

Refugee Review Tribunal

AUSTRALIA

RRT RESEARCH RESPONSE

Research Response Number: CHN17741
Country: China
Date: 11 January 2006

Keywords: China – Shandong – Industrial Disputes – Demonstrations – Newspapers

This response was prepared by the Country Research Section of the Refugee Review Tribunal (RRT) after researching publicly accessible information currently available to the RRT within time constraints. This response is not, and does not purport to be, conclusive as to the merit of any particular claim to refugee status or asylum.

Questions

- 1. Does Shandong have a history of industrial disputes over pay etc?**
- 2. Do Chinese papers carry reports of demonstrations over wages etc?**
- 3. Is there evidence of participants such as the applicant experiencing adverse treatment as a result of making complaints?**
- 4. Is there evidence of people writing pro-democracy letters in the Chinese press?**
- 5. What has been the reaction by authorities to such letters?**

List of Sources Consulted

Internet Sources:

Government Information & Reports

United Nations (UN)

Non-Government Organisations

<http://www.icftu.org/> ICFTU report of violations of trade union rights

<http://www.workersvoiceatwto.org/www/pdf/WhoseMiracleChinaReport.pdf>

<http://web.amnesty.org/library/eng-chn/index>

International News & Politics

Region Specific Links

Topic Specific Links

<http://www.laborrights.org/projects/china/labor/unrest0504.html>

Search Engines

Google search engine <http://www.google.com.au/>

Online Subscription Services

Library Networks

University Sites

Databases:

Public DIMIA	<i>FACTIVA</i> <i>BACIS</i> <i>REFINFO</i>	Reuters Business Briefing Country Information IRBDC Research Responses (Canada)
RRT	<i>ISYS</i>	RRT Country Research database, including Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, US Department of State <i>Country Reports on Human Rights Practices</i> .
RRT Library	<i>FIRST</i>	RRT Library Catalogue

RESPONSE

1. Does Shandong have a history of industrial disputes over pay etc?

Industrial disputes over issues such as pay, retrenchment and erosion of benefits have occurred at a high and rising level in industrial cities all over China for at least ten years, according to most sources. Shandong province is not usually listed as one of the worst provinces for such disputes. (Solinger, D. 2005, 'Rising worker protests in China', *The Korea Herald*, 12 February; US Department of State 2005, *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices 2004 - China*, sec.6b 'Worker Rights: The Right to Organize and Bargain Collectively', February)

The reports below describe the current situation, as well as the situation in 2002 when the Applicant was involved in an industrial dispute.

Industrial disputes in China

Sinologist Dorothy Solinger, Professor of Political Science and Co-Director of the Center for Asian Studies at the University of California, states that "the last annualized figure for labor protests that the Chinese state was willing to announce publicly was 100,000 for the year 1999" but that since that time there had been numerous protests by peasants and workers. (Solinger, D. 2005, 'Rising worker protests in China', *The Korea Herald*, 12 February – Attachment 1).

The causes of the protests, says Solinger, are "unpaid wages and pensions; sudden and massive job terminations; corrupt officials held responsible for the bankruptcy of some industrial enterprises; and an end to most socialist privileges and benefits". Solinger states that retrenched workers have been "increasingly challenging authorities over the past decade". She continues:

As workers' consciousness of their rights increases, they are more and more apt to appeal their grievances to courts of law. Indeed from 1995 to 2001, the number of labor disputes adjudicated by the courts rose from 28,000 to 101,000. Admittedly, workers have often found that arbitration has not helped them, owing to graft and the greater clout of the more powerful managers against whom they have filed suit. But legal redress has managed to turn the attention of at least some disaffected workers temporarily from the streets to mediation, and this has tended to reduce the number of confrontational street demonstrations.

