 1,540 万美元。这是一个思想库得到的收入。这样的机制，思想库怎么会不发达呢？如果所有的思想库都要由政府来负担，恐怕很快就会出问题。一是可能出不了思想，因为政府出钱的话，政府就可以影响它。另一个是

在财政上政府不能负担这样多的思想库。如果思想库只剩下一个或少数的几个，没有真正的思想竞赛和较量，恐怕也不能造成思想奔涌的局面。

由此引出另一个值得重视的问题，也就是我在前面提到的特大公司的政治意义。可口可乐公司管理着近一百万人，管理着美国境内外数以百计的工厂，实际上治理着这些人。把美国每个跨国公司或私营企业管理的人数加起来，就会明白这在政治管理上的意义。因为如果这些公司和工厂都属于政府，需要政府来具体管理的话，政府将会增加许多负担。从管理原理上说，政府也没有这样大的能量。

在资本主义社会中，私人企业追求自己的目标，会用一切可以运用的手段来治理，政府的作用则在于调节私人企业。这样就完成了对人的管理的两重化：社会的自组织系统和政府的自组织系统。政府系统只从上面管制社会的自组织系统，但不陷入其中，因而政府的负担不重。社会的自组织系统有一整套规则、程序和运作，它们的运作是稳定的。政治的变化往往不影响这一整套机制的运作。它们在运作中追求自己目标的同时，推动了社会系统的运转。这是一种政治制度的基础，或者说是美国这种政治制度的基础。美国大公司的作用恰恰在这两方面。这种非经济的作用，大公司本身也没有意识到。如果它们有意识地做这些事，那恐怕会是另一种景象：政治

稳态。

可口可乐是从一座破陋的作坊里发展出来的，其他大型公司也一样。在这个过程达到一定水平时，政治体制和社会制度便趋于稳态。这便是政治和经济的关系。

## 6.上帝在人间

美国社会的宗教，或曰宗教生活，是社会生活的一个基本组成部分。宗教是许多人生活的不可分离的部分。理解美国，不能离开理解美国的宗教生活。进入任何社区，城市也罢，乡村也罢，映入眼帘的必然有大大小小、形形色色的教堂。在一个城市中，教堂之多，往往达到令人惊异的地步。

并不是所有的美国人都信宗教，甚至可以说并不是所有去教堂的人都信教。信教和去教堂的人，大有不同。但不论出于什么样的心理动机和社会动机，他们走进教堂里来了。圣诞节更是宗教生活和宗教情感的体现。圣诞节纪念耶稣基督降世，但这个节日早已世俗化，成为民间的一个节日。同时它也还是一个宗教节日，宗教组织在这个时期会组织各类活动。非宗教组织也一样。

我圣诞节前夕去听了了一个市交响乐团举办的专场音乐会。这类音乐会每年举行一次，唱大致相同的歌曲，均是赞美诗，歌颂救世主。这次的音乐会上演出了亨德尔的《弥赛亚》（Messiah，救世主之意）。当唱到其中一首名叫（《哈利路亚》）的歌曲时，按乔治二世以来的惯例，全场起立。《哈利路亚》即赞美主：“这个世界的王国变成主和基督的王国，万王之王，万主之主将世代统治我



们。”不少美国人在心理上依赖宗教或宗教组织，这造成宗教在美国社会势力强大的局面。

美国人信教，但差别很大。虔诚的教徒有之，他们仍为真正的信徒，怀着非常严肃的崇敬心情来敬仰上帝。他们每周日去教堂望弥撒或做礼拜，积极参加教会组织的各种活动。在家庭生活中，他们也延续传统的家庭宗教生活。我曾在一位相当有地位的金融界人士家中做客。他们在吃晚饭时还要做祷告，主客人拉着手，由其女儿用拉丁文念了一通祷告词。

有的人家也每周日去教堂，但并不信教，并不 Religious（虔诚）。他们习惯于去教堂，每次必去不可，不去便会感到若有所失。我与一位神学教授讨论过这个问题。他说，真正信教的不多，大部分去教堂的人并不信教。但他们可以在教堂里找到一种生活方式，形成一个生活圈子，见到朋友、熟人，可以聊天，可以有一种团体生活。另外有些人保持与教会的密切关系，是因为教会的慈善服务。教会进行大量的慈善活动，不少穷人和有难处的人受惠于教会，自然也与教会保持着较为密切的关系。总之，有众多的人走进教堂，但在情感、认识和目的上有所差别。

宗教之所以能产生这样强大的影响，很重要的一条，就在于宗教的世俗化。宗教活动没有那样多的神秘色彩，与中世纪的宗教活动和宗教组织已大为不同。不少大型的现代化教堂均十分摩登，完全没有旧时教堂尖顶塔楼的风格，而呈现出一种现代化的情调。不少现代化风格的教堂成为争论的对象。教堂里富丽堂皇，青松翠叶装饰。上帝和基督大概连想都不敢想。

宗教组织同时也利用现代化的传播工具传播宗教。几大电台星期天都播送祷告节目，传至千家万户。由著名的牧师主持仪式，所传播的也大多关及每个人日常生活之烦恼与需要。有时候讲一个人如何能成功，有时候讲一个人为何应与他人和睦相处，如此等等。所有题材，都与《圣经》中的语录联系起来。在汉城举行奥运会时，一位著名的牧师在汉城举行祷告，向美国直播，主题是：“在你要求之前，我就会满足你。”这是《圣经》中的话。牧师说，为什么奥运会期间汉城有这样好的天气，是因为上帝在人们请求之前就满足了人们的这个愿望。如此等等。现现代化的大众传播媒介把宗教文化传播到四野八荒，这是十七、十八世纪的传教士所不能比拟的。由于大众传播媒介的强大力量，人们不知不觉地接受了宗教文化，耳濡目染。

宗教产生强大吸引力的另一原因是宗教组织组织了大量的慈善活动。宗教组织有自己的慈善事业，是非赢利性的，经费来自信徒的馈赠。宗教组织往往非常富有，因为不少信徒为了拯救自己的心灵或表明自己的虔诚，大把大把地向教会捐款。这些款项不需收税，由教会支配。教会组织各种慈善活动，救济穷人。如一个教会每周四供应免费午餐，任何人都可以去畅怀大吃。每逢过节，如感恩节，圣诞节，教会便会安排来自外国的学生到美国人家中做客。教会也往往组织旅游，费用很低，在外面住在教徒的家中。诸如此类的活动教会做得不少。在美国这样一个私有制的国家中，政府承担的责任有限，不少无依无靠的人均投入教会怀抱。

教会与其他类型的组织，共同吸引着这层人，这是美国社会组织结构的一个重要方面。

美国的宗教也是五花八门，无奇不有，各式各样的宗教，名目繁多。美国人一般对一种宗教与另一种宗教究竟有什么差别并不关注。他们弄不清究竟有何本质不同，他们只是依从一种宗教，这就足够了。宗教组织多如牛毛，有时候几个人也可以宣称自己信仰一种与众不同的宗教。宗教自由在宪法上受到保护。任何人宣布自己有一种宗教，是其他任何人不能禁止的。哪怕有一天一个人说本人创立的宗教相信蜜蜂为世界的天使，别人也没有办法，只有不信他。由邪恶宗教引起的悲剧不是没有。如琼斯创立的人民圣殿教，最后强迫九百多名信徒在圭亚那集体自杀，一时震撼世界。

宗教组织和宗教活动并非只具有狭隘的意义，它们同时也有广泛的社会意义。宗教组织的庞大和活跃，宗教活动的繁多和广泛，本身就构成一个重要的社会机制。这套机制联系着成千上万的人，协调着成千上万的人，因而有着不可低估的社会功能。说它有社会功能是指它们在公共生活中起着一定的作用。罗宾·洛温

（Robin W·Lovin）在《宗教和美国公众生活》一书中的分析是：（一）宗教可以起维护秩序的作用，宗教保证着权威的模式和民众必要的服从，使得有组织的人类生活可以继续。没有宗教的社会是处在混乱边缘的社会，宗教告诫人们服从上帝和世间的秩序；（二）宗教生活维持并保护着人们的自由。宗教生活对公共生活的最大贡献就是自由。美国的宗教与欧洲有不同的发展历程，它一来到这块大地上就信仰自由，而且是为了逃避宗教迫害而来到这里。宗教共同体竭力保护自己的自由，同时也保护了社会的自由，因为没有社会自由，宗教自由也不会存在。宗教自由给人们一种信念，促使人们在公共生活中也追求自由；（三）宗教生活促进了社会正义。因为宗教传播上帝的福音，宣传平等，这种精神促进了公共生活和政治文化的发展。他认为，此三点，为宗教与公共生活之间的三个基本关系。

细观宗教之功能，我们可以说，洛温的意见并不全面，宗教有社会功能是显而易见的。但宗教的问题也是显而易见的，不能讳言。问题是在不同的文化和社会条件下，这种功能有大有小。归纳这些社会功能，从社会政治管理的角度出发，可以说宗教有三项基本功能：

能够构成一个强大的社会组织系统，它能独立地按照自己的原则管理归依它的人们；

能够构成一个道德价值系统，指导和协调人们的行为；

能够构成一个有力的辐射系统，可以将自己的活动和观念传及社会整体。

当然，以上三项功能只有在一定的条件下才能发挥正向的社会功能，否则往往贻害社会。在不少社会中，宗教是社会动乱的主要原因。宗教要发挥正向的社会功能，需要两个前提：

其一是宗教的非政治化。宗教不能成为政治的工具或成为政治的主宰。中世纪的状况是后者，表现为一种愚昧的专制；现代有些国家实践前者，表现为一种专制的愚昧。

其二是宗教的非迷信化。宗教不能成为迷信，成为迷信就会发生火烧布鲁诺，将童男童女送于河神，求神寻丹的荒诞行为。迷信与宗教是两个不同的领域；宗教更多的在于个人的道德情操修养，追求自律和奉献，迷信往往要求个人奉献于一种观念，不要求理性的过程，只有更多的盲目性和对自我的畏惧。凡是在宗教与迷信没有真正分开的地方，宗教就不能发挥正向的社会功能。

一个社会有一套宗教组织来协调相当一部分人的活动，来为相当一部分人制定一套道德规范和价值规范，可能在总体上有利于共同体生活。不少大思想家均谈到一个理想社会中宗教的不可或缺性，如柏拉图、亚里士多德、卢梭等。一个没有宗教生活的社会，将会失去一个重要的自行的管理机制，政治体制的任务将更加沉重。在宗教存在的地方，政治系统的作用在于协调它们，不使其逾越共同的规范。

宗教在美国如此之发达，与美国社会高度发达的科学技术似有所格格不入。这是一个人类理性之谜。其实美国人对待宗教问题是十分理性的，正象他们对待科学技术一样。一种宗教在美国这样的环境中难以发展成一种迷信。而在其他一些国家中，没有高科技的发展，往往会导致迷信。科技的高度发展，制约了宗教非理性化的潜在可能性。社会表现为一个奇怪的过程，知识越进步，宗教越没有危险性，宗教便越活跃。

自然，任何事物都会成为人们利用的对象，宗教也不例外。最近美国电视报刊集中报道了一位电视布道牧师的丑闻。他与一位妇女私通，同时挪用数以万计的信徒捐款谋取私利，成为一大丑闻。这一事件告诉人们，宗教可以有益于社会，也可以有害于社会，任何有宗教的社会时时均面临着这一难题。

## 九、制度的再生产

### 1.教育系统

对任何社会来说，最困难的任务不是商品或产品的再生产，而是制度的再生产。所谓制度的再生产，是指一种特定的社会制度能否在下一代或子子孙孙中生存下去。制度存在最牢固的基础就是社会的认同。新生代是否认同，关系到一定的社会制度能否再生产的问题。制度再生产最重要的机制是社会的教育。社会教育将社会生产的价值观念传播开来，从而提供了制度生存的基本条件。在美国，制度再生产的机制是十分发达的。

美国社会的教育系统可谓发达，人们说美国是“儿童的天堂，青年的战场，老年的地狱”。“天堂”之说，其中包括儿童能够受到良好的教育。教育还起着另外的功能：美国是一个没有贵族传统的社会，那种传统的欧洲社会的等级观念不强，每个人都有可能进入社会的某个阶层。社会自然有阶层和集团分野，有上下高低之分。掌握高等知识，在一个高技术组织起来的社会中，是进入上等阶层的通行证。实际状况也是如此，清洁工、搬运工等脏活重活，往往由受教育程度不高的人承担。大公司的职员、技术人员或经理，一般需要受过良好的高等教育。在这样机制下，接受教育成为社会的一种信仰。

我之所以说是一种信仰，是因为它构成大部分人的心理沉淀。查理·艾德里安（Charles R·Adrian）说，家长总是希望自己的子女受到良好的教育，希望子女受到比他们更多的教育。虽然没有中国社会那么强烈的望子成龙的观念，但也不会有人望子成虫。子女上名牌大学是美国梦的三大内容之一。

但是，美国社会教育系统组织很特别，它不是一个全国统一的组织，而是各州各异的组织。各州均通过法律建立学校特区，学校特区有权管理公共学校。法律规定成立地方学校委员会，规定委员会成员产生的办法。委员会成员通常由选民选举产生。由此可见教育的重要地位。法律规定委员会可以征税、借贷、建设学校、招募人员，决定地方学校的政策。

各州的法律对教育委员会的规定有所不同，法律写明委员会可以征的税的种类和比率，借贷的最大数目，学制年限，教员的最低工资，教员质量，教学计划的主要内容。许多州选定教科书，建立教学大纲，教学方法，组织州级会考，规定最低的教师学生比例。有些州还规定在课堂上教共产主义和进化论为非法。州立法可以严格控制教育系统，而且往往有细致入微的规定。如爱荷华州规定中学生必须上美国历史和美国政府的课，实际上是传播美国信念。

州设有教育部，由一位州学校部长领导。教育部长是选任官。有的地方由教育委员会或州长任命，以协调州内各校达到州所定的标准。州教育部有权协调和监督州内各校的教学情况。它负责向学校提供技术和信息服务，设定和贯彻最低标准的课程计划，核定教员。另外，州还可以通过补助学校经费来影响学校决策。

尽管州级有较大权力，但在地方学校的主要活动由地方选举的委员会负责。地方学校区是一个行政特区，独立于一般的地方政府，因此它们有很大的自治权。地方学校委员会决定学校的大政方针，在州法律规定以内，权限很大。因此学校委员会的选举竞争激烈。这关系到子女们将在学校中接受何种教育，家长们自然十分关切。

教育领域，在任何社会都是争论最大和分歧最大的地方，保守和进步，传统和现代，有神论和无神论，均会在这个领域中反映出来。委员会成员持什么观念，将很大程度上决定下一代受什么样教育。

这也是美国社会的一大特点，各学校区有相当大的权力，人们自己选举代表，自己决定自己的子女受什么样的教育。联邦政府对地方教育没有什么实质性权力。

这种现象可称之为“教育的非国家化”。世界上许多国家，教育均是国家化的，如日本、法国、苏联、中国等。以前有人说，法国的教育部长可以坐在办公室里看着手表告诉来访者，现在全国所有的小学哪一个年级的学生在上哪一篇课文，甚至教师讲到哪一部分。这里面含有讽刺的意味。美国的教育系统大为不同。每个地方的教育委员会都有权自行选择。我遇到过一位教育委员会的成员，他属于老派人，他说他不喜欢现在青年学生的样子，他希望每个人都得保持三十年代以前的样子：男士西装革履，女士穿裙佩花。

联邦政府在教育中有何作用？原则上讲没多大作用，除了在财政上给予资助外，其余的只能坐壁上观。不过，联邦政府资助的日益扩大，也引起一番争论。因为联邦政府的资助将会影响教育政策的制定，将会削弱州政府和地方教育委员会的权限。另外还有许多私立学校。有的学校是天主教学校，担心宗教选择受影响。此外，种族文化、财产、税收等因素都在起作用。

学校委员会政治性很强，当选的多数是地方名流，如企业家、有产者、经理等。教师往往对学校委员会的人不信任，他们认为教育政策应掌握在教师手中，教育中不应包含政治因素。实际上这种想法不切实际，没有政治的教育恐怕没有，没有教育的政治恐怕也没有。

各州还设有自己的大学，一般有两三所。大学归州政府管辖，由州政府拨款。校长由州长任命。州立大学不由联邦政府出预算。这种体制值得探讨。如果所有大学都由联邦政府出预算的话，联邦政府恐怕也是心有余而力不足的。

学校的设施是一流水准的。爱荷华市的一所小学的布置和装修就十分现代化，场地宽敞，设备齐全。当然，设备好，不等于教育质量高。美国的教育也存在着严重的问题。有的地方教育质量之差，令人难以置信（见第十一章第 2 节“无知的一代”）。种族问题也困扰着教育，白人父母不愿送子女去黑人多的学校，政府强制划区和采取轮流制度，造成不少社会问题。青少年吸毒率很高。教育中潜在的危机，如不解决，将成为一大问题。

总的说来，社会教育系统较为完善，教育经费大概仅次于军费。教育投资是社会进步和全面发展的最重要、最有价值和能得到最大回报的投资。现代化的社会不仅需要现代化的设备，而且需要能创造和掌握这种设备的人。人的现代化是现代化最重要的指标。人的现代化是一个系统的社会工程，必须从小做起。这个艰巨的、代代相继不能停止的工程由谁来做？由社会的教育系统来做。人的一大缺陷是上一代获得的文化知识和伦理道德不能遗传，下一代人必须重新获得。这是教育至关重要的生物学定论。

## 2.MIT

MIT，即著名的麻省理工学院（The Massachusetts Institute of Technology）。这是旧时的译法，按照现在的译法，应译为，“麻州工艺学院”。

麻省理工学院坐落在麻萨诸塞州的剑桥，在波士顿市旁边。美国政治学会主席路辛·派伊教授接待了我们。他是麻省理工学院政治学系的教授。听起来有点奇怪，理工学院里也有政治学系，正象海军学院有政治学系一样（见第九章第 5 节“美国海军学院”）。麻省理工学院的政治学系是非常强的，路辛·派伊是闻名的政治学者。顺便说一下，从很多场合可以发现，美国政治制度的发展与其政治学的发展是相辅相成的。

麻省理工学院是一所典型的美国式大学。该大学 1861 年成立，1865 年招生。二次世界大战中以及战后，学院得到迅速的发展，这段时期学院的研究结合战争的需要，发展较快。目前共有五个学院：农业与计划学院，人文与社会科学学院、工程学院、管理学院和科学学院。学院以理工科和自然科学为主，但也包罗所有的人文科学和社会科学学科。由于这些学科招生较少，其质量反而更高。麻省理工学院现在大约有一万名学生，其中 4,500 名为本科生，5,000 左右为研究生。学生中工程方面占 50%，科学占 20%。在这所学校里，竞争异常激烈，不是精英的学生进不了这所学校。

这所学校的预算是惊人的。接待我们的教授说，学校每年的预算在十亿美元左右，差不多相当于可口可乐公司一年的纯收入。参加接待的有一位教授是麻省理工学院国际问题研究中心的主任，他说了一番“穷话”：“我们中心每年的预算是很少的，很可怜，不能与学校的其他学院比，我们只有 200 万美元。”200 万美元还算少？这个概念与一个中国教授的概念相去甚远。当然与学院的总预算相比，中心的预算是少的。

美国的大学，尤其是名牌大学，的确富甲天下。也正因为如此，大学才发挥了传播现代化的重要功能。美国的现代化可以说是从它的几千所大学中孕育出来的。年轻一代首先在大学中领略现代化，学习现代化，最主要的是获得“现代化的意识”。一代人如果没有“现代化的意识”，那他们只能享受现代化，而不能创造现代化。大学有足够的经费，使大学成为现代化的实验室，每个进入大学的人，都象掉入了“现代化的染缸”。于是，从这里出去时，便已具备了不可磨灭的“现代化意识”。这就是高等教育的作用。

高等教育最重要的功能不在于培养出英才，而在于使每一代人（注意，一代人）都具备现代化意识。

这样庞大的开支如何支付呢？谁付钱呢？麻省理工学院是一所私立大学。大半经费来自于外部的赞助和捐赠。这就是我讲过的社会机制的作用。

之所以说麻省理工学院是一所典型的大学，是因为它反映了美国大学的特点。麻省理工学院的教授称自己的学院为“研究大学”（Research University）。何谓“研究大学”？他们解释说，欧洲的大学的传统注重传递知识，而美国的大学注重发现知识，这就是“研究大学”的基本涵义。麻省理工学院主要围绕着这个目标活动。整个学院以实验室为基轴组织起来，有一千多名教授，既教书又做研究，还有一千多人做辅助工作。

为了鼓励创新，他们认为教师与学生之间的关系是合伙人的关系，因此应当建立一种新的相互关系和新的工作方式，与学生共同发展。教育学生不应只重复过去的知识而应当迎接未来。这种精神，是美国精神这棵大树上的一颗果实。很难估计大学对美国的进步起到的作用有多大，因为太大了。大学在一代又一代的青年人中鼓励创新精神，并且尊重创新，实现创新。这是任何社会进步的主要动力。没有这种氛围，社会便难以进步。尤其是教育。

从事教育的人最容易产生的问题就是把教育视为教授自己已经知道而别人不知道的东西，这是很合理的逻辑。不过，人们还可以有更好的逻辑：鼓励发现教育者和被教育者都不知道的东西。可以说，这是人类进步的火车头。

