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Inspiration

I include the following text here in acknowledgement of my gratitude to my family. In particular to my Ba-chan Sumi whom I was fortunate to spend time with in my infancy and imparted in me my pride of my mixed heritage and the backgrounds of my forebears who make me the individual I am today. More recently to my grand-Auntie Kay with whose personal insights and memories I was able to further personalize this endeavor.

There are a multitude of cases which could stand as examples for understanding how nation-states attempt to control their people. Namely, the process of assimilation into the societal tendencies the government has concluded to be the culture appropriate to one’s nation and community. I chose Executive Order 9066 and its subsequent incarceration of Japanese Americans into concentration 'camps' as one of my case studies because I have strong ties to the subject. Everyone in my grand-mother’s family on my father’s side was taken from their home in Lodi, California to ‘camp’ Rohwer in Arkansas. (Location; Desha county, southeastern Arkansas. Climate; wooded swamp land; high heat, humidity, with sudden rains. Peak population; 8,475. Opening date; September 18, 1942- November 30, 1945.)

My Ba-chan(grandmother in Japanese), Sumiye Hiramoto, was the fifth child of nine, all American-born naturalized citizens with parents who just happened to be born in Japan. Only ever having known the land of their birth where they were raised and worked as their home. At the age of 22 she along with her family was forced from her home, stripped of all her rights and dignity to be detained for ‘national security’ reasons until the end of World War II. In the Spring of 1942, her family was first ‘relocated’ to the Stockton Assembly center in California, (euphemism for a ‘Detention Center’) while their permanent ‘homes’ in the concentration ‘camps' were being prepared. Then that summer, they were shipped off like a herd of animals 1,887 miles away to ‘camp' Rohwer, Arkansas, where she became just another number to the War Relocation Center known as, 30016F. My grand-mother passed away before I could ask her, and hear her personal side of her story, but her ‘baby’ sister, Keiko was willing to speak about her experience. I will be making references to some of her personal experiences (that she has “long-buried” in her memory) throughout the paper.

It is important to understand that my grandmother and her siblings, having been born in America, did not have Japanese citizenship. Yet they were incarcerated as “enemy aliens” right here at home in the land of their birth. Once in ‘camp', my grandmother Sumiye(or Sumi as she was known) being an excellent student applied for and was given a scholarship to Hunter College in New York and allowed to leave Rohwer. Ironically, she was selected as the first official American exchange student to Japan after World War II and attended Gakushuin
University, this time moving across the world to Japan, a land she only knew about from stories her parents had told her.

There, she married my grandfather Jay, a blond haired, blue eyed American of Jewish descent, whom she had met in New York prior to moving to Tokyo. In 1958 in Wakayama, Japan, my grand-parents gave birth to my father, Cellin Gluck and 3 years later to my uncle, Garet Gluck. Even though they shared Japanese heritage through their mother and were born in Japan, the Japanese government did not consider either of them to be Japanese and in a strange twist of fate, never granted them citizenship. My father and his brother are naturalized Americans by blood (jus sanguinis) since both my grand parents including my grand-mother were Americans.

In Japan they were always considered as Americans and people were always amazed how well they spoke Japanese. In turn they grew up being bullied for being “halfies” and never allowed to be fully assimilated into Japanese society. In the 70s my father came ‘home’ to the US for college and discovered for the first time that he was not automatically considered to be American as he had been in Japan. As my father always says; “I didn’t know I was Asian until I came to America…”. The point to this story is that no matter where you are in the world, nation-states harbor utopian versions of the manner in which a true citizen should look, speak, or act, and do their utmost to exclude those who do not fit these ideals.

After speaking with and reading correspondence from my great-aunt Keiko, I decided that since she put ‘camp’ in quotes, so would I. She told me that it has been difficult for her to find another word which suits the category of their desert home behind barbed wire. Especially since in today’s world, ‘camp’ usually signifies someplace happy and out in nature freely enjoying the great outdoors, yet for them, ‘camp’ came to have an entirely different connotation — not necessarily a happy one.

Here goes:
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Introduction

We live in a time desensitized on a daily basis by devastation on a global scale. Wracked by terrorist attacks, bombarded by news and images of mass murders and racial hatred resulting in innocents becoming ‘casualties’ of war and victims to a multitude of atrocities. It becomes easy for these events, not to mention those occurring in the distant past, to fade quietly away. Often, many of these events are brushed off as having happened simply because ‘that’s what it was like back then’ or ‘those were the times’. In this way, we lose track of the fact that these patterns of violence have persisted over the course of human history and not just in recent memory.

Not only is it evident that we are guilty of not having learned from history but by ‘forgetting’ and wiping these events from our consciousness, are doomed to repeat these mistakes in perpetuity. The fading memories and the resulting post-conflict forgiveness that wars pose, is in this way a paradox; however genuinely comforting, that previously warring people on both sides, can forgive one another and ‘learn’ to coexist may be, one must never forget the tragedies that come with war and human conflict of any kind or scale.

What is war? What constitutes an emergency? Can we be said to be at war when we are not directly affected by the causal events leading up to the conflict or only when hostilities are in full swing? Theories of how being in a state of “war” change one’s attitudes towards others, those one considers to be allies, and those we identify as foes. In certain instances, one’s perspective of other people may even extend to seeing them as less than human and subsequently
not worthy of even being designated as a viable “life.” This thinking is frequently accompanied and propagated by the underlying racism evidently prevalent in all nations and peoples.

The resulting denial of basic human rights or any of these ostracized peoples should at the very least, be considered a form of violence. The way in which the media manipulates and propagates the biased reporting of events based on “color” or “religion” further seemingly exasperates any and all already stilted situations. This is how history ends up being written; in a foggy present perspective which is then rewritten and skewed in favor of the oppressor or in most cases, the victor, time and again as time pushes forward. The heroes of the story change and actions which were seen as “good” may later be perceived as “evil” depending on which side may be making the rules or establishing the post mortem. All of these scenarios demonstrate that “war,” and the subsequent actions taken by governments in times of war, transcends into society. Quite often, suppressed prejudices and fears are pried open, motivated by this oppression of others, in search of scapegoats to hold responsible.

The seeming necessity to create a common enemy along Orwellian lines translates directly to the idea of the existence of the “other.” Resulting also in the creation of situations deemed to be worthy of the title ‘national emergency’. These emergencies, real or perceived, then in turn lead to the creation and passing of laws constraining the rights and freedom of citizens.

To understand one way in which a nation state operates and conducts itself under an “emergency,” I will look at America’s impetus for Executive Order 9066, the events leading up to its issuance in 1942 and the resulting plight of the Americans of Japanese origin and
comparing it to what is happening to the Uyghur\(^1\) and other muslim minorities in China today under the guise of combating “terrorism.” Forming comparisons between a case from 77 years ago, and a current one in an attempt to show that history does in fact repeat itself; or at the very least, that we seem incapable of learning from our past mistakes and transgressions. In particular, the manner in which governments construct and use this notion “othering” to divide and conquer their opposition.

