CHINA’S ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS: IS A SPECIALIZED COURT THE SOLUTION?

Darcey J. Goelz

Abstract: China’s economic growth has come at a high price: environmental and natural resource destruction. Presently, China’s legal system is not prepared to protect China’s environmental resources. China’s State Council has expressed an interest in establishing a civil and administrative system to manage environmental matters. Some of the objectives expressed by the State Council could be achieved by creating a special tribunal to address environmental issues, similar to New Zealand’s Environment Court. A specialized court promotes environmental protection, and specialization creates experts in a specific field, allowing for consistency among decisions. An environmental court will fit into China’s current legal system because Chinese law expressly authorizes specialized courts. In fact, China already has specialized courts, including special maritime courts. The creation of a specialized court would not be a panacea for China’s environmental problems, but it is a fundamental first step.

I. INTRODUCTION

Environmental pollution in China is a profoundly urgent concern—and for good reason. China is faced with severe environmental challenges that must be met in order to prevent the destruction of the forests, the extinction of species, the loss of land to desert, and the disappearance of potable water. The impact of environmental damage is not limited to the environment; it also affects the people that live there. China’s lack of legal environmental protection results in toxic living conditions and leaves environmental advocates without tools to protect the environment and themselves. For instance, some citizens wear gas masks to get to work, while other citizens are arrested for photographing illegal chemical discharges. In the time leading up to the Beijing Olympics, China’s environmental problems steadily rose to the forefront of the world’s
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attention. These environmental problems are due primarily to the country’s rapid economic development, but the country’s tumultuous history and problems of corruption are also factors. Seemingly at odds with its environmental record, China has an extensive framework of progressive environmental laws, regulations, and policies. Unfortunately, these laws are often not implemented or enforced. China’s government recognizes the need to reform its legal system to address environmental challenges.

China has the potential to protect and restore the country’s natural environment. To do so, China’s leaders must strengthen the institutions responsible for environmental protection and the “necessary adjunct institutions such as the judiciary.” Of the many possible approaches to addressing the environmental crisis in China, the Chinese government appears willing to embrace a specialized environmental court. In 2005, the State Council issued a decision regarding environmental protection. One of the provisions in the decision implicitly suggests the country harbors a desire to establish a specialized forum for environmental actions. This
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10 Nothing in the State Council Decision expressly states a desire to create a specialized court, but the Decision does imply that changes to the judicial system are a necessary step towards a healthier, cleaner environment. See Shun Yong Yeh, Is China’s Development Path Sustainable? An Overview on the Legal
Comment outlines how China would benefit from the creation of a specialized court system for environmental issues.

To date, there has been no move to develop such a specialized court within China, but courts in other countries could serve as precedents. The framework currently employed in New Zealand offers a useful model and it could be modified to conform to a structure similar to China’s other specialized courts, such as the maritime courts. Such a court would have the expertise to appropriately handle environmental cases and would insulate judges from local pressure. This Comment argues that a specialized court should be adopted to strengthen the country’s potentially powerful environmental regulatory framework.

Part II of this Comment provides an overview of China’s major environmental issues. Part III then discusses China’s legal system, including an assessment of its existing environmental legislation, a general overview of the country’s governmental structure with particular focus on the failure of the current judicial system, and a caveat that a specialized court is not a panacea for the difficulties facing China. Part IV reviews two types of specialized courts that provide approximate potential models for a Chinese Environmental Court: the Environment Court of New Zealand (“NZEC”) and China’s maritime courts. Part V examines the viable structure, authority, jurisdiction, and standing requirements of a specialized environmental court in China. Finally, Part VI analyzes the potential benefits of a specialized court in China’s environmental protection framework.

environmental court, including the advantages stemming from judicial expertise and awareness of a legal forum.

II. China Faces Severe Environmental and Natural Resource Challenges

China has numerous environmental problems that are interrelated and increasingly dangerous to both human health and ecosystems. There are many explanations for these environmental problems, including China’s complicated history, the country’s rapid economic development, and the corrupting influence of local interests.

A. China Has a Variety of Environmental Problems that Combine to Raise Major Political, Social, Economic, and Health Concerns

China must address its environmental problems for economic, social, political, and environmental reasons. China’s primary environmental issues are water pollution, lack of water, air pollution, deforestation, and desertification. China must address these environmental problems because, among other things, the costs to the economy are crippling. The Communist Party of China (“CPC”) is also concerned that environmental damage will prompt social unrest. The Chinese government itself recognizes the costs of environmental pollution, as indicated by its 2005

12 For an additional overview of these and other environmental problems, see Eric W. Orts, Environmental Law with Chinese Characteristics, 11 WM. & MARY BILL RTS. J. 545, 549 (2003).
13 See Elizabeth C. Economy, Environmental Enforcement in China, in CHINA’S ENVIRONMENT AND THE CHALLENGE OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT 102, 102 (Kristen Day ed., 2005) [hereinafter Economy, Environmental Enforcement]. “[T]he price tag for China’s environmental degradation and pollution is estimated to be the equivalent of 8% to 12% of its annual gross domestic product (GDP).” Id.
14 ECONOMY, THE RIVER RUNS BLACK, supra note 7, at 87. In another article, Economy discussed a large protest in June 2007 against the construction of a petrochemical plant in Xiamen. Elizabeth C. Economy, The Great Leap Backward?: The Costs of China’s Environmental Crisis, FOREIGN AFFAIRS, Sept. 1, 2007 [hereinafter Economy, The Great Leap]. She stated that the “Chinese leadership’s greatest fear . . . [is] that its failure to protect the environment may someday serve as the catalyst for broad-based demands for political change.” Id. “In 2005, China was shaken by 51,000 pollution-triggered ‘public disturbances’—demonstrations or riots of a hundred or more people protesting the contamination of rivers and farms—according to the government’s own statistics. (The real figures are almost certainly higher.)” Christina Larson, China’s Pollution Revolution: Contaminated Rivers and Farms Trigger Peasant Protests, WASHINGTON MONTHLY, http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/features/2007/0712.larson2.html (last visited Aug. 10, 2008). One such “public disturbance” resulted when a phosphate fertilizer factory caused widespread damage to crops and endangerment of human health. Sun Xiangming, Is This ‘An Incident of Counterrevolutionary Destruction?' in ENVIRONMENTAL LAW AND POLICY IN THE PEOPLE’S REPUBLIC OF CHINA 277, 277 (Lester Ross & Mitchell A. Silk eds., 1987). The local brigade continually implored the factory and the county to correct the problems, but to no avail. Id. Finally, “[i]n response to the masses’ strong and unanimous demand, and having no other recourse,” a local brigade pulled the “factory’s electricity switch in an expression of protest.” Id.
declaration that “[e]nvironmental pollution and ecosystem destruction have caused enormous economic losses, harmed the health of the masses, and affected societal stability and environmental safety.” To provide a stable government and healthy society, China will have to rectify current, and prevent future, environmental and natural resource damage.

Water pollution and water shortages are “China’s No. 1 environmental problem.” One report indicates that the groundwater aquifers in ninety percent of Chinese cities are polluted, and more than seventy-five percent of surface water in urban areas is unsuitable for drinking and fishing. This leaves hundreds of millions of people without access to safe drinking water. Worse still, the Chinese government has categorized almost thirty percent of the country’s river water as unsuitable to use even for agriculture or industry. These high levels of water pollution result primarily from the use of dirty industrial processes without modern environmental controls combined with rampant industrial irresponsibility. In fact, “[w]ater pollution is so widespread that regulators say a major incident occurs every other day.” In addition, more than forty percent of China’s cities do not have a sewage treatment plant. The lack of sewers and general scarcity of clean water cause “nearly 700 million people [to] drink water contaminated with animal and human waste.” Major instances of water pollution only exacerbate the country’s increasing water shortages. The country is so large that the availability of water varies depending on the region: the country’s
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northern region faces profound water shortages, while in the south there is often destructive flooding.

