

Contents

Part I Jurisprudence of Contemporary International Economic Law

1 On the Marginality, Comprehensiveness, and Independence of International Economic Law Discipline	3
1.1 Narrow Interpretation: IEL as a Novel Branch of Public International Law.....	4
1.2 Broad Interpretation: IEL as Marginal Synthesis of International Laws and National Laws That Adjust Cross-Border Economic Relations.....	5
1.3 Analysis Towards the Above Two Groups of Viewpoints.....	6
1.4 Connection and Difference Between International Economic Law and Public International Law	17
1.5 Connection and Difference Between International Economic Law and Private International Law	18
1.6 Connections and Differences Between International Economic Law and Domestic Economic Law	20
1.7 Connections and Differences Between International Economic Law and International Business Practices.....	24
Annex: Schematic Diagrams of the Mutual Relation as Between International Economic Law and Other Neighboring Legal Departments.....	27
Integrated Diagram.....	27
Decomposed Diagrams	28
References.....	28
2 On the Misunderstandings Relating to China's Current Developments of International Economic Law Discipline	31
2.1 So-Called Nonscientific or Nonnormative	32
2.2 So-Called Polyphagian or Avaricious	35
2.3 So-Called Fickle Fashion or Stirring Heat	36
2.4 So-Called Duplicating Version or Importing Goods.....	38
References.....	43

3	On the Source, Essence of “Yellow Peril” Doctrine and Its Latest Hegemony “Variant”—The “China Threat” Doctrine: From the Perspective of Historical Mainstream of Sino-foreign Economic Interactions and Their Inherent Jurisprudential Principles	45
3.1	Introduction: Is “China Threat Doctrine” History or Reality, Fabrication or Truth?.....	46
3.2	Origin and Essence of “Yellow Peril Doctrine”	49
3.2.1	1870s Version of “Yellow Peril” and “China Threat” by Tsar Russia.....	51
3.2.2	1890s Version of “Yellow Peril” and “China Threat” by the German Empire.....	53
3.2.3	Primitive Version of “Yellow Peril” and “China Threat” by American Hegemonism from the Middle Nineteenth Century to the Late Twentieth Century	57
3.2.4	Revised Version of “Yellow Peril” and “China Threat” by American Hegemonism Since the Twenty-First Century, with the Inheritance from and Development to Its Predecessors.....	64
3.3	Back to Historical Truth: The Long-Standing Mainstream of Sino-Foreign Economic Interactions and Their Inherent Jurisprudential Principles.....	68
3.3.1	China’s Present National Policy of Opening Up Is the Flourish and Development of Its Fine Traditions in History	68
3.3.2	Ancient China’s External Economic Interaction and Its Jurisprudential Principles.....	70
3.3.3	Semicolonial and Semifeudal China’s External Economic Interaction and Its “Jurisprudential” Principles.....	81
3.3.4	Socialist China’s External Economic Interaction and Its Jurisprudential Principles.....	85
3.3.5	China’s Peaceful Rising and Its Long-Term Peaceful Foreign Policy Are Historically Inevitable	91
3.4	Concluding Remarks: Respecting Historical Truth and Reaching Consensus.....	97
	References.....	98

Part II Great Debates on Contemporary Economic Sovereignty

4	The Three Big Rounds of US Unilateralism Versus WTO Multilateralism During the Last Decade: A Combined Analysis of the Great 1994 Sovereignty Debate Section 301 Disputes (1998–2000) and Section 201 Disputes (2002–2003).....	103
4.1	Introduction	104
4.2	Ignition of the Section 201 Disputes: US Unilateralism and Sovereignty.....	107

