

WHO IS FUCKING WHOM?

It has been said that power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely.

Great men are almost always bad men.

These axioms may be traced back to Lord Acton (1834 – 1902), an English historian who, in a letter to Bishop Mandell Creighton, is credited with being the author of what he thought were self-evident truths.

Today, many people may take exception to his reference to great men, being bad men, pointing out that there were quite a number of great men who were good men: Jesus Christ; Abraham Lincoln; Winston Churchill; and, Mahatma Gandhi, just to name 4 of the world's great men.

William Pitt the Elder (1759-1806), Prime Minister of Britain for 2 terms – 1783 to 1801 and 1804 to 1806 -- said something quite similar to that which was uttered by Lord Acton, one century before him, for, in 1770, he is said to have stated: *'Unlimited power is apt to corrupt the minds of those who possess it'*.

In the Hongkong Special Administrative Region (HKSAR) of the People's Republic of China (PRC) of today, these truths of yesteryear, which are still relevant in today's world, generally speaking, should be expanded to include, not only power, but money.

For it is a self-evident truth, also, that, whereas a little money may corrupt only a little, a lot of money may corrupt, absolutely – and there are many cases of corruption in the HKSAR.

In the PRC, it is common for an HKSAR mogul to *'purchase'* one or more comely ladies, simultaneously, to fill his bed and to sate his appetite for young feminine pulchritude.

To mention a few HKSAR moguls, who make no bones about their *'conquests'* in the PRC, and elsewhere, there are Messrs Cecil Chao, of publicly listed Cheuk Nang Technologies (Holdings) Ltd, Tse Siu Luen, of publicly listed Tse Siu Luen Jewellery (International) Ltd, and Martin Kwok Ying Chuen, of publicly listed Chung Hwa Development Holdings Ltd.

And these are 3 names which, immediately, spring to mind – because these people, publicly, flaunt their prizes as though the ladies were won in a great contest whereas, in truth, it was the colour of money which allowed them to purchase the objects of their lust.

Interestingly enough, it is highly unlikely that those moguls, who conquer the all-too-willing ladies of the PRC - - some of them still in their teens -- can do much more than parade the wares at parties and at the exclusive beaches of resorts throughout the Far East.

One rarely hears a disapproving remark from anybody of note in the HKSAR about this situation, although certain wives of some of the lower ranks (that is, the wives of lesser rich men) have complained, quietly.

The Church has been extremely quiet about the sins of the HKSAR very rich, it has been noted.

Perhaps, that is because it is well known that moguls have their own church; and, require no foreign gods.

While the HKSAR Chief Executive, Mr Tung Chee Hwa claims to be a follower of the teachings of Confucius, a 5th Century Chinese philosopher who advocated, among other things, familial virtues -- righteousness, propriety, integrity and filial piety -- his influence on, what could be considered, the corrupting influence of some of our philandering moguls, has been zero.

In fact, his turning of a blind eye to the situation could be taken as being tacit acceptance of the situation, which the Church would, definitely, consider immoral.

It would appear that if Chief Executive Tung Chee Hwa be a true believer in the teachings of Confucius, then he must know, and realise, that the family is central to the well being of the State.

Otherwise, how could filial piety play a part in the family?

Confucianism states this precept, categorically: A good government must be a paternalistic government in which the sovereign is benevolent and honorable.

Respect and honour have to be earned: Money may buy neither of these virtues.

Chief Executive Tung Chee Hwa, by his actions -- or his lack of action -- since his installation in his present powerful position, a position to which his appointment took effect on July 1, 1997, has opened up his 'house' to some of the most socially corrupt influences of the HKSAR and of the PRC.

By so doing, he has, salubriously, condoned the acts, in many cases, of the statutory rape of the young and the innocent ladies and children of the PRC.

(It has been suggested that statutory rape is, hardly, the correct term to describe these PRC ladies, who are being 'bought' by HKSAR moguls, for they should be considered professionals on the ground that they accepted the offer of money and clothes in exchange for being liberal with their sexual favours.)

In the early 1970s, it may be recalled that the Special Investigation Unit of the Royal (formerly) Hongkong Police Force had a commission to seek out and destroy practising Hongkong homosexuals.

Homosexuality was, at that time, a criminal offence. It fell under the statute which permitted buggerers, even of consenting adult buggerers of the same sex, to be incarcerated for Gross Indecency.

Even one Hongkong, notable solicitor of that period, one of some prominence, mind you, a Mr Richard Duffy, went to prison for having an alleged 'harem' of young boys in his Kowloon flat on Kadoorie Avenue.

Mr Duffy was struck off the roll of Hongkong solicitors for his alleged outrageous behavior, which the High Court considered to be not in keeping with his high rank as an officer of the Court.

Mr Duffy had many friends in Hongkong, at the time that he went to prison, including a very prominent barrister, also a flagrant homosexual of those days -- and he still is today -- and that barrister dropped his shorts and fled to Bangkok, Thailand, where he complained to the British Embassy about the treatment of homosexuals in Hongkong by The Royal Hongkong Police Force.

In those days, the PRC Government was quite open about the subject of homosexuality and admitted, openly, that there was no homosexuality in PRC. It is not Chinese 'thing'.

Times have changed, and there is a widespread acceptance of homosexuality in the HKSAR: The civilised world has come to grips with the idea that it is possible for one man loving another -- even though it has a history of more than 3,000 years, at least.

The rape of youth, below the age of consent, by lecherous aged, and aging, men is still considered a crime, punishable by law, however.

For to turn a blind eye to the outrageous behavior of some of our moguls is tantamount to absolving them for their immoral, if not illegal, acts; or, condoning the manifest abuse of the social mores, which the civilised world holds to be sacred.

The arrest and incarceration for 14 months of the 28-year-old Briton, Toby Christopher Acton, former General Manager of the insurance company, Griffiths and Amour (Asia Pacific) Ltd, for having sexual intercourse with a 13-year old girl, hugged the headlines for a short while a year or so ago.

The case ruined the reputation and professional life of Mr Acton, no doubt.

And so it should.

But Mr Acton is no worse, or, if one prefers to put it a little differently, no better (with regard to his licentious actions), than many of the HKSAR moguls who do the same sort of thing, but have yet to be pilloried for their actions.

The difference between Mr Acton and Mr Moneybags is that Mr Acton does not have the vast fortune of the moguls.

He, also, does not attend to the court of Chief Executive Tung Chee Hwa.

So, who is fucking whom?

-- E N D --