



Australian Government
Refugee Review Tribunal

Country Advice

China

China – CHN36164 – Fujian Province –
Putian – Corruption – Demonstrations –
Petitioners – Disturbing public order
offences – Public surveillance – Police
17 February 2010

1. Deleted.

2. Are there any reports on the petitioning or demonstrating by citizens against local/district level government corruption in Putian or Fujian, and treatment of them by police and the authorities? Please provide information on what may happen more generally in China to such people.

There are media and human rights reports on the petitioning and demonstrating by citizens against local/district level government corruption in Putian and Fujian dated from 2004 to 2009. These reports indicate police have detained leaders who have pursued, over several years, anti-corruption complaints via petitioning and/or demonstrations, and courts in Putian have sentenced them to 2-3 years imprisonment for disturbing social order. Those represented by protest leaders have been intimidated, threatened and placed under surveillance.

Putian City authorities have detained and imprisoned for two to three years on public order offences persons who have pursued formal complaints and/or petitions against local officials who allegedly committed corruption. Two cases are detailed below:

In case one, a farmer from Zhuchuan village, Lin Jindian, was charged with “disturbance of public order” and sentenced to two and half years prison in August 2004 by a court in Putian City. He had pursued longstanding corruption complaints on behalf of 30-40 families against a local party secretary and officials. Prior to being charged, Jindian had pursued with county, city, provincial and national governments complaints against officials who had “embezzled public money, didn’t stick to regulations, and levied too many taxes”, and had sold out-of-quota birth permits to families. Several years earlier Jindian’s brother had been beaten and died in a detention centre for first leading the complaints against the officials. The families represented by Jindian were also allegedly intimidated.¹

A second highly publicised case centres on farmer Huang Weizhong of the Chengxing District of Putian City, who represented hundreds of villagers in their complaints against corrupt practices surrounding land requisition, compensation, and resettlement fees. Local officials allegedly failed to follow proper legal procedures for the requisition and the compensation to be paid. Beginning in 2003, Weizhong and the villagers sought redress via lawsuits submitted to various courts, administrative reviews with the Putian City and provincial governments, and petitions to authorities in the capital Beijing. As a final resort, an

¹ ‘Fujian Officials Take Revenge for Complaints Against Them’ 2004, *Radio Free Asia*, 11 September http://www.rfa.org/english/news/social/fujian_corruption-20040911.html - Accessed 5 February 2010 – Attachment 1.

application was made in August 2005 with the Fuzhou City Public Security Bureau (PSB) to hold a demonstration, which was denied and declared an attempt “to disturb public order”. Weizhong was then reportedly interrogated for 12-hours and threatened by police, who forced him to withdraw the application. After being released he and other villager representatives were repeatedly threatened and put under surveillance, with some detained for 3 days. Following a second visit to Beijing, Weizhong was detained for 15 days and charged with “disturbing public order”. In early 2006 he was sentenced to 3 years in prison for “gathering crowds to disturb public order” by the Chengxiang District Court.²

Courts in the provincial capital have very recently also sentenced to prison someone who publicly demonstrated against corruption. In 2009, a legal activist who travelled to Beijing seeking application to demonstrate during the Olympics against official corruption, and who also called for greater participation for the Chinese people in political processes, was sentenced to three years imprisonment by the Fujian Intermediate People’s Court. He was charged on the unrelated matter of “forging official documents and seals”.³

Treatment of protesters/demonstrators against corruption in China

The practices reported above from Putian City and Fujian are consistent with the situation more generally in China. Those who attempt to highlight publicly, particular instances of corruption in China through demonstrations or protests, or through related acts such as formal petitioning (*xinfang*) to Offices of Letters and Visits, are vulnerable to a range of repercussions from the authorities, including:

- being followed by Public Security Bureau officials;
- forcible detention;
- physical harassment; and
- sentenced to several years’ imprisonment for disturbing public order.⁴

A significant number of the demonstrations, assemblies, protests, and group petitioning (*xinfang*) to Offices of Letters and Visits in China each year – often referred to as “mass incidents” – are put down to anger at government corruption. An estimated 127,000 mass incidents/protests involving more than 12 million people took place in 2008. The US State Department has concluded that endemic corruption in China remains a “serious social condition that affected human rights”.⁵

