

**COME ALL RESIDENTS OF HONGKONG:  
WAVE THE FLAG OF TERGIVERSATION, OF FATUOUS FLATTERY  
... AND OF PRETENDED PATRIOTISM !**

It used to be called, *'Waving the flag'*, and the term was, probably, made popular by one of the most-celebrated solicitors of the United States of America (US), Mr Clarence Seward Darrow (1857 – 1938).

It was employed, most notably, by a defence solicitor in a capital case, when, realising that he was on a losing wicket, would explain to the jury that his client, who had been accused of murder, was, during the war, a member of an elite attack force, the members of which had been trained to kill the enemy, quietly, stealthily, and economically.

The solicitor, employing the defence of waving the flag, would explain to the jury:

*'My client is a hero of that terrible war, when the world was threatened by that dictator, who was defeated by the forces of righteousness and Godliness. My client braved death, on a daily basis, and, because of his bravery, he was awarded the highest honour that his country could bestow on one of its brave soldiers, who was considered a great hero of that war. When faced with a perilous situation, which he perceived as one that threatened his very life, he reacted as he had been taught: And struck first. Could one blame him? Can you, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, in good conscience, send such a brave man to his death for the death of the deceased?'*

The entreaty by the solicitor, of course, fails to attack the heart of the matter, which is the nub of the trial, at hand: Did the accused commit the murder?

In the Hongkong Special Administrative Region (HKSAR) of the People's Republic of China (PRC), today, certain members of various organisations, all of which allege that they are extremely loyal to the Government of the PRC, proper, are accusing certain prominent residents of the HKSAR of being disloyal to the PRC Government, the HKSAR Government, and the Chief Executive of the HKSAR, Mr Tung Chee Hwa, of not being patriotic.

A recent public statement from one of these purported PRC loyalists, which amounted to a frontal attack on 3, HKSAR residents, all of whom, by the way, claim to be loyal to the HKSAR and its human population, as well as to the PRC, proper, accuses them of not being patriotic to the PRC Government, at all.

This attack came from Mr Tsang Hin Chi, a member of The Standing Committee of the National People's Congress of the PRC Government, the Honourable Vice Chairman of the All-China Federation of Industry and Commerce, Chairman of The Chinese General Chamber of Commerce and a Council Member of The Hongkong Trade Development Council.

Mr Tsang Hin Chi is, also, the Chairman of publicly listed Goldlion Holdings Ltd, a company, which is listed on the Main Board of The Stock Exchange of Hongkong Ltd, being Stock Code Number 533.

Mr Tsang Hin Chi said, last Friday, that 3 members of the Hongkong Democratic Party, namely Messrs Szeto Wah, Martin Lee Chu Ming and Cheung Man Kwong, are not, really, democratic.

He said:

*'These hardliners in the so-called pro-democracy camp, such as Szeto Wah, Lee Chu Ming and Cheung Man Kwong, are not really democratic. It just happens the name of their party is the Democratic Party.*

*'In light of what they have done, I could say, today, that I definitely don't agree they are patriots.'*

What Mr Tsang Hin Chi is, clearly, attempting to do – and he, seemingly, is getting away with it, considering the number of supporters, who are more than anxious to stand beside him – is to attack the carrier of the message, rather than the message itself.

Which is not very different from employing the defence of waving the flag.

In essence, the attack of Mr Tsang Hin Chi on certain HKSAR residents, who do not agree with certain HKSAR Government edicts, or proposals for the enactment of new legislation by the Government of the HKSAR and/or the Central Government of the PRC, is a feint, calculated to divert attention, away from the real issues at hand, and to appeal to the emotions of the populace of the HKSAR, most of whom are not extremely sophisticated, in any event.

Of course, it is a given that this 70-year-old gentleman has more than a small conflict of interest when attacking certain HKSAR politicians, who oppose, in principle, the promulgation of certain new laws, which appear to have the ability to erode certain freedoms, presently enjoyed by the population of the HKSAR, in that his publicly listed company owns 2, rather large and grand commercial buildings in the PRC, proper, in Guangzhou and Liaoning, along with some rather smart residential property in Guangdong, Guangzhou.

Also, Goldlion has not less than 3, very material joint ventures in the PRC, proper.

And about 79 percent of Goldlion's production of garments is sold in the PRC, proper.

For the 2002 Financial Year, Goldlion reported a Net Profit Attributable to Shareholders of about \$HK10.44 million, which was a 68-percent drop, Year-on-Year.

Chairman Tsang Hin Chi is drawing \$HK12 million per annum from his publicly listed company in total emoluments, according to official company documents.

He holds, beneficially, not less than 55.72 percent of the Issued and Fully Paid-Up Share Capital of the company.

But, notwithstanding what might be construed as Mr Tsang Hin Chi, having a not insubstantial conflict of interest when he attacks HKSAR politicians for, allegedly, not being loyal to the HKSAR Government/the PRC Government – because, in equity, one must come with clean hands – there is, of course, the very important matter, which he has raised: What is patriotism?

Would it be correct to state that patriotism is what many an Englishman would have parroted, during World War II: Right or wrong; king and country?

