

Hong Kong's People Have Spoken - End the Protests

Will Hong Kong's "pro-democracy" movement heed the voice of the people and leave the streets indefinitely? Or remain there, revealing their true, self-serving agenda?

By [Tony Cartalucci](#)

Global Research, November 21, 2014

[Land Destroyer](#)

Region: [Asia](#)

Theme: [Law and Justice](#)

Despite an ongoing media circus in the West portraying a "popular uprising" in Hong Kong, China – in reality the Chinese people and particularly the citizens of Hong Kong have grown tired of the unrest.

After popular demand, the Public Opinion Programme (HKU POP) of the University of Hong Kong conducted a poll asking whether or not the "Occupy Central" movement should come to an end. An overwhelming 80% said yes with HKU POP stating specifically, "almost 80% called for an end to the occupation."

Bloomberg in their article, "Most Hong Kong People Want Pro-Democracy Protests to End Now," would also admit:

About 68 percent of 513 respondents said the government should clear the protesters immediately, according to a survey conducted by the University of Hong Kong Nov. 17-18. Surely, with "Occupy Central" claiming to be a "pro-democracy" movement, it will heed the will of the people and voluntarily withdraw from Hong Kong's streets indefinitely. However, despite the wording of Bloomberg's headline, those blocking up Hong Kong's streets are not "pro-democracy." The backlash against "Occupy Central" is not the Hong Kong public turning on "pro-democracy" protesters but rather the Hong Kong public understanding "Occupy Central" has nothing at all to do with democracy in the first place.

The degree to which the "Occupy Central" has been exposed as a foreign-backed political destabilization is so complete that there is little likelihood that such a destabilization will be possible in Hong Kong, or anywhere else inside of China well into the foreseeable future.

Leaders including Benny Tai and Joshua Wong have all been linked to US State Department funded organizations, projects, and campaigns. "Occupy Central" leaders including Martin Lee and Anson Chan literally were in Washington D.C. earlier this year lobbying for US support in front of the very organizations funding the political activity of virtually every prominent "Occupy Central" leader. Even HKU POP has been implicated in "dirty money" used to qualify an ad hoc referendum carried out by "Occupy Central" ahead of the recent protests.

Heed the Will of the People?

Perhaps greater evidence of "Occupy Central's illegitimacy resides not in its documented financial and political ties to foreign interests, but rather the utter contempt in which "Occupy Central" leaders hold the Hong Kong public's interests.

Before street unrest even began, “Occupy Central” held a “referendum” to gauge public interest in their “proposals.” Only a fifth of Hong Kong’s voting public turned out for the “referendum” which intentionally left out any possible vote to condemn the entire process or the “Occupy Central” movement promoting it. With this paltry “fifth” tentatively “behind” the movement, they took to the streets to disrupt life for the entire special administrative region.

Thousands, or even the tens of thousands the Western media claimed took to the streets at the height of the unrest still only constitutes less than one percent of Hong Kong’s total population – or in other words – “Occupy Central” isn’t an exercise in “pro-democracy” but rather an exercise in loud, violent, minorities posing as a majority.

From start to finish, “Occupy Central’s” agenda of imposing upon Beijing the British Empire’s parting demands when relinquishing control over a region it itself tolerated no “democracy” within, was never supported by the majority of Hong Kong, nor the rest of China of which Hong Kong is now a part of. Instead, it was a foreign-backed project to put a corrupt, treasonous political order into power under the guise of popular support and “democracy.”

Remember the Liars and Manipulators

Readers should take particular note of the Western media’s coverage of this now fully exposed and verified unpopular “popular movement,” understanding the litany of lies, attacks, and spin used to sell an otherwise unpalatable agenda. From Time Magazine’s promotional covers and their attempts to induct Joshua Wong into their “Person of the Year” line-up, to weepy narratives monkeying similar foreign-backed destabilizations in Ukraine and across the Middle East where the result has been bloodshed and the rise of Al Qaeda and literal Nazis.

Care must be taken in the coming days as desperate manipulators both in Hong Kong and among their foreign sponsors in the US and Europe seek to breath new life into the waning and unpopular movement. Masked men have already tried to provoke local police. Attempts to create bloodshed and martyrs may be the only step left to prevent “Occupy Central’s” total and permanent collapse.

When next CNN, the BBC, MSNBC, and their various regional satellite news organizations attempt to foist upon the public tales of “popular uprisings” that just so happen to coincidentally coincide with the West’s agenda of encircling and containing the rise of potential global competitors, “Occupy Central” and its undemocratic cluttering of Hong Kong’s streets against the will of the local population should come to mind.

Advice for Protesters

Anyone can complain. Few can actually propose apolitical solutions that will appeal to everyone regardless of political persuasion. People need jobs, healthcare, infrastructure, education, and access to the tools required to shape and influence the world around them in positive and progressive ways. None of this can be accomplished by blocking roads, complaining, or even voting.

It can be done through direct action, community projects, and other ways of organizing time and energy to produce pragmatic solutions rather than political division.

Images: Protests that don't include programs or pragmatic solutions serve little purpose beyond creating social division, chaos, and even rolling back what is in the best interest of the general public. Real solutions rarely require protests and had young activists attracted to Wall Street's "Occupy Central" charade attempted to pursue real solutions, they would have certainly been met by partners both across the public and government rather than the scorn and condemnation they now face.

"Occupy Central" is a documented attempt by Washington to co-opt Hong Kong's political landscape and use it against Beijing. It hinged on manipulating well-intentioned young people to make life difficult for both the local population of Hong Kong and public administrators in Beijing. It in no way sought or attempted to achieve tangible progress for the benefit of Hong Kong – such as better streets, schools, hospitals, or job prospects, and instead centered around creating a system that would propel "Occupy Central's" leaders into political power.

Spending months, or even years complaining, protesting, and blocking roads in order to establish "democracy" still doesn't answer the "what" or "why" of the fight. What programs or objectives does "Occupy Central" have after they "win?" The answer is intentionally ambiguous relying on catch phrases like "freedom," "democracy," and "human rights," because the reality of "proxy versus Beijing," "Wall Street beachhead," or "neo-colonialism" is utterly unpalatable.

When a real goal or program is actually established – such as improving access to open source educational resources for students, the creation of creative co-working spaces to encourage innovation and small businesses, or creating a network of healthy organic community gardens – ideas that will appeal to people of all political persuasions, young activists will find willing partners both across the public and the government. The idea of "protesting" rather than simply working on actual projects and programs will finally appear as absurd to these activists as the "Occupy Central" movement now appears to the vast majority of Hong Kong's population.

The original source of this article is [Land Destroyer](#)
Copyright © [Tony Cartalucci](#), [Land Destroyer](#), 2014

[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