

Color Revolution: British Empire Targets China Through Hong Kong

by Mike Billington

Oct. 4—Following a week of mass demonstrations in Hong Kong, effectively demanding the overthrow of the Basic Law upon which the former British colony was turned over to Chinese sovereignty in 1997, *People's Daily*, the official paper of the ruling Chinese Communist Party, issued an editorial Oct. 4 denouncing the Western attempt to overthrow China through a “color revolution,” starting in Hong Kong.

Called “Unswervingly Uphold Rule of Law in Hong Kong,” it says that the ongoing shutdown of portions of Hong Kong by “a minority of radical groups,” is creating “all sorts of chaos that have drawn the concern and indignation of the majority of Hong Kong people.” It concludes: “As for the ideas of a very small minority of people to use Hong Kong to create a ‘color revolution’ in the interior of China, that is even more of a day-dream.”

The demonstrations have been carefully scripted by various wings of the Anglo-American “Project Democracy” apparatus, trying to create another “Tiananmen Square” crisis in China, this time centered in Hong Kong. The ostensible demand of the thousands of (mostly) students is that the 2017 election for Hong Kong’s Chief Executive, which will be the first to be based on universal suffrage, must also allow for a Western-style choice of the candidates, with no restrictions. Ironically, this is an explicit rejection of the Basic Law, despite the protesters’ (and their foreign backers’) repeated appeal to “the rule of law.”

To be clear: The Basic Law for Hong Kong, agreed to by both China and the United Kingdom in 1990 in preparation for the 1997 turnover, says the following about the selection of the Chief Executive: “The ultimate aim is the selection of the Chief Executive by universal suffrage upon nomination by a broadly representative nominating committee in accordance with democratic procedures.” I.e., the selection of candidates by an election committee *is the law*. The demand that some other form of selection of candidates must be

adopted is explicitly against the law.

Until now, the Election Committee has chosen the Chief Executive itself; now it will choose the candidates to run in 2017. It is, indeed, “broadly representative,” composed of 1,200 members—300 from the industrial, commercial, and financial sector; 300 from the professions; 300 from labor, social services, and religious institutions; and 300 from the legislature, district councils, and other government officials.

Chris Patten on ‘Democracy’

The most disgusting irony is that Chris Patten, the last “Governor and Commander-in-Chief” of colonial Hong Kong (in whose selection, of course, the people of Hong Kong had no say whatsoever), wrote an op-ed in the *Financial Times* Sept. 4, demanding that London intervene on behalf of the protesters. Baron Patten wrote that “the UK has a continuing moral and political obligation to ensure that China respects its commitments to guarantee Hong Kong’s way of life [!] for 50 years from 1997.”

There are multiple foreign “Project Democracy” operations involved in orchestrating and supporting the demonstrations in Hong Kong. These include substantial funding and “democracy training” from the National Endowment for Democracy, the leading U.S. institution implementing subversion and “regime change” around the world, composed of both Republican and Democratic neo-cons. Their most recent role in funding the neo-nazi coup in Ukraine is infamous internationally.

Both the White House and Secretary of State John Kerry have given their support to this subversion. Kerry, in a press conference Oct. 1 with Chinese Foreign Minister Wang Yi, who visited Washington after appearing at the United Nations, backed the protesters, demanding that Hong Kong must be an “open society with the highest possible degree of autonomy and governed by rule of law.”



Creative Commons/Citobun

Protesters in Hong Kong, Sept. 28, 2014: funding and training courtesy of foreign “Project Democracy” networks.

Minister Wang Yi responded bluntly: “Secretary Kerry mentioned Hong Kong. Hong Kong affairs are China’s internal affairs. All countries should respect China’s sovereignty. And this is also a basic principle governing international relations. I believe for any country, for any society, no one will allow those illegal acts that violate public order. That’s the situation in the United States, and that’s the same situation in Hong Kong.”

The White House joined the imperial intervention. Obama’s spokesman, Josh Earnest, told the press Sept. 29, “The United States supports universal suffrage in Hong Kong in accordance with the Basic Law, and we support the aspirations of the Hong Kong people,” as if the thousands of mostly teenagers represented “the aspirations of the Hong Kong people.”

Wolfowitz, Again

One of the most instructive cases of the character of the “democracy” movement in Hong Kong is Jimmy Lai, who is an asset of the most extreme right-wing neocons in the United States. Jimmy Lai (Lai Chee-Ying), a media mogul who runs Hong Kong’s “pro-democracy” newspaper, the *Apple Daily*, is a financier and propagandist for the color revolution, and is now holding court on the street, granting interviews to the eager world press whores about the high principles of the movement.