John Donne, an English metaphysical poet, who lived between 1572 and 1631, would have described love as being the weight of a teardrop, shed by a lover in anguish over the loss of a beloved one.

Love, physical love, that is, is a human drive, whose properties are predicated by the body's chemistry.

Love is activated by the body's senses: Smell; sight; touch; and, etc.

Patriotism – love and devotion of one's country – is not an innate propensity of man; it is not written in the hearts of man, as is the case of physical love.

While virtue is praiseworthy, no doubt, blind patriotism is not, necessarily, a virtue and, may be considered, very much, a vice.

While general awareness of virtue in a society is very useful, for obvious reasons, patriotism, not founded in truth, but cloaked in the soiled cloth of virtue, could well be determined to be detrimental to the good and smooth workings of a viable and vivacious society.

Conscience, only too often, in the words of William Shakespeare, makes cowards of us all.

Conscience is the knowledge of that which is right and that which is wrong in respect of one's actions.

In all good conscience, could one state that the murder of Julius Caesar in 44 B.C. was a patriotic act: *'Not that I loved Caesar less; but I loved Rome more.'*

Marcus Brutus, a Roman general, one of the conspirators in William Shakespeare's play, entitled, Julius Caesar, while being Caesar's friend and a man of high honour, nevertheless, convinces himself to join in the conspiracy against Caesar's life, believing that Caesar's death is for the greater good.

He argues:

*'And, therefore, think him as a serpent's egg, which, hatched, would, as his kind, grow mischievous ... And kill him in the shell.'*

People, all over the world, frequently break basic moral rules with no inner sense of shame or guilt.

This would suggest, strongly, that such moral rules are not innate, but are learned rules of morality, which civilised man has determined to adopt.

Patriotism is not innate in man; and, it would be an exercise in futility to try to link patriotism, inextricably, with any justifiable universal moral standard.

Because moral standards change, or are modified from one generation to another, as do the winds change course, reversing themselves, according to temperature or the nature of the topography.

Moral concepts, such as Mr Tsang Hin Chi's clear vision of patriotism, concern laws and obligations.

These may, perhaps, best be understood by lawmakers.

And, for the religious men in one's midst, God would be considered the First Lawmaker.

In the absence of the concept of an omnipotent being, however, one has only those people, who are empowered by man to draft laws, laws which are deemed equitable (fair, just, conforming to the principles of justice and right) – or by those people, who by dint of fortune and/or guile, are able to grasp great power over others, thus enabling them to have drafted laws to fit in with their ambitions – which may not be equitable and, only too often, are unconscionable to most reasonable and fair-minded men.

To make the claim, as would Mr Tsang Hin Chi, no doubt, that patriotism is innate in man, is to maintain, it seems, that there is no further need for discussion on this subject, in the same way that one may, rightly, maintain that the love of a man for a woman requires no conscious thought, but is the natural result of chemical flows within the bodies of a man and a woman, not being able to be defined in any other terms.

Such a suggestion by Mr Tsang Hin Chi, that patriotism is innate in man, is an excellent tactic to be employed – if this gentleman is desirous to stymie discussion on the subject, or he wants certain principles to be adopted as authority, without further inquiry.

Thus, to attack Messrs Szeto Wah, Martin Lee Chu Ming and Cheung Man Kwong, accusing them, by their past actions – which have not been fully enunciated by Mr Tsang Hin Chi, by the way – of not being patriotic toward the HKSAR Government and/or the PRC Government, is to imply, strongly, that they should have had, within each and every one of them, that innate and pure understanding of the meaning of patriotism.

To Mr Tsang Hin Chi, without question, patriotism is that deep-seated, innermost knowledge of that which leads to his happiness, and, by extension, to being, indefatigable, one with his country.

To many people, power, wealth, and control over others is synonymous with happiness.

The greatest happiness would appear to be that which presents to man the greatest pleasure.

Conversely, that which causes pain could not be happiness to the normal man.

To one man, pleasure could be defined one way, and, to another, another way.

Thrill-seekers would consider a ride on a roller coaster to be of great pleasure, with the bigger the thrill, the bigger the pleasure.

Others might well consider that the ride on a roller coaster to be synonymous with pain, associated with fear: The bigger the fear, the bigger the pain.

To be part of an elected or appointed opposition in a government is not, necessarily, to be unpatriotic towards one's government or country because it must be so that the true and honest dissenter is as much, if not more, of a patriot as the sycophant or the tergiversate.

Flatterers are rarely good legislators.

When leaders of the HKSAR choose to make themselves bidders at the auction of popularity, their talents, in the construction, or in the continuation of the Government and Government policy, will be of no service, at all: They will be damned as flatterers instead of legislators.

Such people will be weighed on the scales of the electorate in order to determine the fidelity of he, who would flatter in order to achieve his ends.

Moderation should not to be misunderstood and stigmatised as being the virtue of cowards; compromise is not the prudence of traitors.

--    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](mailto:editor@targetnewspapers.com) or [targnews@hkstar.com](mailto:targnews@hkstar.com). TARGET does not guarantee to publish readers' views, but reserves the right so to do subject to the laws of libel.*