Umbrella Revolution:
Hong Kong for Hong Kongers?

Figure 1 Umbrella Revolution: Paper Umbrellas in Causeway Bay

Department of Culture and Global Studies Aalborg University

Master Thesis in MSc in Development and International Relations with specialization in Chinese Area Studies,

10th semester - July 2015

Supervisor: Ane Bislev

Author: Moira Mastrone

Abstract

The purpose of this thesis is to analyze the Umbrella Movement in the 2014's protests in Hong Kong. The thesis focuses on the protests in 2014 and the latest events until June 2015, through understanding the past situation in Hong Kong. Hong Kong has a particular historical background, it was a British colony for 150 years and only in 1997 returned to Chinese control. Today Hong Kong is a Special Administrative Region under the principle of "One country, Two systems", such as Taiwan and Macau. The research also incorporates several theories, which were specifically chosen to analyze the Umbrella Movement's reasons of the protests. The analysis is conducted in order to answer the following problem formulation: *Why are the activists protesting?* I was helped to answer this problem formulation by answering one research question: *What is the democratic deficit in Hong Kong?* To answer the research question I conduct an analysis examining the degree of autonomy of Hong Kong. I go through the foundation of HKSAR and some of the fundamental articles of Hong Kong's mini constitution. The main democratic deficit faced by Hong Kong is the political system. In fact, it is under Chinese control together with foreign affairs. From the analysis has resulted that one of the reasons of the protests in 2014 by the Umbrella Movement is related with the democratic deficit of the territory, such as claiming genuine universal suffrage. The thesis concludes that the activists of the Umbrella Revolution protested, throughout 2014, mainly against the reform package presented by Hong Kong's government to the vote of the LegCo, among other reasons.

Key words: Hong Kong, Umbrella Revolution, 2014, Protests, Chief Executive, China, People's Republic of China, Social Movements, Liberal Democracy, Democracy, Confucianism, Representative Democracy, Activists, Student Protests, Umbrella Movement.

List of acronyms

- 2 -

CCP – Chinese Communist Party

CE – Chief Executive

HKSAR – Hong Kong Special Administrative Region

JD – Joint Declaration

LegCo - Legislative Council

NPC - National People's Congress

NPCSC - Standing Committee of the National People's Congress

PRC – People's Republic of China

SAR – Special Administrative Region

U.N. – United Nation

U.S. – United States of America

Table of contents

1. Introduction

Hong Kong has a long history, as it has been part of China since ancient times. Its history is unique, as the territory was transformed, in a really short time, from a barren island to a large metropolis (Tsang 2009, xi). Moreover, the territory has been part of British colonial empire for 150 years. Great Britain won Hong Kong's territories in the Sino-British Opium war, and since then it controlled Hong Kong while the new territories were lend from China in 1898 for a period of 99 years (Tsang 2009, 37). Mainland China has always been an active actor in Hong Kong's history, even if it was not controlling it directly. Furthermore, since PRC was founded in 1949, it never recognized the legitimacy of British colonial rule in Hong Kong's territories (Yep 2013, vii). Hong Kong's future has always been hanging in the balance for most of its history (Tsang 2009, xi). Many social scientists saw Hong Kong before the handover in 1997, as a "concubine of two masters", while from 1997 others scholars see Hong Kong as a territory enjoying increased autonomy (Ngo 1999, 2). In 1984, China and Great Britain agreed to maintain the current system and way of life of Hong Kong for 50 years, until 2047. In the same period, they agreed to govern Hong Kong with the "One country, two systems" model created by Deng Xiaoping in 1981 and which was already used in other Chinese territories such as Taiwan and after some years Macau.

In the last three decades, Hong Kong has changed from being a British crown colony to a Special Administrative Region (HKSAR) of the People's Republic of China (PRC) (Cullinane and Cullinane 2003, 280). During this transition, Hong Kong had gone through many transformations, and it will face many challenges in the future (Ibid). Unfortunately, in 1997/98 the Asian financial crisis emerged, and therefore the transitional process of Hong Kong has not been an easy one (Ibid.). Hong Kong's economic degradation has had as one of its main causes the global depression, which has led to a large degree of social confusion (Cullinane and Cullinane 2003, 286). Over the years, the people of Hong Kong remained Chinese while sharing a way of life that reminds more London rather than China. Modern Hong Kong is a territory where people from different ethnicity has today a common identity (Tsang 2009, xi).

Hong Kong grabbed my attention in 2014, when the Occupy Central Protests started. Hong Kong was in all major newspapers around the world and I got interested in its history and why there were pro-democratic protests. There are many reasons why the manifestations started, but from what we could read from the newspapers, the main issue was achieving universal suffrage for the next Chief Executive election in 2017. Currently, Hong Kong's vote system is not properly democratic, in fact mainland China nominates the candidates to Chief Executive and where only a certain category of

citizens have the right to vote. Still, according to the newspapers, what the pro-democratic activists want to achieve for 2017 is universal suffrage in a more democratic way, similar on what we are used in western countries (O'Reilly 2014).

Additionally, in 1997 China promised to Hong Kong's people the freedom to manage their domestic affairs, excepting matters of diplomacy and national defense. My aim is to investigate why are in fact the activists protesting, if the only reason is to achieve a form of democracy or there are other issues behind the protests, which are currently going on. Therefore, I have the following problem formulation:

Why are the activists protesting?

To help me to answer my problem formulation I used one research question:

What is the democratic deficit in Hong Kong?

2. Methodology

This chapter has the objective to explain to the readers why I choose the topic, and how the research developed. The methodology chapter will go briefly through the research, the historical background and limitations concerning the research itself.

The topic was decided as I was following the protests in Hong Kong through newspapers since they started, in 2014. The Umbrella Revolution interested me due to the fact that Hong Kong is a special territory together with Macau. Both have been colonies for many years and later, after the decolonization, were transformed in Special Administrative Regions instead of being an independent country as normally happens after decolonization. As I have always been fascinated about these two territories because of their history so different from the rest of China, after the first protests in 2014 got really curious about Hong Kong in particular. Therefore, I decided to go deeper in the topic and discover more about the protests. The next step was to delineate the topic and find a proper problem formulation. As Hong Kong is currently under PRC's control and since 1997 has been declared a Special Administrative Region with high degree of autonomy, I was confused about the nature of the protests. Why did they start? Were the Hong Kongers not happy to be autonomous? A high degree of autonomy entitled the territory an independency from mainland China. I have a personal experience of living in an autonomous region, as I am from the Autonomous Province of Bolzano, which has a high degree of autonomy from the Italian State. Furthermore, I was interested why the protests started with students: did their reasons have something to do with University reforms? I soon realized I had interesting questions about the protests, but they were too many and too broad to be answered in a master thesis. Therefore, through the problem formulation, I tried to focus on something more specific and delineated. Thus, during the process of reviewing literature, has been decided to focus on the reasons why the activists of the Umbrella Revolution were protesting. This is a relevant problem as the protests continued throughout 2014, and the debate between the pro-democratic movements and Hong Kong's and Beijing's governments are still going on in 2015. Moreover, it has been on the international agenda and is an interesting topic for many.

Once the process of formulation a problem was finished, I decided to develop a research question to help solving the problem and provide guidance. As Hong Kong since 1997 has been declared a Special Administrative Region, I realized that understanding the role of China in the territory would help to understand why one of the request by the activists was to achieve genuine democracy. If Hong Kong has a high degree of autonomy, does China interfere somehow in the political system?

To have a better idea of the topic, literature and empirical data about Hong Kong and the 2014's protests were researched. I thought that to have a better understanding of the reasons and the situation the activists were dealing with, it was fundamental to understand the history of Hong Kong during the British rule and after as SAR. After the empirical data has been collected, I searched for theoretical perspectives that could explain the social movements, and tried to understand why the activists are protesting and the role of China towards Hong Kong. Several possibilities have been taken in consideration before a decision was made, which will be discussed later in the thesis. Theoretical framework together with the empirical data helped answering the research question and solving the proposed problem formulation.

2.1 Types of Data

The method used to solve and answer the research question and the problem formulation is primarily qualitative data, this means data, such as academic books, articles, news articles, and academic journal articles. The reason is that there is no quantitative data available, such as numerical and statistical ones. I decided to conduct a secondary analysis, which is defined as an "analysis of data by researchers who will probably not have been involved in the collection of those data" (Bryman 2012, 312). Moreover, this type of analysis suits students projects, as it offers a numerous of benefits (Ibid.), such as cost and time, as well as high quality data for the secondary analysis, as who conducted the first analysis did a rigorous work already (Ibid, 313). Secondary analysis can be used to with both qualitative and quantitative data, but I interpreted the problem formulation as the sort of theoretical one that is best answered through theoretical analysis and argumentative language, instead of, for example, statistical comparison. Due to a professional commitment, the author could not make a field trip, therefore a secondary analysis has been chosen to save time and cost. Moreover, extensive material about Hong Kong's situation is available, and newspapers were always updated with the latest news. Therefore, there was no shortage of data limiting the project. Using this method could generate some disadvantages such as, for example, "lack of familiarity" with the data and the situation (Bryman 2012, 315), due to the fact that it was not conducted on the field directly by me. For this reason and to try to minimize the problem, literature and sources have been carefully chosen, using only reliable sources. As the latest part of the note are from news articles, I tried to collect those who were not strongly supporting nor the protests or Hong Kong and Beijing's government. Moreover, the academic books and academic journal articles can have a tendency to be biased towards the activists view, due to a Western will of democratization. While on the other hand some news articles

could support mainland China's decisions. Because of these occasional biases, I make it clear that I am aware their existence and I tried to be as objective as possible.

2.2 Evaluation of literature

The theoretical framework used for this thesis was sourced from both electronic and printed material. As written before, academic literature from journals, magazines and books was used, as well as news articles. In addition, web pages of several newspapers have been consulted in order to access electronic versions and get the most recent information about the situation in Hong Kong. Therefore the thesis is updated until end of June 2015.

The theoretical framework was needed to help understanding the situation in Hong Kong and how activists shape their protests. Since the beginning I had clear in mind which theories suited perfectly the situation. I wanted to concentrate in several aspects such as, genuine democracy, protests, ex-colonies, and high degree of autonomy. As I later realized, the topic was too broad and it was easy to lose the focus. Therefore, I decided to use less theories than I had planned. The theories I had the intention to use before were genuine democracy, political democracy, post-colonialism, neo-liberalism and political domination, political security, sovereignty, geopolitics and interdependence liberalism, apart from those I actually used. After a review of the available scholar material about the specific topic of the thesis, I decided to use, instead, Democracy, Representative Democracy, Liberal and Illiberal Democracy, Comparison between Confucianism and Democracy, and Social Movements theory. The rest of the theories I had in mind to discuss and further analyze were not specifically connected with Hong Kong's situation, because were requiring much more time to apply. Therefore, those theories chosen have been used in an epistemological way to achieve more knowledge about the topic. They have been used to create an explanatory framework around the topic with the purpose to strengthen my argumentations by discussing in the analysis, together with the rest of the empirical data. Therefore, the theories and the sources, had theoretically proven the validity of the hypotheses presented. In this matter, the Social Movements theory explained why the activists organized in groups and why they act as they did, and the reasons of their demands. Democracy helped to understand the meaning of what could happen in Hong Kong if they achieve a more democratic government in the future, together with representative democracy, which showed how a government that is democratically elected is supposed to be, and showed how not democratic is Hong Kong. Liberal democracy helped to understand the role of China in the situation. While Confucianism explained the basis on which Chinese and part of Hong Kong's populations live, and helped to better

understand the reasons of the protests. This theoretical subchapter shows a conflict between lines of thought, as Huntington affirms that Confucianism and Democracy cannot co-exist in the same territory, while Fukuyama affirms that this co-existence is possible. Therefore, I tried to explain the main values of Confucianism and tried to find argumentation to understand if Hong Kong can be a case where they co-exist.

Other sources of data, such as newspaper articles, books about Hong Kong, articles on important events, and academic articles about the topic of the thesis were used as comparative data and background data to allow the readers to understand my statements.

As written before, I was skeptical about the credibility of some newspapers and information found on internet. I have used English sources, and even if some Chinese sources have been found, I could not use them due my basic level of Chinese language.

2.3 Evaluation of Historical Background

The historical background chapter illustrates Hong Kong's history since it was populated by few fishermen until it became an international commercial center. Hong Kong went through several changes in the last 200 years and protests happened often from late 1940s. The reasons were different, as explained in the chapter 5. This chapter explains the different important steps of Hong Kong during the colonial time. Furthermore it explains the meaning of Special Administrative Region and how the protests developed in 2014. This chapter had the aim to best represent a fair view of all important events in Hong Kong's history until June 2015.

The historical background chapter was the first one written on this thesis, as I wanted to have an overview of the 2014 protests and the past of Hong Kong, in order to be able to research suitable theories for the specific case. Furthermore, I tried to include as many past events as possible, but I wanted to describe only those which were connected with the 2014's protests and relevant to have a better picture of Hong Kong's history. I tried to delineate the way I wanted to follow and what I wanted the reader to know. I divided the chapter in small sub-chapter which will help me later to answer my research questions and problem formulation.

2.4 Limitations

Some limitations have been identified during the research. The main limitation for me was the choice of the theories, as it could have been interesting to include other theories if not for the time and scope constrains. Moreover, in the case of the democracy theory, for example, it is a really broad theory and I had difficulty to screen it and extrapolate only those aspects which could help me in my thesis. As Democracy, after divided in many other democracies, another limitation was to decide which ones to use in my case. Another limitation was the difficulty to highlight the perfect case to analyze Hong Kong, so which theories to use, which due to time constrains, could not be further developed.

Some parts of the theories are important to make the reader understand the specific definition of the theory, but in the case of Hong Kong I could not make use of the theories as a whole, as some parts were not suitable to my case. An example is the comparison between Representative Democracy and Constitutionalism: I thought it was important to make clear the difference to the reader, but in my analysis of Hong Kong what I wanted to use was only Representative Democracy, that is why in the analysis there is no mention to Constitutional Democracy.

Regarding the protests, if I was to analyze all protests in Hong Kong from 1940s to 2015, more importance should be given to those that happened in 2003, 2005, and 2008. This was not the case as my research question is specifically focused on the protests in 2014, even if there were similarities with the past protests.

As written before the subject was investigated in a theoretical manner, and therefore it only contains arguments from theoretical frameworks with no quantitative data. I found many statistics regarding Democratic countries, but as my research concerns why the activists were protesting and not which countries are democratic in the world, I did not use any statistical data I have found.

Another factor that has limited this thesis, is that some electronic sources was inaccessible as there was only the Chinese Mandarin version, and not the English one. As written before my knowledge of Chinese Mandarin is on a basic level, therefore I could not completely understand the news articles. However, the thesis is supported by other academic and official sources.

3. Definitions and concepts

This chapter will give an overview of the different concepts that are used in this thesis. It discusses the definition of Umbrella Revolution/Umbrella Movement, and what does Hong Kong Special Administrative Region under China power means. Moreover, I give an overview on Hong Kong geographically and its main economic resources.

3.1 Hong Kong

Hong Kong consists of a series of islands and one peninsula, which connects it to the rest of the Chinese territory (Hamer and Yeung 1997, vii). The major islands are Hong Kong and Lantau, which are those more populated. Hong Kong was, since 1840s, transformed in the center of government and business. Moreover, is the major commercial and residential area. The rest of the territory was developed too, and the new airport Check Lap Kok was built in 2000, together with new container port facilities. Kowloon is the second major urban area of Hong Kong in which residential, industrial, and commercial facilities developed (Hamer and Yeung 1997, viii).

Hong Kong today is an international city and regional center for business, finance, information, tourism, entrepôt activities, and manufacturing (Yeung 1997, 251). Hong Kong has become a service center, offering services in different types of activities which require a high level of technology and professional input (Ibid.). The rest of the territory is still uninhabited and is known as multiple islands (Hamer and Yeung 1997, viii). In the New Territories, which were lend to Britain until 1997, several major centers of high-density residential development were developed (Ibid.).

