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Executive summary

The Xinjiang Work Forum, convened in May 2010, heralded an unprecedented state-led development push in East Turkestan. Policies adopted at the Work Forum focused on natural resource extraction, infrastructure projects, demolitions, trade promotion, tax reform and the transference of capital, investment and personnel from eastern areas of the People’s Republic of China (PRC). Two years later, the Chinese government has yet to put in place a system to effectively monitor and assess the progress of these region-wide initiatives. Chinese officials have not clearly stated what targets, if any, they are using to measure the effects of their policies. In an echo of Maoist policies of the past, and a continuance of the failure to monitor the progress of the Great Western Development Drive, central and regional Chinese leaders have in the past two years relied upon top-down development while neglecting to lay out a clear blueprint for analyzing its grassroots effects.

The Xinjiang Work Forum was prompted in large part by the tacit acknowledgment on the part of Chinese officials that economic policies in the region had failed to bring about their desired results, such as developmental parity. Inequalities stemming from the failure of these policies, the effects of which were borne largely by the region’s Uyghur and other non-Han populations, contributed to the turbulent unrest that shook the regional capital of Urumchi in July 2009. However, the policies designed at the Work Forum have largely left unaddressed the same inequalities and discrimination that helped lead to the unrest. Three years after the turmoil in Urumchi, development strategy in the region remains devoid of an adequate framework from which to evaluate and mitigate economic conditions impacting the non-Han community, such as unequal income distribution, high levels of poverty, and hiring discrimination. At its core, regional development is plagued by the lack of consultation and participation of Uyghurs and other non-Han residents regarding the formulation and implementation of the policies that affect them.

In this report, the Uyghur Human Rights Project (UHRP) strives to provide an overview of the nature of development policies put in place in the two years since the Work Forum. UHRP also seeks to document the ways in which Work Forum initiatives have not ensured the equal distribution of the benefits of development among the region’s population. Until the flaws in regional development initiatives are remedied, and stark disparities are addressed, the future success of development in East Turkestan will be left in question.
Background

Against a backdrop of imbalanced economic growth between its eastern and western regions, the Chinese central government initiated the Great Western Development Drive (GWDD) as part of its 10th Five Year Plan (2001-2005). Given that disparate rates of regional economic growth could have destabilizing effects, especially in areas with high proportions of non-Han Chinese people, the GWDD initiative was given the ambitious task of achieving economic parity for China’s west.

The GWDD covers a vast geographic area including five autonomous regions, six provinces and one municipality. In East Turkestan, a region that encompasses one-sixth of the entire territory of the People’s Republic of China (PRC), the GWDD was characterized by investment in large-scale natural resources projects and infrastructure development.

In the years following the implementation of the GWDD until unrest in the regional capital of Urumchi in 2009, policies designed to bring regional economic parity had the effect of exacerbating income inequality between Uyghurs and Han Chinese. This section looks to evaluate state performance under the GWDD in regard to employment opportunities, income distribution and levels of poverty.

Employment opportunities

In a 2009 Time Magazine article, journalist Austin Ramzy quotes a Uyghur interviewee on the employment situation among Uyghurs in East Turkestan: “If you’re Han, there are opportunities. But if you’re from my group, there’s nothing you can do...We’re all hungry. We go all over looking for work, but they say they don’t want Uighurs.”

Uyghur economist Ilham Tohti stated that by the end of the 9th Five Year Plan approximately 1.5 million people were unemployed in East Turkestan. Although Tohti did not provide exact figures, he inferred that the majority of this number came from the Uyghur community. The account of the young man in the Time article, taken together with Tohti’s research, suggests both that Uyghur unemployment is high, and that much of
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this unemployment is due to ethnic discrimination. Despite a dearth of state-produced
evidence on the ethnic composition of regional unemployment, evidence does exist to
substantiate discrimination faced by Uyghurs in securing employment across a range of
professions.

The Congressional-Executive Commission on China (CECC) and the Uyghur Human
Rights Project (UHRP) have reported on advertisements that openly discriminate against
Uyghur candidates for jobs with the Xinjiang Production and Construction Corps
(XPCC) and in the regional education sector. Vacancies posted online clearly stated
preferences for people of Han Chinese ethnicity. The CECC survey of XPCC job
announcements showed that of 894 available positions, 744 were reserved for Han
Chinese applicants, and that in Aksu district, of 436 positions in the school district, 347

“Help Wanted” sign outside the Postal Hotel (邮政宾馆) in Kashgar, photo taken in July 2009. The last
line says, “This offer is for Han Chinese (汉族) only, ages 18-30.” ©The Atlantic

borderland. New York: M.E. Sharpe for more on employment discrimination.
positions were set-aside for those of Han Chinese ethnicity. UHRP research uncovered a similar pattern in advertisements from educational institutes in Kashgar and Khotan, as well as in numerous positions for civil service jobs.

CECC research also indicates the practice of ethnic discrimination in the state sector job market that has occurred since the inception of the GWDD is not new. In 2005, CECC reported that all of the 500 to 700 new civil service appointments made by the regional and central government in the Uyghur majority area of southern East Turkestan were reserved for members of the Han nationality. One year on, a further CECC report showed that discrimination had not abated in the recruitment of civil servants.

