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INTRODUCTION

Hong Kong has long enjoyed a vibrant, diverse, and independent media and a unique position as a window into mainland China. Local and foreign correspondents make use of Hong Kong’s unique geopolitical position, cosmopolitanism, and strong protections for freedom of expression to report on news from Hong Kong, mainland China, and the greater Asia region, free from the harsh constraints and censorship that stifle mainland media outlets and journalists. Hong Kong is home to many of Asia’s largest circulation Chinese and English language newspapers, websites, and magazines. In the years since the 1997 handover of Hong Kong from the United Kingdom to mainland China, the media sector has continued to thrive despite some signs of gradual constraint. The deterioration of press freedom has accelerated significantly over the past year, coinciding with a time of political crisis in Hong Kong and growing questions about the future of its unique political status and relationship to China.

Hong Kong’s stature as a bastion of press freedom in Asia is all the more important as the already dire situation for independent journalists, editors, and intellectuals based in mainland China continues to deteriorate. Independent journalists, publishers, and commentators on the mainland face threats, harassment, attacks, and imprisonment for their work; censorship is ubiquitous, and foreign correspondents and news outlets are increasingly restricted in their ability to report on sensitive topics, subject to reprisals involving journalist visas and the accessibility of their websites within China. The world knows much more about China today due to the still vibrant investigative reporting carried out from Hong Kong. While the environment for press freedom in Hong Kong is fundamentally different and far more open than in mainland China, multiple and increasing signs of encroachment on press freedom demand attention.

When the British returned Hong Kong to Chinese control, part of the handover agreement stipulated that Hong Kong was to enjoy a “high degree of autonomy” to manage domestic affairs under a “one country, two systems” framework for 50 years. The Joint Declaration, a 1984 treaty promising continued protections for basic human rights in Hong Kong signed by China and Britain and registered at the United Nations, explicitly guarantees that press freedom will be protected following the handover. The Basic Law, Hong Kong’s mini-Constitution passed in 1990 by the Chinese National People’s Congress, also explicitly protects the rights of Hong Kong’s residents through the year 2047, including the freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of assembly.

In September 2014, thousands of students launched what would become months of public demonstrations on the streets of Hong Kong, spreading a message of protest in favor of democracy over the internet, and in traditional news publications. The people of Hong Kong have shown the will to fight for the rights and freedoms to which they are legally entitled. In September 2014, thousands of students launched what would become months of public demonstrations on the streets of Hong Kong, spreading a message of protest in favor of democracy over the internet, and in traditional news publications. Social media and websites provided commentary and news updates as members of the public occupied the streets.
of Admiralty, Mong Kok, and Causeway Bay, calling for the 2017 election for Hong Kong Chief Executive (the head of government) to “satisfy the international standards in relation to universal suffrage.” Observers and protestors alike posted pictures, video, and text across the internet. The *Wall Street Journal* called the protests, often referred to in the media as “Occupy Central with Love and Peace” or the “Umbrella Movement,” the “boldest challenge to Chinese authoritarianism in a quarter century.”

While the freewheeling nature of the Hong Kong pro-democracy protests and their widespread coverage by local and global press reflected a free and committed press corps hard at work, a closer examination of trends over the last few years reveals a growing climate of insecurity for the media driven by several factors: physical assaults on journalists, attacks on and obstruction of media covering the protests, growing threats to freedom of expression online, politically influenced leadership changes and censorship at media outlets, and the withdrawal of advertising from papers considered critical of Beijing.

After warning that freedom of expression in Hong Kong faced new threats in 2013, the Hong Kong Journalists Association wrote in their 2014 Annual Report that June 2013 through July 2014 was the “darkest for press freedom [in Hong Kong] for several decades.” Notably, the organization called this year the worst on record for press freedom even before the pro-democracy protests raised new concerns about attacks on journalists, alleged police obstruction of media, cyber attacks on an unprecedented scale, and the troubling use of general criminal laws to target pro-democracy speech online.
REPORT FRAMEWORK AND METHODOLOGY

This report begins with a brief overview of press freedom under Hong Kong law and international human rights law, outlining the obligations of the Hong Kong government. The report then analyzes several key issues contributing to a climate of growing insecurity for press freedom in Hong Kong: physical assaults on journalists, attacks on and obstruction of media covering the 2014 pro-democracy protests, growing threats to freedom of expression online, politically motivated leadership changes and censorship at media outlets, and the withdrawal of advertising from papers considered critical of Beijing.

This report is based on a review of news reports and reports from civil society organizations discussing press freedom in Hong Kong; news reports, video recordings, and photographs documenting the pro-democracy protests in 2014, and in-person interviews and email conversations with journalists, media executives, political officials, and media law experts. Requests for comment and information made to Hong Kong police and prosecutors, and to several political officials, had not been returned by the time of publication. The office of the Secretary for Home Affairs declined a meeting with PEN's researchers.

Most of the journalists interviewed, both foreign correspondents and local journalists writing in Chinese or English, requested to remain anonymous due to fear of professional repercussions.
The right to freedom of expression, which includes freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of assembly, is protected both under Hong Kong law and international law. Together, the Basic Law of the Hong Kong S.A.R. (the Basic Law), the Hong Kong Bill of Rights Ordinance (Bill of Rights Ordinance), and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) form a protective legal shield to safeguard press freedom in Hong Kong.

The Right to Freedom of Expression under Hong Kong Law

The Basic Law serves as the constitutional document of Hong Kong. As such, the Basic Law establishes Hong Kong’s essential political and legal principles, prescribes the powers and duties of the government, and guarantees specific rights for its citizens. Freedom of the press is enshrined in Article 27 of the Basic Law, which provides:

“Hong Kong residents shall have freedom of speech, of the press and of publication; freedom of association, of assembly, of procession, and of demonstration; and the right and freedom to form and join trade unions, and to strike.”

Article 39 of the Basic Law requires Hong Kong to enact laws to give the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights effect under domestic law, and the 1991 Bill of Rights Ordinance expressly incorporates the ICCPR’s provisions into Hong Kong law. Article 16 of the Bill of Rights Ordinance is identical to Article 19 of the ICCPR; both state, in relevant part:

“Everyone shall have the right to freedom of expression; this right shall include freedom to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas of all kinds, regardless of frontiers, either orally, in writing, or in print, in the form of art, or through any other media of his choice.”

Furthermore, as noted above, the Sino-British Joint Declaration, a 1984 treaty promising continued protections for basic human rights in Hong Kong signed by China and Britain, explicitly guarantees that press freedom will be protected in Hong Kong following the handover.

The Right to Freedom of the Press under International Law

Article 19 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) protects the right to freedom of expression, including the right to freedom of the press. The United Nations Human Rights Committee, the body that provides authoritative interpretations of the ICCPR’s provisions, has explicitly recognized the value of a free press to an open society:

“A free, uncensored, and unhindered press or other media is essential in any society to ensure freedom of opinion and expression and the enjoyment of other Covenant rights. It constitutes one of the cornerstones of a democratic society. … The free communication of information and ideas about public and political issues between citizens, candidates, and elected representatives is essential. This implies a free press and other media able to comment on public issues without censorship or restraint and to inform public opinion. The public also has a corresponding right to receive media output.”

The Human Rights Committee has affirmed that the right to freedom of expression in the ICCPR protects both the dissemination of news and the process of newsgathering. The Committee has also noted that freedom of the press applies broadly, as journalism may be performed not only by professional full-time reporters, but also by “bloggers and others who engage in forms of self-publication in print, on the internet, or elsewhere.” It has further acknowledged the increasing importance of online media, urging parties to the ICCPR “to take all necessary steps to foster the independence of these new media and to ensure access of individuals thereto.”

Permissible Restrictions on Freedom of Expression under the ICCPR

Freedom of expression, including freedom of the press, may be subject to certain restrictions under international law, but these are strictly limited. Limitations on press freedom implemented in the name of protecting public order must satisfy certain conditions, as the Human Rights Committee has explained:
“It is for the State party to demonstrate the legal basis for any restrictions imposed on freedom of expression… When a State party invokes a legitimate ground for restriction of freedom of expression, it must demonstrate in specific and individualized fashion the precise nature of the threat, and the necessity and proportionality of the specific action taken, in particular by establishing a direct and immediate connection between the expression and the threat.”

The Committee has further specified that “[t]he penalization of a media outlet, publishers or journalists solely for being critical of the government or the political social system espoused by the government can never be considered to be a necessary restriction of freedom of expression.”

Under most circumstances, deliberate interference with newsgathering violates international law. According to the Human Rights Committee, restrictions on journalists’ movement are rarely justified, and the Committee has noted specifically that journalists’ access to “conflict-affected locations, the sites of natural disasters and locations where there are allegations of human rights abuses” should not be restricted. Furthermore, the Committee states that attacks against journalists or others involved in monitoring potential abuses of human rights, including physical assaults, arbitrary arrests, threats, and intimidation, should be “vigorously investigated” and the perpetrators should be prosecuted.