² ‘Chinese peasant land rights representative jailed for disrupting "social order"’ 2006, *BBC Monitoring Asia Pacific*, source: Ming Pao website, Hong Kong, 6 June – Attachment 2; ‘Huang, Weizhong: Imprisoned Rural Activist’, 2006, Chinese Human Rights Defenders website, 5 June http://crd-net.org/Article/Class9/Class48/Class61/200606/20060605202147_1349.html - Accessed 5 February 2010 – Attachment 3; Human Rights Watch (undated), ‘China’s Rights Defenders: Huang Weizhong, Defender of farmers’ rights’, <http://www.hrw.org/en/Chinas-rights-defenders> - Accessed 8 February 2010 – Attachment 4.

³ Amnesty International 2009, ‘China: Free thwarted Olympics petitioner Ji Sizun’, 5 May – Attachment 5.

⁴ For some examples see: ‘People displaced by dam on Yangtze River to protest against corruption’ 2006, *Asia News*, 7 December <http://www.asianews.it/index.php?l=en&art=7951> – Accessed 24 December 2007 – Attachment 6; ‘Launched by Gao, the national hunger strike against Party abuse begins’ 2006, *Asia News*, 6 February – Attachment 7; ‘Village residents and police clash’ 2005, *Asia News*, 19 August – Attachment 8; Human Rights Watch 2002, ‘China Human Rights Update, Human Rights Watch Press Backgrounder, February Section ‘Freedom of Religion and Belief’ http://hrw.org/backgrounder/asia/china_update.htm – Accessed 20 February 2007 – Attachment 9.

⁵ US State Department 2009, *2008 Human Rights Report: China (includes Tibet, Hong Kong, and Macau)*, ‘Government Corruption and Transparency’, 25 February – Attachment 10; ‘Petitioning: The Right to Criticize and Seek Redress’ 2009, Human Rights in China website, 8 February <http://www.ir2008.org/03/issue.php> -

The general treatment of those who lead protests/demonstrations on issues closely associated with corruption was commented upon by DFAT in September 2009, in a report investigating a specific case of civil disturbance in Fuqing City. DFAT believe that detention for a short period would be common for the leader of a non-violent/threatening demonstration:

Civil protest on matters such as land disputes, environmental safety, claims for compensation, etc, are increasingly commonplace in China. Generally speaking, local authorities tolerate peaceful protest that does not breach the law. We have no specific knowledge, but our impression is that the act of being an organiser of a protest, distributing petitions and pamphlets (as long as they were not of a seditious or politically-sensitive nature) would not of themselves result in a person being subject to imprisonment (although detention for a period of time would not be uncommon).

Where a protest descends into violence and threatens local officials, including law enforcement agencies, the calculation would be quite different. Post assesses that if individuals are deemed to have participated in criminal activities such as assaulting police or holding workers hostage (as described in the media accounts), they are likely to face substantial prison terms.⁶

In a 2008 paper from *The China Quarterly* on the profile and roles of those who lead protests, petitions and demonstrations in rural China, the authors give the following on their possible treatment by the authorities:

...sometimes persistence and faith in higher levels pays off. Unlawful fees are revoked, illegal land grabs are reversed and corrupt cadres are dismissed. But more often than not, despite their “reasonable claims” (合理要求), petitioners’ representatives meet with repression. Public security officers raid their homes and confiscate valuables such as furniture, television sets and even coffins. Sometimes local cadres go so far as to tear down the houses of protest leaders, partially or completely. Rural officials may beat protest leaders and their family members, illegally detain them, or have them sentenced to labour education or jail on charges such as “resisting taxes,” “disturbing social order,” “beating up cadres,” “attacking the government,” “impeding government work,” “interfering with law enforcement” or “illegally instigating a disturbance.” Cadres in some places have used periodic strike-hard anti-crime campaigns to imprison petitioners’ representatives in the name of maintaining stability and safeguarding law and order...⁷

Local officials remain sensitive to anti-corruption campaigners and demonstrators for a number of reasons. If large numbers of petitioners from a locale take their grievances to higher levels, regardless of the complaint this reflects badly on local officials.⁸ Local officials may be contractually required to meet performance targets in core areas such as “social stability”, central to their evaluation and assessment by higher officials. Targets in these core

Accessed 11 February 2010 – Attachment 11.: US Congressional-Executive Commission on China 2009, *Annual Report 2009*, 10 October, p. 92 – Attachment 12.