Apple Daily, part of Jimmy Lai’s Next Media, was

launched after the 1989 Tiananmen Square mass demonstrations in Beijing. His funding of the protesters was revealed this past Spring, when his e-mails were leaked to the press. The key role is that of Lai’s bag-man and top assistant, Mark Simon, an American from Falls Church, Va., who previously worked for the Pentagon, did an internship with the CIA, and is a sworn defender and collaborator of the neo-con crowd that ran the G.W. Bush Administrations.

The *South China Morning Post* revealed on Aug. 11 that Simon, Lai, and neocon Paul Wolfowitz, an architect of the illegal and genocidal Iraq War, spent five hours plotting the “color revolution” on a yacht in Hong Kong harbor (date unspecified), while Simon brags in interviews that he is a dedicated neocon. He was introduced to Lai by Bill McGurn, a neocon and G.W. Bush’s chief speech writer. Lai, reports Simon, “was truly friends with Milton Friedman and Gary Becker.”

Lai also has business in Taiwan, and has funded the “black shirt” movement there, which occupied the Parliament in March, demanding that the Taiwan government end its efforts to establish strong economic and political ties with mainland China.

What Next?

Beginning on Oct. 3, groups of older Hong Kong residents have been attacking the demonstrators’ sites, tearing down their tents and banners. Press reports claim they are associated with the Triads (organized

crime gangs), but the press also acknowledges that many residents are cheering them on. Police have arrested dozens of them, but the attacks continue. The demonstrators cancelled a planned meeting with the government, claiming the government is behind the attackers.

Chief Executive Leung Chun-ying said on Oct. 3 that the street must be cleared by Oct. 6, or “all actions necessary” would be taken to ensure that government workers could go back to work.

The *People’s Daily* editorial of Oct. 4, referenced above, elaborates the government’s view:

“The so-called Occupy Central is using illegal methods to pursue the political goal of contravening the Basic Law. No matter what clever talk and gloss the organizers and inciters of Occupy Central use, whether civil disobe-

dience or peaceful nonviolence, the illegality of Occupy Central cannot be changed. The result is a trampling underfoot of the law, seriously disturbed social order, major economic losses, even perhaps injuries and deaths, and other grave results. . . . The measures taken by the Hong Kong police in dealing with Occupy Central are the inevitable demand of protecting the law. . . . A democratic society must respect the opinions of a minority, but that does not mean that a minority can do illegal things; a society based on rule of law must include different voices, but that does not mean that it can appease and connive at illegality. . . . As for the ideas of a very small minority of people to use Hong Kong to create a ‘color revolution’ in the interior of China, that is even more of a daydream.”

mobeir@aol.com

‘Color Revolutions’ Are War

The strategy of the “color revolution” as a form of irregular warfare against states targeted for dissolution or regime change by the British Empire, is identified most closely with the work of Gene Sharp, an Oxford-educated political science professor, now emeritus at the University of Massachusetts. From Sharp’s manual *From Dictatorship to Democracy*, comes the concept of organizing upheavals around a symbolic color, a tactic which has been taken up by such institutions as the National Endowment for Democracy in the United States.

The rash of such “color revolutions” has been well publicized over recent decades, starting with the “yellow revolution” against President Ferdinand Marcos of the Philippines (1986), the “orange revolution” against the Ukrainian government (2004-05), the “rose revolution” against the Georgian government (2003), and many others.

On May 23 of this year, the Russian government and military leadership specifically took note of the significance of the “color revolution” tactic, as a form of warfare. At the Third Moscow Conference on International Security, Russian and Belarusian military speakers gave detailed presentations on the strategy, and how it has played out around the world.

According to the Voice of Russia coverage of the conference, President Vladimir Putin’s message to the conference identified the color revolution tactic, saying, “Obviously, modern challenges and threats make it necessary to stop the archaic logic of geopolitical games with a zero sum game, the attempts to force your own methods and values on other peoples, including by color revolutions.”

Later on, according to notes provided by Americans present at the conference, Russian and Belarusian generals spoke on the strategy and its history. Russian Chief of General Staff Gennadi Gerasimov emphasized that military force is concealed behind the color revolutions. If the protest potential turns out to be insufficient, military force is then used to ensure regime change. Libya was cited as a textbook example. In Syria, the West is using mercenaries and military assistance in an effort to overthrow the government, he said. What began as a purely internal conflict has turned into a battle between religious radicals and the government.

Given the increasingly close security cooperation between Russia and China over the intervening months, including within the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, it is to be expected that the Russian view has been shared, in depth, with their Chinese colleagues.

See *EIR*’s archive at www.larouchepub.com, for more depth.

—Nancy Spannaus