Under Hong Kong law, generally speaking, the media may cover events happening in public places without seeking prior permission. Although the police “are equipped with wide powers to keep public order,” allowing them to take certain measures to regulate public assemblies, in recent years several complaints have been made to the Hong Kong Police Force’s internal review unit regarding police interference with newsgathering activities at public demonstrations, and a number of these complaints have been found to be substantiated by the review unit.
CHALLENGES TO PRESS FREEDOM IN HONG KONG

Physical Assaults on Journalists

Hong Kong has seen a sharp escalation in violent attacks on the media in recent years, with the trend continuing through 2014 and into 2015.

Hong Kong saw 11 reported cases of assaults on journalists between July 2012 and June 2013 and six reported assault cases between July 2013 and June 2014. The physical attacks between July 2012 and June 2014 included an attack on a South China Morning Post (SCMP) photographer while she was covering a story on parallel importers (traders who buy stock tax-free in Hong Kong to resell in mainland China); the beating of a NOW TV cameraman by a participant at a pro-government demonstration; the threatening of a New Tang Dynasty Television reporter with a knife; an attack on the publisher of the political weekly iSun Affairs; the ramming of a car into the front gate of the home of Next Media’s owner, Jimmy Lai; an assault on a Sharp Daily reporter in Central; and an attack on the owner of the free newspaper am730.

Notably, arrests were reported only in the cases involving the attack on the SCMP photographer and the beating of the NOW TV cameraman. In both of these cases the defendants were convicted of common assault, fined HK$1,000 (equivalent to approximately US$125) and given community service orders.

2014 began with a brutal, near-fatal attack on veteran Hong Kong journalist and former Ming Pao Daily News editor Kevin Lau. Ming Pao is a Chinese-language newspaper generally recognized for its critical reporting on the government as well as its reliability and professionalism. During Mr. Lau’s two-year tenure as chief editor of Ming Pao, the newspaper had investigated Hong Kong’s chief executive for a reported “illegal glass canopy extension” attached to his private residence; covered the mysterious death of mainland dissident, Li Wangyang, who had served over twenty years in prison for his participation in the Tiananmen Square protests of 1989; and participated in an investigation by the Washington-based International Consortium of Investigative Journalists into offshore bank accounts held by relatives of several senior mainland Chinese leaders. As an editor, Mr. Lau was known for “resisting pressure from the invisible hands who try to meddle in the newsroom at critical moments.” In January 2014, Ming Pao removed Mr. Lau from his post as chief editor and replaced him with a Malaysian editor “viewed as pro-Beijing.” This incident is discussed in detail below.

Mr. Lau was attacked on February 26, 2014, only three days after thousands of journalists and free speech advocates

“Once people see an attack on a journalist and nobody gets punished, people say ‘Okay, it’s open season on journalists.’ If people can attack journalists and get away with it, it gives other people permission to do the same.”
marched in Hong Kong to protest the erosion of press freedom and free expression. An unknown assailant attacked Mr. Lau as he got out of his car near a neighborhood restaurant he frequently visited in Sai Wan Ho, Hong Kong. Police sources reportedly described the attack as “designed to maim, not kill, to send a warning.” Mr. Lau was admitted to the hospital in critical condition with multiple deep stab wounds to his back and legs, and was unable to return to his work until August 2014. Doctors informed him it could take up to two years to fully recover from the wounds inflicted in the attack. Hong Kong’s Chief Executive and Legislative Council both publicly condemned the attack.

By March 15, 2014, Hong Kong police had arrested eleven people in connection with the attack on Mr. Lau—but none thought to have ordered the assault. Nine of the eleven suspects were released on bail, with two suspects from mainland China remaining in police custody pending further inquiry. At the time of the arrests, Hong Kong Police Commissioner Andy Tsang Wai-hung announced there was no direct evidence to link the attack with Mr. Lau’s professional work as a journalist. The media community criticized Mr. Tsang’s remarks and expressed concern that they indicated police bias ahead of the trial. In its 2014 Annual Report, the Hong Kong Journalists Association pointed to unresolved prior attacks on the media in 1985, 1994, 1996, 1998, and 2013, calling into question “whether at the end of the day the suspects in the Kevin Lau case will ever be convicted – and in particular whether the mastermind behind the attack will ever face trial.” PEN understands that the two individuals still in police custody will go to trial in July 2015.

The attack on Kevin Lau was followed by a similar incident just weeks later. On March 19, 2014, four men attacked two senior executives with the Hong Kong Morning News Media Group, a newly registered media company formed by a group of veteran Hong Kong journalists. The group was planning to launch a new Chinese language newspaper, *Hong Kong Morning News*, later in the year, with the organizers reported as stating, “Hong Kong needs a balanced paper with credibility amid this media ecology.” The attackers struck director and vice-president Lei Iun-han and senior executive Lam Kin-min with metal pipes outside the Hong Kong Science Museum in Tsim Sha Tsui in broad daylight. The pair were taken to the hospital where they received treatment for injuries to their arms and legs. James To Kun-sun, the deputy chairman of
attacks on the media by unidentified assailants continued during the pro-democracy protests, sometimes referred to as the “Umbrella Movement” due to protesters’ use of umbrellas to deflect police tear gas and pepper spray. During the protests, media tycoon and pro-democracy supporter Jimmy Lai Chee-yung, as well as Mr. Lai’s company, Next Media, were the target of multiple attacks by anti-Occupy protestors. Next Media was founded after the crackdown in China in 1989, and is known for its strong pro-democracy stance and criticism of successive Hong Kong government officials. Its flagship newspaper, Apple Daily, is one of the most widely circulated newspapers in Hong Kong and is known for its critical coverage of Beijing. Apple Daily openly supported Occupy Central and provided extensive coverage of students and other participants. The Economist praised the newspaper for its bold coverage of political discourse in Hong Kong during the summer of 2014 and characterized the paper as “a lively tabloid accused of being a tool of radical activists.” Mr. Lai had already faced one unresolved attack on his home in June 2013. An unknown assailant crashed a stolen vehicle through the gate of Mr. Lai’s home in Kowloon, leaving an axe and a machete behind before speeding away.

Attacks on Mr. Lai and his media company started to occur well before Occupy protestors filled the streets of Admiralty, Mong Kok, and Causeway Bay. During the week of June 16, 2014, just days ahead of an online referendum organized by the independent website popvote.hk to collect public opinion on the 2017 election process, Apple Daily’s website experienced a cyber attack, crashing its website. Mr. Lai publicly blamed Beijing for trying to silence voices supporting the public vote. On August 27, 2014, just before Beijing handed down a controversial decision on the election process for the chief executive post for 2017, Hong Kong’s Independent Commission Against Corruption raided Mr. Lai’s home, alleging he made suspicious donations to pro-democracy political groups in Hong Kong. No charges have been filed against Mr. Lai.

Anti-Occupy protestors attacked Mr. Lai and his media company throughout the protests as Mr. Lai stepped up the paper’s editorial backing and Apple Daily’s website provided live coverage of the protests. Anti-Occupy protestors surrounded the Apple Daily offices for several days beginning on October 11, blocking the distribution of the newspaper. Police responded after the media group complained, though no arrests were reported. Hong Kong’s High Court issued an injunction against the anti-Occupy protestors on October 14. In response, the crowds reportedly tore up copies of the injunction and continued to block newspaper distribution. Police officers reportedly formed a human chain to separate the protestors from the Apple Daily staff. Next Media officials ultimately hired a crane to lift the newspaper bundles out over the protestors. In an interview with Mark Simon, a senior executive at Next Media, Mr. Simon confirmed that, to his knowledge, no arrests were made in connection with the blockade around Next Media’s facilities, but also noted, “The police were very helpful... We got an order to clear the area around our facilities and the police enforced the order. When the police were there, the paper went out. The police officers kept the street clear.”

Only one week after the blockade was cleared, masked men poured barrels of soy sauce over thousands of copies of Apple Daily and Headline Daily, a newspaper owned by Sing Tao Corporation, that were waiting to be distributed in the early morning hours of October 22. Police were reportedly seeking 14 suspects, but no arrests were reported. Less than a month later, anti-Occupy protestors directly attacked Mr. Lai at the main protest site in Admiralty on November 12 by throwing animal organs at him. News sources report that the police arrested three men in connection with this attack.

