Digital Authoritarianism and Uyghur Identity Erasure as a Global Inflection Point

Kurniawan Arif Maspul[1*]**, Imam Sopyan**[2]

[1]Al Madinah International University, Malaysia
[2]Universitas Islam Indonesia Internasional (UII), Indonesian

Abstract: In the shadow of global silence, the Uyghur crisis in Xinjiang emerges not merely as a regional atrocity, but as a harrowing blueprint for 21st-century digital authoritarianism. This paper confronts China's systematic campaign of Uyghur identity erasure—through mass internment, linguistic imperialism, forced labor, and AI-powered surveillance—and positions it as a defining inflection point for the global human rights order. Drawing from Gramsci's theory of cultural hegemony, Phillipson's linguistic imperialism, and Wallerstein's world-systems theory, the study constructs a powerful interdisciplinary analysis that connects cultural domination with economic coercion and digital repression. Through comparative historical parallels and contemporary legal frameworks, the paper argues that China's actions constitute crimes against humanity and cultural genocide. Yet this is more than a diagnosis—it is a call to action. The study calls on the world community to move beyond rhetoric and toward coordinated justice by laying out a bold, multi-pronged opposition strategy that includes legal responsibility, economic sanctions, educational resilience, media activism, and cybersecurity. In doing so, it reframes Xinjiang not as China's internal matter, but as the world's moral reckoning. The survival of Uyghur identity, and the credibility of human rights in the digital age, depend on our collective will to confront this dystopian template of repression—and dismantle it.

Keywords: Digital Authoritarianism; Cultural Genocide; Uyghur Identity Erasure; Global Human Rights Crisis; AI-Driven Repression

Introduction

The Uyghur population in Xinjiang faces an unprecedented campaign of systemic oppression, encompassing mass arbitrary detentions, forced assimilation through repressive education policies, and the deliberate erosion of cultural and linguistic identity (Ayup *et al*., 2022; Maizland, 2022). The Chinese government's "bilingual education" initiative, which systematically replaces Uyghur-language instruction with Mandarin Chinese, has been widely criticized as a mechanism of linguistic imperialism (Phillipson, 1992; Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights; 2023). By 2017, nearly all Uyghur-language primary and secondary schools had been either abolished or restructured, with

Mandarin becoming the sole medium of instruction (Baranovitch, 2022; Byler, 2021). Additionally, state-run boarding schools forcibly separate Uyghur children from their families, severing their ancestral connections and accelerating cultural assimilation (Leibold, 2019; Zenz, 2019). Estimates suggest that more than 800,000 Uyghur children have been placed in these institutions, with access to their families severely restricted (Zenz, 2019; UN, 2023).

This educational repression operates alongside a broader strategy of social engineering aimed at dismantling Uyghur identity. The internment of over one million Uyghurs in re-education camps (Zenz, 2019) aligns with historical patterns of forced assimilation seen in other colonial and authoritarian regimes, such as the residential school systems in Canada and Australia (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, 2015). Reports from Amnesty International (2021) and the United Nations (2022) highlight credible evidence of systematic abuses, including forced labor, ideological indoctrination, and state-orchestrated efforts to erase Uyghur religious and cultural practices. These policies not only violate fundamental human rights but also constitute potential crimes against humanity, as outlined in the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (1998).

Given the gravity of this crisis, interdisciplinary frameworks must be employed to develop high-impact solutions that address both the structural and ideological dimensions of the oppression. This study explores advanced countermeasures, drawing from international law, political economy, cultural preservation strategies, and digital resistance. Through a multi-faceted approach, it advocates for legally binding mechanisms, economic and diplomatic interventions, educational resilience, and technological safeguards to challenge the ongoing repression of Uyghurs in Xinjiang.

Methodology

This study employs a multidisciplinary approach to examine the systemic repression of Uyghurs in Xinjiang, integrating legal analysis, political economy, digital surveillance studies, and cultural preservation research. It utilizes a comparative legal review of international human rights treaties, case studies of historical assimilation policies, and an economic analysis of global supply chain dependencies linked to forced labor. The study also incorporates media discourse analysis and advocacy impact assessments to evaluate global responses, offering a comprehensive framework for understanding and countering digital authoritarianism.

