

The Hong Kong Local Elections Were a Monumental Defeat for Fake News, Not China

By [Andrew Korybko](#)

Global Research, November 29, 2019

Region: [Asia, USA](#)

Theme: [Media Disinformation](#)

Marsha Blackburn, a Republican Senator from Tennessee, burnished her anti-China hawk credentials by [ridiculously tweeting](#) that the Hong Kong local elections were a “monumental defeat” for “pro-China lawmakers”. The politician has been on a hostile anti-Chinese spree all this month alleging that the popular Tik-Tok app is [secretly spying](#) on American children and [warning](#) about how the Chinese base in Djibouti could negatively affect American interests in Africa.

She’s now followed through on her promise last week to provide the Hong Kong protesters with social media support by spreading an entirely false narrative about the importance of the city’s latest local elections. They weren’t a “monumental defeat” for “pro-China lawmakers”, but for the fake news speculations that China would rig the vote in order to help establishment figures win. There’s this notion in the Western Mainstream Media that China is a “dictatorship” that doesn’t allow free elections, yet last Sunday’s vote disproved that.

The historically high turnout proved that Hong Kong residents of all political dispositions have faith in the model of “one country, two systems”, rightly believing that their vote will be accurately counted and that the authorities would respect the results, which they have. The people trusted the vote-counters and the fairness of the electoral process, which was a trust that was ultimately well-placed. The people have spoken, and now the city has hundreds of new district council members.

Senator Blackburn scrambled to put a spin on this supposedly “unexpected” outcome, hence why she misleadingly implied that the vote was between “pro-China lawmakers” and what could only be implied by default to have been their “anti-China” opponents. That is a false portrayal of the district council elections since everyone who participated in them accepted the legitimacy of the “one country, two systems” model that has governed Hong Kong’s relations with the mainland since reunification.

Her manipulative framing can only be described as an attempt at information warfare designed to deceive her audience into thinking that the electoral results represented a setback for China. They didn’t, precisely because Hong Kong is an integral part of the People’s Republic and Sunday’s exercise of democracy was perfectly in line with the “one country, two systems” model that Beijing itself agreed to. There were not “pro-China” or “anti-China” candidates, just a diversity of local political views, all of which support their country’s unity.

Other commentators have described the new district council leaders as being “pro-democracy”, which by default implies that their opponents were “anti-democracy”, but this

is also another attempt at spinning the truth. All candidates were “pro-democracy” because they agreed to participate in local elections, with their primary political differences being over the best way to manage local affairs in their neighborhoods. Hong Kong’s residents wanted some fresh faces, which doesn’t undermine the system, but actually renews it.

One of the global trends in recent years has been a preference for political outsiders, which has been more commonly expressed in Western countries than in others. Seeing as how Hong Kong used to be a Western colony for over 150 years, it’s people are still predisposed to some of the influences coming from that part of the world, which partially explains why they embraced this trend in the latest elections. To the credit of the “one country, two systems” model, it flexibly adapted to their political will despite the city’s ongoing crisis.

Returning to Senator Blackburn’s tweet, it’s apparent that she has an agenda in deliberately misportraying the results of the Hong Kong district council elections. They were a “monumental defeat” for fake news, not China, and they were a victory for the “one country, two systems” model, not so-called “pro-democracy” lawmakers like many other Western figures and outlets have claimed in presuming that their opponents were “anti-democracy”. The Chinese people won, while those who are trying to divide them lost.

*

Note to readers: please click the share buttons above or below. Forward this article to your email lists. Crosspost on your blog site, internet forums. etc.

Andrew Korybko is an American Moscow-based political analyst specializing in the relationship between the US strategy in Afro-Eurasia, China’s One Belt One Road global vision of New Silk Road connectivity, and Hybrid Warfare. He is a frequent contributor to Global Research.

Featured image is from Flickr

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Andrew Korybko](#), Global Research, 2019

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Andrew Korybko](#)

About the author:

Andrew Korybko is an American Moscow-based political analyst specializing in the relationship between the US strategy in Afro-Eurasia, China’s One Belt One Road global vision of New Silk Road connectivity, and Hybrid Warfare. He is a frequent contributor to Global Research.

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca