

## **Written evidence submitted by the Inter-Parliamentary Alliance on China (XIN0082)**

### **Introduction**

The Inter-Parliamentary Alliance on China (IPAC) is an international, cross party network of parliamentarians working to reform the approach of democratic countries to China. IPAC works through its 175 members across 19 legislatures to uphold human rights in China, protect the international rules based order and strengthen democracy globally.

The IPAC UK membership is composed of 46 parliamentarians from both Houses of Parliament, with representation from all major political parties.<sup>1</sup>

IPAC UK submits evidence to this Committee in order to encourage the Government to act urgently to hold the Chinese government to account for the state perpetrated human rights abuses against Uyghurs and other ethnic and religious minorities in the Xinjiang region.

### **Summary of recommendations**

In order to influence China towards better human rights practices, IPAC UK recommends that the Government should:

- Support the opening of an investigation at the International Criminal Court on international crimes committed by Chinese officials.
- Invoke China's responsibility for breaches of the Genocide Convention and take action in the appropriate multilateral forums, including the UN Human Rights Council.
- Pursue independent means to make preliminary judgements on genocide determination, such as through the High Court of England and Wales or the Uyghur Tribunal.
- Invoke China's responsibility for breaches of international obligations in bilateral and multilateral settings, such as the UN Convention against Torture.

---

<sup>1</sup> A full membership list is available on the IPAC website: <https://ipac.global/team/>

In order to discourage private sector companies from contributing to human rights abuses, particularly for UK linked businesses with operations in Xinjiang, IPAC UK recommends that the Government should:

- Issue disqualification penalties for businesses facilitating forced labour, through the Company Directors Disqualification Act 1986.
- Update Modern Slavery legislation to include a 'duty of vigilance' principle and enable civil society scrutiny.
- Implement a policy of 'presumptive rebuttal' for businesses with operations in Xinjiang, through legislation modelled on the US Uyghur Forced Labor Prevention Act.

In order to offer support to members of the Uyghur diaspora (and others) who are experiencing persecution and harassment abroad, IPAC UK recommends that the Government should:

- Automatically consider Uyghur asylum seekers as a persecuted group and deserving of refugee status.
- Coordinate international efforts to protect Uyghurs in danger of deportation to China.
- Investigate reports of Chinese agents intimidating and harassing Uyghurs and other groups in the UK.
- Establish a Uyghur Vulnerable Persons Resettlement Scheme, modelled on the Syrian Vulnerable Persons Resettlement Programme.

**(1) How can the UK use organisations and agreements such as the UN Human Rights Council and the Genocide Convention to influence China towards better human rights practices?**

In order to use the UN Human Rights Council and the Genocide Convention to influence China towards better human rights practices, the Inter-Parliamentary Alliance on China (IPAC) recommends that the Government seeks to:

- (1) Support the opening of an investigation at the International Criminal Court on international crimes committed by Chinese officials.**

The UK should support the opening of an independent international investigation by the International Criminal Court (ICC), the only official international judicial body that has jurisdiction to inquire into the suspected mass atrocity crimes taking place in Xinjiang.

Although China is not a State Party to the Rome Statute of the ICC, the fact that many of the crimes committed against the Uyghurs either started or finished in Tajikistan and Cambodia, which are ICC States Parties, gives the Court jurisdiction over the situation. The ICC in the Myanmar/Bangladesh (Rohingya) case provided a clear precedent when it clarified that as soon as one element of the crime is committed on the territory of a State Party, it has jurisdiction.<sup>2</sup>

In light of the above, IPAC urges the UK to support the Complaint filed with the ICC Chief Prosecutor on 8 July 2020 on behalf of the Uyghur and other Turkic victims of international crimes committed by Chinese officials.<sup>3</sup> This could be achieved through:

- Publicly encouraging the Prosecutor to take up this case as a matter of priority and encourage other ICC States Parties to do so during the upcoming ICC Assembly of States Parties, set to take place in The Hague on 14-16 December 2020.
- Referring the situation to the Prosecutor and requesting her to investigate under Article 14 of the Rome Statute.