Air pollution is another area of primary concern. The Beijing Olympics pushed air quality to the forefront of government officials’ attention. In an effort to protect athletes’ health, Beijing officials planned “to limit vehicle use, close factories and do everything in their power to bring blue skies to Beijing.” These are obviously only solutions for the very short-term. Air pollution is not just a problem in Beijing; throughout the country citizens breathe unhealthy air. Particulate matter is one major air pollutant that makes China’s air quality unhealthy. Particulate matter is a result of diesel exhaust, coal-fired power plants, and other sources. It is suspected to be the cause of “up to 90 percent of all deaths from outdoor air pollution.” Other problematic air pollutants include nitrogen oxide and sulfur dioxide. The emission of sulfur dioxide, principally caused by coal burning, leads to acid rains, and “China is now the largest source of SO2 emissions in the world.” Sulfur dioxide (SO2) is a serious problem both nationally and internationally. One-third of China is affected by acid rain and neighboring countries have blamed China for acid rain occurrence within their borders.

26 See Orts, supra note 12, at 552; Zachary Tyler, Note, Transboundary Water Pollution in China: An Analysis of the Failure of the Legal Framework to Protect Downstream Jurisdictions, 19 COLUM. J. ASIAN L. 572, 576 (2006). China is attempting to remedy this disparity and some of the attendant harms through major water diversion programs, such as the Three Gorges Dam. See Orts, supra note 12, at 552. These water diversion projects have their own attendant environmental harms. See id.
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Deforestation and desertification are interrelated environmental problems. Deforestation has caused such catastrophic flooding that most logging activities have been banned throughout the country.\(^{38}\) Widespread desertification in western and northern China is transforming arable land into desert.\(^{39}\) Although China has been fighting desertification through massive reforestation campaigns, these re-planting efforts are often unsuccessful.\(^{40}\) In fact, despite aggressive reforestation efforts, reports show that a quarter of the entire country has turned to desert.\(^{41}\) Desertification is a result of poor anti-erosion practices as “[c]enturies of deforestation, along with the overgrazing of grasslands and overcultivation of cropland, have left much of China’s north and northwest seriously degraded.”\(^{42}\) Desertification is also problematic because it results in major dust storms.\(^{43}\)

B. There Is No Single Cause of China’s Environmental Problems

Ample reasons exist to explain China’s environmental deterioration. Some primary causes include China’s traditional approach to the environment and the devastating effects of rule under Chairman Mao Zedong. One of the more obvious reasons is the country’s primary focus on economic development. Another factor is the existence of political and business influence and corruption at the local level.

1. China’s Traditions and Political History Contributed to the Country’s Current Environmental Crisis

Many traditional Chinese approaches to the environment have prevented successful environmental protection.\(^{44}\) China’s attitudes, institutions, and policies were, and to some extent still are, “rooted in and supported by traditional concepts and philosophies such as Confucianism.”\(^{45}\) Confucianism promotes “man’s need to overcome nature in order to utilize it
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for his own benefit.” While Confucian scholars held a variety of beliefs about the relationship between man and nature, man was the focus of most ideas. In addition to Confucianism, other schools of thought influenced China’s treatment of nature and the environment, including Buddhism, Taoism, and legalism.

As China transitioned to socialist rule, the environment continued to suffer. The People’s Republic of China (“PRC”) was established in 1949, and was led by Mao Zedong until his death in 1976. Chairman Mao’s leadership had devastating consequences for China’s environment and natural resources. “[M]ajor environmental problems and institutional legal weakness are legacies of the Great Leap Forward and the Cultural Revolution.”

2. China’s Primary Focus on Economic Development Comes at the Expense of Environmental Degradation

Although China’s history has had significant impacts on its environment, the country’s environmental problems persist because China continues to aggressively pursue economic growth. Since 1978, when the government first created a socialist market economy, China’s economy has continued to expand. In fact, until 1996, China's economy grew at an annual rate of almost ten percent. Even today, the pace of economic growth has lessened only slightly. Economic reform brought revolutionary changes to China, including raising hundreds of millions of Chinese people.
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out of poverty and bringing the country to the top of the world economy. However, this economic growth creates numerous environmental problems because the growth derives primarily from the expansion of heavy industry and urbanization, both of which increase the use of coal. Many now question whether this fast-paced, environmentally unsustainable economic growth can continue.

3. Local Interests and Corruption Prevent the Enforcement of Environmental Laws

Local political and business interests are often opposed to increased environmental protection, particularly because of the economic implications of requiring expensive equipment and procedures. This “local protectionism” is one reason that existing environmental laws are not enforced. The provincial and local governments that are authorized to implement and enforce national policies do not necessarily follow the central
government’s dictates, especially national environmental policies.63 These lower governments often have a stake in polluting industries,64 allowing local and provincial officials to benefit from lax enforcement.65 “China’s weak legal tradition . . . enables corruption to flourish.”66 Within the judicial system, the self-serving local influence continues; local judiciaries often are dependant on provincial and local governments for funding,67 and “[u]nsurprisingly, conflicts of interest frequently are resolved in favor of local officials’ priority on economic development.”68 Corruption typically results from “family, friendships, and other contacts and reciprocities,” and undermines all hope for evenhanded law enforcement.69

III. CHINA’S LEGAL SYSTEM IS NOT PREPARED TO PROTECT CHINA’S ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES

There are legal obstacles to protecting the environment in China. Both the existing legal system generally and its specific environmental

63 See Economy, The Great Leap, supra note 14 (“local officials rarely heed Beijing’s environmental mandates”); Shun Yong Yeh, supra note 10, at 423-24; Economy, Environmental Enforcement, supra note 13, at 104 (no “follow-through on central mandates to local levels”).

64 See Adam Briggs, China’s Pollution Victims: Still Seeking a Dependable Remedy, 18 GEO. INT’L ENVTL. L. REV. 305, 316-17 (2006) (“any municipality’s worst polluter will often also be its largest employer and largest source of revenue”). See also Economy, Environmental Enforcement, supra note 13, at 108.

65 See ECONOMY, THE RIVER RUNS BLACK, supra note 7, at 118. Interviews with local enforcement officials revealed that industries were difficult to fine or close down “because they are central to the health of the local economy.” Id. A representative example of the pressure of local influence can be seen in the case of Zhang Changjian et al. v. Rongping Chemical Plant, where a group of villagers filed a lawsuit against Asia’s largest producer of potassium chlorate. See Wang, supra note 5, at 212-19 (providing a review and analysis of the case). The plant was releasing pollutants that were negatively impacting villagers’ health and destroying timber stands, bamboo, fruit trees, and crops. Id. at 213. The plaintiffs were subject to great pressures as a result of the lawsuit; for instance, the lead plaintiff was assaulted while collecting water samples, and other plaintiffs were attacked physically and financially. Id. at 215.

66 ECONOMY, THE RIVER RUNS BLACK, supra note 7, at 92.

67 Ruth Greenspan Bell, Culture and History Count: Choosing Environmental Tools to Fit Available Institutions and Experience, 38 IND. L. REV. 637, 645 (2005); Alford & Shen, supra note 61, at 416 (“Subnational judicial salaries and court operating expenses come from subnational, rather than national, funds, leading some observers to question their capacity to maintain a high degree of independence from local officialdom.”). Judges’ career advancement is also “frequently determined locally rather than nationally.” Id. “The local government controls both the personnel and the budget of the courts, making political intervention in the legal system a common problem.” Economy, Environmental Enforcement, supra note 13, at 109.

68 ECONOMY, THE RIVER RUNS BLACK, supra note 7, at 92.

69 Professor Jerome Cohen, Keynote Address at the Vermont Law School Symposium: An Introduction to Law in China (Mar. 2, 2007), in 8 VT. J. ENVTL. L. at 402. As one example, in a lawsuit against a copper factory, the factory “was set up by the local government itself, had the head of the local trade commission as its chief executive, and would certainly be indemnified by the local government if the plaintiffs’ case was a success . . . . Any local judge weighing evidence and deliberating the outcome . . . would realize that his own salary was tied to his decision. This realization would make bias or the appearance of bias unavoidable.” Briggs, supra note 64, at 330.
regulatory framework prevent adequate protection of the country’s ecosystems. The government has an essentially non-existent enforcement mechanism, a weak judicial branch, and vague environmental laws. Each of these factors contributes to China’s inability to protect its environmental resources and human health.