Though admittedly similar in nature, I will not be analyzing the continued and ever present systematic oppression of America’s black population as part of this “othering” by governments. Even though blacks and other minority groups have at one time been and some may say continue to be excluded from American democracy, suffice it to say that blacks as a group were never truly stripped of their rights as a community. This is because for the purposes of this paper, it is necessary to take the position that blacks in America, forcibly brought to this country as slaves, historically were never considered to be in possession of any rights before their arrival to this country. However unfair a viewpoint this may be, not being considered as “individuals” ordained with any rights, they can therefore be said to have been “devoid” of any rights whatsoever. At least in the eyes of the law and the court of public opinion of the time.

The main focus therefore will be placed on the plights of the Japanese Americans and the Uyghur Chinese. The former forcibly removed from their homes and relocated against their will and the latter who are at present being held captive in their very homeland which has essentially

---

\(^1\) Vandenbrink, Rachel. Staff, RFA. “‘Uyghur' or 'Uighur’?” *Radio Free Asia*, Radio Free Asia, 13 Sept. 2010, www.rfa.org/english/news/uyghur/uyghur-spelling-09062010161733.html. - Members of this mostly Muslim ethnic group overwhelmingly prefer the spelling “Uyghur,” which they say more closely approximates the proper orthography and pronunciation in their native language, “Uyƣur.” (The word sounds, when spoken, closer to “toy-gether” than “wee-ger,” as most Westerners enunciate it.) Accessed April 6, 2019
been turned into a veritable concentration ‘camp’. In each of the cases these actions were taken by their respective governments in the name of national security.

First, I will walk the reader through the history of the treatment towards each of the minority groups. I will talk about the long standing racist policies and laws that were implemented before the use of the ‘camps’ became the policy. The event or events that gave each country an excuse to push forward their racist agenda: In America’s case, Pearl Harbor, and for China the globalized “war on terror” and its ‘efforts’ to combat Islamic extremism. Language that is being used in each case to propagate the “othering” of the Japanese Americans and the Uyghur Chinese.

The language and imagery used by both America and China when discussing people each of the governments view as “different” is at the very least demeaning. Both speak of people who have been or are “infected” by ideas deemed improper or dangerous. This “othering” by language and imagery helps instill fear in the minds of the general public, encouraging people to view those whom the government considers to be scapegoats; separate, different, threatening and often times, irredeemable. What is a so-called benevolent state to do then, except quash these threats posed by these “infected” people? The language of dehumanization only becomes shocking once the event has passed and the proper time comes to be able to carefully examine the past.

Looking at the various euphemisms used to cover up the human rights violations in both cases, it becomes evident that without the utilization of these “othering” techniques, there could be no ‘camps’ since it requires the public’s support for it after all is being done in their name and

---

for ‘national security’. Today, it seems as though the world has become accustomed to these acts of dehumanization but paradoxically when one studies the past, all the massive violations against the sanctity of life are resoundingly clear.

Under the rubric of “national security” both nations have restricted the freedoms and locked up their citizens, where the parameters are only singling out a specific people and not just a cause per se. What I mean is that if China is really detaining people purely because they are seen as muslim extremists, then why are they only forcing this on the region of Xinjiang and not also on the remainder of the small Muslim communities throughout China? 70 years ago, using the same reasoning, why did America focus on the Japanese and not on all persons whose heritage belonged to any of the other Axis powers? The Germans, who as a nation were committing unspeakable atrocities against the Jews and other minorities and why also not the Italians? Because for the most part, the Europeans looked no different from the majority of the population which considered themselves American. The fear of the ‘other’(those who don’t fit into the checked box of what it means to be ‘human’ within the framework) and of these ‘others’ being a ‘danger’ to the nation-state obviously did not apply to those not visibly considered different. The world has seen time and time again that the worst violations in human rights have come about in the name of ‘national security’ and should know better than to think that waging war against ‘minorities’ will ever make a state more secure.

I will demonstrate how ‘war’ transcends into society, how the creation of the ‘other’ gets pried out by prejudices and fear which the governments helped instill. The sampling of efforts to draw connections between the expeditious words and images of war (not otherwise in fashion) and building on the raw emotions of what may have once taken place will be used to demonstrate
how blatant racist ideology and stereotyping contributes to poor military and political intelligence. Along with how the adoption of extremist policies to preserve the ideal of American or Chinese homogeneity seems to have been or be the driving factor in both decisions being executed.

I will define the terms war, emergency, combatant and noncombatant, interment ‘camps’ vs. concentration ‘camps’, human rights as exemplified in the name of property and violence, othering and nationalism. Finishing with the legacy Executive Order 9066 left us and in an effort to show what may transpire for China.

It will be difficult to truly do justice to documenting the violence against the Uyghurs. Particularly as I write about it secure in the safety that this isolated ‘camp’ us of Bard College affords me. It is difficult enough to speak of any such unfamiliar far away experiences relying solely on the veracity of news articles, and the varied assumptions of theorists. Add to that the virtual embargo that the Chinese government has placed on anything Uyghur and the task becomes exponentially more ambitious. By restricting physical access to, as well as the news coming from the region, Chinese authorities are also making it extremely difficult to cover(or uncover) these stories, making true reporting nearly impossible⁴. Let us not forget that historians and writers were only able to investigate the true effects of Executive Order 9066 only after years of research unimaginable 70 years ago. Only once when the people who lived through the experience finally felt safe to speak freely about the events validated by their personal experiences.

---

Regardless of the differences, why in both of these cases did Government choose to use ‘camps’ to specifically separate the “threat” from the general population at large? Was it effective then or will it be successful now? In each of these cases, the Government’s attempts to coerce them to renounce their ties to a religion or even a foreign state that is undeniably a part of their identity; to renounce their agency. The ‘camps’ were and are used to bolster the theory that the ideology of these “others” pose a danger to society as a whole, creating more and intensifying racial profiling by forced separation.

Today, we are seeing these same radically irresponsible and one can even say extreme policies being put to use in China, condemning the Uyghurs to a fate not unlike that which befell the Japanese Americans in 1942. For those of us not directly involved, It is easy to forget the past and only see the story as something that happened to ‘them’ and round up all the people with their own stories and turn them into a list of numbers. Making them faceless and nothing more than just another event.

1942 America’s Executive Order 9066 sheds much insight into the subjugation of the Uyghur in China. Not understanding what happened to the Japanese Americans legitimizes the use of violence in place of democratic values and fundamental rights as a norm in response to a real or perceived nation-state emergency. Institutionalized dehumanization and violence also become acceptable social norms. These cases, though different in the matter of the perceived threat which precipitated them, the reaction from the regimes are similar in their disregard for human life, liberty, and dignity. America dehumanizes by blindly incarcerating an entire group of its citizens based on nothing more pertinent than their ethnicity, China punishes its critics and subjugates the Uyghur minority on a massive scale solely on the basis of their ethnicity, enforced
secondarily by their religion. In both situations, these ‘others’ are seen as threats to the safety and sovereignty of the nation state because of their perceived loyalty to a “higher” or at least “different” authority.

Chapter 1: The History of oppression

The Japanese Americans: Pre-Executive Order 9066

Contrary to popular belief, America was never discovered but rather more correctly, appropriated from its original inhabitants. Truthfully, it was colonized by white-Western Europeans who killed and slaughtered millions of Native Americans⁴, often with the belief that they were somehow ordained with the right to so as superior beings. This rule by divine right as inherited from the Europeans set the tone of early American ideology— “white is right.” In this way, America began as a collection of European colonies and was built on oppressing people who didn’t fit in with the emigrating ‘white’ Western Europeans.