**(2) Invoke China’s responsibility for breaches of the Genocide Convention and take action in the appropriate multilateral forums, including the UN Human Rights Council.**

China is a Party to the Genocide Convention, which it ratified in 1983. The only reservation it made upon ratification relates to Article IX of the Convention, which gives the International Court of Justice (ICJ) jurisdiction over disputes relating to the interpretation, application or fulfilment of the Convention.<sup>4</sup> All other articles

---

<sup>2</sup> International Criminal Court (2019). *ICC judges authorise opening of an investigation into the situation in Bangladesh/Myanmar*. Available at: <https://www.icc-cpi.int/Pages/item.aspx?name=pr1495> (Accessed: 30/11/2020).

<sup>3</sup> Temple Garden Chambers (2020). *Complaint filed at International Criminal Court (ICC) on behalf of the East Turkistan Government in Exile*. Available at: <https://tgchambers.com/news-and-resources/news/complaint-filed-at-international-criminal-court-icc-on-behalf-of-the-east-turkistan-government-in-exile/> (Accessed: 30/11/2020).

<sup>4</sup> United Nations Treaty Collection (2020). *Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide*. Available at: [https://treaties.un.org/Pages/ViewDetails.aspx?src=IND&mtdsg\\_no=IV-](https://treaties.un.org/Pages/ViewDetails.aspx?src=IND&mtdsg_no=IV-)

are therefore binding upon the State of China, which is in particular under the obligation not to commit genocide, nor to attempt to commit genocide or to conspire to commit genocide, incite genocide, be complicit in genocide. Moreover, China is under an obligation to prevent and punish genocide under the Convention.

The UK can invoke the responsibility of China for internationally wrongful acts on the basis that it has breached a number of its obligations under the Genocide Convention. It can do so by way of a diplomatic note and it can also bring up the matter in a multilateral forum. In that respect, under Article VIII of the Genocide Convention, “[a]ny Contracting Party may call upon the competent organs of the United Nations to take such action under the Charter of the United Nations as they consider appropriate for the prevention and suppression of acts of genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in article III”.<sup>5</sup>

We would respectfully recommend that the UK, on the basis of that Article, refer the matter to the following forums:

- **The UN General Assembly**  
Human rights issues unquestionably fall within the mandate of the UN General Assembly (‘the UNGA’). If the UK were to refer the matter to the UNGA, it would bring China’s human rights practices under international scrutiny, which could have a deterrent effect on those responsible.

One of the major issues concerning the human rights situation in China is the lack of access of independent international observers and the difficulty to collect evidence in this context. The UK could encourage the UNGA to adopt a resolution to address these issues.

On 21 December 2016, the UNGA adopted resolution 71/248, establishing the International, Impartial and Independent Mechanism to assist in the investigation and prosecution of persons responsible for the most serious crimes under International Law committed in the Syrian Arab Republic since March 2011. The Mechanism’s mandate is “to collect, consolidate, preserve and analyse evidence of violations of international humanitarian law and human rights violations and abuses and to prepare files in order to facilitate and expedite fair and independent criminal proceedings, in

---

[1&chapter=4&clang=en#33](#) (Accessed 30/11/2020)

<sup>5</sup> United Nations Treaty Collection (2020). *Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide*. Available at: [https://treaties.un.org/Pages/ViewDetails.aspx?src=IND&mtmsg\\_no=IV-1&chapter=4&clang=en#33](https://treaties.un.org/Pages/ViewDetails.aspx?src=IND&mtmsg_no=IV-1&chapter=4&clang=en#33) (Accessed 30/11/2020)

*accordance with international law standards, in national, regional or international courts or tribunals that have or may in the future have jurisdiction over these crimes, in accordance with international law.”<sup>6</sup>*

If the UK led a similar initiative regarding China, its importance could not be overstated. It is critical to demand access to the area for the purpose of collecting evidence; however, if China were to refuse such access, the collection of evidence could still take place outside of China, especially in neighbouring countries but also elsewhere, when victims have managed to flee persecutions and are prepared to give testimonies.

