



House of Lords Debate

On the policy towards China

19 December 2024

On 19 December, the House of Lords will debate the policy towards China, especially in relation to human rights and security issues arising from China's actions in Hong Kong, Taiwan, Tibet, and the South China Sea, and against the Uyghurs in Xinjiang.

This briefing comments on the situation of the Uyghur community and calls for comprehensive responses from the UK government.

I. Atrocity Crimes against the Uyghurs

The Uyghurs are a predominantly Muslim ethnic minority group mostly living in the Xinjiang Autonomous Region of the People's Republic of China. According to the United Nations, at least a million Uyghurs had been detained in the so-called 'counter-extremism centres' in Xinjiang. A further two million Uyghurs had been forced into so-called re-education camps for political and cultural indoctrination beginning in the middle of 2017.¹ The detentions, forcible training, as well as alleged abuses inside enclosed government facilities, were later described by the United States, several parliaments and international human rights experts as genocide and crimes against humanity.²

In March 2021, Newlines Institute for Strategy and Policy published a report co-authored by over 50 global experts in human rights, war crimes, and international law, analysing the situation of the Uyghur community in Xinjiang against the legal definition of genocide and the duties to prevent and punish the crime of genocide.³ The report concludes that the Chinese government *'bears State responsibility for committing genocide against the Uyghurs in breach of the 1948 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.'*

In July 2021, in its annual report on people trafficking, the US State Department reported:

In Xinjiang, the government is the trafficker. Authorities use threats of physical violence, forcible drug intake, physical and sexual abuse, and torture to force detainees to work in adjacent or off-site factories or worksites producing garments, footwear, carpets, yarn, food products, holiday decorations, building materials, extractives, materials for solar power equipment and other renewable energy components, consumer electronics, bedding, hair products, cleaning supplies, personal protective equipment, face masks, chemicals, pharmaceuticals, and other goods—and these goods are finding their way into businesses and homes around the world.⁴

¹ See: www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-asia-china-22278037.

² China committed genocide against Uyghurs, independent tribunal rules - BBC News; Xinjiang: US accuses China of 'genocide' of Uyghurs and minority groups - CNN. See: <https://edition.cnn.com/2021/01/19/us/us-xinjiang-china-genocide-intl/index.html>.

³ See:

<https://newlinesinstitute.org/uyghurs/the-uyghur-genocide-an-examination-of-chinas-breaches-of-the-1948-genocide-convention/>.

⁴ See: <https://www.state.gov/forced-labor-in-chinas-xinjiang-region/>.

In September 2021, Michelle Bachelet, the then High Commissioner for Human Rights, said at the opening of the UN Human Rights Council that her Office was finalising its assessment of the available information on allegations of serious human rights violations in that region, with a view to making it public. The report was ultimately published on Aug. 31, 2022, and found that:

the information currently available to [the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights] on implementation of the Government's stated drive against terrorism and 'extremism' in [Xinjiang] in the period 2017-2019 and potentially thereafter, also raises concerns from the perspective of international criminal law. The extent of arbitrary and discriminatory detention of members of Uyghur and other predominantly Muslim groups, pursuant to law and policy, in the context of restrictions and deprivation more generally of fundamental rights enjoyed individually and collectively, may constitute international crimes, in particular crimes against humanity.⁵

In November 2021, the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum's Simon-Skjodt Center for the Prevention of Genocide published its new report 'To Make Us Slowly Disappear: The Chinese Government's Assault on the Uyghurs,' providing their assessment of the situation of Uyghurs in Xinjiang.⁶ The report concludes that the Chinese government may be committing genocide against the Uyghurs. Furthermore, according to its findings, the Chinese government is failing in its legal obligation to prevent the crime of genocide. The report confirms that publicly available information indicates that the Chinese authorities have caused serious mental and bodily harm to members of the Uyghur community through:

the forced sterilisation of Uyghur women; the forced placement of IUDs; the detention of members of the Uyghur community; the physical abuse of detainees; the forced separation of Uyghur families, including children, whether by transfer or detention; and the forced labour extracted from Uyghurs held in detention as well as those recently released or otherwise not detained.

Further, the report indicated the use of rape and sexual violence as yet another way of causing serious bodily or mental harm to the members of the community. The report identified several ways the community is subjected to measures intended to prevent births within the group, including: *'Forced sterilisation of Uyghur women, and the forced or otherwise coerced implantation of IUDs in circumstances where they cannot be removed without surgical intervention approved by the state.'* These methods are said to be leading to the slow disappearance of the community from Xinjiang.