3.2 Hong Kong Special Administrative Region

Hong Kong is a Special Administrative Region since the handover in 1997. China decided, together with Britain, that Hong Kong was going to be ruled under the "one country, two systems" model already used by China in Taiwan, and to be used from 1999 in Macau. The degree of autonomy enjoyed by Hong Kong is regulated by Kong Kong's Basic Law, briefly described below.

As defined in Hong Kong's Basic Law, article 1: "The Hong Kong Special Administrative Region is an inalienable part of the People's Republic of China" (China 1999).

Article 2: "The National People's Congress authorizes the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region to exercise a high degree of autonomy and enjoy executive, legislative and independent judicial power, including that of final adjudication, in accordance with the provisions of this Law" (Ibid).

Article 8: "The laws previously in force in Hong Kong, that is, the common law, rules of equity, ordinances, subordinate legislation and customary law shall be maintained, except for any that contravene this Law, and subject to any amendment by the legislature of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region" (Ibid.).

Article 9: "In addition to the Chinese language, English may also be used as an official language by the executive authorities, legislature and judiciary of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region" (Ibid).

Article 12: "The Hong Kong Special Administrative Region shall be a local administrative region of the People's Republic of China, which shall enjoy a high degree of autonomy and come directly under the Central People's Government" (Ibid.).

3.3 Umbrella Revolution/Umbrella Movement

During the protests in the summer of 2014, the police started to throw pepper spray on the demonstrators. To protect the demonstrators of the spray, local people used Umbrellas. After they did it, colorful umbrellas became the symbol of the protests, until they became all yellow.

Protest leaders affirmed that their demonstrations were not a revolution, but a civil- disobedience movement (Lyengar 2014), and therefore never accepted to be called the Umbrella Revolution or Umbrella Movement, as always used by the media.

4. Presentation of Theories

In this section, I described and discussed different theories, which are mostly connected with democracy. I decided to focus mostly on democracy, because since the beginning of the 2014's protests the activists were claiming to achieve genuine democracy in the future of Hong Kong. I have been interested on understanding what they mean with genuine democracy and if what they really want to achieve is real democracy. Therefore, I decided to start this chapter by describing the term democracy, and its meaning.

Democracy over the centuries developed in different varieties, one of them being representative democracy. This form of democracy describes particularly the representation of the population in the decision-making process and the competences of the mass. As a debate regarding the power of universal suffrage and the right to choose the representatives by the population happened in Hong Kong in 2014, I decided to study representative democracy to be able to analyze, in chapter 4, the case of Hong Kong. Another form of democracy is liberal democracy, common in modern governments, which includes basic rights typical of democracy and some basic components of the liberalism theory. Moreover, I discovered that lately liberal democracy further transformed, and decided to discuss this theory as typical of modern governments to understand if liberal democracy could have some basis in Hong Kong's future government. To conclude this chapter I discuss the Confucianism philosophy combining it with democracy and economic development. Many scholars affirmed in the past that Confucianism and Democracy are not compatible. Therefore, I would like to analyze Hong Kong's situation to discover if they could co-exist, as it happened in Japan. Finally, the last but no less important theory I described, is the social movement theory, fundamental to be able to analyze and understand 2014's protests in Hong Kong.

4.1 The value of democracy

As previously mentioned, in this section I described and discussed the meaning of democracy, its values and how it developed over the centuries. Through the democracy theory, I analyze in chapter 4 what Hong Kong's activists claim as genuine democracy. Moreover, I investigate and analyze what democracy means for Hong Kong and its future.

The word democracy, derives from the word 'demos' in ancient Greek language (Harrison 1995, 2), and still today those who had studied and analyzed the term are not sure about the real meaning.

Literally, democracy means, "rule by the people" (Harrison 1995, 2), so people rule something, and in terms of government, means that "people rule people". After the division of the world in different independent states, those who belong to a state or political system can be ruled by a specific government (Ibid.). More specifically, as people rule people and the rulers are also the ruled, democracy means 'people rule themselves' (Ibid.). The Greek society invented the idea and practiced democracy, while after their society, democracy was not practiced for two millennia (Harrison 1995, 2). In the classical sense of the meaning, a government ruled by democracy, is a government in which the majority rule the population. This condition implies an increase in equality in social condition, as affirmed by Tocqueville (Crick 2002, 92). Furthermore, he interpreted the meaning of the word democracy, affirming that democracy is a "continuous interplay between intermediary groups, the state, and individual rights" (Crick 2002, 65). In Tocqueville's opinion, a high degree of autonomy for locals and groups is essential for democracy when the power is divided between center and localities (Ibid.).

In a democracy, everyone wants to live better, and wants to be free to decide for its own life. Therefore, when the population wants democracy they also want equality, as argued by Dahl (Ringen 2008, 285).

During the centuries, the meaning of democracy did not change but was identified by some basic conditions. As previously mentioned, one of them is equality. Another condition typical of modern democracy is the respect of individual rights, including individual liberties and basic human rights. I am specifying that these conditions are typical of modern democracy, because before the French Revolution not many democratic governments existed as most were monarchies or non-democratic systems. Moreover, the democracy conditions in ancient Greece were completely different from nowadays. In fact, in ancient Greece, towns were independent city-states. Therefore, Athens was a small state in which a small number of people was involved and it was possible for all those who had the rights, to directly participate in the political system and government process (Harrison 1995, 16). Athens was a direct democracy, where each citizen was directly involved and it was not represented by someone else (Ibid.). To be entitled as a citizen, the person had some specific membership conditions, which made a differentiation from those who were just present in the territory. In Athens' democracy those considered citizens were born from citizen parents. Those who were not citizens were called metics and were just residents in the territory, not having any influence in the political system (Ibid.). After those residents, there were the women, which were excluded from full citizenship and they did not have political rights. In the lowest class there were the slaves, with no political rights. In ancient Greece, those who were living under the model 'people rule people' were

just a minority of the population. At the time Athens, which was one of the largest Greek city-states, counted with a population of only 35.000 people (Ibid.,17).

Observing democracy today, it is clearly very different from ancient Greek democracy. As previously mentioned, modern democracy has some basic values, such as liberty, equality, welfare, which are applied to all citizens in the state, with no distinction (Harrison 1995, 2). The Greek democracy, according to Urbinati, was a genuine democracy, because contrary to most democracies, the political power was not only the power of wealth but it was the power of all man with the status of citizen, which equally participated (Urbinati 2006, 2). However, the Greek democracy was, apart from a genuine democracy an unequal one.

Regarding the modern democracy's basic values listed earlier, Samuel P. Huntington adds that there is democracy when collective decision makers of a state are chosen through fair, honest and periodic elections. Moreover, those candidates are freely eligible from all adults in the population of a determined state (Schmitter 1993, 349). Therefore, the mechanism of democracy makes people express what they wish by voting those who rule or have power (Harrison 1995, 3).

Democracy, as written before, presupposes equality but in the real world, in those governments where democracy is more advanced, economic and social conditions are not equal. There are some aspects of the real world, which show that a democratic government is not the perfect government. Aristotle, on the other hand, asserted that democracy was a necessary condition for good, equal government (Crick 2002, 11). Moreover, he wrote that a "good government was a mixture of elements, the few ruling with the consent of the many" (Crick 2002, 11). Crick complemented Aristotle's thought, saying that a good government should be democratic, in the institutional and social sense of the word, including individual liberties, human rights, economic progress and social justice. Furthermore, good government and democracy are not synonyms but one is part of the other, and democracy is more than just equality of political rights (Crick 2002, 92). In a modern globalized world, to be able to manage social transformation, it is necessary to respect individual liberties and accept basic human rights (Ibid.), and not only to achieve mass consent. Modern democracy is characterized by the fact that any person is free to be involved in social transformation, where the state can demonstrate practical benefits in the present to the main middle class, which is supposed to be the majority of the population (Crick 2002, 94). Regarding the typical social structure, Crick made a comparison between modern democracy, where a large middle class is essential, and totalitarian regimes, which aim to be egalitarian but are, however, based on a political and bureaucratic class system (Crick 2002, 94). In democracy, there is a political class, which shares its prestige together with the business, intellectual, and social élites. The state élites are, however, susceptible to variations on their components.

Democracy in modern times is characterized by a parliament, an assembly, and/or a congress that debate publicly in a multi-party system. However, Crick affirmed that in modern democratic governments, the election systems are variable and contestable (Ibid.). In the past, many military governments claimed themselves democratic, just because they were established by active mass support (Ibid.), but all the main democratic characteristics were missing.

In the real world, seems that democracy works better in market capitalism, which instead is unequal (Ringen 2008, 285). As previously mentioned, it develops in countries with advanced economic and social conditions. Even if modern governments live in a condition of inequality because of market capitalism, citizens enjoy a wide range of political equalities (Ibid.). In modern democratic governments, such as the ones in Europe, the rights achieved through a democratic system are taken for granted by most. First of all the rights to vote: citizens are equally enable to decide their leaders through a democratic vote system (Ibid.). The second important factor is that in a democratic system, is that human and political rights are universal (Ibid.). According to Ringen, people protest because they want to achieve democracy and an equal status. However, what they really want is the new wealth generated by economic growth, which only an élite has (Ringen 2008, 285), or motivated, as analyzed by Huntington, by a similar transformation on its neighboring countries (Schmitter 1993, 349). Unfortunately, regular elections do not provide real democracy, and real democracy does not bring equality to the society. Moreover, democracy can co-exist with inequality if its leaders and citizens support democratic values, ideals and practices (Ringen 2008, 285). However, these beliefs have to come from each country's culture and transmitted among generations (Ibid, 286). Otherwise, if the democratic culture gets weakened, democracy is in danger (Ibid.).

At the beginning of the century, the United Nations counted 140 democratic countries in the world (Ringen 2008, 283) of a total of 190 countries. So approximately ⅔ of the world population had multiparty electoral systems. From this analysis it came out that democracy have succeeded in quantitative terms but not in qualitative terms. In fact, Ringen affirmed that even if today many democracies exist around the world, it does not mean they are democracies in qualitative terms (Ibid.). Many countries are a sort of democracy but many of them are fake democracies. This concept will be better explained in the next sub-chapter of representative democracy.

To further proceed on the subject, it is interesting to look at Dahl's comparison between democracy and non-democracy. As written previously in the case of military governments, many countries had regular elections, but those countries were not democracies (Schmitter 1993, 349 - 350). In fact still today, many countries are non-democracy. As argued by Robert Dahl in his book *On Democracy*, democracy is opposed to non-democracy:

"democracy prevents cruel and vicious rule, it guarantees citizens certain fundamental rights that undemocratic systems cannot grant, it ensures its citizens a range of personal freedoms, it enables them to protect their fundamental interests, it provides them the opportunity to exercise self-determination and to live under laws of their own choosing, it gives them the opportunity to exercise moral responsibility, it fosters human development, it fosters a relatively high degree of political equality, it discourages war and it encourages prosperity" (Ringen 2008, 284).

In these conditions, compared with any other alternative, democracy is obviously desirable, as it has many positive consequences for people (Ibid.). As written before, the leaders are fundamental figures to make a democratic system work, due to the fact that to have a stable democracy their support is fundamental, and only the citizens will is not enough (Ibid.). In the case of Hong Kong, since the handover in 1997, activists are fighting for democracy. As Robert Dahl described in his book 'On Democracy', "when the matter is put to the test, people usually prefer democracy" (Ringen 2008, 285). Democracy is desirable because it brings beneficial consequences and because these consequences are good for people. It helps people to live a good, decent life and to have a moral life (Ringen 2008, 284). In those countries where there is not a democratic government, the leaders affirm that it is because the populations are interested in something different than democracy (Ibid., 285). This happens particularly in Asia, where according to leaders, people hold non-western values and ask for "effective delivery in government, and not democracy" (Ibid.). In the case of Hong Kong, it is clear this is not the case, and it will be further discussed in the analysis chapter.

At this point, it is understood that democracy in ancient Greece meant 'people rule themselves', which were a minority of the whole population of the territory. Moreover, it is clear that since Athens, democracy has changed. Nowadays, many governments around the world are democratic in the new sense of the term, which includes basic values such as equality, individual liberties, basic human rights, freedom to vote, and to have fair, honest and periodic elections, as well as a high degree of autonomy for individuals. Since modern democracy developed, after the French Revolution, citizens expect more from the governments. This happens even more when the population is well educated and has an interest on the political system, which represents them. Therefore, if a Constitution is too rigid, it is difficult to modernize a democracy to be able to satisfy citizens (Ringen 2008, 283). To conclude, sovereign states in modern times are different from the past, because political transformation and a capitalist economy are not 'insignificant to their inhabitants'. Citizens are more involved in political matters thanks to the press and broadcasting media (Crick 2002, 170). As previously seen, there are still countries which are non-democratic but, even if trials happened in the past, neither the United Nations or the U.S. have the power to impose democracy, human rights or

universal suffrage in those states where modern democracy is not a reality yet (Ibid.). In the case of Hong Kong, I assume it is possible to find relevant explanations connected with the latest protests, which are demanding universal suffrage and a more democratic government in the future.

4.2 Representative democracy

Democracy developed in many different ways during the centuries, one of them is representative democracy, which mostly describe the connection between the mass and those who represent them on the government. In Hong Kong's case, I decided to describe and later analyze representative democracy, because one of the reasons to protest claimed by the activists is that they want to vote, by universal suffrage, the Chief Executive in 2017's election. Furthermore, they want to be able to vote freely for their representatives in the future. My aim is to describe the main characteristics of representative democracy, to later apply them in the case of Hong Kong.

As it happened for democracy, representative democracy advanced. In the past, when it was developed, the governments and the populations were different from how they are now. This type of democracy started to develop after the French Revolution. At the time, the population was divided in classes and the majority of those governing were from a particular élite. The élite had the competence to rule. However, they represented only a minority of the population, as most of them were nobles, while the rest of the population was not represented. In modern times, the mass started to understand that they had rights as the nobles, therefore they started to be more interested in the political system. The élite government, as written before, is 'rule by one or few', on the other hand, the mass participation is 'rule by many' (Krouse 1982, 510). The role of the representative is important as this person represents and promotes the interests of the represented, but acting independently (Ibid.). Therefore, through the elections and vote, the represented are trusting the representative actions (Krouse 1982, 510). The liberal theories have a more balanced compromise between the élite competence and the mass participation. In this case, representation is made by natural competence, which is distributed between élite and mass, where mass competence is represented by universal suffrage. Liberal theory identifies representative democracy as a way of promoting leadership while preserving some of the basic factors of democracy such as equality and popular sovereignty (Krouse 1982, 511).

In history many examples of man's desire for power exist, and that representation promotes leadership. Therefore, James Mill identified in representative democracy the balance between the interests of those who rule with the interests of those who are ruled (Krouse 1982, 514).

As written before, both true and false democracies exist. In the true democracy, the government represents equally the totality of the citizens. While in the false or fake democracy, which is a non-equal democracy, only a predominant class has the numerical majority in the government (Mill 1977, 448). In the previous sub-chapter I identified equality as one of the characteristics of modern democracy and, as affirmed by J.S. Mill, without it democracy cannot exist (Mill 1977, 449). Most modern democracies are not equal, and therefore are false democracies, where the predominant class benefits from this inequality (Mill 1977, 448). This type is mainly a government of privilege, in which one class possess the only voice in the State (Ibid.). Most probably, the majority in the government is from a ruling class, but it does not represent the majority of the country, and might as well be a minority in the nation (Mill 1977, 450). Within false democracy the representation is given only to the 'local majority' while the other minorities have no organs representing them in the government (Mill 1977, 457). In general, in a representative government, the minority has a part of the deliberation; every group will be represented in a proportional way. The majority of the electors will always have the majority of the representatives but a minority will always have a representation too (Ibid.).

There are two hypothesis in which democracy is in danger, according to Mill: if the representative body is not educated enough, and if the majority in the decision-making is only from a particular class (Ibid.). Thus, Mill argued that to avoid one or both of these hypothesis, the only way is to limit the democratic character of the representation, through restricted suffrage (Ibid, 448). Nowadays, if a democracy has a restricted suffrage it is not considered a democracy, as basic values such as equality, freedom to vote and individual liberties are missing. Therefore, Mill's affirmations are not current.