- **The UN Human Rights Council**  
The UK should also refer the matter to the Human Rights Council, which could also create an independent fact-finding mission or mechanism and demand that independent human rights observers obtain access to the region.

On 24 March 2017, the UN Human Rights Council established an Independent International Fact-Finding Mission on Myanmar, with the mandate “*to establish the facts and circumstances of the alleged recent human rights violations by military and security forces, and abuses, in Myanmar, in particular in Rakhine State*”.<sup>7</sup> When its mandate ended in September 2019, the Mission handed over its evidence to the Independent Investigative Mechanism for Myanmar, also created by the Human Rights Council and operational since 30 August 2019. The mandate of the Mechanism is to collect, consolidate, preserve and analyse evidence of the most serious international crimes and violations of international law committed in Myanmar since 2011. It is further mandated to prepare files in order to facilitate and expedite fair and independent criminal proceedings, in national, regional or international courts or tribunals that have or may in the future have jurisdiction over these crimes.<sup>8</sup>

Likewise, the positive impact that a similar initiative led by the UK would have in the case of China could not be overstated. An alternative would be to appoint a Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in China.

---

<sup>6</sup>UN IIM (2016). *Terms of Reference*. Available at: <https://iim.un.org/terms-of-reference-of-iim/> (Accessed 30/11/2020)

<sup>7</sup> OHCHR (2017). *Independent International Fact-Finding Mission on Myanmar*. Available at: <https://www.ohchr.org/en/hrbodies/hrc/myanmarffm/pages/index.aspx> (Accessed 30/11/2020).

<sup>8</sup> IIMM (2018). *Mandate and establishment*. Available at: <https://iimm.un.org/mandate-and-establishment/> (Accessed 30/11/2020).

The Committee has done so in the past in other situations. To cite one example, in 2011 it appointed a special rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran, to report to the Human Rights Council and the General Assembly. Since then, the mandate of the special rapporteur has been regularly extended.<sup>9</sup> The Human Rights Council has expressed concern at the lack of access permitted to the Special Rapporteur to travel to the Islamic Republic of Iran; nonetheless, the special rapporteur has met with victims of human rights violations allegedly committed in Iran in other countries. He has also met with the victims' families, human rights defenders, lawyers and representatives of civil society organisations in various places. His latest report, dated 28 January 2020, draws on the evidence gathered outside of Iran and contains detailed information on the situation of human rights in the country.<sup>10</sup>

As stated above, it is critical to demand access to the area for the purpose of collecting evidence; however, if China were to refuse such access, the collection of evidence could still be arranged outside of China, especially in neighbouring countries but also elsewhere, when victims have managed to flee persecutions and are prepared to give testimonies.

## **(2) Where these mechanisms prove ineffective, what other international laws and agreements can be used effectively for atrocity prevention?**

In order to consolidate efforts to prevent mass atrocity crimes as outlined in the previous section, IPAC recommends that the Government seeks to:

### **(1) Pursue independent means to make preliminary judgements on genocide determination.**

Though there are mechanisms, as outlined above, to hold China to account for alleged violations of the Genocide Convention in international courts, the UK should also explore alternative means to make preliminary judgements on

---

<sup>9</sup> OHCHR (2018). *Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran*. Available at: <https://www.ohchr.org/en/hrbodies/sp/countriesmandates/ir/pages/sriran.aspx#:~:text=On%206%20July%202018%2C%20Mr,officially%20on%2013%20July%202018>. (Accessed 30/11/2020)

<sup>10</sup> UNGA Human Rights Council (2020). *Situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran (A/43/61)*. Available at: [https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Countries/IR/Report\\_of\\_the\\_Special\\_Rapporteur\\_on\\_the\\_situation\\_of\\_human\\_rights\\_in\\_the\\_Islamic\\_Republic\\_of\\_IranA4361.pdf](https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Countries/IR/Report_of_the_Special_Rapporteur_on_the_situation_of_human_rights_in_the_Islamic_Republic_of_IranA4361.pdf) (Accessed 30/11/2020).