Differences in employment distribution between ethnicities can also be detected amongst companies benefiting from GWDD-generated investment in natural resources extraction. The problem has spanned the length of the GWDD. In 2000, the Washington Post stated that the “[oil] industry is now almost completely run by Han. The China National Petroleum Co. has brought most of its workers here from other parts of China, all but bypassing the provincial Xinjiang Petroleum Bureau in carrying out exploration.” Over ten years later, CECC had seen no improvement among natural resource industry employers. The Commission documented that all 50 jobs advertised by the Xinjiang PetroChina Pipe Engineering Co. in August 2011 had been exclusively reserved for Han Chinese.

Employment discrimination against Uyghurs has continued despite numerous domestic laws preventing such practices. Article 4 of the Chinese Constitution, Articles 9 and 22 of the Regional Ethnic Autonomy Law, Articles 12 and 14 of the Labor Law and Articles 3
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and 28 of the Employment Promotion Law all clearly state that ethnic minorities should receive equal opportunity in the job market.\textsuperscript{13}
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\caption{Han Chinese workers in the natural gas industry in East Turkestan. ©Tianshan Net.}
\end{figure}

In a 2009 article, scholars Ben Hopper and Michael Webber publish the results of a survey on Uyghur and Han attitudes to employment opportunities. Asked whether employment conditions in East Turkestan were better or worse than 10 years ago, 76.3\% of Uyghurs stated that the employment situation was worse as opposed to 48.6\% of Han Chinese. 17.1\% of Uyghurs interviewed said that they felt the situation was better compared to 31.1\% of Han Chinese. “Respondents were also asked the reason for such worsening conditions. Most blamed the escalation in numbers of job seekers and 85 per cent of Uyghurs specified Han in-migrants. Several would not answer the question directly, saying that they did not wish to discuss political matters.”\textsuperscript{14} Hopper and Webber’s study quotes a Uyghur interviewee who echoed the sentiments of many Uyghurs in East Turkestan: “If a Han comes from inner land, there’s always a job ready for him. Even if the Uyghur can speak Chinese and has the requisite skills, the Han won’t give him or her the job.”\textsuperscript{15}


**Income Distribution and Levels of Poverty**

In 2001, proven oil reserves in East Turkestan stood at 2.6 billion tons, and at 647 billion cubic meters for natural gas.\(^{16}\) In 2008, East Turkestan produced 27 million tons of crude oil and 24 billion cubic meters of natural gas.\(^{17}\) By 2009, regional GDP growth at 8.1% was slightly lower than in China as a whole, which stood at 8.7%.\(^{18}\)

Despite the wealth of East Turkestan’s natural resources, Uyghurs are poorer than Han Chinese. Citing a study by Boorah, Gustafsson and Shi, scholar Huhua Cao noted “the estimated probability of being poor in the western region was 5 to 7 points higher for ethnic minorities than for the Han majority.”\(^{19}\) In 2004, four years after the implementation of the GWDD policies, Human Rights Watch senior researcher Nicholas Bequelin observed:


the socio-economic development of ethnic minorities [in East Turkestan] continues to fall behind on all indicators: southern Xinjiang (with a 95 per cent non-Han population) has an average per capita income half the provincial average. In the more prosperous Yili Kazakh Autonomous Prefecture, bordering Kazakhstan, 98 per cent of the officially designated “poor” population is non-Han.20

Calla Wiemer also documented this pattern of lower incomes and higher poverty rates among ethnic minorities in East Turkestan in 2004. She stated that, “there exists a strong pattern of disparity related to ethnicity. Han Chinese tend to be concentrated in more economically developed areas, whereas Turkic peoples predominate in poorer regions.” This spatial and ethnically delineated economic disparity illustrates how little the GWDD has achieved in improving conditions among the Uyghur people.

By 2010, Huhao Cao’s study of spatial and ethnic income disparity in East Turkestan found that: “80% of the total poverty designated counties in the province consist of minority communities where, in most cases, minority populations represent over 90% of the total population. Substantially lower income levels are a distinctive characteristic of minority areas, even when compared to rural populations in non-minority regions.”21


Hopper and Webber discovered that income disparities between Uyghur and Han Chinese were also evident among the urban population in East Turkestan. Hopper and Webber recorded average incomes among Urumchi’s Uyghurs at ¥613.14 per month, which was close to ¥200 less than Han Chinese surveyed in their study. This income disparity accounted for the lower quality of housing for Uyghurs, according to the two scholars: “More sophisticated analysis suggests that Uyghurs have poorer accommodation than Han because they pay less rent, which is in turn a product of lower incomes. On these two measures of integration into city life (income and housing conditions) Han fare significantly better than Uyghurs.”

Geographic areas of East Turkestan that are less networked into the national economy and that contain more Uyghurs may explain higher poverty rates among rural Uyghurs; however, given the evidence that Hopper and Webber present on urban Uyghurs, it is reasonable to suggest that lower incomes and higher poverty is more than simply a regional issue, but also an ethnic issue. As Huhua Cao states: “The concentration of ethnic minorities reflects not only their spatial segregation, but also the degree of their socioeconomic exclusion from the majority.”

The benefits of centrist development planning, such as the GWDD in East Turkestan, have manifested themselves unequally between Han Chinese and Uyghurs. Investment into sectors of the economy that are not traditionally Uyghur areas of economic activity has led to the view that government initiatives are largely aimed at Han Chinese:

The perception is that this development strategy privileges the Han and disadvantages the Uygur and other minorities. Such perceptions reinforce the negative images of the development process – negative images fed by empirical evidence showing the decline of employment opportunities for Uygur people in skilled urban jobs and the tertiary sector.

