



D996/87

:4

2008



# 论·国·际·经·济·法·学

An CHEN on International Economic Law

第四卷

Vo1.IV

陈安 / 著

# 目 录

## 第 四 卷

### 第五编 涉台经济法

- I 两种“两岸人民关系法”之对立与统一——兼谈《闽台自由贸易协定》之可行 ..... (1595)
- 一、两种《草案》的对立与比较 ..... (1596)
- (一) 台湾地区的《条例草案》显然无法为两岸人民所接受 ..... (1596)
- (二) 台湾地区的《条例草案》与内地的《建议草案》之比较 ..... (1598)
- 二、两岸已显重要共识,今后尚待扩大加深 ..... (1599)
- 三、闽台《自由贸易协定》倡议的可行性 ..... (1600)
- (一) 从地缘和血缘看,两省“天生”比邻相亲,具有率先签订《协议》的先天条件 ..... (1601)
- (二) 从两省经贸特点看,具有率先签订《协议》的必要性 ..... (1601)
- (三) 就政治因素看,两省具有率先签订《协议》的可能性 ..... (1602)
- 四、闽台《自由贸易协定》的法律定位 ..... (1603)
- (一) 《协议》是两省地方性单行法 ..... (1603)
- (二) 《协议》是一项相对独立的特别法 ..... (1603)

(三)《协议》是一项前瞻性的试点法和开拓性的示范法 .....	(1604)
(四)《协议》是规范两省经贸活动的多部门综合法 .....	(1605)
<b>II 《台商大陆投资权益保障协议》初剖 .....</b>	<b>(1607)</b>
一、“海基会清单”事出有因 .....	(1608)
二、“廿二条规定”稳定无虞 .....	(1609)
三、立法未周者求其周 .....	(1610)
四、执法不力者宜着力 .....	(1612)
五、要求过高者应降低 .....	(1613)
六、了解不足者待深入 .....	(1617)
七、诸因交错者须综治 .....	(1618)
八、“省际”模式容或可行 .....	(1620)
<b>III 台商内地投资保险可行途径初探 .....</b>	<b>(1624)</b>
一、选用内地现行的投资保险机制 .....	(1625)
二、选用台湾地区现行的海外投资保险机制 .....	(1627)
三、选用两岸协作举办台商内地投资保险的机制 .....	(1629)
(一)“两府模式” .....	(1629)
(二)“两会模式” .....	(1630)
(三)“两省模式” .....	(1631)
(四)“两司模式” .....	(1632)
(五)“合营模式” .....	(1633)
四、选用第三地国家现行的海外投资保险机制 .....	(1633)
五、选用“多边投资担保机构”的保险机制 .....	(1636)
六、选用中国人民保险公司承保或“两岸协作”承保与 MIGA “再保险”相结合的机制 .....	(1639)
<b>IV 《多边投资担保机构公约》对我国台湾地区的适用问题 .....</b>	<b>(1641)</b>
一、选用非多边投资担保机构保险机制存在的局限与障碍 .....	(1643)
(一)选用中国现行投资保险机制的局限与障碍 .....	(1643)

(二) 选用我国台湾地区现行海外投资保险机制的局限与障碍	·····	(1644)
(三) 选用第三地国家现行海外投资保险机制的局限与障碍	·····	(1646)
(四) 选用两岸直接协作保险机制的现实障碍	·····	(1647)
二、选用多边投资担保机构保险机制的具体安排	·····	(1648)
(一) 单独选用现有的 MIGA 保险机制	·····	(1648)
(二) 选用中国人民保险公司与 MIGA 相结合的保险机制	·····	(1649)
<b>V 中国“入世”后海峡两岸经贸问题“政治化”之防治</b>	·····	(1650)
(一) 适用于两岸经贸关系的 WTO 基本规则	·····	(1651)
(二) 两岸经贸问题被台湾地区当局“政治化”的现实和可能	·····	(1653)
(三) 防止两岸经贸争端被台湾地区当局“政治化”的几种设想	·····	(1656)
(一) 组建我国四地自由贸易区的设想和问题	·····	(1656)
(二) 援用“安全例外”条款的设想和问题	·····	(1658)
(三) 援用“互不适用”条款的设想和问题	·····	(1669)
(四) “中国台北”单独关税区 WTO 成员资格的重新审定问题	·····	(1671)
(五) 更新观念,接受挑战,善用 DSU/DSB 机制	·····	(1673)
(四) 几点结论	·····	(1676)