genocide determination. These could include:

- Official support of the independent, ‘people’s tribunals’ such as the Uyghur Tribunal established by Sir Geoffrey Nice QC.<sup>11</sup>

Independent tribunals have proved useful tools for holding states to account for egregious human rights abuses, particularly when efforts to do so through international courts have been blocked. For example, the China Tribunal, which examined claims of forced organ harvesting in China.<sup>12</sup>

The Government could support such efforts through the work of the Uyghur Tribunal through:

- (i) Committing to consider the findings and the recommendations of the Tribunal.
  - (ii) Providing evidence and witness to the Tribunal.
- Establishing mechanisms for the High Court of England and Wales to make preliminary judgements on genocide determination, as proposed in a cross party amendment to the Trade Bill.<sup>13</sup>

Cross-party support has emerged for an amendment to the Trade Bill which would create a mechanism for genocide determination within the UK High Court and invalidate any trade deal entered into with a state judged to be perpetrating genocide.

Lord Hope, Former Supreme Court Justice, commented that this mechanism would allow genocide hearings to follow due process in full accordance with the rule of law. The proposed mechanism would be legally operable and will enable genocide judgements to carry real weight.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> More information on the Uyghur Tribunal at: <https://uyghurtribunal.com/>

<sup>12</sup> Bowcott, A. (2019). ‘China is harvesting organs from detainees, tribunal concludes.’ *The Guardian* 17 June. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2019/jun/17/china-is-harvesting-organs-from-detainees-uk-tribunal-concludes> (Accessed 30/11/2020).

<sup>13</sup> Trade Bill (2020) Amendments to be Moved on Report. Parliament: House of Commons. Available at: [https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/bills/lbill/58-01/128/5801128-R\(d\).pdf](https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/bills/lbill/58-01/128/5801128-R(d).pdf) (Accessed 30/11/2020)

<sup>14</sup> HL Deb (13 Oct 2020). vol. 806. col. 1037. Available at: <https://hansard.parliament.uk/lords/2020-10-13/debates/EE70A907-14EC-4EFE-8833-CE1F2FE82580/TradeBill#main-content> (Accessed 30/11/2020)

**(2) Invoke China's responsibility for breaches of international obligations in bilateral and multilateral settings.**

China's actions are in breach of customary international law as well as several international conventions to which China is a Party, including but not limited to:

- the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment;
- the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination;
- the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women;
- and, the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

As mentioned above in relation to the Genocide Convention, the UK should similarly invoke the responsibility of China for breaches of its obligations under these instruments both in a bilateral setting (e.g. by way of a diplomatic note) and in a multilateral setting (by bringing up the matter in the relevant international forums).

**(4) What mechanisms can the Government use to discourage private sector companies from contributing to human rights abuses?**

The Government can update key pieces of legislation to more effectively discourage private sector companies from contributing to human rights abuses. In particular, IPAC recommends:

**(1) Disqualification penalties for businesses facilitating forced labour.**

The Company Directors Disqualification Act, 1986 requires that company directors "Ensure they/ the company complies with the law and all relevant regulations".<sup>15</sup> The legislation should be amended to make company directors subject to disqualification where they have failed to act on reasonable suspicions or evidence of forced labour or other abuses in their supply chains, or for failing to disclose such abuses in their Modern Slavery Statements required by the Modern Slavery Act 2015.

---

<sup>15</sup> The Insolvency Service (2020). *Guidance: Company Directors Disqualification Act 1986*. Available at: [www.gov.uk/government/publications/company-directors-disqualification-act-1986-and-failed-companies/company-directors-disqualification-act-1986-and-failed-companies#what-is-unfit-conduct](http://www.gov.uk/government/publications/company-directors-disqualification-act-1986-and-failed-companies/company-directors-disqualification-act-1986-and-failed-companies#what-is-unfit-conduct) (Accessed: 30/11/2020).