A. China Has Numerous Environmental Laws, but They Have Not Effectively Addressed the Country’s Environmental Challenges

Historically, environmental protection was considered the purview of the Emperor and his officials; and so individual citizens had little responsibility and took little action to protect the environment. Under that regime, the extent of protection afforded land and water resources depended on how responsibly individual officials executed their duty to protect the natural world.71

In 1978, China, recognizing the need for environmental protection, amended the Chinese Constitution by inserting provisions that require the state to protect the environment and natural resources as well as prevent pollution and other public hazards. Presently, the Chinese Constitution prohibits damage to natural resources and places a duty on the State to protect the environment. However, these constitutional rights are not directly enforceable by the judiciary unless statutes clearly direct the courts to apply a particular right.75

Environmental laws abound in China. The National People’s Congress (“NPC”) has enacted roughly twenty statutes “primarily addressing pollution control, natural resource conservation, and product stewardship.”76 In addition to these statutes, China has extensive
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70 See ECONOMY, THE RIVER RUNS BLACK, supra note 7, at 56.
71 Id.
72 Id. at 95-96.
74 XIAN FA art. 26. The Constitution also provides citizens the “right to criticize” and the “right to make complaints . . . for violations of law,” both of which should be used to raise awareness of environmental and natural resource damage. XIAN FA, art. 41, § 1; see also Xioping Chen, The Difficult Road for Rights Advocacy An Unpredictable Future for the Development of Law in China, 16 TRANSNAT’L L. & CONTEMP. PROBS. 221 (2006).
76 Ferris & Zhang, supra note 5, at 583-84. These laws include: The Air Pollution Prevention and Control Law, The Clean Production Promotion Law, The Law on Desertification Prevention, The
administrative regulations. While China has successfully passed a plethora of environmental laws, policies, and regulations, these have not been implemented. According to one of China's top environmental lawyers, "barely ten percent of China's environmental laws and regulations are actually enforced." The failure of China's extensive environmental regime is likely a result of weak legal institutions.

Another factor contributing to the failure of a seemingly comprehensive scheme is the vague language of the laws. The laws are drafted in such a manner that, even if local governments were to attempt enforcement, the laws can be interpreted with extreme leniency. Some have speculated that these laws are intentionally vague, designed to symbolize China's desire to correct the country's environmental problems, while maintaining the status quo in economic development. Thus, the laws function more like policy statements.

China's environmental laws provide the tools for non-governmental enforcement through a private right of action. The Environmental Protection Law, China's general environmental statute, places liability on polluters.
A polluter will be liable for damages caused by its actions despite compliance with state standards; this is known as no-fault liability. In addition, the burden of proof is placed on defendants in court proceedings; the polluter is forced to prove that its actions did not cause the damages at issue. Each of these requirements should promote successful citizen suits. are more likely to be successful when a polluter is liable despite apparent compliance with state standards, because the polluter is forced forcing a polluter to prove that it did not cause the damage at issue.

Unfortunately, many observe that China’s court system remains weak. In addition, the nation has not traditionally had a culture of utilizing lawyers, courts, or the law in general to resolve disputes, therefore, few will resort to court action on environmental matters. As a result, the existing court system is woefully inadequate to remedy the spiraling deterioration of China’s ecological systems.

B. The Overall Design of the Chinese Legal System Prevents Adequate Enforcement of Environmental Laws

China is essentially a one-party government, controlled by the CPC. The PRC, as a socialist state, centers its government in people’s congresses, which are responsible for creating and supervising all environmental protection bureaus, contains specific provisions for the management and supervision of the environment, pollution control, and legal liability associated with pollution, and requires that provincial governments evaluate the environmental impact of their activities. Id.

Environmental Protection Law art. 41 (promulgated by the Standing Comm. of the NPC, Dec. 26, 1989, effective on date of promulgation) LAWINFOCHINA (last visited Oct. 28, 2008) (P.R.C.) (“A unit that has caused environmental pollution hazard shall have the obligation to eliminate it & make compensation to the unit or individual that has suffered direct losses.”).

Yuhong Zhao, supra note 52, at 178-79.

Wang, supra note 5, at 209 (citing Some Provisions of the Supreme People’s Court on Evidence in Civil Procedures, a document released by the Supreme People’s Courts). One statutory example of the burden of proof states, “[f]or a damage suit arising from the environmental pollution by solid wastes, the inflictor shall assume the burden of proof for the statutory exemption and the nonexistence of causation between its acts and harmful consequences.” Law on the Prevention and Control of Environmental Pollution by Solid Wastes art. 86 (promulgated by the Standing Comm. of the NPC, Dec. 29, 2004, effective Apr. 1, 2005), LAWINFOCHINA (last visited Oct. 28, 2008) (P.R.C.).

Wang, supra note 5, at 202.

Id.

For instance, “[o]nly 9% of people will negotiate with the polluter directly, and only 2% [of] people will sue to the court . . . .” Professor Li Zhiping, Address at the Vermont Law School Symposium: Environmental Challenges Facing Rural Areas in the Process of Industrialization (March 2, 2007), in 8 VT. J. ENVTL. L. at 426. Professor Li Zhiping’s speech provides more information on the survey, particularly the specifics of how the survey was completed. Id. at 426-27. The survey was conducted by about thirteen students in his environmental law clinic and environmental law classes, over a period of four months, through interviews and questionnaires. Id.

See XIAN FA Preamble (“Under the leadership of the Communist Party of China . . . ”).

administrative, judicial, prosecutorial, and military agencies of the state.\textsuperscript{93} The NPC is the highest “organ” of state power,\textsuperscript{94} exercising legislative authority at the central level.\textsuperscript{95} The Constitution also empowers a smaller body,\textsuperscript{96} the Standing Committee of the NPC, with essentially the same authority as the NPC.\textsuperscript{97}

The directives of the NPC and the Standing Committee are executed by the State Council and its agencies.\textsuperscript{98} The State Council is comprised of various departments, commissions, administrations, and offices.\textsuperscript{99} The same legislative and administrative bodies exist at each level of government. The top-down structure provides for little oversight and thus prevents proper enforcement of environmental laws because prevalent regional protectionism creates a tendency for local governments to disregard central government rules and regulations.\textsuperscript{100}