Scholar Isabel Yang adds that state development policies that exacerbate economic disparities between Uyghur and Han Chinese have created considerable strain on inter-ethnic relations:

the investment opportunities in Xinjiang have been mainly brought in by the Han and benefitted the Han. Where the Uygur population is larger, the
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economy tends to be worse off with fewer investment opportunities. Therefore, socio-economic inequality can be translated into ethnic discrimination and hence, state investment can be counter-productive in addressing ethnic tensions.\(^{26}\)

Despite the stated aims of the GWDD, the policies did not resolve the issues of income inequality and increased levels of poverty among non-Han minority groups in East Turkestan. To the contrary, the development policies of the GWDD seem to have exacerbated these problems while furthering the perception among Uyghurs and other minorities that they are being intentionally excluded from development in the region. In 2010, central leaders organized the Xinjiang Work Forum to update and improve their policies for the region. In the next section of the report UHRP will assess the policies that came out of the Xinjiang Work Forum.

---

The Xinjiang Work Forum: Policy and Practice

The Xinjiang Work Forum, which took place from May 17 to 19, 2010 in Beijing, was a meeting of top central government and Party leaders that laid out goals for state economic and political development initiatives in East Turkestan. No Uyghur was present at the meeting, even those Uyghurs within the CCP framework.\(^{27}\) Prior to the Work Forum, central government authorities had outlined a strategic plan to ensure “leapfrog development and lasting stability” in East Turkestan.\(^ {28}\) Newly appointed regional Party chief Zhang Chunxian listed “poor economic structure, lack of capital, infrastructure and skills, […] and social instability” as factors hindering the region’s development.\(^ {29}\)

Both the Work Forum and Zhang’s appointment as the replacement of Wang Lequan, the widely unpopular former Xinjiang Party Secretary, signaled central and regional authorities’ tacit recognition of the need to reform state policy in East Turkestan. The protests and unrest that rocked the regional capital the previous year, beginning on July 5, 2009, revealed the failure of state policies, such as the GWDD, to ensure development and stability in East Turkestan. The regional economy’s double-digit growth prior to July 2009 did not preclude unrest or ease the unemployment that was rampant among young


\(^{29}\) Ibid.
Uyghur men, prompting a government researcher’s assertion that economic factors were “at least half” to blame.\(^{30}\)

Chinese President Hu Jintao told Work Forum attendees, which included representatives of the XPCC,\(^{31}\) military, and People’s Armed Police,\(^{32}\) that the Forum’s two major tasks of development and stability had been prompted by ‘activities of separatist forces to divide the motherland’ and ‘contradictions’ stemming from issues such as the growing needs of a ‘material culture.’”\(^{33}\) Hu also stressed the need to implement current state policy toward regional ethnic and religious affairs,\(^{34}\) suggesting that existing restrictions


\(^{31}\) The XPCC, a Han-run organization that answers to Beijing instead of regional authorities, makes up 13% of East Turkestan’s population, yet controls 31% of the arable land. Founded in 1954, it is a semi-military government organization that administers several medium-sized cities, settlements and farms in East Turkestan.


\(^{34}\) Ibid.
on cultural and religious practices would remain in force. State media reported that officials would renew programs to promote the security of border areas.\textsuperscript{35}

The Work Forum was the first such meeting held with regard to East Turkestan. Chinese officials have held five work forums regarding Tibet, with the latest taking place in January 2010.\textsuperscript{36} Officials at the Xinjiang Work Forum outlined large-scale development plans, funded by government aid worth tens of billions of U.S. dollars,\textsuperscript{37} aimed at building industry, infrastructure, investment and education in the region.\textsuperscript{38} They also announced government plans to create jobs, alleviate poverty,\textsuperscript{39} extend pension

\begin{center}
PetroChina gas station in East Turkestan. ©Wikipedia.
\end{center}
coverage, raise per-capita GDP to the national average, raise regional incomes and increase public service access. A new policy set forth at the Work Forum mandated an increase in the tax base of the region, in which the tax on natural resources was to be determined on price rather than volume. Two months after the Work Forum was held, China National Petroleum Corporation (CNPC) announced that it would develop East Turkestan as China’s leading base for the production, processing and reserve of oil over the next decade, which the firm’s president stated would “contribute to the region’s stability”.

While the Work Forum largely reaffirmed the state’s existing focus on infrastructure and natural resource industries in the region, it also included several initiatives designed to direct state investment away from the Han-dominated northern parts of East Turkestan. One such initiative was a pairing assistance program between 19 ‘developed’ eastern provinces and 82 sub-districts of East Turkestan that includes transfers of human and financial capital.

Absent at the Forum was any acknowledgment of repeated calls on the part of the Uyghur population to address the broader political, religious, economic, and cultural grievances that led to the July 5 unrest. The peaceful demonstration that preceded the unrest was organized as a response to the failure of the Chinese state to protect Uyghurs in Chinese society. Specifically, the mob killings of Uyghurs at a toy factory in Shaoguan, Guangdong Province in June 2009 prompted Uyghurs to protest officials’ failure to prosecute the Chinese perpetrators.

Also absent at the Forum was any declaration to specifically address issues along the lines of ethnic inequality, including inequalities in employment practices in the private and state sectors, as well as disparities in income distribution and poverty levels that reflect inequalities between Uyghurs and Han. No policies were adopted to specifically facilitate the participation of Uyghurs or other non-Han groups in the new investment plans being drawn up for the region. Additionally, no policies were implemented to ensure the preservation of various aspects of the Uyghur cultural realm that are under
threat, including the Uyghur language and the physical and social landscape of Uyghur communities.

