

Henrik Hedlund  
Lund University  
Department of Political Science

STVK12  
Spring 2020  
Tutor: Sarai-Anne Ikenze

# Democratization with a Non-Democratic Influence

Investigating Shifts in Beijing's Employment of Soft Power in Hong Kong



# Abstract

China's approach and response to democratization in Hong Kong have since the city's handover back in 1997 been somewhat of a rollercoaster-esque experience. The path towards democracy has for the people of Hong Kong remained an ongoing struggle for nearly 30 years, with recent developments arguably putting an end towards any hope of future realization. This study seeks to investigate and assess Beijing's response(s) and employment of soft power in Hong Kong, providing potential implications for the process of democratization in the city, past, and present.

This thesis operationalizes a theoretical framework built upon the concept of soft power that analyzes shifts in Beijing's utilization of soft power over two selected cases, the 2014 Umbrella movement and the ongoing 2019-20 Hong Kong protests. By examining and comparing response(s) in reference to shifts in Beijing's soft power utilization against democratization efforts in Hong Kong, variations over time can then be assessed in terms of their potential implication on processes of democratization.

Based on the findings, this thesis argues that identified shifts in Beijing's employment of soft power response(s) over the two selected cases have been 'unmasked' and can currently be more likened to the utilization of sharp power measures instead. Present political developments in Hong Kong showcase Beijing's increasing assertiveness that ultimately, indicate a reversed form of democratization taking place in Hong Kong.

*Keywords:* Hong Kong, China, Beijing, Democratization, Response, Soft power, Sharp power, Protests.

*Word count:* 9959

# Table of Contents

## Glossary and Abbreviations

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>1. Introduction</b>                               | <b>1</b>  |
| 1.1 Purpose and Scope                                | 3         |
| <b>2. Democratization in Hong Kong</b>               | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>3. Theoretical Framework</b>                      | <b>7</b>  |
| 3.1 Chinese Soft Power, Tianxia 天下 and Weiwen 维稳     | 7         |
| 2.3 Operationalized Framework                        | 11        |
| <b>4. Methodology</b>                                | <b>12</b> |
| 4.1 Research Design                                  | 12        |
| 4.2 Data Collection                                  | 15        |
| 4.3 Data Analysis                                    | 16        |
| <b>5. Case Selection</b>                             | <b>17</b> |
| 5.1 2014 Umbrella Movement                           | 17        |
| 5.2 2019-20 Hong Kong Protests                       | 18        |
| <b>6. Data Analysis</b>                              | <b>20</b> |
| 6.1 2014 Umbrella Movement                           | 20        |
| 6.2 2019-20 Hong Kong Protest                        | 23        |
| <b>7. Discussion of Results</b>                      | <b>26</b> |
| 7.1 Shifts in Beijing's Soft Power Response(s)       | 26        |
| 7.2 Beijing's Employment of Sharp Power in Hong Kong | 28        |
| <b>8. Concluding Remarks</b>                         | <b>30</b> |
| <b>9. References</b>                                 | <b>32</b> |
| 9.1 Academic and Methodological Literature           | 32        |
| 9.2 Online Articles                                  | 34        |
| 9.3 2014 Umbrella Movement                           | 37        |
| 9.4 2019-20 Hong Kong Protests                       | 41        |
| <b>10. Appendix</b>                                  | <b>46</b> |

# Glossary and Abbreviations

**Basic Law:** Hong Kong's de facto constitution which was promulgated in 1990 and outlines in accordance with Chinese Law the arrangements for the governance of Hong Kong.

**CCP:** Communist Party of China.

**Chief Executive:** (CE) Head of the Hong Kong SAR and its government.

**Executive Council:** Body consisting of business and political figures who advise the chief executive on policy issues.

**Hong Kong and Macau Affairs Office:** (HKMAO) The Hong Kong and Macau Affairs Office of the State Council in Beijing is the responsible agency of the PRC in promoting cultural, economic, and political cooperation between the mainland, Hong Kong and Macau.

**Hong Kong Liaison Office:** (LOCPG) Liaison Office of the Central People's Government in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, the official representative organ of the PRC government in Hong Kong.

**Sino-British Joint Declaration:** The Agreement signed in 1984 between Britain and China on the handover of Hong Kong.

**Legislative Council:** (LegCo): Hong Kong's legislative body.

**MOFA:** Ministry of Foreign Affairs China.

**Mainland:** Refers to the Chinese geographical mainland and its socio-economic and political system.

**NPC & NPCSC:** National People's Congress, the highest state institution and legislature of the PRC, and NPC Standing Committee.

**"One Country, two systems":** The governing principle under which Hong Kong operates as a Special Administrative Region (SAR) of the PRC.

**PRC:** People's Republic of China.

**SAR:** Special Administrative Region, the status both Hong Kong and Macau enjoy in the PRC political system.



**Figure 1:** Map of Hong Kong SAR



# 1. Introduction

The political fate of Hong Kong managed to remain front-page news globally until its handover to China in 1997. In time for the city's highly anticipated return to the mainland headlines around the world asked, what is going to happen to the last crown colony of the now but extinct British Empire? Opinions were divided and a melancholy hopefulness filled the city's populace (Lam, 2001). Could Hong Kong develop into a full-fledged democracy over time or did the Communist Party of China (CCP) have other, more ominous plans? Following the handover in 1997 and the settlements between Britain and China which Hong Kong was granted a high degree of autonomy and rule of law for a period of 50 years, global interest in the city waned (Summers, 2019). Simultaneously as the world turned their eyes on other more pressing matters, mounting political tension and opposition began to emerge and intensify in Hong Kong (Summers, 2019).

Hong Kong has seen a stark and continued increase in the politicization of social and economical issues, deepening the already strained situation between the two entrenched political camps on either side of the political spectrum which in Hong Kong's case are the Pro-Beijing and Pan-democratic side (Loo, 2017, Summers, 2019). In a situation where the distinction between economic and political issues are growing increasingly hard, coupled with enormous societal inequalities, Hong Kong's uncertain future is only further complicated by the impact of the global coronavirus pandemic and an increasingly assertive influence converging and spreading from the city's authoritarian sovereign, China (Summers, 2019; Tai, 2019, Fong, 2020, The Heritage Foundation, 2020). Chen et al (2015) argue that their sovereign, China, is the most powerful country today blocking democracy's growth, employing various tactics to ensure the court-railing of democratization both domestically and internationally (Chen et al, 2015).

Using terms such as *Mainlandization* coined by Lo (2008) to explain the cultural, economic, and political convergence with the mainland, Hong Kong has clearly taken a path towards increased repression (Lo, 2008; Hui, 2020; The Heritage Foundation, 2020). Fong's (2020) article points out that the situation for democracy and autonomy in Hong Kong once, and maybe for all, has started to spiral out of control following two highly dramatic political months of April and May in 2020, demonstrated with a never before seen assertiveness from Beijing (Fong, 2020; Cheung G, 2020; Cheung T, 2020; Griffiths et al, 2020; Mächts, 2020).

Examining Hong Kong's democratization process from 1997 up to present-day clearly displays a shift in how Beijing has and continues to respond to pushes for democratic reform in Hong Kong (Fong, 2020; Lam, 2001; Tai, 2019; Hui, 2020; Servaes, 2016; Kwong, 2018). Culminating with last year's massive protests in Hong Kong, Beijing has increasingly shifted its understanding of such events to become a matter of national security and referral to the protests as acts of terrorism (Blanchard et al, 2019). Invoking a recent and growing hard-line stance from Beijing that they time and time again have reiterated, all things Hong Kong is purely an internal Chinese affair (Tai et al, 2020; Blanchard et al, 2019).

Thus, this thesis shall specifically target and investigate how response(s) from Beijing to processes of democratization in Hong Kong can be observed to have shifted between two selected cases employing the theoretical concept of soft power.



## 1.1 Purpose and Scope

The purpose of this thesis is to examine changes in Beijing's employment of soft power in response(s) to political developments in Hong Kong over two selected cases. In order to do this, this thesis will investigate how China's, previously and henceforth also referred to as Beijing interchangeably due to the centralized power in the country, can be assessed to have altered response towards political reform in Hong Kong by their employment of soft power. Specifically, the main objective of the thesis is to compare and analyze two selected cases, referred to as flare-ups or incidents, and Beijing's response to them by examining shifts in their utilization of soft power approaches to liken employment of sharp power. The motivation for adopting this approach of examining Beijing's soft power employment towards democratic reform in Hong Kong by analyzing changes in response is chiefly done in order to provide an appropriate benchmark that helps establish a timeline for comparing and evaluating what incident garners which response and if the response then can be deemed to have been adopted or fine-tuned in relation to Beijing's soft power strategy between cases.

In order to narrow down the scope of the thesis and to give variation between the different incidents, the flare-ups will be chosen between the period of 2014 to present-day, arguably the most politically violent and transformative period of Hong Kong politics since the handover in 1997 (Summers, 2019; Hui, 2020; Kwong, 2018; Tai et al, 2020). The selected flare-up incidents are chosen due to their large size, enabling the response(s) and soft power employment from Beijing to be examined from the onset of the incident and sampled throughout to establish if changes have occurred within and then between selected cases, so as to maximize the material available for analysis. Large size incidents also provide an adequate amount of sources and media coverage to cover the most important response(s) and enable multiple perspectives to be examined.

Listed below are the selected cases;

- ***2014 Umbrella Movement***
  
- ***2019-20 Hong Kong Protests (Ongoing)***

In order to establish a relevant benchmark to compare the two selected incidents, the thesis will, as mentioned above, analyze if the response(s) from Beijing can be assessed to have changed in terms of their employment of soft power between the selected cases. Hopeful shifts that might be observed over the proposed timeline is here argued to be if Beijing, for example, can be assessed to have altered their response from accusations, condemning statements to sharp power exercised response(s) and actions. This refers to both responses of economic and political connotations, which would point to a change in their employment of soft power to sharp power as found and exemplified in Hui (2020), Loh (2020), Chou (2015), and Servaes (2016). Variation over time and between cases is thus argued to be a good explanatory force to help contextualize the response(s) from Beijing to political reform in Hong Kong and its potential implication on the city's process of democratization.

The motivation for investigating Beijing's employment and argued shift in usage of soft power in Hong Kong is two-fold, firstly the city presents a unique case within the field of politics due to its status as a Special Administrative Region (SAR) within China and the city's granted autonomy under the governing principle of the One country, two systems (CMAB, 2007). Secondly, Hong Kong's autonomy is in stark contrast to the rights currently enjoyed in the mainland and presents in itself a fascinating case for political scientists; How can the world's largest authoritarian state allow democratic rights on their own soil, let alone give away authority on political matters? The relationship between China and Hong Kong has and continue to be acutely strained, currently highlighted by claims of Beijing encroaching upon Hong Kong's freedoms and undermining the future viability of the One country, two systems principle, governing Hong Kong and their de facto constitution, the Basic Law (Albert, 2019; Cheung, G 2020; Cheung, T 2020; Wong, 2020; Grundy, 2020). Political developments in Hong Kong have been closely monitored and examined academically since its handover, but few studies have traced Beijing's

employment of soft power in the context of Hong Kong over time. Tracing and evaluating Beijing's response to democratic reform by employing the concept of soft power in the context of China, therefore, deserves further merit. Callahan (2015), Chou (2015), Huang et al (2006), Hui (2020), Loh (2016) and Servaes (2016) all highlight the current research gap on the study of defensive/negative/sharp power in light of how Beijing's utilizes it in Hong Kong.