Therefore, the passing of the Naturalization Act of March 20th, 1790 so soon after the founding of our country, should come as no surprise. A decree which stated that "any alien, being a free white person who shall have resided within the limits and under the jurisdiction of the United States for a term of two years, may be admitted to become a citizen thereof."⁵ Meaning,

---

⁴ “Atrocities Against Native Americans.” United to End Genocide, endgenocide.org/learn/past-genocides/native-americans/.

⁵ United States naturalization laws (1790, 1795)
“the naturalization law amounted to a pure “color” law, and placed a “stigma of biological inferiority” on “anyone who doesn’t look white, in this case] yellow races”6. Although, biologically speaking, ‘race’ is a meaningless concept; it continues to have significant implications on peoples’ lives. Before anyone of Asian descent emigrated to America they were already considered as ‘aliens’ invaders of a land to which they did not belong.

The Alien and Sedition Law of 1798 was part of the four laws known as the Alien and Sedition Acts which created regulations and restrictions against ‘aliens’7. It was to arrest and detain or deport ‘enemy aliens’. This act was modified and used as the basis of the incarceration and confiscation of property against Japanese, German, and Italian during World War II—Re-defining American freedom. It was signed in accordance to Proclamation 2525, permitting the immediate apprehension of "alien enemies deemed dangerous to the public health or safety of the United States by the Attorney General or Secretary of War.”8

The Chinese were the first large group of Asian immigrant laborers to enter the United States, beginning in the 1840s. They contributed greatly (specifically in the West) to agricultural and industrial development, even as Americans dismissed them for their “copper” skin. By 1882, anti-Chinese sentiment climaxed in the Chinese Exclusion Act. No more Chinese laborers were allowed in the U.S. After this, there was a void for cheap labor, bosses began to recruit Japanese workers. And unlike the European immigrants that came around the same time, Asians could not become naturalized citizens. Their status as “aliens ineligible to citizenship” confirmed they were not truly welcome in America, at least not on a permanent basis.

---

7 Christgau, John. “Enemies, World War II Alien Internment”, page vii
The first Japanese in America were probably shipwrecked sailors, including John Manjiro who later figured prominently in Commodore Perry’s voyages to open Japan to the outside world, rescued by Captain Whitfield and brought to Hawaii in 1841. They were followed by the first organized group brought to Hawai’i (present day Hawaii) in 1868 as sugar plantation laborers. Nineteen years later, in the Summer of 1887, 30 Japanese men arrived on the mainland in San Francisco with the dream of starting an agricultural colony in California. Like most migrants, the Japanese left their homes in search of a better life. They were “pushed” out of Japan by economic depression and drought, and “pulled” to America by rumors of opportunity and promises of great fortune.

Japanese immigration was part of the great world-wide migration to the U.S. from the late nineteenth into the early twentieth century. Hundreds of thousands of newly arrived immigrants came from around the world; those from Europe found work in northeastern industrial centers. Unlike European counterparts however, the Japanese migrants were not treated with such open arms.

By contrast, most Japanese arriving on the U.S. mainland were farmers in California. As they settled, they joined forces, forming co-ops and alliance to buy land and market their crops. They played a major role in the development of agriculture in the West. Major Japanese-American communicates formed in Livingston, Cortez and Guadalupe, California; Hood River, Oregon, and the White River Valley in Washington. There were also smaller communities in

---


Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, as well as Utah. Anti-Japanese sentiment began to grow in response to their successes.

So successful were the Japanese immigrants in transforming the agricultural landscape that they soon became targets. The United States and the Empire of Japan made an informal “Gentlemen’s agreement of 1907,” in which Japan agreed not to issue passports to emigrants to the United States, except to certain categories of business and professional men\(^{11}\) in return for America not imposing further restrictions on Japanese immigration; in essence closing the doors for Japanese laborers. But this did not satisfy the Anti-Japanese agitators and resulted in the passing 1913 and 1920, Alien Land Laws barring Japanese from owning land in California. Some Issei farmers, themselves denied citizenship, found a way around the law by putting their property in the names of their American-born children.

Then in 1920, Japanese women were no longer allowed to join their families in America, ending the “picture-bride” era. The 1922 Cable Act stripped American citizenship from any woman who married an Issei. And Japanese-language schools were being threatened by local governments of the growing ‘yellow peril’. In response to nationwide concerns, Congress passed the Immigration Act of 1924 placing quotas on all nationalities and completely excluding all immigrants from Asia barring all further Japanese immigration.

People say it was a high number of immigrants from Japan to farmlands in California and the Pacific Northwest which precipitated the prejudice against them. But the reality is that there were never numerically significant immigrants along the west coast. Since Japanese worked for less (since they weren’t considered equal to white Americans therefore seen as less human) it

was more appealing to hire them. This helped break labor the strikes of 1912 in the coal mines in British Columbia and is said to have transcended into America and was the beginning of a larger widespread “Anti-Asian campaign” otherwise known as the origin of the “Yellow Peril.”

Although the majority of the hired labor in British Columbia were Chinese, it made no difference to ignorant white Americans who at the time viewed Asians as all being the same. Working for less was not seen as having a good work ethic. Asians being discriminated against, however, had no choice but to take any job they could just to meet ends need. Compounding the opinion that doing what society considered to be human was undemocratic, insinuating that lacking these “values” the Japanese could never understand American Democracy and therefore would in some convoluted logic, in turn always remain loyal to the Japanese emperor and by extension un-American.

The events that followed only played to the racism towards Japanese Americans. The fact that in 1905, Japan had defeated the much larger Russia never mind that it was only able to do so with the help of Adam Schiff and a consortium of wealthy Jewish Bankers in retaliation for “oppression on the Jews by the Russian government”\textsuperscript{12}, amplified the fear already extant in the anti-Japanese movement; that in line with the xenophobic theory of colonialism, the “yellow-peril,” would soon be at the very door step of the U.S. homeland. Then in 1913, California passed a law, known as “aliens land law,” denying the Japanese the right to own land within the state. Supporters of this law hoped that it would dissuade them from starting a permanent life there and eventually taking over their “white” state. The term “alien” echoed into the immigration act of 1924 - ending further immigration from Japan. This exemplifies, the notion of

there always having been an anti-Japanese sentiment in the U.S. but it wasn’t until Pearl Harbor that historians marked\textsuperscript{13} it as the legitimate demarcation of the anti-Japanese movement.