Authorities at the work conference drew up plans to promote “bilingual” education in all schools in East Turkestan by 2015, focusing on the southern part of the region, with the goal of having all students speak fluent Mandarin by the year 2020. Under the “bilingual” education policy, the Chinese government is implementing the politicized, top-down removal of the Uyghur language at all levels of instruction, and replacing it with Mandarin Chinese. Xinjiang People’s Political Consultative Conference (XPPCC) Chairman Ashat Kerimbay told the Wen Wei Po in advance of the Work Forum, “It’s essential that people in Xinjiang learn Chinese, because not everyone can be provided an interpreter when they interact with ethnic Han people.”

Pairing assistance

Under the “pairing assistance” or “counterpart support” program which authorities renewed and intensified at the Work Forum, relatively prosperous provinces and cities in eastern China provide localities in East Turkestan with fiscal, human, and other


assistance.\textsuperscript{47} While the program has been in place for 15 years, plans formulated at the Work Forum expanded the number of partner locations from 14 to 19 and directed these eastern cities and provinces to provide localities in East Turkestan with more than $1.5 billion over the next five years, focusing on southern East Turkestan.\textsuperscript{48} The number of cities and towns receiving aid in the region also increased to 82 from 56.\textsuperscript{49} Cities and provinces providing partner assistance must invest a designated percentage of annual income, 0.3\% to 0.6\% of fiscal revenue,\textsuperscript{50} to their partner areas.\textsuperscript{51}

Kashgar has been slated to receive nearly half of the total aid allotted to East Turkestan under the counterpart program. The city of Shenzhen, a boomtown north of Hong Kong, has been partnered with Kashgar, and will provide the city with much of the aid it


receives.\(^52\) The city of Shanghai, paired with Kashgar Prefecture, pledged to “complete resettlement projects for 80,000 households” in four counties within three years, in addition to investing in medical treatment, education, and other areas.\(^53\) Guangdong Province has also been paired with two counties in Kashgar Prefecture, and was slated to invest ¥1.078 billion ($166.34 million) on 73 livelihood projects in its partner regions in 2011, in housing, infrastructure, public services and employment.\(^54\) In addition, Shandong Province has been paired with four counties in Kashgar Prefecture, with more than 200 Shandong-backed projects requiring ¥24.6 billion in funding from Shandong companies.

Pairing assistance programs are consistent with investment strategies previously implemented under the GWDD that have exacerbated Uyghur marginalization from the economy. Combined with the state-led onslaught of migration from outside of East Turkestan, the deliberate exclusion of Uyghurs from pairing assistance planning does little to alleviate Uyghur fears that pairing assistance initiatives are calculated to leave them disenfranchised.

**Special economic trading areas**

Officials at the Work Forum mandated the creation, through subsidies and tax incentives, of two “special economic trading areas,” one in Kashgar, and the other along the border with Kazakhstan at Khorgas. Kashgar’s new status prompted the launch of flights to the city from Beijing and Hong Kong, together with construction projects subsidized with aid worth billions of U.S. dollars from the central government.\(^56\) Beijing authorities have touted the new trading areas not only as new sources of economic growth, but as regional economic hubs that help bring about trade with Central, South and western Asian countries, as well as eastern Europe.\(^57\)

The development of the two special areas comes at the same time the government is investing in rail lines from China to both Central Asia and Pakistan, and shortly after the extension of a rail line from Urumchi to Khotan via Kashgar on the Southern Xinjiang
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\(^{55}\) The areas are also referred to in Chinese state media as “economic development zones.”


Railway. Passenger trains began running from Urumchi to Kashgar in December 1999, and from Kashgar to Khotan in June 2011. Since Han migration tends to follow transportation lines, the advent of train service has brought changes to the demography of both cities, although the vast majority of the population in Kashgar and Khotan remains Uyghur, and exact rates of Han in-migration are unclear. The changes taking place in these cities following the arrival of train linkages are the same as those brought about by the demographic shift in East Turkestan as a whole— the erosion of the foundations of Uyghur culture, and their replacement with Han Chinese economic, social, cultural and political institutions.

The central government announced in 2011 that electronics, textiles, metallurgy and renewable energy manufacturing would be key areas for development in Kashgar. As of late 2011, ¥880 million had been spent on a free trade center created at the Khorgas border site, which facilitates cross-border investment in industries such as processing,
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manufacturing, and merchandise procurement,\textsuperscript{61} in addition to development in areas such as chemicals, farm products and pharmaceuticals.\textsuperscript{62}

Kashgar’s mayor, Memet Emin Bekri, has tried to rally Uyghur clergy and their followers in Kashgar to embrace “big construction, big opening and big development.”\textsuperscript{63} State media reported that Kashgar’s new trading area could create as many as 600,000 jobs, more than the current population of Kashgar proper. At the same time, official media reports have recommended that soldiers from other parts of China, as well as skilled migrant workers from cities and provinces providing partnership assistance to Kashgar, be encouraged to relocate or sent to the city to work there.\textsuperscript{64}

The new development zone in Kashgar elicited ¥10.7 billion in investment in 2010, an increase of 52 percent over the previous year, with the majority of funds coming from outside of East Turkestan.\textsuperscript{65} Based upon an existing industrial park covering only five square kilometers, initial plans called for the zone to be expanded first to 8.5 square kilometers and later to 160 square kilometers.\textsuperscript{66} The new development area in Khorgas, which encompasses 73 square kilometers, received total investment of ¥20.8 billion ($3.3 billion) by October 2011, from 12 investment initiatives.\textsuperscript{67} A senior official in charge of the area told the \textit{China Daily} that a planned rail facility was set to become “the biggest transshipment station in Asia”.\textsuperscript{68}