Nonetheless, over the past few years, the number of urban protests in China has risen dramatically, and according to police reports, they are ever larger and better organized. So far, the regime has succeeded in maintaining overall stability through control of the media (thereby preventing one protest movement from learning about and linking up with others); by buying off angry

unemployed workers with temporary stipends; and by suppressing and imprisoning those it cannot dissuade. But these are temporary measures and when considered in tandem with the waves of peasant protest caused by arbitrary taxation, official corruption and wanton land confiscation, party leaders find themselves confronted with a deeply worrisome situation. For what the party now confronts is a political threat no longer made up of students and intellectuals, as in 1989, but of workers and peasants, paradoxically the very disenfranchised classes on which Mao built his revolution and in whose name the Chinese Communist Party has ruled unilaterally for so long (Solinger, D. 2005, 'Rising worker protests in China', *The Korea Herald*, 12 February – Attachment 1).

The most recent US Department of State country report on human rights practices in China give this overview of industrial disputes in 2004:

During the year, the profound economic and social changes affecting workers continued to produce labor-related disputes and worker actions (see Section 2.b.). Most worker protests involved actual and feared job losses, wage or benefit arrears, allegations of owner/management corruption, or worker dissatisfaction with new contracts offered in enterprise restructuring. The Government took swift action to halt protests. Police detained protest leaders and dispersed demonstrations. In some cases, management, often at the direction of the Government, subsequently offered payments that met at least a portion of protesters' demands. The most noteworthy recent labor protests involved thousands of organized workers and sympathizers demonstrating in Liaoyang, Liaoning Province, in 2002. The workers protested alleged corruption in the closure of a major local SOE, the loss of jobs, and wage and benefit irregularities. Two protest leaders, Yao Fuxin and Xiao Yunliang, were convicted on subversion charges and sentenced in May 2003 (see Section 6.a.). After the protests, the former manager of the SOE was convicted of smuggling. The local Government fired Liaoyang's police chief and demoted a top Party official in the city. During the year, worker protests also occurred at private companies. In March and April, significant strikes occurred at factories of Stella International in Dongguan, Guangdong Province. A series of incidents of unrest, including strikes, ended in the detention of over 75 workers on charges of destruction of property, including three workers under age 18. Ten workers were convicted of destruction of property in the incidents but were released on December 31 as a result of court action that either suspended their sentences or lifted criminal sanctions. ...

Neither the Constitution nor the Labor Law provides for the right to strike. The Trade Union Law acknowledges that strikes may occur, in which case the union is to reflect the views and demands of workers in seeking a resolution of the strike. Some observers interpreted this provision to offer at least a theoretical legal basis for the right to strike. However, the Government continued to treat worker protests as illegal demonstrations, indicating that there was still no officially accepted right to strike. In addition, no other types of planned worker action were allowed.

(US Department of State 2005, *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices 2004 - China*, sec.6b 'Worker Rights: The Right to Organize and Bargain Collectively', February – Attachment 2)

Industrial disputes in China in 2002

Tim Pringle, a labour researcher based in Hong Kong, gave an overview of industrial unrest in China at the beginning of 2002 (the year in which the Applicant claims to have taken part in industrial action over unpaid wages) (Pringle, T. 2002, 'Industrial Unrest in China – A Labour Movement in the Making?', *China Labour Bulletin*, 30 January [http://www.china-](http://www.china-labour.org/)

labour.org.hk/public/contents/article?revision%5fid=18602&item%5fid=1558 – Accessed 4 January 2006 – Attachment 3). He refers to “the current explosion of labour unrest in China” which he attributes to “the practically universal attacks on working conditions that have accompanied the latest round of capitalist globalisation”.

The US Department of State *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices 2002* offers a similar picture to their most recent report cited above (Attachment 2). Here are some excerpts:

As the pace of economic change accelerated, changing relationships between workers and management, growing unemployment, wage and benefit arrearages, and uncertainties about the viability of a new social safety net system resulted in a growing number of labor disputes and spontaneous protests.