It was as if the government was just waiting for the perfect opportunity to make sure they would have the publics’ support. During a debate in 1924, the Californian attorney general, testified before congress denoting Japanese and Chinese:

\begin{quote}
“‘They are different in color; different in ideals; different in ideals; different in race; different in ambitions; different in their theory of political economy and government. They speak a different language; they worship another God. They have not in common with the Caucasian a single trait’ Then ten years after, as political and economic relations between the United States and Imperial Japan were deteriorating, a secret State Department investigation concluded that if war broke out between countries, ‘The entire [American Japanese] population on the West Coast will rise and commit sabotage.’”\textsuperscript{14}
\end{quote}

Before, Pearl Harbor even happened the American government already saw portions of their citizenry as traitors. In 1940, a year before America joined World War II, “Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox presented President Roosevelt with a fifteen point program for what should be done if war with Japan came. The twelfth recommendation was: ‘Prepare plans for Concentration ‘camps.’”\textsuperscript{15}

Almost immediately following the bombing of Pearl Harbor, the incarceration of Japanese Americans began. That same night of December 7, 1941, the Federal Bureau of


\textsuperscript{15} Reeves, \textit{Infamy} page 9
Investigation began taking into custody persons of Japanese ancestry. “Under Proclamation 2525, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States and as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, do hereby make public proclamation to all whom it may concern that an invasion has been perpetrated upon the territory of the United States by Empire Japan…. And, acting under and by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution of the United States, and the said sections of the United States Code. I do hereby further proclaim and direct that the conduct to be observed on the part of the United States towards all natives, citizens, denizens, or subjects of Empire of Japan being of the age of fourteen years and upwards who shall be within the Untied States or within any territories in any way subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and not actually naturalized, who for the purpose of this Proclamation and under such sections of the Untied Staes Code are termed alien enemies…”

By marking anyone who was not a “naturalized citizen” as an alien enemy meant that they were excepted from civilian rights or even the temporary rights of non-citizens.

This was only the first step to dismiss anyone who had Japanese heritage as being not American. Beginning with Japanese nationals who had the misfortune of being considered “temporary visitors”; diplomats, businessmen and guest professors were put on boats and sent back to Japan. Proclamation 2525 predated Executive Order 9066 with the goal to sweep up members of high ranking positions in Japanese American circles, since they were considered “dangerous.” In some cases, the only evidence the FBI needed were possessions of any written material with Japanese Characters, including bibles and knitting manuals.

---

16 Presidential Proclamation Aliens No. 2525. Alien Enemies- Japanese
17 Reeves, *Infamy*, page 6-8
The Uyghurs: Pre-1949

The Uyghurs, a Turkic minority ethnic group who make up the largest group in the Chinese region presently known as Xinjiang find themselves caught in a conflict with the central government in Beijing. There isn't a true consensus of how many people live in this region since differing statistics are quoted by different outlets. According to the sixth Chinese census, of the 1.4 billion people living in China, over 20 million are Muslims, making up 1.6% of the entire population. The Hui are the largest Muslim population in China, while the Uyghurs are the second largest. Paradoxically, the Uyghurs face more cultural and religious restrictions than their Hui Muslim counterparts since China considers them to be more Han Chinese.

In a country where the majority population is Han, the central government in Beijing has long treated Xinjiang as a “frontier,” its Turkic Muslim population exotic and ‘alien’, requiring pacification as well as assimilation. Though some Turkic Muslims seek greater freedoms and autonomy under the current government, others hunger for a separate state, causing Beijing to look upon them as ethno-nationalist threats to the Chinese state.


19”Han Chinese.” Definitions.net. STANDS4 LLC, 2019. Web. 10 Apr. 2019 What Does Han Chinese Mean?, www.definitions.net/definition/han chinese. - Han Chinese are an ethnic group native to East Asia. Han Chinese constitute approximately 92% of the population of China and about 20% of the entire global human population, making it the largest ethnic group in the world.
Though prior to Islam, the Uyghurs are said to have embraced Buddhism, Shamanism, and even Manichaeism; records have exposed the Uyghurs history on the land to be over 4000 years old. It is believed that Islam transcended to China during the Caliphate of Uthman ibn Affan, the third Caliph of Islam who sent a delegation to China in 650 CE. This event which people consider as the birth of Islam in China took place only eighteen years after the death of the Prophet Muhammad.

Being at the heart of the Silk Road (the ancient complex network of trade roads connecting Asia, east Africa and the southern most part of Europe), the Uyghurs were able to establish city-states, kingdoms, and even empires rivaling China’s Tang Dynasty (618-907 C.E.). Kashgar and Khotan were oases for travelers stopping to rest and restock as they carried spices, ivory, and slaves creating a vibrant economy and bringing a cosmopolitan character to the Uyghur homeland.

Since the Qur’an (Koran) was originally written in Arabic, with Islam came Arabic scripture. Even today, travelers who dare to retrace the ancient route of the Silk Road through Xinjiang, still find it to be a world vastly different from China. Very few people speak Mandarin,

20"Manichaeism." Definitions.net. STANDS4 LLC, 2019. Web. 30 Apr. 2019. What Does Manichaeism Mean?, www.definitions.net/definition/Manichaeism.(noun) a religion founded by Manes in the third century; a synthesis of Zoroastrian dualism between light and dark and Babylonian folklore and Buddhist ethics and superficial elements of Christianity; spread widely in the Roman Empire but had largely died out by 1000

21 About Uyghurs | Uyghur American Association, uyghuramerican.org/about-uyghurs.


23 A modern alternative for AD. The full form is Anno Domini. It is Medieval Latin for "in the year of the Lord."

24 Franz Michael, China through the ages - History of a civilization, 10
and the “traditions of their ancestors — whose kingdoms have been swallowed by the sands —
live on in faith and food.”

In 934 C.E. during the Karakhanid era, the capital of the Kingdom, Kashgar, became a major center for practicing Islam. The beginning of intertwining religion, ethnicity, territory, and matters of state control began and the Uyghur culture began to be defined as the region itself became predominantly Muslim.

The Islamic Uyghur Kingdom of East Turkestan maintained its independence and cultural prosperity until the Qing Dynasty when the Manchu Empire invaded the nation in 1876. After a long and bloody eight year war the Qing Dynasty succeeded in annexing East Turkestan in 1884, renaming the region “Xinjiang” which translates to “New Territory” or “New Frontier” signifying its location on the other side of the Great Wall of China. Lying in the heart of Asia with its grand deserts, unparalleled mountain ranges, rivers, forest, and grasslands with rich resources Xinjiang became a buffer zone to shield the main heart of China, keeping it safe from invaders. It is therefore important to remember. “when we speak of Chinese culture and its history and evolution we have therefore distinguished between the China of the Chinese and the China of the expanded empire. It was China proper where Chinese culture was shaped.”

The expansion of their empire, passed the Great Wall of China, into the region known as Xinjiang,

---


26 About Uyghurs | Uyghur American Association, uyghuramerican.org/about-uyghurs.

27 Franz, 10

28 40 percent of the nation’s coal deposits and a quarter of its oil reserves.

29 “China proper” or “China within the Wall” (the Great Wall) — territory

30 Franz, 10
proves the Uyghur and other minorities had their own way of life. Though like the West, China came to regard their system as the most civilized form of human communal existence\textsuperscript{31}.

The Qing dynasty ended with the revolution of 1911 establishing the Republic of China (ROC) and ending the imperial system. From 1916-1928 during what is known as the Chinese warlord era, a fragmented period with no centralized leadership, Though the ROC had main control over China the country was divided among former military cliques. At first, Xinjiang being outside the province was able to maintain isolation and not be affected by the upheavals being experienced by the rest of the cliques but eventually, fell into the hands of warlord/Governor, Jin Shuren\textsuperscript{32}, who allied himself with the Soviet Union.