⁶ DIAC Country Information Service 2009, Country Information Report No. 09/64 – PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA: Dongying Village, Longtian County, Fuqing City, Fujian Provin, (sourced from DFAT advice of 8 September 2009, 9 September – Attachment 13.

⁷ Lianjinag, L. and O'Brien, J., 2008, 'Protest Leadership in Rural China', *The China Quarterly*, p.17 - Attachment 14.

⁸ US Congressional-Executive Commission on China 2009, *Annual Report 2009*, 10 October, p. 239 – Attachment 12.

areas are tied to rewards and punishments.⁹ Factors such as these may pressure local officials to suppress those who attempt to highlight practices like corruption.

Areas where bribes or kickbacks are believed concentrated are those with heavy state involvement which includes infrastructural projects and government procurement.¹⁰ The Chinese government itself admits that corruption is a serious problem in some locations and areas of administration; and while it introduces measures and campaigns to combat corruption and thousands of officials are publicly disgraced and/or prosecuted each year for corruption, independent or unofficial anti-corruption campaigners can be viewed with suspicion and as attacking the current political system. Some campaigners have been gaoled on the charge of “leaking state secrets”.¹¹ Adding to the potentially politically sensitive nature of this area is the fact that anger at official corruption was one factor behind the 1989 Tiananmen demonstrations.¹²

The central government does, however, encourage citizens to report corruption cases. In recent years it has operated websites for citizens to report any irregular practices, in part to avoid inaction or retaliation by local officials.¹³ In October 2009 the *Criminal Law of the People’s Republic of China* was amended to include the charge of “using personal influence to take bribes”. A government report on the amendment highlighted, however, that only small numbers of officials are punished for corruption. It also quotes a teacher from China University in Jiangsu province who believed that persons usually faced serious revenge from reporting on corruption and uncertainty remained on the ability of government to protect informers.¹⁴

3. Are petitioners/demonstrators against government corruption detained for around 15 days for disturbing public order? If so, what are circumstances surrounding such detention?

Reports of petitioners/demonstrators against government corruption being detained for short periods (including fifteen days) for disturbing public order or related charges are common.¹⁵

⁹ Smith, G. 2009, ‘Political machinations in a rural county’, *The China Journal*, no.62, July, p. 49 – Attachment 15; US State Department 2009, *2008 Human Rights Report: China (includes Tibet, Hong Kong, and Macau)*, ‘Freedom of Assembly’, 25 February, “Freedom of Assembly” – Attachment 10.

¹⁰ Garnaut, J. 2010, ‘Here the wheels of China’s corruption grind exceedingly fine’, *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 4 January <http://www.smh.com.au/business/here-the-wheels-of-chinas-corruption-grind-exceedingly-fine-20100103-lncs.html> - Accessed 9 February 2010 – Attachment 16; Pei, M. 2007, ‘Corruption threatens China’s future’, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace Policy Brief 55, October, pp.2-3 <http://www.ciaonet.org/pbei/ceip/ceip10314/ceip10314.pdf> – Accessed 11 December 2007 – Attachment 17.

¹¹ ‘Analysis: Doubts voiced over China’s anti-corruption resolve’ 2006, *BBC Monitoring Alert*, 25 October – Attachment 18.

¹² Pei, M. 2007, ‘Corruption threatens China’s future’, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace Policy Brief 55, October <http://www.ciaonet.org/pbei/ceip/ceip10314/ceip10314.pdf> – Accessed 11 December 2007 – Attachment 17.

¹³ US Congressional-Executive Commission on China 2009, *Annual Report 2009*, 10 October, p. 214 – Attachment 12; Cody, E. 2007, ‘Chinese Assail Official Misconduct With Fervor’, *Washington Post*, 20 December <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/12/19/AR2007121900678.html> – Accessed 24 December 2007 – Attachment 19; Huanshu, W. 2009, ‘Online exposure battle corruption’, China.org.cn website, 30 October http://www.china.org.cn/china/2009-10/30/content_18800570.htm - Accessed 5 February 2010 – Attachment 20; ‘China Launches Whistleblower Website’ 2005, *The Age*, 29 December <http://www.theage.com.au/news/technology/china-launches-whistleblower-website/2005/12/29/1135732678059.html#> – Accessed 27 November 2006 – Attachment 21.