Result and Discussion

Digital authoritarianism—the intentional deployment of digital information technologies by repressive regimes to surveil, censor, and manipulate populations—represents a seismic shift in the nature of state power, marking a global inflection point in governance (Freedom House, 2018; Polyakova & Meserole, 2019). No longer confined to physical barriers, governments now leverage AI-driven facial-recognition, pervasive data-analytics platforms, and social-credit mechanisms to entrench control and undermine civil liberties at scale (Feldstein, 2021; Yayboke & Brannen, 2020). From China's Great

Firewall to exported surveillance networks in at least eighteen countries, this model inverts the internet's liberatory promise and rewrites the rules of international order, as authoritarian states forge a new digital sovereignty (Morozov, 2011; Polyakova & Meserole, 2019; Feldstein, 2021). Scholars warn that without a coordinated democratic response—encompassing technology export regulations, human-rights assessments of AI tools, and resilient open-internet frameworks—the world risks capitulating to a dystopian paradigm where digital repression, not human rights, defines the future (Yayboke & Brannen, 2020).

Nowhere is this convergence of surveillance and cultural coercion more evident than in Xinjiang, where China's digital authoritarianism intersects with systematic Uyghur identity erasure (Idris, 2025). State-run boarding schools have processed over 497,000 Uyghur children—imposing Mandarin-only curricula, banning Islamic observances, and severing familial bonds in what human-rights experts call a "social-engineering" campaign of cultural genocide (Zenz, 2019). Simultaneously, more than 630 village names bearing Uyghur religious or cultural significance have been replaced with Communist-ideological labels, rendering ancestral toponyms void of their heritage (Human Rights Watch, 2024; Associated Press, 2024). Independent digital platforms like Bagdax have been dismantled and prominent Uyghur technologists detained, effectively extinguishing online spaces for Uyghur expression (Borak, 2022). This dual assault—melding cutting-edge surveillance with forced cultural assimilation—signals a watershed moment: digital tools are now central to erasing an entire people's identity, setting a chilling precedent for authoritarian regimes worldwide (Feldstein, 2021).

Meanwhile, the situation in Xinjiang and the treatment of the Uyghur population can be analyzed through multiple theoretical lenses, particularly those concerning cultural dominance, linguistic imperialism, human rights violations, and geopolitical strategies. These frameworks provide a structured approach to understanding the mechanisms through which power is exercised and maintained, offering critical insights into China's policies and their global ramifications.

Cultural Hegemony and Linguistic Imperialism

Antonio Gramsci's (2020) theory of cultural hegemony is fundamental in analyzing how dominant groups sustain their power not merely through coercion but through ideological control. The Chinese Communist Party (CCP) has implemented policies that ensure the marginalization of Uyghur cultural and religious expressions while embedding Han Chinese values into state institutions, education, and public life (Harris, 2020). This process aligns with Gramsci's notion that the ruling class maintains authority by shaping cultural norms, making their ideology appear natural and inevitable.

Phillipson's (1992) concept of linguistic imperialism further extends this argument, positing that language suppression serves as a key instrument of cultural assimilation and control. The enforced predominance of Mandarin over Uyghur, the restriction of Islamic and Turkic linguistic expressions in educational and public spaces, and the replacement of Uyghur script with standardized Chinese characters all exemplify linguistic imperialism.

Language is not just a means of communication but a repository of identity, history, and resistance (Skutnabb-Kangas *et al.*, 2017). The systematic erosion of Uyghur linguistic autonomy reflects a broader colonial strategy, akin to policies historically employed in places such as British-controlled Ireland or Indigenous language suppression in North America (Clarke, 2010; Dwyer, 2005).

Comparatively, similar instances of linguistic erasure can be observed in other geopolitical contexts. The Soviet Union's Russification policies, which sought to replace regional languages with Russian, share parallels with China's current approach. Just as Russian became the mandatory language for ethnic minorities in Soviet republics, Mandarin is now the compulsory language in Uyghur schools (Brophy, 2016; Shelestyuk, 2021). Such policies lead to linguistic disenfranchisement, ultimately diminishing the ability of minority groups to transmit cultural knowledge across generations.

