

HONGKONG'S FROG GETS BITTEN ON THE ARSE

The fat frog, which had been sitting on a leaf in the little pond, waiting for an unsuspecting fly to pass by so that it could eat another tidbit, was bitten by a blowfly ... on the arse.

The frog may never recover from the blowfly's sting.

The frog is the Chief Executive of the Hongkong Special Administrative Region (HKSAR) of the People's Republic of China (PRC), Mr Tung Chee Hwa.

The blowfly, of course, is the mass of 500,000 or so protestors of the territory, who, on Tuesday, July 1, walked peacefully through the streets in defiance of the acts, and non-acts, of the Chief Executive over the past 6 years.

Tuesday, July 1, 2003 was the 6th Anniversary of the assumption of sovereignty of the old, British Hongkong by the Government of the PRC.

The march was timed to embarrass the Chief Executive, who was, on that day, hosting the new, PRC Prime Minister/Premier, Mr Wen Jia Bao, at The Convention Centre, Wanchai, where he made a speech, congratulating the Chinese '*compatriots*' of the territory.

Originally planned for between 100,000 people and 200,000 people, the numbers of protestors swelled beyond the organisers' wildest dreams.

The protestors, in blatant defiance of the HKSAR Government, burned the flag of the PRC, an act, which is contrary to the laws of the HKSAR and the PRC, proper.

The Government of Mr Tung Chee Hwa had no inkling that half a million HKSAR people, equal to about 7 percent of the total population, would rally behind the tattered flag of those, who are unhappy with their lot and with the non-action of the Administration of Mr Tung Chee Hwa.

If procrastination is the thief of time, then, the protestors would argue that Mr Tung Chee Hwa is the arch villain of all time.

Mr Tung Chee Hwa has referred, on a number of occasions, to the organisers of the peaceful protest march as being those people who, continuously, bad mouth his Administration and the territory, for no logical or valid reasons.

He has, often, said that such bad-mouthing is destructive and that the organisers should attempt to be constructive not destructive.

It could be justifiably argued that the protest march of July 1 was very constructive – and Mr Tung Chee Hwa, no doubt, appreciated its underlying principle – because, in true Communistic dogma, it was: Power to the People!

It was, in many respects, reminiscent of the People Power Movement, a 4-day protest in 1986 in Manila, the Philippines.

In that incident, it forced the former Philippine President, Mr Ferdinand Marcos, into exile and ended his 14-year dictatorship of the Republic of the Philippines.

Although worldwide coverage of the event portrayed it as a spontaneous uprising, its origins lay in years of rising resentment among military officers and growing protests by Manila's middle class.

Mr Tung Chee Hwa, being an educated man, must have understood that power has but one function: To serve and secure the social welfare of the people.

The people of the HKSAR, normally, are not politically inclined – because they would prefer to make money rather than to vote at the polls or to listen to political speeches, aimed at placating the masses, or obtaining more votes, or delivering diatribes, studded with doublespeak.

But, as the economy of the HKSAR sinks lower and lower into the mire, as certain members of the Inner Sanctum of Mr Tung Chee Hwa are found to be more and more wanting, so it has caused the people of the HKSAR to take to the streets in order to voice their displeasure at their lot.

Ostensibly, the protest march of July 1 was organised due to the HKSAR Government's determination to pass into law the modifications and additions to Article 23 of The Basic Law of the HKSAR (The Basic Law is also, referred to as the mini-constitution).

Officially, the legislation's nomenclature is: The National Security (Legislative Provisions) Bill.

However, Article 23, which is, clearly, designed to curb, inter alia, Press Freedom, the Right of Association, criticism of the authority of Beijing and/or of its officials, the publication of that which are deemed to be State secrets, and, in the formation of groups, not appreciated, or proscribed, from time to time, by the PRC Government, such as the Falun Gong, deemed to be an evil cult by Beijing, it, also, gives the right to the HKSAR police or any member of that uniformed, disciplined branch of Government to enter and to search any office or home without the need of a Search Warrant or without there being due process or a reasonable excuse for such action, such as the reasonable belief by a member of the police force that a crime is being, or has been, committed in the premises.

The insidiousness of the proposed, redrafted and modified Article 23 has been made only too clear over the past year or so, but a number of learned men of the HKSAR have, for reasons only known to them, defended it.

However, following the march of some 500,000, HKSAR ethnically Chinese residents on Tuesday, July 1, Mr Tung Chee Hwa has found himself rather isolated, as many of his sycophants and those same learned men and women, who praised the redrafted Article 23, have jumped ship.