4.3	Conflicts of Sovereignties in the Formation of the WTO System..	111
4.4	The Refraction of Such Conflicts in the United States: “ <i>The Great 1994 Sovereignty Debate</i> ”	113
4.4.1	Away with the “S” Word: [Sovereignty of Other States]!	114
4.4.2	Never Away with the US “S” Word: [“Sovereignty” (Hegemony) of the United States!]	115
4.4.3	The “Contradiction” and Coordination Between “Spear” and “Shield”	121
4.4.4	Some Discussions on “Double Standards,” etc.	122
4.5	“The Great 1994 Sovereignty Debate” and Section 301	125
4.6	The US–EU Economic Sovereignty Disputes Caused by Section 301: Origin and Prelude	128
4.6.1	US–Japan Auto Disputes.....	129
4.6.2	US–E.C. Banana Disputes.....	130
4.6.3	US–E.C. Section 301 Dispute	133
4.7	The US–EU Economic Sovereignty Disputes Caused by Section 301: Claims and Rebuttals	135
4.7.1	The Claims of the E.C. Representatives.....	135
4.7.2	The Rebuttals of the United States.....	138
4.8	The WTO/DSB Panel Report on the Section 301 Case	140
4.9	The Equivocal Law-Enforcing Image Concluded from the Panel Report	142
4.9.1	The Panel Creates a Limit for Its Own Duty, Is Overly Cautious, Dares Not to Transgress the “Mine Bounds,” and Is Irresponsible for Its Duties	143
4.9.2	The Panel Hovers Between the “Two Powers” in Its Attempt to Ingratiate Itself with Both Sides	144
4.9.3	The Panel Leaves the Offender at Large, Criticizing Pettily While Doing It Great Favor	146
4.9.4	The Panel Is Partial to and Pleading for Hegemony and Thus Leaves a Lot of Suspicions and Hidden Perils	147
4.10	The Remaining Suspicions and Latent Perils Entailed by the Panel Report	148
4.10.1	The First Suspicion and Latent Peril.....	148
4.10.2	The Second Suspicion and Latent Peril	150
4.10.3	The Third Suspicion and Latent Peril	151
4.10.4	The Fourth Suspicion and Latent Peril.....	153
4.11	Conclusion.....	156
	References.....	158

5 On the Implications for Developing Countries

of “the Great 1994 Sovereignty Debate” and the EC–US Economic Sovereignty Disputes	159
Reference	163

Part III China’s Strategic Position on Contemporary International Economic Order Issues

6 What Should Be China’s Strategic Position in the Establishment of New International Economic Order? With Comments on Neoliberalistic Economic Order, Constitutional Order of the WTO, and Economic Nationalism’s Disturbance of Globalization 167

6.1 Introduction: International Economic Order, International Economic Law, the Global South–North Contradiction, and China’s Strategic Position 168

6.2 China’s Self-Positioning in History 170

6.2.1 Self-Positioning of Ancient China 170

6.2.2 Self-Positioning of Modern China 171

6.2.3 Mainstream National Consciousness Developed from Post-Opium War for More Than 160 Years and Its Influence on China’s Self-Positioning 172

6.3 China’s Self-Positioning in the Future: To Be One of the Driving Forces and Mainstays for the Establishment of the NIEO 174

6.4 Comprehensive and Accurate Understanding of Deng Xiaoping’s 28-Word Foreign Policy Is a Must for Scientifically Establishing China’s Position 176

6.5 Brief Comments on Theories of Contemporary International Economic Order and China’s Positioning 190

6.5.1 Neoliberalistic Economic Order 190

6.5.2 Constitutional Order of the WTO 196

6.5.3 Economic Nationalism’s Disturbance of Globalization 200

6.6 Conclusions 203

References 204

7 A Reflection of the South–South Coalition in the Last Half Century from the Perspective of International Economic Lawmaking: From Bandung, Doha, and Cancún to Hong Kong 207

