

PART II**THE GIFT TO CHIEF EXECUTIVE TUNG CHEE HWA :
YOU AND 'THE OTHER PEOPLE'**

This is a continuation of [last week's gift to the Chief Executive](#) of the Hongkong Special Administrative Region (HKSAR) of the People's Republic of China (PRC), Mr Tung Chee Hwa, the only man to stand for the highest political office of the HKSAR, and to be completely unopposed.

This does not happen too often, one has to realise.

In fact, it is a first for the HKSAR.

On March 24, 2002, Chief Executive Tung Chee Hwa will be sworn in as the Chief Executive of the 416 square miles that comprise the HKSAR for a second, 5-year term.

In order to withstand the trials and tribulations of his second term, TARGET has taken it upon itself to offer some advise in the hope that the path to righteousness and tranquility will be apparent to this grandfather, an advocate of Confucianism.

Point One

Control the insolence of office, of power, and, most of all, control the licence of the masses.

What you must do is to assign distinct and definitive roles for the rich, the powerful ... and the '*other people*'.

If you are able to do this, effectively, your name will be revered; the HKSAR will be a tranquil place in which to live, during your reign.

Also, you will have few problems between the various factions within the HKSAR because each faction will know its place.

To explain: If the '*other people*' try to attain the unattainable, or think that they have a dog's chance of aspiring to a position that, clearly, would not suit them, for any number of reasons, then, when they learn the truth, they will be very disappointed.

They will, most likely, still think that they should have been afforded the chance to rise to a position to which they would have been, singularly, unsuited, and the disappointment could well lead to despondency.

If, then, a leader should emerge from this group, he could upset the applecart and cause civil strife.

Nothing upsets the proletariat more than the knowledge that their aspirations cannot be met.

So, you should make sure that the '*other people*' are able to harbour only those aspirations that you, surreptitiously, assign to them and/or designate; and, then everybody may live in harmony.

If you fail in this task, there could be conflicts between some of your members of the Legislative Council and the *'other people'*.

Choose the right path from Day One; that path is the one to the establishment of a *'kingdom'*, with you as the undisputed *'king'*, de facto.

You must, at all costs, avoid the notion in the minds of the masses that the HKSAR can resemble a republic.

The reason for this is that The Basic Law of the HKSAR, though it is claimed to be based along the lines of the modern definition of democratic principles, is always subject to the determinations of Beijing, the Capital City of the PRC, and, ultimately, your boss, Mr Tung Chee Hwa.

So The Basic Law, really, lacks many of the definitive laws that a free government requires.

However, only TARGET and you, my dear Chief Executive, know of the gaps and flaws in The Basic Law.

These have been omitted by decree, for good and valid reasons, you understand.

But rejoice in this knowledge for it will give you almost unfettered licence, whereas a constitution of a republic would restrict your actions.

At the same time, control the actions and utterances of the nobility, and of the rich, and of the powerful – because their actions could become overpowering.

If that should happen, and it was well known, the *'other people'* could rise up against them.

And, if that should transpire, then, some of your power will have to be shared with them.

And, your power, or any part of it, you must never concede – for it is unmanly.

Point Two

All men are wicked.

They will always give vent to their evil impulses whenever they have a chance so to do.

Even when some evil impulse is restrained and concealed, there is always some hidden reason for this.

But time will make clear what it is; and, time will give birth to truth.

The hypocrisy of the noble and of the very wealthy may lie hidden for a time, but as soon as they feel that they are not threatened, they may well rise up and treat any and all in their path with the disdain that they, truly, feel.

This is very dangerous.

Remember that man will never do anything that is good except when forced to do so.

Where there is a good deal of freedom of choice, and this freedom can be abused, then anything quickly becomes buried in confusion and disorder.

Hunger and poverty make men industrious, while laws make them good.

When something works well on its own, without the support of the law, there is no need for a new law.

Control of the arrogance of the rich, the famous and the noble should be among your tasks.

Point Three

There are, always, at least 2 distinct viewpoints in every government debate – except where the Jews or the Arabs are concerned and, then, there are 3 distinct viewpoints ... or even more.

The distinct and different viewpoints are always between the elite – the rich and the powerful – and the '*other people*'.

All laws, which are drafted in order to foster liberty, result from the tensions between the elite and the '*other people*'.

Good individuals cannot exist without good education; good education cannot exist without good laws; and, good laws are the result of those very conflicts that many people, unthinkingly criticise.

Anybody that has analysed the outcome of conflicts between the elite and the '*other people*', in days of yore, will find that they never led to exiles, incarceration, or some other horrid governmental determination, or anything contrary to the public good, but always they led to laws and institutions that favoured public liberty.

