



The Betty Letters

My Dear Grandchild,

While exercising my frontal lobe, the other day, it occurred to me that the teachings of Confucius are as true in his time (circa: 551-479 B.C.) as they are today. One of the outstanding essences of greatness in man is originality and purity of thought. This is called creativity. Take, for instance, the concept of Confucius when he said: 'Give unto your mother that which is your mother's; and, unto the Emperor, that which is the Emperor's'. Of course, in the Christian world, the leaders of Churches altered the Confucian analects, plagiarising The Great Man's original, ethical thinking and making it relate to a Christian God. But, for Chinese people, we know ... we know ... Oh, yes! We know. Anyway, be that as it may, the question today is about secessionist forces at work in the Motherland. At the Thirteenth Session of the Tenth National People's Congress' Standing Committee, held last December 25 (in the Christian World, December 25 is the anniversary of that Jew who did well and started his own religion), the anti-secession proposals were passed into law, with the consensus of all the delegates. Such is the loyalty of the Chinese people, well in keeping with the teachings of Confucius. Any delegate of the National People's Congress, who would consider voting against such an anti-secession proposal, would, naturally, be considered a traitor (a) to the mother who gave him birth and (b) to Emperor Premier Wen Jia Bao. The underlying logic of this law is clear: We must keep China along the straight and narrow – One country, One system, for all Chinese people, where-ever they may be. Hongkong is part of the Motherland, of course, but due to its past corruption, which lasted about one hundred and sixty three years, during the time of the British raj, which controlled our land and subjected our people to the British 'fungus', the Chinese people of Hongkong forgot their heritage and veered away from Confucianism. That is the reason that, on certain days of the year, some five hundred thousand Hongkongers go on a walkabout around Hongkong, chanting and singing and throwing their used water bottles on the streets as they proceed down the dusty and hot streets of my city. The United States of America, in 1861, at the outbreak of what is, today, called the American Civil War, determined that Federal Law is sacrosanct. It should, always, be inviolable. And so, today, in my country, it is held that no part of the Motherland may claim that it will not follow the dictates of the Central Government in Beijing. China is one country; China is one people; and, China has but one set of laws – normally, that is. And it is the duty of Emperor Premier Wen Jia Bao to keep China and the Chinese peoples together as a cohesive force. How else can we be strong? Taiwan is part of China and must kowtow to Beijing. I am certain that, if there were a referendum in Taiwan on the matter of independence from the Motherland – I mean a real referendum, such as one would expect in the event that Beijing called for a referendum in the Capital City – I would be willing to bet my new hat that all of the Chinese people would say that they loved the Motherland and wanted to be reunited with it in order to suck on the milk at that breast of the mother of all Chinese people and, in that way, obtain succor in times of need. The alternative would be a bloody war, similar to that which took place at the time of the American Civil War (1861-1865) when hundreds of thousands of North Americans and South Americans lost their lives over a silly thing called, States' Rights – the right of an individual State to enact laws, which may be contrary to the Federal Laws, as promulgated by the Federal Government. There is a conspiracy theory over the assassination of the Sixteenth President of the United States, Mr Abraham Lincoln, you know, with The Vatican, being thought to have engineered his death at the hands of John Wilkes Booth at Ford's Theatre, Washington,

D.C., on April 14, 1865. The theory was that Mr Abraham Lincoln, as a struggling solicitor, prior to being named President of the United States, then domiciled at St. Louis, Illinois, successfully defended, in 1852, Mr Charles Chiniquy, a Catholic priest, who had been accused of fraud by the Bishop of Chicago. The trial was held at Urbana, Illinois, and Mr Abraham Lincoln was victorious. The Vatican has a long memory and a very long arm: It put out a contract on the life of President Lincoln. The actor, John Wilkes Booth, was hired to be the assassin because he was, by training, a Shakespearean actor, having received his training in England under his father, Junius Brutus Booth. History can repeat itself, you know. Confucius was not a religious man, but a teacher of ethics. The prime, underlying element of Confucian ethics is jen, a supreme virtue, representing human qualities at their best. In human relations, jen is manifested in chung, or faithfulness to oneself and others, and shu, or altruism. Other important Confucian virtues include righteousness, propriety, integrity, and filial piety. Politically, Confucius advocated a paternalistic government in which the sovereign is benevolent and honourable and the subjects are respectful and obedient. For schooling, Confucius upheld the theory that, in education, there is no class distinction. At the same time, however, too much education for some of the lower classes is too confusing for them.

*So you see, My Dear Grandchild, there can be no dissenters in the Motherland: Everybody must obey. It is the same in our house: She, who must be obeyed. With those thoughts, I leave you to ponder the lessons of history and how history is the beacon, shining for the future.
Love to all.*

Chief Lady

***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.