The attacks on Mr. Lai and Next Media have continued into 2015. At approximately 1:45 am on January 12, 2015, two unidentified assailants hurled firebombs at the gates to his private residence. Five minutes later, attackers threw a similar firebomb at the gates of the Next Media offices. Two cars suspected to be used in the attacks were later found torched. Police have reportedly identified four suspects in the case. In response to the attack, Secretary for Justice Rimsky Yuen confirmed the investigation is ongoing, and “said it is not appropriate to compare present cases involving people from the media with previous ones as each case has its own circumstances.”
Other pro-democracy media figures have also been attacked. On November 25, 2014, radio broadcaster and media entrepreneur Stephen Shiu Yeuk-yuen was attacked in his car just days after calling on activists to find new ways to protest from the main stage at the Occupy protest site in Admiralty. Mr. Shiu is the founder of Hong Kong Reporter, an internet radio station, and Meme HK, another online radio station known for its pro-democracy stance. Mr. Shiu was reportedly attacked in a “car ambush” in which an unknown assailant smashed his windshield with a metal bar. No arrests had been reported at the time of publication.

In addition to attacks on high-profile media figures, the Hong Kong Journalists Association recorded 24 alleged attacks on journalists between the dates of September 22 and October 29, 2014 in connection with the pro-democracy protests. The allegations include physical and verbal assaults by unidentified assailants, as well as by police, that threatened the safety of media workers and caused media advocacy groups to question police conduct. A full list of the alleged attacks reported to the HKJA is included in the Appendix to this report. These attacks should be fully investigated, and where appropriate, those responsible should be held accountable.

Between October 3-4, 2014, at least ten separate attacks on journalists by unidentified assailants were reported when a number of anti-Occupy protestors entered the Mong Kok Occupy site and attempted to force out the protestors. The alleged attacks reported to the HKJA include the following:

- A Ming Pao News photographer reported a man punched his camera while he was filming the anti-Occupy protestors circling the pro-democracy protestors. The flashlight on his camera broke away and could not be found. The photographer was wearing his press ID and repeatedly shouting, “Calm down. I am a journalist.”

- A journalist filming for Coconuts Media, an online news site, was recording a group of men criticizing the protestors when one of the men slapped his camera and punched him on the side of his head.

- A journalist with U Magazine reported a man hit her arm several times with a hard object. She reported the case to the police after a hospital examination.

In condemning the attacks in Mong Kok on October 3 and 4, 2014, the Foreign Correspondents’ Club, the HKJA, and the International Federation of Journalists also criticized the police for allegedly failing to respond to the assaults and fulfill their responsibility to protect press safety.

During an October 25 rally organized by the Blue Ribbon Movement, known for its anti-protest stance, anti-Occupy protestors attacked a number of journalists attempting to report on the event:

- Hong Kong Television Broadcasting (TVB)’s two news cameramen and a journalist reported verbal and physical abuse including being kicked and punched. The International Federation of Journalists reported that one of the cameramen “was blocked and pulled from behind when he was trying to film a scuffle. When his camera fell, he grabbed his assailant and asked the police to prevent him from leaving, but the police did not help. The cameraman said he was immediately surrounded and assaulted by up to 20 people.”

- The International Federation of Journalists reported an incident involving Radio Television of Hong Kong (RTHK) reporter Wong Wing-yin, stating that she “was asked to prove she was a journalist when she was taking photos. Although Wong had already shown her press card, anti-Occupy Movement protestors ignored this and snatched away her press card and backpack. When she fell down, she was kicked on her leg and torso. She was eventually escorted to safety by foreign journalists.”

Six news unions and associations condemned the attacks. Media reported the police had arrested two suspects and did not exclude making further arrests.

2. Excessive Use of Force and Media Obstruction by Police Before and During Protests

In addition to attacks on members of the media by unidentified assailants in 2014, several allegations of excessive use
of force by police and police interference with the media were reported during the pro-democracy protests. These incidents included pepper spraying journalists, hitting them with batons, and arbitrary arrests of journalists. Given the size and duration of the protests, the small number of reported incidents of police infringements on press freedom suggests that considerable restraint was exercised. Taken together, however, these incidents suggest that Hong Kong police have not been adequately trained on the rights of the press during public demonstrations.

Among the alleged incidents that journalists reported to the HKJA involving the police:

- On October 15, 2014, a cameraman for Social Record Channel (SoREC), an online media portal, was reportedly dragged away by riot police while filming police efforts to clear protestors from the Tamar Garden protest site. Although he repeatedly waved his press identification card, police officers allegedly kicked and punched him and loaded him into a police van. He was released only when an officer in the van recognized that he was a journalist. The cameraman reportedly suffered injuries to his face, neck, and left arm.

- On October 15, 2014, a photographer from InMedia HK reported that a police officer pointed a bottle of pepper spray at him and told him to move back. Although the photographer followed the officer’s instructions, the officer still directed pepper spray in his face several times without giving any warning. The photographer reported that his arms were then twisted in an arm lock as the police removed him from the scene. He repeatedly shouted that he was a member of the press, to which the police responded, “Yes, you are a journalist. So what? Even if you are a journalist, you are not allowed to get so close to film.”

- On October 18, 2014, a police sergeant reportedly ordered an Oriental Daily journalist to move back. The journalist identified himself as a member of the press, and the sergeant replied, “So what?” then used a baton to physically push the journalist, who fell down. The journalist again stated, “I am a journalist. Calm down.” As the journalist tried to get up, he was pepper sprayed by police.

Other instances of alleged police interference with the media reported by Hong Kong news outlets and by journalists interviewed for this report include:

- On November 28, 2014, Ng Cheuk-hang, a freelance journalist who was covering the protest movement for Inmedia HK, was allegedly pushed onto the ground by a police officer who then looked at his press card and, despite Mr. Ng identifying himself as part of the media, instructed his colleague to arrest him. As he described the incident, “I was pushed to the ground by an officer in a deep blue shirt. He saw my press card, and asked who I was. After he looked at my press card, he said [to his colleague] ‘arrest him as well.’ Then he pushed me into a corner with others who were waiting arrest.” The police ended up releasing Mr. Ng after detaining him. He believes the police released him because they did not have evidence to charge him.

- Kayee Fung, a reporter who covered the protest movement for Meme HK, described inconsistent police treatment towards media professionals and increasing restrictions on the media’s access to the events as the Occupy movement continued. Ms. Fung recalled, “In the last few weeks, police obstruction was particularly serious. On the last day when they cleared the Admiralty site, December 11, 2014, the police told the media that if they wished to go out, they could go out after their press cards were checked. When I went out, they forced us to go to a spot, which they said was the only spot where press could go, not freely moving around. They said it was for our safety. All members of the press, including the reporters and cameramen, had to go to that spot.” Later, when Ms. Fung asked the police to return to a blocked area where protestors were waiting to be arrested, she was told she could not return because she was online media. Ms. Fung then went to the other side of the same area where the protestors were waiting to be arrested and the police in that location allowed her to enter. She commented, “I think the police internally do not know how to treat online media,” as she described colleagues who worked for traditional media outlets being allowed to more freely move around blocked areas and being explicitly told by police that “online media could not enter certain areas.”

Many of the journalists and media professionals interviewed for this report did not view excessive use of force or media obstruction by the police as a major threat to press freedom in Hong Kong, stating that they do not think Hong Kong police specifically target members of the media or intention-
ally interfere with press freedom. Some explicitly praised the police's handling of anti-Occupy protesters' attempts to curb free speech. One journalist excused police interference as a sign of police incompetence rather than an intentional act to impede reporting, and suggested police may have been more forceful with journalists near the end of the protests as a human consequence of fatigue and frustration as the days wore on. Tom Grundy, a multimedia freelance journalist who founded the English online news site Hongwong, stated, “There are good weeks and bad weeks at times, but the level of access the Hong Kong police give to journalists is good. Journalists are quite lucky in Hong Kong. You can get behind the police lines and there is better access here than in Europe or North America.”

However, incidents like those recorded here drew criticism from many media organizations, including the HKJA, the Foreign Correspondents’ Club of Hong Kong, the Press Photographers Association, and the International Federation of Journalists, as well as from human rights organizations like Amnesty International. The Foreign Correspondents’ Club stated it was “deeply disturbed” by the reports of attacks on journalists, “especially those ascribed directly to police officers, or where police could have intervened but do not appear to have done so.”

The HKJA stated, “The attacks are not accidental... We are shocked to hear some journalists who carried well-displayed identification cards had become the target of acts of violence by police. They were blocked by police from doing their reporting work. This is totally unacceptable. Only a thorough investigation into the attacks can stop the violence from spreading.” In a further statement responding to the arrests of two journalists in November, the HKJA warned, “The arrests are serious violations of press freedom enshrined in the Basic Law. They serve as an intimidation against the media from monitoring the police action.”