Generally, modern representative democracy represents all people, and not only the majority as it happened in ancient Greece's democracy. Contrary to what Aristotle and Crick affirmed, in Mill's opinion democracy is not the best form of government, unless the society is not organized in classes, with a limited suffrage (Mill 1977, 467). As written before, Mill's idea of representative democracy is not applicable in today's situation, as limited suffrage does not represent a democracy in the modern era. This is even truer in Hong Kong's case, as the activists are fighting since the handover in 1997 to achieve universal suffrage. Hong Kong never had universal suffrage, even during the British rule. However, since 1997 it became a special administrative region with a high degree of autonomy, as stated in the Joint Declaration (JD). Moreover, the citizens feel they achieved some basic values such as liberties and freedom to vote, typical of democracies in Western countries. Currently, in 2015,

Hong Kong has limited universal suffrage and activists are asking to achieve universal suffrage, as other modern countries have, even if they will not be a democracy in the same way these countries are.

In a perfect representative democracy, independent initiative and discretionary judgement by political leaders are compatible (Rosen 1982, 578). Those political leaders have to promote the best interests of the people represented and not reflect only their daily wishes (Krouse 1982, 517). Both independent initiative and discretionary judgement by political leaders are settled by free elections, which are under people's control (Ibid, 518). Contrary to that, in the past when only the élites governed, they acted in their own (Ibid.). Contrary to the definition that democracy means "people rule people", Urbinati affirmed that in her opinion representative democracy is undemocratic. She described representative democracy as "newly empowered 'common people' and the already powerful wealth" (Urbinati 2006, 2), and affirmed that it took many revolutions to become, as it should be, the 'rule of many' (Ibid.). A representative government is not a government that has control over people, but people is supposed to have control over what government does (Urbinati 2006, 10). This is another case typical of representative democracy, which I will analyze lately in the case of Hong Kong, as the citizens cannot select the candidates for the Chief Executive. Hong Kong's people do not have control over their representatives, as they cannot freely vote them.

As seen before, Urbinati affirmed that the Greek democracy was better than modern democracy, even if it was unequal between all the classes, as it was perfectly equal between those citizens who had the right to vote. Even more, she argued that representative democracy is an "original form of government and is not identifiable with electoral democracy" (Urbinati 2006, 4), since those who could actually vote in Athens were not the majority of the population. In the same way as ancient democracy, contemporary democracy is in many cases still controlled only by the representatives, as there has been no development in the selection of the candidates in the institutions (Urbinati 2006, 10). In fact, in the case of Hong Kong, the representatives are not directly selected by the population, which does not vote by universal suffrage. Bernard Manin affirmed that, in contemporary democracy, electoral suffrage did not change anything in practice, as the power is still in the hands of a few people like it was in the 18th century when only few citizens had the right to vote (Urbinati 2006, 10). Modern governments still restrict popular participation according to Urbinati, since modern representative democracy is just an elected form of oligarchy or aristocracy (Ibid.).

I am applying Representative Democracy to the current situation in Hong Kong. Since the 2014's protests the pro-democracy movements in the island are asking universal suffrage for the next executive council election, by affirming that what they want to achieve is a genuine democracy in the

ancient meaning of the term. Regarding representative democracy theory, it is limited as scholars usually analyze in democratic western countries, while Hong Kong as part of China does not fit that description. Despite these critical aspects, I have chosen this theory assuming that it can be used to explain much of Hong Kong's case.

4.3 Liberal democracy vs. illiberal democracy

As true and fake democracies exist, there are also liberal and illiberal democracies. Over the centuries, another type of democracy called illiberal developed from liberal democracy. In this part, I describe mostly liberal democracy, but I will compare it with illiberal democracy. Moreover, I will build the base to analyze the case of Hong Kong, and be able to understand its high degree of autonomy and China's power over the territory.

To be able to understand liberal democracy, it is necessary to have a clear view of what is meant by liberalism. Liberalism has always been interpreted as a political liberty or an economic policy doctrine, which has made possible the rise of democracy (Zakaria 1997, 23). Some basic characteristics of liberalism were indispensable throughout nineteenth and twentieth centuries to keep a democratic government (Beetham 1992, 41). Those basic values fundamental for democracy are typical of liberalism, such as individual freedoms including basic rights, which permit citizens' control over the process of the decision-makers. Moreover, are essential for democracy and democratization the freedoms of expression, movement, association, religion, property and to access to information, which together with the right to vote, without which democracy would be meaningless (Beetham 1992, 41). Other components are fair elections, rule of law, and separation of powers (Zakaria 1997, 22) (Beetham 1992, 41).

So liberalism adds some basic values to the ancient idea of democracy, which today are fundamental to be able to keep a democratic government. Therefore, many of the contemporary governments are liberal democracies. Liberal democracy is a political system, which allows political liberties and democratic rule (Bollen 1993, 1208), where political liberties are the expression of people's' freedom to participate actively in the decision-making rule through representatives (Ibid, 1209). Therefore, liberal democracy and representative democracy are connected to each other as both include the basic characteristics of democracy and the people's expression of vote is fundamental. In fact, today's democratic regimes are mostly electoral democracies (Plattner 1998, 171), as they allow political liberties to their citizens.

As previously mentioned, a new phenomenon have been rising in the international scene: illiberal democracy (Zakaria 1997, 22). Illiberal democracy, according to Zakaria, shows up in those regimes who were democratically elected, but after the second mandate, the decision-makers act by ignoring constitutional limits on their power and privilege, yet, diminishing citizens' basic rights (Zakaria 1997, 22).

According to Freedom House's survey made in 1996-1997, half of the democratic countries in the world were illiberal democracies, and not liberal democracies. Many countries around the world are comfortable with the transformation of capitalism, therefore, as asserted by Zakaria, many are facing the transformation to a different form of democracy (Zakaria 1997, 24), without even realizing it. Based on what Woodrow Wilson affirmed almost 100 years ago, the international community and in particular U.S. had the role of making the world safe for democracy (Ibid, 43). However, as written previously, nor U.N. or U.S. can force other governments to be democratic. Based on it, Zakaria argued that the most influential countries in the world need, is to consolidate democracy and to encourage constitutional democracy around the world, instead of trying to democratize new countries (Ibid.).

Based on liberal and representative democracy, it is possible to affirm that when a country has competitive, multiparty elections it is considered democratic (Zakaria 1997, 25), some of the basic values, which identify a democracy, such as, free election, universal suffrage, equality in the political system, among others, are present. Furthermore, if the basic social, political, religious and economic rights are respected, a country is nowadays catalogued as democratic (Ibid.). As mentioned in sub-chapter 4.1, Aristotle and Crick affirmed that a country, in order to be democratic, needs a good government, which normally is conducted by constitutional liberalism, which in turn refers to the western tradition of rule of law as affirmed by Zakaria (Zakaria 1997, 26). According scholars such as Jefferson, Smith, J. S. Mill, Locke among others, in all its different variants, constitutional liberalism stabilize citizens' basic rights, which governments must accept by limiting its own power (Ibid.).

Western countries have, in the last century, fused democracy and constitutional liberalism, as many of them are ruled based on a written Constitution and a democratic government. However, this was not the case of Hong Kong before the handover, as Britain conducted an undemocratic rule in its colonies (Zakaria 1997, 29). In particular, in Hong Kong, a real democracy was not present under British rule, as a "meaningful election" was never held, although it had a framework of rights and laws, which protected citizens' basic rights, while administrated by a fair court system and bureaucracy (Zakaria 1997, 29). Based on Zakaria's analysis of Hong Kong, Plattner affirmed that

Hong Kong during British rule was the example where liberalism could rule without democracy (Plattner 1998, 173).

Elections are an important benefit for the citizens but are not the only benefit, as according to Zakaria, through democratization and good governance they would achieve much more (Zakaria 1997, 40). Moreover, the process of liberalization and democratization is a long-term process, which needs to be made gradually to be able to adapt it, and elections are just one of the steps (Ibid.). In the case of China, citizens gained more autonomy and economic liberty in the last period, but China needs to modify much more than people's' freedom to be able to be recognized internationally as a liberalizing autocracy in Zakaria's opinion (Ibid.). Furthermore, nowadays for those countries which are not democracies yet, it is better that the international community forces them to establish liberal autocracies, than the development of illiberal democracy (Plattner 1998, 172). Plattner agrees with Zakaria regarding Hong Kong under British rule being the only liberal autocracy in the world (Ibid, 177). Moreover, both agree on recognizing China and other East Asian countries as liberalizing autocracies and not liberal autocracies. That is because, according to them it is not possible to determine if those countries are genuinely constitutional autocracies or liberal autocracies (Ibid, 178).

Since 1997, Hong Kong was not under British rule but returned to China's control. Therefore, based on what Zakaria and Plattner affirmed, it moved from a constitutional liberalist governance to a liberalizing autocracy after the handover in 1997, passing from Britain colony to China. I am applying liberal democracy and all its forms in the case of Hong Kong to better understand the degree of autonomy it gained by being a special administrative region under Chinese control.

4.4 Can Confucianism and Democracy co-exist?

The Asian cultures are based on Confucianism, and from there, attitudes, values, beliefs and traditions derived. China is were Confucianism born and Confucianism traditions are still truly followed today. Hong Kong, on the other hand, is a mixture of cultures, as the population comes from many different ethnicities. In this sub-chapter, I use Confucianism to better understand the new generation in Hong Kong, and whether their demands to Hong Kong's government are somehow related to Confucianism values.

I first describe and explain the main values of Confucianism, which take its name from Confucius. Confucius was a philosopher and scholar, who lived in a period of prosperity and stability in which rose the so called 'Hundred Schools of Thought' (Dacombe, et al. 2013, 22). During this period a

new class of thinkers and scholars arose, and their new ideas changed the structure of the ancient Chinese society (Ibid.). Confucius as philosopher developed his idea of how a state should be governed. His idea enabled the rulers to govern honestly, as his philosophy was based on traditional virtues such as loyalty, duty and respect. In his idea, the junzi, translated as "superior man", would act following these virtues and the society would follow him. Therefore, following these virtues the society could be transformed in "fair and benevolent government" (Dacombe, et al. 2013, 23). This idea could work only if a new structure based on hierarchy would be created in the society, taking into account meritocracy. However, noble families would always be on the top, while the meritocratic administrative class will respect them. Confucius based his idea on identifying society as a traditional Chinese family, in which sons obey the father. He established constant relationships in which both sides have responsibilities, such as father and son. Creating a society based on these relationships, would create an atmosphere of loyalty and respect (Ibid., 24).

Corroborating with what happened during Confucius' time, Huntington recognizes that culture is fundamental in the process of modernization in non-Western countries such as China (Yu 2005, 204).

Traditional Confucianism is defined by Fukuyama as a "meritocratic institution with potentially egalitarian implications" (Fukuyama 1995, 25). Moreover, he explains it as doctrine, which unifies political and social spheres and gives to the state a degree of authority in all daily life aspects (Fukuyama 1995, 26). As written previously, Confucianism is based on hierarchic system, with one or few who have the power and the rest are loyal to those. In the case of a modern countries, those who have the power are the leaders and the citizens are loyal to them. According to Huntington, "traditional Confucianism was either undemocratic or antidemocratic" (Huntington 1991, 24). Even if it was based on meritocracy, it was not equal for everyone in the society as it depended on the role in the relationship. For example, between the sons there was a meritocratic system, but all of them obeyed to the father that had the power in the family (Huntington 1991, 24). If we put this family relationship in a society, there are those who are the sons, which live in a meritocratic system, in which their background does not matter, but at the same time there is one or few who have the power. At the time of Confucius, those were the nobles (Dacombe, et al. 2013, 24). Therefore, in a meritocratic system, careers were opened those talented and not because of social background (Huntington 1991, 24). As previously mentioned, hierarchy and respect were central values of Confucius ideas, in which harmony and cooperation were preferred over disagreement and competition (Ibid.).

Huntington affirmed that China and other Asian countries such as North Korea have a government, are an obstacle to democracy. In his opinion, Confucianism created a non-democratic system. Those

states based on Confucianism traditions could never have a democratic government, in Huntington's opinion, first, because they do not have experience with democracy, second because those government last too long, and their leaders are 'opponents of democratization' (Huntington 1991, 21). Moreover, Huntington and other scholars from the American modernization theory see Confucianism as an obstacle in the modernization process of China (Yu 2005, 204). Yu, and Fukuyama do not agree with Huntington's idea regarding Chinese territories and Confucianism, because Huntington offered only a partial possibility of compatibility between Confucianism and Democracy (Cha, Shin and Nicholas 2011, 154).

Confucianism since Confucius developed and changed, adapting with the time and transforming, therefore, some of the basic values took another shape in modern society. In fact the modern form of Confucianism, gives importance to high-educational systems and bureaucracy, which according to Fukuyama, are the steps to reinforce an egalitarian income distribution (Fukuyama 1995, 25). As people have a high level of literacy, they are more active in democratic debate, which also makes people wealthier (Ibid.)

The debate is not finished, as scholars such as Huntington, Cha, Fukuyama and Yu cannot not agree if Confucianism and democracy could co-exist in a society. They conclude that in a Confucian society, democracy could develop only if the people give less value to Confucianism, and the only possible way would be to reformulate both Confucianism and democracy to a more appropriated version for East Asian countries (Cha, Shin and Nicholas 2011, 159).

Another connection is made between economic development and democracy, which according to Huntington are not possible in a Confucian society. However, Fukuyama analyzed these two aspects in China and Burma's cases, which until now are not democratic (Fukuyama 1995, 21). In his opinion, within economic modernization, peoples' living and educational standards raise, therefore people have more opportunities and not a life close to subsistence level anymore (Ibid.). Furthermore, when there is economic development, well educated middle class citizens emerge. Therefore, those well-educated citizens are normally more active in the political debate, as they want improve their way of life creating pro-democratic movements as it happened in Hong Kong and China too. Economic development is a current characteristic of Hong Kong, which has been transformed in the past decades in an international commercial center. According to Fukuyama, as economic development is present in Asia, the democratization process could continue in the future but it has to assume a specific shape which can match Asian tradition (Fukuyama 1995, 24). As was affirmed by Singaporean former Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew, the Western model of democracy would not have the same effects in an Asian society, such as Singapore (Ibid.). However, in the past, two Asian countries, Japan and

Philippines, experienced democracy because of a direct influence by the U.S. and because those followed less the Confucianism ideology (Huntington 1991, 24). While, as written before, some Asian countries such as China have no experience with democratic governments and no influence by any western democracy, apart from some small groups of radical dissidents, which protest to achieve democracy (Ibid.). Contrary to that, Hong Kong had western experience as it was controlled by Britain for 150 years, and British way of life is influenced by western countries. So, is it possible that Hong Kong in the future could become one of the few Confucian societies in which democracy can develop?

So, even if still today there is not a real answer on the debate if Confucianism and democracy can co-exist in Asia, I have chosen to analyze Hong Kong's case based on these assumptions. Hong Kong started developing its own identity in the late 1960s creating a multicultural society, which includes Confucianism. However, with pro-democracy movements protesting for a genuine democracy, will it be the first case where Confucianism and democracy co-exist? In the analysis chapter, I further investigate if Confucianism traditions can help uncover more about Umbrella Movement's reasons.

4.5 Development of Social movements

The thesis' aim is to analyze the latest 2014 Umbrella Revolution and the Students Movement in Hong Kong to understand their motivation and their demands to Hong Kong and China's governments. To better understand why and how social movements are born, I think it is interesting to first understand the social movement theory to then apply it in the specific case of Hong Kong. Moreover, there are many types of social movements, but those I decided to cover are selected by my judgment of their relevance with contemporary Hong Kong.

As many theories, the social movement theory developed and transformed over the centuries. Therefore, both a traditional theory and a more modern one, that it will be described later, exist.