Human Rights Violations and International Legal Frameworks

The repression of Uyghurs violates several international legal frameworks designed to protect ethnic and religious minorities. These violations can be examined through the lens of key human rights treaties and legal instruments:

1. Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR, 1948) – China's mass internment of Uyghurs contradicts fundamental rights outlined in the UDHR, particularly Article 9 (protection against arbitrary detention) and Article 18 (freedom of thought, conscience, and religion) (United Nations, 1948).

2. International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR, 1966) – Although China signed the ICCPR in 1998, it has yet to ratify the treaty, allowing it to circumvent accountability mechanisms. However, its policies directly violate the ICCPR's provisions on freedom of expression (Article 19) and the prohibition of forced labor (Article 8) (OHCHR, 1966).

3. Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC, 1989) – The forced separation of Uyghur children from their families and their placement in state-run boarding schools aligns with violations of Article 30 of the CRC, which guarantees the rights of minority children to practice their own culture, language, and religion (Human Rights Watch, 2020).

The widespread nature of these abuses also aligns with the legal definition of crimes against humanity as articulated in the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (1998). Amnesty International (2021) and the United Nations (2022) have both reported that China's mass arbitrary detentions, enforced disappearances, and forced sterilizations of Uyghur women constitute crimes against humanity. Some scholars argue that these acts meet the threshold of cultural genocide, a term originally introduced by Raphael Lemkin (1944), which refers to the systematic destruction of cultural and religious identity through state-sanctioned repression (Facing History and Ourselves, 2016; Zenz, 2019).

A comparative perspective can be drawn to the cultural genocide of Indigenous peoples in Canada and Australia, where forced assimilation policies—including residential schools and the prohibition of Indigenous languages—sought to erase native cultures (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, 2015). China's systematic campaign against Uyghurs mirrors these historical patterns, with the additional element of digital surveillance and AI-driven policing, making it an unprecedented case in the 21st century (Jardine *et al.*, 2021).

Global Governance, Political Economy, and the World-System Perspective

David Held's (1995) theory of global governance suggests that transnational institutions and international actors play a crucial role in addressing human rights violations. However, China's economic and political influence over global organizations has hindered meaningful action against its abuses. The United Nations Human Rights Council (UNHRC) has been largely ineffective in holding China accountable, as Beijing has strategically built alliances with nations that depend on Chinese investments (Weiss, 2019). Wallerstein's (2020) world-systems theory provides another useful framework, positioning China within the global capitalist hierarchy. As a rising economic core power, China exerts control over peripheral and semi-peripheral regions, both within and beyond its borders. The exploitation of Uyghurs for forced labor—particularly in textile and agriculture industries—reinforces its dominance in global supply chains (Zenz, 2019). Reports indicate that products linked to forced Uyghur labor have entered international markets, leading to sanctions from Western countries, including the Uyghur Forced Labor Prevention Act (2021) passed by the United States (Congressional-Executive Commission on China, 2022; US Congress, 2021).

Additionally, China's actions must be understood in the context of geopolitical strategy and securitization. The Belt and Road Initiative (BRI), China's expansive infrastructure project, has increased its need for control over Xinjiang, a key transit region (Clarke, 2018). The securitization of Uyghur identity—framing Uyghurs as a potential threat to national stability—serves as a justification for heavy surveillance and crackdowns. This securitization mirrors the U.S. War on Terror rhetoric, which was used to justify mass surveillance, detentions, and human rights abuses against Muslim populations post-9/11 (Baker-Beall & Clark, 2021; Kanat, 2016).

The Intersection of Theory, Policy, and Global Resistance

Synthesizing cultural hegemony, linguistic imperialism, human rights legal frameworks, global governance theories, and political economy perspectives reveals that China's treatment of Uyghurs is a multifaceted dilemma. It is not merely an internal policy issue but a transnational concern that involves global economic interests, international law, and the balance of geopolitical power.

Addressing these violations requires coordinated international efforts that go beyond symbolic condemnations. Strengthening sanctions, ensuring corporate supply chain transparency, and leveraging multilateral pressure through trade agreements are practical

measures that can hold China accountable. Moreover, amplifying Uyghur voices in international platforms, supporting diaspora advocacy groups, and increasing academic and journalistic investigations are essential for sustaining global attention on this crisis.