Police representatives have strenuously denied that journalists have been targeted by police in an effort to suppress press freedom. Former Assistant Commissioner of Police David Ng Ka-sing suggested that these incidents are the result of police working under “extremely chaotic circumstances” and reiterated that police and journalists are “partners.” The police have also stated that they will investigate all complaints lodged about police conduct during the protests “in a fair and impartial manner.” In addition, Hong Kong Chief Executive Leung Chun-Ying issued a statement on October 26 in response to an incident in which several journalists were attacked while covering the protests, saying “The Chief Executive and the Hong Kong Government all along respect press freedom and strongly condemn this savage act. The Police will follow up on the incident in a serious manner.”

Nevertheless, the alleged incidents collected in the Appendix to this report, as well as those reported in Hong Kong news media and by journalists interviewed for this report, suggest that Hong Kong police would benefit from additional training on upholding freedom of the press and freedom of assembly under the challenging conditions posed by large public demonstrations like the pro-democracy protests.

**Threats to Free Expression Online**

1. **Targeting Pro-Democracy Speech Online**

A particularly disturbing development prior to and during the pro-democracy protests was the use of Section 161 of the Crimes Ordinance, “Access to computer with criminal or dishonest intent” (“Section 161”), to target online speech by citizen journalists, bloggers, and ordinary citizens. Between September 26 and November 8, 2014, police arrested 14 people described by one news source as “pro-democracy netizens” for what police termed “cyber crime,” including:

- On October 4, 2014, a 22-year-old man was arrested for allegedly calling on people to join the Occupy movement on social media sites. He was formally charged in the Magistrates Court on December 13, 2014.
- On October 18, 2014, within hours of allegedly posting on the HKGolden website a message urging residents to take to the streets and support the protest movement, a 23-year-old man was arrested in his home. Referring to the arrest, a police spokesman told reporters, “Indciting others to commit criminal acts on the Internet is illegal. Police will investigate, gather evidence and take arrest action.”
- On November 7, 2014, the police arrested a 25-year-old man for allegedly posting a guide on Facebook groups and discussion forums encouraging people to occupy the Government House.

Prior to the pro-democracy protests in 2014, the police had already shown their willingness to use Section 161 in pursuing online speech. Local and international news media reported two cases:

- In June 2014, the police arrested a 15-year-old boy for allegedly posting a guide online on how to storm the Legislative Council building. Prosecutors charged the boy under Section 161 in September 2014.
- Shortly before the Occupy movement began in September 2014, Joshua Wong, the co-founder of the student group Scholarism, is reported to have been arrested by police after he allegedly called on fellow protestors to break through barricades in front of government headquarters. After two days, a judge ordered Wong’s release.

Media law expert Professor Doreen Weisenhaus of the Journalism and Media Studies Centre of the University of Hong Kong has expressed great concern over Hong Kong
“joining a growing trend, particularly in Asia, to use general cyber crime laws to target online speech and online activities.”

Section 161 of Hong Kong’s Crimes Ordinance was adopted in 1993, prior to many modern technological developments. Section 161 states, in part, “any person who obtains access to a computer with intent to commit an offense... whether on the same occasion as he obtains such access or on any future occasion, commits an offense[...].” According to session minutes in Hong Kong’s Legislative Council, Section 161 was a narrowly drafted law intended to combat technology crimes such as online fraud and illegal access to a computer system.

“China has determined they are going to crush the Occupy movement and they are going to do it by cyber attacks... It doesn’t mean we can’t have free speech; it just means we have to fight for it. We have always had to fight for free speech; this is just a new dynamic in the digital age.”

Many experts suggest the police and prosecution may be abusing the law by applying it broadly to curb online speech. Andrew Raffell, a barrister and consultant at the law faculty of Chinese University of Hong Kong, told business news website Quartz, “The police and the prosecution have been allowed to artificially extend [the law] to the point of distortion.” Charles Mok, a member of the IT Functional Constituency in Hong Kong’s Legislative Council, equated Section 161 to a “universal plug that can be attached to all kinds of crimes if the act involves the use of computers, mobile phones or even digital cameras.” Critics further suggest that prosecutors are using the ordinance to seek heavier sentences for individuals who may have used any electronic device in the course of an act that might be criminal in nature, even if the act was in no way computer-specific.

Media professionals, academics, researchers and advocates are also citing these Section 161 arrests as examples of the lack of legal protections for online media and the need for greater transparency surrounding user data requests in Hong Kong. The police reportedly found the person mentioned in one of the cases above using an IP address they acquired from HK Golden’s administrators, upon request, without a court order. Jennifer Zhang, the project manager of the Hong Kong Transparency Report, wrote an op-ed in the South China Morning Post highlighting the ease with which Hong Kong government officials can obtain online bloggers’ personal data and calling on government agencies and internet companies to enact safeguards for protecting online speech.

At least 14 individuals were arrested for “access to a computer with criminal and dishonest intent” or “criminal intimidation” during the pro-democracy protests; there are no reports available regarding further action on the part of the police or prosecutors. Mr. Mok expressed concern that the act of arrest itself may be enough to stifle free speech, even if police later drop the case. He worries that Section 161 is being intentionally used as a scare tactic to let people know they are being watched while using the internet. He noted the Legislative Council has been asking for statistics regarding how many people have been arrested under Section 161, how many people have been formally charged, and whether there have been any final judgments on the cases, but their requests have not been answered. Amidst the growing concern that the government is using generic cyber crime laws to go after online speech, it will be particularly important to monitor how the police, the prosecution, and the courts handle these cases.

2. Cyber Attacks Against Media Websites

Online media and websites for traditional media outlets endured what many, including the content delivery network Cloudflare, which services the sites, have reported to be “the largest cyber attacks in history” as Hong Kong’s political debates intensified.

Multiple distributed denial-of-service (DDoS) attacks began only days before an online referendum in preparation for the 2017 elections was scheduled to take place on the independent website PopVote.hk. The civic group “Occupy Central with Love and Peace” had appointed the Public Opinion Program (POP) at the University of Hong Kong and the Center for Social Policy Studies at the Hong Kong Polytechnic University to host the civil referendum on their servers through the website from June 20 – 22, 2014. The referendum aimed to allow all citizens to voice their opinions on the nomination process in advance of the 2017 elections for chief executive (the head of the Hong Kong government) and had been criticized by pro-Beijing political groups. On June 13, 2014, hours after HKU’s POP started accepting voter pre-registrations, the system reportedly “endured the largest distributed denial-of-service attack in its history.”
16, 2014, HKU POP announced that two of their three hosting providers, UDomain and Amazon Web Services, had subsequently withdrawn their services. On June 18, 2014, Next Media and the Apple Daily website experienced a DDoS attack that rendered the Apple Daily website “paralyzed” for more than ten hours. All Next Media Group websites and cell phone apps in Hong Kong and Taiwan were shut down. Apple Daily had been providing extensive coverage of the debates and events leading up to the referendum, including launching a separate online platform solely for reporting on the referendum.

On June 22, 2014, Apple Daily continued to report that its website was blocked due to the cyber attacks. Lento Yip Yuk-fai, a chairman of the Internet Service Providers’ Association, is reported to have told Apple Daily, “An attack of such a scale would require more than 10,000 computers to launch. It was unlikely to have been launched by ordinary hackers.” Based on the large scale of the attack, the proximity to the online referendum and Apple Daily’s history of supportive coverage of the online referendum, Next Media’s chairman Jimmy Lai blamed Beijing. The International Federation of Journalists’ Asia Pacific Office stated, “This is clearly a cyber attack on a media outlet aimed at suppressing press freedom.”

Next Media and Apple Daily’s website continued to experience cyber attacks on a regular basis throughout the pro-democracy protests. On July 28, 2014, multiple media sources reported that Jimmy Lai’s email account had been hacked. On October 9, news sources reported that he had been the victim of three cyber attacks since July 2014. On October 14, Apple Daily reported that its email systems, website, and mobile apps were under attack, disrupting its internal operations, news publishing, and newspaper production. Next Media executive Mark Simon told PEN that Next Media is “under attack all the time. We just continue to defend our system the best we can. China has determined they are going to crush the Occupy movement and they are going to do it by cyber attacks... It doesn’t mean we can’t have free speech; it just means we have to fight for it. We have always had to fight for free speech; this is just a new dynamic in the digital age.”
Next Media and Apple Daily were not alone in facing online attacks. Following the start of the student occupation of Civic Plaza at Hong Kong’s government headquarters in Admiralty on September 27, 2014, several independent online news sites have suffered prolonged cyber attacks disrupting their ability to disseminate news and at times forcing them entirely offline. The pro-democratic websites Passion Times, Post852, HKDash and InMediaHK all reported cyber attacks during October 2014.

Mr. Simon emphasized the importance of global unity in fighting for free speech in the digital age. He warned, “Five years from now, it is going to be a completely different world. People are going to wake up to these cyber attacks and for repression of free speech on the internet. They openly sponsor and embrace it.”