The number of labor disputes and protests continued to rise during the year, and the intensity of these protests increased. In March thousands of oil workers in Daqing, Heilongjiang Province, publicly protested the terms of their severance from a state-owned oil company. Also in March, thousands of workers in Liaoyang and Fushun cities in Liaoning Province protested **unpaid wages**, layoffs, and alleged corruption. As in previous years, officials largely avoided using violence to end the protests and relied on the police to control and disperse protesters. High-level government officials investigated the circumstances of the Daqing protests and were reported to have concluded that the oil company followed the law in its severance policies. In the Liaoyang protests, police detained four protest leaders.

The Labor Law provides for mediation, arbitration, and court resolution of labor disputes. Under these procedures, cases are to be dealt with first in the workplace, through a mediation committee, then, if unresolved, through a local arbitration committee under government sponsorship. If no solution is reached at this level, the dispute may be submitted to the courts. According to Ministry of Labor and Social Security (MOLSS) statistics, 64,000 labor disputes were settled through mediation in 2001. Arbitration committees nationwide handled 155,000 disputes in 2001, an increase of approximately 14 percent over the previous year. Of these cases, 150,000 were resolved.

(US Department of State 2003, *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices 2002 - China*, sec.6b ‘Worker Rights: The Right to Organize and Bargain Collectively’, February – Attachment 4)

The International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) annual report on China for events in 2002 does not mention Shandong specifically (ICFTU 2003 *China, People’s Republic of: Annual Survey of Violations of Trade Union Rights (2003)*, <http://www.icftu.org/displaydocument.asp?Index=991217713&Language=EN> – Accessed 4 January 2006 – Attachment 5). It notes that in 2002:

Worker protests increased dramatically in 2002. In particular, March to May 2002 saw massive waves of workers’ protest shake the country, especially in the northeastern provinces of Heilongjiang and Liaoning, where workers demonstrated against wage arrears, growing unemployment and corruption, and in favour of independent trade unions....

The Liaoning and Heilongjiang provinces saw major workers’ protests from March through May. Thousands of angry workers from over 20 factories took to the streets of Liaoyang, demanding a basic living allowance, pension and back pay. They also protested against the corruption of local officials who forced the Liaoyang Ferro-Alloy Factory, which produced metal plates for industry, into bankruptcy. 5,000

people had lost their jobs when the State-owned enterprise shut down. The protests were the culmination of a four-year effort by workers to protect their rights, in the context of the shift from a planned economy to a market economy. This has caused large state-owned enterprises (SOEs) to shut down and has resulted in layoffs of millions of workers. **Social unrest was not limited to the northeastern provinces: from south-western Sichuan province to southern Jiangxi province, farmers protested against oppressive taxes and shrinking incomes. The main reason underlying this wave of protest was the workers' demand for payment of wage arrears and pension benefits, as well as for proper compensation when their factories went bankrupt.** However the action was also organized collectively by workers, in defence of their economic and social interests, and thus falls under the category of independent union activity. The government response to these demonstrations alternated between repression and offers of compensation.

Amnesty International released two reports on the situation of protesting workers in early 2002 – these are attached (Amnesty International 2002, *People's Republic Of China: Labour unrest and the suppression of the rights to freedom of association and expression*, AI Index: ASA 17/015/2002, 30 April - Attachment 6; Amnesty International 2002, *'People's Republic Of China: Detained and Imprisoned Labour Rights Activists*, AI Index: ASA 17/014/2002, April - Attachment 7) They state:

In recent years the number of labour disputes and protests involving massive numbers of workers has risen dramatically in China. Workers have been protesting about conditions of employment, low or missing wages, corrupt management and other issues. Such protests are generally illegal as are independent trade unions. Workers, activists and labour leaders have been detained, harassed or imprisoned for taking part in such protests or publicizing them. The rights to freedom of expression and association are routinely denied to many groups and individuals in China when the authorities perceive this as a "threat". Throughout March and April 2002, workers protests, strikes, demonstrations or factory occupations by disgruntled workers in China have been reported nearly every day.

