

Personal Statement

This statement is to address the allegation that in my article entitled “The Emergence of Radical Politics in Hong Kong” published in the The China Review journal of the Chinese University of Hong Kong, Vol.14, No.1, Spring 2014, pp.199-232 (the “**Article**”), I copied four paragraphs from a chapter entitled “The Occupy Central Movement and Political Reform in Hong Kong” written by Dr Jermain TM Lam (the “**Chapter**”) in the book entitled “New Trends of Political Participation in Hong Kong” published by the City University of Hong Kong Press in early July 2014 (the “**Book**”). In fact, I was the editor of the Book.

By way of background, in the middle 2013 or so, I approached Dr Lam to write a chapter on the Occupy Central campaign for the Book. We naturally had some discussions on the issue. Dr Lam delivered a draft of the Chapter to me in October 2013 and I naturally went through it very carefully as editor.

In the autumn of 2013, I was asked by The China Review to write a review article on radical politics in Hong Kong which was later accepted and published as the Article. In the Article there is a short section on the Occupy Central campaign. As this is a review article, I read various source materials, some of which I ultimately referred to and cited. I used Dr Lam’s Chapter to trace some relevant source materials. I read the original sources and these are referred to in the Occupy Central Campaign section of the Article where relevant. In the Article, I cite all relevant footnotes to indicate the sources.

The first paragraph in contention concerns a quotation from the decision of the Standing Committee of the National People’s Congress on December 29, 2007, which is referred to in a Hong Kong government document: HKSAR Government, Consultation Document: Methods for Selecting the Chief Executive and for Forming the Legislative Council in 2012, November 2009, p.42. The Standing Committee’s 29 December 2007 decision is often quoted in community discussions on political reforms in Hong Kong. In the text of the Article itself, I make clear that I am quoting from the Standing Committee’s decision. I also refer to my footnote 54.

The second paragraph concerns two quotations from Qiao Xiaoyang, chairman of the Law Committee of the National People’s Congress, in March 2013 on political reform in Hong Kong. His statements were widely reported by the Hong Kong media on March 25, 2013. Since I wrote in English, I naturally chose to quote from South China Morning Post. The same quotations have been used many, many times in the community’s debate on political reforms in Hong Kong. In the text of the Article itself, I make clear that I am quoting from Qiao. I also refer to my footnote 56.

The third paragraph in controversy concerns Benny Tai’s proposal on Occupy Central. I went back to Mr Tai’s original article in Hong Kong Economic Journal on January 16, 2013 and another relevant report in English in South China Morning Post on February 16, 2013. I mention these two sources in the text of the Article itself and in fact, they are not cited by Dr Lam in the Chapter.

The final paragraph concerns two references to a book by James Fishkin, Democracy and Deliberation, New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1991, p.4. The Occupy Central campaign emphasized deliberation, and several deliberation days had been organized. I attended several talks

delivered by Benny Tai and had come across his discussion of Fishkin's book. So I had some impression of the Occupy Central campaign's philosophical paradigm. I also read Dr Lam's detailed references to the Fishkin book, as well as quickly went through Fishkin's book. I make clear in the text of the Article that I am referring to concepts advocated by Fishkin, which underlie the Occupy Central campaign. I also refer to my footnotes 57 and 58. Paraphrases of Fishkin's ideas are commonly used and referenced by other authors as well.

Anyone who reads the Article, which is a review article, easily understands that the four paragraphs in controversy are making references to ideas that do not come from me and I cannot and do not claim any credit. Indeed, this is clear from the use of quotation marks and footnotes. They do not come from Dr Lam either. Dr. Lam's Chapter, I admit, helped me to trace useful sources and I had read the Chapter very carefully as editor of the Book. But the four paragraphs are not original materials by Dr. Lam either.

Thank you for your attention.

Joseph Y.S. Cheng

24 August 2014