## 第六编 国际法教育

<b>I 改进我国国际法教育的“他山之石”——欧美之行考察见闻</b>	·····	(1681)
(一) 关于国际法专业人才的培养	·····	(1682)
(一) 派人员出国深造应考虑门类、品种和国别的多样化	·····	(1682)
(二) 应积极参加国际性的学术讨论会或学术团体	·····	(1684)
(三) 国际法课程的教学应注重培养学生解决实际问题的能力	·····	(1684)
——大量的课前预习和活跃的课堂对话	·····	(1684)
(四) 提倡由优秀研究生主办学刊——法学拔尖人才的摇篮	·····	(1686)
(五) 注重开发利用外籍华人和港台留学生中的法学人才资源	·····	(1687)
二、关于国际法资料中心的建立	·····	(1688)
三、关于国际法专业力量的合作	·····	(1689)

II	从难从严训练 成果人才并出 .....	(1691)
(1691)	一、实行“大运动量”训练,过法学专业英语关 .....	(1692)
(1692)	二、多学科交叉渗透,建立合理的知识结构 .....	(1694)
(1694)	三、理论联系实际,提高实务工作能力 .....	(1695)
(1695)	四、充分信赖,异以“重担”,严密组织,严格把关 .....	(1696)
(1696)	五、赋予较大“成才自留权”,加速形成“人才生产力” .....	(1697)
III	“博士”新解 .....	(1699)
(1699)	附录 .....	(1701)
(1701)	一、官员与老板:心仪博士帽 .....	(1701)
(1701)	二、“教授”贬值为哪般 .....	(1702)
(1702)	三、该挤挤“学术泡沫”了 .....	(1703)
(1703)	.....	(1703)
IV	是“棒打鸳鸯”吗?——就“李爽事件”评《纽约时报》报道兼答 .....	(1706)
(1706)	美国法学界同行问 .....	(1706)
(1706)	一、李爽是何许人?“李爽事件”的背景如何? .....	(1707)
(1707)	二、李爽触犯了什么法律?犯了什么罪? .....	(1709)
(1709)	三、是打击“鸳鸯”的无情棒?还是拯救沉沦的救生圈? .....	(1712)
(1712)	附录 .....	(1717)
(1717)	一、中国拘禁了法国男人的情妇 .....	(1717)
(1717)	二、法国外交官说中国拘留了他的未婚妻 .....	(1719)
(1719)	三、小题大做——评白天祥等人在所谓“李爽事件”上的喧嚷 .....	(1719)
(1719)	.....	(1719)
<b>第七编 英文版论文选辑</b> .....		
I	Trade Related Agenda, Development and Equity (T. R. A. D. E.): .....	(1725)
(1725)	The Three Big Rounds of U. S. Unilateralism versus WTO .....	(1725)
(1725)	Multilateralism during the Last Decade A Combined Analysis of .....	(1725)
(1725)	the Great 1994 Sovereignty Debate, Section 301 Disputes (1998 - .....	(1725)
(1725)	2000) and Section 201 Disputes (2002 - 2003) .....	(1725)

I	Introduction .....	(1730)
II	Ignition of the Section 201 Disputes: U. S. Unilateralism and Sovereignty .....	(1733)
III	Conflicts of Sovereignties in the Formation of the WTO System .....	(1739)
IV	The Refraction of Such Conflicts in the United States: “The Great 1994 Sovereignty Debate” .....	(1741)
IV.1	Away with the “S” word—[sovereignty of other states]! .....	(1743)
IV.2	Never away with the US “S” word—[“sovereignty”(hegemony) of United States!]) .....	(1745)
IV.3	The “contradiction” and coordination between “spear” and “shield” .....	(1752)
IV.4	Some discussions on “Double Standards” etc. ....	(1753)
V	“The Great 1994 Sovereignty Debate” and Section 301 .....	(1757)
VI	The E. C. -U. S. Economic Sovereignty Disputes Caused by Section 301: Origin and Prelude .....	(1762)
VI.1	U. S. -Japan Auto Disputes .....	(1762)
VI.2	U. S. -E. C. Banana Disputes .....	(1764)
VI.3	E. C. -U. S. Section 301 Dispute .....	(1767)
VII	The E. C. -U. S. Economic Sovereignty Disputes Caused by Section 301: Claims and Rebuttals .....	(1770)
VII.1	The Claims of the E. C. Representatives .....	(1770)
VII.2	The Rebuttals of the United States .....	(1774)
VIII	The WTO/DSB Panel Report on the Section 301 Case .....	(1777)
IX	The Equivocal Law-enforcing Image Concluded from the Panel Report .....	(1781)
IX.1	The Panel Creates a Limit for Its Own Duty, Is Overly Cautious, Dares Not Transgress the “Mine Bounds”, and Is Irresponsible for Its Duties .....	(1781)
IX.2	The Panel Hovers between the “Two Powers” in Its Attempt to	