**Politically Motivated Censorship and Removal of Media Figures**

Significant senior-level personnel changes within the Hong Kong media industry starting in 2013 and continuing in 2014 have led many to fear that Hong Kong’s traditionally diverse range of media options is slowly being strangled by China’s influence. The Hong Kong Journalists Association stated in its 2014 Annual Report that “control of an organization can be achieved either through financial restraint or personnel changes. The personnel changes in the media industry in the year under review are too significant to ignore.”

Hong Kong media organizations are generally free from official government restraints on publications and government censorship of media content. However, the Hong Kong government does have a regulatory framework for media, which treats print and online media differently from broadcast media. Print and online media are largely left to self-regulate, while broadcast media are subject to licensing and detailed regulation. With most print and online media organizations in Hong Kong owned by figures with business interests in mainland China, critics argue that Hong Kong’s self-regulation has led to self-censorship in favor of those interests. As for broadcast media, critics warn that licenses “can become a way for the government to pressure TV and radio stations.”

The Hong Kong Economic Journal, Ming Pao Daily News, and Commercial Radio, all traditionally known for critical reporting on the government, removed or reshuffled editors and/or media executives amidst reports of political pressure in 2013-14. The Hong Kong Economic Journal reportedly received letters of complaint about its critical reporting about the Chief Executive of Hong Kong both from Beijing and from the Chief Executive himself before making senior-level staffing changes in 2013. Commercial Radio, one of only two privately owned radio broadcasting companies in Hong Kong, had reportedly been warned that the Chief Executive was dissatisfied with the outspoken radio host Li Wei-ling’s prime-time morning news show before Commercial Radio reshuffled the time slot for her show and later dismissed her. As referenced above, Ming Pao, which is owned by a Malaysian timber magnate with wide-ranging business interests across Asia, was recognized for its critical coverage of the government under the two-year tenure of chief executive Kevin Lau. The HKJA characterizes the figures who were removed or reshuffled in 2013 and 2014 as “either critical or less willing to give in to pressure in their respective media organizations.”

The Hong Kong Economic Journal, traditionally known as one of the most influential publications in Hong Kong and a vocal critic of the chief executive during his campaign in 2012, went through a series of personnel changes in 2013 that the HKJA characterized as a “leadership earthquake.” In August 2013, the HKEJ named Alice Kwok as chief editor. Kwok is a journalist who had reportedly been one of the subjects of a 2003 HKJA investigation into self-censorship at the Metro Finance channel of Metro Broadcast Corporation, after its then-managing editor was fired. Shortly after assuming the chief editor post at HKEJ in October 2013, deputy chief editor Yuen Yiu-ching and his team of three reporters quit amidst reports that Ms. Kwok “partially withdrew one of their articles, which cited examples alleging that major broadcaster TVB’s news reporting was in favor of Chief Executive Leung Chun-ying.” Ms. Kwok has declined to comment on the matter.

Yuen went on to start his own independent online news site, post852.com, telling the SCMP, “I was forced to set up my own site after the political pressure at the Journal. The current media landscape gives me less and less room to say what I want. I choose to earn less and have more freedom to speak the truth.”

Signs of censorship and political pressure at the HKEJ continued in 2014. Edward Chin Chi-Kin, a weekly columnist for HKEJ for the past nine years, hedge fund manager and supporter of the Occupy movement, informed the media that he “received advice from an editor in February 2014 to write only on financial matters.” He noted that this was the first time in eight years he had been told what to write. He made the issue public and refused to compromise. Subsequently, on September 2, 2014, Mr. Chin announced that HKEJ had abruptly cut his column via an email sent to him over the weekend. Mr. Chin refuted HKEJ’s explanation that his weekly column was being cut due to a new page design, citing the previous editorial advice to write only on financial matters. Mr. Chin stated, “Because of the political and economic situation in today’s Hong Kong, there’s no way for me to write only about finance in my column, since politics and economics are fundamentally inseparable.”

The Independent Commentators’ Association, which counts Chin as a member, released a statement saying, “It is not hard for someone to associate this coincidence with political censorship.”

In March 2014, Chan Ka-ming, another weekly columnist with HKEJ, publicly denounced the HKEJ for rejecting his article entitled, “Done Messing with Hong Kong, Hong Kong is Done.” The article challenged the HKEJ owner’s...
father, Li Ka-shing, on recent public comments in which he criticized the people of Hong Kong for harming Hong Kong’s economy by complaining about social injustices. When the editor reportedly informed Mr. Chan that the article was “a bit extreme” and that he should “fine tune” it, Mr. Chan published his article via the online website House News on March 11, 2014. The HKJA’s 2014 Annual Report notes that the HKEJ’s chief editor denied withdrawing Mr. Chan’s article and finally published the original piece. Commenting on reports of editorial censorship at HKEJ, the International Federation of Journalists expressed deep concern “that Hong Kong’s media managers lack sufficient independence to face ongoing political pressure from China.”

As HKEJ faced criticism around editorial censorship, Commercial Radio moved its outspoken prime-time morning news show host Li Wei-ling to a less prominent evening program on November 15, 2013, amidst criticism that the move was an attempt to gain government support leading up to 2016, when Commercial Radio’s license is set for renewal. Ms. Li publicly asserted that the move was politically motivated, claiming the administration disliked her and government officials had “warned” her to “be careful of her job.” She told the South China Morning Post, “I feel an unprecedented sense of crisis and pressure engulfing not just Commercial Radio, but the whole media industry in Hong Kong.” The station’s chief executive denied that the decision was connected to the station’s license renewal.

Commercial Radio is one of only two privately-owned radio broadcasting corporations in Hong Kong and is regulated by the Communications Authority (CA), an independent statutory body established in 2012. The Communications Authority regulates the broadcasting industry, but Hong Kong’s Chief Executive, in consultation with the Executive Council, ultimately decides whether to grant or renew a license. Commercial Radio’s decision to reshuffle Ms. Li’s airtime came shortly after the government announced a controversial decision not to issue a free-to-air license to Hong Kong Television Network (HKTV), leading to widespread public outcry and a protest attended by tens of thousands of people. Commenting on the protest, SCMP columnist Kelly Yang wrote in The Atlantic, “[The protest participants] saw this decision as just the latest in a long line of policies put forth by the Leung administration to further the interests of China... These protests express a commonly held fear in Hong Kong: that the territory’s core values are being eroded by the pro-Beijing administration.”

Reflecting on the chain of events, political commentator Albert Cheng King-hon wrote:

“It’s obvious that this program arrangement was politically motivated. The whole idea was to muzzle any dissenting voices at Commercial Radio... Now, as then, Commercial Radio’s troubles stem from the harsh reality that its operating license is up for renewal. In the face of political pressure, the broadcaster has chosen self-preservation, putting business interests ahead of anything else, even press freedom... Our media doesn’t seem to realize press freedom and freedom of expression are suffering a slow death, like a frog being slowly boiled alive. How many media organizations do we need to lose before we know we have no voice and no column space to be able to speak out?”

In February 2014, Commercial Radio fired Ms. Li. Her removal drew sharp criticism from the media community, with Ms. Li herself writing on Facebook, “Although they can ruthlessly remove me from my position, they can’t stop me from monitoring Hong Kong’s current affairs.” Ms. Li told reporters, “I’m unreservedly, one hundred per cent sure that this incident is the [Leung] administration’s suppression of the freedom of the press and of speech.” Protests gathered outside Commercial Radio’s headquarters after Li’s removal. The SCMP Editorial Board criticized Commercial Radio’s stated reason for Ms. Li’s removal, that “the basis of trust and co-operation with Li had been destroyed,” as falling “short of expectations of a broadcaster licensed to use public airwaves.” The Board wrote, “confidence in freedom of the press and freedom of expression is so fragile that it takes more than mere words to ease public worries. The government, the media and society have the duty to ensure our freedoms are not eroded.”

Only one month before Ms. Li’s removal, Ming Pao Daily News had also attracted accusations of censorship when chief editor Kevin Lau was replaced. On January 6, 2014, Ming Pao replaced Lau with a Malaysian editor residing in Singapore and viewed by many commentators as pro-Beijing. The replacement, after Mr. Lau’s two years in the position, drew public condemnation from current and former Ming Pao staff and columnists, as well as Hong Kong-based and overseas scholars, and the Hong Kong Professional Teachers’ Union. Mr. Lau’s predecessor had held the position for more than a decade. More than ninety percent of the Ming Pao staff reportedly signed a petition demanding an explanation from the management and calling for guarantees that editorial autonomy and freedom would not be compromised.

Ming Pao management’s decision was widely criticized as a response to political pressure from Beijing based on Mr. Lau’s editorial decisions, and “interpreted as a move to avoid antagonizing Beijing and to reposition the newspaper” as a more moderate conservative voice. In response to Mr. Lau’s removal, thousands of journalists and free speech advocates marched in Hong Kong to protest the erosion of press freedom and free expression in Hong Kong. Yuen Chan, a lecturer in journalism at the Chinese University of Hong Kong, told the New York Times at the time of Mr. Lau’s replacement, “If Ming Pao shifts, there’s even less room for truly independent journalism in Hong Kong. People have been saying that this shows we can’t rely on traditional media anymore.”

