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Abstract:

The existing literature shows that the grieved people, such as laid-off workers and peasants, can use the divisions within the government and seek for the external supports through the personal network to protect their rights or achieve their goals. This thesis focuses on the middle class people in the city, i.e., homeowners.

By illustrating two cases happened in Shenzhen, this thesis finds that the Internet can be utilized as an independent tool to organize and mobilize the common people, voice out their concern, and fight for their rights, even though these homeowners are relatively unknown to each other and live in the new neighborhoods. Enough participants can be mobilized to join in the sustained resistances. The government has to respond to the sustained collective resistances.
Chapter 1:

THE OPPORTUNITY TO WIN FOR THE RESISTANCE IN CHINA

When the Shenzhen Government planned to launch a major project, the Link Way Project of the Shenzhen-Hong Kong Western Corridor, the officials did not expect that the general situation of society had already been changed. Traditionally, the government would publish the project plan through the local newspaper, and the leaders from the higher level or the central government would be invited to preside over the opening ceremony. However, this project could not start as usual this time, and the government was faced with new problems. After the local newspaper reported the plan on 28 August 2003, the homeowners who lived close to the Link Way Project launched a series of actions to oppose this plan. This project could not start until May 2005. The Western Corridor Project, as a whole, had to be rescheduled to be finished on 1 July 2007, in the name of commemorating the 10th anniversary of the Handover of Hong Kong.

It seems that the homeowners can achieve some success from their resistance. Although China has been through great changes in its economics, many other areas remain unchanged. The channels for political participation are still very limited and under rigid management (Cai, 2004). Many demands of common people have to be expressed through uninstitutionalized ways. The so-called disruptive events or collective resistance have been happening more and more frequently in recent years (Kahn, 2006). In order for resisters to win the battle under the authoritarian state, they have to find opportunities within the existing political system, which has not changed much over the years. At the same time, market liberalization has given more space to common people and society
(such as mass media) than before, and resisters have more chances to use mass communication tools. Many studies have found that such opportunities within the government and the support from outsiders, such as mass media, are important for resisters. Since most resistances occur spontaneously, it is very hard for scholars to follow the process of resistances, and there are only several articles focusing on the mobilization ability of resisters. Moreover, it has been observed that many resistances come from familiar communities, such as factories and villages, and existing personal networks are helpful to mobilize common people. As urbanization continues, it is expected that many resistances would occur in new communities, such as the resistance of homeowners. The first issue the resisters should deal with is how to mobilize themselves in the relatively unfamiliar community. This thesis argues that the Internet plays an important role in the process of resistance.

This thesis introduces two cases that happened in Shenzhen: (1) resistance to the Link Way Project of the Shenzhen-Hong Kong Western Corridor; and (2) resistance to the Nanping Expressway Project. The resistances mainly came from the homeowners who lived close to these two projects. Many communities were involved in the resistances. The resistance to the Link Way Project sustained for about two years, and the resistance to the Nanping Expressway Project sustained for about eight months. In general, the resistances achieved some success. This thesis will focus on two issues: (1) the mobilization ability of the homeowners; and (2) whether the homeowners used the existing opportunities and strategies which have been observed by scholars in the resistances of other kinds of people, such as the laid-off workers and peasants?
1.1 The Opportunity to Win.

Before the economic liberalization in urban China, work units supplied both economic income and all kinds of welfare. Under the patron-client relationship, just as Andrew Walder (1986) defined, the state was paternalistic, binding the people to their work units for life, but guaranteeing them a wide range of material and nonmaterial welfare not distributed by market. Since most properties belonged to the state or were collectively owned, and work units distributed all kinds of resources, disputes mainly happened between the people and work units. At the same time, many kinds of disputes were also handled through work units. For the urbanites without work units, the resident committee could take the role of the work unit for them (Read, 2000). People could launch sabotages or other passive action against production under the patron-client system, just as the so-called “everyday resistance” (Scott, 1985). Yet, this relationship could not be sustained when the reform progressed, and many State Owned Enterprises were privatized or restructured. Workers in the state sectors faced new problems, such as unemployment. At the same time, many people found jobs in private sectors and the work unit system did not work for them any more. The condition for using traditional resistance strategy disappeared. Furtive, private, and individual resistances became “popular resistances” which are collective and open.

In China, the number of disturbance events is growing faster and faster each year. According to a Public Security Bureau’s report, the number of “public order disturbances” rose 6.6 percent from year 2004 to 2005, to 87,000 (Kahn, 2006). In urban
areas, collective resistances of laid-off workers and resistances over urban management and development happened very frequently.

More and more angry people go to the street to protest land seizures, corruption, pollution, unemployment, and unpaid wages\(^1\), even though the government always punishes the organizers of collective actions or the government always needs to find some people to be responsible for collective actions, sometimes, the actions incur serious repressions.\(^2\) Occasionally, the protest or resistance can achieve some success.

Even though there is an alternative reason to explain the occurrence and outcome of resistance, which is that more and more common people face injustices, the chances within the political system also shape the opportunities of resistances. The paradigm of “political opportunity theory” shows that the structure of political opportunity shapes the process of social movement (McAdam, 1982: 20-32). Doug McAdam suggested a significant relationship between the political process and the development of black insurgency. McAdam examined the general social and political context from 1930 to 1970 during which the black insurgency developed from silence to formation to its heyday, and decline in 1966-1970. The economical institution, urbanization, electoral

\(^1\) New York Times has reported at least 25 protest cases happened in China from 18 July 1997 to 17 Jan 2006. Many people were involved in the actions to protest many kinds of issues. For example, thousands of workers took to the streets to demand jobs and welfare payments after several large state-owned factories declared bankruptcy (18 July 1997); Thousands of farmers demonstrated against local officials clashed with hundreds of police officers and they were protesting against excessive and arbitrary local taxes (16 Jan, 1999; 1 Feb, 17 June 1999); More than 1,000 workers protested layoffs at the Shanghai Tyre and Rubber Company (8 Mar 2001); Thousands of unpaid miners blocked a rail line, vowing not to leave without three years’ back pay owed them by state-owned mines (10 July 2001); About 5,000 workers from six bankrupted state factories demonstrated and blocked traffic (12, 20, 21, 30, 27 Mar, 13 Sep. 2002); The angry villagers were trying to prevent the construction of a wind-powered plant (9, 10, 17 Dec. 2005), etc.

\(^2\) For the Dongzhou case in Shanwei City of Guangdong Province, the official reported that 4 peasants were killed and the villagers said the number should be more than 20 (see, New York Times, 9, 10, 17 Dec. 2005); for Sanchawan village case in Shaanxi province, 27 villagers were arrested, and many of them were given very long sentences, the leader of the action, Gao Lading, got 15 years in prison (see, New York Times, 21 Jan. 2005); for Liaoyang case in Liaoning province, 4 worker leaders were detained, and one of them was put in jail for 7 years and one for 4 years (see, New York Times, 2, 20 Jan, 10 May, 17 Dec 2003).
shift of the black, and federal government’s attitude to black people shaped the structure of political opportunity for black people. At the same time, the rises of black churches, black organizations, and black colleges were joined together to form an indigenous force to mobilize the movement. To some degree, outside changes also affected the growth of the indigenous force. Even though external support was measured, McAdam believed that the role of external support in his model was not as important as that in other models, such as resource mobilization model (McAdam, 1982:147-148). Both the structure of political opportunities and simultaneous growth of black force attributed to the development of the black insurgency (McAdam, 1982:230).

Without a democratic institution, in general, the political opportunity of the gripped groups in China is very different from that in democratic states. Based on the investigations in rural areas, the “rightful resistance” paradigm was developed by Kevin J. O’Brien (1996) and Liangjiang Li (O’Brien and Li, 2006). There are several main hypothesizes.

“Rightful resistance is a form of popular contention that (1) operates near the boundary of an authorized channel, (2) employs the rhetoric and commitments of the powerful to curb political or economic power, and (3) hinges on locating and exploiting divisions among the powerful. In particular, rightful resistance entails the innovative use of laws, policies, and other officially promoted values to defy “disloyal” political and economic elites; it is a kind of partially sanctioned resistance that uses influential advocates and recognized principles to apply pressure on those in power who have failed to
live up to some professed ideal or who have not implemented some beneficial measure.” (O'Brien, 1996)

In the “rightful resistance” paradigm, rightful rhetoric (politically) and divisions among the powerful are adopted into the resistance strategy of the weak. Rightful rhetoric means politically advantaged standpoint, and divisions among the powerful means different interest groups existed within the government. By using these two weapons, the weak sees some chances to win the resistances. In this sense, political opportunity with Chinese characteristics might exist. There are at least two kinds of divisions.

The first division exists between the higher level government and local government. Stability is of first priority [Wending yadao yiqie]. Since the early 1990s, a policy has been adopted by the Chinese government, which requires top local officials to be responsible for the occurrence of instability (Yu, 2001). The constraint on the local government shapes laid-off workers’ perception of the government and boosts their confidence to take action, and it provides workers the opportunity to take action which could succeed. The government may make concessions to silence disgruntled citizens because citizens can make “big trouble” for the local government (Cai, 2002; Shi and Cai, 2006).

The second division exists among the different government departments. For instance, in a Shanghai community’s resistance case, the homeowners opposed the plan of lower level government to change the use of land. The Municipal Planning Bureau and the Garden and Forestry Bureau exerted significant pressure on the local district government to change their plan (Shi and Cai, 2006). The different government departments have different responsibilities. For example, Bureau of Environmental Protection is
responsible for environmental protection, but the local government might want a high economic growth which could generate environmental pollution.

As to the rightful rhetoric, it means the resisters always use the rhetoric from the central government to curb the misbehavior of the local government. To some degree, it is a kind of division between the central government and the local government.

1.2 Supports from the Third Party.

For the resistance of the weak, many existing researches emphasized the role of “third parties” or outsiders. Michael Lipsky suggested that protest designed to petition to groups which oppose suffering and exploitation might be offering positive inducements in bargaining with the powerful (Lipsky, 1968). Michael Lipsky argued that the “problem of the powerless” in protest activities is to activate “third parties” to enter the implicit or explicit bargaining arena in ways favorable to the protesters. This is one of the few ways in which the relatively powerless parties could “create” bargaining resources. In Lipsky’s definition, “third parties” refers both to the reference publics of target groups and, more narrowly, to the interest groups whose regular interaction with protest targets tended to develop into patterns of influence. To influence third parties, Lipsky argued that communication media is very important. Communication media is extremely powerful in city politics. In granting or withholding publicity, in determining the information most people would have on most issues, and the alternatives they would consider in response to issues, the media truly, as Norton Long (1958) has put it, “set … the civic agenda.” Based on the analysis of farm worker movements from 1949 to 1972, J. Craig Jenkins
and Charles Perrow (1977) argued that the success of insurgency of the powerless come from when there is a combination of sustained outside support and disunity and/or tolerance on the part of political elites. Through using the superior resources of the third party, the powerless can put liberal pressure on public officials. In the resource mobilization model, McCarthy and Zald (1973, 1977) also emphasize the importance of external groups on the development of movements.

In China, political elite monopolizes power. It is hard to find free space for both social movement and social movement organizations. The independent organizations in China, for example, NGOs, are under rigid control (Ching, 1994; Chan, Qiu, Zhu, 2006; Ho, 2001; Yang, 2005). Civil society, according to the definition of Larry Diamond (1999), cannot be used to explain the situation in China, and it is too early to say “the civil society against the state” (Arato, 1981). Interest groups may exist, but they are bound closely with the governments. There is a big gap between the weak and the powerful (Sun, 2003).

Some times, the relative powerful “third party” or outsider is mass media. It can play a powerful role in supporting the action of the weak or voicing out for the weak. It makes local government nervous. Even though mass media is under the control of the government, there are still space for media to report the misbehavior of the local government. For example, the media controlled by higher-level authorities are not subject to the discipline of lower-level governments. Media exposure of the misconduct of local officials may catch the attention of higher-level authorities who will redress the wrongs

---

because of their concern over legitimacy or the possible escalation of conflict in the absence of intervention (Shi and Cai, 2006).

1.3 Mobilization.

As to the weak or the powerless, they do not have enough resources to mobilize themselves and bargain with the powerful. James Q. Wilson (1961) defined this as “the problem of powerless”. “Certain individuals and groups may wish to bargain their interest, but they may lack the resources to do so, i.e., they may lack any stock of inducements (positive or negative) which they can use to influence other parties to act in accordance with at least some of their intentions.”(Wilson, 1961) Negative inducements, such as protest, might be used by a powerless party to bargain with the power party; this forces the power party to compromise if it does not want the powerless to act in a undesirable manner. Wilson believed that this bargaining situation could be based on protest only when these threats relied on the possibility of a mass response. This means that the individuals or groups must have the ability to launch mass protests.

Social movement organizations play a very important role in the process of social movement. Doug McAdam (1982) measured the indigenous growth of black insurgency by three kinds of organizations: black churches, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), and black colleges. Through these three kinds of organizations, black people could be mobilized to launch a series of actions to gain civil rights, and they could achieve their goals at last when the structure of political
opportunity was in favor of them. In the research of McCarthy and Zald (1973, 1977), a lot of topics are focused on the social movement organizations (SMOs).

Social networks are also important for social movements. McAdam (1986) showed that personal ties such as kinship or close friendship are particularly important for recruitment to high-risk activism. Organizations recruited new members through personal network. For high-risk collective action, it was more likely where dense yet diverse international networks are embedded within broader national and transnational institutional and issue networks (Loveman, 1998). Churches and religious leaders used their personal network to protect and support the grieved groups after the coup in Chile (Loveman, 1998).