麻省理工学院的教育应该说是成功的：波士顿地区有百分之七十的公司是这个学院的学生开创的，大多数是高技术公司。有四千多人在全球各国的大学中任教。世界各国的人们也慕名而来。在校园中散步时，可以看见绿色的草坪旁矗立着雄伟的建筑，从这些建筑中走出各种肤色的人。亚裔的学生异常之多。这就是知识的力量。麻省理工学院还制定了专门的非种族歧视政策：“麻萨诸塞理工学院接受任何种族、肤色、性别或民族的学生，他们享有学院学生普遍享有的权利、特权和计划。”这也是知识的力量。

麻省理工学院的影响不仅波及美国社会，而且波及整个世界。它不仅在传播知识，而且还在传播“美国精神”。没有高度发达的教育，一个民族不可能影响其他民族，不可能真正立于世界民族之林。教育不象工业、农业、商业，它不能给人们这些活动所能给予的东西，但它能提供任何其他力量无法提供的东西。

当然，美国的大学不是没有问题的，相反，大学问题成灾。但优秀学生仍然脱颖而出。有些教授对未来忧心忡忡。不过，在麻省理工学院这样的大学中，由于竞争激烈，次货上不了柜台。

### 3.肯尼迪政府学院

麻省理工学院前面有一条美丽的河——查尔斯河。傍晚，沿着这条河慢慢散步，看着周围甜甜蜜蜜的情侣，望着空中飞翔的鸟儿，有一种心旷神怡的感觉。与麻省理工学院共享查尔斯河的另一所大学是哈佛大学，也是世界著名的学府。我们访问了哈佛大学的约翰·肯尼迪政府学院。

肯尼迪政府学院有一座漂亮的现代化建筑。我们在这里受到一位教授的接待。他介绍说，政府学院与大学的政治学系有所不同，它有自己独特的办学目标和计划。它的主要目标是训练人员去公共部门任职，所以称政府学院。

这个学院接受了肯尼迪家族的一笔赠款，所以起名为肯尼迪政府学院。从学院的这个目标来看，它与政治生活的关系就非常密切了。因为它的主要目标是培养在公共部门任职的人，其学生将直接影响政府和制度活动。

肯尼迪政府学院把政府部门和新闻界以及其他一切领域视为公共部门，但不包括象私人企业这样的部门。学院也非一般的行政学院，因为一般的行政学院注重行政学理论和基本知识教育。肯尼迪政府学院注重公共政策的教育，注重培养通才而非专才，其课程也不那么注重理论，而是比较强调联系实际。

我询问了他们的学科与政治学有什么差别。这位教授解释说，政治学研究追求对一些行为的准确描绘，而学院讲究分析实际情况。他说他们已在努力区分两个概念：一个是公共行政（Public Administration），另一个是公共管理（Public Management）。公共行政研究怎样使人和组织更好地服从，而公共管理研究怎样创新，他们在培养学员时注重两个目标：

政策分析的能力，能够对公共领域中的问题做政策分析、计划评估、经济统计等；政治知识，了解政治制度和国际政治方面的一些知识。

他们的研究注重发现政治体制还有多少余地可以开发，这就需要学生有想法（Idea），有创造性、敏感性、想象力和综合能力。他的归纳是：目的具有政治性，预见具有科学性。

说大实话，这就是美国的干部学校。美国人有一个优点，把任何事情都当作是可以开发的领域。政治领域也是如此。把政治问题当成一种象粒子和天体活动一样的对象来研究，这种现象在美国最盛，恐怕连欧洲人都不能做到这么彻底。欧洲人的传统观念是把政治当艺术。美国人的观念是，政治可以是技术。象肯尼迪政府学院这样的学院有不少。其他许多大学的政治学系也在做这样的工作。由私立学校培养政府官员，恐怕也是世界上闻名的。这种对待政治的态度，把政治技术化，既带来了利处，也带来了弊端。但在公共政策人才的培养方面，也就是文官及政策设计人员的培养上，是有效果的。这就为社会制度的运行提供了牢固的基础。

美国是把行政技术化的国家。没有受过高等教育和专门培训，无法在政府中任职。另外，政治机制本身，也迫使政府解决日益错综复杂的社会问题，不然无法争得选票。因此对各种具体问题的研究越来越深入，越来越精密。这里面会产生两个重要的社会效果：

其一是为文官制度提供了素质较高的后备人员，这些人员经过严格的训练，掌握了专门的知识 and 必要的技能，能够为政治统治提供任何可能的服务，从而保障了政治统治的长治久安。

其二是使政府决策成为一门科学。因为政府官员有这样一个训练的背景，政府制定政策时自然就会依照这些标准，不依照这些标准，不仅不能为政府内部的各个部门所接受，同时也不能为社会所接受。政府的现有政策，每天都有成千上万的人在研究，其利弊昭然若揭。可能进入政府领域的人接受的是发现新政策领域的教育，这对促进政府决策又会起推动作用。



一个政府只要能制定出合理的政策，解决社会问题，就能生存下来。资本主义为何“垂而不死，腐而不朽”这个长期争论的问题，恐怕可以在这里找到某种解释。这就是政策有没有成为一种可以研究和开发的领域。

肯尼迪政府学院对自己的计划是充满信心的。人们可以从它的一项计划上看起来。它设有一项专门为发展中国家培养政府分析人才的计划。我们可以通过分析这项计划具体得知他们是怎样做的。这项计划叫爱德华·S·马松（Edward S·Mason）公共政策与管理计划。

他们认为：在现代社会中，每个国家都面临着前所未有的挑战，都必须管理疾速变迁的社会和经济。公共部门有着至关重要的作用。要适应这种变化，公共部门的官员就必须掌握政策分析、决策和政策执行的技能。这项计划就是专门培养发展中国家的高级官员的。计划每年从发展中国家招五十名左右。经过培养，使他们具有杰出的公共服务所具备的分析技能、管理才能和伦理精神。这三个指标都很重要。

参加者来自亚洲、非洲、拉丁美洲的国家，平均年龄 37 岁，都有 12 年的工作经验。课程包括英语、数学、微观经济学、经济学、计算机、企业与政府、犯罪、能源与环境、健康、住房与社会发展、人类资源、国际发展、国际安全、新闻、政治、公共政策、科技、运输、城市经济发展、农业、中央银行等课程。教学方法主要采取案例教育，政策领域分得很细。另外，还组织实地考察，邀请政界人物和学者来开讲座，并组织到国外去访问，如墨西哥、古巴、南朝鲜、埃及、摩洛哥、阿根廷等国家，开阔学生眼界。

可以看出，这个计划是相当不错的，不过，学费也高的吓人：每人 35,012 美元，不包括出国考察的经费。这个计划没有经费，所以经费由学生自己解决。不过，由于肯尼迪政府学院的声誉，它每年都能招到学生。学院也因此发了一笔小财。

美国的公共管理教育有不少问题。但是，由于其成功的方面也多，自然就有吸引力。这种吸引力有一大半不是来自公共部门的成功，而是来自经济的成功。人们有时总有些近视，认为经济成功可以代替一切。说是这样说，不过，公共部门的运作对其社会的作用不可忽视，同时，政策教育部门对公共部门运作的作用更不可忽视。

## 4.“人才工厂”

位于纽约州的 Syracuse University（锡拉求斯大学）的 Maxwell（麦克斯韦尔）学院，是首屈一指的培养公共行政官员的教育机构。它培养的学生进入联邦和州政府以及其他各级政府，成为政府中的行政要员。据说美国驻外大使中有 20 多位出自这所学院，前不久与齐亚·哈克总统共同遭遇空难的前驻巴基斯坦大使

也毕业于这所学院。在华盛顿，这个学院的校友更是成群结队。它的毕业生不仅遍及本土，而且遍及不少第三世界国家。

麦克斯韦尔（Maxwell）公民与公共事务学院建立于 1924 年，是美国第一所公共行政学院。主要目的在于教育和训练文官，至今已经有六十多年的历史。这个学院已经成为重要的人才工厂，不断向各政府机构输送人才。

学院是一个综合性的教育机构，包括人类学系、经济系、地理系、历史系、政治科学系、公共事务系和社会学系。学院在公共行政方面不招收本科生，主要是考虑到本科生缺乏一定的经验和阅历。因此，学院在这个计划上集中训练硕士生和在职生。博士生每年招六名左右，属于 Academic（学术性的），这些人一般不到政府部门做实际工作，而是到教育部门做工作。

MA（硕士学位）的学生主要是培养 Professional（职业性的）人才，进入政府部门。联邦政府和州政府经常派雇员到学院来深造。我在该学院与著名教授罗森布鲁姆交谈时，就有不少年纪较大的人来交作业。我开始对此疑惑不解，后来他解释说，这是联邦政府派来的学生，经过一年训练后，还要去政府部门工作。他开玩笑地说，对他们要客气一点，因为他们均来自于税收部门。

这类学院的功能在于向政策部门和其他机构提供高质量的人才，保证公共管理系统的高效运转。这些学院虽然是教育机构，但他们构成政治系统和行政系统的非正式部分，而且是不可缺少的部分。

我们可以看一下这个学院如何训练学生，力图给学生建立一种什么样的知识结构。学院给公共行政硕士生提供的主要课程如下：

计算机与公共部门的计算机化，主要是引导学生懂得计算机的基本知识，以及如何在公共行政部门中运用计算机，帮助学生实际操作计算机。

公共行政导论，引导学生认识公共行政的基本问题，公共行政所面临的基本问题，以及政策的分析方法。

组织理论，传授有关公共部门组织的知识，尤其是公共组织如何运转和变革，包括公共组织与私人组织的差别，有关组织的各种观念，个人决策和团体决策，组织设计和组织环境关系。

公共行政与民主，考察公共政策和行政在宪法民主环境中的地位和作用，通过法律理论考察行政价值观念（如效率、经济）与宪法价值观念（如平等、自由和必要程序）之间的关系，行政如何协调此两者之间的关系。

全国计划和管理能力，讨论治理的主要困难和长期规划的设定和执行。计划部门、预测表、思想库、跨国银行和公司、政治家、行政精英的作用。全国计划的社会和政治后果以及前提条件。

统计学，提供统计学的基本知识，包括描述统计学、趋势分析、数据分析、抽样、评价和假设预测。

研究与发展政策，提供涉及决策和发展的机构和角色的知识，考察这两方面的方法，包括创新、发明、技术转让、预算和税收政策等。

健康政策，讨论卫生领域中的一些基本政策问题，包括民间资助、改革、艾滋病、联邦对健康防护工业的管制等。

发展经济学，研究第三世界发展的主要问题，包括对发展的措施和理论的回顾。同时分析人口、就业、农业发展、工业化、教育、食品等基本问题。也分析第三世界发展与国际环境有关的课题，如贸易流向、投资、援助和财务。

公共行政的管理经济学，运用微观经济学对公共政策问题进行分析，用经济学观念分析复杂的政策问题。

公共科技发展，研究公共部门在科技发展中的作用，分析特殊的科技发展政策以及政府与工业的关系。

能源原则、问题和选择，研究能源政策以及其他与能源政策有关的课题。

公共管理人员计算机应用，研究如何在大型公共部门中运用计算机处理资料，进行设计，建立组织系统和信息系统。

公共人事与集体协商，讨论文官制度改革，公共部门的增长和衰落，报酬、考绩、平等就业机会，有关公共人事的法律等。

公共财政，分析公共财政，从预算、财政准备、财政评估、适应性，到执行等。财政分析还包括预算的经济属性，政府间税收关系，会计、财政改革等课题。

政府与大众传播媒介，分析政府、报刊、电视和文化精英之间的权力关系和依赖关系，民主社会中信息和文化政策的冲突，以及政府对新闻、传播、艺术、娱乐和闲暇活动的政策。

国防政策，军事、经济和文化，分析国防问题的军事、经济、政治和文化特征。

公共政策分析的量性方法，讨论公共政策分析中的几种定量模式，如成本——效益分析，线性规划理论和决策理论等。

公共管理和政策制定，讨论政策制定的理论、实践和技术，包括组织设计、政府改革、组织沟通、信息管理、组织评估、领导艺术、规划管理等。

健康服务管理，讨论医疗管理，医疗组织等问题。

公共行政的边际经济学，应用微观经济学分析公共政策问题，如供应与需求、公司行为、市场平衡等问题。

发展行政，考察过去 25 年中管理发展计划的经验和教训，分析参与发展计划和行政的角色，发展计划的实施，评估技术等课题。

公共人事管理，分析公共人事系统的基本特征以及这个系统在其中运行的环境，公共人事的基本程序，公共人事管理者的角色和功能。

发展中国家地方政府的财政，讨论地方政府的功能、作用，对地方政府的需求，地方政府的财政来源，上级政府对地方政府的作用。

组织发展，分析组织和组织中人的行为模式，包括组织的结构和过程、组织发展和行为、个人、团体的行为动力、组织问题的发现、适当的组织干预、管理战略、增加组织效益的技术。

以上是公共行政硕士课程的一部分。在硕士生阶段，授课形式大多采用讨论式。要求学生在参加讨论之前，先阅读大量的材料，促使学生尽量全面地掌握这个领域中的有关知识和现有的研究成果。我们可以举“全国计划与管理能力”一门课为例，这门课要求学生读的书包括：

Lodge 和 Vogel 著：《意识形态和民族的竞争性》

《2000 年的全球报告及其批评》

Reich 著：《公共观念的力量》

Ascher 著：《预见》

Deyons 著：《实用计划》

Hayek 著：《通向奴役的道路》

Hirsh 著：《增长的社会局限》

Palmer 著：《里根年代的特征》

Pahrendorf 著：《现代民主的治理》

Page 著：《保讨与经济效益》

Baumal 著：《生产力的增长》

Grieco 著：《依赖与自主之间》

Wildavsky 著：《寻求安全》

Tussman 著：《政府与精神》

Auletta 著：《低层阶级》

Urban 著《与乔治·凯南对话》

Dahl 著：《控制核武器》

一门课要学生读上述书，各门课加起来，学生在训练过程中要接受较为广泛和齐备的专业训练。严格的训练保证了学生的质量。这是麦克斯韦尔学院公共行政计划之所以成功的关键，也是他们训练的学生能够在政府部门大显身手的原因之一。

一个社会的管理水平如何，与其政府官员的水平如何密切相关。如果政府官员素质差、能力低，一个高效能的政府管理系统是不可能形成的，它不具备先决条件。反之，有了受过严格训练的官员队伍，高效率的公共管理就有了基础。公共管理与它的文官制度分不开。文官制度又与政府人才培养分不开，因为文官制度的目的并不是招收社会上最好的人，而是吸收社会上最有政府管理才能的人。单有文官考试，并不能保证政府的高效率，没有人生来就具备政府管理的才能。严格的教育训练是培养这类人才的必由之路。培养专门的政府人才，直接关系到政治与行政系统的质量，从而在相当大的程度上影响着社会政治经济的全面发展。所以我说，专门培养政府人才的教育机构是政府系统的非正式部分。

从对公共行政人员的训练来看，麦克斯韦尔的课程均较职业化，集中在公共行政操作的一面。公共行政讲究对社会事务的具体管理。在现代社会中，政府要承担五花八门的职责，从经济、文化、教育、交通、科技发展、外贸到生老病死、环境保护等，这要求公共行政人员拥有一个领域的专门知识和技能。过于理论化和学术性的训练无助于职业行政人员。职业行政人员需要可用、可行和可操作的知识 and 技能。公共行政教育不走这个方向，也难以真正对社会发展起作用。

## 5.美国海军学院

美国海军学院（U·S Navy Academy）坐落在离华盛顿不远的安娜波里斯市。从华盛顿驱车来到这里只需一个小时左右。安娜波里斯市也是马里兰州州政府和州议会所在地。州议会所在的建筑是州议会所使用的建筑中最古老的一座。当年华盛顿将军就往这里脱下军装，成为文职总统。那个房间至今仍保存原样，供人们参观。这个故事给人许多启示，不过，这里我只想谈谈由参观海军院而引出的想法。

访问计划的一个项目是与海军学院的政治学教授共进午餐，这使我们都感到吃惊，海军学院有一个专门的政治学系？果然不错。政治学系与一般大学的政治学系一样，有本科生和研究生，有完整的政治学系课程。我不知道西点军校和美国空军学院有没有政治学系。坐在旁边的教授告诉我，海军学院政治学系大约有四五百名学生，教授都是文职的，与其他大学的教授一样。我感到奇怪，海军学院政治学系的毕业生干什么？他答道：“到美国海军服役，当军官。另外，海军学院的训练不仅要考虑学生最近的将来的职业，还要考虑他们离开军队之后的需要。因而许多学生选政治学系的课程。”在不少国家中，军事学院有政治课，但没有政治学系，美国军事院校注重对学生进行政治学教育，是政治社会化很重要的部分。

在不少国家，政治不稳定的原因在军队。尤其是非洲、拉丁美洲的国家中，军人干政习以为常。美国军事院校传播美国政治的基本原则和基本精神，其社会功能不可低估。在美国，恐怕没有人接受军人干政，也没有军人能这样做。当然，说没有人这样想，那就太主观了。但问题是，想入非非的人无法付诸行动。在军人中传播一个社会的基本原则，是社会政治发展的一个战略措施。对民主政治发展来说也一样。在发展中国家，首先应在军人中传播民主观念。连美国这样一个发达国家也少不了这一环，何况其他？

美国海军学院号称世界上第一所海军学院，号称有世界上最大的学生宿舍。美国海军之父就葬在这所学院的教堂下面。海军学院临海，远处呈现出蔚蓝色的广阔图景。我问一位在政治学系教书的女教授：“美国青年愿不愿意到这里来？”她说：“很多人申请，每年有几万人申请，只能招一千多人，所以学生质量很高，连女孩子都愿意嫁给他们。”海军学院的学员须穿制服，我们看见学员们一身雪白的衣服，戴着白帽子，头发理得很短，胡须刮得溜光，显得十分精神。小伙子一个个都精神抖擞，大概是精心选择的结果。学院的院长是一位海军中将。学院的领导属军事系统，学院的教学属文职系统，分得十分清楚。这大概也可算是一个特色。

下午正逢美国海军学院的橄榄球队与另一个大学的队交战。主人邀请我们去，从命。

橄榄球是美国的国球，在美国谈话，不会谈橄榄球，大多数场合会话不投机。这当然有些夸大。进入体育场，只见人山人海，一片沸腾。对面看台上坐的是对方的观众和啦啦队，还有一支乐队。这面坐的是海军学院的学生，一片雪白。下面还有一千五百名新生。开始比赛之前，乐队演奏国歌，全场起立，有许多人高唱。然后出来两个人讲话。讲的内容是海军的光荣，说应当世代铭记为海军事业作出贡献的人，他举了六位在越南战场上丧生的海军军官的名字。全场起立，礼炮响了六响。每响一次，看台下方就用布幅展现那六个人的名字，全场默哀。越南战争已经过去多年，他们还念念不忘。在重大场合，都要纪念他们。其目的在于鼓励荣誉感。

接下来，比赛正式开始，双方的啦啦队大吵大闹，海军学院的一年级学生在草坪上排成长队，夹道欢迎自己的队员，比赛场上，双方队员你争我夺，十分激烈。我看橄榄球很简单，没有什么细腻的战术，主要是靠力量和速度。能否抓住和撞倒对方是关键。因此双方的队员都是五大三粗，横冲直撞。但据精通此球的人士说，橄榄球的战术运用大有讲究。

看了比赛之后，有三点印象特别深刻：

其一是美国人注重荣誉。双方观众都极为看重是否得分。如果海军学院的队得了分，学院的学生们就会热烈鼓掌并喝彩。坐在下面的一年级学生就会跑到场子周围去做俯卧撑，估计有几百人，表示高兴得无法发泄。对方队赢了球，对方看台

上会有一片喝彩声，乐队就会演奏一段曲子。双方的啦啦队也不断鼓动，渗透着一种浓烈的荣誉感。

其二是美国人讲究实力。橄榄球有战术，但严格地讲，没有非常精巧的战术，主要是靠力量。世界上大概没有一种运动的上场人数与队员数比例高于橄榄球。橄榄球是硬打硬冲，达到底线为胜。这体现了美国精神，用实力快速达到目的。美国人在军事、政治、经济等许多领域，都本着这种精神。

其三是美国人十分直率。得出这个印象是在球场休息的时候。休息时，对方大学的乐队上场演奏，开始海军学院的学生不以为然，还起哄了两次。后来对方乐队的指挥说，要专门为海军演奏一支曲子，以表示他们对海军的敬意。他们演奏了一支雄壮的曲子，大概是海军军歌之类的。海军学院这边的看台上全体起立，对方看台上的观众也全体起立，场面很感人。演奏完毕，双方热烈鼓掌、呼喊。刚才还是剑拔弩张，一下子变得融洽热忱。

海军学院是一所军事院校，但我们可以看到，它十分注重使政治精神能够得到传播。同时，它注重在各项活动中培养年轻一代的荣誉感，其实是使学生接受早已形成的“民族精神”的熏陶。他们没有把军事院校当成单纯的军事技术院校，只做军事技术训练，而首先把它的教育目的确定为培养合格的公民。从此可以看出，年轻一代不论进入哪类学校，普通大学也好，军事院校也好，都得接受美国精神的洗礼。这个教育目的是第一位的，其他目的都是次要的。由此观之，就不难理解美国如何再生产自己的制度。