In December 2021, the Uyghur Tribunal, an independent inquiry, published its findings stating that the People's Republic of China (PRC) has committed genocide, crimes against

⁵ OHCHR assessment of human rights concerns in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region, People's Republic of China. (2022). OHCHR. <https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/documents/countries/2022-08-31/22-08-31-final-assesment.pdf>

⁶ See:

www.ushmm.org/genocide-prevention/reports-and-resources/the-chinese-governments-assault-on-the-uyghurs

humanity, and torture against Uyghur, Kazakh, and other ethnic minority citizens in the north-west region of China.⁷ The Uyghur Tribunal found that:

Torture of Uyghurs attributable to the PRC is established beyond reasonable doubt. Crimes against humanity attributable to the PRC is established beyond reasonable doubt by acts of: deportation or forcible transfer; imprisonment or other severe deprivation of physical liberty; torture; rape and other sexual violence; enforced sterilisation; persecution; enforced disappearance; and other inhumane acts.

The Uyghur Tribunal further added that *'it is satisfied beyond reasonable doubt that the PRC, by the imposition of measures to prevent births intended to destroy a significant part of the Uyghurs in Xinjiang as such, has committed genocide.'*

China has rejected these allegations, claiming that its policies towards the Uyghurs and other Muslim minorities living in its far western region are necessary to 'fight extremism' and to promote upward economic mobility for the impoverished ethnic groups.⁸ They have dismissed claims it is trying to reduce the Uyghur population through mass sterilisations as 'baseless', and claimed that allegations of forced labour were 'completely fabricated.'

II. Uyghur Forced Labour in the Fashion Industry

Among the atrocities perpetrated against the community is the use of forced labour.

For example, in 2020, the Australian Strategic Policy Institute (ASPI) published a report finding that, between 2017 and 2019, the Chinese Government facilitated the transfer of Uyghur Muslims and other ethnic minorities from Xinjiang to factories in various parts of China.⁹ According to the ASPI report, there are strong indications that some 80,000 Uyghurs have been forced to work in factories that form part of the supply chains of at least 83 global brands including:

Abercrombie & Fitch, Acer, Adidas, Alstom, Amazon, Apple, ASUS, BAIC Motor, BMW, Bombardier, Bosch, BYD, Calvin Klein, Candy, Carter's, Cerruti 1881, Changan Automobile, Cisco, CRRC, Dell, Electrolux, Fila, Founder Group, GAC Group (automobiles), Gap, Geely Auto, General Electric, General Motors, Google, H&M, Haier, Hart Schermer Marx, Hisense, Hitachi, HP, HTC, Huawei, iFlyTek, Jack & Jones, Jaguar, Japan Display Inc., L.L.Bean, Lacoste, Land Rover, Lenovo, LG, Li-Ning, Mayor, Meizu, Mercedes-Benz, MG, Microso, Mitsubishi, Mitsumi, Nike, Nintendo, Nokia, The North Face, Oculus, Oppo, Panasonic, Polo Ralph Lauren, Puma, Roewe, SAIC Motor, Samsung, SGMW, Sharp, Siemens, Skechers, Sony, TDK, Tommy Hilfiger, Toshiba, Tsinghua Tongfang, Uniqlo, Victoria's Secret, Vivo, Volkswagen, Xiaomi, Zara, Zegna, ZTE.

⁷ See: <https://uyghurtribunal.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/Uyghur-Tribunal-Judgment-9th-Dec-21.pdf>.

⁸ See:

<https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2021/2/22/china-rejects-uyghurs-genocide-charge-invites-uns-rights-chief>

⁹ See: <https://www.aspi.org.au/report/uyghurs-sale>.

The report suggests that these companies have used forced Uyghur labour in their supply chains. As a result, they could find themselves in breach of laws prohibiting the importation of goods made with forced labour.

The report focuses on a few case studies. For example, the report alleges that in January 2020, around 600 ethnic minority workers from Xinjiang were employed at Qingdao Taekwang Shoes Co. Ltd., making Nike sneakers. It further adds that:

At the factory, the Uyghur labourers make Nike shoes during the day. In the evening, they attend a night school where they study Mandarin, sing the Chinese national anthem and receive “vocational training” and “patriotic education.” The curriculum closely mirrors that of Xinjiang’s “re-education camps.”