**(2) Update Modern Slavery legislation to include a ‘duty of vigilance’ principle and enable civil society scrutiny.**

The Modern Slavery Act 2015 requires large companies to make annual slavery and human trafficking statements, where companies may choose to report on steps taken to remove the risk of forced labour from supply chains. However, there is no requirement on companies to ensure that reports produced are adequate or effectively implemented.

The government should seek to update the Modern Slavery Act to include a ‘duty of vigilance’ principle for companies. This could be achieved through requirements for to ensure that annual slavery and human trafficking statements are both adequate and effectively implemented.

This could be modelled on France’s 2017 Duty of Vigilance Law, whereby any interested party may petition a judge to ask for a compliance order to be issued should a company’s slavery and human trafficking statement be found inadequate or ineffectively implemented.<sup>16</sup> This would enable civil society groups to scrutinise and hold companies to account for complicity in modern slavery abuses.

**(5) How can UK-linked businesses with operations in Xinjiang be made accountable for any involvement in human rights abuses?**

IPAC notes that:

- **UK linked businesses with operations in Xinjiang risk complicity in gross human rights abuses by default.**

Forced labour is widespread and government backed. Official Chinese government statistics show that up to 80,000 Uyghurs are enrolled in government mandated labour programmes. Despite their official character, mounting evidence suggests that these programmes should be considered conditions of forced labour.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> European Coalition of Corporate Justice (2017). *The French Duty of Vigilance Law: Frequently Asked Questions*. Brussels. Available at: <https://respect.international/french-corporate-duty-of-vigilance-law-english-translation/> (Accessed: 30/11/2020).

<sup>17</sup> Xiuzhong Xu, V. (2020). *Uyghurs for Sale*. Canberra: Australian Strategic Policy Institute. Available at: [https://s3-ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/ad-aspi/2020-11/Uyghurs%20for%20sale%2019%20November%202020\\_0.pdf?kxYJ4zV6fbRf45yIoVehviiB8hnX.qOp](https://s3-ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/ad-aspi/2020-11/Uyghurs%20for%20sale%2019%20November%202020_0.pdf?kxYJ4zV6fbRf45yIoVehviiB8hnX.qOp)

Government bodies are accused of perpetrating gross human rights abuses on Uyghurs and other ethnic and religious minorities. UK linked businesses operating in the region will inevitably work with some of these bodies. Alleged abuses include mass incarceration, torture and forced sterilization.<sup>18</sup> Government bodies such as the Xinjiang Public Security Bureau and Xinjiang Production and Construction Corps have been directly linked to some of these cases.<sup>19</sup>

- **Conventional supply chain auditing practices are ineffective in Xinjiang.**

Businesses with supply chains in the region cannot reliably conclude they are free from forced labour or other abuses. Restricted access to Xinjiang makes attempts to carry out conventional due diligence checks in the region near impossible. A number of reputable auditors have announced that they are no longer able to audit supply chains in the Xinjiang region for this reason.<sup>20</sup>

Consequently, IPAC recommends that:

- (1) **The UK should implement a policy of ‘presumptive rebuttal’ for businesses with operations in Xinjiang.**

Businesses operating in Xinjiang should bear the burden of proof for demonstrating that their operations are not tainted by forced labour or other abuses. This approach would help solve the problems caused by the ineffectiveness of conventional supply chains auditing practices in Xinjiang and the widespread prevalence of forced labour in the region.

The UK should introduce legislation similar to the US Uyghur Forced Labor Prevention Act. The Bill imposes a presumptive ban on imports from the Xinjiang region unless businesses can provide "clear and convincing evidence" that goods sourced in Xinjiang were not made with forced labour. It has received bi-partisan support and awaits Senate Approval.<sup>21</sup>

---

(Accessed: 30/11/2020).

<sup>18</sup> Associated Press (2020). *China cuts Uighur births with IUDs, abortions, sterilization*. Available at: <https://apnews.com/article/269b3de1af34e17c1941a514f78d764c> (Accessed: 30/11/2020)

<sup>19</sup> AFP (2020). ‘US imposes sanctions on Chinese ‘state within a state’ linked to Xinjiang abuses. *The Guardian*, 31 Jul. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/jul/31/us-sanctions-china-xinjiang-uighurs> (Accessed: 30/11/2020).