The judicial branch consists of both courts and procuratorates.\textsuperscript{101} The courts’ structure, divided into four levels, mirrors the top-down hierarchy of the State Council.\textsuperscript{102} China’s judiciary is quite decentralized, with control of the lower courts’ personnel and budget resting in local governments.\textsuperscript{103}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{93} See Wang Chenguang, supra note 49, at 15. There are essentially five levels of government: 1) central, 2) provincial, 3) prefectural (which includes large cities and autonomous regions), 4) county and city, and 5) township/village. \textit{Id.} at 16.
  \item \textsuperscript{94} \textit{XIAN FA} art. 57. See \textit{JIANFU CHEN}, supra note 92, at 113. The NPC convenes once a year, and is composed of almost 3000 deputies. \textit{CHINA: OUTLINES OF THE LEGAL SYSTEM OF THE PEOPLE’S REPUBLIC OF CHINA} 43, 45 (Zhang Fusen & Hu Zejun, eds., 2004).
  \item \textsuperscript{95} \textit{A GUIDE TO THE LEGAL SYSTEM OF THE PRC} 3 (Chris Hunter et al., eds., 1997).
  \item \textsuperscript{96} The Standing Committee is composed of less than 200 members. \textit{JIANFU CHEN}, supra note 92, at 117.
  \item \textsuperscript{97} The Standing Committee is, among other things, empowered to interpret the Constitution and supervise its implementation; to make, revise, and interpret most statutes; and to supervise the State Council and other government bodies. See \textit{XIAN FA} art. 67.
  \item \textsuperscript{98} \textit{JIANFU CHEN}, supra note 92, at 119. The State Council is elected by the NPC. \textit{A GUIDE TO THE LEGAL SYSTEM OF THE PRC}, supra note 95, at 4. Although the Constitution theoretically vests all state power in the NPC and its Standing Committee, the State Council seems to be much more powerful than one would suspect. \textit{JIANFU CHEN}, supra note 92, at 119.
  \item \textsuperscript{99} See \textit{A GUIDE TO THE LEGAL SYSTEM OF THE PRC}, supra note 95, at 5.
  \item \textsuperscript{100} Shun Yong Yeh, supra note 10, at 424.
  \item \textsuperscript{101} The Chinese procuratorate is not only responsible for prosecutions but is also responsible for “the supervision of law” and supervision of important State departments. Ye Feng, \textit{The Chinese Procuratorate and the Anti-Corruption Campaigns in the People’s Republic of China, in IMPLEMENTATION OF LAW IN THE PEOPLE’S REPUBLIC OF CHINA} (Jianfu Chen, Yuwen Li, & Jan Michiel Otto, eds., 2002). The people’s procuratorates are the “state organs for legal supervision.” \textit{XIAN FA} art. 129. The procuratorate system has an organizational structure similar to the court system. See \textit{A Brief Introduction to China}, http://www.lawinfochina.com/Legal/index.asp.
  \item \textsuperscript{102} \textit{ZOU KEYUAN, CHINESE LEGAL REFORM: TOWARDS THE RULE OF LAW} 144 (2006). The levels are: 1) The Supreme People’s Court, 2) the Higher People’s Courts, 3) the Intermediate People’s Courts, and 4) the Basic People’s Courts. \textit{Id.} To give an idea, there are more than 2200 county courts across the country; there are intermediate courts in every major city; and at the provincial level there are 32 high courts. XiXin Wang, supra note 82, at 682.
  \item \textsuperscript{103} \textit{ECONOMY, THE RIVER RUNS BLACK}, supra note 7, at 112.
\end{itemize}
Traditionally, judges were often military officers or merely demobilized soldiers or other civil servants; these individuals often had only a high school education and had no legal training or practice. While there is an ongoing effort to move away from this system, judges still often lack legal education and training. This lack of legal competence is problematic because China’s environmental laws and environmental issues are often complicated.

For China’s legal system to effectively control environmental damage, it is imperative that the judicial system diligently sustain environmental laws and rights. “No matter how perfect the environmental law is and how propitious the provisions are to defend the environmental rights and interests, the environmental law is meaningless if lawyers and judges have no knowledge of the particularity of environmental law.” One organization stated that “[w]hile environmental law is a burgeoning field of study, few judges, lawyers or environmental officials have received formal training. Consequently, environmental cases are difficult to handle. Lack of knowledge of the law affects pollution victims’ ability to get fair, timely redress.” Potential problems that arise as a result of a judiciary without expertise in environmental law include succumbing to local influence, failing to recognize an environmental pollution case, or misplacing the burden of proving causation.

One water pollution case highlights the corrupting effect that local pressures can have on the legal system. The plaintiffs’ mango crops were diseased as a result of dust and smog pollution from two nearby cement plants. After the plaintiffs prevailed in the first trial, the defendants inspired government and CPC party officials to get involved. The resulting report by the government and party officials suggested that the first...

104 Id. at 113.
105 Alford & Shen, supra note 61, at 417.
107 Xu Kezhu, Training Strengthens Environmental Law in China, CLAPV Media Reports, Jan. 5, 2008, http://www.clapv.org/new/cate_en.php?catename=MR. In order to combat this lack of understanding and formal training, CLAPV provides annual training sessions in environmental law to increase judges’, practitioners’, and officials’ practical and theoretical understanding of environmental law. See id. Lecture topics included current environmental legislation, handling complicated issues in environmental tort litigation, rules of evidence in civil cases, handling environmental disputes, application of environmental standards in litigation, and implementation of environmental law in China. Id.
109 Id. at 7.
judge had incorrectly decided the case for a variety of reasons. A retrial was granted, and a panel determined that the plaintiffs’ evidence was too general and that there was no direct evidence of pollution damages. Local economic influences were able to manipulate the court’s lack of awareness and comprehension of environmental laws. Confusion among the courts and judges will not result in constructive case decisions.

In another lawsuit, tendencies to protect local factories could not influence the court, because the impacted, polluting enterprises were in a different county from the court. Upstream factories dumped numerous pollutants into a river, resulting in downstream duck and fish farmers losing significant portions of their stocks. The plaintiffs brought suit after government negotiations failed. The plaintiff farmers initiated suit in their home county, where the injuries occurred. The defendants attempted to have the case moved to the court in the defendant’s county, but the court refused. While the plaintiffs in this case benefited from being before the local court, there are many other instances where the desire to protect local industries works against the plaintiff, especially when the polluting defendant resides in the same county as the court.

A recent case highlights the failure of one court to recognize novel environmental pollution cases. In LiFaJun v. Suzuki Car Company Ltd., a widower, Mr. Zhu, uncovered evidence that his wife may have died as a result of exposure to pollution from the factory. The case was tried in the local court, where the court refused to move the case to the defendant’s county. The court ignored the legal or technical merits of the case in order to support the local enterprises. One prominent environmental lawyer explained that “in all of the suits that we have lost, the courts have not followed the law. Instead they ignored the legal or technical merits of our case in order to support the local enterprises.”
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110 Id. at 7-8.
111 Id. at 8-9.
112 See Wang Canfa, Water Pollution Damages Case in Pizhou, Jiangsu Province, at 1, CLAPV Case Analysis, http://www.clapv.org/new/cate_en.php?catename=CA (describing how pollution from the upper reaches of the Fang Ting River, which begins in Tongshan County, reached the lower reaches of the river, including portions in Pizhou City). Pizhou City is a different county-level city than Tongshan County, although both are under the jurisdiction of Xuzhou in Jiangsu Province. See Cities and Towns, http://www.jiangsu.net/city/.
113 Wang Canfa, supra note 112, at 4-5.
114 See id. at 1-4, 4.
115 See id. at 5.
116 Id. at 5.
117 Another factor weighing in the plaintiffs’ favor in this instance was the provision of free legal resources that the plaintiffs received.
118 One prominent environmental lawyer explained that “[i]n all of the suits that we have lost, the courts have not followed the law. Instead they ignored the legal or technical merits of our case in order to support the local enterprises.” Ted Plafker, Nascent “Green Culture” is Challenging Authorities—and Being Heard: Chinese Activists Take to the Courts, INT’L HERALD TRIB., August 28, 2002, available at http://www.iht.com/articles/2002/08/28/rbeijing_ed3_.php?pass=true. It is difficult to obtain information on Chinese cases because many of them are not published and when they are they are not available in English translations. When organizations, such as CLAPV, produce information about environmental cases, it is usually to laud the rare victory.
result of benzene poisoning. Shortly after purchasing a new car, Mrs. Zhu passed away; subsequently the benzene level in the car’s interior was tested and found to exceed the indoor air quality standard. Mr. Zhu sued Suzuki, the car manufacturer, because he believed that a flaw in their product resulted in Mrs. Zhu’s death. The court rejected the lawsuit on the grounds that Mr. Zhu had not provided adequate evidence of causation that the benzene levels resulted in Mrs. Zhu’s death. If the lawsuit had been brought under the Environmental Protection Law, Mr. Zhu would not have had the burden of proving causation; the burden would have been placed on the car manufacturer to show that the high levels of benzene in the car did not cause Mrs. Zhu’s death. The Center for Legal Assistance to Pollution Victims in China (‘‘CLAPV’’) agreed to assist Mr. Zhu in his appeal after professors affiliated with CLAPV “determined that this was a unique type of environmental pollution case and that the first court had erred in its exercise of the law.” On appeal, Mr. Zhu’s attorneys framed the case as an environmental pollution case, but the higher court still rejected the claim. If the courts had recognized that benzene was an air pollutant and that cases regarding potential injuries resulting from that pollutant should be tried under the EPL, the outcome for Mr. Zhu would likely have been very different. Lawsuits based on environmental torts are a relatively recent phenomenon; courts must be able and willing to recognize and accommodate cases involving environmental pollution.