China's strategies align with historical patterns of cultural domination and forced assimilation seen in colonial contexts worldwide. However, the modern dimension of digital surveillance and research-enhanced repression makes this case uniquely alarming. Moreover, future research should continue to explore the intersection of technology, authoritarian governance, and human rights violations to better understand and combat emerging forms of systemic oppression.

A Multidimensional Strategy to Address Uyghur Repression

The plight of the Uyghur population in Xinjiang represents one of the most pressing human rights crises of the 21st century. Characterized by mass internment, forced labor, cultural erasure, and digital surveillance, the Chinese government's systematic oppression of the Uyghurs necessitates a robust and coordinated global response. Traditional diplomatic condemnations and human rights reports, while significant, have proven insufficient in curbing Beijing's authoritarian grip over the region. Instead, a strategic, multi-layered approach—integrating legal accountability, economic pressure, cultural preservation, media mobilization, and cybersecurity—must be developed to create tangible change. Drawing from historical precedents and theoretical frameworks, this paper explores viable solutions to address the crisis, examining their effectiveness and potential challenges.

1. Strengthening International Legal Mechanisms: Bridging the Accountability Gap

One of the primary obstacles in addressing the Uyghur crisis is the absence of enforceable legal consequences for the Chinese government. While international legal frameworks, such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR, 1948) and the Rome Statute (1998), define mass internment, forced sterilization, and ethnic persecution as crimes against humanity, legal action against China has been limited due to its non-membership in the International Criminal Court (ICC) and veto power at the UN Security Council (Rome Statute, 1998; Amnesty International, 2021). This underscores the need for alternative legal avenues, such as universal jurisdiction and hybrid courts, which have been effective in prosecuting crimes in Rwanda (1994), Yugoslavia (1990s), and Sudan (2000s) (Bassiouni, 2002).

Moreover, the Global Magnitsky Act (2016) provides a legal framework for sanctioning individual perpetrators of human rights abuses, bypassing the need for ICC prosecution. The United States, European Union, and Canada have already imposed targeted sanctions on Chinese officials involved in Uyghur repression (Congressional-Executive Commission on China, 2022). However, Beijing has retaliated with counter-sanctions and diplomatic coercion against states supporting these measures. To enhance the effectiveness of such legal strategies, multilateral coordination is essential, ensuring

that sanctioned individuals are universally blacklisted, minimizing their ability to conduct business globally.

Historically, the Nuremberg Trials (1945-1946) and the prosecution of Serbian war criminals (1990s) illustrate that international justice is possible even in politically sensitive contexts. The Uyghur crisis warrants a similar legal response, possibly through an independent Uyghur tribunal, modeled after the Russell Tribunal on Vietnam (1967), which could serve as a platform for documenting atrocities and advocating for eventual prosecution.

2. Diplomatic and Economic Pressure: Leveraging Global Markets Against Oppression

Economic leverage remains one of the most powerful tools against state-sponsored human rights abuses. The global supply chain dependence on Xinjiang—particularly in textiles, agriculture, and renewable energy components (e.g., solar panels and lithium batteries)—has indirectly enabled forced labor networks (Zenz, 2019). Countries that uphold human rights principles must therefore implement stringent import bans, trade restrictions, and corporate divestment strategies to weaken China's economic foundation in the region. The Uyghur Forced Labor Prevention Act (2021) in the U.S. is a landmark policy, blocking goods suspected of being produced with forced labor. However, enforcement gaps remain, as many corporations find ways to reroute supply chains through third-party intermediaries.

Drawing from the boycott of Apartheid South Africa (1950s–1990s), which significantly pressured the regime through international trade restrictions and corporate withdrawals, a global Uyghur economic boycott movement should be expanded. The G7, European Union, and democratic allies in the Global South must adopt coordinated economic policies, preventing China from exploiting economic asymmetries between nations to undermine sanctions. Alternative production hubs in India, Vietnam, and Latin America should be strengthened to reduce Western dependence on Chinese manufacturing, thereby weakening Beijing's ability to leverage economic retaliation.