The aforementioned entrenched camps in Hong Kong's politics are in this thesis, for the sake of brevity and this thesis inherent scope, simply referred to as either; Beijing, Pro-Beijing, Pro-establishment and on the Pro-democracy side; Political opponents, Protestors, Pro-democracy or the often employed term of Pan-democrats. These two sides represent in essence two different views on Hong Kong's future, either increased integration with the mainland or not, instead favoring expanded democratization. Therefore, when deemed appropriate for the thesis and or when assessing a response(s) from Beijing, further explanations on a specific camp shall be given.

In order to analyze this supposed shift from soft to sharp power in Beijing's response(s) over the selected cases, this thesis employs a theoretical framework and analysis built on the expansion of the concept of soft power by Callahan (2015) and Loh (2016) which argues that soft power inherently is negative and reactionary in the case of China (Callahan, 2015: 216; Loh, 2016: 117). In response to this above-outlined discussion and delimitation, this thesis will adopt the following research question, both in order to follow the outlined purpose and scope but more importantly so a conclusion can be reached. It reads as follows;

***What shifts have there been in Beijing's use of soft power tactics in Hong Kong since 2014, and what are the potential implications of these shifts for processes of democratization in Hong Kong?***

## 2. Democratization in Hong Kong

In order to situate Hong Kong's recent democratic history, the concept of democratization shall be discussed briefly within the context of Hong Kong. This is done to better explain Beijing's approach, here understood as a response(s), to the question of democracy in Hong Kong. The process of democratization in Hong Kong is here understood as a form of political reform.

Democratization as a concept seeks out to understand why some states experience either an expansion or reduction of democracy, usually a turn from authoritarianism towards democratic governance (Grugel, 2002: 12). Democracy as a form of government can be explained as far back as the philosophical idea of Aristotle's, dating back to ancient Greece, which explains democracy as the governance by the many (Lam, 2001: 20).

Before the handover to China in 1997, the last British governor to Hong Kong Chris Patten initiated a series of constitutional efforts aimed at speeding up democratization efforts in the old crown colony. In 1992, Patten introduced his first constitutional package of reforms with hopes that democratic development would continue to take place in Hong Kong after the handover (Lam, 2001: 19). Now that Hong Kong has been under Chinese sovereignty for more than 20 years, democratization efforts have arguably been severely constrained and as of late, ultimately stalled (Ortmann, 2015; Dingding et al, 2015; Tai, 2019; Tai et al, 2020). The factors behind this slowed democratic progression in Hong Kong are numerous, chiefly caused by their authoritarian sovereign, China, and their refusal to allow further democratic reforms to be initiated nor expanded (Chan et al, 2018; Chen et al, 2015; Tai et al, 2020; Tai, 2019; Lam, 2001: 19-21). Tai's (2020) explanation of democracy in Hong Kong is cogent, arguing that the city has regressed from a semi-democratic state to become a semi-authoritarian one, experiencing a reversed form of democratization (Tai et al, 2020: 110-116).

### 3. Theoretical Framework

The theoretical foundation of this thesis shall be built upon the concept of soft power as coined by renowned American political scientist Joseph Nye in his 1990 book titled *Bound to Lead: The Changing Nature of American Power* (Nye, 1990). Before delving further into the main parts of this thesis, it is important to discuss and clarify the different terms employed in this paper. The concept will be discussed further and contextualized in order to explain its inherent relevance and scope for China and Hong Kong and the purposes of this thesis.

#### 3.1 Chinese Soft Power, Tianxia 天下 and Weiwén 维稳

In 2007, former Chinese president Hu Jintao announced that the great '*Chinese Rejuvenation*' needed to be accompanied by a thriving Chinese culture, enhanced and spread by the utilization of soft power globally (Kissinger Institute, 2020). In 2014, during the 18th National Congress of the CCP, reigning Chinese President Xi Jinping once again confirmed China's commitment and usage of soft power by remarking '*We should increase China's soft power, give a good Chinese narrative, and better communicate China's messages to the world*' (Kissinger Institute, 2020). Similar to Hu Jintao, Xi Jinping promulgated in 2013 a grand national plan titled the '*China Dream*' to the Chinese society with demands for a greater soft power push, paramount for its future realization (Kissinger Institute, 2020; Beech, 2014a; Stromseth et al, 2017). China's recent soft power push, with tens of billions of dollars spent, is often highlighted by the growing number of Confucian Institutes globally, spreading China's message to the world (Callahan, 2015; Walker, 2017).

Joseph Nye defines the concept of soft power in this way; '*It is the ability to get others to want what you want through attraction rather than coercion or payments*' (Nye, 2004: 23). In the context of China and

Hong Kong, Professor William A. Callahan at LSE, takes the concept of soft power further and has extended it whereby he argues that China employs soft power in a negative aspect rather than a positive as is originally argued by Nye (1990), (Callahan, 2015: 216-217). Loh's (2016) article extends the concept further as he argues that China's employment of soft power is defensive and reactionary as it is employed to defend their national image primarily and to project a positive one (Loh, 2016: 117). This thesis theoretical framework mainly builds on Callahan's (2015) important extension of the soft power concept and that there is a need for a more multi-dimensional view of soft power. Employing the classic understanding of soft power in the context of China is problematic as noted by Wang et al (2008) since it does not correspond with Nye's (1990; 2004) original conceptualization. Rather, and as argued in Callahan (2015), Chinese discussion on soft power is interesting as it does the exact opposite from Nye's initial understanding, it's negative rather than positive (Callahan, 2015: 220-221). Callahan (2015) further notes that soft power in China's case is employed in their domestic policy, rather than in foreign as Nye (2004) originally explains its usage (Callahan, 2015: 220). Thus, utilizing Callahan's (2015) and Loh's (2016) extension of the soft power concept is here argued to add an important theoretical dimension to the analysis which can help to evaluate and assess these argued shifts in response(s) from Beijing to selected flare-up incidents and ultimately their potential implication on processes of democratization in Hong Kong.

The response(s) from Beijing and their employment of soft power are here argued to pose as a counter-democratic influence on the democratization process in Hong Kong. In order to illustrate the ongoing climate of Beijing's response(s) to democratization efforts in Hong Kong, two examples shall be given that here exemplifies a response from Beijing and their utilization of soft power. Firstly and picking up where this thesis sets out to collect data, the 2014 Umbrella movement, Loh (2016) argues that Beijing's responses were reactionary since they were taken in response to actions they deemed harmful against their national image (Loh, 2016: 118-121). Reactionary responses are identified by efforts in trying to protect, mitigate, or alter the perception of an incident that negatively can impact the perception of a country's image (Loh, 2016; Callahan, 2015). The 2014 Umbrella movement exemplified Beijing's efforts in defending their national image, pride, and strategic interests by trying to steer how media reported on the protests as they were predominantly negative on China's part, subsequently,

Beijing tried projecting a positive national image in defense (Loh, 2016; Servaes, 2016). Therefore, Loh (2016) argues it as a prime example of Beijing's employment of defensive soft power (Loh, 2016: 121-122). Further, Loh (2016) argues that defensive, i.e. negative, soft power in Beijing's case can help understand the process through which they presented their national image during the movement (Loh, 2016: 119). Secondly and a more recent example pertains to the removal and installation of new Chinese directors in their two top agencies concerned with Hong Kong issues, their Liaison Office (LOCPG) in Hong Kong and the Hong Kong and Macau Affairs Office in Beijing (HKMAO). These appointments took place during the first months of 2020 and are described as a response from Beijing based on their discontent with Hong Kong's government's inability of handling the past years' protest, signifying their increased sharp power employment (Zheng et al, 2020, Gao et al, 2020; Hui, 2020).

When the original concept of soft power was conceived by Joseph Nye in 1990 it marked an important cultural turn within the field of International Relations (Lapid & Kratochwil 1997 in Callahan 2015). The concept has today been revised by Nye himself (2004) and evolved by other scholars such as Callahan & Barabantseva (2011), Callahan (2013; 2015), Servaes (2016), Loh (2016) and Wang et al (2008). Presently, soft power can be explained to have different branches or interpretations given the specific context or country of study (Callahan, 2015). The key factor for why soft power is deemed relevant for this thesis is in accordance to Callahan's (2015) argument on Chinese soft power, it is negative rather than positive in terms of their employment strategy (Callahan, 2015: 216). Negative soft power refers to how China employs soft power in hard power terms, with terms such as sharp power argued by Hui (2020) and defensive power by Loh (2016). In Hong Kong's case, and its potential implications on their process of democratization, Hui (2020) exemplifies this by showcasing how Beijing has subverted their once-respected police force and launched a program of dismissal against Pro-democracy supporters in both public and private sectors employing both soft and sharp power measures as a new mean of repression (Hui, 2020: 289-292). Further, Hui (2020) notes that Beijing's employment of sharp power in Hong Kong is wide-ranging because there is significant support for the protests (Hui, 2020: 297). Why label and compare Chinese employment of soft power to sharp power? Following Walker et al (2017) argument which is that both in the case of China and Russia, two ambitious and powerful authoritarian states, their soft power strategies are not done in an actual effort to '*share alternative ideas*' or '*broaden*

*the debate*', inherently resting on attraction or even persuasion, but rather that it centers on distraction and manipulation to maintain power and influence (Walker et al, 2017). Further, Walker et al (2017) note that although not all their soft power techniques are hard in the openly coercive sense, they are not really soft, thus the relevance of the term sharp power (Walker et al, 2017).

The Chinese utilization of soft power has in reference to Chou (2015) an undeniable link to their longstanding Confucianism heritage. The term Tianxia, '*All-under-Heaven*', and Weiwen, '*Upholding Stability*', refer to ancient Chinese ideas about how statecraft should be conducted, which today is still relevant and adhered to by Chinese policymakers (Chou, 2015: 112-113). Further, Goldfarb (2013) in Chou (2015) writes that '*Confucius is more than a symbol of continuity and connection to China's ancient past, his teachings are now a tool of soft power*' (Chou, 2015: 106). Highly relevant in the case of Hong Kong, when Xi Jinping and his Premier Li Keqiang took power in 2013, China's expansion and focus on normative soft power has also been equally matched in hard power terms, 'Weiwen' according to Chou (2015: 106-110). Callahan (2015) notes that soft power in China is a contested concept like in many other countries, but consensus within the PRC is that the objective of employing soft power is to fight against those who view China as a threat and cultivate those who see it as an opportunity (Callahan, 2015: 218). The 2008 Beijing Olympics is usually mentioned as a prime example of China's recent success in employing soft power to portray the nation and the PRC positively to the world (Callahan, 2015: 218).