\textbf{Demolitions}

Officials at the Work Forum also laid forth plans to accelerate the demolition of homes in Uyghur towns and neighborhoods throughout East Turkestan, and to resettle 100,000 herdsmen in the region. The \textit{China Daily} announced after the Work Forum that 700,000 urban families would be moved to “safer and earthquake-resistant houses” by 2015, and that “shantytowns” would “disappear from cities in five years.”\textsuperscript{69}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[64] Ibid.
\item[68] Ibid.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
The vast majority of residents in communities displaced by demolition and reconstruction projects that have taken place have been Uyghurs. The demolition of Kashgar’s Old City, an ancient and vibrant hub of Uyghur culture, has constituted the biggest transformation of Uyghur communities in East Turkestan. Large-scale demolition of the Old City began in February 2009 as part of an official “residents resettlement project” aimed at demolishing 85% of the Old City and moving its 220,000 Uyghur residents (approximately half of the population of Kashgar itself) to other parts of Kashgar.

Demolition work in Kashgar’s Old City was expanded in 2010. A March 2010 report from Tianshan Net stated that the initial “pilot project,” under which demolitions had been carried out in five neighborhoods in the Old City, would be significantly broadened in 2010. Other Uyghur communities throughout the region have also been subjected to major demolition and reconstruction plans since 2010, including (but not limited to) other areas of Kashgar Prefecture, the Tashbulaq (Chinese: Heijiashan) District of Urumchi, Turpan, Hotan, Ghulja, Kumul, Aksu, Korla, and Uyghur neighborhoods in Karamay and Bortala.
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**Tax reform**

Under the new policy on natural resource taxes set forth at the Work Forum, taxes on oil and gas increased from less than one percent to five percent, and from ¥12 ($1.76) per ton to ¥200 ($29.29) per ton. According to the *Global Times*, the new policy would result in an additional ¥five billion ($732 million) in tax revenue per year for the region from China’s top two oil companies, CNPC and Sinopec, alone.²² By 2011, regional authorities recorded over ¥100 billion ($15.9 billion) in revenue.²³ At a grassroots level, tax relief under the new policy was offered to small businesses, and state assistance, especially in securing employment, was promised.²⁴ At the same time, however, large-scale investment in natural resources was re-emphasized. In addition, as with other areas of policy developed at the Work Forum, no tax policy was introduced with the aim of providing tax benefits specifically to the Uyghur population.

**Security initiatives**

In line with a renewed and highly politicized official commitment to promote security and stability in East Turkestan, officials at the Work Forum called on regional government agencies to promote the forum’s goals. For example, the XUAR High People’s Court issued a notice calling on courts in the region, in the “spirit” of the Work Forum, to “serve” the causes of “development by leaps and bounds” in dealing with some types of court cases.²⁵ In addition, the notice stresses the need to ensure the “long term
stability” of the region through actions such as punishing individuals who commit “state security crimes.”  

In their remarks at the Work Forum, both Hu Jintao and Premier Wen Jiabao stressed the need to invest in and strengthen the XPCC. Security chief Zhou Yongkang told Work Forum attendees that the XPCC should play a fundamental role in “liberating people’s thinking”, and should take advantage of “historical opportunities,” in order to ensure the creation of a “moderately well-off society.”

---

76 Ibid; Under Chinese law, individuals can be prosecuted for “endangering state security” if they are believed to have engaged in subversion, “splittism”, and “illegally providing state secrets to overseas entities,” all charges that are of a highly subjective nature in China.


78 Ibid.
An Assessment of the Xinjiang Work Forum

It has been over two years since the Xinjiang Work Forum was convened in Beijing. It is too early to judge the efficacy of the policies stemming from the Work Forum with regards to restructuring policies from the Great Western Development Drive toward “a more equitable spatial pattern of growth” in East Turkestan. However, this does not preclude an analysis that assesses the strategic approach and manner of implementation of Work Forum polices, especially when compared to preceding failed economic policies towards the Uyghurs.

The state approach toward Work Forum policy formation and implementation follows a pattern seen in the shaping of the GWDD. Most notably, participatory mechanisms for Uyghurs are absent in central government policy formation and in local government implementation. These established roles for central-local authorities can be seen at work in a regional economic conference held in Urumchi in December 2011, whose main purpose was for the Xinjiang leadership to study the latest central directives regarding economic policy. Although UHRP cannot independently confirm this, Xinjiang policy analysts have, in conversations with UHRP, noted tensions in this hierarchical and ‘top down’ process. Officials often resent the center’s understanding of realities in the region, especially in regard to the need for greater security measures over ‘development’ in realizing stability in the region.

The lack of Uyghur input into Work Forum policy formation or implementation likely limits the central government’s understanding of local conditions, especially considering the recruitment of 3,749 cadres from other regions to assist with policy implementation. Cadres are routinely relocated around China as a general rule, but the linguistic and customary differences in working with Uyghurs at grassroots levels make it more important to have officials who understand local conditions. As scholar Stanley Toops commented in relation to the regional pairing scheme, “[t]he coordination of all these projects will be quite difficult particularly since the experts from the east coast may not be very familiar with local conditions in Xinjiang.”