Diplomatically, the United Nations Human Rights Council (UNHRC) should establish an independent commission, akin to its investigations into Syrian war crimes (2011-present) and Myanmar's genocide against the Rohingya (2017-present). However, China's influence over developing nations—particularly through Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) investments—poses a barrier to achieving consensus. To counter this, a coalition of democratic nations must create alternative economic partnerships, reducing the reliance of vulnerable nations on Chinese investments while incentivizing them to support human rights-based diplomacy.

3. Education and Cultural Preservation: Resisting Cultural Erasure

One of the most insidious aspects of China's Uyghur policy is its deliberate attempt to erase Uyghur linguistic, religious, and historical identity through re-education camps and state-controlled schooling (Byler, 2021). The suppression of the Uyghur language

mirrors historical cultural genocides, such as Canada's forced assimilation of Indigenous children in residential schools (1800s–1990s) (Truth and Reconciliation Commission, 2015). To counteract this, Uyghur diaspora communities must be supported in establishing independent educational institutions, ensuring the transmission of language, history, and religious knowledge outside China's authoritarian control.

The role of digital education platforms is particularly critical, given China's geographic restrictions on Uyghur movement. Online Uyghur-language schools, cultural archives, and digital textbooks must be developed, similar to Tibetan exile communities' efforts to preserve their heritage through digital means (McGranahan, 2010). Western governments should fund Uyghur-led educational projects, including scholarship programs for Uyghur students, reducing their dependency on state-controlled education systems.

4. Media Mobilization: Shaping Global Narratives

Historical precedents demonstrate that global awareness campaigns can significantly influence policy responses. The human rights campaigns against Apartheid, the Darfur genocide, and the Syrian civil war illustrate how documentaries, investigative journalism, and social media activism can mobilize international action. The work of independent journalists, leaked Chinese government documents, and testimonies from former detainees have already played a critical role in exposing Beijing's policies. However, media censorship and Beijing's global propaganda apparatus continue to obscure the full extent of the crisis.

To combat this, the international community must expand investigative reporting efforts, fund Uyghur-led storytelling projects, and engage high-profile figures in advocacy efforts. The involvement of celebrities, academics, and political leaders in human rights campaigns—similar to the boycotts of the Beijing Olympics (2008, 2022)—can amplify awareness and generate public pressure on governments to act.

5. Cybersecurity and Digital Resistance: Combating Surveillance and Information Suppression

China's use of artificial intelligence, facial recognition, and mass data collection in Xinjiang represents the most advanced form of state surveillance ever deployed against a minority population (Mozur, 2019). Uyghur activists and diaspora communities are frequently targeted by hacking attempts, spyware, and digital harassment. Therefore, ensuring cybersecurity protections for Uyghur activists is paramount.

Governments and human rights organizations must provide training in encrypted communication, VPN usage, and digital security protocols. Similar strategies have been used by dissidents in Iran, Russia, and North Korea, enabling secure activism under oppressive regimes. Additionally, tech companies must be held accountable for their complicity in Beijing's surveillance state—Western governments should implement

policies preventing companies like Huawei, Tencent, and Alibaba from enabling digital oppression.