Many studies have shown that in China many resistance cases happened spontaneously (Chen, 2000; Bernstein and Lü, 2003:146-147). Occasional events or chances can trigger resistances and this is true for many so-called “public order disturbances”. For laid-off workers, spontaneity was also the main characteristic in many cases. For some resistances of laid-off workers, the leaders were important organizers in the collective actions (Cai, 2002). Cai argued that the mobilization is possible with the presence of organizers in most cases. Many kinds of people could serve as the leaders in the laid-off workers’ resistances, for example, previous enterprise leaders, party-member workers, current enterprise leaders, military veterans (Cai, 2002). Resistances of peasants might find rural teachers and veterans to be their leaders (Bernstein and Lü, 2003:147-157). For some less political sensitive resistances, such as privatization and its discontents in factories, the leaders of workers could make their actions legitimate through institutional channels. They could demand the Staff and Workers’ Council to vote and form a committee to lead
the resistance (Chen, 2006). Personal network was very important to mobilize common people to take part in resistances, especially resistances to the government. The leaders might have good relationships with both their colleagues and outsiders or authorities. It is important to mobilize enough participants to enlarge the probability of win (Cai, 2005; Shi and Cai, 2006).

1.4 The Case of the Homeowners’ Resistance

Along with a series of reform plans of urban land and housing policy, private houses began to be sold since 1990s (Wang and Murie, 1999). The real estate market is booming in the new 21st century. The real estate sector generates a great part of GDP, and at the same time, a new group of people is emerging, i.e., homeowners. In the early 1990s, high priced commercial houses were mainly sold to work units, for example, in Shanghai, 85 per cent of commercial housing was sold to work units in 1990 and in 1993 this was 75 per cent (Wang and Murie, 1999). However, as time goes on, the state has arranged banks to supply convenient mortgage plan to individual buyers. More and more urbanites with middle level income have entered into the real estate market. As a result, new commercial housing communities are dispersed within the city. Even though all the urbanities complain of the fast growing prices of housing, real estate developers seem not be worried about the sale of new apartments.

Unfortunately, the homeowners cannot always be happy about their everyday life in new communities, and they need to stand up to deal with many problems. First, the developers and property management company might infringe their legal rights. In a
survey conducted in Beijing, Shanghai, and Guangzhou in 2002, about 90 per cent of the homeowners were not content with the service supplied by property management companies (Li, 2002). The institution that conducted the survey also published a report showing that the developers and property management companies were the second worst sectors in terms of the “bawangxianxiang” (overlord or unfair phenomena in the market) (Zhang, 2005). Many conflicts between homeowners and the developers or the property management companies have emerged in recent years. Some of the conflicts were very severe, for example, many homeowners had even been beaten by persons from the property management companies (Zhang, 2005). However, it has been shown that well organized communities could defeat the property management companies through lawsuits.

The second problem the homeowners face is the developing plan of the government. Infrastructures and redevelopments expand quickly in cities. Many projects might generate negative impacts on the community, especially the commercial value of private housing. For example, in a community in Shanghai, a group of residents sustained a nine-year collective action to protect their community greenbelts from being occupied by company and local governments, and eventually achieved significant success in 2001 (Shi and Cai, 2006). Existing literature showed that some homeowners’ resistances were conducted within the boundaries of the law or government regulations, and personal economic success did not give homeowners any incentive to risk government punishment. These homeowners are moderate middle class people (Cai, 2005). This thesis will focus on two cases.

---

We will examine these two cases to determine whether they depend on the individual leaders and their personal networks to mobilize the common people so as to increase their probability to win? Are they as moderate as the homeowners in other places?

1.5 Research Methods

Two cases that occurred in Shenzhen were selected. The first case is the resistance to the Link Way Project of the Shenzhen-Hong Kong Western Corridor; the second one is the resistance to the Nanping Expressway Project. More than 10 communities took part in the resistance to the Link Way Project, and we will mainly focus on three communities which dominated a majority of the actions. There was mainly one community that resisted the Nanping Expressway Project. Shenzhen is a city which has developed very fast. For meeting its need of expansion and development, the local government has allocated a lot of money for public works. Many of these projects have affected the local urban residents, who are young middle class and have bought housing there. These two cases almost happened at the same time. The communities were very new, and the construction of these communities just finished before the resistances. Under the jurisdiction of the same local government, with similar background, and living in the newly established neighborhoods, we will study how these urban middle class people mobilize themselves to exploit the opportunity to resist the government.

The resistance to the Link Way Project achieved the partial victory, and the resistance to the Nanping Expressway Project achieved almost full victory. For the Link Way Project case, many communities joined in the resistance and the whole process sustained
for about two years. We will mainly focus on three communities: Taohuayuan (THY), Zhaoshang Haiyue (Haiyue), and Shanhaciuilu (SHCL). From Table 1, we can learn about the basic information of these three communities. Different sections of the project were to be built differently, and several communities won the resistance and others did not achieve their goals. The resistance of the Nanping Expressway Project received completely victory. As to the actions, the resistance to the Link Way Project mainly used collective petitions to put pressure on the local government, especially on environmental issues. The environmental experts from the homeowners’ side revalued the environmental effect of the Link Way Project, and this received partial support from the higher level Bureau of Environmental Protection. For the resistance to the Nanping Expressway Project, we will focus on the Fengzehu Shanzhuang community (FZH). The resisters, about 300 homeowners, of the Nanping Expressway Project launched two effective actions within a short term: the first one was to block the road, and the second one was to petition collectively to the provincial government (about 300 homeowners). The homeowners in this area also actively used newspapers to publicize their resistances.

Table 1, Basic Information on the Four Communities Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>THY</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>4-450</td>
<td>Aug.2003 to April 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Haiyue</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>100-200 or more</td>
<td>July 2004 to April 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SHCL</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>about 100</td>
<td>March 2003 to May 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>FZH</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Nov. 2003 to June 2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1: Resistance to the Link Way Project; 2: Resistance to the Nanping Expressway Project

Every community has its Bulletin Board System (BBS) on szhome.com, a website belonged to the Information Center of the Bureau of Land Planning in Shenzhen. The homeowners posted notes on the BBS before they bought their houses. Many people will
visit the community BBS to learn about the concrete information about the developer and community before they decide to buy an apartment in this community. Many websites have been set up for the people to talk about the issues related to the real estate market. By doing so, website developers could obtain significant financial gain as a lot of people are attracted to visit their websites. One of such websites is Soufun.com, which developed very quickly because of rapidly growing real estate advertisement market5. Most new communities found their BBS sites in this kind of websites. Homeowners or expected homeowners are enthusiastic to learn from each other by talking about their problems on the BBS. Since they are relatively disadvantaged in the real estate market, they need to depend on each other to attain a better position or avoid being in an undesirable position. Many discussions are topics on how to buy an apartment without being intolerably cheated, how to decorate a new apartment: choosing a decoration company or hiring a self-employed decoration team leader, and so on. There is much knowledge the homeowners or potential homeowners need to learn, otherwise they will suffer more cheating in an untrustworthy market.

The bulk of the information collected came from the communities’ BBS and newspapers. The homeowners of these four communities use the BBS quite well. They not only use the BBS to learn about the detailed information of communities, but also to mobilize the collective actions and circulate the news of actions. Detailed information about the resistances was announced on the BBS. Except the BBS of one community, the web administrator did not delete this kind of notes. Even for that BBS, most notes related

---

to the resistance were kept, and only when notes were related to politics or other radical rhetoric they would be deleted by the administrator⁶. Yet, more importantly, the angry homeowners posted their words everywhere they could post on the web, especially the websites of powerful media, such as People’s Daily and Xinhua News Agency. The website of People’s Daily even opened special web forums for both cases. The information can be cross referenced by comparing the notes in different BBS.

We have used the newspapers to check the truth of the information posted on the BBSs and to obtain more information. Not like the resistances from peasants and laid-off workers, the mass media kept reporting the development of the homeowners’ resistances. Newspaper from both Guangdong province and outside followed the development of events. For example, Nanfang Dushibao [Southern Metropolis Daily], Nanfang Zhoumo [Southern Weekly], Ershiyishiji Jingji Baodao [21st Century Business Herald], Waitan Huabao [The Bund], Jingji Guancha Bao [The Economic Observer], and so on. Local newspapers in Shenzhen also reported the news of the resistances from the official perspective, such as Shenzhen Shangbao [Shenzhen Economic Daily], Shenzhen Tequbao [Shenzhen Special Zone Daily], and so on. The official plans of the projects can also be found in the local newspapers.

---
⁶ In several notes, the web administrators explained their principles to homeowners: do not post notes related the event to politics or corruption; do not post notes related to the People’s Congress and the Political Consultative Conference when the meetings are held in March.
Chapter 2:

FIRST CASE: RESISTANCE TO THE LINK WAY PROJECT

2.1 The Plan of the Western Corridor.

The plan of the Western Corridor has a long history. Before the handover of Hong Kong, the Central Government had proposed to construct the Western Corridor. At that time, for the Hong Kong side, the Infrastructure Coordinating Committee (ICC) was responsible for this proposal. ICC was set up in late 1994 to serve as a forum for the exchange of views on cross-border infrastructural developments between the Central Government of China and Hong Kong. There were four panels within ICC: Panel on Marine Channels, Roads and Bridges Panel, Air Traffic Control Panel, and Railway Panel. Roads and Bridges Panel dealt with the strategic planning of the construction of roads and bridges. At that moment, the panel was considering two proposals put forward by the Chinese side: the Lingdingyang Bridge joining Zhuhai and Hong Kong, and the Shenzhen Western Corridor across Deep Bay connecting Shekou and the western part of Hong Kong. The Hong Kong Government had appointed consultants to assess the impact of the two proposals on Hong Kong’s environment, land use, traffic and transport infrastructure. In 1996, the West Corridor Preparatory Office was set up in Shenzhen.

In December 1997, the Central Government approved the proposal of the Western Corridor. According to No.(1997) 2617 Document, issued by the Department of Communication and Energy of State Planning Commission, the proposal of the Western

---

Corridor was approved by the Central Government. In this document, the Western Corridor was divided into two parts: Shenzhen Section of Shenzhen Bay Bridge and Shenzhen Bay Custom Port. The Link Way Project to the Western Corridor was approved as a Shenzhen city project. Shenzhen government could finalize the detailed plan of the Link Way Project. In December 2002, the State Planning Commission approved the feasibility report of the Western Corridor (Chen, Jin, 2003).

According to a vice-head of the Nanshan District, the first plan of the Link Way Project was rejected by the Nanshan District government and deputies of the people's congress. This plan suggested using a 5.5 kilometers viaduct to build the whole Link Way. On 19 March 2003, the Development and Planning Bureau of Shenzhen approved the feasibility report of the second plan of the Link Way Project. On 28 August 2003, the government published this plan on mass media. The homeowners whose apartments were near the project learnt the detailed information mainly from the news report from Shenzhen Shangbao [Shenzhen Economic Daily]. This plan included four parts from the custom port to Yueliangwan Dadao. The first part was about 2866 meters long, and it was from the custom port to Xingonlgu. The design mainly used the closed or half closed sunken-style road. The second part was from Xingonlgu to Big Nanshan Park. It was about 361 meters, and it would be open to allow the release of exhaust and ensure the ventilation in the closed road. The third part was about a 395 meter long closed sunken-style road, and it was from Big Nanshan Park to Lizhilin. The last part was from Lizhilin to Yueliangwan Dadao, about 800 meters, and the plan wanted to use a viaduct to build

---

9 See Shenzhen Economic Daily (Shenzhen Shangbao), 28 August 2003
this section. This plan incurred the homeowners’ resistances, especially from the homeowners who were close to the 361 meter open road. On 20 November 2003, the third plan was issued during the expert panel meeting with homeowners. Even though many homeowners were not satisfied with this plan, the government decided to carry out this plan (the viaduct section was redesigned in May 2005). There were two main changes in this plan. First, the open part was moved to the west for 320 meters, and the length was reduced from 361 meters to 100 meters. This was the western portal. Second, the plan included another open portal, between *Houhaibinlu* and the custom port. This eastern portal was 200 meters long.

The second plan incurred different reactions from different communities. *Shanhaicuilu* and *Taizishanzhuang* belong to the *Liwanshequ* Residents’ Committee. Usually, the residents in Liwanshequ Residents’ Committee also belong to the Fore Sea area (*qianhai*). This area is located between *Yueliangwan Dadao Road* and *Big Nanshan Park*. Therefore, the homeowners were concerned about the problems of the viaduct section of the Link Way Project the most. Homeowners in *Lilinshequ* Residents’ Committee (including *Fuyuan, Fumanyuan, Futingyuan, Nanyueshanzhuang, Litingyuan, Baoshanhuayuan*, etc.) and *Zhaoshang Taohuayuan* Residents’ Committee (i.e. Taohuayuan community) were concerned about the 361 meter long open road the most because this part was closer to them than to other communities. The homeowners in Zhaoshang Haiyue Residents’ Committee and the Back Sea (*Houhai*) Residents’ Committee were concerned about the eastern portal most when the third plan was issued (see Table 2). Generally, these two committees belonged to the Back Sea area (*Houhai*).
Table 2: The goals of the THY, Haiyue and SHCL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>THY</th>
<th>Haiyue</th>
<th>SHCL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>first plan</td>
<td>move the open road away</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>improve the design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second plan</td>
<td>move the western portal away</td>
<td>move the eastern portal away</td>
<td>improve the design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The different communities reacted at different times and in different ways. We have selected three communities to illustrate the resistances. The first one is the *Taohuayuan community* (hereafter THY). THY launched the first wave of resistance. With the support from neighbor communities, the plan had to be changed and two portals were adopted to ensure the environmental quality. The second one is *Zhaoshang Haiyuehuayuan* community (hereafter Haiyue). Haiyue was the first community to resist the Link Way Project in the Back Sea area when the government planned to open the eastern portal. They mobilized several communities in the Back Sea area to take the united actions. The third one is the *Shanhaicuilu* community (hereafter SHCL). SHCL is one of the communities in the Fore Sea area. Through their long-term resistance, the government had to redesign the Fore Sea Area section of the Link Way Project several times. Even though data for other communities have also been collected, we will focus on these three communities in this thesis. Most actions were arranged and organized by these three communities in the process of resisting both the partial section and the whole project. The modes of mobilization and organization were similar in these three communities. They used different methods of resistances and had different goals. At last, the outcomes were different even though the government responded to them in similar ways (see Table 2 and Table 3).
Table 3: The Resistances of the THY, Haiyue and SHCL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Petition to local government</th>
<th>Petition to BEP¹</th>
<th>File AR and AL against local BEP²</th>
<th>Application for demonstration³</th>
<th>response of gov't</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THY</td>
<td>very often</td>
<td>from local to state level</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>dialogues and hearings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiyue</td>
<td>several times</td>
<td>local level</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHCL</td>
<td>several times</td>
<td>meet with Pan Yue</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ BEP: the Bureau of Environmental Protection;
² Administrative Reconsideration and Administrative Litigation;
³ Applications were not approved by the Public Security Bureau.