Oversight mechanisms are also conspicuously absent in Work Forum policies. The Xinjiang Work Forum’s very clear lack of interim targets and an independent monitoring body is consistent with previous GWDD policies. This lack of monitoring procedures ensures that Uyghur input on policy performance is absent and any consequent reassessment and realignment of policy in their interests appears unlikely.

---

In addition, the need to monitor the disbursement of increased regional government revenues from restructured natural resource taxes to Uyghurs is important if Uyghur grievances over distribution of benefits are to be addressed. Even though there are very few civil society oversight mechanisms in state interventions in China as a whole, in the case of the Uyghur in East Turkestan, Human Rights Watch researcher Nicholas Bequelin argues that the ‘development model’ in East Turkestan is designed to integrate the region with China.⁸³ At least in the eyes of the government, Uyghur oversight over projects that directly affect them appears to conflict with that longer-term strategy.

The Work Forum has slightly realigned the previous GWDD policies when viewed from the grassroots. The new policies’ small shift has been toward more investment in human development and more spatially dispersed infusions of capital, which differs from the GWDD large-scale investment in natural resources predominately located in the north of the region.⁸⁴ Even so, this adjustment is minor; like the GWDD preceding it, the key focus of the Work Forum is on increased investment in construction and natural resource extraction. Observers such as Xu Jianying at the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences have openly stated that the government should be doing more for marginalized groups in East Turkestan.⁸⁵ While some tax concessions and encouragement for banks to loan to small rural enterprises are included in Work Forum policies, the scale of investment in natural resource industries (a sector of the economy that has largely bypassed Uyghurs) overshadows such initiatives.⁸⁶ There is no evident policy to increase the ratio of Uyghurs employed in the natural resources extraction sector.

In a 2011 article, *Financial Times* reporter Kathrin Hille details how Zhejiang Province financed the building of an industrial park in Hotan, which she says has “done nothing to improve the lot of Hotan’s population.”⁸⁷ Hille adds:

> Most investors who bought plots [in the industrial park] are in no hurry to build factories. Xinjiang’s oil, gas and coal reserves – the big draw for China’s state-owned enterprises – are hundreds of kilometres north of Hotan…Several senior posts in the Hotan city government have been filled by officials from Beijing and critics fear the partnership will fuel corruption and more land speculation. ‘The only thing the Beijing government cares about is how they can profit from this,’ says one Hotan resident who asks not to be named for fear of government retribution.

---


A recent *China Daily* report described the huge investment that had gone into Kashgar from a pairing initiative with Shandong province. The article ironically illustrates a lack of Uyghur participation in investment opportunities despite the Work Forum’s slight policy shift toward smaller business. In the article, there is no mention of Uyghurs as beneficiaries of Shandong investment and all the business owners interviewed had Chinese names. In addition, brick and cement companies were benefitting from the government-mandated demolition of the Uyghur Old City in Kashgar.⁸⁸

![Chinese workers build a Shandong Iron and Steel Group facility near Kashgar. ©China Daily.](image)

When asked in an interview with Chinese state media about the changes that had happened in the first two years of the Work Forum policies, Xinjiang Party Secretary Zhang Chunxian was very short on specifics. He discussed the general growth of the region, but gave no details on Uyghur welfare—a statistic generally absent from Chinese reporting on economic performance.⁹⁹ However, the interview also asked the Party Secretary about security in the region, a key component of the Work Forum targeted at Uyghurs. Zhang responded with familiar refrains of crackdowns on the “three forces”,⁹⁰ management of religious affairs and social management. These measures have been in place in East Turkestan since the Work Forum, with a number of crackdowns and
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⁹⁰ *The three forces are “terrorists, separatists and extremists.”*
extrajudicial killings reported between 2010 and 2012. Therefore, the short-term approach to the realization of “stability” appears to be augmented security measures rather than “development.” However, continuing marginalization and alienation of Uyghurs from the benefits of economic growth in East Turkestan and in China, as well as the cycle of security crackdowns, is ultimately contrary to the interests of stability in the region and appears only likely to feed resentment of the kind that led to the unrest of July 2009.

Special economic trading areas

In the two years following the Work Forum-mandated creation of the special economic trading areas in Kashgar and Khorgas, Chinese state media and Chinese leaders have consistently touted the success of the projects and lauded their effects on the areas’ residents. The new zones are designed to at once bring far-flung cities at the periphery of the Chinese realm closer to the Han economic and cultural sphere, and to integrate these locations with neighboring Central and South Asia through increased trade and investment. Chinese economic scholar Wang Ning said China would use the free trade center at Khorgas to reach out to Central Asian markets and their 60 million potential

---

customers.\(^2\) Kashgar Party Secretary Zeng Cun said in 2010, “We want to turn Kashgar into a world-level international big city.”\(^3\) However, ideological contradictions, in addition to geographic, economic and other differences, present challenges to the Chinese state’s vision to transform Kashgar into a new Shenzhen, one of China’s richest cities. Moreover, if the history of the GWDD is any indication, the economic benefits brought about as the new trading areas flourish are likely to be disproportionately enjoyed by newer, Han Chinese migrants, leaving indigenous Uyghur residents further disenfranchised from the financial boom.