¹⁴ Huanshu, W. 2009, ‘Online exposure battle corruption’, China.org.cn website, 30 October http://www.china.org.cn/china/2009-10/30/content_18800570.htm - Accessed 5 February 2010 – Attachment 20.

¹⁵ For examples see: Jacobs, A. 2008, ‘Beijing’s protest zones: Apply at your own risk’, *The New York Times*, 13 August http://www.nytimes.com/2008/08/13/world/asia/13iht-protest.2.15242827.html?_r=1 - Accessed 11

The *Regulations on Letters and Visits* (RLV) (2005)¹⁶ and *The Public Order Administration Punishment Law* (POAPL) (2005) both allow the public security bureau to detain someone for disturbing public order. While Article 20 of the RLV prohibits acts of petitioning that disrupt public order, there is no stipulation for 15 days of detention for violations. Article 47 of the RLV allows for administrative punishment under the POAPL, which does stipulate 15 day detention. It therefore seems most likely that people can be detained in these circumstances as defined by *The Public Order Administration Punishment Law*.

The Public Order Administration Punishment Law (2005) (POAPL) (中华人民共和国治安管理处罚法)

The POAPL deals with acts disturbing public order, and the penalties to be applied in such circumstances, under Section 1, Article 23. Ringleaders of crowds causing public order disturbances “shall be detained for not less than 10 days but not more than 15 days... and may, in addition, be fined not more than 1,000 Yuan”:

Article 23

A person who commits one of the following acts shall be given a warning or be fined not more than RMB 200 yuan; and if the circumstances are relatively serious, he shall be detained for not less than 5 days but not more than 10 days and may, in addition, be fined not more than 500 yuan:

(1) disturbing the order of government departments, public organizations, enterprises or institutions, thus making it impossible for work, production, business operation, medical care, teaching or scientific research to go on normally but not having caused serious losses;

(2) disturbing the public order at stations, ports, wharves, airports, department stores, parks, exhibition halls or other public places...

Where the acts mentioned in the preceding paragraphs are committed by a crowd, the ringleader shall be detained for not less than 10 days but not more than 15 days and may, in addition, be fined not more than 1,000 yuan.¹⁷

Article 55 of the POAPL may also be relevant to the current case. While not referring to social order disturbances, it applies 10-15 day detention to a person “who incites or engineers an illegal gathering, parade or demonstration and refuses to listen to dissuasions”.

Public order disturbances under Criminal law

The *Criminal Law of the People’s Republic of China* also applies penalties of criminal detention and “public surveillance” for acts of disturbing public order considered serious.

February 2010 – Attachment 22; ‘The Zhongshan Incident’ 2006, Zona Europa website, 16 January http://www.zonaeuropa.com/20060116_1.htm - Accessed 11 February 2010 – Attachment 23; ‘Petitioning: The Right to Criticize and Seek Redress’ 2009, Human Rights in China website, 8 February

<http://www.ir2008.org/03/issue.php> - Accessed 11 February 2010 – Attachment 11; Lianjinag, L. and O’Brien, J., 2008, ‘Protest Leadership in Rural China’, *The China Quarterly*, esp. pp. 4, 12, 17-18, 19 - Attachment 14.

¹⁶ *Regulations on Letters and Visits*, (Adopted 5 January 2005 & Promulgated 1 May 1, 2005), China.org website <http://www.china.org.cn/e-news/news050428-3.htm> - Accessed 11 February 2010 – Attachment 24.

¹⁷ *Law of the People’s Republic of China on Penalties for Administration of Public Security* (Promulgated 28 August 2005 & Effective 1 March 2006), Asian Legal Information Institute website <http://www.asianlii.org/cn/legis/cen/laws/pfaops1501/> - Accessed 26 June 2009 – Attachment 25.