## 6.教育出口

有时候，人们常常会提出一个问题：为什么当今世界有那么多人想移居美国，尤其是发展中国家的人？在美国各地行走，常常可以碰到异国他乡来的人，在一起讨论如何取得绿卡，如何移民。这门活动而成了一门行当，而且是一门赚钱的行当。报纸上常常有这样的广告：“本律师事务所专办绿卡，得不到绿卡，全部退款。”

在不少国家，美国文化，更精确地讲是美国的生活方式（因为不少人认为难以确定美国文化是什么），有着强大的影响。生活方式是一个综合的概念，它不仅指人们在衣食住行、生活习惯方面的定势，而且包括经济行为、管理方式和政治价值等等。人们靠什么来传播一个社会的主导生活方式？古往今来，可以列出多种方式，如军事征服，罗马帝国征服行省，法西斯征服邻国；再如政治关系，如宗主国于殖民地的关系；经济一体化，当今世界体系的形成，国际贸易和金融等关系的大规模交流；教育渗透，如希腊化时代和中世纪的神学化时代。等等。在这些方式中，军事征服是一种强制，政治关系是一种权力，它们都难以保证一种价值观念深入人心，它们可以强制推行一套观念，但不能使人们真正心悦诚服地接受他们，遵守它们。

在当今世界，起主导作用的是后两种力量。一种是经济力量。经济力量的发展向人展现了人的本性中最基本的追求，人们易于接受。美国战后经济的发展成为其生活方式传播的主要媒介。二是教育力量。教育是一种神奇的力量，它潜移默化地向人们传播一个社会的主导信念。在一个社会内部是这样，在一个社会与外部社会的关系上也是这样。

在大学校园中，外国留生成群结队。外国留学生之多，在世界各国名列前茅。教育，成为美国生活方式传播到世界各地的宽大渠道。所以在回答开始的那个问题时，首先要思考美国是怎样影响其他社会，美国怎样向外国传播他们的观念。

在美国求学的不少学生，是得到各种机构的资助而来的。社会存在各种各样的机构，其目的就是鼓励和帮助其他国家的人来美国接受教育。在这方面的投资，也是很少有哪个国家可以与美国相比的。但这些机构在传播美国的生活方式，维持美国的国际地位上所起的作用，是第七舰队和航天飞机所起不到的。

我们来看一下美国最大的非赢利性的国际教育机构：国际教育协会（The Institute of International Education）。这个协会建于 1919 年，主要目的是帮助外国人来美国接受教育，其主要活动内容有：

管理奖学金、资助金和补助，使人们能在自己的国家以外学习，进行研究和接受训练；

组织国际研究方面的项目，并发表研究报告、成果和指南等；

通过在纽约、亚特兰大、芝加哥、丹佛、旧金山、华盛顿、中国、香港、印度尼西亚、墨西哥和泰国等地的办公室提供有关国际研究的信息；

组织关于国际教育问题和发展的报告会和讨论会；

向世界各农业和健康中心提供资金和人员服务。

这是它的主要活动方面。这个组织拥有雄厚的资金，1986 年财政开支为 1 亿多美元。1987 年它属下有 247 个计划，提供经费的有 145 个单位，其中有政府、双边机构、国际组织、基金会、大学和公司。它的各类计划涉及 152 个国家和地区。从训练人才的角度看，它向大约一万人提供便利。这个数目相当于一所中等大学的全部学生。这一万人中，有 5,000 名是在美国读学位的外国学生；2,700 名外国学生在接受非学位计划的训练，或参与职业训练计划，除 200 人外，绝大部分在美国；有 1,200 人来自各国的助教在各种国际中心工作；800 名各国的杰出人物做访问学者。它还资助学校的出版、研究、讨论会、报告会、专业建设等项目，有 562 所高等学校接受过它的资助。如此等等。

由以上数字可以感觉到，仅这样一个机构，就在国际性的教育输出中起这样大的作用，再加之其他的机构，美国的教育输出会构成一种何等巨大的能量。国际教育协会的相当大的一笔资金来自福布赖特（Fulbright）计划。福布赖特计划为政府设立的基金。由此可见，促进教育输出不仅仅是一个教育组织的观念和计划，



而且也是政府的观念和计划。从政治发展的长远战略思之，这是一种具备战略眼光的选择，无论从国内政治看还是从国际政治看。教育输出可能获得的好处，要远远超过经济领域中的一切既得利益。

国际教育协会的具体计划为数众多，其中主要的有福布赖特研究生奖学金，该计划专门向外国学生提供资助；拉丁美洲和加勒比海地区奖学金，主要向拉美国家提供资金；还有非洲学生奖学金，亚洲学生奖学金，欧洲学生奖学金等。与中国有关的有“美中国际关系研究委员会”（Committee on International Relations Studies with the People's Republic of China），由福特基金会、洛克菲勒基金会、麦克阿瑟基金会等出资。1986 年该委员会资助了二十六名中国学生和七位访问学者。协会的活动范围包罗万象，如艺术、音乐、科技、建筑、企业管理、人权、农业、自然资源等。通过这门类杂多的活动，来自异国他乡的学生自然而然地接受美国主导的生活方式。同时也接受核心价值观念。教育输出，影响着相当大层面的人的思想方式、感情取向、心理定式、价值选择和行为准则。在这里受过高等教育的人中，不少人构成所在国的精英阶层，在该国的政治、经济、文化、教育、科技和艺术等领域或多或少起着有些关键的作用。教育输出的基本功能有两个，一是知识传播，二是感情投资。后者是任何国家都不可低估的政治资本。

从政治管理上来说，这种政治资本有两个方面的功能。在国内政治方面，任何政治和行政系统，压力越小，越容易施展身手。政治系统的压力可以来自内部，也可以来自外部。如果外部力量认可并且赞同一种政治系统的活动和选择，那么政治系统所遇到的压力就将大大减少。外部的肯定力量也将抵消内部的否定力量。如果一个政治系统遇到外部强大的反对或不理解，它的内部压力也将上升，政治系统就将遇到麻烦。

在国外政治方面，教育出口创造了一项其他力量无法提供的条件，这就是增进了国外对本国外交政策的理解，这是一国的外部政治活动成功的不可多得的气氛。外部政治活动的成功，往往不在于政策本身是否合理，而在于它是否被理解和被接受，在于它有没有遇到合适的国际舆论。不少国家外交政策的失败，不在于政策本身，而在于没有合适的文化氛围。

教育出口的作用就在这里：它为一个国家的政治扩大了理解的范围。接受了一个国家的生活方式和核心价值，就是形成了用它们进行评价和思考问题的标准。从长远政治发展来看，这方面的投资最有价值。

## 7.科技之炉

芝加哥是美国的特大城市之一。我随朋友一起驱车去芝加哥，用了五个小时。从 80 号高速公路转 55 号高速公路直达芝加哥。55 号公路横穿芝加哥市区。在繁忙的高速公路上，跻身于高速急驶的车队之中，象在纽约一样，令人感到一种现

代化特有的节奏，中国人普遍有这样一种感觉，第一次上高速公路，均有一种莫名其妙的紧张感。

中国人和许多发展中国家的人习惯于慢节奏的生活，突然置身于快节奏中，会有一种心理和文化上的不适应，甚至会有生理上的不适应。我称之为“现代化紧张反应”。但在美国要行动，不能不上高速公路，这种强制的交通速度使人很快消除了“现代化紧张反应”。试想一下，没有这种强制，会是什么样的结果呢？

一个民族，作为整体，在现代化过程中是否会有“现代化紧张反应”，有了又会有什么样的后果，怎样来消除一个民族的“现代化紧张反应”，这是发展中国家面临的一个问题。

我们先参观了海洋博物馆。里面象一个海洋世界，有千奇百怪的鱼类和海洋生物。人们在这里可以了解较为完整的海洋生物知识。然后去参观 Field Museum of National History，实际上是一个自然博物馆加历史博物馆，这样的组合在博物馆中尚不多见。一方面有成千上万的动植物标本，另一方面陈列着美国历史和一些外国历史的文物。这个馆陈列的印第安人的文物和历史是较为全面的。大厅里还矗立着几个巨大的图腾柱，大约是南美什么土著的崇拜物。甚至还陈列了中国清朝的一些东西，但为数不多。从自然和社会博物馆的角度讲，可能是世界第一流的。

令人最感兴趣的还不是以上两个地方，而是科学和工业博物馆（Museum of Science and Industry）。这是一座占地面积很大，陈列物品惊人，但免费参观的博物馆。一进大厅，就可以看到儿童和少年多于成年人，这是完全符合这个馆的建馆目标的。其目的就在于使青年一代在科技之炉中冶炼出科技精神和科技兴趣。

这个馆是芝加哥最吸引人的旅游点之一，每年大约有四百万人前来参观。这个馆共有七十五个展览厅，二千多个展览系列，它通过这些系统的展出向观众表明科学原则、技术进步和工业应用。这个馆与其他馆不同，它的设计有了项特殊原则，就是让观众参与。观众可以按电钮、推动杠杆等，从而参与展出，并获得难忘的经历，尤其是对少年儿童来说。有时候，一按电钮，就有人在电话里说话，有时候，一按电钮，就有电视节目；有时候可以操作机床；有时候可以走进巨大的心脏模型中去了解心脏的构造；有时候可以坐进汽车驾驶模拟器去驾驶汽车；有时候又可以走进地下去了解地壳构造。如此等等。这个博物馆由居里尤斯·罗森沃德（Julius Rosenwald）创建，1933 年开馆。坐落在美丽的杰克逊湖畔。每天吸引了成千上万的人来到这里。

下面简单罗列一下有关的展览项目，以便把握这座“科技之炉”。这里的展览系列包括：各个时代的飞机、旧时的打字机、新闻、电话电报、农业机械、城市建设、电脑、石油、地层、视听、基础科学、工业、汽车、化学、电影、医疗、自行车、邮电、电能、食品、照相、货币、能源、图书馆、生物、人体科学、铁路、海洋、太阳能等。应有尽有。从古代科学和技术的初步发展，到现代科学技术的最新成

就，航天飞机、电脑等，似乎无一遗漏。展览馆还展出了美军在第二次世界大战中缴获的德国潜水艇 U-505。进入这座展览馆，就象进入了科学的殿堂，令人眼花缭乱。这是座真正的“科学之炉”。孩子们由家长带着来到这里，如鱼得水，留连忘返。他们的兴趣被展览馆中各种光能和电能的应用充分调动起来。这些深刻的印象在他们幼小的心灵中将产生何种影响，不难想象。

社会很注重发展整个社会发展和进步所需要的科学和技术。社会发展和进步要想得以顺利实现，首要的就是使年轻一代茁壮成长起来。在这方面，整个社会都不惜花钱，从小学到高中，青少年的学习条件十分优越，故有人称美国是“儿童的天堂”。这套机制是社会持续发展和繁荣的不可忽视的因素，值得研究。在不少社会中，人们的注意力不在人生的早期阶段，而在中期和后期阶段。从个人的生活舒适来说，这是合适的。但对整个社会的进步来说，这是否太迟了呢？

美国虽然是个商品社会，是个金钱至上的社会，然而，在科学和技术教育方面，他们深深懂得怎样花钱才能获得最大的收益。科学和工业博物馆就是一个实例。不少博物馆都是收费的，但科学和工业博物馆是免费的，每天开放，而且博物馆前面巨大的停车场也是免费的。教育也具有这种特征，尽管大学教育所需要的学费是惊人的，但高中以下的教育是免费的。不少地方的人把博物馆也视为一个具有教育功能的机构。在一些非商品化的社会中，各种活动已在走向用金钱标准来计算，而在美国这样一个典型的金钱化的社会中，人们却努力保持一些具有基本教育功能的领域的非商品化，这不仅是一种选择，而且是商品经济下不得不为之的一种政策，要不然这些活动就会被商品经济排挤掉，这一点值得走向商品经济的社会注意。

傍晚时分，登上世界最高的建筑——西尔斯大厦（Sears Tower），遥望远处碧波万顷的湖水，俯瞰近处高低交错的楼宇，更能体会到科学技术创造奇迹的力量。社会的进步需要年轻一代的创新；年轻一代的创新需要他们对已有进步的充分了解，只有这样，他们才能在这个基础上更上一层楼。一个人如果对前人的创造一窍不通，如何能百尺竿头，更进一步呢？如果设计者和建造者从不知道楼为何物，如何能大胆设计呢？正因为有了次高，才有最高，这是一个简单的道理。

社会的一切现代化成就都应充分开放，使社会为宏大的科技之炉，冶炼现代化精神。在一个把现代化成就封闭起来的社会中，最终封闭的是人的精神。

现代化的传递过程，以及教育的功能，在两个层次上再生产一种制度。教育提供了对该制度的价值合理性的认同，科技的传播提供了物质基础。教育和科技虽不直接生产物质产品，但却可以创造未来。

# 十、活跃的智慧

## 1.思想工厂

思想工厂是我自己造的词组，实际上就是通常所说的“思想库”（Think Tanks）。在美国，形形色色的思想库之多，为一大特色。从某种意义上说，美国人乐意将思想本身视为一种产品，论质取货。纵观现代社会的发展，思想库在其中推波助澜，作用非凡。由此想到思想库对社会有无比的重要性，尤其是对社会的传承和革新而言。

在旧金山，去了斯坦福大学，著名的胡佛研究所就在斯坦福大学里，虽然它不是斯坦福大学的一个组成部分。斯坦福大学的建筑带有浓郁的西班牙风格，这和这块土地的历史有关。不过，胡佛研究所没有这种风味。胡佛研究所以其保守观念而闻名。不少教授戏称它为“反动”。里根当政思想的思想基础不少来自胡佛研究所。当然，胡佛研究所也不乏大家，如有名的政治学者李普塞就加盟他们。

胡佛研究所成立于 1919 年。二十年代的资料基础是苏联政府提供的资料，当时胡佛总统向苏联提供援助，苏联无钱支付，美国便要苏联以各种资料互换。不知这个故事的真假。如果是真，倒是很有远见的做法。二次世界大战胜利后，从日本弄来大批资料。后又从中国弄来大批资料。这方面的资料胡佛研究所收存得比较全。在这些资料的基础上，胡佛研究所逐渐发展起来。

加利福尼亚大学伯克莱分校，是最好的大学之一，与古老的哈佛大学不相上下。在伯克莱参观了政府研究所。所长波斯比（Polsby），也是有名的政治学者。他说他的想法是把政府研究所办成一个对全国政策有影响的机构。政府研究所过去主要研究加利福尼亚州政府的问题，今后要向全国发展。这意味着走向一个全国性的思想库。

看了这些思想库，深感它们对美国社会发展有不可低估的作用。想起布鲁金斯学会肯特·威佛（R. Kent Weaver）的一篇文章：“变化中的思想库世界。”这篇文章对思想库的发展有一概览，不妨细看。

对于思想库的定义，众说纷纭，没有定论。一般来说思想库是非赢利性的、独立的机构。也有人开玩笑，如有个叫彼得·凯利（Peter Kelley）的就说：“思想库是这样一种安排，自愿的公司、政府或古怪的巨富拿出几百万美元，支持那些花大部分时间争取把自己的名字变成铅印的人。”（我在翻译时用中国人的习惯，“铅印”在中国人眼里是正式出版，其实在美国正式、非正式都可以铅印）。一般来说，思想库还有两个特点：一是“没有学生的大学”；二是非赢利的政府研究承担者。在美国，思想库“爆炸”。1988 年，华盛顿 D.C. 电话本上列了 124 个“研究所”，还有一些闻名遐迩的思想库不包括在内。

思想库的作用。思想库究竟起什么作用，也是一个可以争论的问题。广言之，思想库的作用有：（1）政策思想的来源。思想库的一项重要任务就是发现和传播短期内不会成为政策的思想，使决策者逐渐接受这些思想。（2）政策提议的源泉和评价者。思想库一般注重推进和评估特殊的政策提议，评价的方法就是发表专著或文章。所以各个思想库都非常注重发表著作。著作是没有学生的大学的主要成果。有些研究机构也为国会立法准备材料。（3）政府计划的评估者。对于政府正在实施的计划，思想库也常常加以评估，以视这些计划能否有效地运转，能否切实有效地达到目标。（4）人员的来源。思想库还可以向政府提供人员和专家，思想库中的成员往往成为政府某个部门的行政者，因为他长期研究这个问题，有比较全面的知识。

思想库的管理。思想库的管理包括很多方面。（1）形象，思想库传统上保持无党派的研究机构的形象，研究问题，提出结论，而不是为已经存在的结论作辩护。但是，这并不意味着思想库没有意识形态的色彩，布鲁金斯学会就常常被视作自由的民主党的思想库，美国研究所（AEI）常常被视为保守的共和党的思想库。不过也不尽然，这两个机构之间有许多“人才流动”。布鲁金斯学会的现任主席也力图将学会的形象造成中立的。不过有的思想库直言不讳，如美国遗产基金会的一位干部说：“我们是保守主义革命的思想突击队。”（2）成员管理。成员管理包括几个方面的问题：一是决定设立专门人员还是委托外面的学者加以研究，两者各有利弊。二是如何使研究人员学会研究政策问题，因为政策问题与学术课题的研究有所不同。受大学严格训练的人，可能较善于研究学术课题，而不善于研究政策课题，因而应加以推进。在人选方面也有问题，是选受过大学精深教育的人，还是选有丰富实践经验的人。自然也是各有利弊。（3）财政。思想库虽然是非赢利性的，但其财政问题尤为重要，没有财源，不会理财，思想库便不能继续。

（4）设定日程。思想库的活动需要组织和安排，不是一盘散沙，因此如何设定日程便是管理中的一个重要问题。究竟选择什么样的政策领域，一个还是两个，或者是都有涉及，怎样建立各种课题之间的关系。等等。（5）成果管理，包括推进出版，扩大影响等方面。

思想库有意无意地起到一种“社会医师”的作用。它们不断寻找和发现社会上存在的问题，提出解决问题的方案，这也是思想库要生存下去和获得资助不可缺少的条件。要获得资助，就得别出心裁或自出机杼。这种机制推动它们去寻找政策问题。很多政策问题便是在这样的机制下寻找出来的。

然而，不管出自什么动力，它们找到了政策问题，就可以使社会存在的问题得到研究。它们的研究成果如果变为政府政策，则会促进社会改进。也许大多数思想库本身就有维持现存政治制度的明确概念，但它们的所作所为恰恰有此效应。

思想库这类“社会医师”，诊断社会，发现病状，寻找原则，预计后果，开设药方。其社会功能不言自明。美国的思想库大多在本世纪二、三十年代发展起来，战后大成气候。这个时期也是美国资本主义社会内部矛盾缓和，经济高度发展的时期。这两者之间没有什么联系吗？恐怕不能简单肯定，也不能简单否定。

最后，我总觉得思想库的译法不好，虽然英文是这个意思。“库”总有些存放东西的意思，思想库不仅存放，而且生产，故用思想工厂。在思想工厂中，充满着活跃的智慧。

## 2. 布鲁金斯学会

布鲁金斯学会（The Brookings Institution）坐落在一幢古典风格的建筑中。早就知道布鲁金斯学会是美国最重要的思想库之一，与兰德公司、胡佛研究所等齐名。布鲁金斯学会成立于 1927 年，由几个研究所合并而成。一个是政府研究所，建立于 1916 年，是第一个全国性的研究公共政策问题的私人机构；二是 1922 年建立的经济学研究所；三是 1924 年建立的罗伯特·布鲁金斯经济与政府研究院，这是较早实验培养公职人员的机构。

新组成的机构以罗伯特·索默斯·布鲁金斯（1850-1932）的名字命名。他是圣路易的一位企业家。布鲁金斯学会是一个私人的、非赢利的组织，财政来源靠一些基金会、公司和个人，另外还有赠款、讨论会报名费、出版物销售费、计算机使用费等。基金会也接受政府的合同研究一些问题，但保留发表权。有一个董事会控制学会活动，保证学会的独立性。董事会主席是主要的行政者，负责提出和协调政策、提出计划，选择人员，负责与政府官员、国会成员、企业界领袖、基金会官员和其他学者进行讨论。

研究课题根据以下几点选择：重要性、时效性、信息来源、调查手段、人员与基金的可能性、计划与布鲁金斯目标的关系。布鲁金斯学会要求每一项研究都必须是学术性的，适于公开发表。布鲁金斯学会本身声称没有政策立场。

布鲁金斯学会的目的是什么呢？那就是印在他们 1987 年年度报告扉页上的罗伯特·布鲁金斯的名言：“如果我们能激发人们去思考这些法律、政府、经济和社会关系的问题，我们对人类做的贡献就将大于任何慈善行为。”布鲁金斯学会主要研究公共政策问题，大体上可分为三类：精确地完整地确定政策问题；使公众注意正在出现的问题；和研究进去政策的成败，温故知新。任何研究都要讲究事实确定，意见有价值，提出的政策是现实的。

我们在布鲁金斯学会与计划主任詹姆斯·D·卡罗尔（James D·Carroll）讨论科学研究与政策制定的关系。他说布鲁金斯学会不注重是否马上影响了决策，也不注重立竿见影的问题，这些应由政府中的专家来研究。布鲁金斯学会注重长期研究，注重对社会发展趋向的研究，尤其注重研究的教育效果，使整个社会对某项发展充分重视，都来分析，这是未来制定合理政策的基础。卡罗尔说，许多成果现在没有用，但有一天人们会想到要用它，这时候布鲁金斯学会已经提供了它们。