2.2 The Process of Mobilization and Resistance in THY

THY is a community which includes 1400 apartments, divides into three phases, i.e. THY I, II and III. The construction of three phases completed in November 2002, December 2003, and May 2005, respectively. There are 480 apartments in THY I and 559, 361 apartments in THY II and III, respectively. The houses in this community are Low-profit Houses¹⁰.

Even though 480 households of the first phase collected their apartment keys in November 2002, they had to spend at least two months on decorating the new apartments. Most homeowners moved to THY after February 2003. Before February 2004, there were only 480 households there. These people were the main force to resist the original plan of the Western Corridor in THY.

¹⁰ Low-profit Houses is a kind of commercial house which is developed by real estate developers or governments. Shenzhen is the first city to build this kind of houses in 1989. Residential Bureau of Shenzhen represents the government to develop Low-profit Houses, and the price of a Low-profit House is a little higher than its cost. Residential Bureau used the profit of Low-profit Houses to counterbalance the loss of building welfare housing at that time.
Previous collective resistance of the THY. As a new community, there were many issues that were of concern, and the homeowners soon found that they had to stand up to fight for their own interests. Before the event of the Western Corridor, the first collective action of the community was about the noise of a transformer substation in the neighborhood. On 26 July 2003, eight homeowners invited an engineer to measure the noise level within the community. The decibel values at eleven spots were higher than national standard. In the evening of August 2, four homeowners met in the public place in community to talk about the problem of noise. This was the first meeting of the homeowners to talk about the public affairs of the community. In the evening of August 12, another meeting was held at the same location (this location was a meeting place for many times). The homeowners decided to launch a movement of collecting signatures in the community and petition to the government to have the noise reduced, if the developer could not solve the problem. The other two issues were also talked about in this meeting: the problem of the Western Corridor and how to form a Homeowners’ Committee (HC). The homeowners contacted a journalist of Shenzhen Shangbao to report the noise problem in THY, and the newspaper did report the news. The leaders of the developer of THY, Employees’ Housing Company of Shekou Industrial Area, came to THY on 24 September, and they told the homeowners that they could solve the problem of transformer substation, but they did not have a plan to deal with the problem of the Western Corridor.

From signatures to homeowners’ meeting to collective petitions. For learning the detailed plan and the environmental evaluation report of the Western Corridor, they decided to launch the first petition. Several homeowners began to collect signatures after
the meeting on 12 August. In the morning of 22 August, four homeowners sent the petition letter and signatures to the Communication Bureau, Bureau of Public Works and Complaints Bureau of the City Government. In the afternoon, they sent the petition materials to the Shekou Industrial Area Government. At the same time, they asked the officials to tell them the concrete plan of the Western Corridor. These four homeowners were very active on the THY community website from the beginning. The first two meetings about the noise problem were also organized by them.

Since the number of homeowners who joined the signature movement and petitioned to the government was not big enough, the homeowners took several mobilizing actions. First, the signature activity was open to all homeowners, and they recruited about sixteen volunteers to take charge of each building to collect signatures from every home. They also tried their best to contact the homeowners of THY II both via the Internet and through personal networks. Second, on 30 August, one homeowner printed 500 copies of the materials about the Western Corridor and sent them to the THY homeowners. Third, the first THY homeowners’ meeting (yezhu dahui) was held on 31 August. More than 200 people attended this meeting, including 10 homeowners from THY II. At this meeting, several decisions were made: 1) The Group of Western Corridor was set up, which included one group head and eight vice group heads; 2) they decided to launch a second petition at 8:30 am on September 4; 3) each vice head should collect all the signatures of their buildings, and find at least three people for petition action on September 4; 4) each homeowner should donate 20 Yuan or more for the cost of following actions; and 5) the homeowners of THY II could download the signature form

---

11 The apartments in THY II had already been sold out at this time. Yet, the construction of THY II had not been finished. Hence, the homeowners were separated and not easy to contact. For them, the easiest way to get in contact is was to use the website of their community.
from the website and collect signatures from their own buildings. The homeowners could contact the group head directly or send their signatures through the community website.

On 4 September, 22 homeowners of THY petitioned to the Bureau of Public Works and Complaints Bureau of the Municipality Government a second time, and they also petitioned to the Bureau of Land Planning and the Western Corridor Office and submitted their petition materials and signatures of the homeowners. Since the number of petitioners was large (22 homeowners), the governments paid more attention this time than the first time. The head of the Bureau of Public Works and several other leaders met with the homeowners and promised to ask the related departments to talk about the questions or report the questions to the upper level government.

The second homeowners’ meeting was held on 6 September. At the meeting, the homeowner representatives told the homeowners about the detailed situation of the action. Another theme at the meeting was to collect donation. Most homeowners at this meeting donated at least 20 Yuan, and many donated 50 or 100 Yuan. The total account of donation in THY was about 7000 Yuan.

The next petition was also made after the meeting. On September 9, about 50 homeowners went to the Bureau of Environmental Protection, the Shenzhen Branch of Shanghai Municipal Engineering Design Institute, and the Employee Housing Company of Shekou Industrial Area. In the afternoon, two division heads from the Bureau of Environmental Protection and the Bureau of Public Works came to the THY community to learn about the actual situation. They promised that they would perform an environmental evaluation for this section of the Western Corridor and inform them of the outcome.
The petitions were intensive in September. On 10 and 15 September, several homeowners went to the Complaints Bureau of the City Government. They sent them more petition materials and asked for a meeting with the mayor who took charge of public works. Miss Wang, the division head of the Complaints Bureau, promised to contact the mayor to report the demands of homeowners. Many homeowners held another meeting in the evening of 20 September. They planned, at the meeting, to apply for a demonstration during National Day if the petition did not work. With two representatives from *Futingyuan*, several homeowners went to the Public Security Bureau to learn about the procedure of application for demonstration on 22 September. On the next day, the homeowner representatives visited several bureaus again to learn about the outcome of their previous petitions they made before, including the Bureau of Public Works, the Bureau of Land Planning, the Environmental Protection Bureau and the Western Corridor Office. They went to the Public Security Bureau to send the application letter for demonstration on National Day.\(^{12}\) This application was in the name of several communities, including THY, Futingyuan, Fumanyuan, Saigeyinxingyuan and Nanyueshanzhuang. On 25 September, about 67 homeowners petitioned to the City Government. At last, they went to Yingbinguan Hotel to give their petition letter and signatures to the experts who were meeting there to discuss the Western Corridor proposal, and one of the homeowners read out the letter before the experts.

*Individual actions.* Many homeowners were very active in voicing their opinions about the plan of the Western Corridor to the government. For example, on the community web, a list of contacting information of the mass media was posted, which included the information of hotlines or journalists’ phone numbers or email addresses.

\(^{12}\) Of course, this application was not approved at last.
The hotlines of many governments and the email addresses of certain officials, such as Party Secretary and the mayor of Shenzhen, were also circulated, and many homeowners reported their experience of calling such hotlines. The open letters or petition letters were also posted on many other websites. For example, one open letter entitled “An Open Letter to Mayor Li Hongzhong” was posted on the web forum of Shenzhen News on 10 October (<http://www.sznews.com/>). This letter was written in the names of two homeowners and other homeowners in Lilinshequ and THY. The webmaster deleted the letter at last, but the staff of this website sent a letter to those two homeowners and other homeowners in Lilinshequ and THY. They said they deleted the open letter from the forum because they received a notice from the upper level government ten minutes ago. The notice said that the open letter had been sent to the government as internal material and would be forwarded to Mayor Li Hongzhong, so the writers should not worry about that the open letter was deleted from the web. Another homeowner also reported the reply from the Communication Bureau for his complaints via the Internet on 29 September.

*Technical weapon of the homeowners.* Two environmental experts stood out to deal with the environmental pollution measurement issues. The activists had called for environmental experts to check the official report since the resistance began. These two experts came from Lilin Shequ, but they had always worked together with THY (see appendix 8). They were retired engineers. Based on the data supplied in the official report, these two experts reevaluated the pollution outcome. Their predicted outcome was totally different from the official measurement and the project would cause serious pollution. Their calculation received the support from professors in Tsinghua University. Their measurement was the main evidence for homeowners to fight against the government.
The government invited one of the experts to join a special group to examine Hong Kong’s experience in dealing with the Western Corridor project; especially the group studied the related environmental issues. Then, the designers also had to arrange a series of dialogues to talk about the detailed environmental measurements with the homeowners and their experts. The environmental pollution reports were the main materials the homeowners used to petition to the provincial and national Bureau of Environmental Protection. Because of their detailed evidence, the provincial and national Bureau of Environmental Protection replied to their petition positively (see Appendix 4). Even though an independent third party was not invited to check which measurement was right, the government had to pay much attention to the possible environmental pollution and this gave significant pressure on the local Bureau of Environmental Protection.

*Dialogue as a response from government.* After a series of actions, the first dialogue between the government and homeowners was arranged on 26 September. In the conference room in the Zhaoshang Street Office, officials of the City Government and Nanshan District Government met with homeowner representatives of THY and Fuyuan. The dialogue was too divergent to attain an agreement. At last, the presiding chairman of the dialogue, Director of Complaints Bureau of Nanshan District, promised that: “1) we understand your opinion; 2) we will reevaluate the plan; 3) there should be a lot of room for revising the plan; 4) we will publicize the plan before the final decision is made; 5) other officials will come here to answer more questions.” For circulating the content of this dialogue, in the evening of 29 September, a meeting was held at the same public place in THY, and 60 more homeowners took part in it and asked for another petition.
On 9 October, just after the seven-day National Day holiday, about 40 homeowners from THY and Lilinshequ planned to petition to the Complaints Bureau of Municipal Government. However, they changed their plan at last because the Nanshan District Government arranged a dialogue with them. The Party Secretary of Nanshan District, Mr. Wang Yi, presided over the dialogue. According to the report from the homeowners, it seemed that they were satisfied with this dialogue. The Party Secretary promised that he would step down if the pollution of the Western Corridor could not meet the national environmental standard. He also said that the plan must be made known to the public before being brought into effect. Also, Mr. Wang, as the representative of Mayor Li Hongzhong, sent the answers of the mayor to the Western Corridor Group of Fuyuan. First, the homeowners’ demands raised to the City Government were understandable, reasonable, and rightful (heqing, heili, hefa). Second, the project design experts should change their original plan. Third, the relevant official departments would talk about this issue with the homeowners. Fourth, the Western Corridor expert panel must consist of homeowner representatives. After that, the homeowners in THY did not launch anymore collective petition. At the same time, the local government had arranged many dialogues and hearings for the homeowners (see Appendix 1).

2.3 The Process of Mobilization and Resistance in Haiyue

Zhaoshang Haiyue is developed by China Merchants Property Development Co., Ltd. (Zhaoshang Dichan). Haiyue occupies 230,000 square-meters and has 3400 apartments. Haiyue is divided into three phases which were finished at different times. Haiyue III has
about 500 apartments and the homeowners collected their keys in June 2005. Haiyue II includes about 1300 apartments and the homeowners collected their keys in August and December 2002, May 2003. Haiyue I includes about 1600 apartments and most homeowners collected their keys in 2000. The main force to resist the plan of the Western Corridor comes from Haiyue II.

Actually, the resistance of Haiyue resulted from the partial victory of THY. As a result of the continuing resistance of THY, the government decided to adopt two portals. The eastern portal in the Back Sea area was near Haiyue. This decision was much worse to Haiyue than before. The direct goal of resistance of Haiyue was to remove the eastern portal or move it further east.

*Collective petitions.* The first collective petition happened on 20 July 2004. It was 11 months later than the action of THY, and it was about nine months from the time when the third plan was publicized. The homeowners rigidly followed the regulation of complaints and assigned five homeowner representatives to send a petition letter and signatures of more than 2000 people in the Back Sea area to the Complaints Bureau of City Government. Moreover, they also asked to meet with city leaders directly. However, the officials of the Complaints Bureau only gave them excuses and refuted their demand. The situation changed after the arrival of more than 100 homeowners of Haiyue and other several communities in the Back Sea area. The government responded more quickly than before. A dialogue was arranged immediately. Mr. Tang, the Vice Secretary-General of the City Party Committee, met ten homeowner representatives accompanying the relevant officials from departments of the City Government and Nanshan District Government.\(^{13}\)

---

\(^{13}\) Other homeowners went to the Citizen Center to send their petition letter to the General Office of the Mayor and other departments. The gate guards of the Citizen Center did not allow the homeowners to enter.
Moderate demonstrations. After this collective action, three other collective actions, in which the homeowners of Haiyue actively took part, happened in the Back Sea area. On 22 July, about 200 homeowners of Weilanhaian protested near Dongbinlu with a banner reading "Tan Xibutongdao Feiqi Zhijiepaifang [Oppose the direct release of the exhaust of the Western Corridor]". On 25 July, about 400 homeowners in the Back Sea area protested near Dongbinlu a second time. After the protest, the people went to the communities in the Back Sea Area to circulate the news within the communities. On 29 August, about 4000 homeowners in the Back Sea area protested in Dongbinlu with banner reading "Xibutongdao Feiqi Canhai Zisun Houda i[The exhaust from the Western Corridor will kill our descendents]".

