Since early 2017, reports have emerged of large-scale arbitrary detention and mass surveillance, forced political indoctrination, severe restrictions on movement and religious practice, torture and inhumane treatment, forced sterilisation, forced separation of children from parents, forced labour and killings of persons in detention in the Xinjiang Uighur Autonomous Region (‘XUAR’ or ‘Xinjiang’) of China. The alleged victims are predominantly Uighur and other Turkic Muslim minorities. After detailed study of the evidence and relevant facts, in October 2020 the Asia Pacific Centre for the Responsibility to Protect issued a report which concluded that:

1. The Chinese government is committing crimes against humanity, including: persecution, imprisonment, torture, forced sterilisation, and enslavement. The evidence may also substantiate further crimes against humanity of enforced disappearance, murder, and rape.

2. There is evidence that genocidal acts may have occurred in Xinjiang, in particular acts of imposing measures to prevent births and forcible transfers. There is also evidence that raises concerns of acts including killing, serious bodily and mental harm, and inflicting conditions that are calculated to bring about physical destruction have occurred in Xinjiang. 

Since 2016, the Chinese government has subjected an estimated 13 million Uighurs and other Turkic Muslims in XUAR to an intrusive system of mass surveillance, large-scale arbitrary detention, forced political indoctrination, and severe restrictions on movement and religious practice. Upwards of a million Uighurs and other Turkic Muslims have been remanded in state custody in what Chinese authorities refer to as ‘re-education’ or ‘de-extremification’ facilities. Former Uighur detainees have described conditions in re-education camps as variously involving crowded cells, indoctrination that drove some to suicide, waterboarding, food deprivation as punishment, beatings, being shackled to chairs for extended periods of time, sleep deprivation, forcibly being drugged, electrical shock treatment, rape and sexual humiliation, and other forms of extreme physical and mental abuse.

Family members both within China and overseas continue to report that they have limited or no access to information about persons held in state detention, and children of detained parents are being treated as de-facto orphans and placed in state-run institutions “without parental consent or access.” There are credible allegations of widespread and systematic sexual and gender based violence perpetrated by Chinese guards in so-called “re-education” camps, which collated survivor and eyewitness testimonies. Survivors have spoken out about experiences of repeated gang rapes, sexual torture involving electric shocks, forced nudity, and of being forced to participate in a “system of organised rape” by undressing others in preparation for abuse. The widespread or systematic use of sexual and gender based violence is a crime against humanity. When used with intent to destroy a group, SGBV falls within the definition of genocide under the Genocide Convention, by causing serious bodily or mental harm, inflicting conditions to bring about the group’s destruction; and imposing measures to prevent births within the group.

Enslavement and forced labour, practices evident in North Korea too, appear common. In March 2020, ASPI released a report “conservatively” estimating that, between 2017 and 2019, more than 80,000 Uighurs were transferred out of Xinjiang to work in factories across China. In many cases, the transfer has been reported as being directly from a re-education camp. Forced labour or otherwise reducing a person to a servile status can amount to the crime of “enslavement” under international law, which occurs when “any or all powers attaching to the right of ownership are exercised” over a person. International jurisprudence regards as salient indications of enslavement: “elements of control and ownership; the restriction or control of an individual’s autonomy, freedom of choice or freedom of
movement; and, often, the accruing of some gain to the perpetrator”. The victim’s consent or free will is absent.

The government is also allegedly separating Uighur children from their parents and enrolling them in state boarding schools, which resembles a government-led “parallel campaign to systematically remove children from their roots” alongside the broader effort to “transform the identity of Xinjiang’s adults” through ‘re-education’ and religious repression. Numerous acts of persecution have occurred against Turkic Muslim minorities, particularly Uighurs, in Xinjiang. Indeed, the alleged facts amenable to characterisation as “persecution” are too vast to cover comprehensively in this Report. Those focused on are: widespread destruction of Uighur cultural and religious heritage (including property, language, and customs); and the organised mass detention and “re-education” of Uighurs and other Turkic Muslims (including associated crimes of imprisonment, forcible transfer, torture, forced sterilisation, and enslavement considered later in the Report).

There have been numerous and credible reports of Uighur historical and holy places being destroyed and desecrated in Xinjiang. Using satellite imagery, the Australian Strategic Policy Institute (ASPI) recently found that of a sample of 533 mosques across Xinjiang, 31.9% had been destroyed, 32.8% were damaged, and 35.3% were undamaged. Extrapolating this data to mosques across Xinjiang, approximately 16,000 mosques may have been damaged or destroyed and 8,450 completely demolished since 2017. Besides mosques, ASPI’s data and analysis suggested that 30% of other sacred sites (included shrines (mazar), cemeteries, and pilgrimage sites) have been demolished, mostly since 2017, and an additional 27.8% have been damaged in some way. This evidence is consistent with individual reports published by NGOs and media of deliberate destruction of mosques and other culturally significant sites. Reports also document destruction of historic Uighur neighbourhoods and old cities, and re-ordering of Uighur households. Reports further indicate that Muslims are prevented, including by official regulation, from: performing traditional rituals and ceremonies, using Arabic, giving their children traditional names, growing beards, wearing Islamic clothing and face coverings, and selling and buying halal food. Each amounts to restriction of Uighur and Muslim customs.