重视长期研究和社会总体研究是布鲁金斯学会成功的值得重视的条件。如果都一拥而上研究政府现在想做的事，恐怕一不利于科学研究，二不利于社会发展。

布鲁金斯学会的研究计划分为几个部分：

经济研究，专门研究美国经济发展中的问题，如怎样提高生产率，如何储蓄增加并投入生产，美国怎样与其他国家在货币和税收方面进行合作，世界市场怎样向自由贸易开放，第三世界的发展如何得到保障，公共服务的质量如何得到提高（如卫生、教育等等），以保证美国处于世界前列；

外交政策研究，研究当今世界的变革，各国的国际化，各国的经济发展，科技、投资转移、跨国债务、国际竞争等，特别列出中国加入世界经济体系这一事实。布鲁金斯学会认为，这些发展要求美国提出新的目标和进行大幅度调整。在这方面，布鲁金斯学会享有名声，我们见了哈里·哈定，四十岁左右，为美国年轻一代中国问题专家，有一本新书叫《中国的第二次革命》，专讲中国的改革，为人们理解中国发生的变化提供了系统的知识背景。这方面的研究覆盖面较广，包括苏联、中国、日本、中东等地；

政府研究，专门研究政府体制与紧迫的社会问题的关系。美国宪法有两百年的历史，两百年中，政治制度大致未变，但社会在日新月异的发展。政府研究主要解决这个问题。主要包括政府效率、政府结构、政府功能、选举法律、总统提名程序、总统与国会关系等问题。

另外，中心还有一个计算机中心，处理和收集数据。有一个公共政策教育中心，专门举行各种讨论会，邀请公共和私人部门的领袖来讨论问题。1987 财政年度，有三千高级人士参加了中心的活动，讨论各类问题，从美国航空计划、电子工业到国际恐怖主义。

最后这一点也是美国社会的一个特点。政府官员或私人部门的高级人士，都愿意参加公众活动，发表演说。这成为一种风尚，也许与政治制度的特性有关，政治制度往往逼得政府官员亮相，不亮相做不长，政府官员也乐于解释自己的政策，这是一种不可多得的沟通，建立了理解政策的基础。政策往往是不被理解的，因为每个人都有自己特殊的生活环境和问题。一项政策要想行之有效，必须被理解。在这方面，美国人实惠，象做生意一样，提供最详细的说明书。而不少社会的政治精神不是如此，而是回避解释。这在一定条件下也是一种政治艺术。

布鲁金斯学会的另一项活动就是组织出版学术著作和刊物。它出版一份刊物，叫《布鲁金斯评论》。另外，每年出版很多著作，1987 年财政年度，出版了二十九本书，六本论文集。布鲁金斯发表的学术著作品质颇高，有点阳春白雪。1987 年，有三本被《Choice》杂志评为“1986-1987 杰出学术著作”，还有其他的图书奖也常常落到这些著作头上。我们在那里会见了几位学者，都撰写了几本学术专著。在这里，写书是学者们的主要活动。

思想库的发展是美国社会在二十世纪令人瞩目的现象之一。可以说，西方国家中，思想库最发达的要算美国。美国人的基本精神是把思想变成一种对象，可以不断地改进、完善，以供人们选择。这是实用主义和商业精神甚嚣尘上的结果。在欧洲社会中，人们的文化观念说到底还是认为，思想有主观倾向，不是可任意选择

的，也不可任意修正。思想库的发展，十九世纪法国的历史学家，以研究美国政治出名的托克维尔没有见识过。而认识今天的美国社会的政治，必须认识这一点。商业精神最讲究货比货。在思想库中也一样，各思想库也是相互竞争。由于美国政党的意识形态相同（当然这句话需要加以限定：首先，这是指民主、共和两大政党，不是指美国所有的政党，如美共等。其次，这仅是指民主、共和党在不搞社会主义或共产主义这一点上意识形态是相同的，除此之外，两大政党的信仰和价值观念差异颇大），大家面临的都是怎样应付危机和矛盾，所以乐于择优而取。这样一种机制，对促进政府行为的合理化自然有利。虽然思想库的结论有时激烈反对现行政策，但总体上都构成这个体制的稳定器。

### 3.卡特中心

战后有一个传统，每届总统离任之后，都要建立一个以这位总统命名的中心，将这位总统任内的文件和资料存放在那里，并把有关的实物，如总统接受的礼品、有重要意义的物品陈列在里面。另外一项基本的内容，就是展示这位总统的政绩。总统中心或称总统图书馆，每座大约要几百万乃至上千万美元，由政府拨款，或加上私人捐赠。卡特总统为佐治亚州人，所以他的中心设在亚特兰大市。

卡特中心（The Carter Center），是一座规模较大的现代化建筑，花费二千五百万美元。据称除了政府拨款之外，卡特还从别处弄来不少钱。建筑的花园颇有东方色彩。整个建筑分为几个部分：

卡特中心，中心是一个半赢利性的机构，目的是通过研究和社会性努力减少社会冲突、消除痛苦和加深人与人之间的理解，这是中心自己声称要做的。中心也声称它是世界上唯一的一位前总统每天参预的机构，中心里面有杰米·卡特的办公室。

爱摩里大学卡特中心，与卡特中心在一座建筑里，主要组织研究、讨论会和发表文章。这个中心在拉美和加勒比海、中东、苏美关系、非洲、健康、人权和冲突等方面进行研究，研究人员与爱摩里大学有非常密切的关系。爱摩里大学的研究生也到这里来做研究。中心多数成员都是爱摩里大学政治学系的教授。其中不乏著名的政治学教授，如卡尔·多伊奇（Karl W·Deutsch）。中心的苏联问题研究也全国闻名，爱摩里大学有全国数得上的卫星电视节目接收系统，每天 24 小时接收苏联的电视节目，进行分析。有一位教授叫艾伦·米基耶维奇（Ellen Mickiewicz），据说她的研究对美国的外交政策制定颇有影响；

全球 2000 家公司，目标是促进发展中国家的健康和农业；

拯救儿童组织，主要负责照料儿童方面的事务，由世界卫生组织、世界银行、联合国发展计划和洛克菲勒基金会资助；



杰米·卡特图书馆和博物馆，这个图书馆大概有二千七百万份文件，供人们研究卡特任期内的政治情况。博物馆的目的在于向公众开放，促进人们对总统制度的理解，这个部分由国家档案馆负责。

重要的是最后那句话：博物馆的目的在于向公众开放，促进人们对总统制度的理解。这种机构是各类向公民传播美国精神、信念、价值观念和政策选择倾向的机构中的一个，其作用在于政治社会化，传播政治原则和政治文化。

我们可以看一下卡特中心如何做这件事。博物馆首先提供一部关于宪法和总统知识的电影，其中穿插卡特做总统时的镜头。电影从独立战争讲起，讲宪法的制定，描绘华盛顿总统的丰功伟绩，介绍政治传统，类似于教授美国政府的课程。任何前来参观的人都可以观看这部电影，免费。进入博物馆看，可以看见大厅分辟为几个部分，每一部分集中展出和介绍一个领域，如外交、环境、健康、财政等。每一个部分都有大幅的照片和说明，并且设有一至两架电视机。电视机上有几个按钮，按钮上注明，如人权、战争、环境等。如果来访者对什么问题有兴趣，只要按一下钮，卡特的形象就会出现在电视机屏幕上，向参观者解释这项政策的背景和指导原则。

最有意思的是，这里还有专门给儿童看的电视录像，是卡通片，题目叫：“如果你想成为美国总统。”画面活泼有趣，生动形象地介绍总统制度。这一点是令人惊奇的，美国人注意在公民成长的各个阶段传播美国的精神。这项工作在任何社会要追求制度稳定都必不可少的。

这种政治社会化的功能，在美国发展得比较完备，这是其社会稳定和政治制度稳定的潜在的因素。每个社会都应当寻找方法来传播其主导价值，没有一套健全和有效的机制，制度的稳定和政治理想的传承是不可能的。

总统图书馆或中心的基本功能不在于保存档案（当然保存档案对后代和历史有不可低估的作用），而在于传播价值和信念。来参观中心的人接踵而至。美国调动各种手段进行某种“政治教育”。可以想象美国人是深通此道的。美国人往往说他们信仰他们的制度，其实他们更信仰他们的信念。

我觉得美国人在政治上注重捍卫和传播信念，甚于维护具体的体制。宪法的持久在于它表明了美国的价值和信念。从体制上来说，这部宪法并不完美。在政治生活中，信念重于制度，因为制度是抽象的，要由人来体现。任何制度，如果其本身不能自动表现在体现它的人的精神中，就都是脆弱的。

所以，总统中心是政治，不是历史。举例便可说明，里根总统卸任前，已在选择在哪里建里根中心。据说看中了加利福尼亚的斯坦福大学。斯坦福大学态度不积极，因为大学是政治中立的学术性机构，而里根中心“带有政治倾向”。后来里根中心便没有设在斯坦福大学校园内。

卡特中心与其他总统图书馆或中心有一点差别，这就是它拥有一个与爱摩里大学政治学系合办的研究中心，实际上就构成了一个思想库。政界的很多高官显臣，

在离开华府和官职之后，纷纷到各类思想库中谋职。他们从政的经验以及与官场的联系，又带动了思想库的研究成果和思想产品介入政治过程，从而推动社会的发展。卡特中心聚集了一小群学者，大部分为政治学者，可见办这中心的自的所在。卡特中心的研究计划，涉及国内政治和国外政治，其意图也是明确的，可谓雄心勃勃。

学者在这里做研究，有非常优厚的条件，全部开支由卡特中心提供。这类中心，有前政治家的胆识和关系，有来自私营企业的经费和资助，有学者们活跃的智慧，它所起到的作用为一般思想库所不能比拟。

## 4. 国防部长论坛

亚特兰大市位于南部。南北战争时，亚特兰大曾是南军和北军交战的战场。南部地区相对来说不如北部地区繁荣。南部人至今对南北战争似乎还耿耿于怀，话题总是离不开这场战争，北方人对此也清楚。我遇到的人听说我要去亚特兰大，告诉我说，那里的人一定会同你讨论南北战争。果不其然，不少人同我谈南北战争，说那场战争毁了亚特兰大，现在的亚特兰大完全是重新建设起来的。在亚特兰大市，我们参观了南方国际研究中心（The Southern Center for International Studies）。这个中心是南方少有的国际研究中心之一，组织了一些具有轰动性的活动，颇为有名。

中心坐落在一幢不大的房子里，这幢房子也是刚刚买下的，正在装修。中心主任 W 向我们介绍了情况：“这个中心有将近 20 年的历史，主要是举办外事政策的讨论会。中心组织了成百名专家和杰出人物与当地企业界、政界、学术界和大众见面。中心的前身是南方国际和公共事务委员会，建于 1967 年，1977 年改组，是一个非赢利性的、教育性的机构。”

何为教育性？我很感兴趣，向他问了这个问题。他解释道：“南方是一个非常重要的地区，但由于各种原因，南方地区对世界不那么开放。今天的科技迫使美国人成为相互依赖的全球共同体的成员。不了解今天的国际社会，是无法决策的。中心的任务是让成员和公众了解这个新的环境，让他们亲耳聆听有关国际经济、外交政策和他国文化的演说，听国际专家、世界领袖的意见：理解这个国际社会。中心本身没有政策倾向和政策立场。”话是这样讲，没有一个机构会没有价值选择，只是怎样表达有所不同罢了。

中心的主要活动包括教育性的研讨会，中国领导人邓小平、法国前总统瓦莱里·吉斯卡尔·德斯坦、前英国首相爱德华·希思、约旦国王侯赛因、沙特阿拉伯王子费萨尔和大部分国家的大使，都应邀来这里做过演讲，由此可见中心的厉害。

中心每年举行一次由前国务卿和国防部长参加的讨论会，由 CBS 电视系统向全国转播，由新闻总署的卫星向海外传播。中心还组织专门的小组，研究一个国家、地区或全球的问题；实施连续的国际商业教育计划；与世界知名人士共进晚餐。

另外，还举办各类讨论会等。中心出版《全球评论》和《国际问题文献》两份刊物。

这个中心的活动是引人注目的，我们可以看一下它组织的几项活动：

1987 年 12 月 18 日，第五届前国务卿年会，与会者有腊斯克、罗杰斯、基辛格、万斯、马斯基、黑格，主题是“美国外交政策的制定”

1988 年 1 月 19 日，中国驻美大使韩叙前来演说。

1988 年 5 月 60，亚太问题年会，题目是：华盛顿——北京——台湾：关系正常化后的十年。

1988 年 9 月 30 日，讨论会，题目叫“向下届政府建议”，有八位前国防部长到会：麦克纳马拉、克利福德、莱尔德、里查德森、施莱幸格、罗斯菲尔德、布朗、温伯格。

从上述活动可以看出，这个中心的能量不可小看。这个中心有多少人呢？经常性的工作人员大概十名左右。资料室只有两个人，负责出版那本《文献》（主要是一些复印文章的汇编，但很有用）。

中心的活动经费从哪里来？这是个关键的问题。经费的来源有多种渠道，有的来自赠款，有的来自基金会，有的来自会费。中心的成员分成许多种类：国际组，25,000 美元或以上；企业主，10,000 美元；发起者，5,000 美元；支持，500 美元；资助，250 美元；普通，100 美元；特别，50 美元。特别组包括学生、教育机构成员、大众传播媒介的代表和退休人员。

自然，单靠这些经费是远远不够的。主要经费来自基金会和企业。W 说，经费来源不能单一，单一的话就有可能被给钱的人操纵。问题是有许多人愿意给钱。象南方国际研究中心这样名扬四海的机构，不少人愿意给钱。这是美国文化不可分割的一部分。前面我谈过布鲁金斯学会，它的主要经费都是来自基金会或什么地方。

此外，重要的成功因素是：高级政府官员乐于做这种事情，离职的政府高级官员也愿意做这种事情。尤其是后面这些人，他们觉得自己有责任对内外政策发表意见。美国人也愿意听来自其他国家的政府官员或领袖发言。一个国家的政策制定不能没有自己的立场，但多听不同人的见解，可以知己知彼。在这个过程中，所有参与的人都会有所收获。政策的优劣有一条普通的标准，就是反对的人是多是少。多了解和掌握不同的见解，就可以制定出覆盖面较广的政策。

这些知名人物如何接待？要不要付报酬？大多数情况下不需要付报酬，因为他们愿意参与这些活动。有些人要付钱。关键的问题是安排他们的行程和日程。从他们走出家门的第一步到回到家里的最后一步，中心都得精心安排，不得有误。这些显赫人物万一有个闪失，事关重大。有时候要用私人飞机接送，那种巨大的，每边有三个门的高级轿车（Limousine）也是必不可少的。

我们看到，南方国际研究中心只是一家私人的机构，但它却有足够的力量召集所有的前任国务卿到亚特兰大市来开会，做演讲，也能邀请所有前任的国防部长到亚特兰大来做演讲，就国内外政策进行分析和讨论，并让公众参与这些活动。于是智慧活跃了。智慧能更好地服务于这个社会 and 这个制度。由此可以看出，美国人有强烈的政治世俗化的观念，强烈的非神秘化的观念。曾经身居高官的人，并不回避这类活动，而是积极支持这类活动。说得难听一点，是他们不甘寂寞，正因为他们不甘寂寞，中心才能起到更大的作用。

象这样的中心，也非绝无仅有。除了它们本身办得成功之外，它们也起到不可低估的社会作用。中心的一个目标就是促进大众教育。实际上众多的这类中心通过他们的活动把美国的价值观念传播给了大众。这类机构是政治社会化的功不可没的机构。政府的一些基本政策通过这样的渠道传播给大众，得到更多的认同。

同时，中心也起到把各界的观念传播给决策者的作用。试想电视台向全国一转播，会产生何等的效果。政策问题往往不在于制定得好不好，制定得好固然是基本，但更重要的是能不能让公众信服政策制定的指导思想。只有做到了这一点，一项政策才能得到贯彻的根本条件。一些政策的无效，并不是政策本身的问题，而是观念和大众的认同问题。这类中心和机构所起的作用，尤其是在政治生活中起的作用，不可低估。它们不是政治的正式机构，但起着政府机构起不到的作用。

## 5.地区事务中心

美国社会的总体发展，很大一部分是由各地方和社区的发展组成的，一个社会的发展不可能凭空产生，社会的现代化和物质文明也不可能凭空产生，要以整个社会的各个基本组成部分的共同发展为前提。单讲宏观发展并不现实。一些第三世界国家在制定社会发展规划时，往往只注重宏观目标，而没有把这些目标建立在具体而细致的小目标上，小目标直接关系到社会每一位成员的切身利益。小目标的达成，不仅构成社会总目标的基础，而且构成社会均衡发展和持续进步的心理机制。

美国社会的一大特点，就是社会的发展相对均衡。每片小的社区之间有差别，但不悬殊，这是作为发达国家最重要的指标之一。自然，也有穷人，也有穷得难以置信的人，但社会总体水平可以说是发达水平。社区政治的发展是社区均衡发展的一项基本条件。社区发展取决于多种因素，如联邦政策、州政策、居民态度、社区结构等。但如何注重推动社区发展为一端。

俄亥俄州位于中西部，我在这里的迈阿密大学访问了三天。大学的教授告诉我，这里地处中部，中部人比西海岸和东海岸的人要保守得多。新的观念往往从东海岸和西海岸萌发，然后慢慢向中间地带运动，越往中间地带运动，势头越弱；故中部地带受新观念的影响不大，较为保守，这是能解释社会文化差别的一个有趣的想法。自然社会绝非清一色的，各种观念，传统与现代、保守和激进，争论激

烈。认识美国社会绝不能将其设想为“铁板一块”。美国有两条海岸线，实在是地理上的天赐，东海岸遥望欧洲，西海岸相隔亚洲。最强大的经济和文化力量均在两个海岸地区。中国的沿海地区也是最为发达的，如果有一条西海岸，恐怕中国不是今天的中国了。

俄亥俄州的迈阿密大学有一个机构令人感兴趣。这就是公共管理和地区事务中心。这个中心的重要目标是进行地方政府行政的研究，促进地方行政的发展。不知其他地方有无此类机构，这是大学研究与地方政治发展结合起来的实例。

这个中心由州政府支持，州政府负责主要财政。这表明州政府力图通过中心的研究、教育、分析来提高地方政府管理水平，向地方政府提供技术帮助。中心的主要功能是向地方政府提供管理技术资助，增强地方政府的能力，促进地方经济的发展，评价公共计划并进行政策研究，服务对象主要是县、市、村、镇政府。

这项计划很好地把高知识与具体发展联结在一起。地方政府缺乏专门人才，难以对很多问题做出估计，需要人帮助。大学有高知识高技术，但无人组织，不会自动转向地方政府。从全国政治来说，地方政府的活动并不引人注目，堂堂大学教授不会留意。但如果组织起来并加以推动，好事自成。

中心一般应地方政府的邀请前往作各项研究，有时中心成员也自行设定地方政府发展所需要的计划，主动上门服务。中心有两名固定人员，拥有电脑、激光打印机等现代化研究设备。中心与大学的政治学系有密切的关系。许多研究工作，由政治学系的教授承担，或由政治学系的学生协助。

可以看一下中心的研究工作，获得具体的概念：

制定巴特勒县的经济数据手册；

进行公民调查，规定蒙罗市的停车场计划；

制定西卡罗顿市的植树规划；

制定凡尔费尔德的人员表格并进行工作调查；

制定汉密尔顿的经济全面发展计划；

对蒙罗市急救服务的成本与效益分析；

对卡里斯勒行政的公民态度调查；

编辑和发行镇董事参考手册；

研究联邦预算和税收政策对俄亥俄农村社区的影响；

召开公共服务研讨会，研讨地方政府面临的共同问题；

编辑有关各种经济和管理问题的手册。

如此等等，一般来说，工作很细、很具体。中心的研究不涉及国家的大政方针，但可以看出，这些研究对地方政府的发展十分有用。

可以再对一份研究报告做具体分析。该中心最后完成的报告叫《普莱勃县经济发展报告》，这份报告的主要目的是提供普莱勃县的社会、经济、地理、文化和人口等方面的具体数据，以吸引企业家和资金，求得本县的经济发展。

报告第一部分简要介绍了县史，然后介绍县的地理位置，县内各镇的分布，高速公路的状况，包括高速公路通往各大城市的距离，如到亚特兰大 496 英里，波士顿 835 英里，芝加哥 250 英里，底特律 223 英里，等等，共列了几十个大城市，另外介绍飞机场的情况，包括附近的国际机场和县内的各个小机场。有很大篇幅用于介绍人口、政府、便利、住房、卫生、医疗、图书馆、教育情况，并详细介绍县内六所学校。这些都是吸引投资和劳力的重要数据。县内有八个镇，各个镇的人口、预算、便利、交通、经济指标均有详细数字。由于这份报告由大学研究中心编制，有一定的权威性，普莱勃县可以通过散发这份资料来达到既定目标。另一方面，这个报告又为县政府分析工作和制定发展目标提供了很好的条件，一举两得。

这个中心给人们的启示是：怎样有效地组织和引导社会的高知识和高技术流向相对落后的地区，怎样有效地促进社会整体的均衡发展。州政府引导俄亥俄大学的手段是：利用经济杠杆。州政府出钱资助建立中心，中心是专业化、非赢利性机构，其任务就是促进地方政府的发展。