Homeowners’ Committee and active IDs on-line. There is a 11-month gap between the first collective action of the homeowners in THY and that of the Back Sea area. The homeowners had paid much attention to the problems of the Western Corridor when considered buying their apartments near the Western Corridor. On 28 August 2003, third plan, which included the eastern portal near the communities in the Back Sea area was published. This plan was much worse than the second plan, which made the section passing this area closed. However, the homeowners in this area did not take action immediately. The first collective action of resisting the plan happened ten months later.

The homeowners of Haiyue II used the Internet to contact each other very early on. Before they collected their apartment keys, they had already contacted each other through the community website. In June 2002, the homeowners set up an on-line homeowners’
association. Many of those who were on the mailing list were the homeowners who would collect their keys in August 2002 or December 2002. There were more than 70 homeowners in this list by the middle September 2002. The main issues they talked about online were suggestions to the developer. They arranged the first homeowners meeting on 17 August via the web, and this time they examined the situation of the buildings and the environment of the community. The second meeting was held on 26 October. The managers from the developer and the property management company, and the homeowners met together to talk about the detailed problems within the community. More than 30 people took part in this meeting. On 12 November, a meeting was arranged to talk about the issues raised in the last meeting. Four main problems were discussed during the meeting: the color of window rims, separated entrance of people and cars, tree and grass planting, and security. However, after that, the homeowners were busy with the decoration of their new apartments. The homeowners did not pay attention to public affairs related to community until the other problems emerged in May 2003. By May 2003, many homeowners had already moved into their new apartments, and the last group of homeowners had also collected their keys. Their living environment was ruined by the trucks which carried soil. The trucks made very loud noises from morning to evening. They called to take action against the trucks on the web, but the action was not carried out because the homeowners found that the trucks did not come again after they posted the note on the web. The government issued a regulation to limit the route of the trucks. In fighting against the trucks, several homeowners met together to set up a group named the Temporary Homeowners’ Committee of Haiyue II. The group met with the manager of the property management company and published the detailed content of
dialogue on the web under the name of the Temporary Homeowners’ Committee of Haiyue II.

On 18 September, a preparatory committee for setting up the Homeowners’ Committee was formed by the property management company. From 10 November to 23 November, the homeowners began to recommend the candidates of the Homeowners’ Committee, i.e. the heads of each building. At that time, the membership of that homeowners’ association had reached 200. A candidate list recommended by this association was published on the web, and the phone number and email address of the coordinator was also attached to the list. At last, 7 candidates of this list were chosen to be the members of the Homeowners’ Committee (HC), and the director was also selected from this list.

HC registered an ID in the community website and published its email address to collect suggestions and demands from the homeowners. After the founding of the HC, several important issues needed to be dealt with. The first issue was to fight against the property management company to protect the parking spaces for the homeowners\(^\text{14}\). The second issue was about the problem of the Western Corridor. The homeowners had been longing for the HC to lead the people to deal with this problem. The HC launched a signature action in March 2004. The HC also sent a petition letter to the Complaints Station of the Nanshan District. The officials of the Complaints Station and the Western Corridor Office introduced the project plan to the HC. However, the HC did not believe that it worked. They posted a note on the web to report their actions and asked for suggestions from the homeowners on June 16 because they did not have enough technical

\(^{14}\)The purchase contract regulates that the property management company owns the right to deal with the parking places. Even though all the homeowners signed this contract, they believed that this rule violated government regulation when the property management company decided to sell the parking spaces.
knowledge to proof that the project would cause environmental pollution or affect their community.

The first mobilization for the common homeowners was led by an active on-line homeowner who had a close relationship with the members of the HC. The first homeowners meeting which focused on the topic of the Western Corridor was held in the Majiang room of Haiyue II two days later after this person posted a calling note on 1 July 2004. About eighteen homeowners attended this meeting, including two members of the HC. Two goals of resistance were set in the meeting. First, the plan should take enough environmental protection measures to treat the exhaust near the custom port. Otherwise, the wind would bring the gas to the Back Sea Area or the whole Nanshan District. Second, the whole Western Corridor should be closed and the exhaust should be well treated. The people who took part in this meeting were divided into four groups. They were, respectively, responsible for contacting the government and developer, propaganda and mobilization, contacting other communities, and information collection. They decided to arrange a meeting each Saturday evening to discuss the progress. They also decided to form a new organization to lead the resistance which was named “Green Western Corridor”. An ID using this name was generated on the community web immediately. Every homeowner in this meeting should mobilize the people in their own buildings.

*Mobilizing the other communities.* After this meeting, the propaganda machine started to work. The homeowners in Haiyue posted the information about the Western Corridor and the action of Haiyue to websites of other communities in the Back Sea area. They
also went to other communities to post the article about the negative effects of the Western Corridor\textsuperscript{15}.

The next Saturday, i.e., 10 July, more than 100 homeowners took part in the meeting. Furthermore, most importantly, the homeowners from other communities also joined. For example, at least 7 people came from the \textit{Weilanhaian} community, which was a neighbor community of Haiyue. The propaganda was very effective and the outcome was strongly significant. \textit{Weilanhaian} initiated their action immediately after this meeting. A small meeting was held two days later among the activists and the members of the HC of \textit{Weilanhaian}. Five days later, the homeowners’ meeting was held and the activists from Haiyue were invited to give a talk. Within one week from 10 July, the number of signatures of \textit{Weilanhaian} reached 1500.

Within July and August 2004, the homeowners of Haiyue took a series of actions which received a response from the government. A series of dialogues were arranged by the government. Yet, the plan did not change for this section.

\textbf{2.4 The Process of Mobilization and Resistance in SHCL}

Shanghaicuilu (SHCL) is developed by the Shenzhen Nanshang Real Estate Development Co. (Nanshang). It is located on the northern side of Nanshan Mountain and near the Fore Sea area. On 28 April 2003, the homeowners collected their keys from the developer. There are 345 apartments in this community. The goal of SHCL’s resistance was to change the plan of the viaduct. The Link Way Project planned to use a

\textsuperscript{15} The title of the article was “Hurts Caused by the Western Corridor (Xibutongdao Zhitong)”. There were three parts: The negative effects of the Western Corridor on the Back Sea area, How to make the Western Corridor green, our actions and petition.
viaduct for the Fore Sea area section. It would bring several impacts on the commercial value and living condition of SHCL.

In fact, the homeowners in SHCL had not taken any collective actions before 13 June 2005, i.e., demonstration or collective petition. They planned a collective petition on 17 October 2003, but this action was not carried out because the local Public Security Station, the Residents’ Committee and the Street Office learnt about their plan and stopped it. A dialogue was arranged by the Nanshan District Government for them that day. The only collective action was to send a petition letter to the General Office of the City Government. The letter was written to the Mayor and Party Secretary.

The most obvious difference between the actions of SHCL and THY or Haiyue was that SHCL did not use collective petition as the main method to express their demand. They preferred to use methods, such as lawsuit.

Organization and its relationship with the developer. In fact, SHCL was one of the earliest communities to mobilize the homeowners to resist the original Western Corridor plan. Before 28 April 2003, they had already arranged many activities to discuss the problem of the Western Corridor. The first meeting was arranged by the developer on 8 December 2002. More than 100 homeowners took part in the meeting. In the name of “My Homestead”, the developer introduced the idea of the plan and design of the community, and the process of construction. At last, they introduced the route and design of the Western Corridor to the homeowners. Their conclusion was that the Western Corridor had many advantages to the homeowners and with no harm. About 20 homeowners who took part in this meeting had contacted each other on-line before the meeting. After the meeting, a temporary homeowners’ committee was set up on-line and
conflict information of the key persons’ was publicized on-line. This committee collected opinions and suggestions from homeowners frequently and sent them to the developer. They met several times to discuss the construction and decoration of the community. At the meeting with managers from the developer on 12 January 2003, the problem of the Western Corridor became the main focus. One engineer of the developer introduced the detailed impact of the Western Corridor to the community.

On 19 March 2003, one homeowner went to Shanghai Design Institute to learn about the detailed plan of the Western Corridor and reported it on-line. The plan included a 5 meter high sound insulation wall when the road passes SHCL, but the designer said they could optimize the plan if the Western Corridor Office agreed. They decided to place pressure on the Western Corridor Office with the developer. On 23 March, several homeowners met a member of the Homeowners’ Committee (Mr. Ao) of Taizishanzhuang which was near SHCL and faced the same situation. Mr. Ao had made many efforts to urge the government to redesign the plan. The homeowners of Taizishanzhuang required the government to change the route of the Link Way Project but did not succeed. On March 24, the first petition letter was sent to the Complaints Bureau of the City Government. They did not receive any response for two weeks. The phone number of the director of the Complaints Bureau of the City Government was published online and many homeowners called the director. The director said the Complaints Bureau had already forwarded the letter to the relevant departments. From April to July, the homeowners were busy with decorating their new apartments. After the construction of the Western Corridor started on 28 August 2003, SHCL began to act again. A meeting was arranged on 31 August, but only three people showed up. Another
meeting was arranged on 6 September, but the topics were very diversified and they did not pay attention to the concrete actions against the Western Corridor.

Encouraged by the partial success of THY, a collective action was planned on 16 October. The homeowners in SHCL also informed the homeowners of Taizishanzhuang of this action. The developer provided transport for the homeowners to the petition location. The action was stopped as mentioned above. Four days later, several homeowners and three managers of the developer met with the officials and engineers of the Western Corridor Office. This meeting was arranged through the one homeowner’s personal network. They learned about the detailed plan related to SHCL. In front of SHCL Building No.18, a viaduct with a five meter high sound insulation wall was to be used. Behind the Building No. 18, a sunken style road was to be adopted with a green belt and sound insulation wall. The nearest point to SHCL was about 30 meters away. On 20 December, two homeowners took part in the meeting arranged by the City Government to learn about the new plan. The two representatives were impressed by their counterparts from THY, who were very active in participation and with environmental protection knowledge. A note was posted on the web on 25 November to call for action. A meeting was planned on 30 November. The note was written in the name of “SHCL Right Protection Action Group for Western Corridor” in which the main members came from the Temporary Homeowners’ Committee. The representative of each building was required to post the note in each building. More than 80 homeowners attended the meeting. Several tasks were achieved during this meeting. Donation, a sum of 11801 Yuan from 68 households, was collected during the meeting. In the afternoon, about 40 homeowners went to the City Government to petition and protest. They protested before
the City Government building for about four hours. At the same time, the activist from THY also contacted the leader of this group and gave several suggestions for future actions. An environmental expert was introduced to this group by an activist of THY. Many banners were made and the homeowners decided to hang them in the community. They also decided to collect information about the Western Corridor and write a petition letter, which would be sent to the City Government and the Bureau of Environmental Protection within two weeks. Before 29 December, the letters were sent out to the related departments. They also sent a petition letter to a deputy of the People’s Congress through personal networks. During this period, this group also paid attention to other problems within the community.

**Leader.** At the meeting on 14 February 2004, one homeowner, Miss Wang, suggested that she could hire two professional people to manage the resistance. She asked for a salary of 2500 Yuan per month for herself and 2000 Yuan per person per month for the two people. However, the group only wanted to pay 1200 Yuan per month for one to two professional persons. Miss Wang decided to launch a donation action by herself in the name of the Temporary Homeowners’ Committee. This behavior confused many homeowners, and the group posted several notes to clarify the division among the homeowners. On 24 May 2004, the SHCL Right Protection Action Group for the Western Corridor decided to give back the remaining money to the donators and the group was dismissed at the same time.

In September 2004, another donation action was launched by the activists, mainly by Miss Wang. Each homeowner was suggested to donate 300 Yuan and the list was publicized in the community with apartment number. Every homeowner could see which
households had donated and which household had not. Within half a month, a total of 32160 Yuan was collected from 108 households. Miss Wang began to lead the resistance. Several actions were made by her and her group: 1) Application for administrative reconsideration. They applied to the Bureau of Environmental Protection of Guangdong Province for canceling No.[2003] 311 document of the Bureau of Environmental Protection in Shenzhen, i.e., “Reply to ‘Environmental Evaluation Report of the Link Way Plan of the Shenzhen-Hong Kong Western Corridor’” and applied to the Shenzhen Municipal Office of Legislative Affairs for canceling one document of Bureau of Development and Planning of Shenzhen, i.e., “Reply to ‘Feasibility Report of the Link Way Engineering Plan of the Shenzhen-Hong Kong Western Corridor’”. 2) Sending the letter to two deputies to the People’s Congress of Shenzhen. 3) Hiring lawyers to file an administrative litigation and for consultation. They also joined the administrative litigation initiated by other communities in the name of all related homeowners of the Western Corridor and filed a lawsuit against the Bureau of Environmental Protection of Shenzhen and other related institutes. 4) When the international forum of the 16th Representative Conference of the Asia-Pacific Environmental Journalists Association was held in Shenzhen on 26 November 2004, Miss Wang asked Mr. Pan Yue, who was the vice head of State Environmental Protection Administration of China, several questions directly during the conference. The next day, Mr. Pan met the homeowner representatives in the hotel to learn about the problems of the Western Corridor and their demands. The Vice Mayor of Shenzhen also met the representatives after the meeting with Mr. Pan.
During this period, Miss Wang and another homeowner were invited to the Nanshan District Public Security Bureau on 13 April 2005. The Vice Head met with them, and three points were delivered by him: 1) the Public Security Bureau supported the homeowners defending their rights through the legal channel, such as administrative litigation; 2) the Public Security Bureau did not support the homeowners using demonstration to deal with the problem; 3) the government would publicize the plan to the homeowners in April 2005. These two homeowners explained that they would not resort to demonstration to protect their right, and they also urged the police to learn more legal knowledge and respect the rights of citizens.