In the 1930s, the central government indicated that non-Chinese areas could seek independence if they wished. In reality, they lied and opted for a system of “nominal self-rule or autonomy by non-Han peoples at local and regional levels yet still under the overreaching control of the ROC, with no right of secession.”\textsuperscript{33} This angered the Xinjiang minorities enough to stage two uprisings against the ROC, once in 1933 and again in 1944 to establish the “Independent Eastern Turkistan Republic” but subsequently failed. This demonstrates the legitimate desire to hold on to their cultural and religious identity which has been systematically oppressed by the Chinese government.

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{Idib, 8}
\footnote{Chapter 3 political history and strategies of control, 1884-1978 By James A. Millward and Nabijan Tursun in the book Xinjiang, by Starr page 91}
\end{footnotes}
However some Turkic people including the Uyghurs, looking to break from both the Han as well as the Soviet Union, were influenced by the Turkish Jadidist movement and inspired by Pan-Turkism (a movement for Turkics to be officially recognized culturally and politically) created the short lived East Turkestan Republic of 1933, centered around the city of Kashgar. Only to be ended a year later by the Hui warlords and the Kuomintang or KMT, the Nationalist Party of China- a political party in the ROC still in operation today. The KMT governed this part of the region while Xinjiang was newly ruled by Sheng Shicai (1933-1944), who worked in close relations with the Soviet Union. In 1937, with pressure from Stalin, Sheng began to purge any leaders in Xinjiang once again causing a rebellion among the Turkic. The rebels seized Kashgard and denounced Sheng Shicai a puppet of the Soviet Union. Sheng appealed to the Soviet Union for help, who sent 5000 Russians soldiers to crush the rebels.

The Japanese invasion of China prevented the KMT from helping so Sheng’s power remained unchallenged. However, convinced that the soviet union would collapse after the Nazis invaded in 1943, Sheng swore alliance to the KMT. When the Soviets pushed back the Nazis, he tried to gain Soviet support once more. When the Soviets refused, Sheng stepped down, allowing the KMT to move in. But unwilling to lose the region, the Soviets helped launch the Ili Rebellion of 1944, supporting a Second East Turkistan Republic.

In 1945, the ROC sent millions troops into the Second East Turkistan Republic region forcing them to sign a truce. With barely any resistance from the Turkic persons who did not

---

34 "Jadids.”. Encyclopedia of Modern Europe: Europe 1789-1914: Encyclopedia of the Age of Industry and Empire, www.encyclopedia.com/history/encyclopedias-almanacs-transcripts-and-maps/jadids: Jadidism (a word meaning modernism, from the Arabic Jadid, meaning new) was a late-nineteenth-century movement of intellectual and political self-renewal and resistance among the Muslim subjects of the Russian Empire.

35 Otherwise known as, Kuomintang or Guomindang or the Nationalist Party of China (NPC) or the Chinese Nationalist Party

36 Political History and Strategies of Control, 1884-1978 by James A. Millward and Nabijian Tursun. In Xinjiang by Starr page 82-85
support the Second East Turkistan Republic seen as a Soviet puppet state which rejected notions of Pan-Turkism and Sheria-Law\(^\text{37}\).

In 1949, with rumors of another revolution taking place in China, the Chinese Muslims once again became optimistic about a better future. In pursuit of real autonomy they fought alongside the Red Army (PRC) led by Mao Zedong not to have their culture suppressed by a Soviet puppet state. Sadly, though they helped Mao to usher in the victory and the PRC succeeded in taking power in 1949, the Uyghurs were to find themselves oppressed once more.

**Executive Order 9066: The United States of America**

One may argue that what happened in 1942 was not the first time that America used its power to strip its citizens of their rights. It can also be pointed out that many minority groups in America today and around the world, though considered citizens of their nation states, are being denied their basic human rights. However this study will again focus primarily on the action of government taking its own ‘citizens’ and forcibly relocating them to ‘camps' or even detaining them in the locales in which they reside.

The point here is not to take away any legitimacy from the Italians or Germans who were otherwise unaffected by Executive Order 9066. I acknowledge the fact that 11,500 German and 3,000 Italian citizens\(^\text{38}\) were also detained and stripped of their rights. But in contrast, they were not forced to endure a comprehensive program of removal followed by incarceration as executed


\(^{38}\) *German and Italian Detainees*, [Densho Encyclopedia](http://encyclopedia.densho.org/German_and_Italian_detainees/).
by the War Relocation Authority (WRA). Americans of German and Italian descent were allowed to keep their national identities were not asked to denounce their heritage nor as a population were they forced to re-pledge their allegiance to the United States. Neither did they have to endure any Anti-German or Anti-Italian national movements. Members of these ethnic groups were fortunate enough to have been eligible for U.S. citizenship, enabling them to be more easily assimilated into the social fabric of American society, compared to their Japanese counterparts. Another reason, I am solely focusing on the Japanese American story is that Americans of German or Italian descent, though at times questioned for their heritage, were only labeled as “potential threats” and left un-interned.

Even the wording used against the Axis Europeans was less aggressive than the those used against the Japanese Americans. The Europeans were given epithets often derived from their names or food like Fritz, Heinie, Jerry and Kraut for the Germans whereas the Japanese were depicted as inhuman often referred to as ‘vermin’ of one sort or another thereby reinforcing the idea of the Japanese not being ‘human’.

In 1941 in preparation for what seemed to be an inevitable war with Japan, the state department sent Curtis B. Munson, to the West coast and Hawaii to investigate the loyalty of Japanese Americans. Delivered to President Roosevelt in November that same year, Munson declared in his report: “There is no Japanese problem on the West Coast.” He found there to be a “remarkable, even extraordinary degree of loyalty among this generally suspect ethnic group.”

---

This report by Munson which clearly stated there was no military necessity for the mass incarceration of Japanese Americans, was ignored and kept secret by the government.\textsuperscript{40}

The internments which were instituted under Executive order 9066, should not be confused with the Enemy Alien Internment Program, authorized by separate Presidential Proclamations\textsuperscript{41} From 1941 to 1946, the FBI and other law enforcement agencies arrested and imprisoned 31,275 persons suspected to have been, ‘enemy aliens’ dangerous to the United States\textsuperscript{42}. These US residents holding Japanese, German, and Italian citizenship were classified as Enemy Aliens and detained by the Department of Justice (DOJ)’s Alien Enemy Control Unit; in many cases involving the incarceration of their American citizen relatives. Wherever the number of apprehensions was too few for the Immigration and Naturalization Service to operate a detention facility, enemy aliens were held by the U.S. Army in their facilities across the United States.\textsuperscript{43}

In the interest of ‘hemispheric security’ the U.S. government went as far as forcing the deportation of over 2,260 persons of Japanese ancestry from 15 Latin American countries who

\textsuperscript{40} He also said “there will be no armed uprising of Japanese…. For the most part the local Japanese are loyal to the United States… Their Family life is disciplined and honorable. The children are obedient and the girls virtuous. [the Nisei] show a pathetic eagerness to be Americans.

