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**(中美关系)**
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**2018年3月22日外交部发言人华春莹主持例行记者会**

　　问：昨天，一名美国国务院高官在台北演讲称，“美台关系”之牢固前所未有，他还称赞台湾是印太地区的“典范”。台湾当局宣布，本周内另一位来自美商务部的高官访台。你对美国有关官员言论有何评论？对美方一周内派两位高官访台有何评论？

　　答：关于近日美台交往问题，昨天我已阐明了中方立场。我想再次强调，台湾问题事关中方的核心利益，是中美关系中最重要和最敏感的问题，一个中国原则是中美关系的政治基础。我们敦促美方恪守一个中国政策和中美三个联合公报规定，停止与台开展任何形式的官方往来和提升实质关系，慎重妥善处理涉台问题，以免严重损害中美关系和台海和平稳定。

　　我也想借此机会提醒那些想打“台湾牌”或有其他什么企图的人认真阅研习近平主席在十三届全国人大一次会议闭幕式上发表的重要讲话中有关维护国家主权和领土完整的内容。我们伟大祖国的每一寸领土都绝对不能也绝对不可能从中国分割出去。希望有关人士在台湾问题上谨言慎行。

　　问：还是有关白宫今天将签署的“备忘录”问题，中方采取了哪些措施避免美方可能宣布的对华贸易制裁和投资限制？双方是否就此进行沟通？

　　答：中美两国在多个层级就经贸问题保持着沟通，双方有基本共识，就是要通过沟通和磋商，本着相互尊重、互利共赢的原则妥善管控分歧，建设性地解决贸易摩擦问题，维护中美经贸关系的健康稳定发展。我想这是两国领导人的共识，也是双方应该共同努力的方向。

最近美方有一些人就可能对中国采取限制措施说了一些话。美方多次使用的一个词就是“公平”或者“对等”。我们之前也说过造成中美贸易不平衡的因素是多方面的，其中有一个原因其实大家看得也是非常清楚的，就是美国对华出口管制政策。中国是美国飞机和大豆的第一大出口市场，汽车和棉花的第二大出口市场。我看到一个数字说美国约有62%的大豆及约25%的波音飞机销往中国，而中国对美国出口大多数是美国没有比较优势也不生产的产品。大家都知道，在贸易当中，要追求完全对等是不现实的，也是毫无道理的。大家可以试想一下，如果美方一方面要求中国买它想要卖的，另一方面却拒绝卖给中国想要买的，而且还就贸易不平衡问题对中国横加指责，这公平吗？那么中国要卖多少玩具才能抵得上一架波音飞机呢？或者说如果中国买了多少波音飞机，美国就应该买同等数量的C919吗？所以我们还是希望双方能够心平气和地坐下来，通过建设性的对话和协商，本着平等互利和相互尊重的精神，寻求互利共赢的解决方法。这也是中美作为世界第二大经济体和第一大经济体，应该为维护世界经济稳定做出的表率或者发挥的积极作用，也符合中美两国共同利益。

http://www.fmprc.gov.cn/web/fyrbt\_673021/t1544125.shtml

2018年3月21日外交部发言人华春莹主持例行记者会

　　问：据报道，美国国务院东亚暨太平洋事务局副助理国务卿黄之瀚正在访问台湾，并将于今晚发表演讲，届时蔡英文还将出席该场活动。美方刚签署“与台湾交往法”，美国官员就访台，中国政府对此是否感到不满？

答：中方坚决反对所谓“与台湾交往法”，已就你提到的有关情况向美方提出严正交涉。我们敦促美方恪守一个中国原则和中美三个联合公报规定，停止与台进行任何形式的官方往来与接触，慎重妥善处理涉台问题，以免对中美关系和台海和平稳定造成严重损害。

<https://www.economist.com/news/finance-and-economics/21738906-if-china-cannot-placate-donald-trump-it-will-fight-him-instead-lose-lose-trade>

**A lose-lose trade war looms between America and China**

If China cannot placate Donald Trump, it will fight him instead
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PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP has not yet started a global trade war. But he has started a frenzy of special pleading and spluttered threats. In the week since he announced tariffs on steel and aluminium imports, countries have scrambled to win reprieves. Australia, the European Union and Japan, among others, have argued that, since they are America’s allies, their products pose no risk to America’s security. If these appeals fail, the EU has been most vocal in vowing to retaliate, in turn prompting Mr Trump to threaten levies on European cars.

In China, ostensibly the focus of Mr Trump’s actions, the public response has been more restrained. Officials have said the two countries should strive for a “win-win outcome”, a favourite bromide in their lexicon. As a rival to America, China knows that an exemption from the tariffs is not on offer. It also knows that it needs to conserve firepower. If this is the first shot in a trade war, it is, for China, small bore. Its steel and aluminium exports to America amount to roughly 0.03% of its GDP, not even a rounding error.

It is two shots to come that have China more worried. Mr Trump has asked China to slash its $375bn bilateral trade surplus by as much as $100bn, a nigh-impossible task. And an investigation into China’s intellectual-property practices is almost over. Mr Trump wants to punish China for the alleged theft of American corporate secrets. Reportedly he will seek to place tariffs on up to $60bn of Chinese imports, focused on technology and telecommunications (see Briefing).

Until recently, Chinese officials thought they had the measure of Mr Trump. During a state visit to China in November, he was treated to a lavish banquet and signing ceremonies for $250bn in cross-border deals. He still speaks fondly of the dinner, but the glow faded quickly on the deals, many of which were restatements of previous commitments. The tariffs on steel and aluminium, though negligible in their impact on China, signalled that hawkish advisers to Mr Trump were in the ascendancy. So behind their mask of calm, Chinese officials are searching for ways to fight back.

The demand that China cut its trade surplus by $100bn is, in a technical sense, risible. As Mei Xinyu, a researcher in a Chinese commerce-ministry think-tank, observes, America complains that China is not a market economy, but asks for a hard target that only a planned economy could hit. The true bilateral trade gap is smaller than reported, since Chinese exports contain many inputs from elsewhere. Add in services, including Chinese students in America, and it is smaller still.

Politically, the demand has helped focus China’s thinking. “There is a sense that they need to give Mr Trump a win, and that the win must be in the form of a big round number that he can tout,” says Eswar Prasad, an economist at Cornell University, who has spoken with Chinese trade officials. One possibility is that China might buy more of its oil and gas from America, and perhaps even make a hefty down payment on future purchases.

But if America imposes stiff penalties in the intellectual-property case—along with stinging tariffs, it might also place new restrictions on Chinese investment and travel visas—China will take a much harder line. A government adviser in Beijing says that regardless of the economic consequences, Xi Jinping, China’s president, will want to show that he is no pushover. Counter-measures will be varied, says David Dollar, America’s former treasury representative in Beijing. China will buy more soyabeans from Brazil instead of from America. It will buy more Airbus planes instead of Boeings. It will tell its students and tourists to go to other countries. It will drag its feet on approvals for American companies in China.

Worryingly, each side thinks that in a trade war of attrition, it would have the advantage. America calculates that China has the bigger surplus, and thus more to lose. But China’s exports to America are less than 3% of its GDP—large but not critically so. China, for its part, thinks Americans would object to paying higher prices for manufactured goods from toys to televisions. But much low-end production is migrating from China to other developing countries and, in a pinch, American consumers might rally round the flag. To invert China’s much-loved win-win motto, this has all the makings of a lose-lose battle.

This article appeared in the Finance and economics section of the print edition under the headline "A lose-lose deal"