

 Read Message  Back to: [Inbox](#)

From:

Date: 2004/03/07 Sun PM 02:10:24 CST

To: [views@cab-review.gov.hk](mailto:views@cab-review.gov.hk)    Move To: 

To The Constitutional Development Task Force:

I would like to remain anonymous.

I would like to contribute to the discussion of "patriotism". I oppose the use of patriotism as a criterion to screen legislators.

1. Patriotism is not explicitly mentioned in the Basic Law. If patriotism is used as a criterion to screen legislators, we may breach the Basic Law.
2. If, as Mr. CH Tung said, the affairs of Hong Kong is the family affairs of China, then Hong Kong is a dysfunctional family. There is no communication between Mainland China and Legislators, in particular, the Democratic Party, and those legislators who go to other countries are smeared. It is like a father does not talk to his sons, and does not allow the sons to go outside to talk to people.
3. In any case, the allegory of Mr. Tung is incorrect. Hong Kong is not a family. Hong Kong is a political entity - a Special Administration Region. Mr. Tung is not our father. Paternalistic rule is not acceptable.
4. Patriotism is itself a loose concept. To some people, sending a son to a western country to receive western education instead of to China is unpatriotic. To some people, receiving knighthood from the British Queen is unpatriotic. To some people, having a foreign passport is unpatriotic. However, patriotism is a sentiment that cannot be defined. It is not simply judged by the acts you do, and in any case, who can be the judge?
5. If patriotism is to be used in any real sense, the Basic Law has to be amended to spell it out in details. It has to be defined in absolutely clear legal terms.
6. If no amendment to the Basic Law is intended as mentioned in (5) above, then patriotism must be treated as irrelevant in the constitutional development of Hong Kong.

Regards,

---

    Move To:

[Search Messages](#)

[Previous](#)

[Next](#)

[Back to: Inbox](#)

[Help](#)