Further, Loh's (2016) relevant contribution to the concept of soft power in Chinese terms is his argument that China enacted a type of defensive, reactionary, soft power in their response to the 2014 Umbrella movement in Hong Kong and beyond to defend their national image and project a positive one (Loh, 2016: 119-120). Loh (2016) provides this explanation on the shifting implication of soft power and why it is reactionary in the case of China;

*'Soft power can be reactionary and defensive in nature as well - a characterization that has been well associated with China. It also explores the dynamics in which 'soft power' can shift from 'defensive' or 'negative' to 'positive.'*' (Loh, 2016: 121).



The theoretical framework for this thesis shall thus be built upon Callahan's (2015) and Loh's (2016) extension on the concept of soft power. Following the above comment on Chinese 'reactionary' employment soft power, here likened to sharp power in accordance with Hui (2020) and Walker et al (2017), the framework shall help to assess and compare the response(s) from Beijing to the selected cases and in reference to their potential impact upon democratization in Hong Kong. Additionally, Callahan (2015) argues that we need a more complex view of soft power and that it is best understood as a; '*Social construction that can tell us about identity and security dynamics, in particular the contingent relations of hard/soft power, positive/negative strategies, and foreign/domestic politics*' (Callahan, 2015: 225).

## 2.3 Operationalized Framework

Thus far, the paper has provided a brief discussion on the process of democratization in Hong Kong and how the concept of soft power can be related and integrated to create a unit of theoretical measurement for assessing and analyzing Beijing's response(s) to the selected cases. However, it is realized that this framework does not capture every single variable explaining why a potential shift in Beijing's soft power strategy in Hong Kong might have occurred. The same is true of its potential impact on democratization. Nonetheless and more importantly, the above outlined theoretical framework does capture the purpose of this thesis and its inherent circumstances pertaining to the concept of soft power in the context of Beijing's response(s) to democratization in Hong Kong.

## 4. Methodology

In this part of the thesis, the employed methods shall be motivated and explained. Further, possible limitations are discussed under each given sub-section.

### 4.1 Research Design

This thesis shall be conducted with the usage of a qualitative methodology, as stipulated in Bryman (2012), in which he explains that a qualitative study emphasizes words rather than quantification in the collection of data and analysis (Bryman, 2012: 380). This study seeks to employ qualitative methods to analyze and compare the findings of Beijing's responses in order to contextualize and explain them in a manner conducive to evaluate their potential impact on democratization in Hong Kong. Thus, the employment of qualitative methods is deemed most appropriate to suit the purpose of this thesis and answer the research question.

The study will, as much research within the field of democratization and concepts of political power, be carried out as a case study. To align and follow the purpose of this thesis as it is examining Beijing's employment of soft power in response(s) to two different flare-up incidents within Hong Kong's democratization process since 2014, the specific design of this study is a qualitative comparative case study. According to Goodwick (2014), a case study is an in-depth examination of a single case, often done overtime to produce contextualized knowledge about the given case (Goodwick, 2014: 1-2). In similarity with a single case study, Goodwick (2014), explains a comparative case study as covering two or more cases so it produces generalizable knowledge about causal questions (Goodwick, 2014: 1). A further reason for selecting a case study design in this thesis also stems from Creswell (2014), argument that it enables the researcher to evaluate and analyze a process in-depth, which in this case is how Beijing shifts in

the employment of soft power in their response(s) towards political reform in Hong Kong can be assessed and compared, with the aim to indicate and discuss potential implications for processes of democratization in Hong Kong (Creswell, 2014: 43).

Regarding the possible limitations of this choice of method, as with any method in social sciences, a case study has its inherent problems. Bryman (2012) relates these problems to issues surrounding generalization as the scope of the findings may be restricted (Bryman, 2012: 406). External validity is often mentioned as a concern for case studies which has to be addressed appropriately via the employment of, for example a triangulation approach to the selected sources (Creswell, 2018: 259-260). Goodwick (2014), further points out that a comparative case study might be highly resource-intensive in some contexts, especially if fieldwork is required, and that it's, therefore, wise to select a smaller number of cases (Goodwick, 2014: 8). To mitigate the issue of resource restraints this thesis will only investigate two selected cases employing a literature review over articles, news articles, and official statements (Bryman, 2012: 549-553). Goodwick (2014), also discusses concerns regarding comparative case studies as they might not have reached the level of description needed in order to portray the richness of the selected cases (Goodwick, 2014: 8). This can be avoided if a sound discussion and justification are done when selecting the cases, which this thesis shall do in a later section (Goodwick, 2014: 8). Further, as this is a bachelor's thesis, limited resources and time constraints mean that only a small selection of cases and sources can be analyzed and interpreted. Hopefully, this thesis has the potential to provide future research with an indication on the question of Beijing's employment of soft power in Hong Kong and its implications on the past, present, and future of democratization in the SAR.

This project shall draw its material and data from primary sources such as government statements from the PRC in Beijing and Beijing's official offices in Hong Kong. These statements can, for example, be found in news articles from major newspapers in Hong Kong such as the South China Morning Post (SCMP), Hong Kong Free Press (HKPF) and international agencies such as Reuters, TIME, The Diplomat and the Associated Press (AP) that reports on Beijing's response(s) and actions. Further, Chinese nationalist newspapers in Beijing such as the Global Times (GB), Xinhua (XH), and China Daily (CD) together with local mouthpieces Wen Wei Po and Tai Kung Pao in Hong Kong shall be employed

to provide Pro-Beijing perspectives. The benefit of employing these above-mentioned Pro-Beijing sources is that they operate popular English versions of their papers. Employing and evaluating both Western and Chinese sources are done in order to mitigate potential biases and provide multiple perspectives and understandings on the political developments in Hong Kong as they are highly contested within the selected cases (Bryman, 2012: 549-553). Other sources such as academic journals and books shall be employed in order to provide additional information and data if deemed necessary when discussing the response(s) potential impact and connotation. This would ensure the cross-checking of the sources and data by means of triangulation as stipulated by Bryman (2012: 392-393).

Official statements from Beijing and articles from their associated newspapers lead to the limitation of language and the capacity to adequately translate and interpret sources. As I don't speak Mandarin fluently I shall mitigate this problem by employing the help of colleagues at the Consulate General of Sweden in Hong Kong and Macau who speak fluent Mandarin and have previous knowledge about the current political situation in China and in particular, Hong Kong. However, and to make clear, this thesis's main data dependence is on English language sources.

Another possible limitation to discuss pertains to the case selection and specifically why I have chosen the two aforementioned flare-up incidents. Firstly, in order to have sufficient data to collect and a good spread of opinions, larger incidents are preferred as they have drawn the most attention both from domestic and international media outlets and actors. Secondly and crucially for this thesis, it is here argued that the selected cases contain the most diverse response(s) from Beijing and therefore, the largest amount of relevant material for the paper's purpose and ability to compare and analyze variations in Beijing's responses and shifts in soft power utilization. Finally, this thesis shall employ purposive sampling in its selection of cases because it lends the author the ability to sample and select cases in a strategic way that is relevant for the research question posed (Bryman, 2012: 418-419). A brief description and justification for each selected case are done in the Case section further below.

## 4.2 Data Collection

The data collection will be based upon material collected from primary sources such as government statements from official Chinese agencies in Hong Kong and Beijing and news reports/articles from media outlets associated with Beijing and regular non-allied media outlets in Hong Kong and internationally. A total of approximately 30 sources per case is deemed necessary to gain a diverse understanding of the incident and the most relevant response(s) from Beijing. The articles and statements shall be gathered by employing the search function in Google News to ensure that the specified time periods are followed and the outlined purpose of this thesis. In order to assess and value this collected data, the theoretical framework constructed above shall be employed. The material collected in these primary and secondary sources targets the response(s) from Beijing to the selected cases and how these over time, can be found to have changed in relation to their employment of soft power.

A response is in this research defined as how Beijing can be considered to have employed soft power methods to define, influence, and or attempt to thwart the process of democratization in Hong Kong or protected their national image and pride. Examples of a response from Beijing were given in the theoretical section on Chinese soft power. In order not to miss important statements from Beijing on a certain incident, the size and scope of the selected flare-up incident need to be large and contain a wide diversity of sources that captures Beijing's 'biggest' responses, done in respect with Bryman's (2012) section on sample size and saturation (Bryman, 2012: 425-428). The general process of locating a response from Beijing is to review the internet employing Google News archival function to search for Beijing's response(s) to the selected cases and their timeframe by employing below listed keywords;

- *Beijing, Beijing response to Hong Kong, 2014 Umbrella movement, Soft power, Sharp power, Hard power, Political response, 2019-20 Hong Kong protests, Hong Kong protests, Democratization, Democracy, Hong Kong politics, Beijing shift in responses, China's soft power in Hong Kong.*

### 4.3 Data Analysis

The data analysis addresses one of the main issues of this research; What response(s), incident, case, or shift in employment of soft power from Beijing is relevant for explaining potential impacts on processes of democratization in Hong Kong? Thus, as this thesis is following a qualitative methodology, each selected incident and the response(s) from Beijing shall be analyzed and assessed by employing the comparative case study method and the theoretical framework stipulated above. Importantly, and as argued in Creswell (2018), is that the data collection and analysis must be carried out as a simultaneous process within qualitative research (Creswell, 2018: 258-259). The selected sources for each case shall be analyzed by employing the operationalized theoretical framework in order to contextualize the response(s) from Beijing and help conclude if their employment of soft power has shifted since 2014, why, and how whilst potentially pointing to its impact on processes of democratization in Hong Kong. Taking reference from Bryman's discussion on qualitative content analysis is here deemed prudent to help seek out and capture underlying themes, namely shifts in Beijing's soft power utilization to liken sharp power measures in their response(s) and actions when analyzing selected documents (Bryman, 2012: 557-559). Further information pertaining to the analysis is given in the Data Analysis section further below. My intent is to present a corroborated analysis based on the chosen materials and the afore-mentioned theoretical framework and research question, keeping in mind the limitations inherent to my study.

## 5. Case Selection

The two cases in this thesis are referred to as flare-up incidents and have been selected in accordance with the method of purposive sampling and specifically, maximum variation sampling found in Bryman (2012). The cases were chosen due to their large size and unprecedented, diverse attention and response they received, both from Beijing and domestically within Hong Kong, but also internationally. Important to note is that the analysis shall not assess the whole incidents themselves as one single case, but rather smaller and selected flare-ups within them that are deemed relevant for the purpose and scope of this thesis (Bryman, 2012: 418-424). A brief description and justification of each case follow below.