(Amnesty International 2002, *People's Republic Of China: Labour unrest and the suppression of the rights to freedom of association and expression*, AI Index: ASA 17/015/2002, 30 April, p.1 - Attachment 6)

A media report notes that, according to the Minister of the Public Security Bureau there were 58,000 protests that [each] involved over 100 people throughout China in 2002, and this number rose to 74,000 in 2003 (Sakai, Tanaka 2005, 'China: Playing with protests', *Asia Times*, 29 November – Attachment 8). The writer opines that:

The rising number of protests is a sign of "economic struggles" rather than "political strife". The cause of the demonstrations is public anger over lost economic benefits, such as compensation that people have not received because of corruption. If municipal and Communist Party officials provide the expected compensation and punish officials accused of corruption, the protests will subside.

2. Do Chinese papers carry reports of demonstrations over wages etc?

It appears that Chinese newspapers do report on a small number of the many demonstrations over wages, but Solinger considers that the government also exercises some restrictions on such reporting.

According to Tim Pringle, a labour researcher based in Hong Kong, Chinese papers carried reports of some demonstrations over wages and other matters in 2002 (when the Applicant was involved in such a demonstration). Pringle noted:

Almost every week in Hong Kong and mainland China, newspapers bring reports of some kind of labour action: a demonstration demanding pensions; a railway line being blocked by angry, unpaid workers; or collective legal action against illegal employer behaviour such as body searches or forced overtime. The mere fact that the Chinese media is reporting selected cases of worker action is testament to how widespread the phenomenon has become. The Public Security Bureau [police] reported that 198,000 labour disputes took place in 1999 ... (Pringle, T. 2002, 'Industrial Unrest in China – A Labour Movement in the Making?', *China Labour Bulletin*, 30 January <http://www.china-labour.org.hk/public/contents/article?revision%5fid=18602&item%5fid=1558> – Accessed 4 January 2006 – Attachment 3).

Another writer on China labour issues, Anita Chan of ANU, also notes that the Chinese press have reported on worker protests:

As economic restructuring steamed ahead at a rapid pace in the 1990s, and as labour violations became more serious and widespread, worker protests had by the mid-1990s increased in scale and frequency. **Much of this has been documented in the Chinese press** and by the international media and Western scholars. (p.7)

In the Chinese press, particularly in newspapers published by the Chinese trade union structure, there have also been reports of cases where workers faced with unemployment and disentitlement of benefits or efforts to privatise the firm by corrupt managers and local officials have, against the odds, taken matters into their own hands and convened their enterprise Staff and Workers Congress to fight off the attempts, in some cases successfully sacking the managers. (p.10) (Chan, A. 2005, 'Recent Trends in Chinese Labour Issues: Signs of Change', *China Perspectives*, Jan – Feb, No. 57 <http://rspas.anu.edu.au/ccp/publications/ChinaPerspectives57.pdf> – Accessed 4 January 2006 – Attachment 9)

Dorothy Solinger, Professor of Political Science and Co-Director of the Center for Asian Studies at the University of California, on the other hand, believes that the Chinese government also uses its control over the media to prevent protesters from learning about other protests:

... the number of urban protests in China has risen dramatically, and according to police reports, they are ever larger and better organized. So far, the regime has succeeded in maintaining overall stability through control of the media (thereby preventing one protest movement from learning about and linking up with others); (Solinger, D. 2005, 'Rising worker protests in China', *The Korea Herald*, 12 February – Attachment 1).

The US Department of State *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices 2004* noted only:

Government continued to control print, broadcast, and electronic media tightly and used them to propagate Government views and Party ideology. All media employees were under explicit, public orders to follow CCP directives and "guide public opinion," as directed by political authorities. Formal and informal guidelines continued to require journalists to avoid coverage of many politically sensitive topics. These public orders, guidelines, and statutes greatly restricted the freedom of

broadcast journalists and newspapers to report the news and led to a high degree of self-censorship. ...