Persons alleging corruption by local officials and petitioning government authorities have been detained, and released on bail, for “gathering people to disturb public order” under Article 290 of the *Criminal Law of the People’s Republic of China*.¹⁸ Article 290 allows for those who lead disturbances considered serious to be imprisoned, and those who actively participate to be imprisoned, or incur criminal detention, public surveillance or deprivation of political rights:

Where an assembled crowd disturbs public order, if the circumstances are so serious that work, production, business, education or scientific research cannot be conducted and serious losses are caused, the ringleaders shall be sentenced to fixed-term imprisonment of not less than three years and not more than seven years, other active participants shall be sentenced to fixed-term imprisonment of not more than three years, criminal detention, public surveillance or deprivation of political rights.

Where an assembled crowd assaults state organs and makes it impossible for the organs to conduct their work and serious losses are caused, the ringleaders shall be sentenced to fixed-term imprisonment of not less than five years and not more than ten years; other active participants shall be sentenced to fixed-term imprisonment of not more than five years, criminal detention, public surveillance or deprivation of political rights.¹⁹

4. What are the repercussions for someone who fails to report to police as required by a formal order?

Very little information was found on the penalties or repercussions for someone who fails to report to police as required by a formal order. The repercussions would likely depend on the type of formal order, that is, whether the penalty was applied following administrative or criminal detention. Chapter IV of *The Public Order Administration Punishment Law (2005)*, which deals with implementing procedures, does not refer to a requirement to report to police following a period of administrative detention. The requirement to report to police on a regular basis following a short period of administrative detention is, however, commonly reported on by overseas human rights sources, though the legal basis for this is not made explicit. Based on limited sources, this requirement is used to monitor the behaviour of those released from detention and/or restrict their ability to travel in order to petition authorities in Beijing or undertake religious pilgrimages. In one instance, a fine was levied by the police against a person who failed to fulfil reporting requirements.²⁰

¹⁸ ‘Deadline Nears for Release of Rural Activist Guo Feixiong’ 2005, Congressional-Executive Commission on China website, 17 November <http://www.cecc.gov/pages/virtualAcad/newsletterListing.php?NLdate=20051201&show=ALL&PHPSESSID=161f685eb4d349e96f7b8c44e5e52771> - Accessed 11 February 2010 – Attachment 26; ‘Procuratorate Indicts Feng Bingxian and Three Other Shaanxi Oil Investors’ 2005, Congressional-Executive Commission on China website, 27 October

<http://www.cecc.gov/pages/virtualAcad/newsletterListing.php?NLdate=20051201&show=ALL&PHPSESSID=161f685eb4d349e96f7b8c44e5e52771> - Accessed 11 February 2010 – Attachment 27.

¹⁹ *Criminal Law of the People’s Republic of China*, (Promulgated 14 March 1997 & Effective 1 October 1997), AsianLII website – Attachment 28.

²⁰ ‘Husband Sentenced to Five Years in Prison, Wife Destitute and Homeless - Yu Zaihua Tells of Her Persecution Experiences over the Past Eight Years’ 2007, Clear Harmony website, 22 July <http://www.clearharmony.net/articles/200707/40425.html> - Accessed 16 February 2010 – Attachment 29; Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada 2005, *CHN100726.EX – China: Situation of Falun Gong practitioners and treatment by state authorities (2001 – 2005)*, 31 October, p.9 – Attachment 30; ‘Appeal letter to the Government of the People’s Republic of China from Bishop Su Zhimin, the Bishop of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Baoding, Hebei China’ 1996, ‘Cardinal King Foundation website, 15 June <http://www.cardinalkungfoundation.org/articles/suappe01.htm> - Accessed 16 February 2010 – Attachment 31.

The legal basis for a person's requirement to report to police may be that referred to in China as public surveillance. The requirement to report one's activities to the Public Security Bureau is a requirement under the *Criminal Law* in those situations where the penalties of public surveillance, a suspended sentence, or release on parole are applied. Public surveillance (管制 *guanzhi*, literally "compulsory restraint") refers to a relatively light criminal penalty applied to criminals who do not have to be confined in prison or reform through labour. When sentenced to public surveillance, a criminal is required to report periodically to a public security organ on his activities. At the same time, his or her case is announced publicly so that their behaviour can be watched.²¹

Articles 38 and 39 of the *Criminal Law of the People's Republic of China* (1997) state the following on public surveillance:

Section 2 Public Surveillance

Article 38

The term of public surveillance shall not be less than three months and not more than two years. Where a criminal is sentenced to public surveillance, his sentence shall be executed by a public security organ.