\textsuperscript{41} World War II Enemy Alien Control Program Overview The National Archives, https://www.archives.gov/research/immigration/enemy-aliens-overview

\textsuperscript{42} Enemies, world war II Alien Internment By John Chistgau page vii

\textsuperscript{43} https://www.thc.texas.gov/preserve/projects-and-programs/military-history/texas-world-war-ii/japanese-german-and-italian
were ‘invited’ to send these people to the United States, ostensibly to be used for prisoner-of-war exchanges with Japan.\footnote{From 1942 to 1945, the people who were deported were incarcerated in the U.S. to be used by the American government as hostages in exchange for Americans held by Japan. About 80 percent of the Latin Americans were Japanese Peruvians. More than 500 Japanese Peruvians were included in the two prisoner-of-war exchanges that took place in 1942-1943. The ones that remained continued to be incarcerated by the U.S. After the war, they were told they were “illegal aliens” but the Peruvian government refused to readmit any Japanese Peruvians even if they were citizens of Peru. As a result some 1,700 Japanese Peruvians were deported to war-divested Japan, a country they have never known and which most had no ties to. 300 hundred remained in the U.S. and fought the deportation status through courts. And 100 Japanese Peruvians were allowed to return to Peru. To this day, the U.S. government has yet to acknowledge the wrong done to the Japanese Latin Americans. \url{http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Japanese_Latin_Americans/}}

Under the guise of a military emergency, “although Executive Order 9066 was written in vague terms that did not specify an ethnicity, it was used for the mass incarceration of Japanese Americans. The government claimed that incarceration was for military necessity and, ironically, to "protect" Japanese Americans from racist retribution they might face as a result of Pearl Harbor. (These reasons were later proven false by the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians in the 1980s.)”\footnote{University of California. "Relocation and Incarceration of Japanese Americans During World War II". — \url{Japanese American Relocation Digital Archives, https://calisphere.org/exhibitions/essay/8/relocation} Retrieved 27 April 2019.} Over 120,000 Americans of Japanese, descent were removed from their homes and relegated to “relocation ‘camps’” scattered throughout the Midwestern states.

On February 19, 1942, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066 into law, arbitrarily yet completely suspending the civil rights of U.S. residents of Japanese ancestry. The three western states, Washington, Oregon, and California along with Hawaii were declared off limit de facto military areas and the removal from them of all “enemy aliens” was ordered.\footnote{History.com Editors. "FDR orders Japanese Americans into internment camps" \url{History, https://www.history.com/this-day-in-history/fdr-signs-executive-order-9066}}, Accessed 10 April 2019 This ‘order’ authorized the “evacuation” of 120,000 persons, citizens and non-citizens alike, into concentration ‘camps’, ignoring the fact that at least 70% of them were law abiding
citizens born right here in the United States. No distinction was made between the Issei, or the first generation who had emigrated from Japan and the Nisei, born in the U.S. and considered to be “second generation” immigrants (from the Japanese for two, “NI” and “SEI" for generation). Add to this the fact that because they were born in the U.S., Japan did not grant the Nisei Japanese citizenship, except in rare case where the births had been registered with the authorities in Japan.

Subsequently, these Japanese Americans discovered that the distinction between alien and citizen was nearly not as important as the difference between yellow and white. Ten hastily constructed ‘camps' were built in order to imprison Japanese Americans of all ages, genders, and beliefs; None of whom were ever charged with any particular crime. They were prisoners without trial. Children who had only ever known America were looked upon as traitors to America- not for anything he or she had said or done but merely because their parents had been born in Japan, a nation with which they were now at war.

**The Uyghurs: - The Peoples Republic of China**

China refers to the area in question as the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region of the People’s Republic of China. Known also as East Turkestan by those outside of the PRC, to recognize the people, descendants of the Turkic people who moved to the region in the 9th century. Although China took and placed the region under its rule in — though one could say sufficient time has passed for a certain Chinese way of life to flourish, historically, East
Turkestan was a part of Central Asia. To be clear, East Turkestan's people, the Uyghurs\(^{47}\) are not ethnically Chinese; they are to this day, descendants of the Turks of Central Asia and not of Han Chinese origin. We must also acknowledge the fact that the Chinese calling them “Uyghur” is also incorrect, for the term has previously been used to describe the largely Buddhist population of the Turpan basin half a millennium ago\(^{48}\).

This paper is not designed to debate over whether China should give them independence or call them by their preferred name. Therefore, for the sake of argument I will be referring to the autonomous East Turkistan population as Uyghurs and in most cases, the Region as Xinjiang in the manner in which they are commonly referred, for ease of identification regardless of political correctness.

In 1954, after years of exhausted efforts for equality, many Uyghurs revolted in an effort to establish an Independent Islamic State. China, responded with an iron fist of suppression by military force followed by the mass production of anti-Muslim propaganda.

During the Hundred Flowers movement of 1956, Mao invited open criticism of the party. Criticism however was slow to follow, no doubt rising from the history of questioning being punishable. But party leaders echoed Mao’s theme, “let a hundred flowers bloom, and a hundred schools of thought contend.”\(^{49}\) Intellectuals began to speak out and the movement of the Anti-Right gained a following.

This revealed the deep discontent with Xinjiang’s promised “autonomy” in actual practice. At the same time the Soviet-Chinese relationship began to weaken. Because of the close

---

\(^{47}\) To learn more about the history of Uyghurs, read *Xinjiang: China’s Muslim Borderland* by S. Frederick Starr

\(^{48}\) Starr, page 103

relationship Xinjiang had with the Soviet Union, when the tensions began to grow in the 50s so did the anti-Soviet sentiment in China, which was then taken out on Xinjiang, whether the Turkic officials were associated or not with the Soviet Union. “What was the anti-right campaign in China was focused in Xinjiang primarily on Islamic figures and ‘local nationalists’ and became in effect a de-Sovietizing purge of non-Han political elites…This campaign labeled 1,612 cadres ‘local nationalist’ [Turkic officials] and dispatched most to labor ‘camps' for thought reform.”

This shows that what is happening today is not the first time China has used ‘camps' to reform or re-educate people. The people, mostly teachers, who were sent away either perished in these ‘camps' or were later released in 1979.

Mao’s next campaign known as the Great leap forward (1958-1962) was of a utopian social and economic design, and predicted to change the lives of Chinese — it did not end well. Famine spread across Xinjiang and other parts of China, killing around 50% of the inhabitants of Chinese villages— 30 to 40 million people.

During this time, China developed around 150 projects, planned, financed and staffed by the Soviet Union. But as tensions between Mao and Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchev (the First Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union) increased with the friendship finally deteriorating, China was unable to handle all the projects by itself and suffered tremendously. To ‘atone’ for his mistake Mao launched another campaign in 1966, known as the Cultural revolution lasting 10 years, to re-impose Maoism. In an effort to bring back the revolutionary spirit that helped the PRC solidify their power he pushed for the youth to purge the “impure”

---

50 Starr, 92
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elements in Chinese society, intolerance and assimilation at the core. Attacking the elderly and the intellectual population since they were the ones who held the history of the people in their hands. Mao’s ideology or Maoism, which the PRC still ‘practices’ today is followed blindly by the people without the knowledge of all the horrible things Mao actually did in the name of progress.

The Cultural revolution’s effect on Xinjiang and its ‘non-Chinese’ people was rooted in xenophobia. “Mao’s wife, Jiang Qing considered minority nationalities ‘foreign invaders’ and aliens” through “outlandish” songs and dances; she reportedly “despised” Xinjiang. Her ignorant anti-Xinjiang sentiment spread across the country— insults and attacks on Islam and its customs became the norm— Qu’rans and other sacred texts in Arabic scripture were burned, Islamic elders were paraded in the streets in humiliating fashion, Islamic sites forcibly closed and ransacked, people put pigs pens into mosques, Uyghur girls’ long hair were cut into bobs, and traditional attire prohibited.