正如我在开始所说，小社区的小目标的达成，是大社会的大目标达成的基础。从宏观上来讲，可以拥有航天飞机，人造卫星，大型计算机等，但这不等于一个社会的均衡发展。现代化在很大程度上并不是前者，而是每一个普通人能生活得更好。这的确是一个观念问题，没有这种认识，社会发展的设计就会不同。

## 6. 知识库

一个社会的发展，与知识尤其是先进知识的传播有不可分离的关系。总结人类历史发展的过程，新知识、新智慧的出现往往并不意味着社会的进步，而只有新知识、新智慧的广泛传播才意味着社会进步。如果没有一个传播过程，新知识、新智慧不会成为推动社会进步的强大力量。

中国古代不乏一些在当时属于杰出的思想，但它们均没有成为推动这个社会进步的动力，令人无不叹息万分。中国古代的思想文化在世界上具有独特的地位，与西方文明有相当的历史地位，但它没能导致中国社会与西方社会的同步发展。关键的原因之一在于没有传播机制。西方社会的发展，尤其是二次大战后高科技的发展，均与知识和观念的传播密切相关。信息传播对西方社会演变和发展的作用不可低估。

大学图书馆系统，在今天的社会上起着主导的传播知识和观念的作用。我参观哈佛大学、MIT、斯坦福大学、加利福尼亚大学、伯克莱分校、密苏里大学克伦布斯特分校、爱荷华大学、俄亥俄州迈阿密大学、耶鲁大学、普林斯顿大学、锡拉杰斯大学、西雅图华盛顿大学、加利福尼亚大学圣地亚哥分校、爱摩里大学、密歇根大学等学校的图书馆，深感这些图书馆在一个社会中所起的作用非同小可。几千所大学的图书馆加起来，构成这个社会管理和运转体制中的一个重要组成部分，同时也是传播知识和智慧的无所不在的网络。

图书馆象一座知识的水库，储蓄着人类有史以来创造和发展的形形色色的知识和智慧。自然，单独一所大学的图书馆做不到这一点，但大学图书馆之间有着密切的合作关系，并通过现代科学技术实现这种合作。图书馆储存着知识的甘露，不使其流失。每一位感到知识饥渴的人都能够到这里畅饮这份甘露。

大学图书馆一般均尽其全力收集各种书籍、刊物、报章等资料。正式出版物自然包括在内。资料无论国内国外，各图书馆均尽力收藏。对于国外资料，一家图书馆不可能尽收囊中，但各家均有侧重。如有的注意收集印度的文献，有的注意收集苏联东欧的文献。耶鲁大学的东亚图书馆，收有大量中文资料，连非正式的出版物都一一收存。“文革”中红卫兵小报在不少大学图书馆中有较为完整的保存，为今天学者们研究这段历史提供了有利的资料基础。我曾问过一位图书馆的负责人，收集资料的原则是什么。他的回答是：“尽可能地收集，我们不知道今天它们有没有用，也许没有用，但对后人研究历史也许就是有用的。”图书馆的功能，不仅在于借书给读者，而且在于收集汇总知识，成为知识水库。任何人需要任何知识均可以在这里得到满足。

图书馆象一个水渠的网络。各大学图书馆之间有着密切的合作关系。图书馆之间可以互通有无。如果一个人在一个学校的图书馆中查不到一份资料或一本书，可以通过图书馆向其他学校去借。杂志上的文章，也可以要求图书馆到其他学校去复印。图书馆之间，也通过电脑系统联结起来，在一个大学的图书馆可以查阅许多家图书馆的藏书。

不少图书馆与国会图书馆有电脑网络联系，可以直接从国会图书馆调资料，如国会辩论记录等，并且可立即打印出来。这个渠道网络不仅连通各图书馆，而且连通每个人。这使知识能够最广泛地传播。在某种意义上，各类图书馆象一个系统，具有较大的“规模效益”。

图书馆象一个开放的知识水库，每个人均可以在里面畅游。一个社会的进步，在于每个人能否接受和掌握这个社会积累和创造的知识。要最大限度地达到这个目标，就要使每个人都能简便、最迅速地得到知识和观念，无论是历史的遗产还是现今的创造。各类图书馆（不仅是大学图书馆），都是开放的，任何人均可进入图书馆。图书馆里的各类书籍、资料、报刊、微缩胶卷、工具书均可使用。图书馆中的所有资料都是开放的，全部存书均开放，任何人都可以借阅。如果是当地居民或大学成员，便可方便地借阅各类收存物。珍本有专门的管理方法，但也可以接近。各图书馆均收存专门的政府文件部分，每位读者都可以借阅。

最大限度的开放性是图书馆发挥最大效益的先决条件。没有这个条件，水库就会成为死水一潭，不起社会功效。建造水库的目的不是存水，而是灌溉。知识水库也一样。

知识水库，不仅起着传播知识、灌溉大脑的作用，同时也起着知识的代际传播作用。图书馆积累了一代又一代人创造的知识，同时实现着这些知识的代际传播。大学图书馆的设备和管理均达到一定的水平。图书馆中的电脑索引，缩微设备，以及复印机等，为查阅各类资料提供了极大的方便。在管理思想上，突出为读者服务的重点，一切追求方便，使读者能够找到他所想寻找的全部资料。

图书馆系统在一个社会的管理中有何作用？这是一个耐人寻味的问题。任何社会的管理，在很大程度上是一种知识管理。政治管理也罢、行政管理也罢、经济管理也罢、技术管理也罢，最终均是对人的管理。人不是抽象的、机械的对象，而是能思维、有主见的对象。主导人的行为首先是人的思想，是人所接受的一整套既成文化和既成观念，以及人们在这个基础上所进行的创造。一切社会的进步和冲突其实都源自对知识的管理。

历史也告诉我们，政治系统面临的一大职责就是管理知识。知识决定政治发展的水平。在某种意义上，知识结构可以导致政治进步，也可以导致政治衰落。历史上政治的每次飞跃，或曰旧政治与新政治的新陈代谢，均与知识的发展与不发展有关。

一个社会采用何种方式来管理知识，在某种程度上可以解释这个社会的格局。传播知识或传播某种知识，不仅是教育的责任，而且是政治的重大责任，有时候还是政治的沉重负担。

美国社会采用分散化管理知识的方式。自然，任何知识管理都不可能是完全非政治化的。但社会的知识管理在更大程度上脱离了行政系统。行政系统形式上不承担这项沉重的责任，高度发达的图书馆系统又使这种管理方法得以实现，在知识传播系统自组织不发达的社会中，行政系统承担着无比沉重的传播知识的重担，这不仅是为了传播知识，而且也是为了给行政系统建立一个牢固的基础。传播知识系统的充分组织化，并达到较高的水准，对社会和政治管理的意义是显而易见的。

## 7.市图书馆

爱荷华市是一个小市，人口大约 1.5 万人。这里主要是个大学城，大学生有 3.5 万人左右。两部分人口加起来，约有 6 万人，这样的小城镇星罗棋布，不少人宁愿选择到这样的小城市来居住，而不愿去纽约、芝加哥这样的大都市。小城市宁静，悠闲，民风纯朴。大城市的人自然瞧不起小城市的人，不过小城市的人并不都羡慕大都市。



原因在哪里？发展中国家，人们都纷纷涌入大城市。五六万人这样的小城市在那里是绝对留不住人才的。可是爱荷华大学里有许多著名的数授，他们也热爱这里的生活气氛，不想他就。除了人们的心理偏好之外，另一个重要因素就是生活条件。小城市的社会活动环境与大城市没有什么根本差异。我们可以从这里的图书馆谈起。

爱荷华市的图书馆相当不错，备有一般大图书馆所拥有的全套设备。市图书馆有不少存书，虽然不能与大学图书馆和国会图书馆相提并论。图书馆拥有较好的视听系统，市民可以在这里面借唱片、录像带、甚至电影，可以“堂吃”，在图书馆里用图书馆的设备看，也可以“外卖”，带回家去看。

图书馆备有电脑，供市民使用，还有复印机等各项设备。市民图书馆的目标与大学图书馆不同，不是用来供学者做学问的，所以它备有大量的儿童读物，这是专门为市民家庭服务的。图书馆里可以看到成群的儿童。图书馆备有各类报刊，数量不多，但也可观。还备有各类工具书，可供查找如全国的大学地址，电话号码，查找高中的情况等。图书馆也有人专门负责剪报和整理材料，读者可以比较方便地找到有关一个问题的剪报。

图书馆还为读者提供另一种服务，这就是把招工广告都集中在一起，需要找工作的可以来此查阅。更绝的是，图书馆备有许多装帧画、油画、名画复制品，装在精制镜框里，这些也可以出借。只要有借书证，就可以借二三个月，在家里挂一挂，然后再到图书馆来换。这是一个别出心裁的点子。所以它不仅是图书馆，还是“图”“书”馆。

整个图书馆的管理是电脑化的。图书馆有一个中心电脑，负责接通图书馆里所有的终端。读者要查什么书，只要查电脑就可以了。为了方便读者，图书馆的电脑也经过精心设计。这些电脑终端没有键盘，只有屏幕。所有的电脑，指令都会显示在屏幕的下方，使用者只要用手指一下某一个指令，电脑就会按指令操作。好象是种感应式的系统。这种设计特别有利于儿童，因为儿童难以记住指令。提供一种“视触式”的指令系统，整个电脑系统就可以轻而易举地运转。在有些地方，电脑系统之所以无法运转，是因为大部分人不懂得怎样操纵电脑。这里做的事，不是人服从电脑，而是让电脑服从人。

这样一座方便的图书馆，对市民是免费的。任何人只要居住爱荷华市，就可以免费得到一张借书卡。如果不是本地市民，只要付一定的费用，也可享用。办一张借书卡十分方便，只要说住在哪里，并出示一定的证件便立等可取。

这座图书馆只是这座小市各种便利设施的一个方面。在大部分小城镇里，人们不会感到明显的落后，人们可以享受到现代化的所有成果。这是社会稳定的一个重要方面。不少发展中国家的一个令人头疼的社会难题，就是如何协调不同地区政治经济发展不平衡的问题。政治经济发展不平衡会引出种种矛盾。这些矛盾并不是人为的，而是社会发展到一定阶段不可避免的。问题是有没有把这些问题上升为政治管理和社会协调的前提，从而去推进全国政治经济发展的均衡化。

政治经济发展的不平衡，会造成地区之间的资源之争，人员流动形成的管理困难，人才过分集中于大都市而引出的全面发展的困难等等。其实第三世界国家中的有些改变，也意味着贫困地区的力量夺取全国最富有的地区。也许这可以列为政治地理学的一个课题。

爱荷华市这个小城，商店区有几大片。纽约或华盛顿商店里有的东西，这里应有尽有。没有人会想亲自到纽约或芝加哥买东西。也很少看到“二道贩子”或“倒爷”，要么是买卖毒品之类的货色。这里的住房、公用设施、第三产业都相当发达。在这里生活，不会感到不方便。所以除了年轻人有出去闯荡天下的念头外，一般市民情绪稳定。有的甚至太稳定了，一辈子没有出过爱荷华州，不知纽约或旧金山为何物。

需要探讨的是，为什么小城市能达到这样的水准？

其一是高度发展的商品经济。这里的大部分商店、第三产业等设施都是私人经营的，商品经济促使私人企业来到各个小城市。只要有顾客，商品经济就会前来。小城镇的商店不仅有美国的产品，而且有世界各国的产品，如日本电气、中国纺织品、台湾、香港的生活用品等。这就是商品经济的力量。发财的欲望促使商人们尽可能扩大销售网络。如果有什么力量可以限制人们发财，小城镇也不会发展起来。

其二是高度发达的交通系统。各个小城镇一般都接通全国的高速公路网络，可以通往全国任何地方。这样方便了私人企业向全国各地投资。公路是由国家或州政府建造的，为企业和个人生活提供了基本条件。由此可以看到公共投资在哪个方面最为重要。如果政府花很多钱在各地造商店，我想不会有今天。

其三是巨大的生产能量。没有高生产率作为后盾，商品不会充分涌流。自然，美国的另外还有项条件是由美元的世界地位带来的：各国产品纷纷涌入美国市场。高科技的发展也为市场繁荣创造了条件：输出高科技，输入大量精巧的生活用品。

其四是有力的管理体制。美国社会发展到今天也是一个渐进的进程，是经过这么多年积累之后才形成的。小城镇的管理体制一般也建立在大众选举的基础上。每届政府要想连任或博得名誉，都得办几件实事。城市及社会发展就这样慢慢积累起来。大众选举可以相对保证管理人员的能力，能力差的会在选举中被淘汰。

美国社会现代化的基础不在纽约之类的大城市，而在千百个小城镇，大城市只是山巅而已。

# 十一、危机的潜流

## 1.家庭观念

对美国人的家庭观念或家庭组织，受过东方文化熏陶的人大多不敢苟同，也不欣赏。美国人的家庭观念与几十年前已大不相同。当然，美国的家庭成千上万，也各不相同。我们分析的只是典型的、代表主流的美国家庭观念。

组成家庭，很重要的是有一男一女结合。对大部分美国男男女女来说，这种结合并不能妨碍他们每个人的私域（privacy）。许多夫妇都相敬如宾，互不干涉对方的私域。他们之间这种关系模式，在中国和日本是不能接受的。男女双方在很多问题都是商量性的，听上去就象是两个不怎么认识的人在谈一件事情。当然，也存在融洽的家庭。

美国人的夫妻生活发展到这一步，是社会长期以来追求个人主义的结果。美国人自小就受到这种训练，视这种价值比任何价值都重要。另一方面，由于长期受这种教育，已变得不那么善于与人打交道，已不会与人共同生活。我个人认为，这是美国社会将来的一个难题。结婚并不能打破在每个人心里筑起的这座堡垒，特别是年轻夫妻。年老的夫妻似乎更需要相互依赖，不那么注意维持内心的屏障。

这道屏障是如何形成的？这要从美国人自幼的环境谈起，谈起来我觉得不少的年轻夫妇太个人主义，太自私，不太注意对儿童的扶养和教育，不象东方人那样望子成龙，也不象传统的西方人那样倾注心血。很小的孩子，甚至连一岁还不到，一般就被送入单独的房间，美国人的观念是，这使孩子学会拥有私域，学会拥有自己的领域，另一方面也可保护家长的私域。这是让儿童学会独立的起步。美国人高度评价独立和个人主义。家长们向孩子们灌输这种观念，同时也是保护自己。他们不希望由于孩子的降生而使自己失去这些。他们内心的这些兴许是无意识的动机推动他们鼓励孩子去“追求第一”和“自立”。从社会效果说，也许有积极的意义。孩子们很早就受到教育，应当自己做决定，应当对自己的行为负责。这使家长可以较早地摆脱孩子的纠缠。

儿童很早就开始挣钱，家长也会给他们一些钱。不少很小的孩子在银行有户头。9岁至10岁的儿童可以为邻居送报纸，13岁至18岁的孩子可以为邻居看孩子。美国社会是一个金钱社会，家长们深知要使孩子获得独立，必须强迫他们学会与金钱打交道。

到了18岁至21岁，家长们便鼓励孩子离开家庭，过独立生活。一般来说，孩子们到了这个岁数，都外出自谋生计。孩子外出之后，与家庭的关系，从中国人的观念来看，十分淡漠。常常可以听到这样的故事，子女打电话给父母，说某日几点钟来，几点钟走，届时便走。年轻人进入社会就象进入战场，要想有一个较好的生活，不能不使出浑身解数。这种压力也迫使他们无力顾及父母。我知道有

些人很爱他们的父母，但他们没有时间经常去看他们。我也知道许多人对老人很淡漠。不少老人住在养老院或什么地方，子女等于没有作用。不论出于哪种情况，子女要赡养老人极为困难。老人的现状教给年轻人的是什么呢？会在年轻人身上留下什么烙印呢？

父母一般也不管子女的婚事，那均由子女自己决定。子女只是把女朋友或男朋友带回家里与父母见见面。美国人在这方面较为随便，豪门望族可能严厉一些。父母也都是这样过来的人。青年一般在中学就有男朋友或女朋友，性的观念较为开放，父母们对十五、十六岁的孩子的异性朋友，并无反对意见。我认识的一位老师就把自己的儿子和儿子的女朋友带到课堂里来，介绍给大家。她的儿子才十五岁。我问她对这种关系有何想法。她说她觉得很好，儿子的女朋友比他大两岁，有自己的汽车，不让她儿子喝酒、抽烟。接受这种事实在美国人看来是家常便饭，因为父母也是这么过来的。女朋友、男朋友的概念决不意味着结婚，当然，也有可能结婚。

对子女的态度是由各种原因产生的，其实我觉得许多人很爱他们的孩子。然而，一般家庭必须让孩子早早独立，供养不起，所以他们无法去爱。反过来，子女也爱父母，但父母的晚年不能依赖子女，子女是无法负担的，因而子女也无法去爱。这层关系对社会有深远的影响。父母的晚年得依靠社会保险或福利制度，而不能依靠子女。老人必须建立起自己的生活。中国文化中包含浓烈的养儿防老的因素，孝道也为中国文化基本概念之一。美国人不是不想有这种观念，而是无法有。有位朋友说，除了文化的因素，物质的条件也是很重要的。养儿防老是农业文明的产物，在工业文明的冲击下势必减弱。

老人的现在就是青年人的未来。老人的这种状况影响着年轻父母对子女的养育态度。从他们开始有孩子起，他们内心中就十分明白，这个孩子将来是不能依靠的，扶养他是一种单方面的义务，大部分情况下不能指望什么报答。这会对父母产生什么样的作用呢？父母要真正承担养育子女的责任，是一个不小的挑战，即战胜他们自身从小形成的个人主义（不是贬意的，而是指一种文化现象），这种文化现象代代相传，要选择新的开端极不容易，这是未来的一个问题。

亚里士多德在二千多年前就说过，家庭是社会的细胞。战后这些年的发展、家庭这个细胞在美国已经分解。表面上看，家庭仍然是社会的细胞，但实际上，真正的社会细胞在美国是个人。家庭组织和家庭观念正在加速这个分解过程。过分传统的家庭对个人的束缚太紧，不利于个人发展。但过分松散的家庭是否就有利于社会的进步呢？家庭本来可以协调不少人际矛盾和人际关系。在家庭分化之后，这些矛盾就得交给社会了。

政府承担着沉重的由于家庭分化而产生的负担，从儿童教育到老人问题。这成为经济和社会发展的一大包袱。但在家庭组织日益分化的今天，这个包袱可能会越来越大。政府能提供的只是物质条件，情感上的问题谁来调节？家庭的分化使社会失去了不少人情，这对一个和谐社会也是不利的。

不少人对家庭的演变也忧心忡忡。新保守主义思潮便是代表之一。新保守主义强调家庭的作用，不少人希望家庭能传递宗教、道德、伦理等基本规范。不过在美国社会这种机制下，要做到这一点，谈何容易。

社会究竟以个人为细胞好还是以家庭为细胞好，家庭应该如何组成，在不同的文化背景下有不同的观念。美国社会至今依然是以家庭为社会基层的单位。但在精神上，家庭正在被架空，而社会还没有形成完整的以个人为细胞的调节机制。最后要问两个问题：

人性究竟适应于过有家庭情感的生活还是没有家庭情感的生活？

个人主义是情感选择的还是不得不接受的？

社会经济的发展是否必然导致传统家庭的分解，美国社会走过的道路似乎是这样。现代化与传统社会结构之间是两难困境。我在新加坡时就深感这个问题的困难。新加坡是华人社会，也是新兴工业国家。经济发达之后遇到的首要问题就是家庭分解的危险。新加坡力图通过儒家文化来缓和现代化的冲击波。家庭观念和家庭组织的演变，也很好地反映出了马尔库塞所描绘的“单面的人”。马尔库塞对美国提出的问题是：爱欲文明能否取代技术文明？我的问题是：除了性爱之外，人类社会还应保持怎样的情感？

## 2.无知的一代？

青年一代的教育危机，已经成为一个令人忧心忡忡的社会问题。大学教育具有相当水准。主要的原因还有，年轻人可以进入大学的面很广，人才是在大学中淘汰出来的，而不是在大学之前。但中学教育令人担忧，中学（高中）教育水平之差，令人吃惊。当然不是全美国都如此，有地区性的差别，在大城市和黑人居住的地区，情况尤其严重。10月4日晚上电视播发了一项特别节目（Burning Questions, 热门问题），题目是：孩子为什么不及格？看了之后，令人大为震惊。在美国这样一个屈指可数的发达国家中，教育水平如此之差，一般人难以想象。

电视节目分为三段：高中生、教师和家长。高中生的基本知识面很窄，电视中报道了一些测验的结果。在有关本国的知识方面，知道美军参加第二次世界大战的起因是珍珠港事件的有81%，知道政府分为立法、司法和行政三个部分并相互制衡的只有64%，知道门罗主义的只有42%。对于最高法院判定黑人和白人隔离违反宪法之事，知道的人只有20%。在世界知识方面，高中生的问题更多。大部分人不知道国际上的政治领袖，但对杰克逊、玛多娜这样红极一时的歌星却十分熟悉，知道奥威尔的《1984年》一书的只有25%。美国人认为这是一个很严重的问题，当然这里面有意识形态的因素。在数学方面，也是惊人，知道10的87%是多少的人，只有60%。在地理方面也同样创造“纪录”，据闻有50%的人找不出华盛顿市在哪里。我认识一位台湾来的留学生。他说有一次一位美国学生问他从哪里来，他说是台湾，没想到对方提了一个令人目瞪口呆的问题：“台湾在欧洲