As discussed above, Chinese environmental laws shift the burden of proof to the defendant. In general, a plaintiff in a tort case would be required to prove that a defendant’s actions had caused the alleged harm. In
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126 In the United States, indoor air pollution is regulated and monitored by the Environmental Protection Agency. See generally U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Indoor Air Quality Homepage, http://www.epa.gov/iaq/index.html.
127 Some Provisions of the Supreme People’s Court on Evidence in Civil Procedures art. 4, states: “The burden of proof in the tort actions shall be assumed according to the following rules . . . . In a compensation lawsuit for damages caused by environmental pollution, the infringing party shall be responsible for producing evidence to prove the existence of exemptions of liabilities as provided in laws or that there is no causal relationship between his act and the harmful consequences . . . .” Some Provisions of the Supreme People’s Court on Evidence in Civil Procedures art. 4 (promulgated by the Supreme People’s Court, Dec. 21, 2001, effective Apr. 1, 2002) LAWINFOCHINA (last visited Oct. 28, 2008) (P.R.C.).
environmental tort cases, once the plaintiff shows injury and some contact with the defendant, the defendant has to prove that the plaintiff’s injuries were caused by something else besides the defendant’s actions. This inversion of the burden of proof is extremely beneficial when employed. Often, however, a court does not understand that the burden of proof must be shifted or does not recognize that a case is an environmental tort deserving of the inversion. In the cement plant case described above, the court attempted on retrial to place the burden of proof onto the plaintiff, instead of on the defendant where it belonged because the case was for damages from environmental pollution. The failure of courts to recognize that the burden of proof must be transferred to the defendant is especially problematic when the plaintiff does not know that the burden should be shifted either, so the plaintiff does not even present it as a possibility to the court. In one case, the plaintiff failed to raise the burden of proof allocation because the plaintiff lacked knowledge of environmental court cases. The plaintiff, the Shuangxi Reservoir Management Bureau, stocked the reservoir with fish that were subsequently killed in large numbers by the release of machine oil from the generator room of the upstream Power Station. As one lawyer on the case stated, “[t]he undertaking judge is obviously ignorant of environmental law, due to which Inversion of Burden of Proof is not adopted in the court hearing. It is urgent for judges and lawyers to take up universal knowledge of environmental law, independent branch of laws, with environmental torts taking place at an increasing rate.” Cases involving complex environmental laws and science would be more appropriately handled in a court experienced in such cases.

C. A Specialized Court Would Not Provide All of the Answers To China’s Environmental Problems, But These Challenges Can Be Indirectly Addressed Through An Environmental Court

While the solution to China’s failing environmental paradigm offered in this comment—developing a specialized court to hear environmental issues—would benefit China’s legal system and help the country face environmental challenges, the effectiveness of such a specialized court
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130 Id. at 1-2.
should not be overstated. There are areas of concern that a specialized court could only indirectly ameliorate. China has grave environmental challenges that cannot easily be remedied. In addition, other issues may compromise any gain in environmental protection that results from a specialized court, including non-enforcement, corruption, and the technical difficulty of correcting already existing problems. In order for the specialized court to effectively function, citizens must be aware of this forum and be willing to utilize it. It is encouraging to note that Chinese citizens are more frequently heading to court with the gravest pollution problems, but people must be willing to challenge less obvious, but nonetheless serious, pollution and natural resource destruction. Ideally, providing a specialized forum will increase the use of litigation as a means of dispute resolution to challenge a variety of environmentally destructive activities. However, without proper legal assistance, Chinese citizens may remain without adequate access to the judicial system. Non-profit legal assistance will be an important contributor to the effective operation and legitimacy of an environmental court system.

The legal road ahead for Chinese environmental activists promises to be difficult, but these difficulties and the potential for failure only underscore the importance of reform and should not prevent an attempt at stability and success. A specialized court would benefit China’s legal system
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132 An environmental court could not directly increase the level of enforcement. Increased enforcement will result most directly from changing attitudes of government officials.

133 Corruption can be addressed to some extent when the State brings charges against government officials. The central Chinese government does realize the important of environmental enforcement and has attempted to address the problem of lax enforcement and corruption through laws and regulations. In order to address dereliction of duty by government officials, the central government has produced the Provisional Measures on the Penalties for Violation of Law or Discipline in Environmental Protection, the Explanation on Certain Issues Relating to the Governing Law in the Criminal Trial for Environmental Pollution Cases by the Higher People’s Court, and the Higher People’s Procuratorate’s Standard for Indictment of Dereliction of Duty. See Shun Yong Yeh, supra note 10 (translating the regulations).

134 See Wang, supra note 5, at 204.

135 The number of environmental disputes increases every year. Wang Canfa, Keynote Address at the Vermont Law School Symposium: Special Functions of Promoting Public Participation in Environmental Protection in Aiding Pollution Victims (March 2, 2007), in China in Transition: Environmental Challenges in the Far East, 8 VT. J. ENVTL. L. at 384-85. “[E]very year there’s at least 20% to 30% increase in environmental complaints” submitted to environmental authorities. Id.

136 See Wang, supra note 5, at 204-05. Many argue for NGO standing to sue in environmental pollution cases. See Patti Goldman, Panel Address at the Vermont Law School Symposium: The International Silk Road: Engaging Domestic Efforts to Protect China’s Environment (March 2, 2007), in China in Transition: Environmental Challenges in the Far East, 8 VT. J. ENVTL. L. at 448-49; see also Orts, supra note 12, at 562-64. See generally Patti Goldman, Public Interest Environmental Litigation in China: Lessons Learned From the U.S. Experience, 8 VT. J. ENVTL. L. 251 (2007). This would greatly increase the likelihood that cases would be heard by a specialized environmental tribunal.
and would begin to resolve many of the problems responsible for environmental degradation.

IV. **CHINA SHOULD USE THE MODELS OF EXISTING SPECIALIZED COURTS TO GUIDE THE DEVELOPMENT OF A CHINESE ENVIRONMENTAL COURT**

China should adopt a specialized court system in order to address the complicated legal issues presented by environmental litigation. Both the New Zealand Environmental Court (“NZEC”) and China’s maritime courts could provide models for the development of an environmental court in China. Environmental and maritime issues are both very complicated areas of law, which benefit from having knowledgeable judicial officials resolve issues. The NZEC is a specialized tribunal that addresses environmental and natural resources issues and disputes in New Zealand. Similarly, the maritime courts in China have exclusive jurisdiction to resolve maritime and admiralty disputes.

A. **New Zealand’s Environment Court Offers a Solution for Managing Environmental Disputes**

New Zealand is at the forefront of developing specialized environmental jurisprudence. It has benefited from the use of a special tribunal to review planning decisions since 1953, when the Town and Country Planning Appeal Board was created. In 1991, the country merged statutory planning and environmental controls into one comprehensive law: the Resource Management Act (“RMA”). The RMA is New Zealand’s primary environmental statute, and “[t]here are few aspects of the management of the air, land and water that are not within its purview.”
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138 The Planning Appeal Board and its successors provided the basis for the current Environmental Court. Trevor Daya-Winterbottom, *Evolving Practice—the Environment Court of New Zealand, 13 ENVTL LIABILITY 119, 119-20 (2005).*


140 David Grinlington, *Access to Environmental Justice in New Zealand, 1999 ACTA JURIDICA 80, 80 (1999).*

141 Id. at 80. There are, however, “a number of areas of environmental law [that] remain outside the Act.” Id.
1996, amendments to the RMA created the Environment Court.\textsuperscript{142} This institution was an important addition to the RMA. One scholar notes that “[the Environment Court] can be said to serve as judge, jury, and executioner over most of the fundamental aspects of the RMA regime.”\textsuperscript{143} The NZEC is an expert tribunal that primarily addresses public interest questions related to resource management and environmental law.\textsuperscript{144}