In December 2020, Newline Institute published a new report on ‘*Coercive Labour in Xinjiang: Labour Transfer and the Mobilisation of Ethnic Minorities to Pick Cotton*’ shedding light on the scale of the issue of forced labour in China.¹⁰ The report stated that:

The evidence shows that in 2018, three Uyghur regions alone mobilised at least 570,000 persons into cotton-picking operations through the government’s coercive labour training and transfer scheme. Xinjiang’s total labour transfer of ethnic minorities into cotton picking likely exceeds that figure by several hundred thousand. Despite increased mechanisation, cotton picking in Xinjiang continues to rely strongly on manual labour.

Research suggests that in 2019, approximately 70% of the region’s cotton fields had to be picked by hand. The southern Xinjiang’s Uyghur regions grow high-quality long-staple cotton which is normally picked by hand. According to the report:

State policies have greatly increased the numbers of local ethnic minority pickers, reducing reliance on outside Han Chinese migrant labourers. The intensive two- to three-month period of cotton picking represents a strategic opportunity to boost rural incomes and therefore plays a key role in achieving the state’s poverty alleviation targets. These targets are mainly achieved through coercive labour transfers.

Considering that Xinjiang produces over 20% of the world’s cotton and in 2019, Xinjiang produced 84.9% of all cotton in China, it is correct to assume that many of the cotton products from China, that we buy and use daily, are trained in forced labour. Indeed, in April 2020, the Global Legal Action Network (GLAN), a group of human rights lawyers, gave evidence to HM Revenue and Customs (HMRC) that brands including Muji, Uniqlo, H&M and Ikea were selling products in the UK containing cotton and yarn from the Xinjiang region.¹¹ In response, H&M and Ikea promised to stop buying cotton from the region. Muji continues to use cotton yarn from Xinjiang but claims that its cotton and yarn are tainted in

¹⁰ See: <https://newlinesinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/20201214-PB-China-Cotton-NISAP-2.pdf>.

¹¹ See:

<https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/chinese-cotton-uk-government-important-uighur-muslim-labour-a9478501.html/>.

forced labour.¹² A similar position was taken by Uniqlo. Other companies, including PVH Corporation, which owns Calvin Klein and Tommy Hilfiger, confirmed that they did not source finished garments from the region.¹³ They further assured that they would avoid business with any factories and mills that produce garments or fabric that use cotton from Xinjiang. Adidas, similarly, confirmed that it did not source its goods from the region and even instructed its suppliers not to source yarn from Xinjiang.

In March 2021, UN experts investigating the situation expressed deep concern about the alleged detention and forced labour of Uyghurs.¹⁴ Their sources report that the Uyghur workers have been subjected to exploitative working and abusive living conditions that may constitute arbitrary detention, human trafficking, forced labour and enslavement. The sources alleged that hundreds of thousands of members of the Uyghur minority had been held in the so-called ‘re-education’ facilities before many of them were forcibly transferred to work in factories in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region and in other Chinese provinces. Those who have escaped the camps reported physical, mental and physical torture, rape and sexual violence. Evidence of mass sterilisations has also been revealed.¹⁵

III. Uyghur Forced Labour in Energy Sector’s Supply Chain

The energy industry is not free from forced labour.

In 2021, the Sheffield Hallam University Helena Kennedy Centre for International Justice published a report entitled *‘In Broad Daylight: Uyghur Forced Labour and Global Solar Supply Chains.’*¹⁶ The report indicates that the People’s Republic of China (PRC) has placed millions of indigenous Uyghur and Kazakh citizens from Xinjiang into what the government calls ‘surplus labour’ and ‘labour transfer’ programmes, or as we should call them - modern-day slavery state-sponsored programmes. The report concluded that the solar industry is particularly vulnerable to forced labour in Xinjiang because:

- 95% of solar modules rely on one primary material – solar-grade polysilicon.
- Polysilicon manufacturers in the Uyghur Region account for approximately 45% of the world’s solar-grade polysilicon supply.

¹² See:

<https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/chinese-cotton-uk-government-important-uyghur-muslim-labour-a9478501.html/>.