的什么地方？”另一位巴拿马来的留学生也曾告诉我：美国大学生对巴拿马的概念，就是一条运河，两旁有许多房子，根本不知道巴拿马是一个国家。

此类问题，在美国讨论已久，对美国人不能书写，不能计算，美国人自己也忧心忡忡。曾有一人告诉我，他认识的一位朋友开一家店，买可口可乐六瓶可以打折扣，如一瓶 50 分，六瓶就只要两美元。一位美国人来买，他向他介绍买六瓶合算，只要两美元，那人就是怎么也算不过来，说宁可一瓶一瓶买。这当然是极端的例子。但这种问题已经影响到社会经济的发展。10 月 3 日的《芝加哥论坛报》报道说，IBM 公司设有一个成人识字（Literacy）中心，正在实施一项计划，教育成年人识字。IBM 公司每周三天开设课程，学生从 20 岁到退休年龄不等。这是这个地区的大公司首次实施这样的计划。IBM 实施这个计划的目的是很值得注意的。他们认为，到九十年代，在这个地区就难以找到他们需要的工人了。IBM 成人识字中心经理 Dave Cox 说：“我们认为成人文盲是个主要的经济问题。如果我们要扩充经济，参与竞争，我们就必须得到经过训练和能够加以训练的劳动力。”

根据 1980 年的统计，伊利诺州的官员估计，该州大约有 200 万人可以被认为是实际上的文盲。估计芝加哥市的这项数字是 75 万人。在全美国，问题之大，不难想象。如果说教育系统不能培养出合格的人才，美国的未来发展就会成为一个十分棘手的问题，日本战后经济成功的一个重要原因，就是其教育制度的严格性。今日的日本，教育体制依然相当有效，这恐怕是美国面临的最大的挑战。

除了知识教育之外，严重的问题还存在于伦理道德和价值观念方面。青年人在这方面的情况也令人担忧。关键的因素是青年一代失去了信仰和伦理观念。保守派对此十分反感。这档电视节目的总结是：孩子们缺乏价值观、纪律和目标。

原因何在？

教师们的答复是：教师的工资太低，待遇太差，高中留不住人，大家都见异思迁。家长的答复是：工作太忙、没有时间照管孩子，挣钱都来不及。问题是，是不是联邦增加拨款就可以解决这个问题呢？可以部分解决，但不能全然解决。美国人的思维容易想到拨款上去。

我在一个中等水平的家庭里看这档电视节目，主人有一位女儿是高中生，另外还有一位女儿的同学。看完电视节目后，我们讨论了这个问题。女孩子说，“美国的确存在这种现象，但在我的学校中问题没有这样严重，同学们的成绩要好得多。学生缺少地理知识，也许与生活太优越有关，他们不需要到别的国度去就可以得到舒适的生活条件。对价值、纪律和目标，不同的人有不同的选择。”她的同学说：“这种问题在大城市和贫困地区特别明显，很多人不会写不会念，他们认为读书不能马上赚钱，而贩毒或做什么事却可以马上赚钱。接受更多的教育没有立即的好处，这是一个重要的原因。”这位高中生是一位想过这个问题的人。

在商品经济中，钱的力量是难以抗拒的。如果没有一种力量加以引导，人们都会唯利是图。最后会引出严重的社会问题。许多发展中国家也都处在这样的困境之

中。发展经济，需要首先调动货币机制，引导人们的精力。等到经济发展了，需要高科技高技术了，才发现难找这样的人才，因为货币力量会趋使人们寻找简单劳动挣钱，而非复杂劳动。这是值得发展中国家引以为戒的。

“货币能解决的问题，智慧一定能解决。但智慧不能解决的问题，货币一定不能解决。”

这家主人的评论更突出地表述了这个问题的严重性。当然，这是一种绝对化了的说法。智慧和货币结合方能解决问题。发展中国家的问题，主要不在于智慧或货币绝对数量的多少，而在于两者如何结合。他说：“青年没有价值、纪律和目标，主要是因为他们的家长也没有。”这句话点明了有知识阶层的忧患所在。这一代是过去的一代造就的，而下一代又将由这一代来造就，结局是可以想象的。

如果基本知识的传递都成问题，那社会的基本价值信念如何传递？如何社会化？这不仅是对美国社会经济的最大挑战，也是对美国政治的最大挑战。新保守主义的兴起表明这种忧虑已达到相当的程度。

### 3. 游离少年

家庭观念的变化，以及家庭组织的松散，在社会产生了什么影响，是促进社会发展，还是相反？这个问题值得研究。个人主义发展的结果，使人担心谁会认真承担家庭的责任。年轻夫妇常常遇到的问题就是怎样解决家庭责任。在中小城市和乡村里的家庭中，我觉得家庭观念还较浓厚。受过高等教育的人对家庭责任也较明确。尽管美国的社会机制使人明确知道子女的不可依赖性，但有责任感的家长依然尽自己的义务，把孩子抚养到成年。

然而，个人主义和私域观念是那样根深蒂固，以至家庭关系中也笼罩着这种氛围。我觉得这种家庭精神——个人主义和私域——使家庭关系较难以调整，家庭中紧张态势（Tension）较大。父母很难管理较大的孩子，尽管父母可能是正确的。父母因为要维持自己的私域，有时难以考虑周全子女的愿望。夫妇之间由于同样的原因也会产生一些问题。

美国的离婚率很高，很多原因不是社会和其他问题，而是个人的精神问题。获得奥斯卡金像奖的电影《克莱默夫妇》，深刻地反映了这种精神状态带来的问题。值得注意的不是乔安娜出走的说不清楚的理由，而是丈夫对孩子的态度。家庭中的这种内在精神带来了不少问题：离婚率高，单身家长多，游离少年多等。我们来看一下游离少年的问题。

游离少年的概念是新加坡人的概念，类似于中国的“逃夜”和北京土话“溜夜”之类。家庭问题首先影响到青少年一代，由于家庭矛盾导致青少年出走，成为社会的一大问题。我之所以觉得这个问题重要，是在于青年乃一个社会的未来。失去了一代青年，就失去了未来。社会的未来如何？答案也在于青年一代的成长。

美国人也深谙此道，参院青少年犯罪调查委员会主席伯奇·百恩（Birch Bayh）在 1976 年就说过：“我们的青年是民族最宝贵的资源。”社会固然能培养出大批精英。但对一个社会来说，需要精英，也需要大众。如果大众是“垮掉的一代”，社会何以进步？

从家庭的组合，走到游离少年，只是想从游离少年的现象追溯家庭的功能。手头有阿诺德·P·鲁宾（Arnold P·Rubin）写的著作，《少年违法：美国的游离少年》。这本书出版于 1976 年。虽然出版于 12 年前，但仍然有价值。

游离少年在美国较为严重。1975 年的估计是每年 100 万，这还是一个保守的数字。与美国 2 亿多人口相比，这不是一个小的数字。1973 年，警察当局抓住的游离少年达 26.5 万。游离少年指的是未成年的儿童和少年未经父母同意离家出走。最小的有 10 岁左右的儿童。我们可以看一下鲁宾描写的一些少年离家出走的原因和结果。

泰丽，“我出走的主要原因是家里紧张空气太浓。”泰丽 17 岁，她说她不想回去，家里太紧张。也不想去学校，学校里学不到有用的东西。

兰迪，17 岁，来自佛罗里达，“父亲把我放上公共汽车，对我说，不要让我再见到你。”他说他出走的原因是，“我父母想摆脱负担……他们认为我的脑子有问题。”他和他的妹妹是收养的。

卡西，圣地亚哥，13 岁开始游离，她说她不能同她的继父在一起，他是酒鬼。他的父亲打她，“有一天我回家晚了一个小时，与一个朋友一起走回家，他就想打我的朋友，我母亲阻止了他。他用皮带打我，问我为什么晚回家，并拿刀来，母亲阻止了他。”

里克，12 岁，里克的父母不住在一起，他有七年没有见到母亲。他和父亲与祖母生活在一起，这三个人都是酒鬼。他父亲喝了酒就揍他。

白基，来自非常舒适的家庭，“我的母亲健康非常糟糕，家里很乱，她希望别人注意她，有时揍我来达到这个目的。”跑了两次以后回到家里，她父亲告诉她不能住在家里，她离家出走，住在街上一个月许。

伯克斯特，15 岁，在纽约被杀害，警察局说是被她的“顾客”杀害的。她曾因卖淫被警察局抓住。但她使警察局相信她已有 19 岁，是第一次干，警察放了她。第二天夜里被杀害。

白克莱，出走之后卖淫被抓，后来被害。原因是她父亲十年前离家出走，不告而别，家庭陷于贫困，不能不依靠政府资助。她想摆脱这种境况。

我仅随便在鲁宾提到的各种例子里举了几项。可以看到，大多数情况下，是由家庭紧张气氛引起的，无论是何种原因造成的紧张气氛。当然也有些儿童因家长不给买高保真音响设备之类的原因而出走的。可是，更深的原因在于不少家庭无法达到真正的内在和谐。人人都想有个人主义和私域，如何会有真正的和谐。个人



主义和私域是美国社会重要的价值观，但它们是否在任何限度内都是有利无弊的？再好的东西，如果让其无限度地泛滥，必然走向反面。在美国，工作部门一般很少关注个人的私域。家庭是否也应如此？或者需要某种调和呢？

游离少年至少反映了家庭缺少吸引力。这个社会问题也意味着社会发展的两个问题：

其一，家庭的社会功能有弱化趋势。家庭是教育青年一代的重要场所，也是协调社会一部分矛盾的场所。由于家庭关系的演变，大量的青少年问题就交给了社会。单为游离少年之事，政府每年要花上千万的美元。相应地，政府也建立了游离少年的收留所等组织和设施。这实际上增加了社会的压力，增加了政府的开支，也增加了人与人之间的紧张关系。

其二，青少年从小在这种环境下成长起来，能否具备一个社会健康发展所需要的心理结构。青少年应该走什么样的道路，虽然不可强迫，但也不能放任自流。这样大数目的青少年生活这样的氛围中，对一个社会的预后不良。实际上，大量的游离少年参与犯罪或成为犯罪的对象，失去了教育机会。日本社会的快速发展，与日本有完整的青少年教养机制有密切的关系。可能用西方文化的观点看，日本的做法不能接受，但日本的成功告诉人们，相背的道路可能意味着失败。每个社会都应找到良好的机制来达到这个目标。美国的今后几代还能撑住美国的架子吗？许多美国人也怀疑。

一个社会的发展，固然要依靠政治体制、企业、金融、科技、文化，但也要依靠基本组织——家庭。问题是怎样协调不断发展的社会精神与家庭之间的关系。

这决定社会政治协调的幅度。

## 4.无毒

### 美国

美国的概念，在今天这个世界上，必须与毒品联系在一起，故称之为“无毒不美国”。毒品已构成美国社会一个难以克服的顽症。里根行政当局最近发动了强大的攻势来反对吸毒贩毒，会有多大效果现在还难说。犯罪集团围绕毒品买卖组织起来，使出浑身解数，与政府的肃毒组织周旋。毒品通过各种渠道进入美国。在一些城市中，要得到一包毒品很容易，大街小巷上有人兜售。不少人吸毒上瘾，结果陷入毒品中不能自拔。有的人吸毒上瘾，不能不为犯罪集团所左右，年轻姑娘由此而不得不卖身换毒品。

毒品正在侵蚀美国，其力量，恐怕超过了历史上各种冲击过美国的力量。毒品的泛滥，也构成对社会体制的强大的挑战。能否抑制并压缩毒品的泛滥，是对社会体制乃至道德精神的一场考验。

毒品泛滥首先影响到青少年的身心健康。青少年吸毒现象异常严重。我看过一部电影，讲一个中学校长如何去治理一个脏乱差的学校，主要对手是一名黑人中学生。他有一群学生拥护，在学校的厕所里公开贩毒。他们设计毒打这名校长，并且拆毁校长的摩托车。最后几个人拿了枪来杀这名校长。几乎就要被打死的时候，校长意外得救，这名学生被警察抓去，警车开走的时候，他两眼死死盯着校长，一副不甘罢休的样子，令人不寒而栗。这里面自然有艺术加工，但恐怕与一些情况严重的实际过程相差无几。毒品组织的触角早已伸到社会各个角落，尤其是青少年集中的场所。在小城镇中可能好一些，在大城市中情况更甚。

我们来看一下一份杂志《Ladies' Home Journal》1987 年 5 月号上的一篇文章。题目叫“孩子与毒品”。作者一开始就引用了里根总统给这份杂志写的信：“毒品威胁着每一个美国家庭和我们自己的生活方式……毒品使年轻人失去他们需要的教育，使每一千名美国人中十人不能工作。毒品与犯罪紧密联系，摧毁财产，提高保险比率，劳累警察局和各类执法人员，给我们造成了巨大的损失……我们的经济损失可以用数以亿计的美元来测量，但如何测量一个生活被毁坏的国家的损失？”这番话，表明了美国遇到的严峻挑战。

青少年吸毒的状况如何？这份杂志对几名青年做了调查。其中有一个人的答复如下：

蒂姆·奥西基：“我在离开小学进入初中时开始吸毒。我发现这所学校中毒品很多，也许是因为我认识了一些大孩子和来自市中心的孩子。我认识的一些人吸毒，开始我不感兴趣。后来我开始吸 Marijuana，不久这种东西不起作用了。后来遇到来自很有钱的家庭的孩子。他们向我介绍昂贵的毒品，如可卡因。我用了，从此可卡因成为我生活中不可分离的一部分。”

青少年在社会、学校或什么地方染上吸毒的习惯之后，便不能自拔，陷入泥淖之中。毒品的花色品种很多。有些是医用的药品，但过量了也会成瘾，对身体有害无益。毒品的名称有：

Heroin, morphine, Codeine, methadone, Cocaine, marbiturates, Amphetamines, LSD, DMT, mescaline, Psilocybin, Alcohol 等。

青少年吸毒犯罪，由吸毒走上犯罪的不计其数。围绕着这个主题，人们制作了大量的电影、电视，写下了难以计数的小说故事。有一部电影写的是几名中学生搞到了一小箱毒品，想出手。与另一帮人联络上后，约好在某处碰头，但发现对方带着凶器，想谋财害命，连忙拔出枪来，才没有遇险。这时另两名学生发现他们有一小箱毒品，便想抢劫。这天他们拿着枪去抢劫，正好遇上另一帮人也来抢，三方交战，死了两人。两名学生中一人被打死了，另一人在逃窜中将有毒品的那群学生的头头的弟弟撞死了，自己进了少年改造所。后者因弟弟死了，极想报仇，

便故意去强奸前者的女朋友，结果也进了少年改造所。两人在少年改造所里明争暗斗。最后，一天夜里，后者打昏了看守，冲进前者的房间，展开一场殊死搏斗，结果是两败俱伤，打得鲜血淋漓。他们都是未成年的青少年。

自然，吸毒者不限于青少年，成年人中吸毒者也是大把大把地可抓。问题是这些人都是从青少年时代就染上了毒瘾。吸毒会产生严重的后果，主要是在身心方面，完全有可能使一个人萎靡不振，有气无力，情绪低落，最后摧毁一个人正常的精神状态，有时甚或导致死亡。

对于吸毒，也有不同的看法。如托马斯·斯萨斯（Thomas S·Szasz）就写了一篇文章，认为：大部分人均反对滥用毒品，认为要采取强制性的政策，因为毒品太危险。但是他认为每个人都可以损害和杀死自己，这是人的自由的一个基本方面。自我摧毁可以被看成是一种罪恶，也可以通过非正式的手段来惩罚，但不能视之为一种罪行或精神疾病，运用警察力量来控制它。因此不让一名成年人拥有毒品是荒谬的。武器、利刃都更为危险，但无人禁止。这是一种权利。所以不能剥夺成年人拥有和使用毒品的权利，尽管大部分人不会使用它们。这是一种典型的反面观念。

这种观念现在不是主流。主流是主张政府采取有效行动来禁止贩毒和吸毒。话说回来，不能说这种论点没有道理。因为枪枝弹药的确要比毒品危险，在美国却可以公开出售。一枪可以打死一个人；一包毒品，只要对方不受用，便打不死人。美国人认为拥有枪是公民权利，那么毒品为什么不能拥有？这个难题，美国人还没有解开。

实际上，这也是对人的权利幅度的挑战。在社会生活中，能给予每个人的自由幅度有多大？这是实际问题。说一个人可以享有全权是不现实的。洛克、卢梭等人讨论的问题，他们未能从实际上解决，今天的人仍未能从实际上解决。恐怕我们还需要对人类做一番再认识。

为什么说吸毒是对美国的一大挑战？问题就在这里。美国人相信每个人有自己决定自己命运的权利，这是个人的自由权，不能剥夺的。这种权利逐步发展，在二次大战之后，从政治领域的选举权利、种族平等权利和男女平等的权利，发展到后来的性自由的权利，追求自己生活方式的权利（如嬉皮士等）等。这一切都被美国人接受了。如今来了个吸毒的权利，美国人却不能接受。因为接受它，意味着民族或民族中相当一部分人的衰败。美国体制中有没有坚固的哲学基础来支持这项反毒行动，现在还不能说。相反的哲学基础却有之。美国人现在大部分赞同禁毒反毒。这是一种事实和情感的选择，是一种公众舆论。未来会是如何？性自由

也曾被认为是不道德的吗？

吸毒问题提出的挑战主要不在哲学领域，很少有人对这类抽象而深奥的问题感兴趣，如果没有形成一定的条件的话。吸毒问题提出的挑战还包括：促使人们吸毒的原因是什么？许多吸毒者的答案是，感到无聊、空虚、恍惚、沮丧，所以借吸毒来刺激一下。据一位精神病医生分析，美国人三分之一有这样或那样的精神问

题。那么，造成这种现象的原因又是什么？这样我们就得走入一个广大的视野。人们生活在一定的社会环境中，这个环境包括家庭、学校、企业、文化、教育、政治、法律等各个方面。这个环境在产生吸毒者呢还是在消除他们？吸毒者越来越多，与日俱增。反毒肃毒只是消极手段，因为只是针对结果而言的。但要改变产生结果的原因，又谈何容易？

我们深知，吸毒对一个民族会产生什么样的危害性。十九世纪中叶之后，鸦片大量输入中国，其产生的危害可以说至今还存在，作为历史，将产生长远的影响。反对吸毒的美国人，大部分担心自己的孩子，少部分人担心整个社会的发展，个别别人想的更远。更远是最难接受的。

## 5.黑社会

黑社会组织或犯罪集团在美国社会中有强大的势力，严密的组织。看过影片《教父》的人对黑手党组织和各集团之间的残酷较量有所了解。看过《家族的荣誉》的人对黑手党的活动和手段有所了解。其他各类文学形式也常常以此为题材。黑社会组织是一个令人头痛的问题。虽然我们看到的大部分是文学作品，有艺术加工的渲染。其实现实生活中，黑社会的存在的确成为这个社会的一大难题，构成对这个富裕社会的极大威胁，也构成对这个社会制度的最大挑战。

11 月 25 日的《纽约时报》上刊登了一篇文章，介绍两个贩毒集团情况，读后令人不寒而栗。这两个集团的名称一个叫 Bloods，一个叫 Crips，基地在加利福尼亚州。他们利用发达的高速公路系统，在全国建立起井井有条的暴力和贩毒组织。这个组织从西海岸的加利福尼亚州发展到东海岸的巴尔的摩和华盛顿，从大城市扩展到小城市。这个网络的主要功能是出售可卡因。这两个组织发展到差不多每一个州，八百处据点。贩毒组织精心经营，成为一种具有良好管理的组织。

贩毒组织不仅扩大力量，而且装备精良。缉毒部门往往由于武器没有贩毒组织精良而被打得落荒而逃。这些组织装备有轻重武器，遇到麻烦，便大打出手。

这些组织一旦来到一座新的城市，往往不是悄悄地来，而是大造声势，开着昂贵豪华的小汽车，穿着珠光宝气的衣服。

这些人往往不带身份证，也不在街头兜售。他们雄心勃勃，来到一个地方，主要是建立销售网络，订合同，俨然象是在做正儿八经的买卖。

最近在密苏里州抓住两名罪犯，带了 1,100 磅可卡因，价值连城。

这两个组织到底有多少人，说不清楚。在洛杉矶县，人数大约在 700 名左右，大多数是黑人。洛杉矶市大约有 27000 名骨干分子。在全国各地，阵容强大。丹佛市大约有 700 人。俄克拉荷马市大约 60 人，加上已经抓住的 30 多人。堪萨斯市也有不少。凡是有他们活动的地方都有大批人马。

他们组织严密，而且肆无忌惮。在大街小巷各处出售毒品，并且恫吓人们不许报告警察局。在奥马哈（Omaha），有一块居住区被称为“越南”，因为这里经常发生枪战，血雨腥风。

最近出版的另一本书，书名叫《Mafia Enforcer: A true Story of Life and Death in the Mob》。作者是托马斯·莱纳和塞西尔·科比。前者系著名的记者，专写犯罪活动内幕，在美国很有名气，得过各种奖，是研究有组织犯罪的专家。后者是一位悔过的犯罪集团要员。犯罪集团悬赏十万美元巨额，要拿他的脑袋。他由警察局严加保护，化名隐姓。这本书由塞西尔·科比口述，托马斯·莱纳记录并写作，暴露了黑社会的内幕，惊心动魄。