7.1 Introduction 207

7.2 From Bandung to Hong Kong: The South–South Coalition Progresses Unevenly 209

7.2.1 The Bandung Conference Among the South–South Countries: The First Asian–African Conference 209

7.2.2 The Group of 77 Among the South Countries 210

7.3 The Fresh Countenance and Forthcoming Obstacles of the South–South Coalition in the Doha–Cancún Process 214

7.4 The Status Quo and Prospects for the South–South Coalition from Cancún to Hong Kong 218

7.4.1 The Multilateral Negotiations Are in Stagnation After the Cancún Deadlock 218

7.4.2	The Prospect of the South–North Multilateral Negotiation Grows Brighter.....	219
7.4.3	The South–North Multilateral Negotiation Again Dims	220
7.4.4	The Positive Fruits of the Hong Kong Conference with Heavy Negative Comments: Shown Up After Numerous Appeals but Still Half-Masked.....	227
7.4.5	New Highlights in the South–North Conflict: Judicial Breakthrough in Recently Litigated WTO Agricultural Disputes	232
7.5	Assessment of the Trend After the Hong Kong Conference in the Light of the Historical Track of the South–South Coalition During the Last 50 Years.....	233
7.5.1	The Historical “6C” Track of South–North Conflicts and Its Characteristics.....	233
7.5.2	To Doha Round’s Success: No Way Except Through the Tenacious South–South Coalition.....	235
	References.....	238
8	Some Jurisprudential Thoughts upon WTO’s Law-Governing, Law-Making, Law-Enforcing, Law-Abiding, and Law-Reforming ...	241
8.1	China’s Age in the WTO Having Reached Full 9 and Entered 10.....	242
8.2	WTO and Its Related International Economic Relationships Must Be Governed by Law	242
8.3	“6C Rule” Embedded in the Law-Making Process of IEL for the Past 60 Years.....	243
8.4	Relationships Among Law-Making, Law-Abiding and Law-Reforming of the WTO and Its “Rules of Game”	245
8.4.1	Should International Weak Groups Wholly Deny or Entirely Accept Existed WTO and Its “Rules of Game” at All?.....	246
8.4.2	Is Law-Reforming of the WTO and Its “Rules of Game” Nothing but a “Political Challenge”?.....	246
8.5	Is the WTO’s Law-Enforcing Body DSB “Bao Qingtian” in the Field of International Economy?.....	248
8.5.1	The “Congenital Deficiency” of the WTO’s Law-Enforcing Body DSB.....	249
8.5.2	The “Postnatal Imbalance” of the WTO’s Law-Enforcing Body DSB	252
8.6	To Attain Goodness and Avoid Harmfulness in Law-Abiding and Law-Adapting, to Promote Law-Reforming and Strengthen Up Weak Through South–South Coalition.....	254
8.7	Rugged and Tough Path for Weak Groups to Promote Law-Reforming and Strengthen Themselves Up, yet a Bright Prospect Through Advancing with Time	258

8.7.1	Rugged and Tough Path for Weak Groups to Promote Law-Reforming and Their Accumulated Achievements During 1947–2000	258
8.7.2	Rugged and Tough Path for Weak Groups to Promote Law-Reforming During 2001: Present and Their Bright Future	264
8.8	Brief Conclusions	267
	References	268

Part IV Divergences on Contemporary Bilateral Investment Treaty

9	Should the Four “Great Safeguards” in Sino-foreign BITs Be Hastily Dismantled? Comments on Critical Provisions Concerning Dispute Settlement in Model US and Canadian BITs	273
9.1	The Provisions Concerning Dispute Settlement in the Chinese BITs and Their Correspondence with Relevant Provisions in the ICSID Convention	274
9.2	Essential Provisions Concerning Dispute Settlement in US and Canadian Model Bits	279
9.3	China Should Not Hastily Accept the Above US and Canadian Provisions or Their Variations When Negotiating and/or Concluding BITs	282
9.3.1	Such Provisions Deviate from the Rights Authorized to Host Countries by International Conventions	282
9.3.2	Such Provisions Do Not Match China’s Current Circumstances	288
9.3.3	Such Provisions Ignore the Bitter Lessons of Some Bits Harming Weak Countries: The Warning from Argentina’s Dilemma	295
9.3.4	Such Provisions Ignore the Latest Legislative Track-Shift in Two Host Countries: Argentina and the United States	298
9.4	Suggestions for Future Sino-foreign BIT Negotiations	302
9.4.1	Strengthening Investigation and Research on Recent Developments in BIT Practice and Acting with High Caution	302
9.4.2	Using Well the Authorizations of Relevant Conventions and Firmly Holding onto the Four Great Safeguards	303
9.4.3	Insisting on “Never Repeat” and Timely “Mending the Fold After Some Sheep Have Been Lost”	304
	References	306
10	Distinguishing Two Types of Countries and Properly Granting Differential Reciprocity Treatment: Re-comments on the Four Safeguards in Sino-Foreign BITs Not to Be Hastily and Completely Dismantled	309
10.1	Background	310
10.2	Major Viewpoints in “The First Comments”	313