In general, social movements are characterized by series of organizations, which sometimes make coalitions with other organizations with the same goals (Ash and Zald 1966, 327). Therefore, large-scale organizations are a collection of groups that are together because of various kinds of pursues and goals (Ash and Zald 1966, 328). These different organizations have different roles in the 'plan of attack' as defined by Ash *et al.* (Ibid, 335). Social movements normally exist in situations in which the environment in transforming (Ibid.). Moreover, movement organizations are formed as a collective grouping a number of people because of common interests, which could be individual or

societal institutions and structures (Ibid, 329). The goals of these organizations are aimed at changing or restructuring something or someone in the society, which cannot be changed by normal bureaucracy (Ibid.). Therefore, social movement is "a collectivity acting with some degree of organization and continuity outside institutional channels for the purpose of promoting or resisting change in the group, society, or world order of which it is a part" (Chiu and Lui 2000, 3).

As stated above, the theory changed with the pass of the years. 'New' social movements develop in periods of fractures in the society. Therefore, social movements are a reaction against changes in the society. Modern social movements are a network of organizations or groups that have in common a specific project with the aim to change the society (Peterson 1989, 420). As it happened in Hong Kong, where different groups with different origins protested together for similar issues, creating for the media the Umbrella Revolution.

One of the definitions of these new social movements was given by Gundelach, which summarizes 'new' social movements in six points, which differentiate them from traditional social science theory (Peterson 1989, 420). First of all, these movements are not related with labor-capitalist conflicts, as they do not represent specific interests of a social class. The purpose of the movement is related to a vision of the future apart from being influenced by the supporters' lifestyle and values. In general, those participating in the movement are from a 'new' middle class, mostly are highly educated and young (Peterson 1989, 421). Organizations are divided between the social movements even if they have a common goal, that is usually to gain influence in various 'political arenas' (Ibid.), in which there is the creation of a dialogue between social movements and state. In fact, social movements develop mostly because they want to change the political opportunities (Chiu and Lui 2000, 3), and are fundamental in historical societal transformation (Peterson 1989, 421). Even more, "social movements find the new openings in the political structure opportunities for bringing their demands to institutional politics" (Chiu and Lui 2000, 5). Therefore, social movements are created when there is a transformation of social conflicts in political action in which networks, other organizations and mass media are relevant (Peterson 1989, 421).

Social movements are a way to deliver a message to the rest of the society (Peterson 1989, 424). Contemporary movements, contrary to the historical ones, are more concerned with information and communicate meaning between the members and the rest of the society, while the previous ones were more affected by material goods and resources. Today's movements are proposing an alternative vision of the framework through invisible networks between the small groups (Peterson 1989, 425). Contemporary social movements are able to activate institutional change, create new élites and contribute to cultural innovation (Peterson 1989, 425).

Social movements existed in Hong Kong since the 1940s, as explained in the next chapter. These movements developed until the protests of 2014. The reasons changed, while the social movements developed. I identified some basic characteristics of this theory in Hong Kong's 2014 protests, which will be analyzed in the 6.1 sub-chapter. The objective is to help understanding why these movements are born and the reasons why the Umbrella Movement is protesting.

In this section, I described a social science theory chosen due to its relevance to understand the latest protests in Hong Kong. My intention is to use the theory to analyze the latest protests of 2014. Why was there the need to create the Umbrella Movement, and why did the student go to the streets before everyone else?

5. Historical Background

This chapter has the aim to explain the current situation in Hong Kong. As Hong Kong went through many changes in the past 200 years, it is fundamental to understand the past to better comprehend the present.

The part of the history, which is relevant for this work, dates back to the activity of British merchants selling opium to China in the market (Ngo 1999, 1). Hong Kong, before being a colony of the British Empire, was an almost inhabited fishing port on the south coast of China, which thanks to British governance was transformed in a capitalist metropolis (Ibid.). Hong Kong and mainland China have always been connected even during the period of British colonial rule, in which China gave its contribution to the development of the island (Ibid.). Today Hong Kong's society, has been created from a unique socio-political environment, by the complex state-society relations between Great Britain and China over the territory (Ibid.).

Before Hong Kong became a British colony, Great Britain had been trading for many years in Asian markets, in particular in the Canton delta region, and they were in need of a place where to establish their trading base. Hong Kong is geographically situated between the Taiwan Strait in the South China Sea, and the Pacific Ocean, which make it a strategic channel for sea traffic and a commercial center of transnational and local trade (Ngo 1999, 15). Different of other European colonies, Hong Kong had a special treatment; in fact, brute force was not used over the natives. However, Britain used coercion and military strength to divide the new colony from mainland China (Ngo 1999, 13). In addition, at the beginning of the British colonial rule over the territory, indigenous populations in Hong Kong have not been persecuted for racial or ethnic segregation and discrimination, as was common in European colonies. The natives from Hong Kong were, in fact, benefitted to a much greater extent and were compensated by Britain with social and economic privileges (Ngo 1999, 14). Moreover, the British government helped the growth of a Chinese bourgeoisie offering land grants and important lucrative monopolies (Ibid.). As was common in European expansion, Great Britain`s cooperation with Hong Kong had the purpose to create a new economic, social and political infrastructure with local people (Ngo 1999, 14).

British colonial expansion was possible thanks to Chinese co-operation (Ngo 1999, 14), which started during the First Anglo-Chinese War (1839-42), known better as the "Opium War" (Tsang 2009, 14), in which Great Britain won Hong Kong's island (Ngo 1999, 14). Britain was naval and military superior than China, which in this position of disadvantages was forced to make peace. The result of the negotiations is the Treaty of Nanjing, signed in 1842 that allowed Britain to create in Hong Kong

a Crown Colony (Tsang 2009, 14). In the years before the defeat of the Chinese Empire by Britain, their relations were conducted without a modern diplomatic method as we are used today (Ibid.).

In this chapter, I explore the historical part related with the main topic, going through the transition of Hong Kong from being a territory disputed between two empires, until the handover in 1997, which turned Hong Kong into a Special Administrative Region (HKSAR) under Chinese rule. I proceed to analyze the development of social movements in Hong Kong, which helped me to better understand, in the analysis chapter, the protests in 2014. To conclude, based on newspapers articles, I describe chronologically the major events which characterized the protests from 2014 until June 2015.

5.1 Hong Kong as British colony

After the Treaty of Nanjing was ratified in 1843, Britain advanced with its economic interests, which meant to increase trade, and to secure the right to trade in China and make as much profit as possible (Tsang 2009, 16). The war between Britain and China made the start of a new era in China's relations with the West, as well as giving rise to the British colony of Hong Kong. Charles Elliot is known as the key founder in the establishment of Hong Kong as a British colony. He proclaimed and asserted the full right of the British Crown to administer the new territory as a British dominion, and to offer protection to its residents. Moreover, he declared that "the natives of the island [...] and all natives of China thereto resorting, shall be governed according to the laws and customs of China, every description of torture expected" (Tsang 2009, 16). What Britain tried to do at the beginning of the instauration of the new colony was not to transform the island in a small Great Britain, as the culture of the natives was completely different. They tried, however, to combine the two ways of life to create a harmonic situation. Before his departure, Elliot declared Hong Kong a free port, and created the beginning of a British administration of the island (Ibid.).

At the same time, the entrepreneurial traders from Britain took advantage of the protection from the British Crown to promote trade with China, including opium. British entrepreneurs were led by Jardine Matheson, a renowned opium merchant company. Entrepreneurs in Hong Kong, enjoyed free trade that had just a little intervention from the British Government (Mizuoka 2014, 26). What made Hong Kong become a capitalist metropolis, was the development of the colony by Britain with the help of mainland China. The colony was shaped by the action of ruling élite, business class, compradors, rural interests, social activists and even marginalized groups (Ngo 1999, xi), and by Charles Elliot that took the initiative at his arrival in the island, creating a small administration which made it possible to developed the island, despite the uncertain future over Hong Kong (Tsang 2009,

17). Hong Kong under British rule was famous for its economic formula: low taxes, few controls, quick profits, and hard work (Mizuoka 2014, 26).

Since the ruling of Britain, China has been always present in Hong Kong's history, contributing to Hong Kong's development by providing cheap supplies and maintaining Hong Kong's stability during the first years of the colonial rule (Ngo 1999, 4).

Differently from the other colonies under British rule, Hong Kong had a special system from 1843, i.e., the 'Royal Charter of the Island of Hong Kong', the Letters Patent and Royal Instructions from Queen Victoria. The Letters Patent and the Royal Instructions were the supreme legislation in colonial Hong Kong, therefore the constitutional structure of a Crown colony was prescribed, and it was one of the few colonies, which shared by most with Britain (Tsang 2009, 18), as the other British colonies had a different treatment. These two documents set the general administrative structure, and stipulated general rules for enforcement. With the Letters Patent, the British Crown entrusted the Governor 'to do and execute all things' (Article II), while in fact the Governor was assisted by both Executive Council and a Legislative Council (Tsang 2009, 18). Therefore, the Governor was in full power and authority to stipulate almost everything that a constitution of an independent country would otherwise do. Not stipulated were universal suffrage and parliamentary democracy, which were largely replaced with the supreme power of the Governor (Mizuoka 2014, 24).

Hong Kong was part of another Anglo-Sino war, the Second Opium War (1856-1860), which transformed the trade and diplomatic relations between the two empires on a stable and sustainable basis (Tsang 2009, 20). Before the end of the war, British troops helped by the French, entered the Forbidden City in Beijing, where it was decisive the defeat of China. The Chinese Prince Gong signed two treaties with Britain and France, known as the Convention of Beijing (Tsang 2009, 36). In this convention the emperor of China ratified the Treaty of Tientsin signed between China and Britain in 1858. In this treaty, Great Britain obtained the opening of more ports, the navigation of the Yangtze, diplomatic representation in Beijing and legislation regarding the opium trade (Tsang 2009, 34). Furthermore, it was decided that the territory of Hong Kong would be expanded to include a small area of the peninsula of Kowloon, which was lent for a period of 99 years until 1997 (Tsang 2009, 34).

Hong Kong during its time under British rule passed from being a settlement colony to an imperial outpost (Tsang 2009, 62), where a colonial society was developed, divided in a colonial hierarchy where there was no legislation against discrimination of the colonials (Ibid.). On the other hand, the

way of life of the British élite, which was living on the island, was governed by liberal democracy and dominated by good economy, politics, and armed forces (Ibid.)

In Hong Kong a clear distinction between the local communities and the British expatriated existed, even if the social classes were not divided by ethnic lines. In fact, were divided merely by local social distinctions. Therefore, the few members of the aristocracy and the Hong Kong's officials and senior business leaders constituted the ruling élite class in the island (Tsang 2009, 62).

During the colonization of Hong Kong by Britain, the British expatriates constituted no more than 0.9 percent of the entire population (Goodstadt 2005, 8). As previously mentioned, part of these expatriates ruled the British Crown Colony until 30 June 1997. The non-British citizens were not considered part of this ruling group, except for a very few who had been co-opted into the ruling class (Mizuoka 2014, 24). In fact, the Chinese population of Hong Kong had to wait until 1925 to be reevaluated, thanks to the new Governor Cecil Clementi, which as a former cadet, could speak fluent Cantonese (Tsang 2004, 96). He was the first to introduce the first ethnic Chinese as unofficial members into the Executive Council. This change demonstrated that Hong Kong's government was conscious of the rising importance of the Chinese community (Tsang 2004, 105).

5.1.1 Japanese occupation of Hong Kong

During the second Sino-Japanese war, in 1941, Hong Kong was invaded by the Japanese Empire (Tsang 2009, 119). The British defense was poor and not well organized, as most of the military forces were already involved in fighting Nazi Germany in Europe. Japan invaded China in 1937, and occupied Hong Kong for 3 years and 8 months. Throughout this period, for the first time since the start of the British rule, Hong Kong was not under the British Crown, but was governed by Japanese army and Britain was only a prisoner and not a ruler anymore. In Hong Kong, Japan ruled for a short period but the impact of Japan in Hong Kong destroyed the 'myth of the invincibility of the British Empire' (Ibid.).

The British expatriates and the Chinese of Hong Kong, fought and tried to resist against the Japanese, while the British government in London was already thinking about the future of Hong Kong, planning the restoration of British sovereignty at the end of the war against Japan (Ibid.).

China presumed that the British sovereignty in Hong Kong would not be restored after the Japanese occupation. Therefore, China was sure that Hong Kong would return under its sovereignty after 1945 (Tsang 2009, 126). As a consequence, in 1942, Britain started to accept that there was a 'Hong Kong

problem' (Ibid.), and the government needed to discuss about Hong Kong's future. While before the Japanese occupation, as previously mentioned, Hong Kong was autonomous and able to administer the territory without British intervention.

In February 1942, the Lieutenant General Isogai Rensuke became the first Japanese Governor of Hong Kong. For the Japanese, Hong Kong's territory was strategically important as a defense of all East Asian territories from Western Imperialism. The period of Japanese occupation of Hong Kong's territories was not easy for the population that lived under terror because of the hardship of the Japanese army. In the late 1943, British expatriates, Chinese of Hong Kong and other minorities living on the island grouped in resistance movements to help others to escape from Hong Kong (Ibid.).

The Pacific War ended in 1945, when Japan accepted the terms of the allied powers in the Potsdam Declaration. Japanese Emperor Hirohito ordered the troops to surrender, and the British took the initiative to sail in direction of Hong Kong. At the time, Hong Kong was under Chinese control and the British had to ask Chinese consent before sailing to Hong Kong, but they did not. In fact, the intention of the British was to retake Hong Kong before the Chinese army. China was interested on the territory too, but it could not fight against Britain over Hong Kong, because it just became one of the 5 founding members of the United Nations and, for that reason, its hands were tied (Tsang 2009, 136). China and Britain could not agree about the Japanese surrender, therefore, they asked U.S. for support.

5.1.2 A new era for Hong Kong

In 1946 the new Hong Kong Governor, Sir Mark Young, restored the government and reintroduced the British rules in the island. Governor Young started ruling Hong Kong after a period of difficulties, mostly because of scarcity of food, and because of the bad economy inherited by the Japanese Military Administration. His work started in a delicate situation, as he knew that Hong Kong was changed because of the Japanese occupation and the population needed to be ruled differently. For this reason, he started a series of reforms. He knew that reforms were necessary to keep Hong Kong under Britain. Thus, he decided to give to the Hong Kongers popular political participation, introducing representation in the local administration (Tsang 2009, 148). Unfortunately, his idea was never put to practice, as his successor, Sir Grantham, did not agree with it. When the economy of Hong Kong was restored, it grew very fast: 36% in 4 years (Ibid.). In this period, Hong Kong was transformed in an industrial colony, a highly industrialized one involved in manufacturing and exports. In fact, in

1958, Hong Kong acquired financial autonomy, thanks to its stable fiscal foundation, which freed the colonial government from borrowing money from Britain (Mizuoka 2014, 25).

Shanghai was a strong competitor of Hong Kong in textile industry before CCP took power in China in 1949, but after it, many industries relocated from Shanghai to Hong Kong. Moreover, there was the Western trade embargo against PRC and the border was closed in 1950 (Tsang 2009, 164).

Until 1950, people could freely move to and from China, but because of the Communist regime, which was governing China, movement of people on the border was reduced. Many Chinese people, decided to immigrate to Hong Kong in the 1950s, and those Chinese who worked and lived there decided to settle in Hong Kong forever (Ibid.).

From the 1950s and during all the 1970s, the Chinese population of Hong Kong started to create their local identity, as they could not be part of China anymore, and their way of life was different from that in the PRC. Those who migrated from the mainland to Hong Kong knew that they had to start considering themselves as Hong Kongers and not just sojourners or visitors anymore, and started to get involved and interested about local political affairs (Tsang 2009, 182). In the analysis chapter, I will analyze this new generation of Chinese ethnicity through Confucianism philosophy.