The establishment of the NZEC is generally accepted as a “notable success.”\textsuperscript{145} One former Environment Court judge concluded that “the [NZEC] has established a practice of open and patient hearings, and reasoned decisions that have normative value for primary decision-makers and professional advisers.”\textsuperscript{146} Overall, the NZEC plays an important role in protecting the country’s public resources and the public interest under the RMA.\textsuperscript{147}

\textbf{B. Chinese Specialized Courts Address Complicated and Important Subjects in Ways that Can Inform the Creation of a Chinese Environmental Court}

Specialized courts are authorized under the provisions of China’s Law on the Organization of the People’s Courts of the People’s Republic of China (“Organization Law”).\textsuperscript{148} Article 2 of the 1979 Organization Law stipulates that “the trial power of the People’s Republic of China is exercised by the following people’s courts: (1) local people’s courts at various levels; (2) specialized people’s courts; [and] (3) the Supreme People’s Court . . . . Specialized people’s courts include: military courts, railway transport courts, maritime transport courts, forestry courts and other specialized courts.”\textsuperscript{149}

Currently, China has specialized courts for each of these areas of law,\textsuperscript{150} as well as a specialized court for patent, copyright, and trademark

\begin{footnotes}
\item[142] RMA, Part 11, §§ 247-308, and Part 12, §§ 309-343D, are the provisions that detail the specifics of the Environment Court.
\item[143] Birdsong 1998, supra note 137, at 1.
\item[144] Daya-Winterbottom, supra note 138, at 121.
\item[145] Id. at 120.
\item[146] Id.
\item[147] Stephen Higgs, Mediating Sustainability, 37 ENVTL. L. 61, 80 (2007).
\item[148] See Curtis Pew, Robert Jarvis, & Mark Sidel, Maritime Courts in the Middle Kingdom: China’s Great Leap Seaward, 11 MAR. LAW. 237, n.7 (1986). The law was adopted in 1951. Id.
\end{footnotes}
disputes. One scholar explains that the purpose of these courts is to provide a judicial body which is capable of handling specific, complex areas of the law. This same rationale suggests that a specialized environmental court would benefit both China’s environment and China’s judiciary, by raising the quality of judicial decision-making.

China’s maritime courts serve as an instructive example of an effective specialized court whose structure and operation could be incorporated to develop an environmental court. China’s maritime courts system are a useful model because they have experience resolving complex disputes and they demonstrate the type of judicial institution that would be acceptable to the Chinese government.

V. A SPECIALIZED ENVIRONMENTAL COURT WOULD SUIT CHINA’S CURRENT LEGAL SYSTEM

The Chinese government should exploit its ability to develop specialized courts under Chinese law and create a court dedicated to overseeing environmental and natural resource disputes. In developing an environmental court, China should consider the examples that the NZEC and the Chinese maritime courts offer. The Chinese Environmental Courts’ structure, authority, jurisdiction, and standing requirements should be developed through modification of New Zealand’s Environment Court and China’s maritime courts.

A. The Structure of the NZEC and the Maritime Courts Should Be Used as a Model for the Creation of a Chinese Environmental Court

The NZEC is not a very large judicial body; it is currently composed of seven Judges, three Alternate Judges, fifteen Commissioners, and six
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151 See Ryan Goldstein et. al., Specialized IP Trial Courts Around the World, 18 No. 10 INTELL. PROP. & TECH. L. J. 1 (Oct. 2006). These courts were created in 1993. Id.

152 Mark Hamilton, Sailing in a Sea of Obscurity: The Growing Importance of China’s Maritime Arbitration Commission, 3 ASIAN-PAC. L. & POL’Y J. 477, 505-06 (2002). “[J]udges have developed technical and legal expertise from repeated exposure to . . . cases and experience interpreting . . . law. This enables . . . judges to resolve disputes quickly and efficiently.” Id. at 505.

153 Maritime courts were established by the NPC Standing Committee in 1984 with the Decision of the Standing Committee of the National People’s Congress on the Establishment of Maritime Courts in Coastal Port Cities. Pew, Jarvis, & Sidel, supra note 148, at 241.

154 Of course, “any recommendations coming from an outside Western observer must be careful to take into account the unique legal, political, and cultural situation of Chinese society. Direct ‘transplants’ of Western environmental laws are unlikely to take root very easily, if at all . . . . Environmental solutions for China should focus instead on building the basic institutional infrastructure and capacities needed for an effective and efficient administrative legal system . . . .” Orts, supra note 12, at 546.
Deputy Commissioners. The Environmental Judges are ordinary judges who are appointed for life, while the Environmental Commissioners are experts who are appointed for five year terms. The commissioners are technically-oriented laypersons who work alongside judges, preside over hearings, and assist in writing judicial decisions. The commissioners are not required to have legal training because they are appointed to ensure that the NZEC “possesses a mix of knowledge and experience” in relevant matters. Hearings are generally open to the public and are relatively informal, as the court is not bound by the country’s rules of evidence.

China’s maritime courts have a different structure than the NZEC. There are multiple maritime courts, located all along China’s coast. The maritime courts are trial-level courts only, with appeals managed by the relevant provincial Supreme Courts. The individual maritime courts are divided into different offices, with two different trial divisions. One trial section handles admiralty cases, while the other manages maritime commerce issues. Each court also has a research office and a court administration office. There is a court president who oversees every office, while each trial division additionally has its own president. Many of the maritime courts’ judges have formal training in maritime law.
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155 Environment Court of New Zealand, http://www.justice.govt.nz/environment/home.asp (last visited Apr. 17, 2008). “A quorum for the court is one judge and one commissioner, but hearings can also be held with one judge and two commissioners or, more rarely, a judge or commissioner sitting alone.” Higgs, supra note 147, at 75.
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158 See id. at 33. The commissioners also oversee court mediation, which is a method of dispute resolution that is actively promoted by NZEC. Id.
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160 RMA § 253. Desirable skills include expertise in business, economics, local government affairs, planning and resource management, environmental science, architecture and engineering, or techniques in alternative dispute resolution. Higgs, supra note 147, at 75; see also RMA § 253; Environment Court of New Zealand, *Mediation*, http://www.justice.govt.nz/environment/procedure/mediation.asp (last visited April 18, 2008) (“Experience in alternative dispute resolution is one of the criteria for eligibility for appointment as an Environment Commissioner.”).
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Within the maritime court system there is also a powerful arbitration body. The maritime judges are empowered to compel and oversee maritime arbitrations.169 Drawing from each of these examples, China can develop a court akin to the NZEC that fits within China’s existing legal regime. The concept of using technically-oriented laypersons accords with the Chinese tradition of laypersons’ participation in judicial decision-making, and could even improve the quality of decision-making by requiring technical expertise.170 By adopting a preference for judges who have some relevant knowledge or experience in addition to legal comprehension, China would focus its environmental talent on environmental needs and develop a knowledgeable judiciary.

The NZEC’s small size makes direct implementation of a similar structure in China impossible. China’s large geographical and political size would require multiple specialized courts spread across the country. Like the maritime courts, the environment courts could be located without reference to the smaller political boundaries that the general courts follow. The maritime courts are located in relevant areas: port cities.171 Similarly, the environment courts should be located in areas of particular environmental importance and concern. The country’s immensity generates numerous areas that would benefit from a specialized court. For example, courts could be located in larger cities—such as Beijing—that have rampant air pollution, in cities in the Northern provinces where desertification is quickly conquering the land, and near major waterways where water quality issues arise often.