<sup>20</sup> Xiao, E. (2020). ‘Auditors say they no longer will inspect labor conditions at Xinjiang factories.’ *The Wall Street Journal*, Sept 21. Available at: <https://www.wsj.com/articles/auditors-say-they-no-longer-will-inspect-labor-conditions-at-xinjiang-factories-11600697706> (Accessed: 30/11/2020).

<sup>21</sup> H.R.6210 - Uyghur Forced Labor Prevention Act. U.S. Congress. Available at: <https://www.congress.gov/bill/116th-congress/house-bill/6210> (Accessed: 30/11/2020).

This response would be commensurate with the urgency and extremity of the deteriorating human rights situation in Xinjiang.

**(6) What is the best form of support to offer to members of the Uyghur diaspora (and others) who are experiencing persecution and harassment abroad?**

IPAC recommends that the Government considers offering the following means of support to members of the Uyghur diaspora:

- **Automatic consideration of Uyghur asylum seekers as a persecuted group and deserving of refugee status.**

The UK should follow the lead of Sweden in halting the deportation of Uyghur asylum seekers and automatically grant refugee status on the basis that Uyghurs are a group at risk of persecution in China.<sup>22</sup>

Uyghur asylum seekers deported to China are thought to face harassment, arrest and detention in internment camps, with those imprisoned allegedly tortured and forced to renounce their religion.<sup>23</sup> In 2018, a Uyghur asylum seeker in Germany was mistakenly deported to China in 2018 after an administrative error and is now thought to be detained.<sup>24</sup>

- **Coordinate international efforts to protect Uyghurs in danger of deportation to China.**

Many Uyghur refugees are at risk of deportation back to China. Human Rights Watch has warned that Uyghurs deported to China face the risk of torture and arbitrary detention.<sup>25</sup> Thailand is known to have deported hundreds of Uyghurs to China in recent years, while Turkey is accused of deporting Uyghurs to China through third countries such as Tajikistan.<sup>26</sup> <sup>27</sup> Egypt, Saudi Arabia, the UAE,

---

<sup>22</sup> Baynes, C. (2019). 'Sweden grants refugee status to China's Uighur Muslims, prompting calls for UK to follow suit.' *The Independent*, 20 Mar. Available at: <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/sweden-uighur-muslim-china-refugees-camps-asylum-seekers-a8832191.html> (Accessed: 30/11/2020).

<sup>23</sup> Human Rights Watch (2017). *Egypt: Don't deport Uyghurs to China*. Available at: <https://www.hrw.org/news/2017/07/08/egypt-dont-deport-uyghurs-china> (Accessed 30/11/2020)

<sup>24</sup> Deutsche Welle (2018). 'Germany expels Uighur asylum seeker to China "in error"'. Available at: <https://www.dw.com/en/germany-expels-uighur-asylum-seeker-to-china-in-error/a-44970788> (Accessed 30/11/2020)

<sup>25</sup> Human Rights Watch (2017). *Egypt: Don't deport Uyghurs to China*. Available at: <https://www.hrw.org/news/2017/07/08/egypt-dont-deport-uyghurs-china> (Accessed 30/11/2020)

<sup>26</sup> Putz, C (2015). 'Thailand deports 100 Uyghurs to China'. *The Diplomat* Jul 11. Available at:

Pakistan, Kazakhstan and Cambodia have or are considering deporting Uyghurs to China.<sup>28 29 30 31</sup>

The UK should coordinate international efforts to protect Uyghurs at risk of deportation in third countries. Actions could include diplomatic representations to states known to deport Uyghurs and support for NGOs seeking to provide legal assistance and an international 'hotline' for Uyghurs at risk of deportation.