Reports of the situation in Xinjiang have documented instances in which Uighur or other Turkic Muslims have been taken away by authorities to “re-education” camps without identifying to friends and family where they have been taken to or for how long. Such instances suggest the crime of “enforced disappearance”, which is defined in the ICC Statute as the “arrest, detention or abduction of persons by, or with the authorisation, support or acquiescence of, a State or political organisation, followed by a refusal to acknowledge that deprivation of freedom or to give information on the fate or whereabouts of those persons, with the intention of removing them from the protection of law for a prolonged period of time”. The “essence” of the crime has been articulated as “that the friends and families of the direct victims do not know whether the persons concerned are alive or dead”. Enforced disappearances are also common, especially of Uighur intellectuals and prominent cultural figures. Relevant evidence is also contained in the “Xinjiang Papers” leaked to the New York Times. One paper is a directive advising local officials of how to engage with students returning to the Xinjiang “and whose family members are being punished during the ‘Strike Hard’ campaign”. The document advises officials as to how to handle questions about the location and fate of their relatives without any specificity. Officials are to give only a vague reference to where relatives are—“in a training school set up by the government” because “they have come under a degree of harmful influence in religious extremism and violent terrorist thoughts”—and for an indeterminate period of time—“an extended period”.
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In relation to the question of genocide, there is significant evidence available to establish forced sterilisation as having occurred in Xinjiang. As a matter of law, the crime of “forced sterilisation” occurs when: (1) the perpetrator deprives one or more persons of biological reproductive capacity; and (2) the conduct was neither justified by the medical treatment of the person nor carried out with their genuine consent. Individual reports by NGOs and news agencies documenting interviews with Uighur women, as well as doctors that have treated Uighur women both in Xinjiang and abroad, are strong evidence that numerous women have been sterilised by Chinese authorities and without their genuine consent. The occurrence of these sterilisations is consistent with official government statistics, which document a significant decline in birth rates in Xinjiang and a disproportionate rise in sterilisations in Xinjiang as compared to the rest of mainland China. Individual reports which document sterilisations as variably having occurred against patients’ wills, without genuine consent, or without informing the patient of the procedure, prove that some, if not most, of these sterilisations have occurred forcibly.

The international response to atrocity crimes in China has been lacklustre at best, creating a climate of impunity. Besides the US, in recent months a number of countries have publicly identified China’s human rights violations as atrocity crimes and have called on China to respect the rights of its Turkic Muslim. A Canadian parliamentary committee labelled Chinese policy “genocide” whilst the British parliament has begun to consider following the US in imposing sanctions. The issue was also raised by a joint a statement on Xinjiang issued on behalf of 23 countries at a UN General Assembly Third Committee session on the Committee for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination in late October. China has reacted with predictable hostility. Condemnation of China’s policy by the UN and Western governments and media continues to rankle Beijing. In December, China responded by ramping up its political propaganda, including through editorials in state-run media and documentary videos posted on Twitter and YouTube. China also secured support for a rebuttal statement issued by Belarus on behalf of 54 countries, including Pakistan, Russia, Egypt, the Democratic Republic of Congo and Serbia. This statement defended China’s policies in XUAR, noting China’s “remarkable achievements in the field of human rights” through successfully returning “safety and security” to Xinjiang where “the human rights of people of all ethnic groups there are safeguarded”. This mirrored the strategy China adopted in the UN Human Rights Council in July. In response to a letter of concern issued by 22 (mostly Western) states, UN ambassadors from 37 countries including Russia, Saudi Arabia, North Korea, Myanmar, Algeria, the Philippines and Zimbabwe issued a letter commending China’s counter-terrorism policy. Arab and Muslim-majority states also continue to refuse to speak out against China’s treatment of Turkic Muslims, with some even voicing support for China’s policies in Xinjiang.

**Recommendations**

The government of China must:

- **Immediately halt violations in XUAR that may amount to crimes against humanity and genocide, and take active measures to prevent the recurrence or escalation of such violations;**
- **Direct the government in XUAR to repeal the 2017 Regulation on De-extremification, and respond favourably to the requests of UN special procedures mandate holders to undertake an official visit to China with unhindered access to detention facilities in Xinjiang;**
- **Grant the OHCHR unfettered access to all locations in XUAR.**

All concerned states should:

- **Condemn crimes against humanity by Chinese authorities in XUAR;**
• Examine what bilateral measures they could take to encourage China to immediately halt violations in XUAR and take tangible steps to apply pressure and uphold accountability;
• Cooperate to utilize all multilateral avenues, including the UN Security Council, General Assembly, Human Rights Council, and other bodies as appropriate, to express disapproval of Chinese policies encourage the authorities to change course.

In particular, the UN Human Rights Council should:

• Urgently establish an investigation to gather information to assess whether patterns of abuses in Xinjiang constitute crimes against humanity that are universally prohibited under international law.

The OHCHR and special procedures mandate holders should:

• Continue to call for the immediate release of persons involuntarily held in detention without due process, closely monitor the situation in Xinjiang, and continue to urge China to uphold the human rights and fundamental freedoms of Turkic Muslims and to accept independent UN observers in Xinjiang.
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