Journalists who reported on topics that met with the Government's or local authorities' disapproval continued to suffer harassment, detention, and imprisonment. ...

Newspapers could not report on corruption without government and party approval, and publishers published such material at their own risk. During the year, journalists and editors who exposed corruption scandals frequently faced problems with the authorities, and the Government continued to close publications and punish journalists for printing material deemed too sensitive.

(US Department of State 2005, *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices 2004 - China*, sec.2a 'Respect for Civil Liberties: Freedom of Speech and Press', February – Attachment 2)

3. Is there evidence of participants such as the applicant experiencing adverse treatment as a result of making complaints?

Reports indicate that local authorities and police regularly use violence or legal action against protesters.

Sakai reports:

Protests frequently prompt revenge. Local officials send gangsters to threaten and physically harm people who have raised their voices against government abuse. (Sakai, Tanaka 2005, 'China: Playing with protests', *Asia Times*, 29 November – Attachment 8).

A recent lengthy Human Rights Watch report (Human Rights Watch 2005, "*We could disappear at any time*": *Retaliation and abuses against Chinese petitioners*, December <http://hrw.org/reports/2005/china1205/china1205wcover.pdf> – Attachment 10) discusses the "petitioner" system through which millions of Chinese citizen lodge complaints with the government about local officials or police. It notes the low success rate for such petitions and then continues:

However, the worst aspect of the system is the retaliation that many petitioners experience. Petitioners are often beaten, intimidated, and even kidnapped for airing their grievances. Professor Yu's report states that over 50 percent of respondents reported that they had been beaten by state actors or agents. (p.5)

According to the CASS survey in 2004, over 50 percent of petitioners had been beaten by an official, over 40 percent had family members who had been beaten by officials, over 53 percent had been beaten by thugs hired by officials, and over 50 percent had been detained or imprisoned. Nineteen percent had been sentenced to reeducation through labor.(p.44)

Sentences of reeducation through labor (RTL)—made by police with no judicial recourse—are often used to punish petitioners for their activities. According to the Ministry of Public Security, reeducation through labor is an administrative method of reform used to change offenders to people who obey and respect the law through compulsory labor. It was established in 1957 as part of the government's campaign to reform citizens who commit minor offenses through "education." However, the recipient of a reeducation through labor sentence has no right to a hearing, counsel, or any kind of judicial review. Sentences are often meted out by local police bureaus. ... Under the current system, people can be detained up to three years, which can be extended by another year based on the prison authorities' judgment. In practice, some

people can be detained longer. (pp.56-7)

There are also many reports of protest leaders being detained, arrested and even sentenced to prison terms. For example, Amnesty International state:

In many cases, peaceful protests by workers over pay and benefits have turned into pitched battles between the workers and armed police called to quell the protests, resulting in casualties and arrests. Labour activists have been arrested and often beaten. Some have been sentenced to long terms in prison.

(Amnesty International 2002, *People's Republic Of China: Labour unrest and the suppression of the rights to freedom of association and expression*, AI Index: ASA 17/015/2002, 30 April - Attachment 6)

The US Department of State *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices 2002* notes the punishment of leaders of several large demonstrations in 2002:

In March, over several weeks, tens of thousands of workers in Liaoyang and Fushun, Liaoning Province, and Daqing, Heilongjiang Province, protested against nonpayment of back wages, loss of benefits, and inadequate severance pay. Many alleged that managers and local government officials had stolen funds earmarked for plant modernization and pension plans. **Police detained four leaders of the protests--Yao Fuxin, Pang Qingxiang, Xiao Yunliang, and Wang Zhaoming--without charge. Their families had serious difficulties finding defense attorneys. After 9 months, Pang Qingxiang and Wang Zhaoming were released on probation but barred from meeting with other laid-off workers. On December 31, Wang Zhaoming was detained again** after he hired a lawyer to sue the police over his 9 months of detention. Yao Fuxin and Xiao Yunliang were charged with subversion for political activities they allegedly had engaged in several years before the labor protests occurred. (sec.2b)