10.3	Some New Thoughts for Future Sino-Foreign BIT Negotiations	315
10.3.1	Strengthening Investigation and Research on Recent Internal and External Developments and Acting with High Caution	315
10.3.2	Using Well the Authorizations of the Relevant Conventions and Firmly Uphold the Four Great Safeguards	316
10.3.3	Distinguishing Two Kinds of Countries, Granting Differential Reciprocity, Excluding or Limiting the Application of MFN to International Dispute Settlement Procedures	317
10.4	The Theoretical Grounds and Practical Precedents for Adopting Differential Treatment Based on the Distinguishing Two Types of Countries	324
10.4.1	Differential Treatment Conforms to the Universal Philosophy of “Analyze Issues Under Their Concrete Situations”	324
10.4.2	Differential Treatment Conforms to the Basic Jurisprudence of “Equity and Mutual Benefit”	324
10.4.3	Differential Treatment Conforms to the Basic International Law Principle of Supremacy of State Sovereignty	326
10.4.4	Differential Treatment Conforms to the Evolution of the Principle of MFN Treatment.....	327
10.4.5	Differential Treatment and Exclusion or Limitation of the Application of MFN Treatment to the Dispute Settlement Procedures Conforms to the Latest Repeated Warnings from UNCTAD.....	329
10.4.6	Differential Treatment Conforms to the Current International Arbitration Practices	330
10.4.7	The Precedents of Granting Differential Treatment and Excluding or Limiting the Application of MFN Clause	332
10.5	Conclusion.....	333
	References.....	334
11	Queries to the Recent ICSID Decision on Jurisdiction Upon the Case of Tza Yap Shum v. Republic of Peru: Should China–Peru BIT 1994 Be Applied to Hong Kong SAR Under the “One Country, Two Systems” Policy?	337
11.1	Introduction: Summary of the Dispute.....	338
11.2	Main Issues and Basic Academic Views.....	339
11.2.1	Main Issues.....	339
11.2.2	Basic Academic Views.....	340
11.2.3	Three Aspects of Queries	340

11.3	Queries upon Applicability of China–Foreign BITs to Chinese Nationals with the Right of Abode in Hong Kong.....	341
11.3.1	Historical Overview of Hong Kong Before and After Its Return to China.....	341
11.3.2	The China–British Joint Declaration.....	342
11.3.3	The Joint Liaison Group.....	343
11.3.4	The Basic Law of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region	344
11.3.5	Applicability of the China–Peru BIT 1994 to Hong Kong Residents	352
11.4	Queries upon Scope of the Arbitration Provision in the China–Peru BIT 1994	353
11.4.1	Historical Overview of China’s Accession to the ICSID Convention.....	353
11.4.2	China’s Policy on the Resolution of Investment Treaty Disputes	356
11.4.3	Scope and Nature of the Dispute Resolution Provision in the China–Peru BIT 1994	363
11.5	Queries upon the Twisted Interpretation Against Articles 31 and 32 of the Vienna Convention of Laws of Treaties.....	365
11.5.1	How Did the Tribunal Twistingly Interpret Articles 31 and 32 of VCLT?	365
11.5.2	What Scientific Approaches Should Be Used to Find True and Correct Interpretation on Articles 31 and 32 of VCLT per se and the Peru–China BIT 1994?	367
11.5.3	With Respect to Key Instruments Such as Joint Declaration and Basic Law	367
11.5.4	With Respect to Rules of International Law Applicable in the Relations Between the Parties	369
11.5.5	With Respect to Specific Circumstances of the Conclusion of Peru–China BIT 1994.....	369
11.6	Conclusion: ICSID’s Decision on Case No. Arb/07/6 Is Incorrect, Unreasonable, and Unacceptable.....	371
	References.....	371
12	Should “The Perspective of South–North Contradictions” Be Abandoned?: Focusing on 2012 Sino-Canada BIT.....	373
12.1	China’s Scientific Position: Still a Developing Country, Belonging to the South Camp	375
12.2	The Source and Stream of South–North Contradictions.....	377
12.2.1	The Essence of Modern BIT: A Product of South–North Contradiction.....	379
12.2.2	Conclusion of South–North BIT: A Process of Benefits Exchange and Mutual Compromise, Not Necessarily a Process in Pursuit of “Universal Values”	380