Several meetings were arranged for SHCL and the design was changed several times. On 20 July 2005, in a dialogue with engineers, the homeowners were informed that there would adopt two reforms. The low noise material would be used to build the road. A 195 meter long closed noise barrier would be used for the part near SHCL. On 4 November, seven homeowners visited the Nanshan District Government. Officials and engineers informed them of the latest design. The 195 meter closed noise barrier was extended to 320 meters and the road would be sunken for five to seven meters below ground level. The homeowners asked for a much longer closed noise barrier, of course. The designer explained they had already done their best. This design ensured that the nearest building of SHCL to the Western Corridor was at least 120 meters away from the open road. This was the final plan.
Chapter 3:

SECOND CASE: THE RESISTANCE TO THE NANPING EXPRESSWAY PROJECT

The Nanping Expressway is related to the Western Corridor. It starts from the Fore Sea area of the Nanshan District to Pingshan of the Longgang District. It is about 44.5 kilometers.

The homeowners of Fengzehu community (FZH) knew the detailed plan of FZH section of the Nanping Expressway on 3 November 2003. In this plan, the project would use the contracted land of FZH, and the project planned to use open cutting and viaduct for FZH section. The path of project was about 40 meters away from the community’s kindergarten. If this plan was carried out, the impact would be huge to existing buildings. Most homeowners worried that the commercial value of their apartments would depreciate, and they could not enjoy a peaceful life any more.

Block the road. A meeting was arranged on 4 November 2003. On Nov. 10, more than 500 homeowners protested before the building of the City Government. The leader of the City Government did not come out to meet them, but an official from the Bureau of Land Planning met them and told them that the plan could not be changed because everything had already been decided. The homeowners were very angry and disappointed. They went back and blocked the Huanggang Road which was the main road to come in or leave the Shenzhen Special Zone. They blocked the road from 1:40 pm to 3:20 pm.\(^\text{16}\)

About 500 police went there to stop this blockage\textsuperscript{17}. An intense conflict between the homeowners and police happened. At last, six homeowners and security guards of the community were detained. The newspaper in Shenzhen also reported this event on 11 November, but the tone was pro-government.

On 11 November, almost 500 homeowners went to the People’s Congress and the Political Consultative Conference in Shenzhen to report the event. The officials in these institutes met the homeowners and asked them to be patient to wait for the outcome. One middle level official of the Complaints Bureau of the City Government told them that they had forwarded their petition letter to city leaders and they would arrange the homeowners to meet the Mayor on 26 November, which day was arranged as open day for citizens to meet with the Mayor.

The homeowners set up a Preparatory Committee of Homeowners’ Committee of FZH on 26 November. The Preparatory Committee registered an ID as “United Together [Tuanjieyizhi]” on the community website. This ID had posted about 140 notes on the web to inform the homeowners of the latest actions and information, and some notes were also related to community management. Several notes had been deleted by the web administrators.

\textit{Petition to higher level government.} Since the homeowners did not get the chance to meet the Mayor, on 28 November, more than 300 homeowners went to Guangzhou to protest before the building of the Provincial Government and the Provincial People’s Congress. The officials of Shenzhen went to Guangzhou to meet the homeowners accompanied by the official of the Provincial Government and the Provincial People’s

\textsuperscript{17} This number was reported by homeowners in their open letter to journalists of People’s Daily and its news web. This letter was written on 16 July 2004.
Congress. They explained that the Mayor did not meet the homeowners on 26 November because the final plan had not been decided.

_Continuing petition to local government._ On 25 November, more than 60 homeowners went to the Bureau of Land Planning in Shenzhen. The officials told them that there was only very small room for adjusting the plan. The chance of moving the viaduct out of the contracted land of FZH was very slim. They also visited the designing institute.

On 3 December, homeowners went to the Complaints Bureau of the City Government to express their demands. 1) The Nanping Expressway should be moved away from the contracted land of FZH; 2) The detained people should be released; and 3) The homeowners would use law to protect their legal rights. The next day, the detained homeowners were released. The community hung out yellow ribbons and several very big banners to celebrate their home coming. One week later, the police came to the community to remove the yellow ribbons and banners.

On 9 December, homeowners went to Wuzhou Hotel and sent the petition letter to the senior advisors of the Shenzhen City Government. On 11 December, homeowners sent their petition letter to editors and journalists who took part in the National Meeting of Newspaper General Editors. On 24 December, more than 300 homeowners petitioned to the City Government again.

On 23 February 2004, about 100 homeowners went to the Bureau of Land Planning again. On 27 February, the head of the Bureau of Land Planning invited the homeowner representatives to his office to discuss the expressway design.

The homeowners planned to circulate the petition materials to deputies of the Shenzhen People’s Congress and the Political Consultative Conference on 28 February.
The police raided in the office of Preparatory Committee and took away the banners and materials in the evening of 27 February. However, more than 100 homeowners still went to the conference venue and tried to meet the deputies. The police stopped their action.

*Stop to pay mortgage to bank.* From the beginning, many homeowners suggested to stop paying the mortgages to the bank. This suggestion received a lot of support. This action had not been carried out until March 2004. Since the homeowners became more and more impatient to wait for the final decision of the government, they decided to put more pressure on the government. Since March, more than 170 homeowners stopped paying their mortgages to bank. This action developed into a game between the bank and the homeowners, and the government did not intervene in this action. Sustaining for about two months, the homeowners found it useless, so they gave up.

*Use outside newspaper.* The Preparatory Committee decided to use the power of mass media. There were two ways to publicize the events. First, they encouraged the homeowners to post notes on every kind of websites, especially Xinhua Newsnet, which belongs to Xinhua News Agency, and People’s Web, which belongs to People’s Daily\(^{18}\). The action to block the road could not be posted on their community website on szhome.com. The web administrators deleted this kind of notes immediately\(^{19}\). The outside websites gave more freedom to the homeowners than local websites. At the same time, they also needed to spread the news about their events. Second, they kept in contact with journalists, especially journalists of Nanfang Dushibao. On 17 November, FZH advertised on Nanfang Dushibao to make an apology for the 500 homeowners blocking

\(^{18}\) Just like the case of Western Corridor, the People’s Web opened a special forum for the FZH case. When we tried to enter this website in April, 2007, the forum web could not be found any more.  

\(^{19}\) In fact, the relationship between web administrators and homeowners was not that bad. The homeowners could complain to the web administrators for deleting their notes. The administrators kept this kind of notes on the web.
Huanghuagang Road, so-called irrational behavior what did they do on 10 November. At the same time, Nanfang Dushibao wrote a 4500 word report on this event (Feng, Fu, Liu, Xu, 2003). On 18 November, one editorial of Nanfang Dushibao supported the behavior of the homeowners and it was titled “Giving space to responsive citizens to argue their rights” (Qiufeng, 2003). On 21 November, FZH advertised on Nanfang Dushibao to invite lawyers, scholars, journalists, and officials to take part in the seminar on “Rational Right Protection and Arousal of Citizen Conscience [Lixing Weiquan yu Fazhi Gongminyishi de Juexing]” in the FZH community. Nanfang Dushibao reported this seminar on 24 November (Benbaojizhe, 2003). Many people joined this seminar: two directors from the Homeowners’ Committee of other communities, right protection activist Mr. Wang Hai, lawyers, and many journalists. The developer representative said in the seminar that they did not receive any notice from the government to use their land on which they planned to develop the second phase of FZH.

On 31 December, Nanfang Dushibao reported the ten big events that happened in Shenzhen in 2003. The FZH case received the second largest number of votes (Nanfang Dushibao, 2003).

Project exhibition and hearing meeting. On 17 January 2004, the redesigned plan was exhibited in the community. In this plan, the route was the same as the original plan, but there was a 390 meter long closed cutting. Exits would be built with the man-made mountains and noise barrier. Among the 700 homeowners who filled the questionnaires, 90% of whom opposed the plan and demanded that the viaduct should be moved out of

---

20 The newspaper also reported the predicament of the developer. The developer was a State Owned Enterprise from Shanghai. In fact, they depended on second part of FZH to earn money. See: Mofei, “Expressway passes through the mountain and lake, Shanghai Company faces predicament in Shenzhen[Kuaisulu Chuanyue ‘Shanhuilinhai’ Shanghai Loupan de Shenzhen Jingyu]”, The Economic Observer[Jingji Guancha Bao], 7 December 2003.
the community. The other 10% opposed the plan and demanded the government to redesign the plan.

From 16 March to 20 March, the second redesigned plan was exhibited in the community. The homeowners rejected it too. The impatient homeowners went to the City Government on 26 March and asked for a meeting with the Mayor. The Executive Vice Mayor met the homeowners and promised that the final plan should make the homeowners satisfied.

On 29 June, a public hearing was held. Seven homeowners and one developer representative attended the meeting. During the hearing, the designing institute supported the plan and moved the expressway 138 meters further south, and there was a 400 meter long closed sunken road within the contracted land of the FZH community. The route was 215 meters further away from the kindergarten and 369 meters away from the main buildings. Several months later, the 400 meter long closed sunken road was extended to 480 meters long (see, Appendix 7).
Chapter 4:

**DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

The homeowners of THY and SHCL achieved some success in their resistances to Link Way Project, but Haiyue did not achieve their goal. We must consider the technical limitation in the sense that there must be a portal in the eastern part of the Link Way Project. As to FZH, even though they wanted more success, they already attained their original goals and the government made concession.

Even though the homeowners in these four communities had not lived in the same community for a long time, many actions were organized very well and a lot of people participated in the resistance. The efficient communication among the resisters was important to mobilize the common people. In these communities, the Internet played a very important role to mobilize the homeowners. Many on-line active homeowners became the organizers or leaders of the resistances. Also, because of the convenient communication, the cost of organization decreased. In fact, several rights protection organizations were formed on-line at first. The mobilization and organization ability enabled the homeowners to launch sustained collective actions. The government had to respond to the demands of the homeowners; otherwise the legitimacy would be doubted.

**4.1 The Role of the Internet.**

In these two cases, the communities were very new, and some of them resisted the official plan just when the homeowners moved in the communities. This characteristic is
very different from that of the collective actions of laid-off workers and villagers. Often, the laid-off workers and villagers have known each other for many years. The reputation of the activists is known by the average participants and it is convenient for organizers to mobilize the average people. For example, initiators or organizers of laid-off workers’ collective actions include current enterprise leaders, previous enterprise cadres, retired workers, military veterans, non-cadre Party members and common workers (Cai, 2002). This kind of people is very suitable to get responses from common followers. However, as the above discussion suggests, we can find that the homeowners were very well organized even though they did not know each other.

Admittedly, we collected our data through the Internet, so selection bias is a potential problem. This means that the homeowners might have also used other kinds of methods to mobilize and organized themselves other than the Internet. However, after we analyze the role of the Internet, We find that other methods could not play the same role as internet.

Table 4: The Dates of Moving Into the Communities, Beginning the resistance, and Setting up the BBSs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>THY</th>
<th>Haiyue</th>
<th>SHCL</th>
<th>FZH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>when they moved in the community</td>
<td>Feb-03</td>
<td>Nov 2002-March 2003</td>
<td>Jul-03</td>
<td>August-Dec. 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when they started the resistance</td>
<td>Aug-03</td>
<td>Jul-04</td>
<td>Nov. 2003</td>
<td>Nov. 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when BBS was set up</td>
<td>22/10/2002</td>
<td>14/9/2000</td>
<td>27/6/2002</td>
<td>23/9/2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the Table 4, we can find that many homeowners had begun to use the Internet to get to know each other and organize routine activities before the resistance. They knew that individuals were powerless compared to the government and the developers. More
people mean more power. It was a routine for them to unite together to achieve their goal and it was expected that this would make them much stronger. In each case, we can find this kind of activities. For people who are not familiar with each other, the Internet is the most available tool for them. As one homeowner of SHCL mentioned on the BBS, he/she had asked for the contacting information of the homeowners from the property management company, but the property management company refuted him/her, so he/she had to call for information of the homeowners through the BBS to make a contacting list. To some degree, the Internet was the only way to unite this group of people, especially before they moved into their new apartments. Activities, such as hiking, having meats together, football team, badminton team, and so on, were also organized through the Internet for these people. There are other kinds of groups which also are formed through the Internet in the real estate market, for example, “Jiti kanfangtuan” [the group to collectively investigate housing], “tuangou” [the group to buy apartments together].

Several resistance organizations were formed on-line, for example, the Temporary Homeowners’ Committee of SHCL. In Haiyue II, On-line Homeowners Association was also founded before they moved into the community. At the same time, the activists on the BBS could always call for a homeowners’ meeting and urge the homeowners to take part when necessary. The IDs of the activists on the BBS were known to homeowners who usually browse the web. Sometimes, common people would urge the activists to organize a meeting; sometimes, the activists would initiate the meetings. This kind of meeting was the main channel to decide on the formation of rights protection groups, and the on-line activists were the main force of the rights protection groups. We can look at the groups in these communities. THY founded the Group of Western Corridor in which
the main leaders came from the on-line activists. Even though the official Homeowners’ Committee was founded in Haiyue II, “Green Western Corridor” was founded to deal with a specific issue, what was mobilized and organized by a well known ID on the BBS. The active IDs in FZH community’s BBS also played the important role in organizing the first homeowners’ meeting and forming the official rights protection group “Preparatory Committee of the Homeowners’ Committee of FZH”. Actually, several on-line activists tried their best to mobilize the common homeowners to launch the first petition. This is the significant difference between the laid-off workers’ resistance and the homeowners’ resistance. Many collective actions for laid-off workers happened spontaneously and unexpectedly (Cai, 2002; Chen, 2000)21. They depended heavily on the leaders, not organizations. Organizations were set up very quickly for the homeowners’ resistances.