(US Department of State 2003, *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices 2002 - China*, sec.6b 'Worker Rights: The Right to Organize and Bargain Collectively', February – Attachment 4)

The *China Labour Bulletin* notes one example of Shandong labour activists in 2002 who were found guilty of “disrupting government institutions” and “disturbing social order” and were sentenced to two and five years’ imprisonment. They had organised public protests against the bankruptcy of their factory, which declared bankruptcy in August 2002 and had failed to pay the workers’ wages or social insurance benefits ('List of Imprisoned Labour Rights Activists in China' 2005, *China Labour Bulletin*, 4 June, '6: Kong Jun', p.2 http://iso.china-labour.org.hk/public/contents/article?revision_id=9153&item_id=9137 – Accessed 4 January 2006 – Attachment 11).

4. Is there evidence of people writing pro-democracy letters in the Chinese press?

No evidence was found in the sources consulted of people writing pro-democracy letters in the Chinese press. As noted by the US Department of State, the Chinese press is tightly controlled by the Chinese government. The US Department of State *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices 2004* notes:

Government continued to control print, broadcast, and electronic media tightly and used them to propagate Government views and Party ideology. All media employees were under explicit, public orders to follow CCP directives and "guide public

opinion," as directed by political authorities. Formal and informal guidelines continued to require journalists to avoid coverage of many politically sensitive topics. These public orders, guidelines, and statutes greatly restricted the freedom of broadcast journalists and newspapers to report the news and led to a high degree of self-censorship. ...

Journalists who reported on topics that met with the Government's or local authorities' disapproval continued to suffer harassment, detention, and imprisonment. ...

(US Department of State 2005, *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices 2004 - China*, sec.2a 'Respect for Civil Liberties: Freedom of Speech and Press', February – Attachment 2)

Reporters Without Borders give a similar assessment of press control in China (Reporters Without Borders 2005, *China - Annual report 2005*, 5 March

http://www.rsf.org/article.php3?id_article=13426&Valider=OK – Accessed 11 January 2006 – Attachment 12). They state:

A flourishing written press is monitored by the Propaganda Department, now renamed the Publicity Department. Newspaper editors enjoy every freedom to boost profits, through advertising, updating their publications or even raising capital on the stock exchange. But they have to fall in with the orders of the communist party and ensure that their staff operate a system of self-censorship. ...

Xiao Weibi, editor of the magazine *Tong Zhou Gong Jin*, who was sacked in September for carrying an interview with a former communist party leader in Quangdong, who backed political reform. ..

Press freedom's number one enemy is however the Publicity Department, which is under the direct control of the communist party central committee. Unable to censor everything, it regularly orders journalists not to write about the more sensitive political and social issues. It is also responsible for ensuring silence on the major taboo subjects....

The Publicity Department also aims to keep dissident and other intellectual critics out of the press through a blacklist.

5. What has been the reaction by authorities to such letters?

Although no evidence was found in the sources consulted of people writing pro-democracy letters in the Chinese press, the Chinese government has acted to detain or imprison those publicly criticising the Communist Party or advocating democracy, either on the Internet or in other ways. The US Department of State *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices 2004* notes:

Several individuals were jailed for their Internet publications during the year. ... In May, freelance journalist Liu Shui was sentenced to 2 years' administrative detention in Shenzhen in what NGOs claimed was retaliation for essays about reassessing the 1989 Tiananmen massacre and political reform that he wrote and posted on the Internet. Former Hubei Province civil servant Du Daobin was convicted of inciting subversion in June for his Internet writings about democracy. Du's prison sentence was suspended, but he appealed his conviction, arguing that his trial was unfair and that his writings did not incite subversion and were protected free speech. (US Department of State 2005, *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices 2004 -*

China, sec.2a ‘Respect for Civil Liberties: Freedom of Speech and Press’, February – Attachment 2).