12.3	2012 Sino-Canada BIT as a Typical Example of South-North Benefits Exchange and Mutual Compromise: Focusing on the “Expropriation and Compensation Clause”	381
12.3.1	South-North Divergence on “Compensation Standard”	383
12.3.2	South-North Divergence on “Compensation Evaluation”	384
12.3.3	A Recent South-North Compromise on Compensation for Expropriation and Its Valuation Criteria.....	387
12.4	2012 Sino-Canada BIT as a Typical Example of South-North Benefits Exchange and Mutual Compromise: Focusing on the “Dispute Settlement Clause”	388
12.4.1	South-North Divergence and Compromise on MFN Treatment Exception	389
12.4.2	South-North Divergence and Compromise on Financial and Prudential Carve-Out.....	391
12.4.3	South-North Divergence and Compromise on Taxation Carve-Out	392
12.4.4	South-North Divergence and Compromise on the Exception of Exhaustion of Local Remedies	394
12.4.5	South-North Divergence and Compromise on the National Security Exception.....	396
12.5	Doha Round: Clear Evidence that Perspective of South-North Contradictions Should Not Be Abandoned in the Construction of International Economic Rules.....	397
12.6	Concluding Remarks.....	399
12.7	Annex: Interpretation of China-Canada Bilateral Investment Protection Agreement by an Official from the Department of Treaty and Law of MOFCOM	400
12.7.1	What Are the Main Contents of the Agreement?.....	400
12.7.2	What Is the Significance of Signing the Agreement?	402
	References.....	402

Part V Contemporary China’s Legislation on Sino-Foreign Economic Issues

13	To Open Wider or to Close Again: China’s Foreign Investment Policies and Laws	407
13.1	The 1982 Constitution.....	407
13.2	Current Policies	408
13.2.1	Coordination with China’s Economic Aims	409
13.2.2	Just Rights and Legal Profits.....	410
13.2.3	Full Decision-Making Power	411
13.2.4	Attraction of Foreign Investors	412