Information circulation also depended heavily on the Internet. First, internal information was circulated effectively using the Internet. Just as Charles Tilly argued, “the more extensive its common identity and internal networks, the more organized the group. CATNESS×NETNESS=ORGANIZATION.”(Tilly, 1978: 63) Catness and netness mean a set of individuals comprising both a category and a network. In these new communities, without a strong personal network among themselves, information circulation was very important to shape their common feelings and informed them of related news. Each rights protection teams or groups registered an ID on the BBS to circulate the news and call for more actions. The most efficient case was the official ID “United Together” of “the Preparatory Committee of Homeowners’ Committee of FZH”. This ID posted at least 140 notes on the BBS without counting the deleted ones which

were unavailable. This group of middle class in the city was busy with their jobs. The BBS was the most convenient way to learn about the development of their resistance. Second, to make more people know about their concern was also important for the homeowners, and using the Internet was their first choice. There were two reasons why the homeowners broadcasted their events to the outside. Mass media in Shenzhen and internet companies located in Shenzhen were under control of the local government. The newspapers in Shenzhen did not report the legal demands of the homeowners objectively, and they followed the propaganda spirit of the local government. Szhome.com belonged to the Bureau of Land Planning, and many topics could not be posted on the communities BBS. Especially for the BBS of FZH, more rigid administration was encountered than other BBSs, because they made more serious trouble for the government and their notes were more radical than those of other communities. The other reason was that circulating the events to the outside could place pressure on the local government. The logic of resistance in China, just as analyzed before, is that the local government is not as good as the central government, and the local government is only afraid of the higher level governments. This is the constraint of local governments (Cai, 2002). In this sense, publicizing the events to the outside plays the same role as the petition to higher level government. The homeowners did a good job to post notes on websites. The web of People’s Daily even opened two new forums for these cases, and one was for FZH and the other was for the Western Corridor²². This kind of propaganda was effective²³ and a byproduct of this behavior was that a lot of mass media paid attention to their events.

²² We cannot access these two websites in April and May, 2007. According to notes posted on the BBS in szhome.com, these two websites were very active during their resistance.

²³ Based on the interview and observation, some media institutes collected the topics on-line, edited them into special internal references and sent them to upper level cadres. For example, this is a routine job for the
4.2 The Role of Organization.

As mentioned above, each community set up their own rights protection group (see Table 5). Organization is important for several reasons.

Table 5: The Organizations of the Four Communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>community</th>
<th>Rights protection organization</th>
<th>date of formation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THY</td>
<td>The Group of Western Corridor</td>
<td>30/08/2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiyue</td>
<td>Green Western Corridor</td>
<td>3/7/2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHCL</td>
<td>HSCL Right Protection Action Group for Western Corridor</td>
<td>30/11/2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FZH</td>
<td>Preparatory Committee of Homeowners’ Committee of FZH</td>
<td>26/11/2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mobilizing average homeowners.* Governmental infrastructure projects could hurt the market value of every homeowner’s apartment, but it did not mean that collective actions would emerge automatically. First, many homeowners did not even know the project details. Second, grievance would not change the situation, and it was needed to mobilize the common people to participate in the popular actions. Many homeowners’ meetings were held by activists at the beginning and rights protection groups later. Detailed information was released at the meeting, and each building was assigned a head to circulate the information and mobilize the homeowners in each building.

*Rationalizing the demands.* Individuals had different demands. It was important to rationalize these different demands and make them practicable. The rights protection group, as an organization, was reasonable to set its goals and targets. The goals were their

---

staff at Xinhuanet.com (the web of Xinhua News Agency) to collect the opinions on its web. In many times, Premier Wen Jiabao mentioned that he paid attention to the opinions on the Internet, especially xinhuanet.com (see, among others, Xinhuanet.com, “Wen Jiabao: Wo Liulan le Xinhuwang, Wangmin Shenshen Gandong le Wo [Wen Jiabao: I have browsed the xinhuanet.com and I was touched by the opinion of the people]”, 14 March 2005).
demands, and the targets referred to the official bureaus which should be responsible for these demands. Rights protection groups made concrete goals after they learned about the plan, for instance, the goal of FZH was to move the expressway out of the contracted land. The communities that resisted the Link Way Project also made their goals for each community. This made the bargaining with the government much easier.

Organizing the actions. After the formation of the rights protection group, actions could be planned. We can look at all collective actions, except for the first action of FZH, all the actions were planned by rights protection groups. The action could be expected and sustainable.

To be the representatives of the homeowners to bargain with the government. To stop the collective petitions, governments arranged a series of dialogue with the homeowners. The leaders or members of rights protection groups were always the homeowner representatives. In a case illustrated in Chen’s paper, when collective action of laid-off workers developed into demonstrations on the streets, even the police could not force the people to leave. When the government sent officials to talk with the worker representatives, they could not find a representative among the workers (Chen 2000). As to this case, even though the government promised to provide assistance to the workers, the situation became a zero sum game. The government must either meet the demands of protesters or repress the protest.

Contacting the outside. It was obvious in the FZH case. The rights protection group arranged a series of activities to seek external support. They posted advertisements in newspapers, organized seminars, invited journalists to join community parties, published their contact information for journalists. Another activity was also important which was
to mobilize the related communities. When Haiyue decided to react to the Link Way Project plan, one of its actions was to mobilize the communities nearby. Weilanhaian was one of the communities mobilized by Haiyue. When SHCL began to resist the plan, THY sent a representative and a technical expert to give advice. The organization facilitated interactions among communities.

4.3 Characteristics of Homeowners’ Resistance.

Except for the meeting of Miss Wang with the police, other leaders did not face such problems. The police entered FZH several times, but not to punish the leaders. It was quite safe being a group leader. Existing research shows that being the activists and leaders of villagers and workers is very dangerous. It is easy for the government to punish a few people to threaten the others. As to the homeowners, they could easily reach the Internet, and many of them had a college education. They had reasonably good income. All of these made them different from the villagers and laid-off workers. However, in the whole resistance, they also used strategies which were used by laid-off workers and peasants.

First, they used the divisions within the government. The homeowners mainly petitioned to two kinds of departments: one was the city or provincial government; the other was the Bureau of Environmental Protection at different levels. When they resisted the Link Way Project, the homeowners used the divisions quite well. In the whole process, two technical experts from the Lilin Residents’ Committee focused on the technical problems. They calculated and reevaluated the environmental items by
themselves to testify the faults in the official environmental report. The professors from Tsinghua University affirmed their calculation. This made it very difficult for the local government to persuade the homeowners. Since they were not satisfied with the work of the Bureau of Environmental Protection in Shenzhen, the homeowners petitioned or applied for administrative reconsideration to the Bureau of Environmental Protection of Guangdong Province and the State Environmental Protection Administration of China. The homeowners created the chance to meet with the Vice Head of the State Environmental Protection Administration of China, and obtained the oral support from the Vice Head24. In August 2005, the State Environmental Protection Administration of China issued a document to reply the petition letter of homeowners. In 27 June 2006, a vice division head of the State Environmental Protection Administration of China, Mr. Zhao, came to Shenzhen to deal with the issue of environmental problem of the Link Way Project. Shenzhen government promised to revise the design. The Bureau of Environmental Protection of Guangdong Province also responded to their petition (see Appendix 4). The main environmental evaluation institute, Shenzhen Environmental Science Research Institute, was publicly criticized by the State Environmental Protection Administration of China in 2004. The environmental problems were the main means to attack the plan. Another strategy was to launch collective petitions to the upper level government. For example, about 300 homeowners of FZH petitioned to the Provincial Government when they could not meet with the Mayor of Shenzhen. Second, they used negative inducement when the institutional channel did not work. In these two cases, the

24 Newspapers published the detailed information about this meeting. See, Qi Chen and Tianming Sun, “Xibutongdao Shenzhen Cejiexian Yanxian Jumin Yaoqiu Kai Huanbao Tingzhenghui [The Residents Near the Link Way Project of the Shenzhen-Hong Kong Western Corridor Ask for Environmental Evidentiary Hearing]”, Nanfang Dushibao, 30 November 2004.
homeowners seldom used negative strategies. Only at the beginning of the resistance of FZH, about 300 homeowners blocked the main road in Shenzhen. This behavior worked well; at least the government had to change their attitude and began to learn the homeowners’ will and demands. This action also made the police pay more attention to the homeowners’ behavior than to homeowners’ resistance to the Link Way Project. Third, the homeowners tried their best to publicize the events. The motivation to attract the attention of media was strong in both cases, especially in FZH. They also publicized the events through the Internet.

Under the same political system, the strategies for many groups are similar. However, the different groups have different abilities to mobilize their indigenous force and use different ways to utilize the opportunity. With the power of the Internet and united organizations, the homeowners could achieve some of their objectives which other groups could not.

*Mobilizing indigenous resources.* Homeowners’ meetings empower the rights protection organizations the ability to achieve many tasks. In each community, donation was collected by rights protection groups. To some degree, the homeowners were willing to donate money. Money could be used to make banners, cover the transport fee, hire lawyers, and so on. The common people were also mobilized to take part in and use their personal network to collect information from the government. One important factor of collective action is the large number of people involved. Through the organization, there were always enough people who could be mobilized to take part in collective actions. Frequently, there were several hundreds of homeowners taking part in collective actions.
Positively using media. They used traditional media to gain support. Take FZH as an example. A journalist of Nanfang Dushibao reported their blockage. Then, the homeowners posted more newsworthy events through the media. Two advertisements were made in Nanfang Dushibao: one was a apology for their road blockage, and the other was to invite outsiders to join their seminar. These behaviors were new in China. The advertisements, *per se*, became the focus of the media. At last, the resistance and the homeowners’ rational behavior became the focus of the media. Journalists from powerful media, for example Xinhua News Agency, went to the communities to collect information. When the media in Shenzhen published official viewpoints, the media outside played the role of arguing against the local government.

Using their own words rather than the rightful rhetoric. Just like the title of the FZH seminar showed, “Rational Right Protection and Arousal of Citizen Conscience [Lixing Weiquan yu Fazhi Gongminyishi de Juexing]”, the homeowners did not follow the discourse of the government. On the contrary, they used their own words to urge the government to change their old cliché. Actually, there was a debate on the BBS and a lot notes joined the debate. This debate came from two editorials in Shenzhen Special Zone Daily. On 24 November 2003, Shenzhen Special Zone Daily published an editorial titled “Baizheng ‘Xiaowo’ yu ‘Dawo’ [Balance the Relationship between ‘the Big’ and ‘the Small’ ]” (Benbaopinglunyuan, 2003). In this editorial, the author asked individuals to make compromise when the collective interest could be attained through individual concession. Individuals should pay attention to the long-term interest and the interest of all the people other than their own short term interest. Three days later, another editorial was published in the same newspaper, “‘Nao’ Bushi Banfa [ ‘Making Trouble’ is not a
way to solve problem]” (Benbaopinglunyuan, 2003). This editorial said that the government was working for the people’s interest and the project could serve this goal. Some people protested before the City Government for their own interests. This behavior was understandable but did not work. They should deal with this through the administrative process or legal process. Many homeowners wrote articles to argue this viewpoint. They said they did not know who was “the Big” and who represented “the Big”. There were only several people or clubs who owned the title of “the Big”. Without “the Small”, what is the meaning of “the Big”, etc. As to “making trouble”, they argued why the government did not make the institutional channels more effective. The same issue also arose in the process of resisting the Link Way Project. In the dialogue with the homeowners on 26 September 2003, one official asked them to sacrifice the individual interests to collective interests. The homeowners wrote an open letter to the municipal leader after the dialogue. It argued that the government should abide by the law to carry out the governance and should not say “sacrifice” without accountability [Zhengfu yao Yifa Xingzheng, Buyao Qingyan Xisheng].

It seems that the homeowners are much stronger than the villagers and laid-off workers in resisting the government. An official said that “Who is much more disadvantaged? It is our government,” when the journalist asked questions about the resistance to the Link Way Project (Chen, Jin, 2005). It cannot be generally true under an authoritarian regime, but the government must respond to this kind of actions to some degree. We can find that the government arranged many meeting or dialogues for the homeowners, and the final plan partly accommodated the demands of the homeowners.
4.4 Conclusion

As to the political rights, it is the same for the homeowners and laid-off workers or peasants. All of them are politically powerless. However, the power in economy and knowledge give homeowners more chances to achieve their goals.

To some degree, the weaker the group, the more dependent it is on third parties. Yet, the third party, especially from the society, will often make the event politically sensitive in China. Media and divisions among the government are more available to be used for resisters. These two means are either the government *per se* or controlled heavily by the government. This is both the chance for “rightful resistance” and limitation to “rightful resistance”. We can often see from the reports of New York Times that the weak always fails and the local government’s will to repress is strong. The cost of repression is very small or zero.

The mobilization ability and the support from mass media give the resisters many chances to avoid repression and achieve some success. These two aspects shape the indigenous force of the grieved groups in China. When we look at the outcome of the resistances in China, the opportunity within the government and the indigenous force of the resisters must be observed together.