- **Investigate reports of Chinese agents intimidating and harassing Uyghurs and other groups in the UK.**

Human rights groups have raised concerns that Chinese government agents are monitoring, intimidating and harassing Uyghurs living in the UK and other states.<sup>32</sup> According to the World Uyghur Congress, Uyghurs in the UK report frequently receiving threatening messages from agents thought to be acting on behalf of the Chinese government. These messages often demand the ceasing of political activity or selling information on the actions of other Uyghurs abroad in return for the safety of relatives in China.<sup>33</sup>

The Government should act to investigate the role of the Chinese government in monitoring and harassing Uyghur dissidents, and also consider similar allegations concerning Hong Kong activists and Chinese dissidents in the UK.<sup>34</sup>

---

<https://thediplomat.com/2015/07/thailand-deports-100-uyghurs-to-china/> (Accessed 30/11/2020)

<sup>27</sup> Ullah, A. (2020). 'Turkey accused of deporting Uighurs back to China via third countries'. *Middle East Eye*, 27 Jul. Available at: <https://www.middleeasteye.net/news/uighurs-china-turkey-accused-deporting-third-countries> (Accessed 30/11/2020)

<sup>28</sup> MEE (2020). Middle East countries deported exiled Uighurs to China: Report. *Middle East Eye*, 02 Oct. Available at: <https://www.middleeasteye.net/news/uighur-china-middle-east-deport-beijing> (Accessed 30/11/2020)

<sup>29</sup> Radio Free Asia (2011). *Pakistan deports Uyghurs*. Available at: <https://www.rfa.org/english/news/uyghur/pakistan-08102011175506.html> (Accessed 30/11/2020)

<sup>30</sup> Radio Free Asia (2020) *Former Camp Detainee Says Kazakhstan Plans to Deport Her to China*. Available at: <https://www.rfa.org/english/news/uyghur/deport-01022020154739.html> (Accessed 30/11/2020)

<sup>31</sup> Ferrie, J. (2009). 'Cambodia to deport Uighurs despite persecution fears.' *Reuters*, Dec 19. Available at: <https://uk.reuters.com/article/us-cambodia-china-uighurs/cambodia-to-deport-uighurs-despite-persecution-fears-idUSTRE5BI0TX20091219> (Accessed 30/11/2020)

<sup>32</sup> Amnesty International UK (2020). *China: Uyghurs living abroad relentlessly harassed and intimidated - new testimony*. Available at: <https://www.amnesty.org.uk/press-releases/china-uyghurs-living-abroad-relentlessly-harassed-and-intimidated-new-testimony> (Accessed 30/11/2020)

<sup>33</sup> Bakht, S. (2020). 'China is spying on Uighur Muslims in the UK'. *Vice News*, 15 May. Available at: <https://www.vice.com/en/article/akzww8/china-surveillance-uighur-muslims-uk> (Accessed 30/11/2020)

<sup>34</sup> Yan, S. (2020). 'China continues to harass exiles on British soil, claim victims.' *The Times*, 16 Aug. Available at: <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2020/08/16/exclusive-china-continues-harass-exiles-british-soil-claim-victims/> (Accessed 30/11/2020)

The Government should also work with NGOs such as the World Uyghur Congress to identify and protect Uyghurs in the UK who are at risk of intimidation and harassment.<sup>35</sup>

- **Establish a Uyghur Vulnerable Persons Resettlement Scheme.**

The Government should commit to resettling the most vulnerable Uyghurs who have fled Xinjiang. Priority groups could include children and victims of torture or sexual violence.

The scheme could be modelled on the Syrian Vulnerable Persons Resettlement Programme, working with local authorities and other partners to reach those most in need.<sup>36</sup> Through this the Government should work to provide medical and psychological care where needed, including psychotherapy, individual and family counselling, bereavement support for children and adults, and specialist support for victims of torture and sexual violence.

**November 2020**

---

<sup>35</sup> World Uyghur Congress: <https://www.uyghurcongress.org/en/>

<sup>36</sup> Home Office (2017). *Guidance: Syrian vulnerable person resettlement programme fact sheet*. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/syrian-vulnerable-person-resettlement-programme-fact-sheet> (Accessed 30/11/2020)