13.3	Substantive Laws.....	415
13.3.1	Joint Venture Law	415
13.3.2	Law of Special Economic Zones.....	432
13.3.3	Economic Contract Law.....	437
13.3.4	Sino-Foreign Economic Contract Law.....	439
13.3.5	Trademark Law	439
13.3.6	Patent Law.....	442
13.4	Procedure Laws.....	446
13.4.1	Civil Procedure Law.....	446
13.4.2	Arbitration Rules.....	448
13.5	Conclusion.....	451
	References.....	452
14	To Close Again or to Open Wider: The Sino-US Economic Interdependence and the Legal Environment for Foreign Investment in China After Tiananmen.....	453
14.1	Washington: Most Favored Nation $\neq$ Most Favorite Nation.....	454
14.2	Beijing: MFN-China, United States in the Same Boat	455
14.3	Quiet Swallows Sensitive to Climate	457
14.4	Six New Facets Added to the Legal	459
14.4.1	Joint Ventures Law Amended	460
14.4.2	Land-Tract Development Measures Promulgated.....	461
14.4.3	Pudong: A Heart-Side Area Widely Opened	462
14.4.4	Tax Law for Foreign Investors Being Unified and Made More Preferential.....	463
14.4.5	Administrative Procedure Law Enforced	464
14.4.6	ICSID System Accepted	465
14.5	The Baby and the Bath Water	465
15	Should an Absolute Immunity from Nationalization for Foreign Investment Be Enacted in China's Economic Law?	467
15.1	Reasons for Raising the Question	467
15.2	Two Different Views	468
15.3	The Writer's Personal Views.....	471
	References.....	480
16	China's Special Economic Zones and Coastal Port Cities: Their Development and Legal Framework	483
16.1	Theoretical Debates.....	484
16.2	Practical Development	486
16.3	Baby and Dirty Water: Maturation of the Policy	491
16.3.1	The Yang Yibang Case.....	492
16.3.2	The Zhou Zhirong Case	493
16.3.3	The Wang Zhong Case	495
16.4	Legal Framework	503
16.4.1	Preferential Tax Treatments in SEZs, ETEDEZs, COPOCIs, and CEOAs	504

16.4.2	Labor and Wages in SEZs, ETEDEZs, COPOCIs, and CEOAs.....	515
16.4.3	Land Use and Management in the SEZs, ETEDEZs, COPOCIs, and CEOAs	518
16.4.4	Enterprise Registration in the SEZs, ETEDEZs, COPOCIs, and CEOAs	521
16.4.5	Technology Imports into the SEZs, ETEDEZs, COPOCIs, and CEOAs	525
16.4.6	Foreigners Entering and Leaving China's SEZs	528
16.4.7	Economic Combination Between the SEZs et al. and Inlands	529
16.5	Latest Incentives.....	531
16.5.1	Lower Taxes	536
16.5.2	Lesser Fees	538
16.5.3	Cheaper Labor.....	539
16.5.4	More Preferences	540
16.5.5	Greater Autonomy.....	541
16.5.6	Simpler Formalities.....	542
	References.....	546
17	Why Some Sino-foreign Economic Contracts Are Void and How Voidness Can Be Prevented.....	547
17.1	Contracts Must Be Observed and Illegal Contracts Are Void	547
17.2	The "Eel Fry" Incident: A Series of Illegal Contracts	550
17.3	Contracts with Unqualified Parties Are Void	554
17.3.1	A Noncorporate Body Cannot Be a Party to a Foreign Economic Contract	555
17.3.2	A Corporation That Is Prohibited by Law Cannot Be a Party to a Foreign Economic Contract.....	555
17.3.3	A Corporation Cannot Be a Party to a Sino-foreign Economic Contract That Is Outside Its Registered Business Scope.....	556
17.3.4	At Present, Chinese Citizens Cannot Generally Act in Their Individual Status as Parties to Sino-foreign Economic Contracts	558
17.4	Contracts with Illegal Contents Are Void	560
17.5	Two Contracts Involving Hong Kong	568
17.6	Preventing the Formation of Invalid Contracts and Handling These Contracts	575
	Reference	579
18	On the Supervision Mechanism of Chinese Foreign-Related Arbitration and Its Tally with International Practices.....	581
18.1	Introduction	581
18.2	Promulgation of the Arbitration Law	582