Amidst this backdrop of controversial media leadership changes, the Hong Kong Journalists Association’s publication The Journalist, which serves as a platform for the HKJA to...
**INSTANCSES OF MEDIA SELF-CENSORSHIP REPORTED TO THE JOURNALIST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEDIA</th>
<th>CENSORSHIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TV Stations</strong></td>
<td>A senior decided the rental-allowance fraud scandal of Mak Chai-kwong “cannot be the top story” on the day a newspaper broke it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Editors delayed broadcast of a June 4 story ready in afternoon but not sub-edited until evening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reporters are barred from interviewing scholars taking part in pan-democratic activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Events of pro-government group Voice of Loving Hong Kong must be covered and broadcasted although they are not really newsworthy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reporter looking into ICAC inquiry into a pro-government group that received public funds in run up to 2012 Legco election obtained explosive documents from a source. Editor thought the source attempted to influence election results and banned coverage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Newspapers</strong></td>
<td>A photo showing dock workers throwing food at an effigy of Li Ka-shing during their strike last year was removed from a page.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reports and commentaries of China Desk cannot single out PRC President Xi Jinping for criticism. Put “the leadership” instead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Property stories cannot target a single private project, and cannot go with photos of a particular private project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Police remove a man in June 4 T-shirt from housing estate during visit by then PRC Vice-Premier Li Keqiang in 2011. Story was taken out and condensed into a sentence at the end of another story.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reporter made follow-up enquiries with government departments in the wake of corruption scandal of then ICAC chief Timothy Tong. Editor urged reporter to stop working after departments took issue with paper.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

quarter of her bonus. The TVB news director refused to comment on the treatment of the staff members.

Many veteran journalists and media advocates interviewed for this report expressed deep concern about the political and economic pressures that threaten the vibrant diversity of publications and opinions in Hong Kong's media environment. Shirley Yam, vice-chairperson for the Hong Kong Journalists Association, said, “We are not talking about information not being reported at all, but we are talking about under-reporting, untimely reporting and reports being buried in back pages of publications.”

Paul Mooney, an award-winning American freelance journalist who worked for the SCMP for twenty years until 2012, commented, “It’s about the articles that aren’t getting published. It is hard to figure out what the logic is for what gets into the paper and what does not, so the papers allow in just enough to avoid having their credibility questioned. You have to ask about the articles that aren’t being published.” Another mid-career journalist who requested anonymity called on readers to be critical: “Journalists can push back more when the public is critical. Journalists can use the public criticism to push back on owners and senior editors when they try to block articles.”

One Hong Kong journalist interviewed for this report notes that the recent changes in the political environment have created added pressure on the government to influence mainstream media. The journalist said:

“The Beijing government and the Hong Kong government know they have a difficult political task in front of them. Hong Kong has an unpopular chief executive trying to push through a very unpopular reform package so the government feels a need to influence mainstream media. History repeats itself. This happened once in 2003 to 2004 when the SAR government was in a weak position, when they had to sell a controversial package, we saw radio stations suddenly dropping their charismatic hosts, forcing them to shut up. Now it is happening again in 2014. When the chairlady of the HKJA says Hong Kong journalism is now facing a long and cold winter, she is referring to the change in political atmosphere affecting press freedom.”

On January 14, 2015, Chief Executive C.Y. Leung directly attacked the University of Hong Kong Student Union’s magazine, Undergrad, in his annual policy address, reportedly declaring: “Undergrad and other students … have misstated some facts. We must stay alert. We also ask political figures … to advise them against putting forward such fallacies,” according to SCMP.

**Politically Motivated Economic Pressures on Media Outlets**

Press freedom in Hong Kong was also challenged by politically motivated economic pressures in 2014, as international banks withdrew long-standing advertising contracts with Hong Kong’s leading pro-democracy Chinese-language newspaper, Apple Daily, and top magazine, Next. Noting that advertisements are a vital source of revenue for both electronic and print media, the Hong Kong Journalists Association warned in its 2014 Annual Report, “[b]y placing or pulling advertisements, those in power can exert immense influence on the media and its management. The beauty of such tactics is that they are much less visible to outsiders and finding hard evidence is never easy.”

Many laud Hong Kong’s broad spectrum of media sources as essential to maintaining press freedom in the city and fear that the advertising moves seen in 2014 will destroy that diversity.

Multiple journalists and media professionals interviewed by PEN identified economic pressure on the media as one of the biggest threats to press freedom in Hong Kong. Many suggested the rise in online media, together with China’s increasing influence over Hong Kong’s economy, makes traditional media more susceptible to loss of advertising revenue. Francis Moriarty said, “A lot of things are achieved through economic pressure that would be more difficult to achieve through political pressure. Costs have gotten outrageous… Having a large circulation does not protect you from the costs. You have to pay for the cost of printing all those papers. Advertising revenues are critical in Hong Kong to cover those costs.”
Yuen Chan, a journalism lecturer at the Chinese University of Hong Kong, wrote in an article for *The World Post*:

“[T]o many [in Hong Kong], the free press is increasingly being undermined by a creeping form of self-censorship, political pressure from leaders close to Beijing and the realities of the media market: State-backed Chinese companies are emerging as important advertisers, giving them the power to shape news coverage by threatening to yank their ads. Pressure sometimes comes from Hong Kong companies that do business in China. Apple Daily—whose reporters are barred from reporting in mainland China—recently confirmed that major local banks have pulled ads from the newspaper, a sign that business can suffer if coverage offends those with ties to Beijing.”

Multinational banks’ withdrawals of advertising drew scathing criticism from pro-democracy supporter Jimmy Lai. The banks, Hong Kong Shanghai Banking Corporation (HSBC) and Standard Chartered, reportedly started to pull advertisements from *Apple Daily* and *Next* in late 2013. The two banks were reported to have spent a combined $3.6 million in 2013 on Next Media advertising and were among Next Media’s biggest financial advertising clients. HSBC stopped its advertisements in August 2013 and Standard Chartered stopped its advertisements in December 2013. Mark Simon told the *New York Times* that two local banks, Bank of East Asia and Hang Seng Bank, stopped advertising around the same time. In an interview with PEN, Mr. Simon noted that, financially, Next Media can continue without these big advertisers but advertising bans might harm smaller media outlets, forcing the “little guys” to close down and limiting the variety of media sources in Hong Kong.

While Hong Kong media organizations and critics have long accused the Chinese government of pressuring state-owned Chinese companies to withdraw advertisements in Hong Kong, this was the first time Hong Kong media has seen what many critics suggest is China’s political pressure on global companies. In response to inquiries by media and government officials, both multinational banks reportedly stated that they withdrew their advertising for “commercial” and “marketing” reasons. Anson Chan, who served as Chief Secretary, the second-highest-ranking official in Hong Kong, and is an advocate for media freedom in Hong Kong, wrote to ask the banks why they pulled their advertising.

In an interview with the *New York Times*, Ms. Chan said she was not reassured by the banks’ responses reiterating that advertising decisions are commercial. Ms. Chan stated, “An international bank like HSBC and Standard Chartered, if you act this way, it is the first step down a very slippery slope. What happens the next time they call up and say we don’t like you doing business with certain clients? Are you also going to cave in?”

Mr. Simon was widely referenced in the media in 2014 asserting that the Beijing government pressured the banks to remove their advertising due to Next Media’s continuing coverage of protests against China’s creeping influence in Hong Kong. Notably, Mr. Simon told the *New York Times* that a representative from HSBC “told him that the decision to stop advertising came after the deputy director of the Central Government’s Liaison Office in Hong Kong, Yang Jian, told the bank to end its advertising relationship.” The Liaison Office is the de facto “embassy” for Beijing in Hong Kong.

*Am730*, a free local daily newspaper in Hong Kong known for its independent and comparatively moderate voice, also saw long-standing advertisers withdraw advertisements at the end of 2013 and into 2014. Mr. Shih Wing-ching, the founder and owner of *Am730*, accused Beijing of stifling press freedom in Hong Kong citing the sudden withdrawal of advertisements from three “mainland-backed companies” without explanations. Based on a study conducted by Annisa Lee Lai, associate professor at the School of Journalism and Communication at the Chinese University of Hong Kong, the HKJA noted in its 2014 Annual Report that the Bank of China, China Construction Bank (Asia) and China CITIC Bank International withdrew or “drastically cut” advertisements from *Am730* in the final quarter of 2013 after previously placing advertisements frequently.