### 5.1 2014 Umbrella Movement

Catapulting Hong Kong back onto the center stage of international attention after almost 20 years, the Occupy movement, popularly referred to as the ‘Umbrella Revolution’ by its supporters caught both the Beijing and Hong Kong governments off-guard. The 79-day long occupation of Hong Kong’s central business districts proved not to be another short-lived protest but the turning point in what today has become the norm in massive political protests in the city. The term ‘Umbrella’ comes from the striking pictures of protestors fending off tear gas canisters fired at them by riot police during the clashes (Summers, 2019). One immediate factor behind the movement was the contentious question of the upcoming 2017 election of the next Chief Executive (CE) and beyond which many in Hong Kong wanted to be appointed by universal suffrage and not a Beijing controlled electoral college known as the Election Committee (EC) (Summers, 2019; Ortmann, 2015). Underlying factors included socio-economic issues and the ongoing fear of Beijing’s increasing influence in Hong Kong’s affairs (Summers, 2019; Tai, 2019; Tai, 2020; Ortmann, 2015).

Marking the clear-cut return of Hong Kong to the international political stage once again, the 2014 Umbrella movement shook the very political foundation of Hong Kong and primed a generation of political protests and debate. The case is therefore deemed relevant to investigate further and assess in comparison to the 2019-20 Protests currently unfolding in Hong Kong by employing the above-mentioned theoretical framework and methodology. Sources collected for this case range from the period of 18 February 2014 to 31 December 2014.

## 5.2 2019-20 Hong Kong Protests (Ongoing)

Never before in Hong Kong's political history had a single event caused so much political upheaval and societal discontent as when the Secretary for Safety John Lee introduced an proposed Extradition Bill on March 29, 2019, in their legislative council (LegCo). Little could have prepared Hong Kong's government for the catastrophically violent chain of events they had unleashed by introducing the bill. The bill tried to enable a mechanism for transfers of fugitives not only to Taiwan but also to the Mainland and Macau (Summers, 2019; Tai, 2019; Tai, 2020). In clear distinction from the 2014 Umbrella movement, the 2019-20 protest has been notorious for its violence and deepening politicization of socio-economic issues, deepening the divide already existing between the two largest political camps, the Pro-Beijing and Pan-Democrats and their supporters in the city. The year-long protests have been fraught with notable incidents and acts of violence from all sides, highlighted by flare-ups such as the July first storming of LegCo, August 31 police storming of Prince Edward MTR station, ban on face-masks and multiple violent university sieges (Hui, 2020; Tai et al 2020).

With a break in hostilities caused by the outbreak of the coronavirus pandemic, rising tensions and political conflict has yet again returned to Hong Kong following two politically turbulent months of April and May in 2020 as illustrated by Fong (2020) and Cheung G (2020). With a coming resurgence in protests being expected and an unprecedented hard-line stance from Beijing, the 2019-20 protests are like the 2014 Umbrella movement an excellent choice for this thesis as it arguably contains the most diverse and decisive material available. It also presents a striking shift from previous political movements in Hong



Kong concerning the amount of media attention garnered. Sources collected for this case range from the period of 15 March, 2019 to 27 May, 2020.

## 6. Data Analysis

The analysis comprises around 30 sources per case whose content firstly shall be extracted below under each sub-section and then discussed, guided by employing the above created theoretical framework and previously established research question. Secondly, a summary and theoretical discussion on the findings shall be presented where Beijing's shift in employment of soft power over the selected cases shall be contextualized and instances of sharp power exemplified. Finally, some concluding remarks shall indicate the findings potential implication on the process of democratization in Hong Kong.

### 6.1 2014 Umbrella Movement

Subsequently, after examining 30 sources covering the Umbrella movement it is reasonably clear that the Chinese employment of soft power in the 2014 Umbrella movement was almost exclusively defensive in nature, in line with Loh's (2016) arguments that Beijing employed soft power reactionary and defensively to protect their national image (Loh, 2016: 117-120).

This is signified by the constant effort by Beijing to condemn and call out democratic events as illegal, involving foreign meddling and damaging to Hong Kong, such as their response to Occupy Central with Love and Peace (OLCP) Pro-democracy referendum (Kaiman, 2014). This response was also highlighted by then CE Leung Chun-Ying remarks and the major efforts of Beijing controlled censors to scrub the mainland clear of the OLCP's referendum (Kaiman, 2014). In Gracie's (2014) article titled '*Has President Xi Jinping achieved his China Dream*', it is exemplified how the Umbrella movement made clear to China how limited their soft power reach in Hong Kong actually was and that with frustrations were mounting in Beijing's top leadership, demanding every bit of their propaganda capacity, which is in line with

negative soft power, to convince the mainland audience that the situation in Hong Kong was under their absolute control (Gracie, 2014). Liu's (2014) article discussed Xi's personal trouble containing the protests in Hong Kong and Beijing's harsh crackdown on supporters of the protests in the mainland including increased censorship and revoked press visas for the foreign press (Liu, 2014). In a similar vein, the articles by Chen (2014), Keane (2014), Buckley et al (2014), Beech (2014a), Beech (2014b) and the BBC Monitoring (2014) all contain Beijing responses and statements reflecting defensive and reactionary soft power utilization in defense of their national image and security, blaming foreign intervention and ordering crackdowns in the mainland, Tibet and Xinjiang whilst keeping an 'arms-length' to the developments in Hong Kong. Further foul interference or a possible crackdown in Hong Kong by Beijing is reported to only reduce their soft power capacity, meaning a threatened Beijing needs to find another approach to contain the protests but in statements, Beijing continues to assert their jurisdiction and right to monitor Hong Kong affairs (Hall, 2014; Chen, 2014; Keane, 2014; Lague et al, 2014; Beech, 2014a; Beech, 2014b; BBC Monitoring, 2014; Buckley et al, 2014).

Bradsher et al (2014), Jacobs (2014), and Torode et al (2014) articles contain essential statements to a harder response, implying Beijing's actual steering of the HKSAR government's response to the protests with the LOCPG seemingly in charge. This includes the 2014 Beijing White Paper which stipulated that Beijing enjoys comprehensive jurisdiction over Hong Kong and that the city's high degree of autonomy was subject to Beijing's authorization. Suggestive of sharp power employment, with the white paper declaring the nominating guidelines for upcoming CE elections, it ended hopes for universal suffrage in Hong Kong for good, cementing Beijing's absolute authority (Denyer, 2014; Torode et al, 2014). This response arguably stems from the national security perspective adopted by Beijing, now considering the protests in Hong Kong as a growing threat to national stability with potential spillover effects into the mainland (Bradsher et al, 2014; Jacobs, 2014; Torode et al, 2014). In the BBC Monitoring (2014) article '*China Media: Hong Kong's "Social Order"*', multiple Chinese sources in the mainland are now 'finally' starting to comment on the protests, expressing their strong opposition, condemning them as seriously disrupting for Hong Kong's social order, backed by the United States who is trying to incite a new color revolution (BBC Monitoring, 2014). With Beijing-allied outlets in the mainland starting to comment on

the situation in Hong Kong, Keck (2014), links this to Beijing again defending themselves in response to the protests, implying yet again foreign intervention (Keck, 2014).

China-allied newspaper Global Times with author Yiwei (2014) presents Beijing's effort to shift the blame on the protestors with a poll that indicates that the majority of 'normal' people in Hong Kong and China oppose the protests, writing that *'Independence for Hong Kong is impossible'* (Yiwei, 2014). The Hong Kong-based newspaper South China Morning Post (SCMP) article by Ying-kit (2014) also reference the Global Times as a state mouthpiece for Beijing, trying to influence and steer the discourse in Hong Kong to protect their image and portray the protests as unlawful and highly damaging (Ying-kit, 2014; Phillips 2014). Further articles from the Wong (2014), BBC (2014), Li (2014) Siu et al (2014) and Huifeng et al (2014) together indicate Beijing's defensive employment of soft power with responses such as the statement by MOFA spokesperson Hong Lei saying foreign intervention and the protests are seriously attacking China's human rights record and law (Xinhua, 2014). As the movement continued to occupy Hong Kong's central districts, the rhetoric and response from Beijing continued to harden with Cheung et al (2014) reporting Beijing's recurring claim of foreign influence as an effort to overthrow the Hong Kong regime, possibly ending with bloodshed and that China will not compromise on Hong Kong (Cheung et al, 2014; Keck, 2014b). This hardening response is 'resonated' in articles by Pomfret (2014) and Lague et al (2014b) and So et al (2014) who signify and exemplify Beijing top leaders anger and frustration with the protests, who are responding with asserting China's absolute 'paternal' rights over Hong Kong, with LOCPG director citing the mainland as having been too lenient with Hong Kong. With Xi Jinping on numerous occasions backing HKSAR's government and CE Leung, stressing the need to safeguard law and order under Hong Kong's de facto constitution, the Basic Law. Stressing the rule of law and support of Hong Kong's government seemed to be Beijing's most adhered response and Xi Jinping's catchphrase towards the protests (So et al, 2014; Pomfret, 2014; Lague et al, 2014b).

## 6.2 2019-20 Hong Kong Protest

A shift in Beijing's responses and employment of soft power can be identified to have taken place between the two selected cases. Much in the vein of Hui's (2020) article on Beijing's increasing hard repression in Hong Kong, Beijing's responses and employment of soft power have been reportedly found in the 30 examined sources to more or less have failed, causing Beijing to employ measures more in line with sharp power (Hui, 2020; Servaes, 2016; Tai et al, 2020).

Lum (2020) reports on the 13th of May 2020 that the independent investigation into the Hong Kong police during the protests has cleared them of any wrongdoing, stating the police only employed violence in self-defense and within international policing standards, submitting a formal protest in response to the UN condemning the protestors' actions (Lum, 2020). Beijing has strongly supported Hong Kong's police force conduct in the protests, both before and after the investigation, increasingly referring to protestors as terrorists and demanding the enactment of tougher laws to enable the police to more easily apprehend protestors (Lum, 2020; McGleenon, 2020). With Beijing's continued focus on and rapid expansion of the Greater Bay Area (GBA), Shenzhen is receiving increasingly more attention as the unrest in Hong Kong continues, not a surprising response from Beijing where frustration is mounting as efforts to influence the city is failing (Lo, 2020). Fong (2020) reports that Beijing is increasingly intervening in Hong Kong affairs in response to the West as it is preoccupied dealing with the coronavirus pandemic (Fong, 2020). With Beijing pushing for increased stability in Hong Kong, Fong (2020) highlights their request for the enactment of Article 23 (*See Appendix 2 for further detail*) of the Basic Law concerning national security, redefining the role of the LOCPG, reshuffling top positions within Hong Kong's government and increased interference in Hong Kong's judiciary (Fong, 2020). Blanchard et al (2020) reports that China's MOFA continues to assert its right to oversee Hong Kong and strongly condemns foreign actor's alleged efforts to undermine Hong Kong's stability (Blanchard et al, 2020). The reshuffle in Hong Kong's cabinet reflects Beijing's effort to tighten control in Hong Kong, firing those ministers they thought

handled the protests poorly and increasing the pressure on Pro-democracy legislatures in Hong Kong's LegCo (Cheng, 2020). Meanwhile, the newly appointed ministers are all Pro-Beijing (Cheng, 2020).