The creation of economic development zones in Shenzhen, Zhuhai and four other areas of China has engendered increased openness to the outside world alongside a more favorable political and economic climate.\(^4\) In the three decades that transformed Shenzhen from a fishing village to an economic miracle, it has gained an image as a relatively liberal city, partly due to its proximity to Hong Kong and Taiwan. In Kashgar, while money flows freely among developers and investors, the government cracks down with repressive tactics on what it calls “illegal religious activities” and “reactionary” materials, and ethnic tensions simmer just below the surface.\(^5\) Government officials maintain a heavy security presence in Kashgar in an attempt to intimidate the Uyghur population and even harass foreign reporters.\(^6\) Regional authorities have a documented history of linking policies ostensibly aimed at improving rural economic conditions with actions to heighten political controls and deepen ethnic unity and anti-separatism campaigns.\(^7\)

While Shenzhen has experienced its own growing pains from the droves of migrant workers flocking there for employment opportunities,\(^8\) it has not had to deal with the ethnic divisions found in Kashgar and other parts of East Turkestan, and migration to Shenzhen has been devoid of the type of state direction exercised in East Turkestan.


\(^{94}\) Ibid.


Overseas scholars have noted Uyghurs’ perception that they cannot compete in the market due to ethnic discrimination, leading to Uyghurs’ unprecedented isolation despite the trade links, roads and railways increasingly connecting the region to the rest of the world.  

Despite the proliferation of Chinese goods throughout Central Asian countries, widespread poverty and a lack of sophisticated distribution networks in Central Asia inhibit the potential for Central Asian countries to serve as a sustainable market for Chinese goods and services. These challenges are somewhat balanced against official geopolitical considerations, as China’s net trade with Central Asia now exceeds that of Russia, and Chinese leaders are eager to negotiate greater Chinese influence in the region under Russia’s lingering shadow. However, the clear difficulties inherent in the region’s immature logistical systems have meant that state policies have been necessary to compensate for a lack of more vigorous market-driven trade between East Turkestan and Central Asia. Chinese leaders have used political will to substitute for more capitalistic motives and justify the intensive development of such trade.


Chinese commentators have also highlighted the lack of sustainable markets in the areas surrounding Kashgar, as well as the relatively harsh terrain and the predominance of agriculture in the region, as potential challenges to trade and economic growth. By contrast, Shenzhen’s favorable location across the border from Hong Kong, with its long-held international economic connections and access to ships crossing the ocean to thriving markets, provided a massive boost to the SEZ’s growth and success, as well as near-instant access to international markets and established export processes.

**The China-Eurasia Expo**

Parallel to the development of economic trading areas in Kashgar and Khorgas, Chinese authorities have also implemented policies promoting the development of trade, industry and other fields in Urumchi since the 2010 Xinjiang Work Forum. These policies have facilitated growth in Urumchi’s development zones and industrial parks. In addition, officials at the Work Forum announced that an annual trade fair held in Urumchi would be upgraded and re-launched as the “China-Eurasia Expo,” and promoted the event as an opportunity to expand trade with Central and South Asia.

Reporting from the 2011 Expo, *Al Jazeera* documented the exclusion of Uyghurs and their lack of a voice in the development of the region. *Al Jazeera* journalist Melissa Chan, who was later expelled from China for her work on sensitive topics, reported that
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plainclothes police officers questioned and intimidated the Uyghur man her reporting team had arranged to interpret for them, causing him to turn down the job, and also harassed a Uyghur blacksmith who had approached them. In particular, Chan noted the almost total lack of Uyghur representation at the Expo itself, contrasting this with Chinese officials’ stated aim of using forums like the Expo to benefit East Turkestan’s Uyghur population and enhance regional stability.

The demolition of Uyghur communities

Zhang Chunxian told reporters in May 2012 that more than 500,000 households in East Turkestan had been moved under demolition and resettlement programs in the previous two years, and 29,000 herdsmen had been resettled in that time period. Official Chinese media is rife with reports extolling the benefits of demolishing Uyghurs’ old homes and resettling them into new, modern apartment buildings. The China Daily quoted a Uyghur villager from Yengisar County in Kashgar Prefecture who had originally been hesitant to move as saying, “Now I wish I could live 100 years in the new house.”

However, Chinese state media, in the absence of independent domestic media and forums for popular debate, has manufactured a skewed portrayal of Uyghur opinions on demolition projects. Official Chinese narratives that offer a nearly universally positive appraisal of demolition and resettlement projects must be viewed with deep skepticism, in light of the discontent voiced by Uyghurs in outlets not controlled by the Chinese state.

New apartments on the outskirts of Kashgar built to house Uyghurs resettled from the Old City not only differ starkly in style from traditional Uyghur architecture but are located far from the Old City itself. This has led to severe disruptions in the community

108 Ibid.

and religious traditions of Uyghurs. For instance, many Uyghurs have found it difficult to attend mosque every day as they did in their old homes, and others have found it difficult to buy daily provisions. The displacement of Uyghurs from the Old City has also raised concerns about their ability to earn a living in their new neighborhoods, as in past waves of demolition when Uyghurs forcibly moved out of the Old City subsequently lost their livelihoods.

Overseas media reports have raised questions about the safety and integrity of the new buildings for Uyghurs on the edge of Kashgar, despite official pronouncements regarding the ability of the new buildings to withstand earthquakes up to magnitude 8. A journalist for the Australian Broadcasting Corporation reported that the newly-built “Pomegranate Compound”, located five kilometers away from the Old City, was already showing serious signs of “wear and tear”, and was “built of simple small farmhouse

Uyghur man in front of a demolished house in Kashgar. ©Melting Colours.
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bricks with no steel girders – hardly cutting-edge quake-safe technology.\textsuperscript{116} In addition, the large number of surveillance cameras that the reporter observed outside of the new apartments represents the state’s pervasive control and monitoring of Uyghurs in their new environments.