The homeowners’ resistance has added another dimension to the history of resistance in recent China. They have used the Internet to unite themselves. For protecting their own interests, special rights protection organizations have been easily set up easily because of the mobilization ability of the Internet. These strategies can support them to launch sustainable actions to resist the government. To some degree, the government responded
to their resistances quickly and was willing to compromise with the homeowners. The so-called independent organizations are hardly truly independent in China. The Internet can be utilized as an independent tool to organize and mobilize the common people, voice out their concern, and fight for their rights.
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## Appendix 1: The Actions of Homeowners in Resistance to the Link Way Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open Letter/Letter Petition</td>
<td>From 15/09/2003 to 18/09/2005</td>
<td>All related homeowners.</td>
<td>About 30 letters were written to the mayor and party boss of Shenzhen, Environmental Protection Bureau of Shenzhen, Guangdong Province and Central Government, Premier Wen Jiabao, and some of them were technical critique articles. These letters were both send to government institutes as petition letters and published on the web.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>21/8/2003</td>
<td>THY</td>
<td>Less than 200 persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/9/2003</td>
<td>THY</td>
<td>95% of household in A district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11/05/2005-12/05/2005</td>
<td>SHCL</td>
<td>More than 600 persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donation</td>
<td>4/9/2003</td>
<td>THY</td>
<td>20 Yuan per Home, more than 7000 Yuan in total.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9/2003</td>
<td>SHCL</td>
<td>300 Yuan per home, totally 32160 Yuan before 14/09/2004 by 108 households. about 25000Yuan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14/9/2003</td>
<td>Zhaoshang Haiyue</td>
<td>Send letters, emails, and call to every government department related to this construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4/9/2003</td>
<td>22 homeowners of THY</td>
<td>Petition to Environmental Protection Bureau, Shanghai Municipal Engineering Design Institute and Shekou Industrial Area Employee Housing Company.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9/9/2003</td>
<td>About 50 homeowners of THY</td>
<td>Send petition materials to Complaints Bureau of Municipality Government and ask to talk with the mayor who takes charge of public works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/09/2003</td>
<td>THY</td>
<td>Send petition materials to Complaints Bureau of Municipality Government and ask to talk with the mayor who takes charge of public works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15/09/2003</td>
<td>THY</td>
<td>Homeowner representatives petition to Bureau of Public Works, Bureau of Land Planning, Environmental Protection Bureau and Western Corridor Office again</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23/09/2003</td>
<td>THY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to consult the outcome of petitions before. They went to Public Security Bureau to send the application for demonstration during holiday of National Day. Petition to Municipal Government. At last, they went to Yingbinguan Hotel to send the petition letter and signature to experts who were talking about the Western Corridor proposal there, and one of them read the letter out before the experts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25/09/2003</td>
<td>67 homeowners of THY to consult outcome of petitions before.</td>
<td>THY, Haiyue and other several communities</td>
<td>Petition to Municipal Government.  At last, they went to Yingbinguan Hotel to send the petition letter and signature to experts who were talking about the Western Corridor proposal there, and one of them read the letter out before the experts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/7/2004</td>
<td>200 homeowners of Houhai to consult outcome of petitions before.</td>
<td>Houhai</td>
<td>Petition to Municipal Government.  At last, they went to Yingbinguan Hotel to send the petition letter and signature to experts who were talking about the Western Corridor proposal there, and one of them read the letter out before the experts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/8/2004</td>
<td>Community and Weilinhaian representatives to consult outcome of petitions before.</td>
<td>Weilinhaian</td>
<td>Petition to Municipal Government.  At last, they went to Yingbinguan Hotel to send the petition letter and signature to experts who were talking about the Western Corridor proposal there, and one of them read the letter out before the experts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/9/2004</td>
<td>Homeowners of Lilin to consult outcome of petitions before.</td>
<td>Lilin</td>
<td>Petition to Municipal Government.  At last, they went to Yingbinguan Hotel to send the petition letter and signature to experts who were talking about the Western Corridor proposal there, and one of them read the letter out before the experts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13/6/2005</td>
<td>SHCL to consult outcome of petitions before.</td>
<td>SHCL</td>
<td>Petition to Municipal Government.  At last, they went to Yingbinguan Hotel to send the petition letter and signature to experts who were talking about the Western Corridor proposal there, and one of them read the letter out before the experts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23/9/2003</td>
<td>THY and Fuyuan homeowners to consult outcome of petitions before.</td>
<td>THY and Fuyuan homeowners</td>
<td>Petition to Municipal Government.  At last, they went to Yingbinguan Hotel to send the petition letter and signature to experts who were talking about the Western Corridor proposal there, and one of them read the letter out before the experts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/10/2004</td>
<td>Houhai homeowners to consult outcome of petitions before.</td>
<td>Houhai</td>
<td>Petition to Municipal Government.  At last, they went to Yingbinguan Hotel to send the petition letter and signature to experts who were talking about the Western Corridor proposal there, and one of them read the letter out before the experts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/7/2003</td>
<td>Weilinhaian homeowners to consult outcome of petitions before.</td>
<td>Weilinhaian</td>
<td>Petition to Municipal Government.  At last, they went to Yingbinguan Hotel to send the petition letter and signature to experts who were talking about the Western Corridor proposal there, and one of them read the letter out before the experts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/7/2003</td>
<td>400 homeowners of Houhai to consult outcome of petitions before.</td>
<td>Houhai</td>
<td>Petition to Municipal Government.  At last, they went to Yingbinguan Hotel to send the petition letter and signature to experts who were talking about the Western Corridor proposal there, and one of them read the letter out before the experts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/8/2004</td>
<td>About 4000 homeowners of Houhai to consult outcome of petitions before.</td>
<td>Houhai</td>
<td>Petition to Municipal Government.  At last, they went to Yingbinguan Hotel to send the petition letter and signature to experts who were talking about the Western Corridor proposal there, and one of them read the letter out before the experts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/12/2004</td>
<td>SHCL to consult outcome of petitions before.</td>
<td>SHCL</td>
<td>Petition to Municipal Government.  At last, they went to Yingbinguan Hotel to send the petition letter and signature to experts who were talking about the Western Corridor proposal there, and one of them read the letter out before the experts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/2/2005</td>
<td>SHCL to consult outcome of petitions before.</td>
<td>SHCL</td>
<td>Petition to Municipal Government.  At last, they went to Yingbinguan Hotel to send the petition letter and signature to experts who were talking about the Western Corridor proposal there, and one of them read the letter out before the experts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16/03/2005</td>
<td>In the name of all related homeowners to consult outcome of petitions before.</td>
<td>SHCL</td>
<td>Petition to Municipal Government.  At last, they went to Yingbinguan Hotel to send the petition letter and signature to experts who were talking about the Western Corridor proposal there, and one of them read the letter out before the experts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25/05/2005</td>
<td>SHCL to consult outcome of petitions before.</td>
<td>SHCL</td>
<td>Petition to Municipal Government.  At last, they went to Yingbinguan Hotel to send the petition letter and signature to experts who were talking about the Western Corridor proposal there, and one of them read the letter out before the experts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: The Meetings Arranged by Government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Government Participants</th>
<th>Homeowners Participants</th>
<th>Response of government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24/9/2003</td>
<td>THY</td>
<td>Leaders of Employees’ Housing Company of Shekou Industrial Area</td>
<td>THY</td>
<td>They did not have a plan to deal with the problem of Western Corridor. But they could solve the problem of transformer substation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leaders of Employees’ Housing Company of Shekou Industrial Area</td>
<td>Homeowners’ Representatives of THY and Lilin Shequ (Fuyuan)</td>
<td>Director of Complaints Bureau of Nanshan District promised that: 1) we had known your opinion; 2) we will reevaluate the plan; 3) there should be some room for reforming the plan; 4) we will publish the plan to the society before the final plan is made; 5) other officials will come here to answer more questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/09/2003</td>
<td>Zhaoshang Street Office</td>
<td>Officials of Municipal Government and Nanshan District Government</td>
<td>More than 30 homeowners of THY and Lilin Shequ (Fuyuan)</td>
<td>Party secretary promise that he will step down if the pollution of Western Corridor cannot attain the national environmental criterion. He also said that the plan must make the public known before bringing into effect. (Homeowners changed their original petition plan to Municipal Government)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/10/2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>Party secretary with other officials of Nanshan District</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Tang drew a conclusion of this dialogue: 1) let’s Nanshan District Government and Shekou Industrial Area receive the homeowners’ visiting and answer their questions first. 2) it was a big issue in the agenda of the Party Secretary and The mayor. 3) designing institutes should optimize the plan quickly. 4) this plan cannot convince the homeowners. Government will pay the money for a group to investigate the experience of Hong Kong, and this group should be formed by the related government officials, designing engineers and homeowners. 5) the homeowners should not petition to government again before we made the final decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/10/2003</td>
<td>First Conference</td>
<td>Mr. Zuo, vice mayor, Mr. Tang, Deputy Secretary-General, and other 24 officials and engineers.</td>
<td>Four homeowner representatives</td>
<td>Public Security Station, Street Office, and Residents’ Committee stopped the petition action and inform Nanshan District Government of this situation, so they made a meeting with homeowners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/10/2003</td>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>Mr. Tang, Deputy Secretary-General, and other people from government department and designing institutes</td>
<td>Experts from homeowners and representatives of several communities.</td>
<td>The optimized plan was shown during the meeting. There were two open segments, 100 meters long for western portal and 200 meters long for eastern portal. Every community was at least 120 meters away from portal and this arrangement can ensure to attain the environmental criterion. The homeowners required that the way should be close. The waster gas must be treated and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/11/2003</td>
<td>Office in Municipal Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/12/2003</td>
<td>Yingbinguan Hotel</td>
<td>7 officials or engineers from Western Corridor Office, Bureau of Public Works,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bureau of Environmental Protection, Nanshan Station of Environmental Protection,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Studying Institute.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 homeowners from Liyuan Xiaozhuan, 3 from THY, 1 from SHCL. Residents'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Committee of Lilin Shequ, Mr. Shi and Mr. Qian.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/1/2004</td>
<td>Lilin Shequ Conference Room in</td>
<td>Engineer Dai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nanshan District Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/01/2004</td>
<td>Conference room of Municipal</td>
<td>Officials from Nanshan District and Municipal Government, Mr. Tang, Deputy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Secretary-General, related people from divisions of both Municipal government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and Nanshan district</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/07/2004</td>
<td>The building of Nanshan District</td>
<td>THY and other communities near to Western Portal. Twelve homeowners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>representatives of Houhai communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19 homeowners from THY and Lilin Shequ. 5 persons were allowed to join the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>meeting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/07/2004</td>
<td>The building of Nanshan District</td>
<td>Officials from Nanshan District and engineers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Officials from Nanshan District (including related Street Office and Residents'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Committee) and Municipal Government and engineers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/07/2004</td>
<td>The office in SHCL</td>
<td>SHCL and Taizi Shanzhuang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 homeowner representatives from Zhaoshang Street and Yaoai Street.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/08/2004</td>
<td>SHCL District</td>
<td>Homeowners asked that the plan should adopt the subway or closed type road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to construct the Link Way. The president asked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions about the way to measure the number of vehicles, the conclusion of the environmental evaluation report, different numbers from different departments. The homeowners of SHCL ask why not invite them to the dialogue before. The engineer testified that the environmental quality beyond 120 meters do not have problem. The meeting president promised to reflect the opinion to related government departments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27/11/2004</td>
<td>Morning, In Qilin Shanzhuang</td>
<td>Mr. Lv Ruifeng, Vice Mayor, Several homeowner representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/11/2004</td>
<td>Afternoon, In Qilin Shanzhuang</td>
<td>Mr. Pan Yue, Vice-Head of State Environmental Protection Administration of China, Several homeowner representatives, Four representative of SHCL for Liwan Residents Committee, and other homeowners and lawyers from other communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/4/2005</td>
<td>Nanshan District Government</td>
<td>Mr. Xie, District Head. Vice head of Bureau of Public Works and Head of Environmental Science Research Institute and other 6 experts from outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/5/2005</td>
<td>Weilinhaian, Haiyue, SHCL THY</td>
<td>The evidentiary hearing must be held before start of construction. The homeowners ask to use subway. They gave the petition letter and the report from Legal Aid Center of Sun Yat-sen University. Three documents were exhibited in these communities: Presentation of the Plan of Link Way, Explanation of the Questions of 'Environmental Report', Legislative Opinions about the Questions of Project of Link Way to Western Corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/7/2005</td>
<td>Nanshan District Government</td>
<td>Officials from Nanshan District and engineers, 6 representatives of SHCL, The detailed design was shown to homeowners. The homeowners required longer closed road when the Western Corridor past SHCL.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix 3: On-line letter petition and its reply

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>信访时间:</th>
<th>2003-10-6 16:22:53</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>信访内容:</td>
<td>领导同志您好，听说南坪快速路今年开始建，明年通车。经过万家灯火，并且可能会拆掉第4栋，请问是否确有此事？在哪里可以找到万家灯火花园的法定图则？盼复为感！</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>初审结果:</td>
<td>回复</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>办理告知:</td>
<td>我们已把您的意见转给有关部门处理，将在规定时间内答复。谢谢您的到访！</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>答复时间:</td>
<td>2003-10-9 16:57:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>办理部门名称:</td>
<td>市政处</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>办理结果内容:</td>
<td>根据市政府安排，南坪快速路将在今年底开工，争取明年底通车。现由我局正在开展方案设计，推荐线路走向经过“万家灯火”，是否拆迁，由于方案未定，暂时无法确定。“万家灯火”花园片区法定图则目前还没有开展工作，所以无法提供。感谢您对我市规划国土管理工作的关注。</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
广东省环境保护局办公室

关于对群众反映深圳市西部通道侧接线隧道敞口段
环境影响评价存在问题处理情况的答复

深圳市南山区蔚蓝海岸住宅小区、荔林社区群众：

你们于2004年8月11日上访我局，反映深圳市西部通道侧接线隧道敞口段环境影响评价存在问题。对此我局领导十分重视，按照群众信访属地处理原则，我局于8月23日发函至深圳市环保局，要求其高度重视该问题，认真进行调查核实，积极协调处理，切实做好群众工作；并建议深圳市环保局为彻底消除群众顾虑，请国家环保总局环境影响评估专家对群众反映的环评报告书存在的问题进行复核，并将有关情况答复群众。

感谢你们对环保工作的关心与支持。

二〇〇四年八月三十一日
集会示威申请书

深圳市公安局：

根据《中华人民共和国集会游行示威法》第四章第十一条、第二十三条，第十三条、第十七条、第二十一条等有关规定，我集会举行集会、示威活动，特依据《中华人民共和国集会游行示威法》的审批办法及相关条款在规定时间内予以批准。