¹³ See:

<https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2020/jul/23/virtually-entire-fashion-industry-implicated-in-uyghur-forced-labour-say-rights-groups-china>

¹⁴ See: <https://www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=26957&LangID=E>

¹⁵ See:

<https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/china-conducting-mass-sterilization-muslim-minorities-amount-genocide/story?id=71519132>

¹⁶ See:

<https://www.shu.ac.uk/helena-kennedy-centre-international-justice/research-and-projects/all-projects/in-broad-daylight>.

- All polysilicon manufacturers in the Uyghur Region have reported their participation in labour transfer programmes and/or are supplied by raw materials companies that have.
- In 2020, China produced an additional 30% of the world's polysilicon on top of that produced in the Uyghur Region, a significant proportion of which may be affected by forced labour in the Uyghur Region as well.¹⁷

The report further identified:

- 11 companies engaged in labour transfers;
- 4 additional companies located within industrial parks have accepted labour transfers;
- 90 Chinese and international companies whose supply chains are affected.¹⁸

In 2023, the Sheffield Hallam University Helena Kennedy Centre for International Justice, in their report *'Overexposed: Uyghur Region Exposure Assessment for Solar Industry Sourcing'*, examined the issue of the lack of transparency by mapping—to the extent that available data and expertise in the field make possible—the supply chains of the solar industry's titans as well as a selection of other solar module manufacturers.¹⁹

The report found that:

- The Uyghur Region now accounts for approximately 35% of the world's polysilicon (down from 45%) and as much as 32% of global metallurgical-grade silicon production.
- **The vast majority of modules produced globally continues to have exposure to the Uyghur Region. Production in China significantly increases exposure.**
- Some of the world's largest module manufacturers appear to have bifurcated their supply chains to create a product line that they claim to be free of Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region inputs, though evidence of these claims varies by supplier. Most companies have suggested that these supply chains are dedicated to the US market or designed with [US Uyghur Forced Labor Prevention Act] compliance in mind. The portion of modules made by China-based companies on these dedicated supply chains appears to range from 7–14% of the companies' total production capacity globally.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ See:

<https://acrobat.adobe.com/link/track?uri=urn%3Aaaid%3Ausc%3AUS%3A5f29b5fb-e705-45a1-8b24-d61de77d8ddc&viewer%21megaVerb=group-discover>.

- Companies that have created supply chains purportedly free of Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region inputs continue to source from suppliers or sub-suppliers that have exposure to the Uyghur Region for other product lines.
- It is sometimes impossible to determine if it is indeed the case that their dedicated product lines are Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region-input-free because companies do not disclose sufficient supply chain information.
- Despite significant global pressure for increased transparency, information regarding solar industry sourcing is becoming less transparent over time, thwarting the world's ability to source ethically.²⁰

The issue of Uyghur forced labour-tainted solar panels is not a far-away problem without any relevance to HMG.

In April 2021, the Guardian published a report revealing that solar projects commissioned by the Ministry of Defence, the government's Coal Authority, United Utilities and some of the UK's biggest renewable energy developers are using panels made by Chinese solar companies accused of exploiting forced labour camps in Xinjiang province.²¹ According to the report, up to 40% of the UK's solar farms were built using panels manufactured by China's biggest solar panel companies, including Jinko Solar, JA Solar and Trina Solar. These companies were named as having links to Uyghur forced labour. The Guardian reported that:

An industry source, speaking on condition of anonymity, told the Guardian that the industry was scrambling to distance itself from the use of forced labour, and that up to four in 10 of the UK's existing solar farms were built using panels from the companies named in the report.

While many were built before 2016, the Guardian has found a string of more recent deals that raise questions about how carefully UK businesses and government agencies are vetting their supply chains.

Many manufacturers in China's solar industry operate factories in countries across Asia but may still use the raw polysilicon materials produced in Xinjiang, making it difficult to determine whether a particular production line has been exposed to alleged labour exploitation. China limits access for outside observers and media to Xinjiang.²²

In December 2023, BBC reported that the British Army was using solar panels made by companies that claimed to have a very high exposure to forced labour in China.²³ At the time, it was reported that the British Army was investing £200m in solar panels across four of its sites. The BBC reporting referred to another report from Sheffield Hallam University from

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ See:

<https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2021/apr/23/revealed-uk-solar-projects-using-panels-from-firms-linked-to-xinjiang-forced-labour>.

²² Ibid.

²³ See: <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-67550551>.