In the end Mao was responsible for 40 to 70 million deaths during a time marked for being otherwise relatively peaceful, a shocking number not often mentioned in the West— more than Hitler and Stalin combined. Thanks to the Party’s control over education and public discourse, they have whitewashed Mao’s legacy not questioned by anyone in China let alone America. China has falsely transformed him into a hero and all powerful founding father of the nation. Mao is more popular today than at any other time in history including while he was alive.

---
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China as a nation has been in existence in one form or another for over 3000 years with a multitude of governments, empires, and dynasties. While their republic, only 70 years old could be considered to be nothing if not merely another hiccup in its long and varied history.

It was not until the PRC’s power shifted to Deng Xiaoping in 1978, that the government “finally restored the notion of “autonomy” for minority nationalities and dropped from the constitution the Maoist dictum that ‘national struggle is in final analysis a question of class struggle’”\(^{57}\).

With its new leader, the PRC rewrote its constitution in 1978, granting Muslims religious freedoms under article 36. Like everything else, freedom of religion ‘exists’ in China but with the proviso of specific stipulations; The government only protects that which falls under “normal religious activity,” defined in registered places of worship without ever defining what it considers to be “normal”\(^{58}\). While the state at the same time officially espouses state atheism. It has approved of only five official sanctioned religious organizations; the Buddhist Association of China, Chinese Patriotic Catholic Association, Chinese Taoist Association, Three-self Patriotic movement, and the Islamic Association of China— which are permitted to hold worship services. Any other unregistered groups like the Uyghur Muslims - face various degrees of harassment and eventual imprisonment— where forced religious conversion to atheism takes place.\(^{59}\)

\(^{57}\) Starr , 97


In 2000, under the Great Western Development Strategy\(^{60}\), a policy of internal migration was put in place and China moved Han-Chinese into these ethnic regions to dilute the local population. The Han settlers are given economic incentives and dominate certain segments of the local economy and political machinery. This policy has changed the ethnic balance of the region over time. A Census done in 2010 showed of the 21.82 million people of Xinjiang, 45.84% to be Uyghurs and 40.48% Han\(^{61}\). A Uyghur once said in an interview for the *New York Times*;

“Sometimes when I look around me and see so many Han, I feel like I am a stranger in my own homeland.”\(^{62}\)

China openly joined the “war on terror” in 2001; while President George W. Bush publicly praised China’s support in the campaign\(^{63}\), Muslims in China feared for their lives. Hiding behind the now all too familiar excuse of combating “terrorism,” China detained over one million Uyghurs to be “re-educated” and to “correct” their “infectious” “extremist views.” Basically stripping Uyghurs of their individuality, this policy emphasizes that anyone not fitting within the Han-Chinese life-style the state has set to be “dangerous.”

In 2009, in the Xinjiang capital Urumqi, a violent tussle resulted in clashes between Uyghur protesters, the Han Chinese population, and the police. During the following days wide-scale police sweeps, Human Rights Watch reported at least 43 cases of missing persons,\(^{64}\) and the

\(^{60}\) page 27 of The Great Opening of the West development strategy and its impact on the life and livelihood of Tibetan pastoralists: Sedentarisation of Tibetan pastoralists in Zeku County as a result of implementation of socioeconomic and environmental development projects in Qinghai Province, P.R. China


\(^{63}\) Starr, 101

numbers only grew. Most of the violence occurring in Xinjiang goes unnoticed since the government doesn’t want to cause more tension between the Han-Chinese and the Uyghurs.

In 2013, President Xi Jinping came into power increasing repression in all aspects of life. His “pet project” the Belt Road Initiative (BRI), a cheaper and more reliable way to preserve economic stability. By transforming and reviving the ancient trading route into the Silk Road Economic Belt and exploiting its natural resources, this project would reduce China’s dependence on imported energy. To show what is at stake, the BRI which connects 65 other countries in infrastructure was responsible for 3 trillion dollars in trade between 2014-2016.

The government followed in 2014 with the “Strike hard campaign.” Even the aggressive name attests to the brutal tactics China has taken to control what they view as a serious threat posed by separatist, Islamist, and terrorist. Anyone suspected of exhibiting any abnormal thoughts or behaviors relatable to “the three evils” (separatism, terrorism, and extremism) are subjected to ‘corrections’ in these ‘camps’. Stating concerns relating to “the three evils” has been used as the grounds to restrict religious practices as well as when talking about counter-terrorism operations in China.

Presently, Chinese officials are encouraged to achieve high rates of detentions, therefore are more inclined to disregard basic human rights actually guaranteed under Chinese laws. This

---
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campaign mainly targets any who “challenges…state security, ethnic unity, and social stability,” meaning anyone who does not ‘act’ like a Han-Chinese person. Under this campaign people are being imprisoned for “harmless and inconsequential” reasons. The objectives to strengthening broader control and a tighter net of surveillance across the region.

But rights groups and exiles from China claim there is no evidence of a working Uyghur militant group out to get the government, and express that much of the unrest is due to frustrations of the 60 years of repression in Xinjiang finally coming to a boil. According to a 2015 *New York Times* article by Andrew Jacobs, when the attack on a coal mine first happened, no Chinese news outlet reported nor would any officials make statements. Surprising, since Jacobs claims it to be one of the deadliest outbreaks of violence Xinjiang has experienced in recent years. More than 50 people, most of them Han Chinese were dead, at least five of them police officers, and dozens more had been wounded, according to victims’ relatives and residents. If any of those events happened in Europe or America it would most certainly have gotten more attention.

The Chinese government has now blamed any and all unrest within the region on Uyghur separatist groups but has targeted the entire population. But the violence Uyghur separatist have committed as James Leibold an expert on Xinjiang puts it, are due to “triggers often locally embedded, whether it be reprisal for a woman who’s been publicly unveiled, and her family

---
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shamed, or people striking back after a relative has been detained by police” One cannot blame the civil unrest of non separatist individuals who are acting as lone wolves out of frustration in response to the intense repression.

There is no chance China would ever give up Xinjiang since it holds 25% of China’s hydrocarbon reserves and not to mention 38% of its coal as well as the beating heart of BRI system. Many journalists have cited this as being the backbone to China’s oppression against the Uyghur population.

This reinforced the need for Xi’s perception of keeping the Uyghurs and other ethnic minorities under control. And his preventive actions against ethnic minorities from attempting true autonomy or succession. Not in the name of combating terrorism but to prevent a separatism that would jeopardize Xi’s pipeline plans.

The tight grip Xi has around religious practices, specifically the Uyghurs, is not in the name of bettering them but is in response to the cry for independence or even recognition. “Postcolonial scholars, for example, demonstrated that colonizing powers narrated an ‘other’ whom they set out to save, dominate, control, civilize, and/or extract resources through colonization.” He plans to “sinicize” the Uyghurs and to have “their foreign influence purged.” With the thought process of erasing Islam from the Uyghurs, essentially erasing their
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identities, Uyghurs would assimilate into Han-culture therefore ridding any separatist movement in the region.