Dimension	Strategic Actions	Historical/Comparative Precedents	Anticipated Challenges
International Legal Accountability	- Utilize Universal Jurisdiction cases in national courts (e.g., Germany, UK) - Establish an independent Uyghur tribunal akin to the Russell Tribunal (1967) - Enforce Global Magnitsky sanctions on individuals involved in atrocities	Nuremberg Trials (1945-46), Yugoslavia Tribunal (1993), Rwanda Genocide cases (1994), Sudan (2005)	China's UN veto power, ICC non-membership, diplomatic coercion, legal evidence barriers
Diplomatic & Economic Pressure	- Enforce import bans and divestment from Xinjiang-linked supply chains (e.g., textiles, solar panels) - Expand Uyghur Forced Labor Prevention Acts globally - Build alternative production hubs in South Asia and Latin America	Anti-Apartheid boycotts (1950s–90s), Rohingya response at UNHRC (2017), Darfur sanctions (2004)	China's economic retaliation, Global South dependence via Belt and Road loans, enforcement loopholes
Education & Cultural Preservation	- Fund Uyghur-run schools and online academies in exile communities - Support Uyghur-language preservation, religious education, and digital archives - Offer scholarship programs to displaced Uyghur youth	Tibetan exile schools (1960s–present), Indigenous language revival post-Residential Schools (Canada)	State propaganda suppression, diaspora resource constraints, risk of digital infiltration
Media Mobilization & Advocacy	- Fund Uyghur-led documentaries, podcasts, and journalism - Organize celebrity-led global awareness campaigns - Use sports and cultural boycotts to amplify advocacy	Anti-Apartheid sports boycotts, Beijing Olympics protests (2008, 2022), Save Darfur movement (2006)	Global media censorship, disinformation campaigns, activist targeting by state-backed cyber operations
Cybersecurity & Digital Resistance	- Provide cybersecurity training, VPN services, and encrypted tools to Uyghur activists - Pressure tech companies enabling surveillance (e.g., Huawei, Alibaba) - Build secure digital refugee networks	Iran's Green Movement (2009), Russian dissident networks (2020), Tibetan resistance (online)	Sophisticated AI surveillance, Uyghur diaspora hacking, digital repression export by China

Figure 1. A Multidimensional Strategy to Address the Uyghur Human Rights Crisis

Addressing the Uyghur crisis requires a holistic, strategic response that combines legal action, economic pressure, cultural preservation, media influence, and digital resistance. Historical precedents demonstrate that coordinated, sustained action can dismantle even the most entrenched authoritarian policies. The global community can help end Uyghur persecution and provide justice for individuals impacted by learning from previous movements and adapting techniques to the present geopolitical and technical situation.

Conclusion

The systematic oppression of the Uyghur population in Xinjiang represents not merely a regional crisis but a pivotal test for the integrity of the international human rights order, the resilience of global governance structures, and the limits of economic interdependence in confronting state-led atrocities. The Chinese government's campaign of forced assimilation—manifesting through mass internment, linguistic imperialism, repressive surveillance, and economic exploitation—signals a strategic recalibration of authoritarian control in the digital age. This repression is not an isolated episode but a manifestation of a broader global struggle over cultural sovereignty, human dignity, and geopolitical power.

Historical parallels, from the Russification policies of the Soviet Union to the colonial-era cultural erasures in North America and Australia, demonstrate that state-led suppression of identity is often the precursor to systemic violence. Yet, the scale, technological sophistication, and geopolitical insulation of China's policies in Xinjiang introduce an unprecedented challenge to existing legal and diplomatic frameworks. If left unchallenged, this case sets a dangerous precedent, normalizing the fusion of digital surveillance, ethno-nationalist policies, and economic coercion as a template for authoritarian consolidation worldwide.

Future scholarship must transcend conventional human rights discourse and engage with the rapidly evolving landscape of global authoritarianism, economic coercion, and digital governance. Moreover, interdisciplinary research must interrogate the economic structures that sustain forced labor networks, the vulnerabilities of international supply chains, and the political asymmetries that enable diplomatic paralysis in the face of human rights catastrophes. Just as past generations confronted apartheid, ethnic cleansing, and colonial subjugation with coordinated economic, legal, and grassroots mobilization, the present crisis necessitates a paradigm shift—one that fuses technological countermeasures, legal innovation, and global advocacy to disrupt the machinery of modern authoritarianism. The survival of Uyghur identity, and indeed the credibility of the global human rights system, hinges on the ability of scholars, policymakers, and civil society to construct a framework of resistance that is as adaptive, strategic, and unrelenting as the forces of oppression it seeks to dismantle.

References

Amnesty International. (2021, June 10). China: Draconian repression of Muslims in Xinjiang amounts to crimes against humanity. Amnesty International. https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2021/06/china-draconian-repression-of-muslims-in-xinjiang-amounts-to-crimes-against-humanity-2/

Amnesty International. (2022, May 28). China: UN visit falls short of addressing crimes against humanity in Xinjiang. Amnesty

International. https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2022/05/un-xinjiang-china-visit/

Associated Press. (2024, June 18). Religious and cultural mentions removed from names of China's Xinjiang villages, rights groups say. *AP News*. Retrieved from https://apnews.com/article/da3152596943e4d5ff9a5b232582782e

Ayup, A., Tékin, S., & Sidick, E. (2022). Linguistic, Cultural, and Ethnic Genocide of the Uyghurs in Xinjiang, China. *The Handbook of Linguistic Human Rights*, 341-355.