本次集会游行活动的主要诉求是，对市政府领导关于深圳西部通道项目的非法决定，采取集会和游行方式予以反对。我们深信这一决定的合法性和合理性，依法依规进行和平表达。

参加本次集会的人数为10000人，涉及社区20多个。具体集会路线为…。

集会示威活动由…领导，现场指挥，确保活动的顺利进行。

特此申请，敬请准许。

集会示威活动筹备委员会

2004年11月28日上午九时，在深圳南山出口举办。
Appendix 6: The Path of Link Way Project

Map Source: google, accessed May 2, 2007
Appendix 7: The Designs of FZH Section of Nanping Expressway

First Design of Nanping Expressway, Map Source: Shenzhen Government

Final design. Map Source: google, accessed May 2, 2007
Appendix 8: An Example of Petition Letters

关于对《环境影响报告书》涉及的内容
提出的—些意见

前言

一、环境保护有法可依，执法必严

2003 年 10 月 31 日，李鸿忠市长在全市的环保工作会议上做了重要讲话：“保护环境事关人民群众切身利益”，“是一项最大的民心工程”，“加强环境保护，实现经济、社会和环境的协调发展，是提高我市综合竞争力，建设国际化城市的必由之路。要从战略高度充分认识做好环保工作的重要意义。”“我们只有最大限度地克服经济发展和环境保护才有持久的生命力和竞争力”。这些讲话反映了市政府对环境保护的重视和保护环境的决心，我们感到十分欣慰。

早在 1979 年我国就颁布了《环境保护法(试行)》，历经修改，1989 年通过了新的《环境保护法》。

1993 年国家环保总局公布了《关于进一步做好建设项目环境保护管理工作的几点意见》。

1998 年国务院发布了《建设项目环境保护管理条例》。

以上的法律法规对建设项目环境保护的基本原则和管理程序都作出了明确规定。而真正把环境保护提到应有战略高度的，则是经过了四年的时间反复讨论、辩论和论证，并于 2002 年 10 月通过，2003 年 9 月 1 日起实施的《环评法》(见注 4)，这是我国环境立法最为重大的进展。表明我国党、政府、人民已经从世界各国和国内的经验及教训中对环境保护有了高度的认识。它力求从决策的源头防止环境污染和生态破坏，从项目评价进
入到战略评价，标志着我国环境与资源立法步入到一个新的阶段，对环境保护有着重要的意义。

现在，已经制定了相关的法律法规，我们要做的工作则是依法办事，执法必严。正如李市长所讲：“环保工作是一项艰巨的工作，既要有高度的责任心，又要建立有效的工作机制，工作要步步落实”。

做好环保工作要讲求科学的态度。环保部门抓敢管固然重要，但更重要的是各有关部门都要把环保工作当作自己的工作来抓，而不是把它看作一个包袱，更不能把环保措施看作是应付环保部门的挡箭牌。建设部门应该对项目的环保工作负责到底。

做好环保工作没有负责精神和科学精神不行，没有群众的积极参与和监督也不行。群众中蕴藏着巨大的积极性和创造性，许多环境问题与他们的切身利益息息相关。因此，《环评法》第二十一条对此作出了明确的规定。

二、我们对《环境影响报告书》涉及的内容提出我们的一些意见

根据《环评法》的有关规定及要求，我们提出以下一些具体意见，并明确要求有关部门在报批《环境影响报告书》时附具我们提出的意见采纳或不采纳的说明：

意见之一：西部通道集中了大量以柴油机为主的重载车辆横穿小小的南头半岛，这对南头半岛会造成严重的大气污染，我们要求对下沉式敞开的路段全部实行封闭，并在隧道内净化空气。

据OD调查，深圳市的过境车辆占全市的39.92%，约有38.34%的车辆适宜从西部通道过境。由于‘西部通道’开通后，这部分过境车辆将缩短了市内55%的路程。因此，从全市来看，市区内将减少21.09%(38.34%×55%)的尾气污染，中心区则减少了38.34%的尾气污染，另有17.25%(38.34%
\( \times 45\% \)则转移到了小小的南头半岛，这使得只有特区面积 7～8% 的南头半岛的汽车尾气排放强度将是特区平均排放强度的十倍以上，这么大的排放强度可能会对整个南头半岛带来灾难性的污染！

最近，深圳市有关政府部门和香港有关部门经最后确认，‘西部通道’远景的通车量是：小客车 30000 辆次/日，大客车 1500 辆次/日，普通货车 23000 辆次/日，货柜车 35000 辆次/日。货车及大客车共计 59500 辆次/日，其中绝大部分是柴油车。一条公路能有这么大的交通量这在全国是绝无仅有的，在世界上也是罕见的。请问：最后设计的交通量是否就是以上的所述的交通量？如果修改了，我们要知道修改的依据是什么？如果以后突破了又怎么办？

据交通部科学研究院王惠臣等著的《中国公路建设与可持续发展》一文的介绍(书 2)，实测国内九条已建成的高速公路发现：这九条已建成的高速公路，堂堂超标。其中：CO 超标 2 条，NO₂ 超标 4 条，TSP 超标 3 条，噪声监测夜间则是 100% 超标。严分口岸的严重污染也证明了这点。西部通道怎么能够做到不超标？

我们建议：(1) 学习日本东京都地下高速公路的环保措施，西部通道的隧道部分实现无污染排放(见《环球时报》2003 年 1 月 24 日第 13 版“科技”)，这样可以把西部通道约 40%的汽车尾气处理掉；(2) 可以先采取过渡方案，隧道全封闭，高空排放，同时拨专款立项研究或引进技术，一旦条件成熟即可实施。这一意见能否采纳？为什么？

意见之二：特殊的地理环境和特定的气象条件将加剧汽车尾气对环境的污染，一定要按规范认真测算。

环境影响保护行业标准《环境影响评价技术导则 总纲》HJ/T2.2-93
7.5.5 及 8.5 中都指出“如项目设置在沿海或大面积水域附近，还应计算海岸线蒸烟地面浓度的最大值和分布值”。要“根据预测结果分析出现超标时的气象条件。例如静风、大气不稳定状态、日出和日落前后的蒸烟和辐射逆温的形成、海岸线蒸烟、下沉逆温、因特定的地表或地形条件引起的局部环流（如海陆风……）、背风湍急现象等。给出其中的主要影响因素以及这些因素出现的时间、强度、周期和频率”。西部通道侧接线正好位于大南山北麓，东西向穿过南头半岛，东向为后海湾，西向为前海湾，具备了上述海岸线蒸烟及背风湍等严重污染的条件。请问：《环境影响报告书》是否严格按此行业标准进行认真的测算和评估？

据 HJ/T2.2-93—4.1.2 节规定，经计算，本项目的评价工作等级应是 2 级，因此依 5.2 节规定，应查阅地理条件一致的最近 5 年以上的气象台站的气候要素资料，依 5.5 节规定应收集评价区内及界外地区各例行大气监测点近 3 年监测资料，统计分析各季主要污染物的浓度值、超标值、变化趋势等，这样才能作出更科学、更符合实际的环评报告。请问《环境影响报告书》是这么做的吗？

意见之三：应该对非正常排放进行评价，并提出相应的环保措施。

HJ/T2.2-93 中 5.4.4.4 节规定：除调查统计主要污染物的正常排放外，还应估计其非正常排放量。据有关资料指出：“汽车在公路受到阻塞时，应查阅有关文献来计算”或做实验模拟测算。盐田港区及盐港等口岸道路，塞车是家常便饭，尤其遇到特殊天气，如一场大雨或台风过后，常常一塞就数十个小时甚至几天，整条公路塞几十公里。请问：《环境影响报告书》对这种情况的污染是否有进行计算？结果如何？

意见之四：工程完成后应进行环境监测并对附近小人群健康进行调
查。

HJ/T 2.2-93—8.2.13 节规定：“当建设项目规模较大，且排放的污染物
toxicity 较大时，应进行一定的人群健康调查，待工程结束后进行健康监控”。
我国华南地区是酸雨污染严重的区域之一，深圳市也不能幸免，尤其要指
出的时：南头半岛有几座燃煤燃油电厂，这些厂 SO₂（二氧化硫）的排放
比较严重，"西部通道" 汽车尾气的排放物主要是 NOₓ（氮氧化物）、CO
（一氧化碳）、HC（低碳化合物）。这些污染物相遇时有的会相互催化，在
阳光照射下，它们会发生化学反应，生成臭氧、醛类、过氧乙酰、硫酸、
硝酸等气溶胶，其毒性比 NOₓ、SO₂ 大许多倍（见书 1）。

我们建议：对附近小区各类人群进行抽样调查，选择血铅浓度和其他
与呼吸系统有关的健康指标，象哮喘之类的疾病等进行健康调查，以便更
有效地监控工程项目对环境的影响及监测对附近小区人们的健康有无相关
性，更好地保障人们的健康。请问：我们这一建议能否采纳，为什么？

意见之五：应评价环境保护对土地开发利用的影响

HJ/T 2.1-93—8.2.11.3 节规定：对土地的利用也应作调查。侧接线工程
的南侧正是蛇口招商局开发的桃花园 II、III、IV 期生活小区，应该对比全
封闭高排气筒式的排放、沿线排放、低排气筒式排放对环境污染程度的区
别，对比各类排放方式对该地区土地开发利用的不同范围及不同档次的影
响，尤其要对比对规划中的南山公园环境的影响，对比对百年南山荔枝品
牌的影响。规划中的大南山公园是南山人民期待已久的休闲健身之处，如
果环境保护工作做得不好，造成严重污染，该如何向人民交待？向种下名
闻遐迩的南山百年荔枝的深圳先人及其子孙交待？

意见之六：小烟囱分散排放不可取。排气筒的高度大小对改善大气环
境，降低社区的污染有明显影响，地面小烟囱分散排放违背科学及有关法规。

整个通道采取封闭方式，并在适当位置设排气通道引至合适地点，由排气筒高空排放是最为合理的过渡方案。排气筒位置的选择及高度的选定对改善大气环境、降低污染至关重要。有人提出了设立许多个矮小烟囱分散排放的意见。我们认为这种意见是不可取的。首先，东滨路目前的污染已经超标，如果“西部通道”建成，加上比现在多几倍的，每天几万辆汽车沿线排放的汽车尾气，就会使东滨路的污染程度严重加剧，再则，从技术角度分析这种意见也是不可取的。我们依据有关规范作如下比较：

GB/T3840-91（注1）—6.2节给出了单一排气筒允许排放的计算式为：

\[ Q = C_m R K_e \]

其中，
- \( Q \) 为排气筒允许排放率，kg/h；
- \( C_m \) 为标准浓度限值，mg/m³；（标准状态下每立方米的含量）；
- \( R \) 为排放系数；
- \( K_e \) 为地区性经济技术系数，取值为 0.5~1.5。

参照标准，深圳是 5 号地区，其不同高度的排气筒对应的排放系数列表如下：

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>排气筒有效高度（m）</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>80</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>排放系数 R</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

从上述表中可以看出，随着烟囱高度的增加，允许的排放按平方的关系增加，因为地面浓度和烟囱有效高度的平方成反比，且高排气筒还有较大的抬升高度，使排气筒的有效高度比实际高度增加很多。可见采用单座高烟囱排放的方式对减少地面的污染比较有利。
据我们计算，采用敞口排放或低烟囱排放对 100m 至 300m 均会造成严重污染。我们要请问有些部门，为什么坚持无排气筒方案或低矮排气筒方案？

以上是我们对《环境影响报告书》涉及的内容提出我们的一些见解，希望有关部门能认真考虑我们的意见，认真负责地做好《环境影响报告书》，并对我们的意见给出明确的采纳或不采纳，以及不采纳原因的答复。

此外，我们还有几个问题要向市政府有关部门请教:

一、《深圳市城市综合交通与轨道交通规划》中提出:“深港过境货运交通将完全与城市交通分离，一般货运及其作业将远离并避开生活及商业区，使深圳居民免受噪音等干扰”。这一规划思想显然是正确的，但从这一规划的思想来衡量‘西部通道’的现在走向显然是不合理的。应该沿海直通宝安区的沿海大道。

问题一：规划国土局为什么会批准现在的‘西部通道’走向方案？

二、 据悉，1997 年审批‘西部通道’方案走向时，曾在‘西部通道’两侧划出 200 米蓝线的‘不准建筑区’。可自 1997 年以来，先后在此蓝线区内‘不准建筑区’建起的社区有：福满园、桃花园、花园城等多个生活小区。

问题二：既然已规定通道两侧 200 米的蓝线为‘不准建筑区’，为何会在‘不准建筑区’内出现上述这么多的生活社区？

三、 据国家环保总局 15 号令，自 2003 年 1 月 1 日起实行的《建设项目环境影响文件分级审批规定》，第三条、第六条、附表二中三、交通中公路款“长度 2000 米及以上的独立公路桥梁、隧道”：“其他工程总投资 2 亿元及以上”规定：其《环境影响报告书》须由国家环保总局审批”。‘西部
局审批。

问题三：深圳市政府是否遵守上述规定，报国家环保总局审批？

以上是我们社区全体居民对《环境影响报告书》涉及的内容提出的一些看法及意见，希望有关部门能认真考虑和研究，并给我们以明确的答复。

注：
1、GB/T 3840-91 制定地方大气污染物排放标准的技术方法
2、HJ/T 2.1-93 环境影响评价技术导则 总纲
3、HJ/T 2.2-93 环境影响评价技术导则 大气环境
4、《环评法》《中华人民共和国环境影响评价法》
5、文献 1：《大气环境和污染控制基础》吴忠标编，化学工业出版社 ISBN7-5025-3769-4/X1.74
6、文献 2：《交通与环境》
7、文献 3：《空气污染控制》姜安玺等编著，化学工业出版社 ISBN7-5025-4410-0

荔林、桃花园社区全体居民

2003 年 11 月 13 日