

**Refugee Review Tribunal
AUSTRALIA**

RRT RESEARCH RESPONSE

Research Response Number: CHN34454
Country: China
Date: 10 March 2009

Keywords: China – Qian Huan – Xiao Jing Huan – Fujian President – Dissidents – Mental institutions – Bribery

This response was prepared by the Research & Information Services Section of the Refugee Review Tribunal (RRT) after researching publicly accessible information currently available to the RRT within time constraints. This response is not, and does not purport to be, conclusive as to the merit of any particular claim to refugee status or asylum. This research response may not, under any circumstance, be cited in a decision or any other document. Anyone wishing to use this information may only cite the primary source material contained herein.

Questions

- 1. Do you have information on Qian Huan?**
- 2. Do you have information on Xiao Jing Huan?**
- 4. Do you know who the President of Fujian province was on 4 February 2008?**
- 5. What information is there on sending political dissidents to mental institutions in China generally, or Fuzhou specifically?**
- 6. Do you have any information on the bribing of medical staff or police to be released from mental institutions?**
- 7. Do you have any information on conditions inside mental institutions, in Fuzhou or generally?**

RESPONSE

1. Do you have information on Qian Huan?

No information was found in the sources consulted on a person named Qian Huan (including variations of the name) in Fujian said to be a nephew of Xiao Jing Huan (including variations of the name), the President of Fujian province.

2. Do you have information on Xiao Jing Huan?

3. Do you know who the President of Fujian province was on 4 February 2008?

Xiao Jing Huan refers to Huang Xiaojing.

Huang Xiaojing was re-elected governor of Fujian province in January 2008. He has been governor of the province since January 2005. Huang Xiaojing was born in 1946 in Fuzhou,

Fujian province (Guodong, Du 2008, 'Huang Xiaojing re-elected governor of Fujian Province', *Xinhua*, 24 January http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2008-01/24/content_7488255.htm – Accessed 26 February 2009 – Attachment 1; 'Who's Who in China's Leadership: Huang Xiaojing' (undated), China.org website http://www.china.org.cn/features/leadership/2009-02/10/content_17254270.htm – Accessed 26 February 2009 – Attachment 2).

4. What information is there on sending political dissidents to mental institutions in China generally, or Fuzhou specifically?

Sources report that a tactic used by the Chinese authorities to silence dissidents is to admit them into psychiatric hospitals. The hospitals may either be normal institutions for the mentally ill or the highly secretive institutions for the criminally insane (“ankang”). Sources have commented on the treatment of people sent to such institutions. No information was found in the sources consulted on political dissidents being sent to mental institutions in Fuzhou. However, one source noted that there is an ankang institution in Fuzhou. There is also a Falun Gong report of a practitioner being sent to the Fuzhou City Mental Hospital.

A November 2008 report by the Chinese Human Rights Defenders (CHRD) states that government officials exploit general and vague provisions in the Criminal Law regarding involuntary hospitalisation to place dissidents in psychiatric hospitals. Police are not required to arrange independent mental health evaluations of individuals and may subject them to involuntary hospitalisation following approval from a higher Public Security Bureau (PSB). Lawyers generally find it difficult to effectively intervene to assist individuals sent to psychiatric hospitals. Also, the PSB reportedly persuades the family to sign an agreement to commit an individual into a psychiatric hospital against the person's will (Chinese Human Rights Defenders (CHRD) 2008, *Persistent Torture, Unaccountable Torturers: A Report on China's Implementation of Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment*, 5 November http://www.crd-net.org/Article/Class9/Class11/200811/20081105101541_11571.html – Accessed 27 February 2009 – Attachment 3).

According to the Laogai Research Foundation:

Law enforcement authorities have the power to forcibly commit individuals to psychiatric facilities (Ankang). Political dissidents are often sent to psychiatric hospitals instead of jails because arrest warrants are not necessary (The Laogai Research Foundation 2006, *Laogai Handbook 2005-2006*, October, pp.22-23 – Attachment 4).