Multiple statements from Beijing and their two top Hong Kong agencies, the HKMAO and LOCPG strongly condemn and vilify opposition lawmakers in Hong Kong's LegCo as they accuse them of filibustering, singling out Pro-democracy LegCo member Dennis Kwok. Beijing reaffirms that they have a duty to react when Hong Kong's fundamental interests are threatened, adamantly denying in responses that they are not interfering in Hong Kong affairs (Wong, 2020b; Cheung et al, 2020; Lok-kei, 2020; Wong et al, 2020). On April 24, Ng et al (2020) report that China is prosecuting the first overseas national for interfering in Hong Kong affairs, a Belizean businessman stands accused of funding key 'hostile forces' in the United States, endangering Chinese national security, urging Hong Kong to enact Article 23's in the Basic Law. The prosecution comes at the same time as officials in Beijing states that the protests in Hong Kong are showing more and more signs of terrorism (Ng et al, 2020); Shen, 2020). Beijing has desperately tried to regain popular opinion and support in Hong Kong after the Pro-Beijing's humiliating defeat last September in the district council elections by assembling a coalition of Pro-Beijing heavyweights. The effort is aiming to boost Pro-Establishment candidates in LegCo and to combat forces seeking to undermine the One Country, two systems principle according to Beijing (Wong, 2020c; Fung, 2020). Beijing's hardening rhetoric in Hong Kong is evident as multiple sources reports, notably by statements their MOFA, HKMAO, and LOCPG who stress that if protests return after the corona-pandemic, Hong Kong is doomed (Cheung et al, 2020b, Cheung et al, 2020c; Straits Times, 2020b). Beijing and their allies in Hong Kong continue to feel the restraints of their authority in the city, continuing to stress supposed threats towards national security and foreign interference in Hong Kong, urging lawmakers to introduce Article 23 whilst asserting their absolute jurisdiction over Hong Kong affairs (Wong, 2020d; Wong, 2020e; Straits Time, 2020a).

Debates on Beijing's employment of soft power and propaganda in Hong Kong is noted in Maloney's article (2020) who together with Yuan (2020), Sweeney (2020) and Lau (2020) indicating to have failed, citing mounting pressure and frustration in Beijing as they attempt to regain control over the developments in Hong Kong and contain the protests (Maloney, 2020; Yuan, 2020; Sweeney, 2020; Lau,

2020). Under the cover of the ongoing coronavirus pandemic raging globally, Beijing soft power is hardening and uses the pandemic as a cover for a crackdown in Hong Kong, highlighted by their effort to regain control over LegCo by disqualifying opposition lawmakers, pushing for the implementation of Article 23 to safeguard national security stating supposed terrorism in Hong Kong coupled with a proposed bill banning insults of the Chinese national anthem (Dapiran, 2020; Shen, 2020; Sweeney, 2020; Hui, 2020b; Gunia, 2020). Beijing continues to accuse foreign powers such as the United States and the United Kingdom of meddling in Hong Kong affairs and strongly condemning them for implicating that China employs sharp power (Ho-him, 2020; Straits Times, 2020a; Bland, 2020; Pepper, 2020). Meanwhile, Beijing response to criticism is signified by the expulsion of foreign journalists, pressuring companies to fire personnel supporting the protests, MOFA criticizing history exams in Hong Kong whilst reaffirming that their agencies in Hong Kong's has the right to handle affairs in the city, thereby circumventing Article 22 of the Basic Law (Cheung et al, 2020d; Bland, 2020; Ho-him, 2020; Fung, 2020; Pepper, 2020). Most notably, Beijing's recent decision to introduce a new bill on Hong Kong's national security legislation in similarity with Article 23 in Hong Kong's Basic Law is in statements done to ensure national security and to stabilize the situation in Hong Kong whilst preventing further foreign interference (Mei, 2020; Griffiths et al, 2020; Cheung G, 2020; Cheung T, 2020; Mächts, 2020; NPC GOV, 2020).

## 7. Discussion of Results

The two following subsections shall provide a discussion and contextualization of Beijing's argued shift in their employment of soft power and subsequent utilization of sharp power in Hong Kong.

### 7.1 Shifts in Beijing's Soft Power Response(s)

After reviewing more than 60 sources pertaining to Beijing's response(s) to the selected cases employing the concept of soft power and this thesis theoretical framework, a clear shift in their employment of soft power has occurred. The shift is predominantly clear in the second case where Beijing has progressed to employing distinct forms of sharp power to manage and steer political developments in Hong Kong.

Considering the first case, the 2014 Umbrella movement, Beijing seemingly refrained from actual sharp power measures, instead adhering to reactionary soft power responses such as statements highly condemning the protest and blaming supposed foreign influence from undermining the stability of Hong Kong. In line with the theoretical framework, the response(s) from Beijing are negative in their employment of soft power, done to protect their national image and project the protests as violent troublemakers threatening national security and the continued viability of the One country, two systems principle. The statements from Beijing signified a reactionary, 'victimized' response to what they lamented as an effort by foreign meddling to instigate another 'color' revolution in Hong Kong. The 2014 Umbrella 'Revolution' took Beijing by surprise and they had to play catchup throughout the protests, notably by their initial refusal to allow mainland outlets to cover the protests, strictly censoring the developments in the mainland, trusting their classic soft power employment of propaganda to deal with the 'Hong Kong issue'. Beijing's lacking soft power attraction in Hong Kong has been a problem since the handover given the inherent political history between the Mainland and Hong Kong, with these differences becoming strikingly apparent for the first time in the 2014 Umbrella movement, reminding



Beijing that the people of Hong Kong still was a very hard crowd to convenience and control compared to the mainland, especially when employing classic soft power strategies (Loh, 2016; Servaes, 2016; Kwong, 2018; Beech, 2014a).

As the 2019-20 protests continue to progress, it is clear that Beijing has lost patience with Hong Kong's persistent insubordination, moving away from trying to influence and sway public opinion on the protests with condemning statements to direct intervention, indicated by their recent decision to introduce a bill similar to Article 23 of Hong Kong's Basic Law, bypassing the need to have it approved in Hong Kong's LegCo. Beijing could be argued to have moved from words to action with regards to the two cases, with the current developments further cementing Beijing's employment of sharp power as their attempts at soft power arguably have failed to deter further protests and opposition in Hong Kong. Taking key lessons from their experience during the 2014 Umbrella movement, Beijing seemingly knew that a new large-scale political conflict simply couldn't be contained and solved by arguing or persuading, it needed to be repressed by employing harder and sharper measures (Hui, 2020; Tai et al; 2020). With the coronavirus pandemic raging globally, Beijing has seemingly made an effort to intervene in Hong Kong with the hope that global attention is preoccupied elsewhere. By actively dictating the operating conditions of LegCo, redefining the roles of their official offices in Hong Kong, subsequently naming new, hard-line directors, Beijing has made a clear assertive effort to reduce Hong Kong's capacity to deal with the protests, let alone their own governance according to Hong Kong's Basic Law and the One Country, two systems. As Alvaro (2018) asked back in 2018, "*Better to be loved or feared?*" Beijing can now be argued to have shifted to employing fear as their measure to finally coerce Hong Kong into submission (Alvaro, 2018). During the 2014 Umbrella movement, Beijing was at an arm's length to Hong Kong affairs, trying to subdue the movement with propaganda and defensive statements and response(s). As the 2019-20 protests raged into its second year without any real progress in terms of Beijing 'containing' the situation, their previous employment of reactionary soft power quickly turned sharp as Beijing's earlier patience seemingly has disappeared.

## 7.2 Beijing's Employment of Sharp Power in Hong Kong

A brief exemplification of Beijing's sharp power employment in Hong Kong shall follow in order to provide evidence for this above-argued shift in response(s) between the two cases.

During the 2014 Umbrella movement, the most relevant sharp power example is Beijing's issued white paper, a 14,500-page long document affirming Beijing's absolute control over Hong Kong, stipulating the election guidelines for upcoming CE elections, effectively ruling out the possibility of universal suffrage (Hume, 2014). In the direct aftermath of the Umbrella movement, increasing sharp power response(s) from Beijing began to emerge and intensify. In 2015, Chinese agents kidnapped five staff members of a Hong Kong bookstore in Causeway Bay, followed up with the high-profile kidnapping of Chinese born Swedish citizen and book publisher Gui Minhai in Thailand 2015 and his subsequent sentencing to ten years imprisonment in 2020 (Lewis, 2016; Ramzy, 2020). In 2019, the 'Umbrella Nine', prominent protest leaders during the movement, was sentenced to various sentences employing old colonial statutes for their involvement in the 2014 Umbrella movement, signifying Beijing's strong discontent with their conduct and hope to deter further disobedience (Sataline, 2019; Tai, 2019; Tai, 2020).

The 2019-20 protests have several notable incidents of Beijing's turn towards sharp power, indicated with their argued subversion of Hong Kong's police force to act as Beijing's security force in Hong Kong and the NPC's new decision on Hong Kong's national security legislation (Hui, 2020; McGleenon, 2020; Lum, 2020). The recent proposed decision by the NPC on May 21, 2020, refers to a bill introduced to address and to quote the NPC "*Highly necessary improvement*" of Hong Kong's National Security Legislation, much in line with an actual enactment of Article 23 of Hong Kong's Basic Law but without needing it approved in Hong Kong's LegCo, effectively bypassing the legislature (GOV HK, 2020; NPC GOV, 2020; Wong, 2020; Grundy, 2020). MOFA's Hong Kong commissioner Xie Feng once again reiterated Beijing's wish that the protests may be classified as acts of terrorism as they posed an immediate danger to China's national security (TT, 2020). On May 27, Beijing unexpectedly expanded its scope on the decision and confirmed that the resolution would prohibit 'activities' that 'seriously endanger

national security (Cheung, 2020). Beijing's decision has caused widespread political panic and protests in Hong Kong with political analysts and the Pro-democracy camp in Hong Kong arguing that this is the end of Hong Kong's independence and the One Country, two systems (Hui, 2020; Griffiths et al, 2020; Cheung G, 2020; Cheung T, 2020; Mächts, 2020; Wong, 2020; HKFP, 2020c). Hernández (2020) article in The New York Times describes the decision by the NPC as *“China’s propaganda machine (going) into full gear as the government sought to defend new laws aimed at limiting dissent and protest in Hong Kong.”* (Hernández, 2020).