5.1.3   Social Movements in Hong Kong before the handover in 1997

Social protests are not new in Hong Kong. In fact, protests, riots and disturbances characterized Hong Kong's history from the 1940s until today. The first protests in Hong Kong's history can be traced to the late 1940s. In 1946, a series of strikes started and continued until 1949, with a high intensity of industrial conflicts mainly focused on wages (Ngo 1999, 102). At the time, Hong Kong, even if still under British rule, was deeply influenced by the Chinese situation. The revolts were known as the 'confrontation', related to the Cultural Revolution, which was happening in China in the same period (Tsang 2009, 184). During this period, in Hong Kong, many were loyal to Mao Zedong, and to demonstrate their loyalty to mainland China, launched their version of the 'Cultural Revolution' in Hong Kong (Tsang 2009, 188). Therefore, during the period of the Chinese Revolution, two politically oriented trade union councils were born in Hong Kong. In 1947 the pro-Communist Federation of Trade Unions was born, while in 1948 the pro-Nationalist Trade Union Council was created (Ibid.). The last big strike of this period was on 30th of January 1950, and is known as the Hong Kong Tramway workers' strike in which the police had to intervene violently (Ibid, 103).

During all 1950s, Hong Kong was influenced by Chinese politics, and confrontations between the pro-Nationalist and pro-Communist communities happened (Ngo 1999, 103). In the 1950s, Hong

Kong was characterized by several riots, the two largest in 1952, in Kowloon, and in 1956 in Kowloon and Tsuen Wan. The latter were known as the 'Double Tenth Riots', in which some activists died and others have been later deported (Ibid, 103).

Riots and strikes, which have happened in Hong Kong in the 1960s, were provoked by different reasons than the previous ones. The most known Kowloon disturbances happened between 1965 and 1966. These disturbances were characterized by riots, demonstrations, marches, and violent street confrontation between the pro-Nationalist groups and the pro-Communist groups (Ngo 1999, 103). These disturbances in particular, symbolized, as affirmed by Lui and Chiu, "a turning point in the history of social conflicts in Hong Kong" (Ibid.). The first reason why these disturbances were born was in opposition to a fare increase by the Star Ferry. However, others reasons soon followed, which made a new generation of Hong Kongers emerge. This generation, on the contrary of their parents, was ready to express itself and its frustrations, and not just tacitly accept (Ibid, 104). Contrary to the disturbances in the 1950s, there was no political control of the situation, furthermore, there was no coordination and there was no central organization (Ibid.). Moreover, the colonial administration was totally unprepared and, afterwards, the police in Hong Kong went through anti-riot training and was allowed to use force to separate the disturbances (Tsang 2009, 188).

Another series of disturbances happened in 1967, beginning in a factory of the Hong Kong Artificial Flower Works, which turned into a riot on the 6th of May 1967. From the middle to the end of 1967, there was a period of violent riots in Hong Kong, which were born because of the bad conditions of the industrial workers (Ibid., 104). As mentioned by Tsang, they most probably were still organized and directed by the local branch of the CCP (Tsang 2009, 183) similar to what happened in 1966 (Ngo 1999, 105). During the confrontation in 1967, 51 people were killed, included 10 police officers, 12 civilians and many rioters, other 1172 were injured (Tsang 2009, 188).

From 1966 the riots showed the social discontent among the local population and particularly among young people, which was mainly because of the social gap between government and the population. The new generation of Hong Kongers was different from those of the pre-war generations or from their parents. According to Tsang, the young population in Hong Kong in the 1960s had a much better education than their parents, in fact there were 983.500 children of primary school age in 1966. Moreover, they had 'sufficiently secure livelihoods', which made them able to desire better chances in their lives (Tsang 2009, 189). In 1967, they had to choose to support either Communist China or the local government. Hong Kong's government until then provided stability, order and good life and

work possibilities for all locals. These locals felt for the first time part of Hong Kong, and the British-Hong Kong's government was their government (Ibid.).

In the 1970s, thanks to the Governors Sir Trench and Sir Murray MacLehose, a series of reforms happened. One of the most important was in 1971, when the Independent Commission Against Corruption was installed. Moreover, thanks to the expansion of the economy, the per capita GDP grew, improving the living standards and producing a generation of self-made billionaires (Tsang 2009, 192).

5.2 Hong Kong's new generation

As mentioned above, young Chinese Hong Kongers started feeling as if Hong Kong was their home, even if their families migrated from China. Tsang affirmed that "the 1960s was an important transitional period in the eventual emergence of a Hong Kong identity" (Tsang 2009, 183), resulting from the 1960s protests in which this new generation emerged.

The popular culture started to emerge and it was based on the Cantonese language, although the original language has been modified by the way of living and new terms and usages were introduced. Between 1978 and 1980 there was a massive flux of illegal Chinese immigrants moving to Hong Kong, to try to escape from the PRC. Hong Kong's government established, until 1980, the "touch base policy" (Tsang 2009, 193), that permitted to an illegal immigrant from China to stay in Hong Kong and receive the citizenship after 7 years of residence, if he reached Hong Kong's urban area and established there, found a job or reunified with the family members (Ibid.).

Still according to Tsang, Hong Kong's government in the 1980s was a perfect match between British colonial administration, and the main basic Confucianism principles such as efficiency, fairness, honesty, benevolent paternalism (Tsang 2009, 197).

Even if since 1960s Governors made several reforms, the colony remained undemocratic and ruled by the Crown's colony constitutional structure. In the 1980s, the will of the local people to become a democratic country increased. Tsang (2009) analyzed that in Hong Kong's history there were two main reasons why the colony did not become a democracy between 1947 and 1982: the insufficient public demand from the local people, and the existence of a government which had met the public expectations. As previously mentioned, the young local people were very satisfied with their life, so they were not asking more to the government at the time, despite the occurrence of a few riots in the past years. After the disturbances in the 1960s, the government created the City District Officers to

improve the channels of communication between the population and the Governor, and to increase public's participation in the local affairs of the colony.

What encouraged the local people to ask for democracy was the opening of negotiations between Britain and China to decide for the future of Hong Kong.

5.3 Hong Kong in transition (1982-1984)

Hong Kong was under British rule for 150 years until 1997. The last part of the history of Hong Kong under British rule can help us to understand better the present by analyzing the past (Ngo 1999, 111).

Before the 1980s, the only government body elected by the citizens was the Urban Council. Universal suffrage was introduced in Hong Kong in 1981 (Chu, Diamond and Nathan 2010, 188), but included only the professional élite and not the entire population.

Negotiations about the future of Hong Kong started in early September 1982, with the visit of the British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher to Beijing. In this occasion, Britain and China agreed on returning the colony to China on 1st of July 1997 (Ngo 1999, 111), as a consequence of the lease of the New Territories, which were lent to Britain for 99 years. The 1982 Sino-British agreement was the beginning of the decolonization process in Hong Kong.

China after the agreement was sure to be again in possession of the colony after 1997, and in December 1982, PRC released a new constitution including an article referring to Hong Kong, Macau and Taiwan (Tsang 2009, 221).

In 1984 the two governments signed the Sino-British JD, which decided formally that Hong Kong was going back to China in 1997 (J. T. Lam 1995, 53). Hong Kong would not achieve independence or a democratic government in 1997, but it would be transformed from a colony into a Special Administrative Region under PRC sovereignty. They agreed that Hong Kong would enjoy a high degree of autonomy in internal affairs for 50 years - until 2047. This decision was made by the two governments, which were the past and future of Hong Kong, without considering in the decision the Hong Kongers, which did not have any representative. While Beijing affirmed that they were represented by the Executive and Legislative Councils, which it was not a real representation of the local people as the members of both Councils were all nominated by the Governor and not with public elections (J. T. Lam 1995, 55). From a survey made in 1982, as mentioned by Richard Baum, only 4% of the adult locals living in Hong Kong wanted the colony to return to China (Baum 1999, 418).

While after the signature of the JD and the assurance of being autonomous for 50 years, the local citizens were much more confident to return to the mainland (Ibid.).

From the 1980s, the conflicts related to political issues increased drastically, because before the agreement between the two governments, the decolonization process and a possible democratization were really far from the political reality (Ngo 1999, 112). The fight for democratization characterized the protests between 1980s and 1990s (Ibid.), in particular after 1989, with the Tiananmen Incident. After the Tiananmen Square Massacre, the people of Hong Kong went to the streets to protest against the Chinese government and its method to suppress pro-democracy demonstrators in Beijing (Baum 1999, 418). The largest anti-Communist demonstrations in the world in 1989 happened in Hong Kong, where 20% of the population, around one million people, marched on the streets (Ibid).

The democratization process started in 1985, as a consequence of what was stipulated in the JD. The two governments agreed that the SAR was going to be constituted by elections. Between 1985 and 1988, the Legislative Council was constituted by 24 indirectly elected members, 22 appointed members, and 10 official members (J. T. Lam 1995, 54). What the population wanted was universal suffrage, and not elections held only by the professional élite, which was less than 1% of the total population (Ibid.).

In 1990, the Basic Law was adopted in Hong Kong, also known as the mini constitution of HKSAR (Ash, Ferdinand and Hook 2000, 176). The Basic Law defines the functions of HKSAR, and more importantly, it includes the fundamental rights and duties of the residents and the relationship between Hong Kong and PRC (Ibid.). Moreover, the Basic Law provided that after the third term, in 2005, China had the power to modify, in case of need, the method of selection of the LegCo and Chief Executive (J. Chan 2014, 572).

What was decided with the Basic Law was to keep Hong Kong unchanged for the next 50 years, so that it kept its western way of life and capitalist economy. Furthermore, the Article 9 of the Basic Law established that in Hong Kong apart of the Chinese language, English was considered an official language too and was to be used by the executive authorities, legislature and judiciary (Bray and Koo 2004, 220).

In 1992, arrived in Hong Kong its last Governor under British Crown, Chris Patten. During his mandate, he made a series of political proposals, which were known as "Patten Package", in which he established direct elected legislature (MacPherson 1997, 280), this package included:

"

1. the expansion of the directly elected seats of the Legislative Council from 18 to 20 members;
2. the adoption of a one-man-one-vote system in functional constituency elections;
3. the expansion of the scope of functional constituencies to include every working citizen;
4. the abolition of appointed membership in district boards and municipal councils;
5. the formation of an Election Committee composed of directly elected members of the district boards and the municipal councils to elect 10 members to the Legislative Council, and
6. the separation of the membership of the Executive and Legislative Councils" (J. T. Lam 1995, 55).

Patten wanted to make Hong Kong more democratic before the handover, in order to keep it like this until 2047, since as agreed with China in the JD this could not be changed until there.

However, after these series of reforms, China accused Hong Kong's government of introducing radical democratic reforms which would damage the stability and prosperity of Hong Kong (J. T. Lam 1995, 56). Because of these strong and negative reactions from China about the "Patten Package", the British-Hong Kong Government had to delay the legislation of these reforms. Between 1993 and 1994 the two governments discussed about these democratic reforms and China declared that if any of these reforms was implemented they would not have complied with what was agreed in the JD, and were going to modify Hong Kong's system after the handover in 1997 (J. T. Lam 1995, 56). At the end, it was agreed that after the handover, China was going to be the final sovereign master, and it was going to review all Hong Kong's laws and contracts to make them effective after 1997 (Ibid). China affirmed that even if Hong Kong would get a high degree of autonomy, in the reality it was not going to be totally independent (J. T. Lam 1995, 61), as part of the political system and administration would still go through Beijing before being effective in Hong Kong.

5.4 Hong Kong Special Administrative Region

On the 1st of July 1997 Hong Kong became a Special Administrative Region (HKSAR) of the PRC, governed by the Basic Law promulgated by the National People's Congress (NPC) in Beijing (Chu, Diamond and Nathan 2010, 187). In 1997 the last British governor, Chris Patten, handed Hong Kong back to the PRC (Cullinane and Cullinane 2003, 279), for the first time since 1842 (Bray and Koo 2004, 220).

During the Sino-British negotiations from 1981 to 1984, China had subsidized financial stability in Hong Kong and had made investments in the territory's real estate, buildings and companies (Overholt 1991, 30). Therefore, since the negotiations started, China acted as if Hong Kong was already under its power, and started to influence the economy on the island in order to be able to have flourishing international commerce after the handover. Moreover, Beijing used Hong Kong's market to its own benefit, as China was subject to an embargo from U.S.

Britain and China agreed, in the JD of 1984, that from the reunification until 2047 a preservation of much of the colonial system was guaranteed for the HKSAR (Cullen and Loh 2005, 153).

As agreed in the JD, Hong Kong would have a high degree of autonomy, and would be in charge of it local affairs, where Hong Kongers would rule Hong Kong. The same system used by China in Taiwan, and after in Macau, was applied in Hong Kong: the "One Country – Two Systems", which had the aim to maintain prosperity and stability in Hong Kong (Ash, Ferdinand and Hook 2000, 98). After 1997, Hong Kong under China's sovereignty has been subject to several democratic reforms regarding the process for the selection of the legislature (J. Chan 2014, 572).

Under the Basic Law, HKSAR enjoys only a restricted form of democratic participation. Hong Kong's government is selected mainly by Beijing (Cullen and Loh 2005, 153), with some cases of universal suffrage. In fact, from 1997, the administrative head of the HKSAR is the Chief Executive, which is not democratically elected through universal suffrage, but by a selected election committee, constituted of 800 members from the professional élite in the community (Cullinane and Cullinane 2003, 280). Moreover, the Chief Executive has all the power in his hands, as there is no political party structure in Hong Kong. However, when the CE needs, he can call upon the services of a few experienced politicians and political advisers (Cullen and Loh 2005, 2). After the handover in 1997, mainland China had the power to rewrite the rules of how to govern Hong Kong, as agreed with Britain after the "Patten Package" (S. H.-W. Wong 2015, 6).

Under the Executive Council there is the Legislative Council, which is the city's legislature (S. H.-W. Wong 2015, 6). Contrary to the case of the Chief Executive, the LegCo is partly elected through universal suffrage every four years (Ibid.), but in fact less than half of its members are directly elected by all Hong Kong's residents (Cullen and Loh 2005, 153) . The LegCo consists of 60 elected members: 24 elected by geographical constituencies, 30 elected by functional constituencies and 6 elected by an election committee (Cullinane and Cullinane 2003, 280). The geographical constituencies are contented by two political camps: the pro-establishment camp consisting of pro-Beijing parties which support the single-party regime, as happens in China, while the second is the pan-democratic camp which is constituted by pro-democracy parties that promote the cause of democratization (S. H.-W. Wong 2015, 6). The 30 elected members of the functional constituencies are not elected by universal

suffrage, but only by a tiny electorate (Sing 2009, 98). The composition of the LegCo, even in 2014, was barely 60% by popular vote, which represent less than 30% of the votes in the legislature (J. Chan 2014, 572). Since 2005, mainland China can change the selection procedure of the LegCo and CE if needed, but the central government has repeatedly decided that there is no need (Ibid.). Beijing is not new in promising to Hong Kong universal suffrage. After 1997, Beijing promised once more, in 2004, that it would introduce universal suffrage on the vote for Chief Executive before 2012, but that did not happen. In 2003, Hong Kong has been again the stage of new demonstrations, the main one on 1st of July rally in 2003, in which more than half million citizens marched on the streets to protest against the national security legislation and the incompetence of Hong Kong's government in dealing with social and economic crisis (Chan and Lee 2007, 94). During 2005, Hong Kong has seen the resignation of the unpopular Chief Executive Tung Chee-hwa, and the local economy showed a sign of sustainable recovery and one week before the LegCo vote, Hong Kong's residents went to the streets (Ibid.). The major issue behind 2005's demonstrations was the government's political reform proposal, which was criticized as too conservative. On July1st 2006, 40.000 Hong Kongers went to the streets and demonstrated again to achieve a rapid democratization on the territory (Ibid.). Chan and Lee asserted that the 2006 protests are considered the 'forming core of a new pro-democracy movement in Hong Kong' (Ibid., 54). Since 2007, Beijing asserted that they would allow universal suffrage in Hong Kong on the election of the Chief Executive in 2017, and would allow, by 2020, the vote for the entire LegCo (Sing 2009, 98). It was not the first time that the LegCo was at the center of the debate in Hong Kong, in fact it had already been between 1985 and 1987. In this occasion, Britain rejected the demands, as they affirmed that China was the one who should bring democracy to Hong Kong, as at the time there was already an agreement regarding the handover in 1997 (J. Chan 2014, 571). The first changes by Hong Kong's government have been in 1991, with the introduction of partial universal suffrage for the election of the LegCo. Since then, the directly elected component has increased, but still today it is not more than 50% of the members of the LegCo (Ibid., 572). As will be seen in the subchapter 3.5, at the moment, by June 2015, Beijing and the pro-democratic parties in Hong Kong are discussing regarding the elections of 2017 and several political reforms.