18.3	A Comparison Among China's Trial Supervision, Domestic Arbitration Supervision and Foreign-Related Arbitration Supervision, and Some Pending Issues	584
18.4	A Discussion on the Reasonableness of China's Separate Legislation for Domestic and Foreign-Related Arbitration Supervision	591
18.4.1	The Issue on Tallying Provisions Concerning Foreign-Related Arbitration Supervision of Arbitration Law with Those of Civil Procedure Law	592
18.4.2	The Issue on Tallying Provisions Concerning Foreign-Related Arbitration Supervision of Arbitration Law with Those of International Treaties	596
18.4.3	The Issue on Tallying Provisions Concerning Foreign-Related Arbitration Supervision of Arbitration Law with Those of Advanced Practices in Current Arbitration Enactments of Other Countries	600
18.4.4	The "Uniqueness" of China's Foreign-Related Arbitration Supervision and the Necessity of Tallying Its Supervision Mechanism with International Treaties and Practices	608
18.5	Some Ideas on How to Strengthen the Current Chinese Foreign-Related Arbitration Supervision Mechanism	618
	References	621

19	Is Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards an Issue for Establishment and Improvement in China?	623
19.1	1949–1978 (About 30 Years): Related-Legislation Blank	623
19.2	1979–1994 (15 Years): Domestic Legislation Established and International Conventions Acceded	624
19.2.1	Promulgating PRC's Civil Procedure Law (For Trial Use)	624
19.2.2	Acceding to the New York Convention of 1958	624
19.2.3	Acceding to the Washington Convention of 1965	625
19.2.4	Promulgating PRC's Civil Procedure Law (Formal)	625
19.2.5	Promulgating PRC's Arbitration Law	626
19.3	1995–Present: Judicial Explanations Added	627
19.3.1	Obstacles from "Local Protectionism"	627
19.3.2	"Double Report System" Preliminary Established: To Overcome the "Local Protectionism"	628
19.3.3	"Double Report System" Strengthened: To Overcome the "Local Protectionism"	630
19.4	Domestic Legislations Need to Be Further Improved	630

Part VI Contemporary Chinese Practices on International Economic Disputes (Cases Analysis)

20 The Truth Among the Fogbound “Expropriation” Claim: Comments on British X Investment Co. Versus British Y Insurance Co. Case	635
20.1 Summary of the Case	635
20.2 Questions for Answers	637
20.3 Expert’s Views and Opinions	638
20.3.1 In the CJV Contract Dated on 25 December 1996, Which Aimed to Establish C Power Company, the Provisions of Article 15 on Distribution of Profit Were in Compliance with the Laws at That Time and Have Been in Compliance with the Laws	638
20.3.2 For the “Circular [1998] No. 31” of the State Council on Strengthening the Administration and Carrying on Check of the Foreign Exchange and Foreign Debt Issued in September 1998, Its Legal Force Is Not Complete	639
20.3.3 The “Circular [1998] No. 31” Has No Legal Effect of Retroactivity.....	641
20.3.4 Actually, the Aforesaid Prohibitive Provisions in the “Circular [1998] No. 31” Have Been Amended Again and Again in 2002 and 2004.....	643
20.3.5 “Circular [2002] No. 43” Is Not an “Expropriation Decree”; New Agreements on 11 March 2003 Are Not “Behaviors of Expropriation”.....	646
20.3.6 Provisions in the Foreign Investment Regulations and “Bilateral Investment Agreement Between PRC and UK” Concerning the Expropriation of Foreign Investment	650
20.4 Conclusion.....	652
21 The Approach of “Winning from Both Sides” Used in the “Expropriation” Claim: Re-comments on British X Investment Co. Versus British Y Insurance Co. Case	655
21.1 [Q1] and [A1].....	655
21.2 [Q2] and [A2].....	657
21.3 [Q3] and [A3].....	657
21.4 [Q4] and [A4].....	658
21.5 [Q5] and [A5].....	659
21.6 [Q6] and [A6].....	660
21.7 [Q7] and [A7].....	661
21.8 [Q8] and [A8].....	662
21.9 [Q9] and [A9].....	663