## 8. Concluding Remarks

This study has sought to explain shifts in Beijing's employment of soft power within and between two selected cases from 2014 up to date, done in order to explain its possible impact on the process of democratization in Hong Kong. Employing this paper's theoretical framework built on the foundation of Joseph Nye's concept of soft power (1990) and extended by Callahan (2015) and Loh (2016), it was applied to Beijing's response(s) towards two case-incidents in Hong Kong to establish whether or not they had shifted their employment of soft power to liken sharp power exercised responses and actions. After reviewing and analyzing more than 60 sources spanning the two selected cases, the material points to the fact that Beijing has turned towards employing sharp power measures instead of utilizing soft power in its inherent connotation. Beijing's employment of sharp power likened measures is found to a far greater extent during the 2019-20 protests. The findings of the primary sources have secondary source and academic support, clearly backed by the latest political developments in Hong Kong during late May 2020 with the NPC's decision to address Hong Kong's national security law.

Beijing has evidently lost patience with Hong Kong's continued insubordination and Hong Kong's government handling of the protests during the second analyzed case, which in Beijing's eyes has further undermined the stability of the city, posing a threat towards their legitimacy, both domestically and abroad. By employing measures that no longer mainly resemble soft power to influence and steer developments in Hong Kong, Beijing's latest conduct supports this thesis findings that they are taking a more assertive and direct interventionist approach to Hong Kong affairs in 2019-20 compared to back in 2014. As argued by Alvaro (2018), when soft power efforts fail, authoritarian states tend to shift towards sharp or hard power to finally coerce their opponents into submission, here shown and now exemplified in Beijing's response(s) to and measure taken in Hong Kong during late May 2020 (Alvaro, 2018). In a statement from the United States Secretary of State Mike Pompeo on May 28, he announced that the United States no longer views Hong Kong as an autonomous part of China given Beijing's latest actions

in the city, stating that; *It's now clear that China is modeling Hong Kong after itself*, sending shock waves throughout policy circles in China and Hong Kong (Magnier, 2020). This development could jeopardize the special trade status between the United States and Hong Kong. Also mentioned was the possibility of future United States sanctions against Hong Kong (Magnier, 2020; Wong, 2020).

Thus, this study has shown shifts in Beijing's employment of soft power not only impacted the two examined cases but Hong Kong's society at large, with continued encroachments upon Hong Kong's democratic rights. With the NPC's recent decision to address Hong Kong's national security legislation in late May 2020, many analysts deem this to be the end of Hong Kong's autonomy and the governing principle of the One Country, two systems. With Beijing's current focus on the latter form of Chinese 'soft' power, *Weiwen*, or *'Upholding Stability'*, Hong Kong's autonomous rule and special rights are arguably the last obstacles standing in the way of China achieving this supposed stability. So what then for the process of democratization in Hong Kong? The potential implications of this shift in Beijing's soft power utilization are arguably grim, causing the level of democracy in Hong Kong to now deteriorate even further. By employing measures more in line with coercive sharp power to ensure absolute control over Hong Kong, granting lawful support to enable harder crackdowns on political dissidents and protestors, Beijing's latest responses demonstrate that they are not backing down from previous statements that Hong Kong truly is an internal affair.

## 9. References

### 9.1 Academic and Methodological Literature

Bryman, A. (2012). *Social research methods*. Oxford University Press.

Creswell, J. W. (2018). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. 4th ed. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications.

Chan, K. et al. (2019). 'A critical appraisal of the international factors in "One Country, Two Systems" and democratization in Hong Kong'. *Asian Education and Development Studies*.

Dingding, C. et al. (2015). 'Democracy promotion and China: blocker or bystander?', *Democratization*, 22:3, 400-418.

Goodrick, D. (2014). 'Comparative Case Studies: Methodological Briefs - Impact Evaluation No. 9', *Methodological Briefs no. 9*.

Grugel, J. (2002). *Democratization : a critical introduction*. Palgrave.

Hui, V. T. (2020). 'Beijing's Hard and Soft Repression in Hong Kong', *Orbis*, 64(2), pp. 289–311.

Kwong, Y. (2018). 'Political repression in a sub-national hybrid regime: the PRC's governing strategies in Hong Kong', *Contemporary Politics*, 24(4), pp. 361–378.

Lam, J. T. M. (2001). 'Consolidation of democracy in Hong Kong under Chinese sovereignty', *Asian Affairs: An American Review*, 28(1), pp. 19–35.

Nye, J.S. (1990). *Bound to Lead: The Changing Nature of American Power*: New York.

Nye, J.S. (2004). *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*, p. x. New York: Public Affairs.

- Ortmann, S. (2015). 'The umbrella movement and Hong Kong's protracted democratization process'. *Asian Affairs*, 46(1), pp.32-50.
- Servaes, J. (2016). 'The Chinese dream shattered between hard and soft power?', *Media, Culture and Society*, 38(3), pp. 437–449.
- Stromseth, J.R. et al. (2017). *China's governance puzzle: Enabling transparency and participation in a single-party state*.
- Summers, T. (2019). *China's Hong Kong: The Politics of a Global City*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Agenda Publishing.
- Tai, B. Y.-T. (2019). 'Stages of Hong Kong's democratic movement', *Asian Journal of Comparative Politics*, 4(4), pp. 352–380.
- Tai, B. et al. (2020). 'Pursuing Democracy in an Authoritarian State: Protest and the Rule of Law in Hong Kong', *Social & Legal Studies*, 29(1), pp. 107–145.
- Wang, H. and Lu, Y.C. (2008). 'The conception of soft power and its policy implications: A comparative study of China and Taiwan'. *Journal of contemporary China*, 17(56), pp.425-447.
- Wong, M. Y. H. (2017). 'Discussing without deciding, deciding without acting', *Asian Journal of Comparative Politics*, 2(4), pp. 347–361.
- Yanzhong H. et al. (2006). 'Dragon's Underbelly: An Analysis of China's Soft Power', *East Asia: An International Quarterly*, 23(4), pp. 22–44.

## 9.2 Online Articles

- Albert, E. (2020). “Democracy in Hong Kong”, *Council on Foreign Relations*, 22 May, Available at: <https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/democracy-hong-kong> [Accessed: 16 April 2020]
- Alvaro, J. (2018). “Better to be loved or feared? As soft power fails, China turns to sharp measures”, *Hong Kong Free Press*, 3 March, Available at: <https://hongkongfp.com/2018/03/03/better-loved-feared-soft-power-fails-china-turns-s Harper-measures/> [Accessed: 24 May 2020]
- Cheung, T. (2020). “Beijing expands proposed national security law for Hong Kong to prohibit ‘activities’ that would ‘seriously endanger national security’”, *South China Morning Post*, 27 May, Available at: <https://www.scmp.com/news/hong-kong/politics/article/3086076/beijings-new-national-security-law-will-not-harm-hong-kongs> [Accessed: 27 May 2020]
- Gao, L. et al. (2020). “Key facts about new head of China’s liaison office in Hong Kong”, *Reuters*, 6 January, Available at: <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-honkong-china-liaison-factbox/key-facts-about-new-head-of-chinas-liaison-office-in-hong-kong-idUSKBN1Z50AS> [Accessed: 10 May 2020]
- Google News. Archival news search function, Available at: <https://news.google.com/topstories?hl=en-US&gl=US&ceid=US:en> [Accessed: 25 May 2020]
- Grundy, T. (2020). “‘Highly necessary’: Beijing to discuss enacting national security law in Hong Kong following months of protest”, *Hong Kong Free Press*, 21 May, Available at: <https://hongkongfp.com/2020/05/21/breaking-beijing-to-discuss-enacting-national-security-law-in-hong-kong-following-months-of-protest/> [Accessed: 21 May 2020]
- Hernández, J. (2020). “China Deploys Propaganda Machine To Defend Move Against Hong Kong”, *The New York Times*, 23 May, Available at: <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/05/23/world/asia/china-hong-kong-propaganda.html> [Accessed: 24 May 2020]



- Hume, T. (2014). “Alarm in Hong Kong at Chinese white paper affirming Beijing control”, *CNN*, 13 June, Available at: <https://edition.cnn.com/2014/06/11/world/asia/hong-kong-beijing-two-systems-paper/index.html> [Accessed: 24 May 2020]
- Kissinger Institute. (2020). China’s Soft Power Campaign. Available at: <https://www.wilsoncenter.org/chinas-soft-power-campaign> [Accessed: 17 April 2020]
- Lewis, S. (2016). “China Has Finally Told Hong Kong It Is Holding the 3 Missing Booksellers”, *TIME*, 5 February, Available at: <https://time.com/4208964/china-hong-kong-booksellers/> [Accessed: 24 May 2020]
- Magnier, M. (2020). “Hong Kong is no longer autonomous from China, US determines, as Mike Pompeo makes certification that may mean sanctions”, *South China Morning Post*, 28 May, Available at: <https://www.scmp.com/news/china/politics/article/3086406/hong-kong-no-longer-enjoying-promised-autonomy-china-pompeo> [Accessed: 28 May 2020]
- NPC. (2020). “Presidium elected, agenda set for China’s annual legislative session”, *NPC*, 22 May, Available at: <http://www.npc.gov.cn/englishnpc/c23934/202005/ce05b9dfce7546209e6630e7ba73a653.shtml> [Accessed: 24 May 2020]
- Ramzy, A. (2020). “China Sentences Hong Kong Bookseller Gui Minhai to 10 Years in Prison”, *The New York Times*, 25 February, Available at: <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/02/25/world/asia/gui-minhai-china-hong-kong-swedish-bookseller.html> [Accessed: 24 May 2020]
- Sataline, S. (2019). “‘Umbrella nine’ Hong Kong pro-democracy leaders sentenced to jail”, *The Guardian*, 24 April, Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2019/apr/24/umbrella-nine-hong-kong-pro-democracy-leaders-sentenced-to-jail> [Accessed: 25 May 2020]
- The Heritage Foundation. (2020). Country Profile Hong Kong. Available at: <https://www.heritage.org/index/country/hongkong> [Accessed: 14 April 2020]
- The Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region. (2007). The Joint Declaration. Available at: <https://www.cmab.gov.hk/en/issues/joint2.htm> [Accessed: 12 April 2020]