In 2008, the pan-democrats parties were already discussing with Beijing to achieve universal suffrage in the 2012 elections, with a petition with 10.000 signatures demanding it (A. Wong 2008).

The 2012 elections were at the center of the debate between the pan-democrats and Beijing throughout 2010. At the time, the Constitutional Affairs Sir Lam Sui-lung argued that the central government wanted to help Hong Kong since 2007, when the universal suffrage timetable was adopted, with the aim to allow universal suffrage in the Chief Executive election of 2017 and LegCo elections in 2020 (Chong 2012).

Therefore, since 2012, the focus has been on the nomination process of the next Chief Executive for the election of 2017 (J. Chan 2014, 573). As asserted in the article 45 of the Basic Law, the CE 'shall be elected by universal suffrage upon nomination by a broadly representative nomination committee in accordance with a democratic process' (Ibid.). Before the NPCSC's decision upon the nomination of the CE candidates, Hong Kongers were 'divided and polarized', as affirmed by Chan. Hong Kong's government began a consultation from 2013 throughout 2014 (Ibid.), and by the end of 2014 there were different proposals which were not convincing to any of the actors in the consultation (Ibid.).

5.5 Understanding the Umbrella Revolution and recent events (2014-2015 protests)

University professor Benny Tai, together with two other professors, started the Occupy Central Movement in the end of 2012 (J. Chan 2014, 574), which has been at the center of the Umbrella Movement in 2014's protests. Professor Tai started a campaign for democracy in Hong Kong since he was a young university student, and he represents the new young generation which starting emerging in the 1960s demonstrations. Therefore, the Occupy Central Movement was born in 2012, with the intention to create a model for selecting the Chief Executive without any restrictions on the 2017's election (Ibid).

The name of the movement just represents Hong Kong, as in fact, Central is the name of the area in the center of the metropolis, heart of the financial district and nearby the government offices. They wanted to create a peaceful movement, but at the same time a movement of civil disobedience. In June 2014, after the consultancy process of Hong Kong's government, the 15 models previously proposed by the community have been voted. The result was that only three of those models for popular vote were chosen, which included only a few elements of civic nomination. Thus, those who could vote were not free to choose, but they had to vote in favor of the civic nomination. Due to this failure, at that time, the Occupy Central movement had low support among the population (Ibid., 575). In the end of July 2014, the Chief Executive submitted the Hong Kong government's consultation process to the NPCSC. Afterwards, in August 2014, the NPCSC decided to keep the same model to select the Election Committee used in 2012, for the 2017's election (Ibid.). Moreover, they decided that each candidate would need the authorization of more than 50% of the members of the nomination committee, while on the selection of the previous Executive Committee the requirement was 12,5%. With this decision, the pro-democratic parties are left with limited choices. Chan affirmed that in his opinion they had 2 choices only, the first one was to use their representation in the LegCo to vote the

electoral legislation introduced by Hong Kong's government, while the second choice would be to take the issue to the streets (Ibid., 576).

After the NPCSC's decision, students started to boycott classes and demonstrate outside the government headquarters (J. Chan 2014, 576). The protests were peaceful, and the students had no intention of destroying or damaging anything (Zhu 2014). By the end of September 2014, Benny Tai and his group of the Occupy Central Movement joined the students on the streets. Afterwards, the demonstrations spread all over Hong Kong's streets, occupying the Central, shopping districts at Causeway Bay, and Mongkok (J. Chan 2014, 576). As is usually the case with demonstrations, the police tried to contain the group and to stop other people from joining the protests (J. Chan 2014, 576) using unnecessary violence in Mongkok (O'Reilly 2014). After the police started to use tear gas against the protesters, many other Hong Kongers joined the demonstrations, supporting the students using umbrellas as a protection from the Police's pepper spray (J. Chan 2014, 576). This friendly gesture from the Hong Kongers originated the movement's popular name, Umbrella Movement (Ibid.).

The ones at the origin of the protests wanted the NPCSC to take back its decision made in August 2014, and restart the consultation process allowing civil nomination (Ibid.) for next Chief Executive's election (O'Reilly 2014). Moreover, after the police started using tear gas, students asked for the resignation of the current Chief Executive (J. Chan 2014, 576). Furthermore, many scholars, including Chan, think that another reason why the students started protesting in 2014 was because they wanted a greater control of their lives, in particular their economic prospects (Ibid., 578). Unfortunately, Hong Kong's government took a decision, which is in accordance with Article 45 of the Basic Law; therefore, they decided Hong Kong could not achieve civil nomination for next election (J. Chan 2014, 576). Moreover, in the JD is was never affirmed that Hong Kong would receive universal suffrage, and that is why Beijing thought that its proposal was much more than Hong Kong ever had (Zhu 2014).

Because the protests spread all over the metropolis, the main roads were occupied, causing considerable inconvenience to the public and many people who were affected by it were dissatisfied with the demonstrations (J. Chan 2014, 576).

The protests were conducted, as mentioned above, by many different organizations, and the movement could not be controlled anymore (J. Chan 2014, 576). Some organizations were pro-democracy while others were pro-Beijing (O'Reilly 2014), such as the Anti-Occupy Central group which, as affirmed by Chan, was financed by the central government (J. Chan 2014, 577).

On 21st of October 2014, Hong Kong's government finally met the students, which had the opportunity to present the demands to the government. As previously exposed, two of the requests were the cancellation of the decision the government had taken in August 2014, and the selection of the Chief Executive by civil nomination. Moreover, the students asked for the abolishment of the functional constituencies (J. Chan 2014, 577), which at the moment are not selected by universal suffrage (Sing 2009, 98). The last request was a clear timetable to achieve these objectives (J. Chan 2014, 577).

The NPCSC decided to submit a report including all issues caused by their decision in August 2014 to the central government in Beijing. Moreover, it promised to continue the dialogue with the protestors, and that Hong Kong's government will continue to work on the constitutional reform after 2017 (J. Chan 2014, 577). Consequently, the students were not satisfied with these decisions and decided to keep protesting on the streets. On the other hand, the pro-Beijing groups managed to get an injunction against the pro-democratic students to clear the areas occupied by them (Ibid.). After all these difficulties, the students did not want to retreat, as it would mean a defeat, therefore they affirmed, in November 2014, that they wanted to continue stay on the streets (Ibid.). By contrast, as Hong Kong's government could not satisfy the students' requests, they decided to let the protests go on hoping they would stop as soon as the dissatisfaction of the public grew (J. Chan 2014, 578). While Beijing had condemned the movement, adding that foreign actors such as U.S. were behind it (Ibid.), even if they had no proof. Additionally, Beijing affirmed that the demonstrations of the Umbrella Movement were not regarding Hong Kong's democracy, but 'national security', and therefore Beijing had no intention to suppress the movement, since it was not on the mainland leaders' agenda (J. Chan 2014, 578).

Chan argued that the students were discussing with Hong Kong's government, which had the hands tied, as the political reforms were decided by the central government (Ibid., 578).

Beijing promised to Britain that the current system at the handover in 1997 could not be changed until 2047. Therefore, from one side Beijing could not modify the system itself nor introduce universal suffrage (Zhu 2014, 1). On the other hand, also as agreed with Britain in the Basic Law, from 2005 the central government could modify the selection of the Chief Executive, if needed (J. Chan 2014, 572). Moreover, Britain regularly checks on Hong Kong and David Cameron affirmed, in October 2014, that people of Hong Kong should have "real choices" to vote, even more as when Britain returned the colony to China, they agreed on guaranteeing the essential rights and freedoms (Blair, Telegraph.co.uk 2015).

The protests in 2014 by the Occupy Central Movement were directly connected with China's present and future (Harris 2014). Additionally, the demonstrations caused considerable inconvenience to the local community, and the occupation started to have an impact on the economy (J. Chan 2014, 578). In fact, property prices increased considerably, and economic inequality between rich and poor Hong Kongers grew (Ibid.).

In April 2015, Hong Kong's government proposed a plan for electoral reform. In this plan, residents would have the power to choose their next Chief Executive in the 2017 elections between a number of candidates which had been previously approved by Beijing (Blair, Telegraph.co.uk 2015).

Throughout the first semester of 2015, the debate between protestors and Hong Kong's government continued. In April 2015, Pro-Democracy protest leaders said that if the CCP would not change the way of voting the Chief Executive, they would return to the streets, as they did in 2014 (Phillips 2015). Under the Pro-Democracy groups' proposals, 5 million people would be allowed to vote for up to three candidates, who would have been previously approved by 1200 members nominated by Beijing (Phillips 2015). Normally they are approved by 800 members of the élite Hong Kong class. By contrast, the Pro-Democracy protest leaders accuse Beijing of introducing a "fake democracy" with these political reforms (Phillips 2015), while their request is to achieve genuine choice of candidates for next election in 2017 (AP 2015).

On May 3rd 2015 the Chief Executive Leung Chun-Ying urged the Pro-Democracy Movement to accept the proposed political reform package, as it could be dropped by the next Chief Executive, and therefore should be voted as soon as possible to become real (J. Lam 2015).

By June 2015, the debate between Hong Kong's government and Pro-Democratic groups was still going on.

On the 17th of June, Hong Kong's government submitted the reform package, presented to Hong Kongers in August 2014 and described earlier in the chapter, to the LegCo (Tiezzi 2015), which had until the 19th of June to vote it. The proposal was defeated because Hong Kong's Lawmakers have rejected the reform package (AP 2015) by boycotting the vote: only 37 members of 70 were present during the vote (Alexander and Ng 2015), while 47 votes were needed to reach the 2/3 majority (Blair and Ng 2015). Therefore, Hong Kong's government did not have enough support to pass the reform (AP 2015). After the vote Alan Leong, member of Hong Kong's LegCo affirmed that "this is not the end of the democratic movement. This is a new beginning" (Alexander and Ng 2015). As the reform package has not been approved, the selection of Chief Executive for next election of 2017 would be in the same way as in 2012's election (Ibid.).

The week after the vote, many international newspapers published hard words against the Pro-Democracy Camp, accusing them to destroy Hong Kong's democratic development process (AP 2015).

In last days of June 2015, Professor Tai affirmed on an interview that a new wave of protests is being planned (AP 2015).

6. Analysis

The thesis until now had the aim to trace a way, which leads to understanding how and what Hong Kong is today. Hong Kong has a long history, as before being a British colony it was a territory under the Chinese Empire, and since 1997 is under Chinese control again.

Thanks to the British and with the help of the Chinese, today Hong Kong is a Special Administrative Region under Chinese control, an international metropolis, a developed harbor and an international commercial center. Lately, most people have heard more about Hong Kong, because in 2014 has been on the center of a series of protests, and still today, June 2015, people still talk about Hong Kong's situation because the dispute between the Umbrella Movement and Hong Kong's government has not been solved.

This part of the thesis combines the theories described in chapter 4 with the specific case of Hong Kong and the Umbrella Movement in particular. I decided to divide the analysis chapter in 4 sub-chapters, which will help me to answer my problem formulation "Why *are the activists protesting?*".

I go through the 2014's protests and the specific demands of the Umbrella Movement. Moreover, I analyze the demonstrations of the past to understand if the reasons are similar and to discover if what the Hong Kongers want to achieve changed with the time. After this, my intention is to understand how autonomous from China is Hong Kong in order to answer my research question "*What is the democratic deficit in Hong Kong?*"

The intention of my research question is to create an understanding through the democratic deficit in Hong Kong, if the demands of the Umbrella Movement are based on an effective deficit, and what will happen if their demands will be answered.

Based on the structure of the previous chapters and the analysis, I will be able to answer my problem formulation and research question in the conclusive part.

6.1 Understanding the Umbrella Movement in 2014's protests

This part examines the 2014's demonstrations. Through the Social Movement Theory I analyze why the protests started and why these different movements originated to demonstrate together creating the Umbrella Movement. After uncovering the reasons why part of the Hong Kongers went to the streets in 2014, I analyze if the reasons are common with the past protests.

In the theoretical part, I decided to describe and explain the development of the social movement, based on the basic characteristics of the Social Movement Theory. As written in the chapter 4.5, I decided to make a selection, since many different Social Movement Theory exist. Therefore, I analyze 2014's protests and its characteristics, which are typical both of the New Social Movement Theory and the Social Movement Theory.

Those who started the 2014's protests were students, which decided to boycott classes and started to demonstrate outside the government headquarter in Hong Kong. Young high-educated people are those who typically start protests, according to the New Social Movement Theory. The students conducted for all the 11 weeks of protests, peaceful demonstrations with no intention to destroy or damage anything. These students were not from the same social class, as their background was not important. The reasons why they were protesting, on the other hand, have been fundamental to make them organize in a unique group sharing the same purpose. One of the reasons why the students started protesting on the streets was the electoral reform package presented by NPCSC in August 2014. The package was supposed to allow universal suffrage for the CE election in 2017, as decided by the NPCSC in 2007. Instead, the package required 50% of the members of the national committee to vote the candidates, instead of the 12,5% allowed before the reform package. Consequently, the students went to the streets to protest against the reform package, did not include universal suffrage. As is typical of the Social Movement Theory, the activists protest because of a transformation in the environment that mostly did not match their will. Often, when the protests are intense, as in Hong Kong in 2014, the stability of the society has been broken, and as Gundelach affirmed, social movements are the force to change the fracture in the society and pass from a societal formation to another (Peterson 1989, 420). In fact, through the protests in the streets since October 2014, the Umbrella Movement demands a change in the political system of Hong Kong.

After some days from the first protest, the young students have been joined by the Occupy Central Movement, which had protested in 2012. The Occupy Central Movement identifies the past young generation which emerged in Hong Kong in the protests of the 1960s, as some of its members actually participated in the protests of 1960s.

After the students and the Occupy Central Movement started to protest together, the newspapers started to call the organizations the Umbrella Movement or Umbrella Revolution. The organizations were protesting together because of common interests and specific goals, but they did not want to be identified with one name, even more as they did not intend to make any revolution. This aspect is typical of the New Social Movement Theory, and in fact the organizations, even if they have a common goal, do not want to be identified as a single movement. They never accepted to be called

Umbrella Revolution, as the protests were peaceful. The activists never used force during the demonstrations, in contrast to the police, that started using pepper spray. The result is that the newspapers identified the protestors as a unique movement, under the name of Umbrella Movement, as the protestors used umbrellas to protect themselves from the pepper spray. After the students took the streets, many other Hong Kongers joined the protests to support the students that had started the protests against the political reform package. This called the attention of the media, thanks to the colorful umbrellas. In fact, mass media is fundamental for a social movement as, together with networks and the initiative of other organizations, helps the transformation of social conflicts in political actions, by spreading the demands of the activists all over the world. Until the end of 2014, the students and other members of the Umbrella Movement did not achieve any requested demands and, as a result, continued protesting on the streets. However, Beijing affirmed that because of what is written in the Basic Law, the activists were supposed to be glad of the proposal made by the NPCSC. In fact, the Basic Law states that the CE election is made by a nomination committee, which is appointed by the Central government. The nomination committee is composed by 800 members divided per sectors and each candidate would need the authorization of 12,5% of the members of the nomination committee, while the reform package proposed would require the authorization by more than 50% of the members of the nomination of the committee. Despite of what is affirmed by Beijing, the Umbrella Movement would not accept any reform that was not including universal suffrage.