With regard to the reaction of the authorities to letters calling for democratic change, many dissidents were arrested for signing an open letter to the 16th Party Congress in 2002 calling for political reform and a reappraisal of the official verdict on the 1989 Tiananmen massacre (Human Rights in China (HRIC) 2004, ‘Dissident Sang Jiancheng Sentenced to 3 Years in Prison’, HRIC Press Release, 6 January – Attachment 13; US Department of State 2005, *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices 2004 - China*, sec. Section 3 ‘Respect for Political Rights: The Right of Citizens to Change Their Government’, February – Attachment 2).. The US Department of State *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices 2004* states:

The CCP retained a monopoly on political power and forbade the creation of new political parties. ... At the time of the 16th Party Congress in 2002, authorities targeted many remaining activists for signing an open letter calling for political reform and a reappraisal of the official verdict on the 1989 Tiananmen massacre ... In December, Zhejiang and Jiangsu Province activists were interrogated and a few, including Yang Tianshui and Wang Rongqing, were detained after they publicly proposed that the NPC draft a political party law.
(US Department of State 2005, *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices 2004 - China*, sec. Section 3 ‘Respect for Political Rights: The Right of Citizens to Change Their Government’, February – Attachment 2).

List of Attachments

1. Solinger, D. 2005, ‘Rising worker protests in China’, *The Korea Herald*, 12 February (Factiva)
2. US Department of State 2005, *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices 2004 - China*, sec.6b ‘Worker Rights: The Right to Organize and Bargain Collectively’, February
3. Pringle, T. 2002, ‘Industrial Unrest in China – A Labour Movement in the Making?’, *China Labour Bulletin*, 30 January <http://www.china-labour.org.hk/public/contents/article?revision%5fid=18602&item%5fid=1558> – Accessed 4 January 2006)
4. US Department of State 2003, *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices 2002 - China*, sec.6b ‘Worker Rights: The Right to Organize and Bargain Collectively’, February –
5. ICFTU 2003 *China, People’s Republic of: Annual Survey of Violations of Trade Union Rights (2003)*, (<http://www.icftu.org/displaydocument.asp?Index=991217713&Language=EN> – Accessed 4 January 2006)
6. Amnesty International 2002, *People’s Republic Of China: Labour unrest and the suppression of the rights to freedom of association and expression*, AI Index: ASA 17/015/2002, 30 April, (<http://web.amnesty.org/library/index/engasa170152002> – Accessed 4 January 2006)
7. Amnesty International 2002, ‘*People’s Republic Of China: Detained and Imprisoned Labour Rights Activists*, AI Index: ASA 17/014/2002, April

8. Sakai, Tanaka 2005, 'China: Playing with protests', *Asia Times*, 29 November (CISNET CX141385)
9. Chan, A. 2005, 'Recent Trends in Chinese Labour Issues: Signs of Change', *China Perspectives*, Jan – Feb, No. 57
(<http://rspas.anu.edu.au/ccp/publications/ChinaPerspectives57.pdf> – Accessed 4 January 2006)
10. Human Rights Watch 2005, "*We could disappear at any time*": Retaliation and abuses against Chinese petitioners, December
(<http://hrw.org/reports/2005/china1205/china1205wcover.pdf>)
11. 'List of Imprisoned Labour Rights Activists in China' 2005, *China Labour Bulletin*, 4 June, (http://iso.china-labour.org.hk/public/contents/article?revision_id=9153&item_id=9137 – Accessed 4 January 2006)
12. Reporters Without Borders 2005, *China - Annual report 2005*, 5 March
(http://www.rsf.org/article.php3?id_article=13426&Valider=OK – Accessed 11 January 2006)
13. Human Rights in China (HRIC) 2004, 'Dissident Sang Jiancheng Sentenced to 3 Years in Prison', HRIC Press Release, 6 January