我们仅来看下他们在书的最前面勾勒的犯罪集团的组织图表。一类是家族式的犯罪集团，如黑手党。最高层是委员会，下面是老板，老板下面是小老板，小老板下面是头头（Caporegima）。头头下面是士兵（Soldiers），士兵的职责是强制执行纪律，手段是威胁、进攻和暗杀，同时执行领导层的命令。犯罪集团同时与各类人员和组织结成庞大的网。黑手党一般从事两种活动：一类为合法活动，如银行、酒吧、俱乐部、食品生产、工会、保险、房产、饭店、娱乐等，应有尽有；另一类为非法活动，如酒精、攻击、爆炸、贿赂、出口、绑架、暗杀、卖淫、偷盗等。

另一类组织是非家族型的，称为 Motorcycle Gang。这类组织有全国性领导层：主席、副主席、司库等。下面有 Sergeant at Arms, War Lord, Road Captain, 他们负责管束集团成员，管制非成员，手段也是殴打、暗杀等。他们与社会三教九流有广泛的联系。从事的活动也有两类：合法活动包括汽车买卖、酒吧、娱乐、俱乐部、食品、摩托车买卖、房产、饭店、货运、建筑、古董等。非法活动与黑手党相同。

这类组织组织严密，能量惊人，主宰着很大一部分美国社会。白宫治理着美国社会，黑社会组织也治理着很大一部分美国社会，但这一部分是黑暗的。我们可以来看一下这本书中描写的一个场景（第五章，卖身姑娘）：

“他们常常打死一些女人以保护他们自己，因为他们认为她们可能会变成告密者，这是许多姑娘消失的一个原因。消失者或者受酷刑，或者被谋杀。她们被肢解，钉在十字架上或被扔进荒地，让野兽吃光尸体，不留痕迹。姑娘们也因其他原因而消失。有时她们在低级的酒吧里做妓女或伴舞，在 16 岁或 18 岁时就变得太老和无用了。有的因为想摆脱拥有她们的俱乐部，有的没有上交规定上交的钱，有的仅仅是因为没有挣到足够的钱……”

看了这样的章节，不禁要问，这是美国吗？不错，这是美国。这是硬币的另一面。政府承认这些犯罪集团威胁着社会。1985 年，联邦调查局的统计表明，最大的四个犯罪集团有 3,800 名成员，这还不包括八百个小的集团。今天，犯罪组织和黑手党的势力已大有发展，成为社会最令人头痛的问题之一。

犯罪组织的存在构成对制度的一大挑战。有组织的犯罪的出现，本身就表明一种体制上的漏洞。自然，不能说哪一种体制可以完全避免犯罪。但犯罪集团发展到全国性的大规模组织，实在是值得思考的问题。体制有这方面的漏洞。需要说明的是：我这里讲的洞，仅指可以透过某种东西的空间，并没有特定的设定。从这方面讲：

其一，美国人的观念是有罪必究，无罪不管，法律放在那里，只有当触犯法律后，才加以追究。也许这是政制的一项重要原则，任何人的行为不能在一开始就治罪和禁止，要以观后效。可是，象有组织犯罪这样的活动，等到它们人多势众时，已无法控制和治罪。美国的状况就是一个实例。

其二，美国人的观念是任何人都可以自行组织起来，这是一种权利。这也是政制的一项基本原则。美国的政党活动便是这种原则运作的结果。但是，如果允许结社，那么任何人都可以结社。社会只能惩罚犯罪的个人，而无力对付这些组织。这些组织往往具有合法和不合法的两面性，使想取缔它们的人碍于一些理由而难以达到目标。

这两个问题，是美国政制的潜在问题。犯罪组织把它们放到了明处。任何社会在设计体制时，均会遇到这类问题，想禁止的由于想允许的决定而不能禁止，不想给予的由于想给予的决定而只能给予。如果说美国政制过去、现在或将来有什么问题，问题就在这里。美国政制在给予和允许方面是一个十分成功的政制，但在禁止和防范方面不是一个值得赞扬的政制。美国人想制止很多东西，但往往适得其反，越想禁止的东西，结果却越多。

## 6.乞丐王国

维克多·雨果的不朽之作《巴黎圣母院》，向人们描绘了曾几何时法国巴黎乞丐们的苦难和生活，卡西摩多和艾斯美拉达的形象令人难以忘怀。根据雨果《巴黎圣母院》改编的电影，为人们展现了卡西摩多栩栩如生的形象。这个形象那样生动，使人们把他视为下层人的典型形象。令人奇怪的是，如今走在堪称二十世纪第一巨富大国的美国的土地上，总感到有不少人与这个形象相象。他们肮脏、污秽、衣冠不整、目光呆滞、行动迟缓，脸上带着一种看一眼便不能忘怀的可怜表情。这样的人为数不少，构成二十世纪八十年代美国的乞丐王国，也构成美国的一大社会问题。

对于这些人，报章的正式叫法为 Homeless，即无家可归的人。由于无家可归的人越来越多，朝野对这个问题越来越重视，这一段的报纸和政府发言人常常谈论这个问题。走在大大小小的城市里，都可以看到大批无家可归的人。他们或是坐在大街旁，呆呆的，或是向人要钱，或是蜷曲在哪个角落或门洞里睡觉，或是背着一大堆破破烂烂的东西在慢慢行走……这里可以举我亲眼所见的几个事例来谈这个问题：

1988 年 8 月份，华盛顿。一位英国政治学者邀请我去一家黎巴嫩饭店吃饭。我们说好两人从下榻的华盛顿希尔顿旅馆走到那家饭店去，顺便看看华盛顿的夜景。我们傍晚 7 点从希尔顿出发，走到市中心最热闹的一条街上。有一位黑人拦住我们，问我们有没有零钱。这是我第一次碰到 Homeless。这天晚上，在吃饭的来回路上，遇到的 Homeless 和向我们要钱的人不下十名。这个概率很大的。

1988 年 12 月，纽约。纽约的这类人物大概较为集中。那天晚上朋友开车一起去纽约，准备投宿在一位朋友家中。由于对纽约的街道不熟，车开进了哈莱姆区。这是纽约犯罪最高的一个区。当时已是夜半。只看到每一个街口都有成群的人，有的在大声喧哗，有的在喝酒，一种令人恐慌的气氛包围着我们。第二天向朋友一打听，知道昨夜闯入了哈莱姆区，不禁一身冷汗。

1988 年 12 月，纽约。到一位朋友家里去，走到他住的那幢门口，看见台阶上坐着一个人，正在吃东西。衣冠不整，旁边有一大堆破烂的行李。不由得提高警惕，迟疑要不要进去。结果那人先抬起头来，原来是一位老妇人。她说：“不要伤害我，我是无家可归的人，我只是坐在这里吃东西，不会做别的事。”听了她的话，心中泛起一种巨大的怜悯。

1988 年 1 月，伯克莱。我在加利福尼亚大学的伯克莱分校的东亚研究所做访问学者，每天中午去吃饭，要走过一条商业街。这条街上要钱的真多。就在商业街一侧的一个门洞里，连续几天我们都看到地上铺着旧报纸和纸板，以及一些乱七八糟的碎纸，每天晚上有人在这里就宿，盖着破絮。尽管我们没有见到那个人，但可以想象他是什么样的形象。

这样的见闻很多，恐怕任何一位在美国的人都会有这样的遭遇。冬天来临，西海岸各城市中无家可归的人特别集中。在旧金山市的市政厅门前，有成群结队的无家可归的人。在西雅图市的大街小巷，无家可归的人聚集在车站和公共场所。纽约的火车站厕所里，一大群无家可归的人在里面要钱，吓得一般人不敢上茅房；Greyhound 车站里也不逊色。1989 年 1 月 20 日，是布什宣誓就任第四十一任总统的日子，在他发表慷慨激昂的演说时，电视里穿插了一个画面：一名无家可归的人盖着一堆乱七八糟的东西在地上睡觉。可见，这个问题已经多么严重。

1989 年 1 月 16 日的《纽约时报》在头版上有一篇文章，讨论 Homeless 带来的社会问题。说的是一座小村，叫艾姆斯福特，成为韦斯特切斯特县无家可归的人的“首都”。这个村子共有 3,300 名常住居民，但无家可归的人却达 378 人。他们住在那里的四家汽车旅馆中。纽约州法律规定：任何人如果需要紧急住处，便应提供给他。所以县的福利部门安排这些事情。在这 378 人中，只有 9 人来自这座村庄，大部分人来自其他地方，如波士顿、路易斯安那、奥来根等地。韦斯特切斯特县 1988 年花了 5400 万美元来安置他们，今年计划花 6400 万美元。无家可归的人集中在这里，引起了当地人的惶惶不安，生活质量下降了，犯罪率上升了，殴斗增加，他们担心往日的平静会被打破。不少人准备前往他地。从这里我们可以看出，无家可归的人会带来什么样的社会问题和冲突。艾姆斯福特只

是一个很小的社区，但遇到了这样多的无家可归的人带来的麻烦。整个美国加起来，又该如何呢？

为什么有无家可归的人？这是一个不能简单答复的问题。有的人认为，那是他们自己愿意，很多无家可归的人看上去年轻力壮，他们宁愿行乞，也不愿去找工作。不少人对这样的人并不表同情。也有人认为，不久前将一些没有侵害行为的精神病人放出来，是无家可归的人队伍壮大的主要原因。他们精神上有毛病，不可能去从事工作，而他们的家庭或亲属也不愿意照顾他们，所以不少人沦为无家可归的人。

说真的，在美国，在大街上见到不正常的人，不要感到奇怪，因为太多。也有的人从越战来分析，认为无家可归的人有许多是越战老兵，他们在越战中吸毒以支撑自己的意志，结果不能自拔，毁坏了身心健康，无法象正常人那样工作，也就只能走上这条路。如此等等。

这种现象，颇令人费解。它对美国的制度和美国精神是一个挑战。一方面是商品的极大丰富，另一方面是为数众多的赤贫的人。就财富本身而言，美国不象一些发展中国家。那些国家资源本身匮乏，在怎么分配也无法满足所有人的基本需要。而社会的财富，如果用另一种方式分配足以使所有无家可归的人都过上体面的生活，问题是，这种分配方式在这个制度下难以形成，不符合这个制度的性质。

或许有人会说，无家可归的现象与制度无关。那么，美国文化和美国精神也没有提供解决这个问题条件。政府和民间的不少机构的确在着力解决这个问题，但是谈何容易。无家可归的人本身，无论出于什么原因，可能是自身的原因，也可能是社会的原因，但这种现象的存在，对这个社会就是一个挑战。美国并不会因有这些问题而被认为是一个贫穷落后的国家，人们照样认为美国是一个头号发达国家。然而，美国因有这些现象，从而被人们更好地认识。

任何社会都不可能十全十美，任何政治和行政管理也都不可能面面俱到。一个好的政治和行政系统，不在于它一开始就设计得天衣无缝，而在于它能针对不断冒出来的问题，来发展和壮大自身。自然，关键在于它要有这种能力，且这种能力要符合它们制度运转的内在逻辑。

## 7.黑色挑战

“黑色挑战”，或称“黑色风暴”，我指的是黑人问题。黑人引起的社会和政治问题，成为一个令人头痛的问题，也构成对社会的严重挑战。有的人把黑人问题比喻成最大的社会难题，说这个问题最终将成为致命问题。在美国，可以深深感觉到，这个说法有一定的道理。

马丁·路德·金中心坐落在亚特兰大市。我去参观了这个中心。与卡特中心比较起来，马丁·路德·金中心就显得小而破旧，部分原因是其建立的年代比较早。



马丁·路德·金是著名的黑人民权领袖。直到六十年代，黑人问题和种族歧视还十分严重。那时存在着只有白人可去的学校，只有白人可乘的汽车，只有白人人可住的旅馆，只有白人可住的地区，黑人没有地位，没有资金。那个年代，为了打破这种种族隔离，曾发生过大规模的动乱和暴力行动，联邦政府不得不出动军队保护黑人学生去白人学校上学。尽管法院裁决种族隔离违宪，实际生活中种族歧视依然长存不散。从那时至今，已有二十多年，虽然黑人的生活状况有所改善，但黑人的问题却越来越严重。

爱摩里大学的一位中国留学生告诉我：“在南方，尽管自南北战争之后，黑人得到了解放，但黑人地位依然很低。”南北战争的起因就是取消还是保存奴隶制度。我们知道的《汤姆叔叔的小屋》描绘了黑人在当时的地位。林肯总统的功绩之一就是完成了这项目标：解放黑奴。一百多年过去后，黑人不是奴隶了，但黑人却依然没有白人所享有的社会地位。

他说，在亚特兰大市附近有一个县，种族歧视的情况尤为严重。至今这个县还反对黑人居住。据说那里没有黑人。凡是有黑人住进去，都会被排挤出来。反种族歧视组织多次支持有胆量的黑人住进去，都被打出来。去年一个反种族歧视组织为抗议这种态度，在该县组织了一次游行，结果被那个县的人打得落花流水。后来报刊报道了这件事，引起全国人的愤怒，各地的人都声援这个组织，前来参加游行，弄得警察局十分紧张。该县的人见反对他们的人人多势众，众怒难犯，没有敢动手。但反对种族歧视的人也只能是游行一下，没有取得什么长久的结果。至今，该县依然歧视黑人。

今日，在大多数地方已经没有明确规定的歧视黑人的政策，甚至有相反的规定：政府机构等一定要雇佣黑人。有的白人觉得这是颠倒歧视，因为有时候白人比黑人更有能力胜任一个职位，但由于规定要雇佣黑人，白人便处于不公平的竞争位置上。

然而，这只是表面现象，在很多白人心中，讨厌黑人的心理十分强烈。例如，在一些白人的住宅区，黑人要是住进去，许多白人都会搬走。有黑人居住，房价会下跌，因为白人不愿来住。这种事实造成黑人和白人基本上分区居住。每个大城市都有黑人区，一般都是比较落后和脏乱差的地区。有的黑人得了百万美元，还是不能跻身白人的上层社会。美国人的表面文章做得很漂亮，表面上看没有什么种族歧视，实际上根深蒂固。

黑人的社会地位比较低，文化水平也较差，经济状况更糟糕。人们在大街上会遇到许多可怜巴巴要钱的人，大部分是黑人，华盛顿这样的人多得惊人，和繁华都市太不协调；在大街广场上会看到许多卖艺的人，大多是黑人；还可以看到招工处和救济处排队的人，大多是黑人；流浪街头无家可归的人，大多是黑人；穿得破破烂烂、衣冠不整的人，大多也是黑人。当然白人也有这样潦倒的人，但人数较少。观光者看到这种状况，自然会提心吊胆。

黑人居住区最能典型地反映黑人的困境。我在旧金山、纽约、纽黑文、费城、华盛顿、亚特兰大都去过黑人居住区，给人的印象极为糟糕。一般来说，都比白人居住的地区脏乱差，一眼就可以看出是贫穷地段。不少户门前，都坐着一些懒洋洋的黑人。年轻人三五成群地站在街上，令人心里打鼓。纽约的黑人居住区尤其糟糕，里面的犯罪率极高。有一位朋友告诉我，有一次一位美国人带他去纽约黑人区参观，车开到一半，一辆警车紧追不舍。他们以为违反了交通规则。停下来后，警察问他们知不知道前面是什么地方，他们说知道。警察说多加小心。他们俩只敢快速开过黑人区，不敢下来。他说如果车子抛了锚，就不知道要发生什么事了。

黑人的生活状况极差，在走投无路后，大多走上犯罪道路。整个社会的犯罪状况可列世界前茅，黑人尤烈。听到不少关于黑人抢劫中国人的故事。有一位朋友说，有一次他陪一位同事去饭店，在楼梯上遇到两个黑人拿着刀要钱。一位中国留学生告诉我，纽约的四十二街的犯罪猖獗，中国驻纽约领事馆正好往这条街上。罪犯专门抢中国人的钱。纽约警察局不得不在领馆前安排了骑警，一般的警察已经不敷为用（不过我没有看到中国驻纽约总领事馆门前有骑警）。这可是在光天化日之下。

黑人中杰出人物层出不穷，他们也成为社会崇拜的偶像：如田径运动员、歌星、篮球运动员、垒球运动员、拳击运动员、橄榄球运动员。不过黑人的总体地位没有变化。

黑人的问题已构成一种循环，这个环难以解开。黑人的整体文化较低，经济水平差，在生育方面不加控制，福利制度规定儿童可以领得政府救济。黑人的生育率高于白人。黑人儿童得不到良好的生活环境，也得不到良好的教育。因为上一代人就没有受到良好的教育，不接受一些基本的价值观，儿童自然也得不到教育和熏陶。从小在黑人区的环境中长大，潜移默化，心理不平衡。一代一代的黑人成长起来，又没有很好的技能和教育，因而不能从事技术要求较高的职位。不少儿童没有父母或只有一个家长，往往只有母亲。很多儿童的母亲是 Child mother，称“儿童母亲”，即十四五岁就怀孕，并有了孩子。这样的孩子如何能得到良好的教育。这种状况，在黑人社会中并不少见。他们长成之后，只能从事较低层的工作，得不到较高的经济报酬。少数人经过奋斗摆脱了这种困境，但又难以为白人社会所接受。这样代代相传，使黑人问题的雪球越滚越大。

黑色挑战正在威胁着社会和制度。到目前为止，制度对这个问题是软弱无力，或者说无能为力的。由于制度无所作为，反黑人主义的思潮正在兴起，新保守主义者所谓的“颠倒歧视”便具有这种意思。种族隔离已经成为历史，不过黑色挑战越来越大。三 K 党甚嚣尘上的时代已成为过去，可是不能说它一去不返了。如果社会不能找出改善黑人状况的根本方法，最后的结局很可能是更猛烈的反黑人行动。这是人类的弱点，在无法解决一个问题时，最便利的选择就是强烈反对它。

差不多每个社会都有类似的问题，有一部分人被视为“劣等人”。但产生这种问题可能有不同的原因，有的出自文化差别，有的出自历史源流，有的出自风俗习

惯，有的出自制度。对美国来说，主要的原因在于制度，所以说，黑人问题是对这个社会制度的挑战。

## 8.土著的情况

美国是殖民地的一个重要原因就是欧洲人漂洋过海来到新大陆时，这块土地上已经有人居住，并且拥有这里的土地。这就是印第安人。最早的土著可以追溯到一万年以前。1925 年，一名叫乔治·麦克琼金（George McJunkin）的黑人牛仔在新墨西哥地区发现了一堆半烧焦的野兽骨头。据科学家后来分析，这些野兽是一万年前被猎人打死的。在这之前，人们一般认为土著的历史只有几千年。那么这些人是谁？从哪里来？

从 1925 年之后，科学家经过考证，认为土著在美洲大陆生活了至少两万年。但关于他们如何到达美洲大陆的问题，说法不一。一种方法是，在冰川时代，白令海峡没有海水，人们可以通过陆地跨越海峡。最早的土著可能来自亚洲。从印第安人的长相来看，与蒙古族十分相象。这种说法有一定道理。不过，有些科学家并不以为然。尤其是印第安人学者，他们认为这样的理论否认了印第安人对美洲土地的原始所有权，因为他们也是从他域移民而来的。至于印第安人究竟从哪里来的，恐怕是个难解之谜。

欧洲人来到美洲之后，就产生了两种文化的冲突。欧洲人对印第安人的文化不屑一顾，斥之为低等文化。《美洲：人民与价值》一书对照了这两种文化的差异。印第安人的文化包括一般文化的因素：（1）提供衣食住行的方式；（2）宗教活动；（3）艺术创造；（4）团体组织；（5）传播文化的手段。在印第安文化中，这些成分具有。印第安人有自己的多种特殊文化现象。但是印第安人不具备文明（Civilization），这是欧洲人才具备的。文明包括：（1）先进的技术，如金属的利用；（2）高度发达的生活组织，如城市；（3）知识成果，如年历，文字等；（4）分工。后面这些，印第安人没有。

从欧洲文化的观念出发，蔑视印第安人的心理是自然而然的。直到二十世纪六十年代之后，人们方开始学会尊重不同文化。自然，尊重不同文化不等于看得起它。今天的美国人对诸多种文化都是持这种态度。他们表面上文质彬彬，尊重一套不同文化，但实际上轻视它——大概可以说，包括对日本文化。

其实美洲的印第安人有惊人的文化成果，如玛雅文化、阿兹德克文化、印加文化等。不过这些文化没有发展成现代文明，原因何在，恐怕也是不解之谜。

把美洲土著称为印第安人是欧洲人的偏见。1492 年，哥伦布抵达美洲，误以为加勒比海岛屿是“印度”，于是就把这些地方的人称为“印度人”。后来发现是个大错，硬将错就错，称之为印第安人。如果是误把英国当成印度，一定会改过来。

欧洲人来到美洲大陆之后，便同印第安人发生冲突。据说欧洲人把各种疾病带到美洲大陆。欧洲人为对付各种疾病，发展出成套的医药，而印第安人没有。当时各村的死亡率在百分之八十至九十左右。利米里奇（Limirich）说，1831 年，法国著名的学者阿莱克西·托克维尔写道：“上天没有使他们变得文明，他们注定要死去。”今天美国白人已不象过去那样持这种露骨的观念，但另一种观念是存在的：上天没有使他们变得富有，他们注定要受穷。是的，很强烈的观念。