Such specialized courts would accept the responsibility of overseeing both trial and appellate cases. The basic structure of the Chinese Environmental Court would have to follow the general structure of all Chinese courts, which are internally divided into various substantive and

169 Pew, Jarvis, & Sidel, supra note 148, at 243.
170 Historically, judges in the people’s courts were not required to hold law degrees. China has recently strengthened the qualification requirements to be a judge, so that the level of education required is a bachelor’s degree in law or a bachelor’s degree in some other subject combined with knowledge of law. See Judges Law ch. 4 (promulgated by the Standing Comm. of the NPC, June 30, 2001, effective July 1, 1995) LAWINFOCHINA (last visited Oct. 28, 2008) (P.R.C.) (amending the 1995 Judge’s Law); see also RANDALL PEERENBOOM, CHINA’S LONG MARCH TOWARD RULE OF LAW 291 (2002). Thus, people with relevant environmental knowledge and training could become judges by gathering legal knowledge in their other studies. Id.
171 See Decision of the Standing Committee of the National People’s Congress on the Establishment of Maritime Courts in Coastal Port Cities (promulgated by the Standing Comm. of the NPC, Nov. 14, 1984, effective on date of promulgation) LAWINFOCHINA (last visited Oct. 28, 2008) (P.R.C.); see also Pew, Jarvis, & Sidel, supra note 148, at 241.
administrative divisions.172 Adhering to the structure of all Chinese courts, the environmental court would be divided up by different substantive divisions, including an appellate division, a civil division, and a criminal division.175 The administrative divisions would include a research office, a supervision office, a planning and finance section, and a political department.176 Akin to both the NZEC and the maritime courts, a Chinese Environmental Court should have a mediation and arbitration section. This is an important component of all dispute resolution in China, and it would likely increase the efficiency and use of an environmental court.177 That there are a large number of different divisions and sections of the court may raise concerns that the environmental court system would be quite large and unwieldy. However, these various divisions are present in all Chinese courts; installing another unique court system with the same fundamental design should not prove especially difficult.

B. To Accommodate Traditional Chinese Understanding of the Judiciary’s Role, the Scope of the Chinese Environmental Court’s Authority Should be a Modified Version of the NZEC’s Authority

In New Zealand, the Environment Court has the authority to hear all cases brought under the RMA and some issues regulated by other statutes related to environmental and planning issues.178 The NZEC exercises authority under the RMA in three realms. First, it has the power to interpret the law through declarations.179 Second, it has the power to review de novo local government authorities’ decisions when those decisions are brought to
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172 Peerenboom, supra note 170, at 283.
173 The appellate division within the environmental court would simply hear appeals from administrative decisions. Appeals from environmental court decisions would be brought before the Supreme Court in the relevant province, as maritime court appeals are brought. See Li & Ingram, supra note 163, at 22-23.
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175 While China’s maritime courts do not have jurisdiction over criminal cases, at least two of China’s other special courts—the military court and the railway and transport court—have jurisdiction over criminal cases. Zhu Guobin, Constitutional Law, in INTRODUCTION TO CHINESE LAW 31, 61-62 (Wang Chenguang & Zhang Xianchu eds., 1997).
176 See Peerenboom, supra note 170, at 284.
177 For more on judicial mediation, see Yuhong Zhao, supra note 52.
179 RMA §§ 310-313; see also Birdsong 2002, supra note 156, at 28-30.
the NZEC by reference or appeal. Lastly, the NZEC has the authority to enforce the RMA’s requirements through civil or criminal proceedings.

The power to make declarations regarding “[t]he existence or extent of any function, power, right, or duty” under the RMA is a powerful tool. The Environment Court is empowered to engage in fairly “sweeping and intensive environmental policymaking.” When combined with the power to review decisions by regional and territorial authorities, this power of declaration allows the NZEC to review generally the policy statements and policy decisions of the various levels of government, excluding national policy statements. The NZEC has the authority to review other decisions of government authorities, such as decisions on applications for resource consents. The Court also can issue enforcement orders under the RMA, and this ability is far-reaching and powerful.

The Chinese maritime courts’ authority is seemingly limited by the practical nature of the specialty area. Their authority appears to be limited mainly to reviewing de novo disputes between various parties. These courts appear to handle contract disputes primarily, and do not delve into
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185 Id. at 30-31. Applications for resource consents are essentially an application for land use, and a resource consent must be obtained for most development and other land use activities. See Ministry for the Environment, Setting the Scene: Resource Consents, http://www.mfe.govt.nz/publications/rma/everyday/consent-submission-jun06/html/page3.html (last visited April 17, 2008). The NZEC is afforded de novo review of these proceedings. See RMA § 276; see also Birdsong 2002, supra note 156, at 30-31.
186 RMA §§ 314-321. These enforcement orders may, among other things, 1) enjoin a person from acting in a manner that contravenes the RMA or other regulations, rules, or orders; 2) enjoin a person from acting in a manner that is likely to be objectionable or to have an adverse impact on the environment; 3) require a person to act affirmatively to ensure compliance with the RMA or to avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects on the environment; and 4) require a person to compensate others for the reasonable costs associated with avoiding,remedying, or mitigating adverse effects on the environment caused by that person. RMA § 314. There are many other actions the NZEC may require through enforcement actions. See id.
187 Birdsong 2002, supra note 156, at 32.
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189 See id. at 245-50 (three of the four cases that the authors describe are contract disputes, the fourth is seemingly a tort issue involving financial injury from an anchor severing an underwater electric cable);
policy or constitutional issues to resolve those disputes. The maritime courts have the authority to embark on investigations of cases, including requesting evidence that the court believes is necessary for the determination of the action. The maritime courts also are granted the authority to issue injunctions; this power allows a maritime court to order someone to do or refrain from doing something in order to prevent infringement of the legitimate rights and interests of another.

Chinese courts of second instance can review lower courts’ decisions and administrative actions with the discretion to investigate and conduct a new hearing. Thus, one aspect of the NZEC and the maritime courts that should remain in effect in the Chinese Environment Court is the authority to review cases de novo. Understanding the centralized nature of Chinese political decision-making, the court would not be granted the legal authority to make broad declarations of law. Furthermore, review cannot be granted over administrative decisions, as such review is precluded by China’s Administrative Procedure Law.
C. The NZEC’s and the Maritime Courts’ Jurisdictional Reach Should Be the Model for a Chinese Environmental Court

The NZEC is an expert tribunal that primarily addresses public interest questions related to resource management and environmental law.\(^{195}\) The NZEC exercises jurisdiction over all aspects of the RMA and some aspects of other statutes. It has the same status and powers in exercising its jurisdiction as a District Court,\(^{196}\) but is “not bound by the usual procedural and evidentiary formalities of other courts of law.”\(^{197}\) Rather, the Environment Court establishes its own rules of conduct and evidence.\(^{198}\)

China’s maritime courts exercise exclusive jurisdiction over any maritime matter.\(^{199}\) The rules for the maritime courts expressly designate the types of cases that the maritime courts are authorized to handle.\(^{200}\) The maritime courts are permitted to “hear appeals from maritime administrative decisions, fines, and rulings,”\(^{201}\) but do not have any jurisdiction over criminal proceedings.\(^{202}\) Interestingly, the maritime courts are granted express jurisdiction to hear cases involving marine pollution, such as discharge of oil or hazardous wastes.\(^{203}\) This overlap with a potential environmental court would have to be resolved by the NPC upon the creation of a specialized environmental court. The maritime courts have international jurisdiction, in order to hear cases involving foreign parties or elements.\(^{204}\) Each court’s territorial jurisdiction is based on geographical location.\(^{205}\)

China’s specialized environmental courts should assume jurisdiction over questions of natural resource and environmental law. Beyond that critical resemblance to the NZEC, however, the jurisdiction granted to

\(^{195}\) Daya-Winterbottom, supra note 138, at 121.

\(^{196}\) RMA § 278.

\(^{197}\) Birdsong 2002, supra note 156, at 28; see also RMA § 276(2).
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\(^{201}\) Pew, Jarvis, & Sidel, supra note 148, at 243.

\(^{202}\) Decision of the Standing Committee of the National People’s Congress on the Establishment of Maritime Courts in Coastal Port Cities § 3 (promulgated by the Standing Comm. of the NPC, Nov. 14, 1984, effective on date of promulgation) LAWINFOCHINA (last visited Oct. 28, 2008) (P.R.C.).
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China’s environmental courts would have to be modified. While the NZEC has jurisdiction over all cases and controversies arising primarily under one statute, China’s environmental laws are not so consolidated. Either the Chinese specialized court should have express jurisdiction over the many specific environmental statutes and administrative regulations, or the types of disputes the court could hear should be specifically enumerated, much like China’s maritime courts.