The US State Department in its human rights report for 2008 states on ankang institutions:

According to foreign researchers, the country had 20 ankang institutions (high-security psychiatric hospitals for the criminally insane) directly administered by the Ministry of Public Security (MPS). **Political activists**, underground religious believers, persons who repeatedly petitioned the government, members of the banned Chinese Democracy Party (CDP), and Falun Gong adherents were among those housed with mentally ill patients in these institutions, and they had no mechanism for objecting to public security officials' determinations of mental illness. Patients in these hospitals reportedly were given medicine against their will and forcibly subjected to electric shock treatment. The regulations for committing a person to an ankang facility were not clear. Activists sentenced to administrative detention also reported they were strapped to beds or other devices for days at

a time, beaten, forcibly injected or fed medications, and denied food and use of toilet facilities (US Department of State 2009, 'Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman, or Degrading Treatment or Punishment' in *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2008 – China*, 25 February – Attachment 5).

A January 2009 news article, reporting that the Shanghai police had detained a female activist who had been in trouble with the authorities since the late 1980s, stated that the government often used the tactic of admitting people to psychiatric hospitals "to silence dissidents" ('Activist held after protest outside Shanghai meeting: rights groups' 2009, *Agence France Presse*, 14 January – Attachment 6).

Robin Munro, in his book *China's Psychiatric Inquisition: Dissent, Psychiatry and the Law in Post-1949 China*, states that the name "Ankang" means "Peace and Health". He also noted that, in addition to the 20 ankang institutions mentioned by the US State Department, a further nine confirmed or suspected institutions were located through internet searches by him in August 2004. According to Munro, it is the government's stated goal to eventually establish an ankang centre in every city in China with a population of one million or above. The entire ankang network is administered by the Ministry of Public Security's Bureau No. 13 (*Gong'an Bu Shisan Ju*) (Munro, Robin 2006, *China's Psychiatric Inquisition: Dissent, Psychiatry and the Law in Post-1949 China*, Wildy, Simmonds & Hill, London, pp.246,248-249, footnote 519 – Attachment 7).

Also in *China's Psychiatric Inquisition: Dissent, Psychiatry and the Law in Post-1949 China*, Munro outlines the criteria for compulsorily admitting mentally ill offenders into ankang custody which appeared in an official police encyclopaedia published in 1990. The encyclopaedia explained three main types of people who were to be taken into police psychiatric custody. The second type of person refers to "political maniacs" as follows:

The second are those commonly known as "political maniacs" (*zhengzhi fengzi*), who shout reactionary slogans, write reactionary banners and reactionary letters, make anti-government speeches in public, and express opinions on important domestic and international affairs (Munro, Robin 2006, *China's Psychiatric Inquisition: Dissent, Psychiatry and the Law in Post-1949 China*, Wildy, Simmonds & Hill, London, p.256 – Attachment 7).

Munro also listed from the police encyclopaedia five criteria for dealing with mentally ill people falling within the three categories:

The public security organs have primary responsibility for the management and treatment of the following five kinds of severely mentally ill persons, all of whom pose a relatively grave threat to social order:

1. Persons carrying knives who commit violent or injurious acts; those who are suicidal; and those who commit arson or other acts that seriously disturb social order, with definite consequences.
2. Persons who disrupt the normal work of Party and government offices or who disrupt normal work and production in enterprises, scientific and educational institutions, thereby posing a danger.
3. Persons who frequently expose themselves naked, or otherwise harm social morals, in busy crowded areas or in public places.

4. Persons who shout reactionary slogans, or who stick up or distribute reactionary banners and leaflets, thereby exerting an undesirable political influence.
5. Mentally ill people who drift in from other areas and disrupt the public order of society.

Upon encountering any of these five types of people, the public security organs are to take them into custody for treatment (Munro, Robin 2006, *China's Psychiatric Inquisition: Dissent, Psychiatry and the Law in Post-1949 China*, Wildy, Simmonds & Hill, London, pp.256-257 – Attachment 7).

Munro, in a chapter concerning the Falun Gong in his book *China's Psychiatric Inquisition: Dissent, Psychiatry and the Law in Post-1949 China*, refers to the ankang system spreading to regular mental healthcare facilities. Munro writes:

As indicated earlier, there have been relatively few reports of Falun Gong practitioners having been sent to Ankang facilities in the course of the crackdown since mid-1999. Partly this is because at present only a couple of dozen cities and provinces in China have built such facilities, and partly it is a reflection of the security authorities' apparent preference for using compulsory civil committal in cases of this type. It has recently emerged, however, that from the early 1990s onwards, a number of city governments in China began setting up "Ankang Wards" (*Ankang Bingfang*) on the premises of regular psychiatric hospitals at local level. According to the Dalian municipal regulations of November 1992, for example: "County-level (Municipal) and District-level Governments can establish Ankang Wards in mental hospitals under their administrative jurisdiction in order to carry out, upon authorization from the Dalian City PSB, the custody and treatment of mentally ill people who have provoked incidents or disasters." Clearly, **this move blurs further the already hazy and tenuous institutional distinction in China between places of civil psychiatric committal and institutions for the criminally insane**. Or to put the matter another way: the Ankang system is now spreading its tentacles into the country's regular mental healthcare facilities... (Munro, Robin 2006, *China's Psychiatric Inquisition: Dissent, Psychiatry and the Law in Post-1949 China*, Wildy, Simmonds & Hill, London, pp.236-237 – Attachment 7).

There are other reports of petitioners being taken into psychiatric hospitals:

- Officers at Qibao Town Police Station took a petitioner to the Minghang Psychiatric Hospital (UN Commission on Human Rights 2006, 'Report of the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, Manfred Nowak: Mission to China', *United Nations Economic and Social Council*, E/CN.4/2006/6/Add.6, 10 March, p.57/para. 13 – Attachment 8).
- People being taken to Wuhan Mental Hospital and Shanghai mental hospitals ('Book details mental hospital abuse' 2009, *Radio Free Asia*, 19 February <http://www.rfa.org/english/news/china/psychiatry-02192009163219.html> – Accessed 24 February 2009 – Attachment 9).

In December 2008 a number of English language sources stated that the state-owned *Beijing News* reported that authorities in Xintai, Shandong province, had confined petitioners to mental hospitals.

An *Associated Press Newswires* article stated that:

Chinese provincial authorities lock up critics and complainants in mental hospitals, local media reported in a rare look at official abuse of China's psychiatric health system.

According to an article in the Beijing News, Shandong provincial officials in the city of Xintai south of the capital committed people who were seeking to attract the attention of higher authorities to their complaints over local corruption or land seizures.

Some were forced to take psychiatric drugs and all were told they would not be released until they signed pledges to drop their complaints, the paper said.

The article appeared in the Beijing News on Monday and has been widely reproduced by other media. It also prompted a highly critical editorial Tuesday in the English-language China Daily, a newspaper targeted at foreigners.

The paper's allegations could not immediately be verified independently. An administrator with the Xintai Mental Health Hospital named in the report denied abuses.

"We are now repudiating this rumor. Some people were so irresponsible in talking. Some facts are completely made up," said the man, who refused to give his name. Other local officials said the reports were being investigated.

However, the China Daily editorial on Tuesday cited the report as clear evidence that officials had abused their authority.

"Oppressing petitioners is no way to govern or to redress their grievances," said the editorial, beneath the headline "Stop this cruelty."

The Beijing News report was picked up by other state media, including the Web site of the Communist Party's flagship People's Daily (Bodeen, Christopher 2008, 'Chinese newspaper reports officials locked up government critics in mental wards', *Associated Press Newswires*, 9 December – Attachment 10).

The *Associated Press Newswires* article also quotes Robin Munro on the *Beijing News* report:

That marks the first time in years that this issue has been given such a high profile, said Robin Munro, a research associate with the University of London's School of Oriental and African Studies.

Munro, who has researched abuse claims extensively, said that could represent a desire to prompt a crackdown on misuse of mental hospitals to silence critics, which he said have grown more popular as other police powers to detain were eliminated.

"Criminal justice is actually getting better, and a modicum of due process is required for detention," Munro said. Mental hospitals used to skirt such rules, putting critics out of action, breaking their spirits and discrediting their complaints, he said.

Chinese law gives authorities wide-ranging powers to commit people without recourse to lawyers or appeal, making the system ripe for abuse, he said.

The Shandong case is in line "with what I've been tracking in recent years," Munro said (Bodeen, Christopher 2008, 'Chinese newspaper reports officials locked up government critics in mental wards', *Associated Press Newswires*, 9 December – Attachment 10).

The article also reported comments by the Deputy Director of the Institute of Mental Health at Peking University as follows:

Huang Yueqin, deputy director of the Institute of Mental Health at the prestigious Peking University, said she was unfamiliar with such abuses but that they would constitute a serious violation of medical ethics.

“I don’t think the mental health hospitals would take people in only because they are petitioners,” Huang said, adding that such facilities were often short of beds to begin with.

While Chinese officials deny institutionalizing petitioners simply for complaining, many are quick to affirm that they believe many to be mentally ill (Bodeen, Christopher 2008, ‘Chinese newspaper reports officials locked up government critics in mental wards’, *Associated Press Newswires*, 9 December – Attachment 10).

The New York Times also reported on the *Beijing News* article. It stated that:

In an investigative report published Monday by a state-owned newspaper, public security officials in the city of Xintai in Shandong Province were said to have been institutionalizing residents who persist in their personal campaigns to expose corruption or the unfair seizure of their property. Some people said they were committed for up to two years, and several of those interviewed said they were forcibly medicated (Jacobs, Andrew 2008, ‘China Stifles Dissenters With Pills, Paper Says’, *The New York Times*, 9 December – Attachment 11).

The New York Times article continued:

Sun Fawu, 57, a farmer seeking compensation for land spoiled by a coal-mining operation, said he was seized by local authorities on his way to petition the central government in Beijing and taken to the Xintai Mental Health Center in October.

During a 20-day stay, he said, he was lashed to a bed, forced to take pills and given injections that made him numb and woozy. According to the paper, when he told the doctor he was a petitioner, not mentally ill, the doctor said: “I don’t care if you’re sick or not. As long as you are sent by the township government, I’ll treat you as a mental patient.”

In an interview with the newspaper, the hospital’s director, Wu Yuzhu, acknowledged that some of the 18 patients brought there by the police in recent years were not deranged, but he said that he had no choice but to take them in. “The hospital also had its misgivings,” he said.

Xintai officials do not see any shame in the tactic, and they boasted that hospitalizing people they characterized as troublemakers saved money that would have been spent chasing them to Beijing. There is another reason to stop petitioners who seek redress from higher levels of government: they can prove embarrassing to local officials, especially if they make it to Beijing.

The Xintai government Web site noted that provincial authorities had recently referred to Xintai as “an advanced city in building a safe Shandong.” They said that from January to May this year, the number of petitioners who went over the heads of local authorities was 274, a 4 percent drop from the same period in 2007. Although China is not known for the kind of systematic abuse of psychiatry that occurred in the Soviet Union, human rights advocates say forced institutionalizations are not uncommon in smaller cities. Robin Munro, the research director of China Labor Bulletin, a rights organization in Hong Kong, said such “an kang” wards – Chinese for peace and health – were a convenient and effective means of dealing with pesky dissidents.

“Once a detainee has been officially diagnosed as dangerously mentally ill, they’re immediately taken out of the criminal justice system and they lose all legal rights, said Mr. Munro, who has researched China’s practice of psychiatric detention.

In recent years practitioners of Falun Gong, the banned spiritual movement, have complained of what they call coerced hospitalizations. One of China’s best-known dissidents, Wang Wanxing, spent 13 years in a police-run psychiatric institution under conditions he later described as abusive.

In one recent, well-publicized case, Wang Jingmei, the mother of a man convicted of killing six policemen in Shanghai, was held incommunicado at a mental hospital for five months and released only days before her son was executed in late November.

The article in *The Beijing News* about the hospitalizations in Xintai was notable for the attention it gained in China’s constrained state-run media. Such Communist Party stalwarts as *People’s Daily* and the Xinhua news agency republished the article, and it was picked up by scores of Web sites. At Sina.com, the country’s most popular portal, the report ranked as the fifth most-viewed news headline, and readers posted more than 23,000 comments by evening. The indignation expressed was universal, with many clamoring for the dismissal of those involved. “They’re no different from animals,” read one post. “No, they’re worse.”

By Monday evening, the Xintai city government was rejecting the report by *The Beijing News* as reckless and slanted. In a telephone interview broadcast on Shandong provincial television, an unidentified municipal official suggested that those confined to the mental hospital had gone mad from their single-minded quest for justice. “There are some people who have been petitioning for years and become mentally aggravated,” the official said.

Reached by phone on Monday, a hospital employee said Mr. Wu, the hospital director who voiced his misgivings to *The Beijing News*, was unavailable. The employee, Hu Peng, said that officials from the local government had taken him away for “a meeting” earlier in the day.

Although he would not provide a reporter with contact information for the former patients, Mr. Hu defended the hospitalizations, saying that all those delivered by the Public Security Bureau were sick. He added that the hospital was not authorized to provide a diagnosis to the patients, only to treat them. “We definitely would not accept those without mental problems,” he said (Jacobs, Andrew 2008, ‘China Stifles Dissenters With Pills, Paper Says’, *The New York Times*, 9 December – Attachment 11).

In addition, TODAY (a Singaporean publication) included in its report concerning the confinement of petitioners in Xintai the following:

In recent years, local authorities like those in Shandong have “cracked down” on petitioners.

But the petitioners argued that they are not “insane”, and asked if the local government had the right to put them in mental hospitals.

Shandong’s Xintai Mental Hospital director Wu Yuzhu said his doctors would not admit anyone who “does not look mentally unstable”.

But he added that usually “the local government would come prepared with medical diagnosis from other doctors, and we cannot possibly repudiate reports from our counterparts”.

...It is unclear how widespread the phenomenon of putting petitioners in mental hospitals is, but Mr Sun's case is one of a few that have been made public by a handful of Chinese media outlets (Siow, Maria 2008, 'Locking up the sane; Local officials must take steps to address petitioners' concerns', *TODAY*, 10 December – Attachment 12).

Of interest is that Robin Munro in his book *China's Psychiatric Inquisition: Dissent, Psychiatry and the Law in Post-1949 China* concludes:

There are surely few more potent deterrents to dissident activity of any kind than the threat of permanent or semi-permanent forced removal to an institution for the criminally insane. A potential Chinese dissident or religious nonconformist may be prepared to face imprisonment for his or her beliefs, but indefinite psychiatric custody is probably quite another matter. Additionally, psychiatric labelling of this kind serves to stigmatise and socially marginalize the dissident in a way that regular criminal imprisonment, in the present era at least, often fails to do (Munro, Robin 2006, *China's Psychiatric Inquisition: Dissent, Psychiatry and the Law in Post-1949 China*, Wildy, Simmonds & Hill, London, p.298 – Attachment 7).

Little information was found in the sources consulted on sending to political dissidents to mental institutions in Fuzhou.

A Falun Gong source referred to a "Fuzhou City Mental Hospital" in which a practitioner was said to have been injected with drugs designed for mental patients ('Psychiatric torture' 2005, Falun Gong Human Rights Working Group website <http://falunhr.org/index.php?option=content&task=view&id=324&Itemid=0> – Accessed 20 October 2006 – Attachment 13).

Also, Munro has identified Fuzhou as having an ankang facility (Munro, Robin 2006, *China's Psychiatric Inquisition: Dissent, Psychiatry and the Law in Post-1949 China*, Wildy, Simmonds & Hill, London, p.247/footnote 519 – Attachment 7).

5. Do you have any information on the bribing of medical staff or police to be released from mental institutions?

No information was found in the sources consulted on medical staff or police being bribed to release people from mental institutions. There are reports that bribery was used to secure the release of a person from a form of administrative detention known as "shelter for deportation", now abolished, which included the detention of mentally ill persons. According to Robin Munro, Falun Gong practitioners have reportedly been required to pay fines or unreceipted charges for board and treatment prior to their release from hospitals.

Munro writes:

Another type of administrative detention that was recently abolished is "shelter for deportation" (*shourong qiansong*, also known as "custody and repatriation".) This was a measure whereby the police could detain vagrants, beggars and persons believed to be living and working in areas outside their place of "household registration" (*hukou suozaidi*) and for which they lacked the necessary residence approval documents. Once detained, such people were sent to special police holding camps for periods ranging from several days to more than a year, before being forcibly escorted back to their original place of residence. **The police frequently used this measure to extort bribes from the detainees or their relatives, in order to secure the detainee's release**, and conditions in the holding camps were widely reported to be considerably worse than in any other type of police detention centre in

China...in June 2003 the government finally abolished this form of administrative detention...(Munro, Robin 2006, *China's Psychiatric Inquisition: Dissent, Psychiatry and the Law in Post-1949 China*, Wildy, Simmonds & Hill, London, pp.52-53 – Attachment 7).

Becquelin noted in a Human Rights in China article, dated 23 February 2003, that “custody and repatriation” included the detention of mentally ill persons (Becquelin, Nicolas 2003, ‘Enforcing the rural-urban divide: Use of Custody and Repatriation detention triples in 10 years’, Human Rights in China website, 23 February <http://www.hrichina.org/public/contents/article?revision%5fid=4150&item%5fid=4149> – Accessed 3 March 2009 – Attachment 14).

Also, Munro refers to Falun Gong practitioners being released from mental hospitals:

...After several weeks or months of such treatment, they would typically be pressured by the medical staff into writing and signing confessional statements renouncing their belief in Falun Gong, as a precondition for their eventual release; in many cases, they were reportedly then required to pay fines or unreceipted charges of several thousand *yuan* for their board and treatment at the hospitals...(Munro, Robin 2006, *China's Psychiatric Inquisition: Dissent, Psychiatry and the Law in Post-1949 China*, Wildy, Simmonds & Hill, London, p.227 – Attachment 7).

It is of interest that Munro cites a case where a woman paid a doctor to have her husband admitted to an *ankang* facility (Munro, Robin 2006, *China's Psychiatric Inquisition: Dissent, Psychiatry and the Law in Post-1949 China*, Wildy, Simmonds & Hill, London, pp.276-278 – Attachment 7).

6. Do you have any information on conditions inside mental institutions, in Fuzhou or generally?

Little information was found in the sources consulted on the conditions inside mental institutions in China generally. Robin Munro describes an *ankang* facility in Beijing and a journal article briefly traces the evolution of a mid-tier psychiatric hospital in China. No information was found in the sources consulted on the conditions inside mental institutions in Fuzhou.

Munro states that large *ankang* centres can accommodate around 1,000 inmates. The largest facility in Tianjin is thought to have a much higher capacity (Munro, Robin 2006, *China's Psychiatric Inquisition: Dissent, Psychiatry and the Law in Post-1949 China*, Wildy, Simmonds & Hill, London, p.248 – Attachment 7).

Munro cites a 1996 source, a forensic psychiatrist who formerly worked at the Harbin No. 1 Special Hospital and was later based at the Beijing *Ankang* institute, on the following official description of the Beijing *Ankang* facility:

...the Beijing facility is divided into three parts: a closed and highly secure zone (*fengbi qu*), where all new admissions are placed; a semi-open zone, holding around half of the inmates; and an open zone, mainly devoted to work-therapy activities, where inmates scheduled for release are held...the facility is run “fully in accordance with humanitarian principles,” although he also acknowledges that “many problems remain to be solved.” In his view, *Ankang* centres should primarily be places of treatment, rather than detention or punishment: “If the reverse were true, so that the medical objectives became secondary, and the principal purpose was simply to lock up the patients and keep them in custody, then it would be wrong,

and the nature and aims of Ankang hospitals would no longer be the same” (Munro, Robin 2006, *China’s Psychiatric Inquisition: Dissent, Psychiatry and the Law in Post-1949 China*, Wildy, Simmonds & Hill, London, pp.259/footnote 555,331 – Attachment 7).

Munro also cited a later 2001 source suggesting that the “triple zone” policy mentioned above is being applied in other ankang facilities (Munro, Robin 2006, *China’s Psychiatric Inquisition: Dissent, Psychiatry and the Law in Post-1949 China*, Wildy, Simmonds & Hill, London, pp.247/footnote 515, 259/footnote 555 – Attachment 7).

In addition, a 2005 *Harvard Health Policy Review* article described the evolution of a mid-tier psychiatric hospital in China over 12 years in the following terms:

...In 1994, the hospital was an independent 300 bed facility whose dedicated and well-trained staff delivered high quality psychiatric care. The hospital was nearly always at 100% occupancy. Five years later, significant downsizing had occurred, with the original hospital relocated to two floors of a nearby general hospital. In the transition, inpatient capacity was reduced to 60 beds. Nevertheless, the staff remained optimistic and hard-working, and the hospital remained fully occupied. In the past year, the author visited this facility again. Though the unit remained in the same location, there were drastic changes. The administration of the department, once independent, had become subsumed under the overall administration of the general hospital. Although the total number of beds remained the same, the census was rarely at full occupancy. The cost of hospitalization had increased significantly, from 2000 Yuan (\$250 USD) per month to 5000 Yuan (\$625 USD) per month. Additionally, many of the outpatient services were underutilized. Only a fraction of the original staff continued to work on in the department. The director seemed demoralized. He described the difficulties of running the service given the current circumstances, expressed concern about the financial viability of the unit, and solicited ideas about how to help bolster the financial standing of his unit...(Park, Lawrence et al. 2005, ‘Mental Health Care in China: Recent Changes and Future Challenges’, *Harvard Health Policy Review*, Fall, Vol. 6, No. 2, pp.38-39 <http://www.hcs.harvard.edu/~hhpr/currentissue/park.pdf> – Accessed 5 March 2009 – Attachment 15).

Munro also comments on the psychiatric profession generally in China:

It should also be stressed at the outset that the extent to which China’s psychiatric profession as a whole is currently directly involved or complicit in these abuses remains unclear. It seems likely that the misuse of legal psychiatry in the suppression of dissent in China is nowadays confined mainly to those working within the sub-specialist domain of police psychiatry – a small and still secretive field of which most regular Chinese psychiatrists appear to have little or direct professional knowledge or experience. Despite the worrying numbers of Falun Gong practitioners who have been sent to mental hospitals since 1999, it would probably be doing contemporary Chinese psychiatry an injustice to suggest that more than a small minority of its practitioners are nowadays misusing their professional skills in this way. Over the past two decades or so, the wider field of general psychiatry in China has been moving into steadily greater conformity, in most areas of practice, with internationally accepted standards of mental healthcare diagnosis and treatment (Munro, Robin 2006, *China’s Psychiatric Inquisition: Dissent, Psychiatry and the Law in Post-1949 China*, Wildy, Simmonds & Hill, London, p.15 – Attachment 7).

List of Sources Consulted

Internet Sources:

Google search engine

Community Health Journal <http://www.springerlink.com/content/101590/>

Human Rights in China (HRIC) <http://www.hrichina.org/public/>

The Lancet <http://www.thelancet.com/home>

Psychiatric News <http://pn.psychiatryonline.org/index.dtl>

Databases:

FACTIVA (news database)

BACIS (DIAC Country Information database)

REFINFO (IRBDC (Canada) Country Information database)

ISYS (RRT Research & Information database, including Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, US Department of State Reports)

RRT Library Catalogue

Munro, Robin 2006, '[The Ankang: China's Special Psychiatric Hospitals](#)', *Journal of Comparative Law*, Vol. 1, No. 1 <http://www.thejcl.com/pdfs/munro.pdf> – Accessed 9 March 2009.

Munro, Robin 2002, *Dangerous Minds: Political Psychiatry in China Today and its Origins in the Mao Era*, Human Rights Watch and Geneva Initiative on Psychiatry, August, New York.

List of Attachments

1. Guodong, Du 2008, 'Huang Xiaojing re-elected governor of Fujian Province', *Xinhua*, 24 January http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2008-01/24/content_7488255.htm – Accessed 26 February 2009.
2. 'Who's Who in China's Leadership: Huang Xiaojing' (undated), China.org website http://www.china.org.cn/features/leadership/2009-02/10/content_17254270.htm – Accessed 26 February 2009.
3. Chinese Human Rights Defenders (CHRD) 2008, *Persistent Torture, Unaccountable Torturers: A Report on China's Implementation of Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment*, 5 November http://www.crd-net.org/Article/Class9/Class11/200811/20081105101541_11571.html – Accessed 27 February 2009.
4. The Laogai Research Foundation 2006, *Laogai Handbook 2005-2006*, October.
5. US Department of State 2009, *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2008 – China*, 25 February.
6. 'Activist held after protest outside Shanghai meeting: rights groups' 2009, *Agence France Presse*, 14 January. (FACTIVA)
7. Munro, Robin 2006, *China's Psychiatric Inquisition: Dissent, Psychiatry and the Law in Post-1949 China*, Wildy, Simmonds & Hill, London.
8. UN Commission on Human Rights 2006, 'Report of the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, Manfred Nowak:

Mission to China', *United Nations Economic and Social Council*, E/CN.4/2006/6/Add.6, 10 March.

9. 'Book details mental hospital abuse' 2009, *Radio Free Asia*, 19 February <http://www.rfa.org/english/news/china/psychiatry-02192009163219.html> – Accessed 24 February 2009. (CISNET China CX221260)
10. Bodeen, Christopher 2008, 'Chinese newspaper reports officials locked up government critics in mental wards', *Associated Press Newswires*, 9 December. (FACTIVA)
11. Jacobs, Andrew 2008, 'China Stifles Dissenters With Pills, Paper Says', *The New York Times*, 9 December. (FACTIVA)
12. Siow, Maria 2008, 'Locking up the sane; Local officials must take steps to address petitioners' concerns', *TODAY*, 10 December. (FACTIVA)
13. 'Psychiatric torture' 2005, Falun Gong Human Rights Working Group website <http://falunhr.org/index.php?option=content&task=view&id=324&Itemid=0> – Accessed 20 October 2006.
14. Becquelin, Nicolas 2003, 'Enforcing the rural-urban divide: Use of Custody and Repatriation detention triples in 10 years', Human Rights in China website, 23 February <http://www.hrichina.org/public/contents/article?revision%5fid=4150&item%5fid=4149> – Accessed 3 March 2009.
15. Park, Lawrence et al. 2005, 'Mental Health Care in China: Recent Changes and Future Challenges', *Harvard Health Policy Review*, Fall, Vol. 6, No. 2, pp.35-45 <http://www.hcs.harvard.edu/~hhpr/currentissue/park.pdf> – Accessed 5 March 2009.