(0851)	.....	Ingratiate Itself with Both Sides .....	(1783)
	IX. 3	The Panel Leaves the Offender at Large, Criticizing Pettily While	
(8851)	.....	Doing It Great Favor .....	(1786)
	IX. 4	The Panel Is Partial to and Pleading for Hegemony and Thus	
(8851)	.....	Leaves a lot of Suspicions and Hidden Perils .....	(1787)
	X	The Remaining Suspicions and Latent Perils Entailed by the	
(1741)	.....	Panel Report .....	(1788)
(1741)	X. 1	The First Suspicion and Latent Peril .....	(1788)
(1741)	X. 2	The Second Suspicion and Latent Peril .....	(1791)
(1741)	X. 3	The Third Suspicion and Latent Peril .....	(1793)
(1741)	X. 4	The Fourth Suspicion and Latent Peril .....	(1795)
(1752)	XI	The Implications for Developing Countries of "The Great	
(1752)	.....	1994 Sovereignty Debate" and the E. C. -U. S. Economic	
(1752)	.....	Sovereignty Disputes .....	(1799)
	XII	Conclusion .....	(1805)
(1752)	.....	Section 301, Origin and Precede .....	(1752)
	II	<b>A Reflection on the South-South Coalition in the Last Half-Century</b>	
(1752)	.....	<b>from the Perspective of International Economic Law-making From</b>	
(1752)	.....	<b>Bandung, Doha and Cancún to Hong Kong</b> .....	(1808)
	I	Introduction .....	(1810)
(1752)	II	From Bandung to Hong Kong: The South-South Coalition	
(1752)	.....	Progresses Unevenly .....	(1812)
(1752)	A.	The Bandung Conference among the South-South Countries; The	
(1752)	.....	First Asian-African Conference .....	(1813)
(1752)	B.	The Group of 77 among the South Countries .....	(1813)
(1752)	III	The Fresh Countenance and Forthcoming Obstacles of the	
(1752)	.....	South-South Coalition in the Doha-Cancún Process .....	(1819)
(1752)	IV	The Status Quo and Prospects for the South-South Coalition	
(1752)	.....	from Cancún to Hong Kong .....	(1824)
(1752)	A.	The Multilateral Negotiations Stagnated after the Cancún Deadlock	



.....	(1824)
B. The Prospect of the South-North Multilateral Negotiation Grew Brighter .....	(1825)
C. The South-North Multilateral Negotiation again Dimmed .....	(1826)
D. The Positive Fruits of the Hong Kong Conference with Heavy Negative Comments-Emergent after Numerous Appeals but Still Half-masked .....	(1836)
E. New Highlights in the South-North Conflict—Judicial Breakthrough in Recently Litigated WTO Agricultural Disputes .....	(1843)
V Assessment of the Trend after the Hong Kong Conference from the Perspective of the South-South Coalition during the Last Fifty Years .....	(1844)
A. The Historical “6C” Track of South-North Conflicts and Its Characteristics .....	(1844)
B. For the Doha Round’s Success; Tenacious South-South Coalition Will Once Again Be Necessary .....	(1846)
VI Concluding Remarks; What Lies Ahead? .....	(1849)
References .....	(1851)
<b>III Should the Four “Great Safeguards” in Sino-Foreign BITs Be Hastily Dismantled? Comments on Critical Provisions concerning Dispute Settlement in Model U. S. and Canadian BITs .....</b>	<b>(1853)</b>
I The Provisions concerning Dispute Settlement in the Chinese BITs and Their Correspondence with Relevant Provisions in the ICSID Convention .....	(1856)
II Essential Provisions concerning Dispute Settlement in U. S. and Canadian Model BITs .....	(1862)
III China Should Not Hastily Accept the above U. S. and Canadian Provisions or their Variations when Negotiating and/or Concluding BITs .....	(1867)

A.	Such Provisions Deviate from the Rights Authorized to Host Countries by International Conventions	(1867)
B.	Such Provisions Do Not Match China's Current Circumstances	(1874)
C.	Such Provisions Ignore the Bitter Lessons of Some BITs Harming Weak Countries; The Warning from Argentina's Dilemma	(1885)
D.	Such Provisions Ignore the Latest Legislative Track-Shift in Two Host Countries—Argentina and the United States	(1890)
IV	Suggestions for Future Sino-Foreign BIT Negotiations	(1896)
A.	Strengthening Investigation and Research on Recent Developments in BIT Practice and Acting with High Caution	(1896)
B.	Using Well the Authorizations of Relevant Conventions and Firmly Holding onto the Four Great Safeguards	(1897)
C.	Insisting on "Never Repeat" and Timely "Mending the Fold after some Sheep Have Been Lost"	(1899)
IV	<b>Distinguishing Two Types of Countries and Properly Granting Differential Reciprocity Treatment—Re-comments on the Four Safeguards in Sino-Foreign BITs Not to Be Hastily and Completely Dismantled</b>	(1902)
I	Background	(1905)
II	Major Viewpoints in "the First Comments"	(1909)
III	Some New Thoughts for Future Sino-foreign BIT Negotiations	(1912)
A.	Strengthening Investigation and Research on Recent Internal and External Developments and Acting with High Caution	(1912)
B.	Using Well the Authorizations of the Relevant Conventions and Firmly Uphold the Four Great Safeguards	(1913)
C.	Distinguishing Two Kinds of Countries, Granting Differential Reciprocity, Excluding or Limiting the Application of MFN to International Dispute Settlement Procedures	(1915)

IV	The Theoretical Grounds and Practical Precedents for Adopting Differential Treatment Based on the Distinguishing Two Types of Countries	(1924)
A.	Differential Treatment Conforms to the Universal Philosophy of “Analyze Issues under Their Concrete Situations”	(1924)
B.	Differential Treatment Conforms to the Basic Jurisprudence of “Equity and Mutual Benefit”	(1924)
C.	Differential Treatment Conforms to the Basic International Legal Principle of Supremacy of State Sovereignty	(1927)
D.	Differential Treatment Conforms to the Evolution of the Principle of MFN Treatment	(1928)
E.	Differential Treatment and Exclusion or Limitation of the Application of MFN Treatment to the Dispute Settlement Procedures Conforms to the Latest Repeated Warnings from UNCTAD	(1930)
F.	Differential Treatment Conforms to the Current International Arbitration Practices	(1933)
G.	The Precedents of Granting Differential Treatment and Excluding or Limiting the Application of MFN Clause	(1935)
V	Conclusion	(1936)
V	<b>Could China-Peru BIT 1994 Be Applied to Hong Kong Special Administration Region under “One Country, Two Systems” ? — A Jurisprudential Analysis on the Case of Tza Yap Shum v. Republic of Peru</b>	(1939)
I	Introduction; Summary of the Disputing Case	(1942)
II	Main Issues & Basic Conclusions	(1944)
2.1	Main Issues	(1944)
2.2	Basic Conclusions	(1945)
III	Issue upon the Claimant’s Chinese Nationality	(1946)
3.1	Acquisition of Chinese Nationality	(1946)

3.2	Loss of Chinese Nationality	(1947)
3.3	Application of the Nationality Law to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region	(1948)
3.4	Proof of Chinese Nationality	(1948)
3.5	HKSAR Passport as Proof of Chinese Nationality	(1949)
IV	Issue upon Applicability of SINO-FOREIGN BITs to Chinese Nationals with the Right of Abode in Hong Kong	(1951)
4.1	Historical Overview of Hong Kong Before and After Its Return to China	(1952)
4.2	The Sino-British Joint Declaration	(1953)
4.3	The Joint Liaison Group	(1955)
4.4	The Basic Law of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region	(1957)
4.5	Applicability of the China-Peru BIT 1994 to Hong Kong Residents	(1968)
V	Issue upon Scope of the Arbitration Provision in the China-Peru BIT 1994	(1969)
5.1	China's Accession to the ICSID Convention	(1970)
5.2	China's Policy on the Resolution of Investment Treaty Disputes	(1973)
5.3	Scope and Nature of the Dispute Resolution Provision in the China-Peru BIT	(1983)
VI	Issue upon Scope of the Most-Favoured-Nation Clause in the China-Peru BIT 1994	(1986)
6.1	China's Historical Experience with the Most-Favoured-Nation Treatment	(1986)
6.2	The Most-Favoured-Nation Clause in the China-Peru BIT 1994	(1989)
6.3	Use of the Most-Favoured-Nation Clause to Create New ICSID Jurisdiction	(1990)
6.4	The Consensus on the Essence of MFN Clause in Contemporary	

.....	International Law Community; MFN Treatment is Merely a Derivative of State Sovereignty .....	(2002)
6.5	Interpreting the MFN Clause in the China-Peru BIT 1994 under the VCLT .....	(2003)
6.6	The Scientific Interpretation of MFN Clause in the China-Peru BIT 1994 by Further Using the ICSID Convention and the China-Peru BIT 1994 <i>per se</i> .....	(2008)
6.7	The Repeated Warnings by Authoritative Documents of UN and the Strict Interpretation of MFN Clause in Contemporary World .....	(2011)
6.8	The Restrictions and Exclusions of the MFN Provision in Contemporary Treaty Practices .....	(2016)
6.9	The Restrictions and Exclusions of the MFN Provision by ICSID Practices (Precedent Decisions) .....	(2017)
6.10	Tracing Back to the Specific MFN Issue in China-Peru BIT 1994 .....	(2024)
VII	Conclusion .....	(2025)
<b>VI</b>	<b>Is Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards An Issue for Establishment and Improvement in China?</b> .....	(2027)
I	1949 - 1978 (about 30 Years): Related-Legislation Blank .....	(2028)
II	1979 - 1994 (15 Years): Domestic Legislation Established and International Conventions Acceded .....	(2029)
1.	Promulgating PRC's Civil Procedure Law (for Trial Use) .....	(2029)
2.	Acceding to the New York Convention of 1958 .....	(2030)
3.	Acceding to the Washington Convention of 1965 .....	(2030)
4.	Promulgating PRC's Civil Procedure Law (Formal) .....	(2031)
5.	Promulgating PRC's Arbitration Law .....	(2031)
III	1995 - present: Judicial Explanations Added .....	(2032)

1. Obstacles from “Local-protectionism”	(2032)
2. “Double Report System” Preliminary Established; to Overcome the “Local-protectionism”	(2034)
3. “Double Report System” Strengthened; to Overcome the “Local-protectionism”	(2036)
IV Domestic Legislations Need to Be Further Improved	(2037)
<b>VII The Truth among the Fogbound “Expropriation” Claim; Comments on British X Investment Co. v. British Y Insurance Co. Case</b>	(2039)
I Summary of the Case	(2040)
II Questions for Answers	(2042)
III Expert’s Views & Opinions	(2043)
(I) In the CJV Contract dated on 25 December 1996, which aimed to establish C Power Company, the provisions of Article 15 on distribution of profit was in compliance with the laws at that time and have been in compliance with the laws	(2043)
(II) For the “Circular [1998] No. 31” of the State Council on Strengthening the Administration and Carrying on Check of the Foreign Exchange and Foreign Debt issued in September 1998, its legal force is not complete	(2045)
(III) The “Circular [1998] No. 31” has no legal effect of retroactivity	(2047)
(IV) Actually, the aforesaid prohibitive provisions in the “Circular [1998] No. 31” has been amended again and again in 2002 and 2004	(2050)
(V) “Circular [2002] No. 43” is not an “expropriation decree”; New Agreements on 11 March 2003 are not “behaviors of expropriation”	(2055)
(VI) Provisions in the Foreign Investment Regulations and “Bilateral Investment Agreement between PRC and UK” concerning the expropriation of foreign investment	(2061)

IV	Conclusion .....	(2063)
VIII	<b>The Approach of “Winning from Both Sides” Used in the “Expropriation” Claim: Re-Comments on British X Investment Co. v. British Y Insurance Co. Case .....</b>	(2066)
	[Q1] & [A1].....	(2066)
	[Q2] & [A2].....	(2068)
	[Q3] & [A3].....	(2069)
	[Q4] & [A4].....	(2070)
	[Q5] & [A5].....	(2071)
	[Q6] & [A6].....	(2072)
	[Q7] & [A7].....	(2074)
	[Q8] & [A8].....	(2076)
	[Q9] & [A9].....	(2077)
	[Q10] & [A10].....	(2077)
	[Q11] & [A11].....	(2078)
	[Q12] & [A12].....	(2080)
	[Q13] & [A13].....	(2085)
	[Q14] & [A14].....	(2086)
IX	<b>On the Serious Violation of Chinese <i>Jus Cogens</i> : Comments on the Case of importing Toxic Brazilian Soybeans into China [ <i>Expert’s Legal Opinion on Zhonghe v. Bunge Case</i> ].....</b>	(2092)
	I Brief CV of the Expert .....	(2093)
	II Summary of the Case .....	(2094)
	III Questions Consulted .....	(2098)
	IV Expert’s Views & Opinions .....	(2099)
	V Brief Conclusion .....	(2113)

# 5

第五编

---

涉台经济法