- The Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region. (2017). Full Text of the Constitution and the Basic Law, Article 23, Available at: [https://www.basiclaw.gov.hk/pda/en/basiclawtext/chapter\\_2.html](https://www.basiclaw.gov.hk/pda/en/basiclawtext/chapter_2.html) [Accessed: 24 May 2020]
- TT. (2020). “Kina: Protesterna i Hongkong hade inslag av terrorism”, *SVD*, 25 May, Available at: <https://www.svd.se/kina-begicks-terrorhandlingar-vid-protester/om/protesterna-i-hongkong> [Accessed: 25 May 2020]
- Walker, C. et al. (2017). “The Meaning of Sharp Power, How Authoritarian States Project Influence”, *Foreign Affairs*, 16 November, Available at: <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/china/2017-11-16/meaning-sharp-power> [Accessed: 10 April 2020]
- Wong, E. (2020). “Hong Kong Has Lost Autonomy, Pompeo Says, Opening Door to U.S. Action”, *The New York Times*, 28 May, Available at: <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/05/27/us/politics/china-hong-kong-pompeo-trade.html> [Accessed: 28 May 2020]
- Wong, R. (2020). “‘This is the end of Hong Kong’: Reactions pour in as Beijing proposes security law” *Hong Kong Free Press*, 22 May, Available at: <https://hongkongfp.com/2020/05/22/this-is-the-end-of-hong-kong-reactions-pour-in-as-beijing-proposes-security-law/> [Accessed: 22 May 2020]
- Zheng, S. (2020). “Beijing blasts Western critics who ‘smear China’ with the term Sharp Power”, *South China Morning Post*, 2 March, Available at: <https://www.scmp.com/news/china/diplomacy-defence/article/2135516/beijing-blasts-western-critics-who-smear-china-term> [Accessed: 25 May 2020]
- Zheng, W. et al. (2020). “China upgrades Hong Kong affairs with new chief”, *South China Morning Post*, 13 February, Available at: <https://www.scmp.com/news/china/politics/article/3050401/china-appoints-new-director-hong-kong-and-macau-liaison-office> [Accessed: 11 May 2020]

### 9.3 2014 Umbrella Movement

- BBC. (2014). “China ‘censors Hong Kong protests posts on social media’”, *BBC*, 29 September, Available at: <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-china-29411270> [Accessed: 17 May 2020]
- BBC Monitoring. (2014). “China media: Hong Kong’s ‘social order’”, *BBC*, 1 October, Available at: <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-china-29437851> [Accessed: 17 May 2020]
- Beech, H. (2014a). “Xi Jinping’s Power of One”, *TIME*, 6 November, Available at: <https://time.com/magazine/south-pacific/3560695/auto-draft-2/> [Accessed: 19 April 2020]
- Beech, H. (2014b). “Chinese Media Say Hong Kong’s ‘Radical Activists’ Are Doomed”, *TIME*, 29 September, Available at: <https://time.com/3443686/china-hong-kong-media-democracy-protests/> [Accessed: 17 May 2020]
- Bradsher, K. et al. (2014). “Beijing Is Directing Hong Kong Strategy, Government Insider Say”, *The New York Times*, 17 October, Available at: <https://www.nytimes.com/2014/10/18/world/asia/china-is-directing-response-to-hong-kong-protests.html> [Accessed: 15 May 2020]
- Buckley, C. et al. (2014). “China Restricts Voting Reforms for Hong Kong”, *The New York Times*, 31 August, Available at: <https://www.nytimes.com/2014/09/01/world/asia/hong-kong-elections.html> [Accessed: 16 May 2020]
- Chen, G. (2014). “Why China’s President Wants to Save Hong Kong, Not Destroy It”, *Foreign Policy*, 6 October, Available at: <https://foreignpolicy.com/2014/10/06/why-chinas-president-wants-to-save-hong-kong-not-destroy-it/> [Accessed: 15 May 2020]
- Cheung, T. et al. (2014). “Hong Kong poised for political showdown on 2017 election; Jimmy Lai to join Occupy”, *South China Morning Post*, 31 August, Available at: <https://www.scmp.com/news/hong-kong/article/1582080/hong-kong-poised-political-s-howdown-2017-election> [Accessed: 18 May 2020]

- Denyer, S. (2014). "Chinese government reminds Hong Kong 'who's the real boss' with white paper spelling out its interpretation of the region's 'one country, two systems' model", *The Independent*, 12 June, Available at: <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/asia/chinese-government-reminds-hong-kong-whos-the-real-boss-with-white-paper-spelling-out-its-9533244.html> [Accessed: 14 May 2020]
- Gracie, C. (2014). "Has President Xi Jinping achieved his China Dream?", *BBC*, 19 December, Available at: <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-china-30544572> [Accessed: 14 May 2020]
- Hall, J. (2014). "Hong Kong protesters threaten to occupy government buildings if leader does not resign by Thursday amid fears China has hacked into demonstrators' phones", *Daily Mail*, 1 October, Available at: <https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2775508/Lightning-rain-fail-deter-resolute-Hong-Kong-protesters.html> [Accessed: 13 May 2020]
- Huifeng. et al. (2014). "Protestors not sincere in ending impasse: mainland commentary", *South China Morning Post*, 15 October, Available at: <https://www.scmp.com/news/hong-kong/article/1616513/protesters-not-sincere-ending-impasse-mainland-commentary> [Accessed: 18 May 2020]
- Jacobs, A. (2014). "From Tibet to Taiwan, China's Periphery Watches Hong Kong Protests Intently", *The New York Times*, 5 October, Available at: <https://www.nytimes.com/2014/10/06/world/from-tibet-to-taiwan-chinas-outer-regions-watch-hong-kong-protests-intently.html> [Accessed: 11 May 2020]
- Kaiman, J. (2014). "Hong Kong's unofficial pro-democracy referendum irks Beijing", *The Guardian*, 25 June, Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/jun/25/hong-kong-unofficial-pro-democracy-referendum-beijing> [Accessed: 14 April 2020]
- Keane, J. (2014). "The Umbrella Revolution in Hong Kong: a second Tiananmen?", *The Conversation*, 30 September, Available at: <https://theconversation.com/the-umbrella-revolution-in-hong-kong-a-second-tiananmen-32285> [Accessed: 16 May 2020]

- Keck, Z. (2014). “China Claims US Behind Hong Kong Protests”, *The Diplomat*, 12 October, Available at: <https://thediplomat.com/2014/10/china-claims-us-behind-hong-kong-protests/> [Accessed: 15 May 2020]
- Keck, Z. (2014b). “China Signals No Compromise on Hong Kong”, *The Diplomat*, 15 October, Available at: <https://thediplomat.com/2014/10/china-signals-no-compromise-on-hong-kong/> [Accessed: 18 May 2020]
- Lague, D. et al. (2014). “Special Report: In ‘Umbrella Revolution,’ China Confronts limits of its power”, *Reuters*, 1 October, Available at: <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-hongkong-china-specialreport/special-report-in-umbrella-revolution-china-confronts-limits-of-its-power-idUSKCN0HQ4ZA20141001> [Accessed: 12 May 2020]
- Lague, D. et al. (2014b). “Special Report: How China spies on Hong Kong’s democrats”, *Reuters*, 15 December, Available at: <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-hong-kong-surveillance-special-report/special-report-how-china-spies-on-hong-kongs-democrats-idUSKBN0JT00120141215> [Accessed: 18 May 2020]
- Li, Z. (2014). “Pro-democracy activism not in Hong Kong’s interest, China warns”, *CNN*, 1 July, Available at: <https://edition.cnn.com/2014/07/01/world/asia/hk-rally-china-response/index.html> [Accessed: 17 May 2020]
- Liu, M. (2014). “Will China Crush Hong Kong’s ‘Umbrella Revolution?’”, *Politico*, 1 October, Available at: <https://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2014/10/will-china-crush-hong-kongs-umbrella-revolution-111533> [Accessed: 15 May 2020]
- Torode, G. et al. (2014). “Why Hong Kong is having its biggest protests since 1997”, *Business Insider*, 1 July 2014, Available at: <https://www.businessinsider.com/whats-happening-right-now-is-a-battle-for-hong-kong-s-soul-2014-7?r=US&IR=T> [Accessed: 15 May 2020]

- Phillips, T. (2014). "China uses Margaret Thatcher's private secretary to attack Hong Kong protests", *The Telegraph*, 6 October, Available at: <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/hongkong/11143542/China-uses-Margaret-Thatchers-private-secretary-to-attack-Hong-Kong-protests.html> [Accessed: 18 May 2020]
- Pomfret, J. (2014). "China asserts paternal rights over Hong Kong in democracy clash", *Reuters*, 11 September, Available at: <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-china-hongkong-insight/china-asserts-paternal-rights-over-hong-kong-in-democracy-clash-idUSKBN0H600120140911> [Accessed: 18 May 2020]
- Siu, P. et al. (2014). "Hong Kong and Macau Affairs Office joins backlash against 'locust' protest" *South China Morning Post*, 18 February, Available at: <https://www.scmp.com/news/hong-kong/article/1430175/hong-kong-and-macau-affairs-office-joins-backlash-against-locust> [Accessed: 17 May 2020]
- So, P. et al. (2014). "Xi Jinping pledges support for Hong Kong's efforts to safeguard rule of law", *South China Morning Post*, 9 November, Available at: <https://www.scmp.com/news/hong-kong/article/1635672/xi-jinping-pledges-support-hong-kongs-efforts-safeguard-rule-law> [Accessed: 18 May 2020]
- Wong, C. (2014). "HK protest won't last: Leung", *Global Times*, 13 October, Available at: <http://www.globaltimes.cn/content/885889.shtml> [Accessed: 17 May 2020]
- Xinhua. (2014). "China denounces US Support for HK protest", *Global Times*, 11 October, Available at: <http://www.globaltimes.cn/content/885612.shtml> [Accessed: 16 May 2020]
- Yiwei, Z. (2014). "Majority angry at HK protest: poll", *Global Times*, 25 July, Available at: <http://www.globaltimes.cn/content/844566.shtml> [Accessed: 16 May 2020]
- Ying-kit, Lai. (2014). "Global Times warns Hong Kong could become next 'Ukraine or Thailand'", *South China Morning Post*, 3 July, Available at: <https://www.scmp.com/news/hong-kong/article/1545567/global-times-warns-hong-kong-could-become-next-ukraine-or-thailand> [Accessed: 16 May 2020]

## 9.4 2019-20 Hong Kong Protests

- Blanchard, B. et al. (2020). “China says Hong Kong matters purely an internal affair”, *Reuters*, 11 June, Available at:  
<https://www.reuters.com/article/us-hongkong-extradition-china/china-says-hong-kong-matters-purely-an-internal-affair-idUSKCN1TC0N4> [Accessed: 19 April 2020]
- Bland, B. (2020). “HONG KONG'S NEW 'BASIC LAW' IS THAT WHATEVER CHINA SAYS, GOES”, *Lowy Institute*, 15 May, Available at:  
<https://www.lowyinstitute.org/publications/hong-kong-new-basic-law-whatever-china-says-goes> [Accessed: 20 May 2020]
- Cheng, L. (2020). “Hong Kong cabinet reshuffle not linked to extradition bill protests but non-performance, disappointing critics”, *South China Morning Post*, 22 April, Available at:  
<https://www.scmp.com/news/hong-kong/politics/article/3080936/hong-kong-cabinet-reshuffle-sends-signal-opposition-and> [Accessed: 19 May 2020]
- Cheung, G. (2020). “Two Sessions 2020: Beijing ‘out of patience’ after long wait for Hong Kong national security law, plans to proscribe secession, foreign interference and terrorism in city”, *South China Morning Post*, 21 May, Available at:  
<https://www.scmp.com/news/hong-kong/politics/article/3085412/two-sessions-2020-how-far-will-beijing-go-push-article-23> [Accessed: 21 May 2020]
- Cheung, G. et al. (2020). “Beijing’s attack on Hong Kong opposition viewed as ‘taste of what’s to come’ as attention pivots from coronavirus to city’s legislative elections”, *South China Morning Post*, 15 April, Available at:  
<https://www.scmp.com/news/hong-kong/politics/article/3079962/beijings-attack-hong-kong-opposition-viewed-taste-whats> [Accessed: 19 May 2020]
- Cheung, G. et al. (2020d). “Hong Kong in midst of tussle over ‘tricky’ relationship between liaison office, Basic Law, and daily running of the city”, *South China Morning Post*, 21 April, Available at:  
<https://www.scmp.com/news/hong-kong/politics/article/3080777/suddenly-question-hong-kong-government-finds-defining> [Accessed: 20 May 2020]