Article 39

A criminal who is sentenced to public surveillance must observe the following rules during the term in which his sentence is being executed:

- (1) observe laws and administrative regulations, submit to supervision;
- (2) forbidden to exercise the rights of freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, of association, of procession and of demonstration without approval of the public organ;
- (3) report on his own activities according to the demand of the organ executing the public surveillance;
- (4) observe the stipulation on meeting with guests by the organ executing the public surveillance; and
- (5) report and obtain approval from the organ executing public surveillance for departure from the county or city where he lives or change in residence.

Criminals sentenced to public surveillance shall, while engaged in labour, receive equal pay for equal work.

Article 40

Upon the expiration of a term of public surveillance, the executing organ shall immediately announce the termination of public surveillance to the criminal sentenced to public surveillance and to his unit or the masses of the place of his residence.

Article 41

²¹ See note to: *Criminal Law of the People's Republic of China* (Promulgated 14 March & Effective 1 October 1997), AsianLII website, <http://www.asianlii.org/cgi-bin/disp.pl/cn/legis/cen/laws/cl104/cl104.html?query=^guanzhi> - Accessed 17 February 2010 – Attachment 32.

A term of public surveillance shall be counted from the date the judgment begins to be executed; if the criminal is held in custody before the execution of the judgment, each day spent in custody shall be considered as two days of the term sentenced.²²

No information was found on the treatment of those who violate these public surveillance requirements.

List of Attachments:

1. 'Fujian Officials Take Revenge for Complaints against Them' 2004, *Radio Free Asia*, 11 September http://www.rfa.org/english/news/social/fujian_corruption-20040911.html – Accessed 5 February 2010.
2. 'Chinese peasant land rights representative jailed for disrupting "social order"' 2006, *BBC Monitoring Asia Pacific*, source: Ming Pao website, Hong Kong, 6 June. (FACTIVA)
3. 'Huang, Weizhong: Imprisoned Rural Activist', 2006, Chinese Human Rights Defenders website, 5 June http://crd-net.org/Article/Class9/Class48/Class61/200606/20060605202147_1349.html – Accessed 5 February 2010.
4. Human Rights Watch (undated), 'China's Rights Defenders: Huang Weizhong, Defender of farmers' rights', <http://www.hrw.org/en/Chinas-rights-defenders> – Accessed 8 February 2010.
5. Amnesty International 2009, 'China: Free thwarted Olympics petitioner Ji Sizun', 5 May.
6. 'People displaced by dam on Yangtze River to protest against corruption' 2006, *Asia News*, 7 December <http://www.asianews.it/index.php?l=en&art=7951> – Accessed 24 December 2007.
7. 'Launched by Gao, the national hunger strike against Party abuse begins' 2006, *Asia News*, 6 February. (CISNET 'China' CX145967)
8. 'Village residents and police clash' 2005, *Asia News*, 19 August. (CISNET 'China' CX131842)
9. Human Rights Watch 2002, 'China Human Rights Update, Human Rights Watch Press Backgrounder, February Section 'Freedom of Religion and Belief' http://hrw.org/backgrounder/asia/china_update.htm – Accessed 20 February 2007.
10. US State Department 2009, *2008 Human Rights Report: China (includes Tibet, Hong Kong, and Macau)*, 25 February.
11. 'Petitioning: The Right to Criticize and Seek Redress' 2009, Human Rights in China website, 8 February <http://www.ir2008.org/03/issue.php> – Accessed 11 February 2010.

²² *Criminal Law of the People's Republic of China*, (Promulgated 14 March 1997 & Effective 1 October 1997), AsianLII website – Attachment 27.