Another aspect typical of New Social Movement Theory that can be traced in the 2014's protests is that the activists want to be part of the 'political arena' by starting a dialogue with the government. This dialogue happened on the 21st of October 2014, when the students could directly present their demands to Hong Kong's government. The request was to take back the decision the government made during the summer 2014, to conduct the selection of the Chief Executive in 2017 in the same way they did in 2012. As a result of this decision, no universal suffrage would be allowed.

All the groups part of the Umbrella Movement had the same goals, but their way of manifesting was different. In fact, based on the Social Theory Movement, the organizations taking part in the protests have a different role in the 'plan of attack'. The Occupy Central Movement had the role to create and present to Hong Kong's government a different proposal regarding the way the Chief Executive would be selected in 2017's election. The students, on the other hand, had the role to protest and try to get a dialogue with the government outside the institutional channels.

There are several reasons why the students protested and, as mentioned above, one of the reasons the reform package, while another reason was to achieve universal suffrage for the next CE election and from 2017 forever. Another reason which is secondary to those described, is related to their way of

life, since the new young generation is used to live in a globalized world, which is influenced by the Western way of life. This connects with the fact that before 1997 Hong Kong was under Britain, which together with China agreed that after the handover Hong Kong would keep the system and the way of life until 2047. Therefore, the new Hong Kong's generation has an idea of future that they want to achieve, which is influenced by their life style. They want a better life, in which political liberties and basic human rights are respected. Moreover, they want a wealthier life with better economic and social conditions.

Social Movements, old and new, are a series of organizations that group in a movement because of common goals. This is the case of all protests in Hong Kong since 1940s. The aim of all the demonstrations was to change something in the society, which would not be changed by normal bureaucracy. While the demonstrations and riots before the 1980s had a more labor-capitalist conflict, which is typical of Social Movement Theory, the latest protests and those of 2014, in contrast, have more political issues reasons, aimed to change political opportunities.

In the sub-chapter 5.1.3, I described social movements in Hong Kong before the handover in 1997. The first protests, as previously mentioned, had a different purpose than those in 2014. In fact, the first protests were more industrial conflicts, mainly focused on wage problematics. At the time, Hong Kong was highly influenced by China and its Cultural Revolution, which influenced Hong Kong throughout the 1950s. In this period, the protests and riots were often organized by workers and unions. Whereas students went to the streets for the first time in the 1960s. During these riots a new generations of Hong Kongers come out. The protests in the 1960s counted with the participation of some members of the 2014's Occupy Central Movement. During this period, some of the riots were still organized against economic-capitalist issues and social gap between the population and the élite class. Even if some of these riots were organized by workers, those most involved were the local population and young people, similar to what happened in 2014's protests. The young people started to go to the streets because they wanted a better life than that of their parents. In fact, they did not want to live in 'sufficiently secure livelihoods' anymore (Tsang 2009, 189). On the contrary, they wanted to achieve wealth and good job positions. It is possible to see a few similarities between the protests in the 1960s and those in 2014, while no similarities exist between the 1940s protests and those in 2014.

Based on the Social Movement Theory, I can affirm that the new Hong Kongers' generation in 2014, want to change Hong Kong from how it was in the past. They demand from the government changes in the political sphere. They mostly ask for universal suffrage, in order to be free to vote whoever they want to represent them until 2022. It is possible the more demands might follow, but at this time,

they want to achieve basic individual liberties, in the same way the young Hong Kongers in the 1960s wanted.

6.2 Hong Kong's request of 'genuine democracy'

This sub-chapter discusses and examines the affirmation of some newspapers in 2014 that Hong Kongers wanted to achieve genuine democracy. Therefore, I analyze their genuine democracy demand in relation to the main concept of democracy, explained in the chapter 4. The aim of this sub-chapter, similar to the previous one, is to help answering the problem formulation.

On the 19th of June 2015 the lawmakers rejected the reform package proposed by Hong Kong's government. With the approval of that reform, Hong Kong's citizens would still not able to vote for their future CE through universal suffrage. Therefore, the political reform package has been rejected because it did not allow genuine universal suffrage. Activists of the Umbrella Movement and media, since the beginning of the protests in 2014, use the term genuine democracy to explain what they want to achieve for next CE election in 2017. They use this term as a synonymous of genuine universal suffrage. As written in chapter 4.1, democracy includes some basic characteristics and universal suffrage is one of them. Therefore, universal suffrage is only one aspect of genuine democracy, and not a synonym. However, what the Umbrella Movement want by asking genuine democracy to Hong Kong's government, is free elections to all Hong Kong's citizens.

Apart from universal suffrage, as mentioned above, the other characteristics of modern democracy are equality in social conditions, individual liberties, basic human rights, and fair, honest and periodic elections. Moreover, as typical of representative democracy, the mass is represented by universal suffrage. Through elections and the right to vote by universal suffrage, the represented trust the representatives' actions. As genuine democracy literally means 'people rule people', Hong Kong's activists asking for genuine democracy want to be able to choose their representatives through universal suffrage entirely, not only in a part of the election. In the classical sense of the meaning, a government ruled by democracy is a government in which the majority, in this case the Hong Kongers, rule the population on the island.

Another important aspect of democracy is to have fair, honest and periodic elections. The Chief Executive is, since 1997, elected every 5 years, as stated in the Basic Law. Nevertheless, the way he is elected is not democratic, as Hong Kongers can vote on a list of candidates that are selected by Beijing. Candidates that, according to the media, represent Pro-Beijing interests (E. Yu 2014).

Therefore, the election is not fair and honest, as the Hong Kongers are not free to choose who will represent them. It is, in fact, only a pseudo universal suffrage (K. Chan 2015), as they can vote by universal suffrage only the list of candidates already selected by the nomination committee. Moreover, as written in a previous chapter, the Chief Executive is the only who has the administrative power in Hong Kong as there are no political parties. However, he can consult politicians only in specific occasions in which he needs a consultation. Apart from the CE, the other political body is the LegCo, which is entitled on the legislature in the territory. Similar to the CE, the LegCo can be voted by universal suffrage, although only 24 of the total 60 members. In fact, if the Umbrella Movement manages to achieve complete universal suffrage for next CE election in 2017, it will continue fight to achieve universal suffrage for LegCo election in 2020 (Martin 2009-2010, i).

The activists and the lawmakers who did not approved the political reform package accused Hong Kong's government of wanting to establish a fake democracy (Phillips, Telegraph.co.uk 2015), by allowing universal suffrage only after the committee already pre-selected the candidates. From the theoretical part in sub-chapter 4.2, a fake democracy represents the type of democracy which is not equal democracy, and in which only a predominant class has the numerical majority in the government. In the case of Hong Kong, the predominant class is decided by Beijing through the nominating committee that selects the candidates for the position of Chief Executive. In contrast, what the activists want is a true democracy in which the government represents equally the totality citizens. Therefore, the Umbrella Movement wants Hong Kong to be free to rule itself, by choosing its representatives. Moreover, in case of a fake democracy, Hong Kong's citizens would have a restricted suffrage, which is not considered democracy; even more as basic democratic characteristics such as equality, freedom to vote and individual liberties are missing.

6.3 Understanding Hong Kong's autonomy and its relations with mainland China

In the chapter 5.4 it was described how the HKSAR is governed since 1997 under Chinese sovereignty. Moreover, in the sub-chapter 3.2 I decided to transcribe some specific articles extrapolated from the Basic Law. This mini constitution of Hong Kong makes clear what is in the Hong Kong's power and what is decided only by Beijing. Based on these material and two of the theories I described in chapter 4, Representative Democracy and Liberal Democracy, I propose an answer to my research question "*What is the democratic deficit in Hong Kong?*".

Taiwan, Hong Kong and, from 1999, Macau, are regulated by the principle "One country, two systems" created by Deng Xiaoping initially to solve the question of Taiwan, and later applied to Hong Kong and Macau too. China used this principle in those territories, which had a complicated historical background. This principle was based on the mission of accomplishing national reunification, present in the Third Plenary Session of the Eleventh Central Committee of the CPC in 1978. Furthermore, China and Britain in 1984, agreed that Hong Kong after the handover in 1997, would keep the same political, economic and capitalist systems it had under British control.

Hong Kong, in 1997, under the principle of "One country, two systems" has been transformed in a Special Administrative Region under Chinese sovereignty. China since the JD with Britain in 1984 stated clearly that the high degree of autonomy of Hong Kong would not mean a total independence. China, gave Hong Kong several powers to let it control the territory without the intervention of Beijing. However, it kept two fundamental powers: political control, and foreign affairs.

The Umbrella Movement asks since 2014 for genuine universal suffrage to Hong Kong's government, which cannot take political decisions as those are in China's control. As explained in chapter 4, to be able to establish a stable democracy, both leaders and citizens have to support the idea (Ringen 2008). In the case of Hong Kong, though, the only asking for genuine democracy is the Umbrella Movement. As a result, it has no support from the CE or the LegCo, apart from the Pro-democracy lawmakers. Moreover, as the political power is under Chinese control, Beijing decided to transfer its power to the hands of an élite that representing Pro-Beijing interests under central government's guidance.

According to the agreement with Britain, China is supposed to observe a high degree of self-restraint in the domestic affairs of Hong Kong (Yep 2013, 4, Yep 2013). The Basic Law mainly prescribes the relations between the central government and Hong Kong's government. In fact, the SAR is allowed by NPC, as stated in the article 2 of the Basic Law, to exercise a high degree of autonomy in the territory and enjoy the administrative, executive, legislative and judicial powers. Furthermore, article 5 of this 'mini-constitution' established that the "socialist system and policies shall not be practiced in the HKSAR". Britain and China agreed that the previous capitalist system Hong Kong had under British rule and the way of life should remain unchanged until 2047 (Wong 2015, 50). As should the previous laws in force in the territory, such as common law, rules of equity, ordinances, subordinate legislation and customary law (Wong 2015, 51). The exception being any law that is not compatible with PRC's laws.

Another aspect agreed between Britain and China, was the preservation of free market capitalism, and that China would allow freedom of speech and press, which are essential in safeguarding the freedom of information (Ibid., 52). Therefore, Hong Kong was provided with several freedoms typical

of liberal democracies, such as freedom of expression and access to information. While China kept under its jurisdiction the selection procedure of the Chief Executive and part of the LegCo. Therefore, China allows Hong Kong to have several liberties, but still keeps one of the fundamental liberties, in the form of political liberties, which are the expression of people's freedom to participate actively in the decision-making rule, by means of universal suffrage. Universal suffrage and people's rights to vote for their representatives are fundamental liberties of representative democracy and liberal democracy, therefore of genuine democracy itself.

Hong Kong as a Special Administrative Region has several powers, which China transferred to the hands of the CE and LegCo. HKSAR is independent from China for all domestic affairs such as property rights, civic liberties, judiciary system, among others. Those liberties such as property, association, movements, expression are typical of liberal democracy. In fact, article 6 and 7 of the Basic law established that the HKSAR's government should protect private ownership and that land and natural resources facing part of HKSAR territory are only at HKSAR disposal (Wong 2015, 50). Another factor which makes Honk Kong special is that on the contrary of other Chinese subnational governments, it does not have to submit part of its income to Beijing, but they can keep all (Ibid).

Therefore, Hong Kongers are entitled to several liberties, but that makes Hong Kong only a pseudo democracy, due to the lack of political liberties, which diminish citizen's basic rights.

By achieving genuine democracy, Hong Kong will not be completely independent from China, but it will achieve a higher degree of autonomy, which might make possible the rise of a democracy in the future. However, as written in theory section, the process of liberalization and democratization is a long-term process, which needs time to allow the population to adapt.

Hong Kong possesses some of the several characteristics of Liberal and Representative Democracy thanks to the agreement Britain and China made in 1984, and which China will keep until 2047. On the other hand, some basic liberties are missing, therefore a democratic deficit exists in Hong Kong due to the political control of China over Hong Kong. It is due to this deficit that the Umbrella Movement took the streets in to protest. As exposed in the previous sub-chapter, the Umbrella Movement demands genuine democracy, by means of universal suffrage, which is the mass' natural competence. By achieving universal suffrage in Hong Kong, the government would represent the majority of the population and, therefore, the government would 'rule many'. On the contrary, until genuine universal suffrage is not be allowed on the island, the government represents only those supporting Pro-Beijing groups.

Universal suffrage is fundamental in representative democracy, and, in fact, through elections and the right to vote the citizens trust their representatives. According to Representative Democracy, as the CE is not completely elected by the Hong Kongers, the citizens do not trust him as he is acting on the interests of Beijing.

Until Hong Kong does not achieve universal suffrage, only an élite class acting on Beijing's interests will rule the territory. Therefore, the Umbrella Revolution started protesting in 2014 to achieve universal suffrage, and equality in the political system allowing all citizens to vote freely.

6.4 Hong Kongers – People rule people

Hong Kong is an international territory, where many different minorities share the same dream of achieving genuine democracy for the future. In this part, I concentrate on the minority that derives from Chinese descendants that follow Confucianism traditions in daily life. I choose to analyze Confucianism values together with the demand for genuine democracy, because I think will contribute on the formulation of an answer to the problem formulation.

As presented on chapter 6.2, the Umbrella Movement activists demand genuine democracy and genuine universal suffrage. Those protesting are mostly students that represent the new generation, which consider themselves as Hong Kongers and not descendants from China or other minorities present on the territory. In the sub-chapter 6.1, I analyzed the social movements, which are typically organized by young high-educated people, as in Hong Kong's protests in 2014. Nowadays, those who want a transformation in the local society are young people that start to plan their future and want a better life in their territory.

Another case in which young high-educated people organized social movements in Hong Kong, was during the 1960s protests, at the time when the 'new' generation started to have the feeling that Hong Kong was their home and not the territory in which their descendants emigrated long time ago anymore. Many of them emigrated from China, some during the Cultural Revolution, while others in the years after. In fact, during the 1960s, Hong Kong was the center of an important transitional period where the first Hong Kongers emerged (Tsang 2009, 183).

Another case in which Hong Kongers emerged was during the protests between 2003 and 2007, which can be considered as "forming the core of a reinvigorated pro-democracy movement in the city" (Chan and Lee 2007, 93).

Most of the young Hong Kongers from Chinese ethnicity participated in the protests in 2014. Those of Chinese descendants follow Confucianism traditions in their daily life. Later in this sub-chapter, I analyze how Confucianism traditions have been transformed during the years to fit with the way of life of the new generation, and understand why the Umbrella Movement demands genuine democracy and a better future. In addition, many Hong Kongers, which are from Chinese descendants, claim themselves as part of the Hong Kong identity. As written in sub-chapter 4.4, Confucianism is based on several values, which drive the person during its life. One of these values is honesty, which is fundamental in Confucius' idea of a fair and benevolent government. The Umbrella Movement, demands fair and honest elections through genuine universal suffrage from the government of Hong Kong.

Confucius developed an ideal government, based on basic and fundamental values: one of them, as written before, is honesty, while the others are loyalty, duty and respect. Through fair and honest elections, the Hong Kongers want to choose their own representatives, which will promote and represent the best interests of the people whom they represent. Moreover, through universal suffrage, the represented are trusting the representative actions, while the activists protesting do not feel represented by the majority, since those on the power represent Beijing's interests (E. Yu 2014).

According to Huntington, culture is fundamental in the process of modernization in territories such as Hong Kong (Yu 2005, 204). In fact as typical in the Social Movement theory, those who protest went through a historical social transformation, in the same way as Hong Kong since the handover in 1997. Moreover, the Umbrella Movement was born because they wanted to modify their political opportunities in the territory and create a better government and future for them and the next Hong Kong generations.

As it is usual in all cultures, traditions change and some parts of it get lost with the time. As affirmed by Tsang, Hong Kongers kept only some aspects of this ancient philosophy. Many aspects of Confucianism were not typical of an egalitarian culture. In fact, Confucianism was meritocratic but still based on a hierarchic system. The new generation in Hong Kong protests together, and their social background is not important. They are unified in a single movement together with other organizations because they have a common goal. They are looking to modify the present to have a better future were equity and equality are basic values. Furthermore, modern Confucianism gives attention to high-education systems and bureaucracy, which, according to Fukuyama, are steps to reinforce an egalitarian income distribution (Fukuyama 1995, 25).