To concentrate all environmental matters in one court, China’s environmental courts should be empowered to hear both civil and criminal cases. While the maritime courts are not given authority to hear criminal cases, the NZEC does have such power. Criminal jurisdiction would be necessary for a Chinese Environmental Court because it would force all disputes involving environmental issues to be heard by one court, which would provide consistency in decision-making and also would allow citizens to better understand the court’s purview. Specifically, a Chinese Environmental Court should have authority to hear those cases the State brings against Chinese officials for failing to enforce environmental statutes. These types of cases are likely to involve complicated environmental statutes, and it would provide the court with the ability to oversee this critical aspect of environmental problems.

D. The Standing Requirements for the NZEC Should be Modified to Follow Chinese Law

The standing requirements for a specialized court in China will necessarily have to be different than the NZEC’s very open standing rules. The RMA gives any person standing to sue who participated in a government decision. In China, public participation in the creation of regulation merely means commenting on a potential rule, action, or other decision, such as making a submission to a council. See Birdsong 1998, supra note 137, at 10. In addition, a person has standing to sue if she or he is affected by the decision or represents some relevant aspect of the public interest. Id. Also, any person may request that the NZEC initiate proceedings regarding a criminal offense committed under the RMA. Id.
rules and regulations is extremely limited.\textsuperscript{210} The standing requirements in a Chinese specialized environmental court must comply with Chinese law. Only those individual citizens or organizations whose legal rights and interest have been directly affected by another’s activities have standing to bring a lawsuit.\textsuperscript{211}

In sum, a Chinese Environment Court would share much in common with the NZEC. Like the NZEC it would have jurisdiction over all environmental matters and it would have a similar structure to the NZEC. But a specialized court would need to fit within the existing Chinese legal system; it would therefore differ from the NZEC in its standing requirements and it would have more limited authority than the NZEC. Overall, these proposed aspects of a Chinese Environment Court would create a tribunal addressing environmental matters, which are often complicated and contentious. A specialized court would provide a forum for Chinese citizens to redress injuries to their health and environment. While it is daunting to fashion a specialized court for an issue of such importance, it is possible to learn from what has been done already and use that knowledge to create a unique and successful institution.

VI. A SPECIALIZED ENVIRONMENTAL COURT WOULD PROMOTE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION IN CHINA

Specialized courts create experts in a specific field, and allow for consistency and uniformity in decisions. Each of these benefits could help stabilize the Chinese legal system and promote investment in China’s economy. One commentator concluded that the use of a specialized and expert tribunal increases public confidence in that court’s determinations; improves efficiency of environmental litigation, particularly because “[r]elatively less time (and expense) is necessary to reliably inform the Court about the issues it is adjudicating”; and contributes to environmentally sound decision-making.\textsuperscript{212} Another scholar found that specialization increases expertise, which is beneficial because expertise provides more ability to


\textsuperscript{211} Yuhong Zhao, supra note 52, at 176. To establish standing, certain conditions must be met: “the plaintiff must be a citizen, legal person, or organization having a direct interest with the case; there must be a specific defendant; there must be a concrete claim, a factual basis, and a cause for the lawsuit; and, the lawsuit must be within the scope and jurisdiction of the court.” Civil Procedure Law ch. 12, § 1, art. 108.

\textsuperscript{212} Birdsong 1998, supra note 137, at 55.
understand and interpret complex legislation. Specialization may also improve consistency, which allows for greater predictability and has the potential to enhance efficiency. Moreover, specialization may have a positive impact on public opinion. Expertise is improved in a specialized court both through initial appointments and continued education. The creation of a specialized unit makes it more feasible to hire staff composed at least partly of specialists, and expertise continues to develop as a result of repetition in subject matter.

The positive impact on public opinion and greater predictability both offer the Chinese government a reason to adopt a specialized court. Both of these effects could draw further economic investment from foreign corporations into the country. More predictable and effective enforcement of existing environmental laws also has the potential to increase the appeal of using clean technology.

Having a special litigation forum where Chinese citizens can voice their concerns might ultimately improve the environmental protection system overall. One scholar noted three benefits that increased litigation could offer: environmental education and related technical training for officials and the judiciary, expertise breeds consistency within a specialized field, and expertise continues to develop as a result of repetition in subject matter.


As it currently stands, multinational companies believe that using cleaner technology to comply with environmental laws will allow cheaper, dirtier plants to undercut the complying companies’ profits; thus, many multinational companies do not use the same cleaner technologies in China that they use in other countries. See Economy, *The River Runs Black*, supra note 7, at 200. Most companies have cleaner technology available; if China wants to benefit from better technology, there will have to be predictability in enforcement. See id. at 198-99.
could offer China: improved environmental law-making, increased public awareness, and pressure on polluting industries. While these positive impacts of litigation have the potential to occur in the current Chinese legal system, these impacts would likely be amplified by the existence of an environmental court. A specialized tribunal will likely increase the amount of environmental litigation. This will occur because public awareness about environmental litigation will be raised by media attention to this new court and because citizens will likely feel that they will have more success in a court that specializes in understanding environmental laws and science. Ideally, the existence of a special forum for bringing environmental disputes should raise citizen awareness about environmental problems and about litigation as a dispute resolution tool.

VII. CONCLUSION

China has dealt itself a bad environmental hand. To continue playing it is a losing proposition, with assured catastrophic consequences to the Chinese people. The struggle to establish the rule of law as the final arbiter of environmental conflicts must begin with a credible legal process that offers participants and the public an impartial, efficient, and enforceable result. Without question, many changes must occur within the legal system in order to accomplish this goal; however, these barriers should not delay the establishment of a specialized environmental court. The success of the NZEC provides a model that can be modified to address the particular sensitivities of China’s culture and political system. China must alter its

---

220 Litigation has the potential to improve environmental law-making because litigation more clearly defines the roles, rights, and responsibilities of parties by interpreting legislation. Yuhong Zhao, supra note 52, at 174. Legislation is often vague and ambiguous; but when judges understand the laws, litigation allows courts to detect the gaps, loopholes, and other contradictions that exist within those laws. Id. The Standing Committee or the State Council can alter laws and regulations if a court interprets them in unexpected ways. Id.

221 Litigation creates ripple effects that raise public awareness. Id. When plaintiffs succeed in their challenges of polluting industries or destructive companies, these cases are reported in the media. This allows others to “become aware of their environmental rights” and encourages others to take legal action to assert their rights. Id. at 174-75. One prominent environmental advocate—the head of the Legal Aid Centre for Pollution Victims in Beijing—sees environmental litigation as “the most effective way to disseminate the law and educate the public.” Id. at 175.

222 Litigation coerces polluting industries to pay attention to their environmental effects; perhaps economic pressure is the most effective tool in combating the destruction that economic growth has wrought. Litigation allows victims to shift the cost of pollution to the polluters. Even if every case is not successful, litigation will send a “clear and strong warning to other potential offenders that pollution prevention needs to be taken seriously.” Yuhong Zhao, supra note 52, at 175.

course in order to protect the country’s important natural resources and to
make the country a healthy place for its citizens. Adopting a specialized
court will stimulate the country’s potentially powerful environmental
regulatory framework. The specific aspects of this specialized court could
be developed through modification of China’s maritime courts and the
NZEC.

Providing a new forum for environmental disputes will focus the
country’s energy, which has long been used for economic growth and
development, to create innovative solutions to China’s environmental
problems. In addition, an environmental court may inspire world leaders to
assist China in solving the country’s environmental difficulties; other
countries and multi-national corporations could provide technology and
knowledge to support China’s movement towards environmental
sustainability. China must provide some signal to others that it is willing
and able to correct the country’s environmental devastation; creating a
special court could be just the indication necessary. It is important for China
to find a balance between economic viability and environmental
sustainability, and creating an environment court is one step on the path to
this equilibrium.