- Cheung, T. (2020). “Two Sessions 2020: Beijing sets sights on Hong Kong legal system as part of national security move”, *South China Morning Post*, 22 May, Available at: <https://www.scmp.com/news/hong-kong/politics/article/3085574/two-sessions-2020-beijing-sets-sights-hong-kong-legal> [Accessed: 22 May 2020]
- Cheung, T. et al. (2020c) “No future for Hong Kong if protest violence return, Beijing warns”, *South China Morning Post*, 2 May, Available at: <https://www.scmp.com/news/hong-kong/politics/article/3082598/beijings-office-hong-kong-slams-radical-protesters-after?> [Accessed: 19 May 2020]
- Dapiran, A. (2020). “The Pandemic is Cover for a Crackdown in Hong Kong”, *Foreign Policy*, 22 April, Available at: <https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/04/22/hong-kong-protests-china-coronavirus-pandemic/> [Accessed: 20 May 2020]
- Fong, B. (2020). “With a New Cold War on the Rise, What Next For Hong Kong’s Autonomy?”, *The Diplomat*, April 27, Available at: <https://thediplomat.com/2020/04/with-a-new-cold-war-on-the-rise-what-next-for-hong-kongs-autonomy/> [Accessed: 15 May 2020]
- Fung, A. (2020). “Hong Kong lawmakers clash as pro-Beijing camp elects chair”, *AP*, 18 May, Available at: <https://apnews.com/53ad729c99fe22f16e7960a36e6253ec> [Accessed: 20 May 2020]
- Griffiths, J. et al. (2020). “Beijing to propose hugely controversial security law in Hong Kong”, *CNN*, 22 May, Available at: <https://edition.cnn.com/2020/05/21/asia/hong-kong-npc-article-23-intl-hnk/index.html> [Accessed: 22 May 2020]
- Gunia, A. (2020). “Hong Kong’s National Anthem Bill Is Sparking Renewed Protests. Here’s What to Know”, *TIME*, 27 May, Available at: <https://time.com/5842352/hong-kong-national-anthem-bill-protests/> [Accessed: 27 May 2020]
- Ho-him, C. et al. (2020). “Beijing blasts ‘poisonous’ Hong Kong exam question on whether Japan did more good than harm to China during first half of last century and warns of ‘rage’ of Chinese people”, *South China Morning Post*, 15 May, Available at: <https://www.scmp.com/news/hong-kong/education/article/3084523/beijings-foreign-ministry-takes-aim-hong-kong-exam> [Accessed: 20 May 2020]



- Hui, M. (2020b). “Under the cover of a pandemic, China is dismantling Hong Kong’s last freedoms”, *Quartz*, 20 April, Available at:  
<https://qz.com/1841137/china-uses-coronavirus-as-cover-to-erode-hong-kong-freedoms/> [Accessed: 20 May 2020]
- Lau, J. (2020). “Why the Taiwanese are thinking more about their identity”, *New Statesman*, 15 May, Available at:  
<https://www.newstatesman.com/international/places/2020/05/taiwanese-independence-taiwan-china-beijing-identity-hong-kong> [Accessed: 20 May 2020]
- Lo, A. (2020). “Beijing’s non-Tiananmen response: Build up Shenzhen, forget Hong Kong”, *South China Morning Post*, 21 August, Available at:  
<https://www.scmp.com/comment/opinion/article/3023774/beijings-non-tiananmen-response-build-shenzhen-forget-hong-kong> [Accessed: 17 May 2020]
- Lok-kei, S. (2020). “Hong Kong could lose its autonomy if opposition lawmakers don’t stop ‘fooling around’, says prominent loyalist”, *South China Morning Post*, 15 April, Available at:  
<https://www.scmp.com/news/hong-kong/politics/article/3079985/hong-kong-could-lose-its-autonomy-if-opposition-lawmakers> [Accessed: 19 May 2020]
- Lum, A. (2020). “Hong Kong police ‘systematically infringed’ human rights of protest arrestees, local group argues in report destined for UN”, *South China Morning Post*, 13 May, Available at:  
<https://www.scmp.com/news/hong-kong/politics/article/3084050/hong-kong-police-systematically-infringed-human-rights> [Accessed: 18 May 2020]
- McGleenon, B. (2020). “Hong Kong protests: Police brutality vindicated by Beijing backed complaints commission”, *Express*, 16 May, Available at:  
<https://www.express.co.uk/news/world/1283245/hong-kong-protests-police-abuse-ipcc-police-complaints-commission-beijing-carrie-lam> [Accessed: 18 May 2020]
- Maloney, J. (2020). “Opinion: Hard vs. Soft Power in the Hong Kong Protests”, *McGill Journal of Political Studies*, 26 November, Available at:  
<https://mjps.ssmu.ca/2019/11/26/opinion-hard-vs-soft-power-in-the-hong-kong-protests/> [Accessed: 20 May 2020]

- Mei, M. (2020). "China Focus: Draft decision on HK national security legislation submitted to NPC", *Xinhua*, 22 May, Available at:  
[http://www.xinhuanet.com/english/2020-05/22/c\\_139078396.htm](http://www.xinhuanet.com/english/2020-05/22/c_139078396.htm) [Accessed: 22 May 2020]
- Mächs, M. (2020). "Ilska i Hongkong mot Pekings säkerhetslagar", *SVD*, 22 May, Available at:  
<https://www.svd.se/peking-lagger-fram-kritiserat-hongkongforslag> [Accessed: 22 May 2020]
- Ng, T. et al (2020). "China prosecutes first overseas national for Hong Kong interference", *South China Morning Post*, 24 April, Available at:  
<https://www.scmp.com/news/china/politics/article/3081348/china-prosecutes-first-overseas-national-hong-kong-interference> [Accessed: 19 May 2020]
- Pepper, S. (2020). "'Clarifying' the Basic Law: Beijing acts to contain Hong Kong's protest movement", *Hong Kong Free Press*, 8 May, Available at:  
<https://hongkongfp.com/2020/05/08/clarifying-the-basic-law-beijing-acts-to-contain-hong-kongs-protest-movement/> [Accessed: 20 May 2020]
- Reuters in Straits Time. (2020a). "China says it strongly supports HK govt's arrest of activists", *Straits Time*, 22 April, Available at:  
<https://www.straitstimes.com/asia/east-asia/china-says-it-strongly-supports-hk-govts-arrest-of-activists> [Accessed: 20 May 2020]
- Reuters in Straits Time. (2020b). "China says Hong Kong will never be calm unless violent protesters removed", *Straits Time*, 6 May, Available at:  
<https://www.straitstimes.com/asia/east-asia/china-says-hong-kong-will-never-be-calm-unless-violent-protesters-removed> [Accessed: 20 May 2020]
- Shen, S. (2020). "China's Strategy for Hollowing out Hong Kong", *The Diplomat*, 5 May, Available at:  
<https://thediplomat.com/2020/05/chinas-strategy-for-hollowing-out-hong-kong/> [Accessed: 19 May 2020]
- Sweeney, P. (2020). "Breakingviews - China's soft power will be hardened by the virus", *Reuters*, 8 May, Available at:  
<https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-china-breakingview/breakingviews-chinas-soft-power-will-be-hardened-by-the-virus-idUSKBN22K0P9> [Accessed: 20 May 2020]

- Wong, N. et al. (2020). “Beijing’s liaison office says it has right to handle Hong Kong affairs, as provided by constitution and Basic Law”, *South China Morning Post*, 17 April, Available at: <https://www.scmp.com/news/hong-kong/politics/article/3080506/beijings-liaison-office-says-it-has-right-handle-hong-kong?> [Accessed: 19 May 2020]
- Wong, N. (2020b). “Beijing not backing down from brewing battle, underscoring right of Hong Kong agencies to ‘exercise jurisdiction’”, *South China Morning Post*, 21 April, Available at: <https://www.scmp.com/news/hong-kong/politics/article/3080928/beijing-not-backing-down-brewing-battle-underscoring-right> [Accessed: 19 May 2020]
- Wong, N. (2020c). “Coalition of Hong Kong heavyweights assembling to boost pro-Beijing candidates ahead of September’s Legco election”, *South China Morning Post*, 23 April, Available at: <https://www.scmp.com/news/hong-kong/politics/article/3081303/coalition-hong-kong-heavyweights-assembling-boost-pro?> [Accessed: 19 May 2020]
- Wong, N. (2020d). “Beijing liaison office slams US-funded report ‘filled with lies’ about national security law, Hong Kong protest movement”, *South China Morning Post*, 3 May, Available at: <https://www.scmp.com/news/hong-kong/politics/article/3082663/beijing-liaison-office-slams-us-funded-report-filled-lies> [Accessed: 19 May 2020]
- Wong, N. et al. (2020e). “Hong Kong government’s flip-flopping in Beijing power row escalates tensions with opposition lawmakers, with mass protest planned”, *South China Morning Post*, 19 April, Available at: <https://www.scmp.com/news/hong-kong/politics/article/3080577/controversy-over-beijings-liaison-office-role-deepens-after?> [Accessed: 20 May 2020]
- Yuan, L. (2020). “China’s Soft-Power Failure: Condemning Hong Kong’s Protests”, *The New York Times*, 20 August, Available at: <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/08/20/business/china-hong-kong-social-media-soft-power.html> [Accessed: 20 May 2020]

# 10. Appendix

**Figure 1: Map of HKSAR**



Source: [http://motherearthtravel.com/hong\\_kong/map.htm](http://motherearthtravel.com/hong_kong/map.htm)

## **Appendix 2: Stipulation of Article 23 in the Basic Law**

‘The Hong Kong Special Administrative Region shall enact laws on its own to prohibit any act of treason, secession, sedition, subversion against the Central People’s Government, or theft of state secrets, to prohibit foreign political organizations or bodies from conducting political activities in the Region, and to prohibit political organizations or bodies of the Region from establishing ties with foreign political organizations or bodies.’

Source: [https://www.basiclaw.gov.hk/pda/en/basiclawtext/chapter\\_2.html](https://www.basiclaw.gov.hk/pda/en/basiclawtext/chapter_2.html)