In the name of “safeguarding social stability,”\textsuperscript{117} officials also began carrying out demolitions of “shanty towns” in Urumchi after the Work Forum, including residences in the predominantly-Uyghur Tashbulaq [Chinese: Heijiashan] District, which began in July 2010.\textsuperscript{118} Many of the district’s residents have traditionally been Uyghur merchants from the south who have come to Urumchi to do business.\textsuperscript{119} Government officials asserted


that “poor management of the area” had led Uyghur migrants in Tashbulaq to participate in the unrest that took place on July 5, 2009.  

Some residents of areas like Tashbulaq have been moved into new, six-story buildings in Urumchi with running water and central heating. However, only those individuals who had lived in the city for at least two years were eligible for new housing, leaving large numbers of poorer Uyghurs from southern East Turkestan without a housing option in Urumchi.

**On the sidelines of progress**

As demolition, reconstruction and investment charge ahead at an unprecedented pace, development in East Turkestan has left much of the Uyghur population marginalized, unable to attain the benefits accrued by Han migrants in the region. Regional and central government authorities have already proclaimed the success of the Work Forum’s development in the region, but the question remains as to who is enjoying the profits of development.

A dearth of official measures to ensure the inclusion of the Uyghur voice in devising and carrying out development in East Turkestan has guaranteed that assessments regarding developmental success in the region have been one-sided. The failure to ask Uyghurs how they wish to enhance their own economic prospects and transform their own communities has meant that success is calculated only from the perspective of the dominant Han population. On the edges of East Turkestan’s new cityscapes, Uyghurs are left to wonder when they will see the advantages of the tremendous growth taking place around them. Until they are given the chance to offer their perspective beyond the pages of newspaper propaganda that portrays their gratitude to the Chinese Communist Party’s benevolence, the future envisioned by Uyghurs themselves will be subsumed by the din of commerce taking place at their doorstep.
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Recommendations

For the government of the People’s Republic of China

• Implement measures to ensure that new business and development initiatives launched in East Turkestan provide equal opportunity employment to Uyghurs and other non-Han residents, according to the Chinese Constitution, the Regional Ethnic Autonomy Law, the Labor Law and the Employment Promotion Law, and design and implement policies to increase the ratio of Uyghurs employed in the natural resources extraction sector.

• Eliminate ethnic discrimination in the hiring process for employment opportunities in the state sector and the XPCC, according to the Chinese Constitution, the Regional Ethnic Autonomy Law, the Labor Law and the Employment Promotion Law.

• Undertake research to compare unemployment conditions, income disparities and poverty rates among ethnic groups in East Turkestan, in addition to researching and comparing unemployment conditions among different regions within East Turkestan; and make the results of such research public.

• Establish measures and institutions that can be monitored by civil society, such as interim targets and an independent monitoring body, to systematically and transparently evaluate the effectiveness of development initiatives carried out under the banner of the 2010 Xinjiang Work Forum.

• Establish transparent measures to monitor the disbursement of increased regional government funds from restructured natural resource revenue.

• Realize Article 2 of the Declaration on the Right to Development, which establishes “active, free and meaningful participation in development,” and take steps to ensure the meaningful participation of Uyghurs, at all levels, in the determination and evaluation of policies regarding development, investment, employment and education in East Turkestan.

• Take action to broaden the focus of development initiatives beyond the scope of infrastructure and natural resource industries, and expand development initiatives designed to enhance local, grassroots development and smaller-scale industries.

• Implement measures mandating the consultation of Uyghurs and other non-Han residents of East Turkestan alongside “pairing assistance” programs that bring in “expertise” from other areas of the People’s Republic of China, in order to ensure development that benefits Uyghurs and that is carried out in accordance with local expertise and conditions, including language and customs.

• End initiatives, such as instructions to judicial officials regarding criminal punishment, mandated by the 2010 Xinjiang Work Forum that politicize work in the judicial and criminal fields toward the goal of advancing development strategies.
• End the highly-politicized security crackdowns and “stability” and “ethnic unity” campaigns that have been enforced since the 2010 Xinjiang Work Forum in the name of development.

• Cease immediately all demolitions of Uyghur neighborhoods across East Turkestan until a transparent process of genuine consultation has been undertaken with residents.

For concerned governments and private sector institutions

• Raise the issue of development at bilateral human rights dialogues with the People’s Republic of China, and call upon the Chinese government to ensure the consultation and participation of Uyghurs in development processes; and urge Chinese officials to implement procedures ensuring that Uyghurs enjoy a fair share of the benefits of development.

• Urge Chinese counterparts in joint venture endeavors in East Turkestan to implement measures ensuring equal employment opportunities for Uyghurs and other non-Han residents.
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The Uyghur American Association (UAA) works to promote the preservation and flourishing of a rich, humanistic and diverse Uyghur culture, and to support the right of the Uyghur people to use peaceful, democratic means to determine their own political future in East Turkestan.

The UAA launched the UHRP in 2004 to promote improved human rights conditions for Uyghurs and other indigenous groups in East Turkestan, on the premise that the assurance of basic human rights will facilitate the realization of the community’s democratic aspirations.

UHRP also works to raise the profile of the Uyghur people and the plight of all “minority” peoples in East Turkestan by:

Researching, writing and publishing news stories and longer reports covering a broad range human rights issues involving civil and political rights, through to social cultural and economic rights;

Preparing briefings – either written or in person – for journalists, academics, diplomats and politicians on the human rights situation faced by the Uyghur people and others in East Turkestan.