21.10	[Q10] and [A10]	663
21.11	[Q11] and [A11]	664
21.12	[Q12] and [A12]	665
21.13	[Q13] and [A13]	669
21.14	[Q14] and [A14]	669
22	On the Serious Violation of Chinese Jus Cogens: Comments on the Case of Importing Toxic Brazilian Soybeans into China (Expert's Legal Opinion on Zhonghe Versus Bunge Case)	675
22.1	Brief CV of the Expert	676
22.2	Summary of the Case	677
22.3	Questions Consulted.....	679
22.4	Expert's Views and Opinions	680
22.5	Brief Conclusion	689
	Reference	690
23	Isn't the Strict Prohibition on Importing Toxic Brazilian Soybeans into China "Illegal"?—A Rebuttal to Lawyer Song's Allegation	691
23.1	Procedural Unfairness	692
23.2	Partiality of Mr. Song	692
23.3	The Powers and Authority of AQSIQ	693
23.4	Whether Professor CHEN Is Qualified to Deal with English Law	711
24	Three Aspects of Inquiry into a Judgment: Comments on the High Court Decision, 1993 No. A8176, in the Supreme Court of Hong Kong	717
24.1	Introduction	717
24.2	Brief Facts	718
24.3	Query One to the Judgment: On the Jurisdiction of the Case	723
24.3.1	The Judgment Detained and Left the Jurisdiction over the Case to the Court of Hong Kong, Obliterated the Close Connections Among Contract A158, Contract B, and Contract C, as Well as Those Between Contract A158 and Bill of Exchange 10732C. It Thus Thoroughly Violated the Legal Principles of "Autonomy of Will" and <i>Pacta Sunt Servanda</i>	724
24.3.2	The Judgment Detained and Left the Jurisdiction over the Dispute of the Bill of Exchange to the Court of Hong Kong and Refused to Stay the Proceedings of the Case, Thus Thoroughly Violating the Hong Kong Arbitration Ordinance.....	729
24.3.3	The Judgment Detained and Left the Jurisdiction over the Dispute of the Bill of Exchange to the Court of Hong Kong and Refused to Stay the Proceedings of the Case, Thus Thoroughly Violating the International Treaty That Britain Has Acceded to and to Which Hong Kong Is Legally Bound	731

24.3.4	The Judgment Detained and Left the Jurisdiction over the Dispute of the Bill of Exchange to the Court of Hong Kong, Thus Thoroughly Violating Universally Acknowledged International Practice.....	732
24.3.5	The Judgment That Detained and Left the Jurisdiction over the Dispute of the Bill of Exchange to the Court of Hong Kong Is a Lack of Due Respect for Chinese Laws and Regulations That Tally with International Practice	734
24.4	Query Two to the Judgment: On the Recognition in Chinese Law of the “Autonomy” of the Bill of Exchange Dispute in This Case	739
24.4.1	There Does Not Exist in the Laws of China Such a Strange Expression of “The Autonomy of Bills of Exchange” and Absolute “Independence” of Bills of Exchange as Extremely Esteemed by Mr. Dicks	740
24.4.2	Mr. Dicks’ Citations from the Procedures for Bank Settlements of China Are Garbled and Out of Context....	741
24.4.3	When Citing Mr. Guo Feng’s Article, Mr. Dicks Has Emasculated Its Rerequisite and Garbled Its Original Meaning.....	743
24.4.4	Mr. Dicks’ Opinion Runs Counter to the Generally Accepted Viewpoints of Chinese Academic Works on Bill Laws, the Stipulations of Relevant International Convention, and the Bill Law of China.....	745
24.4.5	Mr. Dicks Has Distorted the Original Text When Quoting the Civil Procedure Law of PRC as Evidence for the Said “Autonomy of Bills of Exchange”.....	748
24.5	Query Three to the Judgment: On the Defendant’s Right of Defense in This Case	749
24.5.1	The Reason “It Was Too Late” Is Not Tenable	750
24.5.2	Denying Equal Right of Defense to the Defendant Is Against the Principle of Equity and International Practice on Litigation Procedures	751
24.6	Conclusion: The Judgment Based on the Presumptuously Fabricated Rules (Made by Mr. Kaplan and Mr. Dicks) Will Definitely Lose All Its Legal Binding Effect	752
	References.....	752
	Annex	753
	Index.....	781