2023, Overexposed, which found that while scrutiny of solar supply chains has increased, transparency has decreased in the solar industry. As the report stressed, the lack of transparency has made it increasingly difficult to verify whether supply chains are free from the risk of Uyghur forced labour and reduces trust in the solar industry.

IV. The UK Responses to the Atrocities against the Uyghurs

On 22 April 2021, the UK House of Commons approved a non-binding motion recognising the atrocities as genocide and calling on the Chinese government to fulfil its obligations under international human rights law.²⁴ **This determination was not followed by any comprehensive responses.**

The UK has laws that are aimed at tackling modern-day slavery, including the Modern Slavery Act 2015 (MSA 2015). Among others, section 54 of the MSA 2015 requires businesses with more than £36 million turnover to publish a slavery and human trafficking statement every year. However, the UK Government does not monitor whether Section 54 statements comply with the MSA 2015 and has never used its powers to penalise companies if they do not.²⁵

In January 2021, in response to reports of forced labour in Xinjiang, Dominic Raab MP, the then Foreign Secretary, announced ‘a range of new measures to send a clear message that these violations of human rights are unacceptable, and at the same time to safeguard UK businesses and public bodies from any involvement or links with them.’²⁶ These measures included:

First, (...) new, robust and detailed guidance to UK businesses on the specific risks faced by companies with links to Xinjiang and underlining the challenges of conducting effective due diligence there. A minister-led campaign of business engagement will reinforce the need for UK businesses to take concerted action to address that particular and specific risk.

Second, we are strengthening the operation of the Modern Slavery Act. The Home Office will introduce fines for businesses that do not comply with their transparency obligations. The Home Secretary will introduce the necessary legislation, setting out the level of those fines, as soon as parliamentary time allows.

Third, we announced last September that the transparency requirements that apply to UK businesses under the Modern Slavery Act will be extended to the public sector. The FCDO will now work with the Cabinet Office to provide guidance and support to

²⁴ See:

<https://news.sky.com/story/house-of-commons-declares-uyghurs-are-being-subjected-to-genocide-in-china-12283995>

²⁵ See: Public Accounts Committee, Reducing Modern Slavery (May 2018).

²⁶ See:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/uk-government-announces-business-measures-over-xinjiang-human-rights-abuses>.

UK government bodies to exclude suppliers, where there is sufficient evidence of human rights violations in any of their supply chains. (...)

Fourth, the government will conduct an urgent review of export controls as they apply specifically geographically to the situation in Xinjiang, to make sure that we are doing everything that we can to prevent the export of any goods that could directly or indirectly contribute to human rights violations in that region.²⁷

In December 2021, Lord Ahmad of Wimbledon indicated that:

we are making good progress in implementing these measures. Our guidance to businesses has been updated; Ministers and officials have engaged with UK businesses and trade bodies; the review of export controls is underway, and we will introduce financial penalties under the Modern Slavery Act as soon as parliamentary time allows.²⁸

On 26 April 2022, the UK government tabled an amendment to the Health and Care Bill, which recognised the very serious problem of slavery and human trafficking in the supply chains in NHS procurement. The amendment gives the Secretary of State the power ‘*by regulations make such provision as the Secretary of State thinks appropriate with a view to eradicating the use in the health service in England of goods or services that are tainted by slavery and human trafficking.*’ Unfortunately, this does not necessarily mean banning the products tainted by forced labour. Furthermore, the amendment is limited to NHS procurement.

Several other amendments were considered to ensure that the UK does not buy products which are trained in forced labour.

In 2022, the Sheffield Hallam University Helena Kennedy Centre for International Justice published a report with UNISON and Stop Uyghur Genocide entitled ‘***Dirty Energy: Sourcing Solar Energy without Uyghur Forced Labour***’²⁹ to provide a guide on Uyghur forced labour and solar supply chains and help local government authorities (and other public bodies) make better purchasing decisions and streamline their solar supplier vetting process.

In January 2024, the Sheffield Hallam University Helena Kennedy Centre for International Justice, Anti-Slavery International, and the Investor Alliance for Human Rights published a policy guidance ‘***Respecting Rights in Renewable Energy: Supporting Investment in Sustainable and Ethical Green Technologies***’ on how to mitigate Uyghur forced labour risks in the renewable energy sector.³⁰

²⁷

See: <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/foreign-secretary-on-the-situation-in-xinjiang-and-the-governments-response>.

