

Hong Kong Security Law Is Common Sense, Not Controversial

By Tony Cartalucci

Global Research, July 17, 2020

Region: <u>Asia</u>, <u>USA</u>

Theme: Intelligence, Law and Justice

China's special administration region of Hong Kong saw the passing of a security law outlawing acts universally recognized as criminal and threats to any nation's security and sovereignty.

Despite what would appear to be common sense legislation, the Western media has cried "controversy." While the West claims it fears curbs on freedoms inside China – it is becoming increasingly clear that the West's real fears revolve around the "freedom" of its proxies and their attempts to maintain Hong Kong as a defacto Western foothold.

British state media, the BBC in <u>their article</u>, "Hong Kong security law: What is it and is it worrying?," would note:

Hong Kong was always meant to have a security law, but could never pass one because it was so unpopular. So this is about China stepping in to ensure the city has a legal framework to deal with what it sees as serious challenges to its authority.

The BBC would also list acts criminalized under the law which include:

- secession breaking away from the country
- subversion undermining the power or authority of the central government
- terrorism using violence or intimidation against people
- collusion with foreign or external forces

Nothing on the list is in any way controversial, with virtually all other nations on Earth maintaining similar laws on their respective books.

Additionally, Hong Kong – a region that belonged to China before being taken by force by the British Empire in 1841 and a region that now once again belongs to China after its handover to Beijing in 1997 – is clearly China's to govern and to do so in any manner China decides. Laws it passes regarding Hong Kong are not Washington or London's business just as laws passed regarding US or UK territory are none of Beijing's.

The BBC and many others across the Western media have attempted to claim the new security law is "controversial" simply because despite the UK's handover of Hong Kong to China in 1997, the UK and the US have both attempted to maintain the region as a foothold inside China – and to do so specifically by engaging in literally everything on the list outlawed by the bill – including secession, subversion, terrorism, and collusion.

The BBC article explains:

Hong Kong was handed back to China from British control in 1997, but under a unique agreement – a mini-constitution called the Basic Law and a so-called "one country, two systems" principle.

The BBC never explains why China should be bound by an agreement made with the UK – a hostile foreign occupier now fully departed from China's restored sovereign territory.

Those complaining the loudest in Hong Kong – according to the BBC article itself – include culprits guilty of all the above – including Joshua Wong and his US-backed "Demosisto" political party and other recipients of US and UK funding and support.

Wong and mobs he helped organize and lead systematically destroyed Hong Kong's infrastructure, used violence against political opponents, and openly appealed to the US and UK to intervene.

Repeatedly exposed have been the vast amounts of resources from the US government funneled into Hong Kong propping up this so-called "pro-democracy" movement.

The generally pro-Western South China Morning Post even admitted to extensive US meddling in Hong Kong in <u>an article titled</u>, "US has been exposed for funding last year's Hong Kong protests."

The article noted:

Imagine how the American government would react if multiple Chinese state agencies such as Xinhua were exposed secretly helping protest groups across the United States to evade surveillance and crackdowns by law enforcement agencies.

Washington would probably threaten China with war. Roughly, though, the little-known but powerful US Agency for Global Media has been doing just that in Hong Kong. It oversees funding for various news and information operations around the world, including Voice of America and Radio Free Asia.

About US\$2 million was earmarked for the protest movement in Hong Kong, but has now been frozen as part of a general overhaul and restructuring by a new agency boss.

As clear as the South China Morning Post article makes US meddling in Hong Kong, it is just scratching the surface of the scale and duration of US meddling in China's internal affairs – particularly in regards to Hong Kong.

Virtually <u>every aspect of Hong Kong's opposition is a product of US meddling</u> with the majority of protest leaders having literally been hosted in Washington D.C. and the direct recipients of US funding and support to build up their respective movements and carry out US objectives under the smokescreen of promoting "democracy." This has been the case for years, long before the most recent protests.

All of this constitutes a clear breech of China's sovereignty – a violation of international law and norms – but also a violation in terms of Washington's own laws. For example, were

China – as the South China Morning Post article imagined – aiding subversion in the US in a similar manner – it would be deemed absolutely illegal under US law and those involved would face equal or harsher punishments than under Hong Kong's new security law.

That China's move to shield its borders from overt, admitted foreign meddling should be considered "controversial" by the West illustrates just how deep the West's double standards run and how Western foreign policy is driven by the principle of "might makes right" with all other principles serving merely as smokescreens.

And while the US and UK condemn China for reasserting itself over its own territory and people, the US and UK both continue illegal wars and occupations thousands of miles from their own shores all across the globe. The Western media is tellingly silent about this hypocrisy.

While the US and UK may believe crying "controversy" over the new Hong Kong security law helps paint themselves as defenders of "human rights," "freedom," and "democracy," it in fact only further paints Western foreign policy as dangerously hypocritical.

*

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.

Tony Cartalucci is a Bangkok-based geopolitical researcher and writer, especially for the online magazine <u>"New Eastern Outlook"</u> where this article was originally published. He is a frequent contributor to Global Research.

Featured image is from Global Times

The original source of this article is Global Research Copyright © <u>Tony Cartalucci</u>, Global Research, 2020

Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page

Become a Member of Global Research

Articles by: Tony Cartalucci

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