It is no secret that certain, high-powered Legislative Councillors and Executive Councillors have, recently, flown to Beijing in order to ask for help from the very people who helped to seat Mr Tung Chee Hwa as the head honcho of the territory.

The cry has gone out: Sack the Chief Executive!

The echoes of that cry are reverberating throughout many corridors of power in many countries of the world.

The world, today, has put the PRC's 1997 acquisition of Hongkong under the microscope.

Last Saturday, the Chief Executive back-pedalled, somewhat, saying, at a Press Conference, that he would make certain changes to the proposed, modified Article 23 in order to appease the masses.

He did not say that the changes to the proposed legislation would be made because it was right and proper, but only because it would appease the concern of the people, whom he is charged to be their titular Head of State by Beijing.

He said, also, that the Government must press ahead with the legislative process as scheduled because everybody, clearly, knows that *'we (the HKSAR) have the responsibility and the constitutional duty to enact laws to protect national security.'*

He said:

'It is a matter, relating to the national dignity and the glory of the Chinese race.

'Safeguarding national security is the prerequisite for the successful implementation of the (concept of) "one country, two systems".

'It is a prerequisite for maintaining the good relations between Hongkong and the Chinese Mainland; it is a prerequisite for revitalising the economy and safeguarding our long-term interests.

'I suggest that everybody should reflect, rationally, about how to maintain stability in Hongkong and to properly manage some of the fundamental relationships, help maintain our stability, including our relations with the Chinese Mainland and the international community.'

The second and third readings of the legislation were to proceed, as scheduled, today, July 9, 2003.

However, on Monday, July 7, following the tendering of the previous Sunday's resignation of Mr James Tien, the Chairman of the Liberal Party and a member of Mr Tung Chee Hwa's elite Executive Council, the Chief Executive had, yet another, change of heart.

Last Monday, Mr Tung Chee Hwa announced:

'I announced, last Saturday, that, in response to the concerns and aspirations of the community, the Government decided to introduce significant and important amendments to the three, most controversial areas of The National Security (Legislative Provisions) Bill.

'Many members of the community considered that the Government had responded positively to their concerns.

'However, quite a number of them hoped that the Government could allow them more time to study the amendments and The Bill in greater detail.

'The Liberal Party issued a statement, last night, asking the Government to defer the resumption of the second reading of The Bill.

'Mr James Tien, also, tendered his resignation from the Executive Council.

'I immediately convened a special meeting of the Executive Council.

'In light of the position of the Liberal Party, we have decided, after detailed deliberations, to defer the resumption of the second reading of The Bill and to step up our efforts to explain the amendments to the community in the coming days.

'I wish to reiterate that the SAR has a constitutional duty to legislate for the protection of national security.

'Upon enactment of the legislation, the Government and the community can then work together to revitalise the economy.

'I have accepted Mr Tien's resignation from the Executive Council.

'I welcome the Liberal Party's restatement of its continued support for the legislative work of The Bill in order to safeguard national security.'

The proposed legislation was to have been revised, Mr Tung Chee Hwa had explained, the previous Saturday, with the deletion of the provision that allows some groups to be banned in the HKSAR, and adds certain protections for HKSAR journalists, who publish Government classified information.

Also, it curtails police powers, somewhat.

Backing up his boss, Mr Donald Tsang, Chief Secretary for Administration, said, at a meeting of the Legislative Council, on Friday, July 4:

'Human rights and freedom are values that Hongkong treasures.

'The Government understands that people will continue to enjoy these rights ... the Government will not deprive people of these rights because of Article 23 ... We have a constitutional duty to enact the Bill.'

If Mr Donald Tsang was correct, then, for what reason did Mr Tung Chee Hwa find it necessary to make modifications and deletions to the proposed draft legislation?

Or did Mr Donald Tsang make a mistake?

Or, perhaps, Mr Donald Tsang was engaging in doublespeak, also?

Tergiversation

Tergiversation is well known to be endemic of HKSAR, would-be politicians and moguls of the first order, but even the most staunch tergiversates are having trouble in keeping the faith, these days.

Of that there can be little doubt, as was evidenced by the resignation of Mr James Tien.

As Mr Tung Chee Hwa falls from grace, so he will, without question, find himself more and more isolated, deserted even by those people whom he, personally, placed in positions of power in his Inner Sanctum.

Mr Tung Chee Hwa supports the concept of cronyism, respecting, most avidly, the mystique and power of the dollar.

As such, many of his *'advisers'* are HKSAR moguls and their sons, as well as some of the richest men of the territory, whether or not they are capable of making a constructive contribution to the Government.

The anomaly of the current situation may not be well appreciated, however, because many of the events, leading up to the present crisis, were orchestrated by well-meaning, HKSAR politicians, who were trying to score brownie points among the high and mighty in the Capital City of the PRC.

As far as Beijing is concerned, if certain self-serving, HKSAR Legislative Councillors and/or senior HKSAR Civil Servants can bulldoze certain pieces of legislation through the process, especially those pieces of legislation that may assist Beijing in the future, then, the credit should go to the Chief Executive for his correct choice of assistants and/or appointees to the Legislative Council and/or the Executive Council.

Should things go terribly wrong, however – as is the case, today – then, it is for the account of those who proposed the legislation, in the first instance.

Then, hang out the HKSAR Chief Executive to dry for permitting the situation to reach such crisis proportions.

Mr Tung Chee Hwa, also, stated, last Saturday:

‘... my colleagues and myself have to do better ... we have decided to make amendments to further allay people’s fears ...’.

Without realising it, no doubt, he was making a tacit admission that he and his merry men and women, specifically Ms Regina Ip, Secretary for Security, had not done well enough in the past.

Put another way: He is an abject failure as a politician, both yesteryear and today.

(One cannot be too harsh on Ms Regina Ip because, after all, she was only following instructions)

As a businessman, prior to his donning the purple of office, it was known that Mr Tung Chee Hwa had not been the cat’s pyjamas; and, now, as a political puppet of Beijing in the HKSAR, he is an abject failure, also.

Beijing is forced to judge him, not by his ability to skip through the political minefields, without tripping an explosion, but how he keeps the HKSAR peaceful, prosperous, with the population under control so as not to embarrass the Central Government.

The one no-no, as far as Beijing is concerned, is that he must not embarrass the Central Government of the most populous country in the world.

Because of Mr Tung Chee Hwa’s ineptitude, the entire world is, today, watching to see how Beijing, not the Chief Executive of the HKSAR, will solve the problems – which were created by Beijing’s choice of their man in the former British Colony of Hongkong.

Because of Mr Tung Chee Hwa, the new PRC Prime Minister/Premier, Mr Wen Jia Bao, faces his first trial under fire.

This is not, normally, the way that the game of politics is played in Asia’s largest country.

It is a red mark on the ledger for Mr Tung Chee Hwa.

The one aspect of red marks in Beijing’s ledger is that they are indelible.

The Replacements

On February 19, 2003, **TARGET** wrote an exclusive report, following a conversation that the Editor of this medium had with an extremely high-ranking Beijing politician. (Please see [TARGET Intelligence Report, Volume V, Number 33](#))

The gist of that conversation was that Mr Tung Chee Hwa would fall ‘sick’ due to the pressures of office and that he should be permitted to take a nice, long sabbatical, lasting for some years.

His prospective replacements were told to **TARGET** as being, subject to their acceptance:

1. Mr Henry Tang Ying Yen, Secretary for Commerce, Industry and Technology of the HKSAR; and,
2. Dr Arthur Li Kwok Cheung, Secretary for Education and Manpower of the HKSAR.

TARGET did extensive research on Beijing’s prospects to replace Mr Tung Chee Hwa.

This is what this medium wrote, last February:

Mr Henry Tang Ying Yen

The prime candidate to replace Mr Tung Chee Hwa is thought to be Mr Henry Tang Ying Yen, a 50-year-old Minister, who is the Secretary for Commerce, Industry and Technology.

Appointed to his post in July 2002, Mr Henry Tang Ying Yen is responsible for policies, relating to information technology, telecommunications, broadcasting, film services, innovation and technology, external commercial relations, industry and business support, intellectual protection and inward investment promotion.

He has been a member of the Executive Council since 1997 and, prior to that time, he served on the Legislative Council for 7 years, from 1991 to 1998.

Prior to joining the Government, Mr Henry Tang Ying Yen was an industrialist in the HKSAR.

*Mr Henry Tang Ying Yen is known to be very wealthy and, in March 2002, he sold his house at Number 23, Big Wave Bay Road for \$HK100 million, according to **TOLFIN (TARGET'S** Computerised Online Financial Intelligence Service and Credit-Checking Provider).*

He is married with 4 children.