Baker-Beall, C., & Clark, R. (2021). A "Post-Copenhagen" Analysis of China's Securitization of the Uyghur: A Counterproductive Securitization?. *Democracy and Security*, *17*(4), 427-454.

Baranovitch, N. (2022). The "Bilingual Education" Policy in Xinjiang Revisited: New Evidence of Open Resistance and Active Support among the Uyghur Elite. Modern China, 48(1), 134-166. https://doi.org/10.1177/0097700420969135

Bassiouni, M. C. (Ed.). (2002). *Post-conflict justice* (p. 91). Ardsley, NY: Transnational Publishers.

Borak, M. (2022, November 2). The strange death of the Uyghur internet. *WIRED*. Retrieved from https://www.wired.com/story/uyghur-internet-erased-china/

Brophy, D. (2016). *Uyghur nation: Reform and revolution on the Russia-China frontier*. Harvard University Press.

Byler, D. (2021). *In the Camps: China's High-Tech Penal Colony*. Columbia Global Reports. http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctv2dzzqqm

Byler, D. (2022). *Terror Capitalism: Uyghur Dispossession and Masculinity in a Chinese City*. Duke University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv21zp29g

Clarke, M. (2010). *The Xinjiang conflict: Uyghur identity, language policy, and political discourse*. East-West Center. https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/resrep06543.1.pdf

Clarke, M. (2018). The belt and road initiative: Exploring Beijing's motivations and challenges for its new silk road. *Strategic Analysis*, *42*(2), 84-102.

Congressional-Executive Commission on China. (2022). *Annual report 2021*. U.S. Government Publishing Office. https://www.congress.gov/117/cprt/JPRT44458/CPRT-117JPRT44458.pdf

Dwyer, A. M. (2005). *The Xinjiang conflict: Uyghur identity, language policy, and political discourse*. East-West Center. https://www.eastwestcenter.org/publications/xinjiang-conflict-uyghur-identity-language-policy-and-political-discourse

Economy, E. C. (2018). *The third revolution: Xi Jinping and the new Chinese state*. Oxford University Press. https://books.google.com.sa/books/about/The_Third_Revolution.html?id=3hBQDwAAQBAJ&redir_esc=y

Facing History and Ourselves. (2016). *Raphael Lemkin and the Genocide Convention*. https://www.facinghistory.org/resource-library/raphael-lemkin-genocide-convention

Feldstein, S. (2021). Digital repression: How technology strengthens autocracies. *Journal of Democracy*, *32*(2), 25–39. Retrieved from https://www.journalofdemocracy.org/articles/digital-repression-how-technology-strengthens-autocracies/

Freedom House. (2018). *Freedom on the Net 2018: The rise of digital authoritarianism*. Retrieved from https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-net/2018/rise-digital-authoritarianism

Gramsci, A. (2020). Selections from the prison notebooks. In *The applied theatre reader* (pp. 141-142). Routledge.

Harris, R. (2020). *Soundscapes of Uyghur Islam*. Indiana University Press.

Held, D. (1995). *Democracy and the global order: From the modern state to cosmopolitan governance*. Stanford University Press.