As already mentioned, the young generation in Hong Kong which emerged in the 1960s, between 2003 and 2007 protests and in 2014 were high-educated people and, as a consequence, more active

in the democratic debate because of their knowledge. Moreover, thanks to their studies they know that more liberalized governments exist, in which people have a wealthier life and a better future with growth in economic and social conditions (Fukuyama 1995, 25). In a country characterized by economic modernization as has been the case of Hong Kong in the last years, people raise their living and educational standards. Finally, in a period of economic development a well-educated middle class emerges, as happened in Hong Kong. New generations in the years have tried to transform social conflicts in political action to react against the current society.

7. Conclusion

The main goal of the thesis was to determine why the activists were protesting in Hong Kong in 2014. The second major objective was to understand the democratic deficit in Hong Kong. I decided to focus on Pro-democracy groups and social movements in Hong Kong during 2014 and part of 2015. To better conduct the analysis, I decided to examine Hong Kong's situation starting from the past, when it was still a British colony until its transformation in a Special Administrative Region under the principle of "One country, two systems" under China's control. What I wanted to understand is the current situation in Hong Kong, and to find out the reasons behind the Umbrella Movement protests.

Hong Kong has been a British colony for 150 years, and in 1997 returned to Chinese control. Contrary to many others former colonies, Hong Kong did not become an independent state, but a Special Administrative Region with a high degree of autonomy. During my analysis, I investigated the degree of autonomy of Hong Kong to be able to answer the research question. I wanted to find out "*What is the democratic deficit in Hong Kong?*". I decided to focus on the degree of autonomy that China lets Hong Kong have, through an analysis of the HKSAR and some of the Basic Law articles. Moreover, in this part of the analysis I applied two of the theories I have selected: Representative Democracy and Liberal Democracy. China decided to apply the principle "One country, two systems" on those territories which had a particular historical background, such as Taiwan, Hong Kong and Macau. In the specific case of Hong Kong, the territory had been part of the British colonies for 150 years, and returned to China only after 1997. Britain and China agreed in 1984 to establish in Hong Kong a Special Administrative Region, giving to the territory a high degree of autonomy and keeping the same capitalist system it had during the British rule for another 50 years, until 2047. From my analysis, I found out that Hong Kong has a democratic deficit in the political system. In fact, these deficit in political power, which is in China's hands, is one of the factors not allowing Hong Kong to be completely autonomous. Hong Kong administrates independently the executive, legislative and judicial powers. While China has the control of the political power and all the foreign affairs matters. The foreign affairs matters will always be under Chinese control, as even if Hong Kong is a Special Administrative Region, it is not an independent country but only a Chinese territory with a high degree of autonomy.

Hong Kong is independently in charge of its economic system, and on the contrary of the other Chinese territories possess several liberties such as freedom of speech and press, expression and information, typical of liberal democracy. As China controls the political liberties of the Hong

Kongers, not allowing them to vote for their representatives by universal suffrage, some basic fundamental liberties are denied to the citizens. Based on my analysis, I can affirm that the main democratic deficit in Hong Kong are political liberties. In fact, the Hong Kongers do not possess the right to vote and free elections. The two political powers in Hong Kong are the Chief Executive and LegCo, which are not elected by universal suffrage. The CE is selected by a nomination committee formed by the Central government. While the LegCo is voted by universal suffrage only in part, with only 24 members out of 60 elected by the residents. In Hong Kong, there has never been a democratic government, not even under British rule. However, the new generation differently from the past, by organizing the Umbrella Movement demands from Beijing and the Hong Kong's government genuine democracy. While China keeps the control over the political system in Hong Kong, the rise of democracy will not be possible.

Returning to the main focus, presented at the beginning of this study, it is now possible to state that the Umbrella Movement went to the streets to protest because their demands match what I found out is the democratic deficit in Hong Kong: the lack of political freedom. Through the analysis of the Umbrella Movement, and the degree of autonomy of Hong Kong, it was possible to answer the problem formulation "*Why are the activists protesting?*"

The Umbrella Movement grouped, in a single movement, several organizations including the students and the Occupy Central Movement. These organizations were protesting for the same reasons, even if their "plan of attack" was different. Through the examinations of the Social Movement Theory and Democracy theory, I was able to analyze the situation in Hong Kong during the protests of 2014. The main actors in the 2014's protests were Hong Kong's students, which emerged as the new generation to change the society through protests and pacific demonstrations on the streets. From my analysis, I found out that social movements are characterized by young highly-educated citizens, which group in organizations to protest against the current situation. The Umbrella Movement, in fact, protests to achieve genuine democracy for the next Chief Executive election, to be held in 2017. Since 2007, Hong Kong's government promised to its citizens that the next CE election would allow, for the first time, universal suffrage in the territory. Since then, many proposals have been made, several by the Pro-democracy groups, including the Occupy Central Movement. Until 2014 no proposal have been accepted by the LegCo, which on the other hand presented to the Pro-democracy lawmakers a reform package which allowed a higher degree of selection but not universal suffrage. On the 19th of June 2015 the reform package was rejected by the Pro-democracy lawmakers, and until the end of June no steps forward were taken. Based on my analysis, I can conclude that the Umbrella Movement's reasons were all connected with the actual democratic deficit of Hong Kong. As the political system

is under Chinese control, and since 2007 no reforms have been made to allow universal suffrage on the SAR, the Movement protests to achieve genuine democracy for the next 2017 CE election. By achieving genuine democracy, the Umbrella Movement wants to achieve genuine universal suffrage to allow all residents in Hong Kong to vote free elections in the territory. Moreover, they wanted to achieve other basic fundamental liberties, which would allow Hong Kong to start a democratization process for the future. The young highly-educated students in Hong Kong protest mainly against the reform package. However, there are many other reasons, as they want to change Hong Kong for a better future, which includes genuine universal suffrage for all Hong Kongers, a better life in which basic human rights are respected, and a wealthier life with better economic and social conditions.

By achieving genuine universal suffrage, Hong Kongers will gain much more independence from China, which will make a rise of democracy possible. However, even if the genuine universal suffrage is achieved, it will not make of Hong Kong an independent state, but only increase its high-degree of autonomy, as it will continue to be Chinese territory. Moreover, as I previously mentioned, achieving universal suffrage will only create the possibility for democracy to rise, as the process of liberalization and democratization is a long-term process, which needs to be made gradually to make the citizens to adapt to it, where free elections and the right to vote for every citizen is just one of the steps.

8. Bibliography

Alexander, Harriet, and Ellie Ng. *The Telegraph.* June 18, 2015.
http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/hongkong/11682778/Hong-Kong-rejects-Beijing-backed-political-reform-package.html (accessed June 21, 2015).

AP. *The Telegraph.* June 19, 2015.
http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/hongkong/11685365/Chinese-media-condemns-Hong-Kong-as-selfish-destroyers-of-democracy-after-key-vote.html (accessed June 21, 2015).

Ash, Robert, Peter Ferdinand, and Brian Hook. *Hong Kong in Transition: The Handover Years.* New York: Macmillan Press, 2000.

Ash, Roberta, and Mayer N. Zald. "Social Movement Organizations: Growth, Decay and Change." *Social forces*, 1966: 327-341.

Baum, Richard. "Enter the dragon: China's courtship of Hong Kong, 982-1999." *Communist and Post-Communist Studies*, 1999: 417 - 436.

Beetham, David. "Liberal Democracy and the Limits of Democratization." *Political Studies*, 1992: 40-53.

Blair, David. *Telegraph.co.uk.* April 22, 2015.
http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/hongkong/11555565/Britains-response-to-Hong-Kong-democracy-protests-offended-all-sides.html (accessed May 03, 2015).

Blair, David, and Ellie Ng. *The Telegraph.* June 17, 2015.
http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/hongkong/11680076/Hong-Kong-vote-reform-Security-heightened-amid-fears-of-mass-protests.html (accessed June 21, 2015).

Bollen, Kenneth. "Liberal Democracy: Validity and Method Factors in Cross-National Measures." *American Journal of Political Science*, 1993: 1207-1230.

Bray, Mark, and Ramsey Koo. "Postcolonial patterns and paradoxes: language and education in Hong Kong and Macao." *Comparative Education*, 2004: 215 - 239.

Bryman, Alan. *Social Research Methods - 4th edition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Cha, Dana, Doh C. Shin, and Spina Nicholas. "Confucianism and Democracy: A Review of the Opposing Conceptualizations." *Japanese Journal of Political Science*, 2011: 143-160.

Chan, Johannes. "Hong Kong's Umbrella Movement." *The Round Table*, 2014: 571-580.

Chan, Joseph M., and Francis L.F. Lee. "Political Opportunities, Social Mobilization and Collective Action: The Re-invigorated Pro-Democracy Movement in Hong Kong." *The China Review*, 2007: 93-121.

Chan, Kevin. *The Independent.* February 01, 2015. http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/asia/hong-kong-protesters-revive-calls-for-genuine-democracy-10016903.html (accessed July 15, 2015).

China, People's Republic of. "The Basic Law of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China: Adopted on 4 April 1990 by the Seventh National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China at Its Third Session." 04 04, 1999. http://www.basiclaw.gov.hk/en/basiclawtext/images/basiclaw_full_text_en.pdf (accessed 07 15, 2015).

Chiu, Stephen Wing Kai, and Tai Lok Lui. *The Dynamics of Social Movement in Hong Kong.* Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2000.

Chong, Tanna. *South China Morning Post.* October 20, 2012. http://www.scmp.com/news/hong-kong/article/1065255/former-chief-secretary-stephen-lam-upbeat-hong-kong-uk-speech (accessed June 21, 2015).

Chu, Yun-Han, Larry Diamond, and Andrew J. Nathan. *How East Asians View Democracy.* New York: Columbia University Press, 2010.

Crick, Bernard. *Democracy: A very short introduction.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Cullen, Richard, and Christine Loh. "POLITICAL REFORM IN HONG KONG - The New Principal Officials Accountability System." *Journal of Contemporary China*, 2005: 153-176.

Cullinane, Kevin, and Sharon Cullinane. "City Profile Hong Kong." *Elsevier Science Ltd*, 2003: 279-288.

Dacombe, Rod, et al. *The Politics Book - Big Idea Simply Explained.* London: Dorling Kindersley Limited, 2013.

Fukuyama, Francis. "Confucianism and Democracy." *Journal of Democracy*, 1995: 20-33.

Goodstadt, Leo F. "Introduction - Conflict and Collaboration." In *Uneasy Partners - The Conflict Between Public Interest and Private Profit in Hong Kong*, edited by Leo F. Goodstadt, 8. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2005.

Hamer, Andrew, and Yue-man Yeung. "Primer - A short primer on Hong Kong's geography." *Cities*, 1997: vii - viii.

Harris, Peter. *The Diplomat.* October 11, 2014. http://thediplomat.com/2014/10/putting-hong-kong-in-historical-context/ (accessed January 01, 2015).

Harrison, Ross. *Democracy.* London, New York: Routledge, 1995.

Huntington, Samuel P. "Democracy's Third Wave." *Journal of Democracy*, 1991: 12-34.

—. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order.* New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996.

Krouse, Richard W. "Two Concepts of Democratic Representation: James and John Stuart Mill." *The Journal of Politcs*, 1982: 509-537.

Lam, Jeffie. *South China Morning Post.* May 03, 2015. http://www.scmp.com/news/hong-kong/article/1784823/chief-executive-leung-chun-ying-urges-pan-democrats-accept-political (accessed May 03, 2015).

Lam, Jermain T.M. "Hong Kong's Democratic Challenge." *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, 1995: 53-66.

Lyengar, Rishi. *Time.* October 05, 2014. http://time.com/3471366/hong-kong-umbrella-revolution-occupy-central-democracy-explainer-6-questions/ (accessed July 18, 2015).

MacPherson, Kerrie L. "The city and the state: historical reflections on Hong Kong's identity in transition, 1997 and beyond." *Pergamon*, 1997: 279-286.

Martin, Michael F. *Prospects for Democracy in Hong Kong: The 2012 Election Reforms.* Hong Kong: Congressional Research Service - DIANE Publishing, 2009-2010.

Mill, John Stuart. *Essays on Politics and Society.* Toronto: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1977.

Mizuoka, Fujio. "Contriving 'laissez-faire': Conceptualising the British colonial rule of Hong Kong." *City, Culture and Society*, 2014: 23-32.

Ngo, Tak-Wing. "Colonialism in Hong Kong Revisited." In *Hong Kong's history. State and Society under colonial rule*, by Tak-Wing Ngo, 1-13. London and New York: Routledge, 1999.

O'Reilly, Brendan P. *The DIplomat.* October 08, 2014. http://thediplomat.com/2014/10/hong-kongs-counter-protesters/ (accessed February 05, 2015).

Ogle, Alex. "Des petits parapluies en papier exposés pendant une manifestation à Causeway Bay." *AFP - Making-of - Oser la democratie.* November 16, 2014. http://blogs.afp.com/makingof/?post/hong-kong-oser-la-democratie#.VTuYrSHtmko (accessed May 25, 2015).

Overholt, William H. "Hong Kong and China after 1997: The Real Issues." *Proceedings of the Accademy of Political Science*, 1991: 30-52.

Peterson, Abby. "Review: Social Movement Theory." *Acta Sociologica*, 1989: 419-426.

Phillips, Tom. *Telegraph.co.uk.* April 22, 2015. http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/china/11554226/Hong-Kong-activists-threaten-new-protests-against-fake-democracy.html (accessed May 03, 2015).

—. *The Guardian.* June 16, 2015. http://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/jun/16/china-must-grant-hong-kong-genuine-democracy-says-activist-on-eve-of-vote (accessed July 14, 2015).

Plattner, Marc F. "Liberalism and Democracy: Can't have one without the other." *Foreign Affairs*, 1998: 171-180.

Ringen, Stein. "Robert A. Dahl: Defender of Democracy." *Springer Science + Business Media*, 2008: 283-287.

Rosen, Frederick. "Review Article - Jeremy Bentham: Recent interpretations." *Political Studies*, 1982: 575-581.

Schmitter, Philippe C. "Review: Democracy's Third Wave." *The Review of Politics*, 1993: 348-351.

Sing, Ming. "Hong Kong's Democrats Hold Their Own." *Journal of Democracy*, 2009: 98-112.

Tiezzi, Shannon. *The Diplomat.* June 04, 2015. http://thediplomat.com/2015/06/hong-kongs-democratic-dilemma/ (accessed June 05 , 2015).

Tsang, Steve. *A Modern History of Hong Kong.* II. London - New York: I. B. Tauris, 2009.

Urbinati, Nadia. *Representative Democracy: Principles and Genealogy.* Chicago: The University of Chicago, 2006.

Wong, Albert. *South China Morning Post.* January 13, 2008.
http://www.scmp.com/article/622777/pan-democrats-keep-momentum-2012 (accessed June 20, 2015).

Wong, Stan Hok-Wui. *Electoral Politics in Post-1997 Hong Kong - Protest, Patronage, and the Media.* Singapore: Springer, 2015.

Yep, Ray. *Negotiating Autonomy in Greater China. Hong Kong and its Sovereign Before and After 1997.* Copenhagen: nias press, 2013.

Yeung, Yue-man. "Planning for Pearl City: Hong Kong's future, 1997 and beyond." *Cities*, 1997: 249-256.

Yu, Elaine. *Waging no Violence.* July 18, 2014. http://wagingnonviolence.org/feature/hong-kongs-occupy-central-pushes-genuine-democracy/ (accessed July 14, 2015).

Yu, Ying-shih. "Confucianism and China's Encounter with the West in Historical Perspective." *A Journal of Comparative Philosophy*, 2005: 203-216.

Zakaria, Fareed. "The Rise of Illiberal Democracy." *Foreign Affairs*, 1997: 22-43.

Zhu, Zhiqun. *The Diplomat.* October 07, 2014. http://thediplomat.com/2014/10/what-next-for-hong-kongs-democracy/ (accessed January 05, 2015).