12. US Congressional-Executive Commission on China 2009, *Annual Report 2009*, 10 October.
13. DIAC Country Information Service 2009, Country Information Report No. 09/64 – *PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA: Dongying Village, Longtian County, Fuqing City, Fujian Province*, (sourced from DFAT advice of 8 September 2009, 9 September. (Cisnet China – CX233014)
14. Lianjinag, L. and O'Brien, J., 2008, 'Protest Leadership in Rural China', *The China Quarterly*, pp.1-23.
15. Smith, G. 2009, 'Political machinations in a rural county', *The China Journal*, no.62, July, pp.29-59.
16. Garnaut, J. 2010, 'Here the wheels of China's corruption grind exceedingly fine', *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 4 January <http://www.smh.com.au/business/here-the-wheels-of-chinas-corruption-grind-exceedingly-fine-20100103-lncs.html> – Accessed 9 February 2010.
17. Pei, M. 2007, 'Corruption threatens China's future', Carnegie Endowment for International Peace Policy Brief 55, October <http://www.ciaonet.org/pbei/ceip/ceip10314/ceip10314.pdf> – Accessed 11 December 2007.
18. 'Analysis: Doubts voiced over China's anti-corruption resolve' 2006, *BBC Monitoring Alert*, 25 October. (Cisnet China – CX164140)
19. Cody, E. 2007, 'Chinese Assail Official Misconduct With Fervor', *Washington Post*, 20 December <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/12/19/AR2007121900678.html> – Accessed 24 December 2007.
20. Huanshu, W. 2009, 'Online exposure battle corruption', China.org.cn website, 30 October http://www.china.org.cn/china/2009-10/30/content_18800570.htm – Accessed 5 February 2010.
21. 'China Launches Whistleblower Website' 2005, *The Age*, 29 December <http://www.theage.com.au/news/technology/china-launches-whistleblower-website/2005/12/29/1135732678059.html#> – Accessed 17 February 2010.
22. Jacobs, A. 2008, 'Beijing's protest zones: Apply at your own risk', *The New York Times*, 13 August http://www.nytimes.com/2008/08/13/world/asia/13iht-protest.2.15242827.html?_r=1 – Accessed 11 February 2010.
23. 'The Zhongshan Incident' 2006, Zona Europa website, 16 January http://www.zonaeuropa.com/20060116_1.htm – Accessed 11 February 2010.
24. *Regulations on Letters and Visits*, (Adopted 5 January 2005 & Promulgated 1 May 1, 2005), China.org website <http://www.china.org.cn/e-news/news050428-3.htm> – Accessed 11 February 2010.
25. *Law of the People's Republic of China on Penalties for Administration of Public Security* (Promulgated 28 August 2005 & Effective 1 March 2006), Asian Legal

- Information Institute website <http://www.asianlii.org/cn/legis/cen/laws/pfaops1501/> – Accessed 26 June 2009.
26. ‘Deadline Nears for Release of Rural Activist Guo Feixiong’ 2005, Congressional-Executive Commission on China website, 17 November
<http://www.cecc.gov/pages/virtualAcad/newsletterListing.phpd?NLdate=20051201&show=ALL&PHPSESSID=161f685eb4d349e96f7b8c44e5e52771> – Accessed 11 February 2010.
 27. ‘Procuratorate Indicts Feng Bingxian and Three Other Shaanxi Oil Investors’ 2005, Congressional-Executive Commission on China website, 27 October
<http://www.cecc.gov/pages/virtualAcad/newsletterListing.phpd?NLdate=20051201&show=ALL&PHPSESSID=161f685eb4d349e96f7b8c44e5e52771> – Accessed 11 February 2010.
 28. *Criminal Law of the People’s Republic of China*, (Promulgated 14 March 1997 & Effective 1 October 1997), AsianLII website.
 29. ‘Husband Sentenced to Five Years in Prison, Wife Destitute and Homeless - Yu Zaihua Tells of Her Persecution Experiences over the Past Eight Years’ 2007, Clear Harmony website, 22 July <http://www.clearharmony.net/articles/200707/40425.html> – Accessed 16 February 2010.
 30. Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada 2005, *CHN100726.EX – China: Situation of Falun Gong practitioners and treatment by state authorities (2001 – 2005)*, 31 October. (Cisnet China – CX145448)
 31. ‘Appeal letter to the Government of the People’s Republic of China from Bishop Su Zhimin, the Bishop of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Baoding, Hebei China’ 1996, ‘Cardinal King Foundation website, 15 June
<http://www.cardinalkungfoundation.org/articles/suappe01.htm> – Accessed 16 February 2010.
 32. *Criminal Law of the People’s Republic of China* (Promulgated 14 March & Effective 1 October 1997), AsianLII website, <http://www.asianlii.org/cgi-bin/disp.pl/cn/legis/cen/laws/cl104/cl104.html?query=^guanzhi> – Accessed 17 February 2010.