Or, at least, they had the appearances of favouring public liberty.

So, beware!

Horrid things, about which one reads, are, usually, more horrid than the facts, themselves.

Every city ought to have practices that enable the '*other people*' to give expression to their aspirations.

The demands of a free people are rarely harmful to the cause of liberty; they are a response to either oppression or to the prospect of oppression.

When the '*other people*' are mistaken, and there is a remedy to hand in open-air forums, Victoria Park, Chater Garden and Statue Square, to name just 3 central places where open-air forums may be held with ease, some sensible man must get up and harangue them, showing them how they are wrong.

The Filipino domestics, who congregate in these places, will harmonise as the sensible man explains – because the Filipinos are there daily, in any case, praising their little gods, in between their dances and their eating of crispy pata and chicken bones.

It is said that though the '*other people*' are ignorant, they are, nevertheless, capable of recognising the truth.

Because every state has an elite and the '*other people*', the question always arises as to on whom it falls to be the guardian of protecting liberty.

The answer is, simply, that the elite are more reliable, of course.

However, there is another consideration, too.

One ought to entrust something to people who have no desire to steal it.

In business, as you are aware, your best partner to select is the rich one – because the rich are unlikely to steal from the rich, preferring to steal from the poor, who do not have the power of the rich, individually or collectively.

It is said that when one has a dollar in one's pocket, one does not stoop to collect the tao-ling (a 5-cent piece) that has fallen on the pavement.

The objectives of the elite and the '*other people*' are that the elite are keen to dominate, while the '*other people*' are desirous of not being subjugated to that position of domination.

As a consequence, the *'other people'* have a greater desire to live as free men, having less prospects of seizing power for themselves.

So, if one puts a select group of the *'other people'* in charge of protecting liberty, they will do a bang-up job and, since they cannot hope to monopolise power, themselves, they will ensure that nobody else does.

Look at the schisms within the Democratic Party: This political party is rife with such schisms because the members can't agree on very much, most of the time.

Confucius always maintained: *'Nature finds its own path.'*

The protection of liberty for the powerful accomplishes a number of good things: One aspect is that it satisfies some of the elite's aspirations and, because the elite have a greater role in society as a result of having the power, they are more likely to be content; and, you subtract a measure of authority from the *'other people'*, who are, more often than not, insatiable.

Remember, it is the *'other people'* who are responsible for all of the innumerable conflicts and clashes within a society.

Their behaviour is likely to make the elite desperate, which, in the long run, will have evil consequences.

Point Four

That brings TARGET to the last question of the day: Which group within a society is the more dangerous: Those who want to acquire new power; or, those who are anxious not to lose the power that they have won?

Either aspiration can be the cause of terrible conflict.

But such conflicts are, for the most part, caused by those who already have power because the fear of losing it gives them exactly the same ambitions as those who want to acquire power.

Men, by and large, do not feel that they are secure in the possession of their property – unless they are constantly acquiring more from somebody else.

Of all people, Mr Tung Chee Hwa, you should understand that principle because, no doubt, you still remember your acquisition of Furness Withy (Chartering) Ltd, as it came to be known.

In case you are having a little trouble in recalling this company acquisition, it was consummated in 1989 when you, as Chairman of publicly listed Orient Overseas (Holdings) Ltd, purchased 65 percent of the Issued and Fully Paid-Up Share Capital of this UK company.

It was soon after the acquisition of this ship-broking and ship-operating company that Orient Overseas (Holdings) Ltd hit a patch of heavy financial seas, was it not?

Getting back to the matter of man's security, it is said that those who already have power are in a better position to use their influence, and their resources, in order to bring about change.

In addition, their improper and self-interested behaviour excites, in the hearts of the powerless, the desire to have power, either in order to take their revenge on their enemies, by taking what they have from them, or in order to acquire for themselves what wealth and those honours they see their opponents abusing.

**NEXT WEEK: SLANDER AND MURDER –
WHEN THEY ARE ACCEPTABLE AND WHEN THEY ARE NOT ACCEPTABLE**

-- E N D --

*While TARGET makes every attempt to ensure accuracy of all data published,
TARGET cannot be held responsible for any errors and/or omissions.*

*If readers feel that they would like to voice their opinions about that which
they have read in TARGET, please feel free to e-mail your views to
editor@targetnewspapers.com or targnews@hkstar.com. TARGET does not
guarantee to publish readers' views, but reserves the right so to do subject
to the laws of libel.*