On July 26, 2014, the pro-democracy online media site *House News* suddenly closed down. *House News* was founded in 2012 by former Commercial Radio Chief Operating Officer Tony Tsou Tung-ho, writer and cultural critic Leung Man-tao, former adviser to the government’s Central Policy Unit Lau Sai-leung, and columnist Gregory Sung Hon-sang. Tsou, a businessman who regularly traveled into mainland China, cited fear, political pressure, and worsening finances as reasons for the closure, and reported feeling scared every time he crossed the border. Ex-columnist for *House News* Evan Fowler described the publication as a once-vibrant and neutral media outlet where journalists did not have to “censor or frame their writing within certain boundaries” to satisfy political and economic pressures. Mr. Fowler expressed deep concern over growing pressures on press freedom in Hong Kong. Sophie Richardson of Human Rights Watch also noted the damaging impact of *House News*’s closure, arguing that “[i]f Hong Kong is left with a press that only the Chinese government likes, everyone loses… A few years ago, it seemed inconceivable that the vibrant Hong Kong media could be strong-armed into obedience. But it now seems disturbingly possible that a few years from now we might not even know an outlet like *House News* had ever existed.”
RECOMMENDATIONS

While the rule of law remains strong in Hong Kong and journalists continue to enjoy a relatively free environment for reporting, the issues documented in this report indicate that press freedom in Hong Kong is at increasing risk. Media outlets are forced to contend with growing direct and indirect pressure to censor stories and silence journalists perceived as critical of Beijing, and a worrying pattern of physical assaults on journalists and media outlets continues.

On the basis of this report’s findings, PEN American Center makes the following recommendations:

To the Government of Hong Kong:

- Promptly and thoroughly investigate all reported attacks against journalists and media personnel, and hold accountable those found responsible. Provide regular public updates about the status of investigations.

- Ensure that Hong Kong police are fully trained on the rights of the media during public demonstrations, and that members of the media may do their job documenting public demonstrations without undue interference.

- Protect freedom of speech online, in accordance with the UN Human Rights Council’s resolution on human rights on the internet, which affirms that “the same rights that people have offline must also be protected online, in particular freedom of expression.”

- Provide public information, including regular updates, on cases brought under Section 161 of the Crimes Ordinance, including numbers of arrests, formal charges brought, and the final disposition of each case.

- Establish publicly accessible, standard procedures for government requests for internet users’ data, including due process protections and transparency requirements.

- Establish a transparent and independent process for media broadcasting licensing.
To the international community:

- Actively monitor the government of Hong Kong’s continued compliance with its obligations under the ICCPR, particularly those relating to press freedom, and take appropriate measures to publicly report on the government’s record of compliance.

- Request that the United Nations Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Opinion and Expression engage the Chinese government on the issue of freedom of expression in Hong Kong, and include Hong Kong in reports to the UN political bodies.

- Publicly and privately support press freedom in Hong Kong as vital to democracy, important to the free flow of information within and outside of Hong Kong, and as a bulwark in relation to the situation of press freedom in mainland China.

- Raise concerns regarding infringements on press freedom and internet freedom in Hong Kong in bilateral and multilateral discussions with both the Hong Kong and Beijing governments.

- Exert pressure on mainland Chinese authorities to cease all efforts to interfere with press freedom in Hong Kong, including the use of political pressure on commercial entities to persuade them to withdraw advertisements from Hong Kong publications that are critical of government authorities.

- International organizations, institutions, and businesses should avoid commercial decisions, including with respect to business operations, advertising, and partnerships, that compromise values of independence and respect for human rights or otherwise reinforce or enable rights infringements.

To local and overseas press organizations, and human rights organizations:

- Closely monitor and document developments in Hong Kong that affect press freedom, including physical assaults on journalists, censorship, the withdrawal of advertising from media outlets for apparently political reasons, and encroachments on freedom of expression online.

- Ensure that Hong Kong is specifically included, and its unique challenges addressed, in global reports that monitor conditions for freedom of expression and press freedom around the world.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>WHERE/WHEN</th>
<th>HOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 香港電台女記者 （RTHK Journalist）</td>
<td>25 Oct 2014，尖沙嘴鐘樓外</td>
<td>被質疑記者身份，一度遭參加者包圍，被試圖扯奪記者證及背包，並跌倒地，更被人踢打，腰部受傷，耳機損毁。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. TVB News Cameraman</td>
<td>25 Oct 2014，尖沙嘴鐘樓旁</td>
<td>被多人包圍拉扯及襲擊，攝影機被拉跌至地上，他表示要報警，隨即遭襲擊，他的眼鏡被扯走，上衣被扯爛，背部及肋骨均被抓傷。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Apple Daily Journalist</td>
<td>24 Oct 2014，旺角彌敦道近山東街</td>
<td>一班戴口罩的男子到旺角彌敦道近山東街拆路障，期間發生推撞，記者遭一名戴口罩男子揮掌打落面部。</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*记者提供录像

**Video provided by Inmedia HK:**

https://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=VSded&v=VSA7M0nR3Gg#t=9

*有佩带记者证

**Wearing a press card**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHO?</th>
<th>WHERE/WHEN?</th>
<th>HOW?</th>
<th>PRESS ID?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. 蘋果攝影記者 Apple Daily Photographer</td>
<td>10月16日約凌晨1點 龍和道近添馬公園 1 am, 16 Oct 2014 Near Tamar Park on Lung Wo Road</td>
<td>三名警員欲拘捕一名示威者時，引起過百名示威者起哄，兩名警員於是拿出警棍向人群揮動，其間該名記者感覺到至少中了兩棍，腹部、右手臂及右腳大腿有紅腫及瘀傷。該名記者認為，他有佩帶記者證，而警員與示威者對峙達數分數，故可合理識別他的記者身份。該記者表示，相信是混亂中遭擊中。</td>
<td>有佩帶記者證</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. AM730攝影記者 AM730 Cameraman</td>
<td>10月15日凌晨2點45分 龍和道 2:45 am, 15 Oct 2014 Lung Wo Road</td>
<td>警方驅散示威者期間，要求在場所有人士除下眼罩，他被警察推至通往添馬公園的樓梯，在雙方氣氛緩和之際，一名警員突然衝前扯去記者的鏡片，當警員察覺是記者後立即放手，但眼罩內的眼鏡碎裂，幸玻璃未插進眼睛。 During the police operation to remove the protesters, the police requested everyone to remove their goggles. The journalist thought that the police should recognise his identity as he was wearing a press card and there was some time before they decided to use their baton. The journalist believed that he was hit in chaos.</td>
<td>有佩帶記者證</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. SocREC攝影記者 SocREC Cameraman</td>
<td>10月15日清晨 添馬公園 Early morning, 15 Oct 2014 Tamar Garden</td>
<td>該名记者在添馬公園採訪清場，被持防暴裝備的警察強行拉入警員堆之中，拳打腳踢接近30秒，記者的眼鏡、頭盔以及眼罩被打至飛脫。一輪暴打後，兩名警員把該名記者拖行近30秒，送上警察押送犯人的旅遊巴上。拖行期間，受傷記者不停向警察展示記者證，但警察依然沒有停止毆打，更用粗口辱罵記者。 While filming the clearance of barricades and protesters, he was dragged away by a group of anti-riot policemen. He was allegedly kicked and punched for 30 seconds, before being dragged onto the floor of a coach. He repeatedly waved his press identity card on the way but was ignored. He was released only when an officer of the Police Public Relations Branch recognised him as a journalist in the coach. Hospital examination confirmed he suffered injuries to his face, forehead, nose, mouth, neck and left arm.</td>
<td>有展示記者證</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 獨立媒體網攝影記者 Inmedia HK Photographer</td>
<td>10月15日凌晨3點龍和道 3 am, 15 Oct 2014 Lung Wo Road</td>
<td>該名記者採訪期間，一名警察突然上前用胡椒噴霧指嚇他，記者遵從警員指示後退，但警察仍然在毫無警示下多次正面對準記者面部發射胡椒噴霧；後來，該記者雖然多次重申記者身份，警察仍然把他雙手扭轉並押走。其後警察更對記者吆喝：「記者又點，記者大哂？」、「記者又點，記者唔可以行前影相架嘛！」 Pointing a bottle of pepper spray at him, a police officer told him to move back. Though the journalist obliged, the officer still pepper-sprayed his face several times without giving any warning. With his arms twisted in an armlock, the journalist was removed by a policeman at the scene. While he repeatedly shouted out his press identity, the officer said: &quot;Yes, you are a journalist. So what? Even if you are a journalist, you are not allowed to get so close to film.&quot;</td>
<td>有展示記者證</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 無綫電視新聞部攝影記者 TVB News Department Cameraman</td>
<td>10月15日凌晨3點龍和道 3 am, 15 Oct 2014 Lung Wo Road Admiralty</td>
<td>警員清場期間，驅趕大批記者，該名攝影記者被地扭傷腳部。 While filming the clearance of barricades and protesters by the police, he was pulled away from the ramp by an officer who twisted his leg.</td>
<td>不詳</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO?</td>
<td>WHERE/WHEN?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Inmedia HK Journalist</td>
<td>Lung Wo Road, 10 Oct 2014 (10:15 am)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Inmedia HK Journalist</td>
<td>2014, 10月5日 (5 Oct 2014 3:10 am)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Apple Daily Journalist</td>
<td>1 am, 4 Oct 2014 near the Citic Pacific Tower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Shuo Online Journalist</td>
<td>1 am, 4 Oct 2014 near the Citic Pacific Tower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Ming Pao News Reporter</td>
<td>2am, 4 Oct 2014 Entry to the Central Government Office from the Citic Pacific Tower pedestrian flyover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**12.** 受襲受阻人士

獨立媒體網記者

Inmedia HK Journalist

**地點 / 時間**

Lung Wo Road, 10 Oct 2014 (10:15 am)

**詳情**

獨立媒體網記者在龍和道採訪時，逢警方要求後退，被警方用圓盾推傷。

While reporting on the police clearance of barricades and protestors, he was pushed back by the anti-riot police. His head was injured by a police shield.