²⁸ See: <https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2021-11-29/hl4447>.

²⁹ See: <https://www.unison.org.uk/content/uploads/2022/08/Clean-dirty-energy-1.pdf>.

³⁰ See: <https://www.antislavery.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/ASI-HCIJ-IAHR-Policy-Brief-updated.pdf>.

V. International Responses: The Uyghur Forced Labour Prevention Act (United States)

Over the years, the US has introduced import bans on certain products tainted with forced labour. In addition, on 23 December 2021, President Biden signed into law the Uyghur Forced Labour Prevention Act,³¹ a bipartisan bill to ensure that goods made with forced labour in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region of the People's Republic of China do not enter the United States market. The law is a direct response to reports of Uyghurs and other Turkic minorities being subjected to forced labour and other atrocities and is to prevent US businesses and consumers from becoming complicit in the atrocities.

The Uyghur Forced Labour Prevention Act creates a rebuttable presumption that any goods, wares, articles, and merchandise mined, produced, or manufactured wholly or in part in Xinjiang or produced by a listed entity, the importation of such goods, wares, articles, is prohibited and such goods, wares, articles, and merchandise are not entitled to entry at any of the ports of the United States.

The Act provides for an exception where the importer has fully complied with the guidance described in the Act, completely and substantively responded to all inquiries for information submitted by the Commissioner to ascertain the origin of the goods, and ‘by clear and convincing evidence, that the good, ware, article, or merchandise was not mined, produced, or manufactured wholly or in part by forced labour.’

Commenting upon the development, Speaker Nancy Pelosi said that:

The ongoing genocide perpetrated by the Chinese government against the Uyghur people and other Muslim minorities is a challenge to the conscience of the entire world, which is why the House twice passed legislation to hold the Chinese Communist Party [CCP] accountable for its exploitation of forced labour and put an end to this horrific practice.

Pelosi added:

Congress, on a bipartisan and bicameral basis, will continue to condemn and confront the CCP’s human rights abuses in Xinjiang and many other abuses in the region, from Hong Kong to Tibet to the mainland. If America does not speak out for human rights in China because of commercial interests, we lose all moral authority to speak out for human rights in any place in the world.

The Act is a welcome step to ensure that businesses are not complicit in the atrocities perpetrated against the Uyghurs in Xinjiang.

The Act places the burden on those importing the goods to prove that the products are not tainted with forced labour. This is to reflect that businesses too have human rights obligations. Businesses have a responsibility to respect human rights wherever they operate in the world, in accordance with the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights

³¹ See: <https://www.congress.gov/bill/117th-congress/house-bill/6256/text>.

(UNGPs). This corporate responsibility exists even if the state (where the companies operate) does not fulfil its duty to adhere to human rights obligations. Businesses must step up their efforts to ensure that their supply chain due diligence is conducted and publicise it to ensure transparency of the process. They must ensure that if human rights abuses are identified, such abuses are stopped, and remedial actions are taken as a matter of urgency. The human rights project will not work if businesses look the other way when human rights abuses are happening.

VI. Recommendations

The UK Government should, among others:

- Conduct an assessment of the situation of Uyghurs in Xinjiang, including in line with its JACS assessment, but also against the UN's Framework for Analysis of Atrocity Crimes; and identify a comprehensive response plan that is fully reflective of the nature and scale of the atrocities.
- Review the laws pertaining to the issue of modern-day slavery, including in the supply chains, and identify shortfalls that enable products tainted in forced labour to continue to flood the UK market.
- Introduce laws to address the shortfalls, including:
 - To ban the import of all products from Xinjiang, unless the importer can prove that the products were not tainted in modern-day slavery;
 - Where it is not possible to univocally exclude the possibility that the products were tainted in modern-day slavery, the products must be labelled accordingly, to inform customers accordingly.
- Lead the efforts at the UN to ensure that the situation of the Uyghurs is given the attention it requires, including following up on the findings of the former UN High Commissioner for Human Rights and securing time to discuss the findings; and establishing a UN (General Assembly) mechanism to collect and preserve the evidence of the crimes committed against the Uyghurs (akin IIM, IIMM and/or UNITAD).
- Raise the community's situation at every engagement with Chinese counterparts.

Contact:

Dr Ewelina U. Ochab, IBAHRI senior programme lawyer, co-founder of the Coalition for Genocide Response ewelina.ochab@int-bar.org