Mr Henry Tang Ying Yen appears to have all of the attributes that Beijing requires for a person to assume the post of Chief Executive of the HKSAR:

- 1. He is independently wealthy;*
- 2. He has a history in business;*
- 3. He has rarely been outwardly critical of the HKSAR Government or of the PRC Government;*
- 4. He is a university graduate (Mr Henry Tang Ying Yen holds a Bachelor of Arts Degree from The University of Michigan, the USA); and,*
- 5. He is squeaky clean, having never been known to have been involved in unseemly litigation; and, he has led, what Beijing would consider to be, an exemplary lifestyle, also preferring to be very low key.*

Dr Arthur Li Kwok Cheung

Dr Arthur Li Kwok Cheung is a member of one of the richest and most prominent families of the HKSAR: The Li Family.

The Li Family comprises:

Mr David Li Kwok Po, the Chairman of The Bank of East Asia Ltd (Code: 23, Main Board, The Stock Exchange of Hongkong Ltd);

Mr Simon Li Fook Sean, a Hongkong Affairs Adviser to the PRC Government and, formerly, a Vice President in the Court of Appeal in the old Hongkong; and,

Mr Andrew Li Kwok Nang, Chief Justice of the HKSAR Court of Final Appeal.

Dr Arthur Li Kwok Cheung is the brother of Dr David Li Kwok Po and, presently, holds the post of Minister and Secretary of Education and Manpower.

Before taking up his present post, he was Vice Chancellor of The Chinese University of Hongkong.

As Professor Arthur Li, he served as Professor of Surgery and Dean of the Faculty of Medicine, The Chinese University of Hongkong.

*He is a large shareholder of The Bank of East Asia Ltd, owning, in his name, 7,594,363 shares, equivalent to a little more than one half of one percent of the Issued and Fully Paid-Up Share Capital, according to **TOLFIN**.*

At today's stock-market quotation of The Bank of East Asia, this parcel of shares has a market value of not less than \$HK110 million.

Beijing may consider that Dr Arthur Li Kwok Cheung's uncle, Mr Ronald Li Fook Shiu, is a bit of a black mark for this illustrious Family since Mr Ronald Li Fook Shiu went to prison in 1988 for corruption.

Mr Ronald Li Fook Shiu, however, founded Far East Exchange in 1969 in defiance of the dominance of the British-controlled, Hongkong Stock Exchange, as it was then called.

However, greed got the better of this multi-billionaire who, in 1988, was jailed for corruption offences. He spent about 18 months in Stanley Prison.

He is, now, thought to be living in Toronto, Canada, and Bangkok, Thailand.

However, that would be the only possible objection that Beijing would have in respect of Dr Arthur Li Kwok Cheung, being a prime candidate for the top job of the HKSAR:

- 1. He is an intellectual;*
- 2. He is immensely wealthy;*
- 3. He is squeaky clean; and,*
- 4. He has extensive experience in managing large and complex institutions, including non-academic organisations.*

The Hierarchy

When one looks at the structure of the HKSAR Government on its website, one notes that, flowing down from the Chief Executive is Mr Henry Tang Ying Yen, with Dr Arthur Li Kwok Cheung, appearing in the next tier of Government bigwigs.

It gives on the appearance of the pecking order of Government, in fact.

This is, often, the way that the PRC Government delineates and distinguishes the most important persons within a level of government.

It is highly unlikely that Mr Henry Tang Ying Yen was given such prominence over Dr Arthur Li Kwok Cheung by accident: That is not the way that Beijing arranges things.

When Mr Tung Chee Hwa stood for 'election' to be the First Chief Executive of the HKSAR on December 11, 1996, he was placed in the middle of the other 2 candidates for the post in the Convention Centre, Wanchai.

Mr Tung Chee Hwa's position was underneath the logo of the HKSAR: The bauhinia flower, now widely accepted as the national flower of the HKSAR.

It was not by accident that he was placed in that prominent position.

When he rose to take his place on the podium of the Convention Centre, in order to deliver his election speech, the then PRC Director of The Hongkong and Macau Affairs Office, Mr Lu Ping,

clapped loudly and ostentatiously, causing all of his sycophants to follow suit.

Long before the elections for the First Chief Executive of the HKSAR, it was widely known that Mr Tung Chee Hwa would get the job.

That is the way of the PRC Government.

One wonders, however, whether or not anybody would want the hottest seat in the HKSAR because it would appear that the base of the seat has been soiled with the faeces of the fat frog.

-- 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.