** PRESS ID?**

有展示記者證

Press identity displayed

**13.** 受襲受阻人士

獨立媒體網記者

Inmedia HK Journalist

**地點 / 時間**

2014, 10月5日 (5 Oct 2014 3:10 am)

**詳情**

兩位記者在上海街及山東街採訪時，警方在事發現場設置人牆，與示威者對峙，雙方曾發生推撞。其中一名警員在記者表明身份後，將記者推跌。

Two journalists were covering the news. The police had created a human chain against the protestors and scuffles had erupted. One police officer gave a sudden push against the journalist who later fell down. He was stepped on by the police and the people at the scene. The people later carried him away from the scene. His left leg was injured and he was sent to have his condition checked.

** PRESS ID?**

身上有掛記者證，亦有當面向警員表示身份

The journalist wore a press card and indicated his identity twice.

**14.** 受襲受阻人士

Apple Daily Journalist

**地點 / 時間**

1 am, 4 Oct 2014 near the Citic Pacific Tower

**詳情**

採訪警察與示威者對峙期間，多名警察向記者攻擊。

He was covering the clash between the police and the protestors on the flyover. He was punched by two to three plainclothed policemen.

** PRESS ID?**

掛有所屬院校印發的記者證。

Wearing a press identity card issued by the Shue Yan University

**15.** 受襲受阻人士

A journalist of Shuo Online

**地點 / 時間**

1 am, 4 Oct 2014 near the Citic Pacific Tower

**詳情**

採訪衝突，期間突遭兩至三名衝向人群的便裝警員的手臂撞到，至左胸口紅腫及疼痛。

The journalist was witnessing the clash between the police and the protestors on the flyover. A policeman has suddenly pushed him in chest.

** PRESS ID?**

身穿寫有「記者」字眼背心，衝撞時有大叫「記者」及後退。

Wearing a press jacket. He shouted "I am a journalist" when he was elbowed.

**16.** 受襲受阻人士

Ming Pao News Reporter

**地點 / 時間**

2am, 4 Oct 2014 Entry to the Central Government Office from the Citic Pacific Tower pedestrian flyover

**詳情**

採訪衝突，期間突然被多名便裝警員用手臂推撞。

The journalist was watching the clash between the Occupy protesters and their opponents. He was elbowed by two to three plainclothed policemen. He sustained bruises and pain.

** PRESS ID?**

身穿寫有「記者」字眼背心，衝撞時有大叫「記者」及後退。

Wearing a press jacket. He shouted "I am a journalist" when he was elbowed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>受駁阻人士</th>
<th>地點/時間</th>
<th>詳情</th>
<th>PRESS ID?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>17. Coconut Media</strong></td>
<td>10月3日旺角 3 Oct 2014 Mongkok</td>
<td>在拍攝反佔中分子叫罵時，被其中一名男子拍打鏡頭，再拍打頭部。 He was filming a group of men criticising the Occupy protestors. One of the men slapped his camera and punched him on the side of his head.</td>
<td>不詳 NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18. Radio Television Hong Kong TV Journalist</strong></td>
<td>10月3日旺角 3 Oct 2014 Mongkok</td>
<td>被不停指罵留守人士的藍衣中年男士襲擊，該名記者雖多次提及記者身分，仍被對方多次揮拳攻擊頭部。他稱眼鏡和手上攝影機在過程中損毁，警察現已拘留襲擊男子。 A man who has been shouting angry remarks to the Occupy Movement protestors punched his head out of the blue. His left eye bled. He sustained a bruised eye and swollen nose. His camera and glasses were damaged. The man was then arrested by the police.</td>
<td>身穿附有記者大字之背心，已多次表明自己是記者 He shouted &quot;I am a journalist&quot; several times when attacked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19. U Magazine Journalist</strong></td>
<td>10月3日旺角 3 Oct 2014 Mongkok</td>
<td>晚上被一名男子以硬物多次拍打手臂，已驗傷，並報警，手部有瘀傷。 A man hit her arm several times with a hard object. She has reported the case to the police after hospital examination. She sustained bruises.</td>
<td>增有記者證 Press ID displayed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20. 明報攝影記者 Ming Pao News Photographer</strong></td>
<td>10月3日旺角彌敦道與亞皆老街交界 3 Oct 2014 Intersection of Nathan Road and Argyle Street</td>
<td>晚上拍攝反佔中人士包圍集會群眾時，突然遭一名男子揮拳打向相機，閃光燈被打至飛脫，並於混亂中遺失。 He was filming the encirclement of the Occupy protestors by their opponents. A man punched his camera. The flash light broke away and could not be found.</td>
<td>不時表明「冷靜，我係記者」，有配戴記者證。 Wearing his press ID and repeatedly shouting: “Calm down. I am a journalist.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>21. South China Morning Post Journalist</strong></td>
<td>10月3日晚上8時25分旺角佔中主台旁 8:25 pm, 3 Oct 2014 Mongkok, next to the Occupy Movement tent</td>
<td>在警方防線後，被人拋擲滿載之膠水瓶，擊中頭部。 He was working behind a cordon line formed by some policemen. His head was hit by a full water bottle thrown from the side of the anti-Occupy protestors.</td>
<td>增有記者證，並穿有記者大字之背心。 Wearing his press card and a press jacket with big print of PRESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WHO?</strong></td>
<td>地點/時間 <strong>WHERE/WHEN?</strong></td>
<td>詳情 <strong>HOW?</strong></td>
<td>PRESS ID?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. 香港電台記者 Radio Television Hong Kong Journalist</td>
<td>10月3日 金鐘中信大廈附近天橋 3 Oct 2014 The flyover near the Citic Pacific Tower</td>
<td>採訪一群警員與佔領人士對峙，被一名警員以警棍打腰。驗傷時，發現盤骨附近軟組織受損，傷處紅腫，記者感覺痛楚。 He was reporting on the clash between a team of policemen and the Occupy movement protestors. A policeman hit him on his waist with a baton. The soft tissues near the pelvis were damaged. The journalist suffered bruises and pain.</td>
<td>22.香港電台記者 Radio Television Hong Kong Journalist 22.香港電台記者 Radio Television Hong Kong Journalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Freelance Journalist</td>
<td>10月3日 旺角被圍巴士旁 3 Oct 2014 Mongkok</td>
<td>被一名反佔中男子以水瓶迎面拍打。 A man who has been criticising the Occupy Movement protestors suddenly hit his face with a water bottle.</td>
<td>沒有 No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. DBC Radio Journalist</td>
<td>9月28日晚上10時45分 干諾道中及美利道交界石壆(友邦金融中心附近) 10.45 pm, 28 Sep 2014 Near Prudential Financial Tower on Connaught Road Central</td>
<td>記者站在友邦金融中心旁，當防暴警察施放催淚彈，市民紛紛往金鐘方向後退，記者則趁此時機站在石壆拍攝防暴警察推進場面，有防暴警察立即拉著他的背囊並把他由石壆扯落地，記者高呼他是記者，但對方一邊叫他上天橋影相，一邊繼續拉著他的背囊逼他走。記者被拉扯到天橋樓梯，由於處於倒後退的姿勢，腳跟撞到天橋第一級樓梯，重心不穩向後跌。 The police fired a round of tear gas. He was filming the retreat of protestors from a ramp. He refused a police order to get down. A policeman grabbed him by his backpack; yanked him down and forced him onto a pedestrian bridge. He fell and got injured.</td>
<td>有穿著公司提供的橙色印有記者字樣背心及戴記者證 Press identity displayed while wearing an orange press jacket.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>