Human Rights Watch. (2024, June 18). *China: Hundreds of Uyghur village names change*. Retrieved from https://www.hrw.org/news/2024/06/18/china-hundreds-uyghur-village-names-change

Idris, A. (2025, January 24). *How China's boarding schools in Xinjiang (East Turkistan) are erasing a people's identity: A Uyghur view*. Center for Uyghur Studies. Retrieved from

https://uyghurstudy.org/how-chinas-boarding-schools-in-xinjiang-east-turkistan-are-erasing-a-peoples-identity-a-uyghur-view/

International Criminal Court. (1998). *Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court*. https://www.icc-cpi.int/publications/core-legal-texts/rome-statute-international-criminal-court

Jardine, B., Lemon, E., & Hall, N. (2021). *No space left to run: China's transnational repression of Uyghurs*. Uyghur Human Rights Project and Oxus Society for Central Asian Affairs. https://uhrp.org/report/no-space-left-to-run-chinas-transnational-repression-of-uyghurs/

Kanat, K. B. (2016). The securitization of the Uyghur question and its challenges. *Insight Turkey, 18*(1), 191-219. https://pure.psu.edu/en/publications/the-securitization-of-the-uyghur-question-and-its-challenges

Leibold, J. (2019). Surveillance in China's Xinjiang Region: Ethnic Sorting, Coercion, and Inducement. *Journal of Contemporary China, 29*(121), 46–60. https://doi.org/10.1080/10670564.2019.1621529

Maizland, L. (2022, September 22). China's repression of Uyghurs in Xinjiang. *Council on Foreign Relations*. https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/china-xinjiang-uyghurs-muslims-repression-genocide-human-rights

McGranahan, C. (2010). *Arrested histories: Tibet, the CIA, and memories of a forgotten war*. Duke University Press. https://archive.org/details/arrestedhistorie0000mcgr

Morozov, E. (2011). *The Net Delusion: The Dark Side of Internet Freedom*. New York, NY: PublicAffairs.

Mozur, P. (2019, April 14). One month, 500,000 face scans: How China is using A.I. to profile a minority. *The New York Times*. https://www.nytimes.com/2019/04/14/technology/china-surveillance-artificial-intelligence-racial-profiling.html

Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. (1966). *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*. https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/international-covenant-civil-and-political-rights

Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. (2023, September 26). China: Xinjiang's forced separations and language policies for Uyghur children carry risk of forced assimilation, say UN experts. OHCHR. https://www.ohchr.org/en/press-releases/2023/09/china-xinjiangs-forced-separations-and-language-policies-uyghur-children

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford University Press.

Polyakova, A., & Meserole, C. (2019, August). *Exporting digital authoritarianism: The Russian and Chinese models* (Policy Brief). Brookings Institution. Retrieved from https://www.brookings.edu/research/exporting-digital-authoritarianism/

Shelestyuk, E. V. (2021). Soviet Language Policy and Education in the Post-WWII Period. *Социолингвистика*, (4 (8)), 60-85.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T., Phillipson, R., & Wiley, J. (Eds.). (2023). *The handbook of linguistic human rights*. John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated.

Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. (2015). *Canada's residential schools: The final report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada*. McGill-Queen's University Press. https://publications.gc.ca/site/eng/9.807830/publication.html

U.S. Congress. (2021). *Uyghur Forced Labor Prevention Act, H.R. 1155, 117th Congress*. https://www.congress.gov/bill/117th-congress/house-bill/1155

United Nations. (1948). *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. https://www.un.org/en/about-us/universal-declaration-of-human-rights

United Nations. (1989). *Convention on the Rights of the Child*. UNICEF. https://www.unicef.org/child-rights-convention

United Nations. (2022, August 31). China responsible for 'serious human rights violations' in Xinjiang province: UN human rights report. UN News. https://news.un.org/en/story/2022/08/1125932

United Nations. (2023, September 26). Rights experts warn against forced separation of Uyghur children in China. UN News. https://news.un.org/en/story/2023/09/1141502

Wallerstein, I. (2020). *World-systems analysis: An introduction*. duke university Press.

Yayboke, E., & Brannen, S. (2020, October 15). *Promote and build: A strategic approach to digital authoritarianism*. Center for Strategic and International Studies. Retrieved from https://www.csis.org/analysis/promote-and-build-strategic-approach-digital-authoritarianism

Zenz, A. (2019). Beyond the camps: Beijing's long-term scheme of coercive labor, poverty alleviation and social control in Xinjiang. *Journal of Political Risk*, *7*(12), 1-23.

Zenz, A. (2019, July 4). Break their roots: Evidence for China's parent–child separation campaign in Xinjiang. *Journal of Political Risk*. Retrieved from https://www.jpolrisk.com/break-their-roots/