最初一段时间，欧洲人与印第安人之间还存在良好的关系。但那是最初来做生意的欧洲人，而非移民。正象最初与中国人做生意的欧洲人一样。最初欧洲人向一部分印第安人提供马匹和枪枝，支持他们向内地扩张。印第安人的社会组织 and 权力关系重组。最初，印第安人也友好地欢迎欧洲人。当时欧洲人需要印第安人，以取得食物之类的东西。印第安人并不需要欧洲人。

但是，印第安人后来不得不依赖欧洲人，重要的原因之一就是贸易。贸易渐渐使自给自足的部落变得依赖外界。依赖欧洲人制造的产品，如酒之类。印第安人为了得到欧洲货，不能不为之效力。他们为债务所束缚。托马斯·杰弗逊说：“我们抓住一头狼的耳朵，既不能控制它，又不能放它走而没有危险。”这是 1820 年讲的话，这头狼指的就是印第安人。时值今日，这种感觉恐怕不存了。

后来一长段时间里，欧洲移民开始大举剥夺印第安人的土地，驱赶和杀戮印第安人。白人与印第安人的长期血战开始了。今日美国的电影和文献中有大量描绘这些场景的作品。直到最后，建立起保留地，把印第安人圈在一定的范围内。就象人们对待一些动物的态度一样——建立自然保护区。

白人对印第安人的态度历来较为奇怪，也不同于他们对待黑人。内战之后，宪法修正案肯定了黑人的权利。黑人获得解放之前，黑人在众院计算人数时只算五分之三。修正案肯定了黑人享有同等权利，但没有包括印第安人。很长时间内，印第安人不能出庭作证，不能拥有财产，不能投票，不能离开保留地。白人对印第安人和黑人的态度有所不同。对待黑人，白人长期拒绝他们享有文明的成果，学校、教堂、商店、饭店和公共场所不对黑人开放。而对印第安人的孩子却不同。法律要求他们接受白人的制度，印第安人的孩子被强制送去学校。保留地里有教堂。白人希望印第安人接受白人的制度和生活方式，很有些驯化野生动物的意思。白人对待印第安人和黑人的这种差别，在于印第安人是土生土长的，是土地的所有者；而黑人是外来的。虽然在社会地位上两者相差无几，但印第安人是真正的美洲人，欧洲人的难题是，怎样使真正的美洲人“认同他们的国家”。

时至今日，印第安人的问题依然是社会的一个问题。现在美国大约有 50 万印第安人。他们的境况大都不能与平均水平相比。由于失望和悲观，酗酒严重。印第安人青年的自杀率高于平均数 10

，50%的人没有工作，80%的人要依靠政府救济。印第安人至今仍不能说认同了盎格鲁-撒克逊文化或主流文化。他们有自己的文化和自己的语言。印第安人的教育

程度一般不高，很难到保留地以外去找工作，竞争。有少数印第安人来到城市，但他们会返回居住地，从心理上来说他们认同自己的文化。

印第安人没有黑人那样多，所以他们对社会的实际挑战并不那么大。不过，他们对美国文明是一种挑战，即为什么欧洲移民在这么长的时间里没能同化印第安人。我觉得这里不是技术问题，而是心理问题。如同不少地方充分显示了美国的文化，其反美情绪却更强烈。

## 9.精神危机

美国社会有没有精神危机？有些人不会思考这些问题。经济的高度发达，使人们不再去探讨这个表象后面的事态发展。处于美国社会之外的人，自然很难去探索繁华景象背后的东西，呈现在眼前的令人眼花缭乱的种种景象已够难对付的了。一俊遮百丑，在一个社会经济高度发达时，尤其会产生这种状况。然而生活在吾土吾民中的人们，往往就更愿意思考这个问题。愿意思考这个问题的，又往往是到了一定年纪或有一定思想的人。社会物质高度发达的景象之后，存在着什么样的精神状态？不少被称为保守主义者的思想家认为，存在着精神危机。

最近一本颇受争议的书是 *The Closing of The American Mind: How Higher Education Has Failed Democracy and Impoverished The Souls of Today's Students*（《美国精神的结束：美国高等教育如何搞垮民主制，如何使今天的学生灵魂空虚》）。作者阿兰·布鲁姆（Allan Bloom）是芝加哥大学约翰·M·奥林民主的理论与实践调查中心成员，社会思想委员会的教授，曾译过柏拉图的《理想国》和卢梭的《爱弥儿》。此书发表之后，引起激烈争论，强烈的反响。不少人认为这是保守主义的旗帜，黑人运动和女权主义者反应尤为强烈，因为布鲁姆主张的观念在很多方面与黑人人权运动和女权主义运动相悖。但也有许多人大声叫好，据说里根就认为这是一本好书，我问过几位大学里的教授，他们也认为是一本好书。

布鲁姆的主要论点是什么？布鲁姆的主要思路是，如今的大学教育已不能使教育对象掌握奠基西方社会的传统价值观念。大学在现代的发展越来越走向一种文化相对主义和精神开放。文化相对主义要求精神开放。但这种文化相对主义暗含的逻辑是世上没有绝对的价值，任何事物都是可以接受的，或不能接受的。这种观念成为一种德行（virtue）。布鲁姆认为每一个教育系统都有一个道德目标，教育系统力图达到这个目标，并在课程中体现这个目标。

五十年代，美国的教育在追求这一目标。文化相对主义成功地摧毁了西方中心主义的思想，但同时也削弱了西方文化的地位。在这种精神的主导下，大学教育的结果是年轻人对以往没有概念，对将来没有看法。负责进行高等教育的大学不提供西方哲学和文学的光辉历史的知识。学生们无法通过这些知识来理解自然的秩序和人在自然中的位置。大学没有提供严肃的学习过程所需要的自我意识。

结果是什么呢？

青年一代对西方历史上的经典著作知之甚少。布鲁姆说有一次上课时他问学生有什么书给他们留下了最深的印象，竟然没有一个人能说出一本名著来。有一个人说是《圣经》，但大学里是不教此书的。学生们有时去看一些电影，如《甘地》、《托马斯·莫尔》，但这些电影，在布鲁姆看来，是经过人为的艺术加工的。学生们读《克莱默夫妇》，以了解离婚和性生活，但很少有人把《安娜·卡列尼娜》、《红与黑》视为自己生活中不可缺少的东西。女权主义者是经典著作的敌人（这里可以了解为什么女权主义者反对布鲁姆）。

布鲁姆认为，六十年代和七十年代的反精英主义和种族主义的斗争对学生与书的关系影响很小。那些积极分子很少攻击古典著作。但是所有的文学都是有性别差异的，以往的作家，苏格拉底、柏拉图、莎士比亚、卢梭、托尔斯泰、斯汤达，怎么会有今天女权主义的想法。在多种力量的作用下，古典名著已成为昨日黄花。

西方音乐中的精品，青年一代对之越来越淡漠，哪怕去听这些音乐，也缺少必要的灵感和激情。虽然二十世纪可以说是音乐的世纪，青年一代无比迷恋音乐，但他们迷恋的是摇滚乐、现代音乐，古典音乐在年轻一代中已经死去。贝多芬，肖邦、勃拉姆斯、莫扎特、瓦格纳等，已日益受到冷落。西方教育历来注重音乐在教育中的地位，认为音乐可以陶冶性情，苏格拉底和柏拉图就有所议论。如今教育丧失了音乐的一面，这将意味着什么？

青年一代也丧失了作为一个完整的人在社会上生活所需要的基本品质。他们在现代社会的加工下，具有新的品质，这些品质与新的社会格局相适应，同时也意味着某种危机。青年一代变成了自我中心型（Self-Centeredness），学生们不能说不好，但也不能说高尚和崇高。个人主义的过热发展，必然导致家庭的衰落和个人中心主义的成长。学生们依然感兴趣的著作是加缪的《局外人》，这里面意味着什么，毋需多言。

性革命和女权主义给人类创造性地提出了无穷无尽的挑战。性解放是对清教传统的反叛，但性解放的直接后果是把幸福理解为肉体放松，承认肉欲并不是危险的东西。这两股运动严重冲击了西方传统的价值观念。同时，青年一代也变成分离型的（Separateness），每个人都是相互分离的。布鲁姆称之为社会性的孤独者（Social solitaries）。这种分离型的最显而易见的象征就是离婚。离婚率高表明越来越多的美国人不愿意生活在一起。爱，对学生来说已经十分陌生。他们自小就有性生活，而且发展性关系十分容易，爱的情感已经十分淡漠，人与人之间的关系中已经缺少了这种可贵的情感。

布鲁姆列举了大量事实来说明他所谓美国精神的终结。他本人是主张弘扬西方的文化传统和文明的。他赞美柏拉图、苏格拉底、洛克、卢梭、康德、莎士比亚、培根等人的文化和精神创造，主张运用这些遗产来传延西方文明和文化精神。他讨论了自然状态与社会状态、自我、创造性、文化、价值这样一些基本观念。立论和论据大部分来自西方历史上的经典作家。布鲁姆对法国文化有特殊的感情，

也许是他译了《爱弥儿》一书的缘故。书中时时可以看出他对法国文化的赞同和熟悉。

布鲁姆将这种发展的总趋势称为虚无主义（Nihilism）。虚无主义成为美国方式，这对文化发展和美国精神是致命的冲击，由于这种态势的发展，美国的价值体系正在衰落，整个民主体制也在受到巨大的冲击。布鲁姆赞同托克维尔的观念，托克维尔曾认为大学在美国民主政治中具有重要的地位。托克维尔认为，民主的最大危险在于奴役公共舆论，民主的要求是每个人能自我决定自己的态度。民主使人摆脱传统政治强制、宗教等教条。人是自由的，但人要能自我判断。而西方传统的价值体系的衰落，最终将冲击民主制度，社会没有任何价值体系可以作为引导个人决策的价值体系，大学教育也不提供这种体系。思想与社会发展之间有非常密切的关系，思想终结了，在这种思想指引下的社会制度和行为方式也会终结。

布鲁姆的观点自然属于保守主义的观点，在一些主张进步的人看来，不足为取，因为社会总要进步，旧的东西总要被淘汰。值得注意的是他提出来的问题。美国精神面临着严重的挑战是一个事实，青年一代对西方传统价值观念的无知也是事实。这种精神领域中的变革又将在多大程度上影响社会的发展和管理呢？任何社会制度的存在和运转，绝不是仅靠法律条文的规定就能生效的，首先是要人们信仰这些基本价值，并由这些基本价值来指导行为方式。如果价值系统崩溃了，社会制度何以为续？

在许多社会中，问题往往不是出在体制上，而是出在价值体系的衰落上。一个社会没有核心的价值体系，便会遇到最大的政治协调和管理难题。这里人们往往遇到一个两难的困境：一方面社会进步要求有新的价值系统，冲破旧的价值系统的束缚；另一方面社会和谐和制度稳定要求保持社会价值系统的核心部分，否则一个社会的价值系统就会终结，整个社会陷于混乱和道德危机是不可避免的。

由此引出另一个两难困境：如果任社会自然发展，传统的价值观念便很难保存下来，社会发展的趋势总是要不断淘汰过去的东西，新一代必然对往昔毫无概念，没有教育便没有延续。如果是民主的，由人们来选择，新一代一代的人们很难说对以往有何感情，选择的结果往往是不言自明的。那么，谁来完成这项社会功能呢？

每一个思考社会安定和发展的人，恐怕首先要思考这个问题。

## 10.太阳帝国

最近有一部电影叫《太阳帝国》，描写第二次世界大战期间在上海的日本侵略军和一群西方人之间的关系。西方人在二战期间被关进集中营，由一队日本兵看守着，受尽折磨，忍饥挨饿，人的尊严受到侮辱。在日本经济高奏凯歌地打入美国国土和世界市场的时候，美国导演拍摄了这样一部电影。很难揣度导演的意图。但影片至少告诫人们，日本人与西方人有不同的价值观念，日本人具有凶猛，残

忍的一面，日本人不承认人的基本价值和信仰。这里是否意味着日本人与西方人在另一个战场——经济领域——上取胜的原因，需要人们自己思量。

日本的经济成功被誉为奇迹。日本人自己也对此也是趾高气扬。二次大战，日本战败，国土被占领。然而，从人类历史的发展来看，日本在相当短的时间内一跃而起，成为世界上首屈一指的经济大国。自然目前不能谈政治大国和军事大国。有些日本人向往这一点，目前尚不能谈，未来却并非没有可能。总结人类社会发展的经验，强国的力量：一在军事力量，二在经济力量，三在政治艺术。日本人不乏后两者，只是前者受宪法约束，不过宪法仅为一纸条文，也是人制定的。一代人相信的东西，下一代并不肯定会相信。只要风水一转，情形就会大不相同。

太阳帝国正在逼迫美国就范。日本经济的实力令美国人刮目相看，二次大战即将结束前，著名文化人类学者本尼迪克特写过一本轰动一时的书，叫《菊花与刀》。书中对日本文化有精到的分析与见解，但不乏优等民族看待低等民族的味道。好象动物学家描绘大猩猩或金丝猴的生活习性，详尽、准确，但绝无羡慕之感。几十年后，另一位美国人写了一本书叫《日本名列第一》。作者系哈佛大学教授傅高义。这本书里就绝无动物学家的体验了，而且是充满了赞扬和羡慕之感。这一转变，颇具戏剧性。

1988 年 11 月 28 日，一位不透露姓名的日本人在伦敦拍卖行购买一幅毕加索 1905 年的画，付款三千八百多万美元，创二十世纪艺术作品价格纪录，此价为一幅画的世界第三最高价格。由此可见日本人的实力。日本对美国的经济入侵，远远超过了珍珠港事件那一顿饭的狂轰滥炸。在美国的大街上，举目皆是日本汽车，Toyota, Honda, Nissan 等。在电器商店里，更是日本化，各类日本电器产品琳琅满目，应有尽有。日本人在美国大举购买房产。旧金山日本人满地走，檀香山据闻已成为日本人天下。日本人购买房屋付现金。由于日本人的到来，房价大涨，没钱的美国人只能望房兴叹。亚特兰大市 IBM 的高楼，收归日本所有。我在圣路易市的一个全美最好的花园中参观，结果看了一大半的日本花园。最近世界最高建筑芝加哥的 Sears Tower 在出售，有人担心会落到日本人手里。有一位朋友告诉我，有的日本人买房子从来不先问价，在城市里转悠，看到中意的房子就只一下，让人搞来。日本对美国的投资大大增加。许多日本产品是在美国本土生产的。太阳帝国的影子正笼罩着美国。

我们来看一下一些严肃的数字。日本人口（1985）1.2 亿，美国为 2.89 亿。日本国土为 37.7 万多平方公里，美国为 937.2 万多平方公里，日本只有美国的零头。1987 年的 GNP（国民生产总值），日本为 23,850 亿，美国为 44,880 亿。贸易总值，日本为 3,790 亿，美国为 6,770 亿。从国土和人口的比率看，GNP 和贸易总值相差不大。日本的贸易（1987）对美国出口占总额的 36.5%，进口只占 21%，而美国（1986）对日本出口只占总额的 11.9%，进口占 22.4%。投资额也很高，日本目前在美国许多州设有工厂。从人均国民总产值来看，日本已超过美国，1985 年美国的数字为 16,709 美元，日本为 17,244 美元。从 1981 年至 1985 年，美国的国民生产总值增长率为 2.4%，日本为 4.1%。美日两国之间的贸



易差额越来越大。二次大战时，美国人由于战火而知道日本。今天，美国人由于享乐而知道日本。日本经济的侵入，表现在它占领了大部分美国家庭。

太阳帝国的力量象核聚变那样增长。1985 年时，1 美元兑换 240 日元，如今只能兑换 130 日元。苏珊·芝拉（Susan Chira）在《纽约时报》（1988.11.28）上著文说：

日本公司可以轻而易举地战胜竞争对手，购买美国的财产或公司；

日本投资者借了巨款给美国，大部分购买了 Treasury securities，他们可以动摇市场；

日本成为当地的经济统治者，其他国家和地区的货币不象日元升值那样快。日本在台湾、南朝鲜有大量投资，日本能左右这些地区；

日本成为比美国更大的世界巨富，它捐钱给发展中国家，拥有了新的权力，能影响国际经济政策的制定。

日本人现在可以左右美国经济，许多美国人对此忧心忡忡。美国向日本大举借债，把控制权奉送给日本。1988 年前七个月，日本花了 90 亿美元购买外国公司，其中好几家为美国公司。美国的市场、公司纷纷沦陷，为日本人所占领。

太阳帝国对美国的挑战是严峻的。目前虽不能说日本取代美国，而且在近期内也不能作如是说，不过日本的咄咄逼人的长剑已直接指向美国。日本实际上是在美国的卵翼下成长起来的。美军占领，朝鲜战争和越南战争，日本都得到好处。日本现行体制的轮廓也是美国人的产品。然而，今天，战败国日本比战胜国美国还要财大气粗。日本人也不愿隐瞒这种感觉，乐于翻身道情。在不少地方等于做给美国人看，美国人有时只能干瞪眼。在自由经济的原则下，无法将日本人拒之门外。况且美国经济确有难言之苦，不能不仰人鼻息。从心理和情感上说，美国人并不喜欢日本人。

问题是为什么会有这样一个结局？除了管理体制等各方面的原因之外，两种文化的差别是一个重要原因。一定的制度必然会发生不以人的意志为转移的作用，但一定的文化更会发生不以人的意志为转移的作用。美日两国经济竞争的结局，便是两种文化不同基因的产物。在很大程度上，这更是文化的制约，而非体制的制约。有人说，美国同日本比，东方文化就占了上风。

哪些因素在发生作用？这里难以一一枚举，只能略举大端。

日本文化推崇集体主义，美国文化推崇个人主义。现代化大生产讲的是分工配合，日本文化中的集体主义基因更适于协作生产。美国的个人主义，往往排斥大规模或忘我的合作，美国人首先讲要个人的地位。美国人往往思考个人的成功，而日本人往往被引导思考集体的成功。日本大公司的统一精神在美国难以发现。日本人可以终身奉献给一个公司，做一个细小环节的工作。美国人恐怕难以做到这一

点。对于一个社会的发展来说，集体主义有利有弊，但集体主义凝聚的力量大于个人主义，这是显而易见的。

日本文化注重个人奉献，美国文化注重个人享乐。美国的文化是享乐主义的。工作是为了享乐，美国人从来不跟自己过不去，有钱必花。有大批存款的美国人是有稀有动物。不少人往往不知明天从哪里弄钱。美国人借钱买房子，买汽车，上大学等等。先花了再说。日本文化中个人的位置不高，也不强调个人享乐，而是主张个人奉献，日本男人工作，许多人要工作到半夜，都是自觉自愿的，没有加班费之说。有人告诉我，如果日本男人在公司工作晚上不干到半夜，人们就会认为他没有戏唱，不受重视。美国人的生活水平在世界上可能是数一数二的，在住房、交通、教育、饮食、环境等方面均超过日本，虽然人均收入没有日本高。享乐主义文化导致人们将大笔钱用于福利，而非投资。日本人是典型的“经济动物”，投资欲很强，而在个人享受方面却不象美国人那样注重，日本人讲究享乐，近年来开始有所时兴，但从根本上说不符合日本文化的精神。

日本文化是管制型的文化，美国文化是放手型的文化。日本文化造成的氛围是，每个人都接受严格的管理，于是整个经济和社会机制组织得较为严密，整个机器的运转较为统一。这套机制用在经济发展方面，必然会释放出巨大的能量。美国人不可能接受日本式的管理，美国人比较散漫，比较随便，机器的运转也较为民主。日本人受上峰强制去打天下，非打不可，不打不行。美国人往往出于自己的动机去打天下，上峰的指示也可以民主地否定，上峰对此也可以接受。在日本没有这样的故事，或者这样的故事不多。

如此等等。这里提出的问题，不仅是两种文化的差别，而且是要求人们再评价两种体制。美国的体制，总体来说建筑在个人主义、享乐主义和民主主义的基础上，但它正明显地输给一个集体主义、忘我主义和权威主义的体制。也许美国人宁可在经济上输给别人，也不愿放弃自己的体制。这套体制保证信仰的实现，同时也保证了社会的一定繁荣。今天的世界格局，似乎表明这套体制难以保证美国的最发达地位。人们往往面临这样的选择：维持价值体系，还是追求更有效的体制——但违背传统的价值体系。有的时候问题在于，一定的文化能否允许一个社会选择全然不同的体制，往往不行。另一方面，美国人又不可能接受日本文化。美国人对日本文化往往不那么感兴趣，不少人认为日本人处于不发达的文化氛围中。在这一点上，不少美国人看不起日本人。这种心理屏障将保证美国的发展不快于日本，同时也保证美国人难以最后接受太阳帝国。

美国今天遇到了来自日本的挑战，很大一部分原因在于美国的体制、文化和价值反对美国本身。二次大战后，美国获得了得天独厚的天时、地利、人和的条件，社会经济以惊人的速度发展起来。然而，相隔三、四十年后，美国的地位就受到了严峻和有力的挑战。可以说，日本只是第一个向美国挑战的民族。在下个世纪里，必然会有更多的民族也向美国提出挑战。那时，美国人才会真正反省自己的政治、经济和文化。

当然，仅就日本和美国而言，日本在资源、领土上不可能超越美国。问题是美国社会上存在的种种相斥因素和力量如果继续这样运动下去，不仅会使其优势发挥不出来，而且会构成不可阻挡的危机的潜流。