Chapter 2. The Creation of Nationalism

There is no political or social force stronger than national or group identity. The idea of liberal individualism might sometimes be more dominant but its antithesis that which balances it is nationalism. For most people, the nation to which one belongs is the first and fundamental way one defines oneself, even if one does not acknowledge it. But what is the driving force of this unnatural allegiance to said identity? Was it developed as a political motivator and what utility does national identity have? We may never know, since nationalism is an “anomaly” as it has been proven very difficult for analysts as they struggle to define what it is.

One of the first groups of theories is through primordialism, arguing that since nations are ancient, nationalism is a natural phenomenon. Theorists, like Clifford Geertz, who support primordialism believe national identities were natural, ineffable, and refer to “features attributed to blood ties.”

Through this lens, nationalism is explained through contiguity, custom, blood relations, language, but that it is something that one is born into naturally. A “priori” that is considered

79 Anderson, 3
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82 like Immanuel Kant’s a priori knowledge, that is independent of all experiences, a natural phenomena.
to be an unchangeable social construction but as an inevitable mode of being\textsuperscript{83}. These ties of kinship are strongly tied to a deep emotion that are uncontrollable rather than rational\textsuperscript{84}.

Modern theorists, like Ernest Gellner and Benedict Anderson, are generally critical of this theory, claiming these ties are anything but natural and socially constructed. They argue that the language of primordialism implies that national identity is a spiritual, mystical, unchangeable phenomenon that has been here from the beginning\textsuperscript{85} (explaining Chinese right to lands?) Identity for a primordialist is something that affects a person, something one does not have any control over.

Supporting their argument, national identity is a concept that has developed roughly over the last two centuries, simultaneously it is a modern phenomena like capitalism, democracy, urbanization, and industrialization.\textsuperscript{86} In other words, national identity is not a natural or biological inclination, but a construct that has a modern cause.

For Gellner and Anderson, modern nationalism is a distinct and clear result of Western industrialization in the 19th century. Whereby, the difference between the modern world and the pre-modern one is that physical work in any pure form has all but disappeared. What is still called manual labor does not involve actual physical labor but generally involves controlling, managing and maintaining machines. Which requires a certain proficiency, requiring a basic framework that is transferable, a framework largely based on the scientific method. A machine to

\textsuperscript{83} The Poverty of Primordialism: The Demystification of Ethnic Attachments. Authors: Eller, Jack David and Coughlan, Reed M. page. 187

\textsuperscript{84} Coakley, 332

\textsuperscript{85} Eller, Jack David and Coughlan, Reed M. 191

\textsuperscript{86} Anderson, 7
make parts for dolls is not so different from a machine that makes a car but what is important is being able to read instructions which requires speaking the basic language.

Instead of being born into a family of farmers, a citizens would now be better off learning the basic education required to transfer their talents between ‘simplistic’ jobs.

Gellner, writes:

A modern society is, in this respect, like a modern army, only more so. It provides a very prolonged and fairly thorough training for all its recruits, insisting on certain shared qualifications: literacy, numeracy, basic work habits and social skills, familiarity with basic technical and social skills. For the large majority of the population the distinctive skills involved in working life are superimposed on the basic training, either on the job or as part of a much less prolonged supplementary training; and the assumption is that anyone who has completed the generic training common to the entire population can be re-trained for most other jobs without too much difficulty.\(^{87}\)

In other words, a shared national culture is necessary for citizens to be mobile within that culture. Education, especially universal literacy is key and national identity is essential to modern industrial societies. In this regard, China claims that they are trying to “re-educate” and assimilate the Uyghurs to integrate them into Chinese culture. Yet, the Uyghurs only see the Han Chinese as invaders and occupiers of their land. They see a nationalism not their own being imposed upon them by efforts of a ‘foreign’ central government not of their making. One could
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almost say conversely, at the outbreak of World War II, white Americans were convinced that the Americans of Japanese descent didn’t share a common national culture; they were outsiders and didn’t belong in America. While the Japanese Americans felt they were entitled to this same culture and sense of belonging for having been born in the US and actually sought out this American sense of Nationalism.

Though both cases are clearly driven by nationalism, there is an interesting juxtaposition nonetheless that in the US the ‘oppressed’ were the ones seen as being land grabbing occupiers and in China, it is the ‘oppressors’ who are the ones so accused.

For Anderson, national identity is *imagined* but not any less real. He reminds us that “It is imagined because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion….”88 Attributing national identity to a number of key phenomena; (1) the idea of a continuously stable national identity replacing the religious worldview that had dominated Europe throughout the medieval period89, helped by (2) the printing press, argues that with the emergence of the newspaper, the nation is presented as a continuous story.90 Representing the nation as a single community with a singular communal narrative91, one then assumes that the imagined others in the same community have read the same story, therefore sharing a cultural code92.
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88 Anderson, 6
89 Ibid, 12
90 Ibid, 38
91 Ibid, 25
92 Ibid, 26
One must ask then how is this community imagined? “Communities are to be distinguished, not by their falsity/genuineness, but by the style in which they are imagined.”

**Other-ing**

Nationalism is objectively modern, there is nothing like it when you go further back in time over the last few centuries. But it is taken by its adherence referring to things that are primordial, historically ancient. Nationalism therefore is an appeal to tradition even if it is a demonstrably recent phenomenon. Being formally universal, everyone is expected to have a nationality as everyone is expected to have a gender or other kinds of constructs.

So what does it mean to belong to a nation? If we use Benedict Anderson's anthological definition of the nation as “an imagined political community- imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign.” Limited, seeing as the nation is subjected to a politically constructed boundary, where political entities are restricted of how much geographical land area it can occupy, displacing many people. The Uyghurs are not confined within the bounds of China, they have been displaced because of the creation of the political boundaries giving China the legitimacy under international law.

In the words of Anderson, “the nation understands itself as limited, and, as such, does not visualize itself as something which is bounded or finite”, meaning that a true nation needs to
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transcend boundaries and physical restrictions and “yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion.”\textsuperscript{97} Without this ‘communion’ the nation as a cohesive entity cannot exist.

Nations are bound by the political boundaries they have constructed imaginary or otherwise. “Nationalism is not the awakening of nations of self-consciousness: it \textit{invents} nations where they do not exist.”\textsuperscript{98}

Though there are disagreements with certain primordial markers such as the homeland of the Uyghurs. The artificial borders China created around Xinjiang “follow official designation of national identities”\textsuperscript{99}, a practice within the works of \textit{ethnicization}, defining the history of control. Meaning, because Uyghurs live within the borders of China they are forced to ascribe to the identity of Han-Chinese so China can continue to dominate them with China’s cry of historical heritage to back up their claim,\textsuperscript{100} including but not limited to subjugation. China being the hegemony of the region, politically constructed the bounders of Xinjiang for the purpose of creating a buffer against invaders, while claiming Uyghurs are inherently Chinese because they live within the borders of China. Which came first…

While America had invented a sort of imaginary American community where Japanese Americans do not fit in. These nations were operating from the logic that nationalism is rooted in culture and language. Therefore by extension, if one’s roots are different from those of the ‘inherent’ nations’ how will one ever maintain a sense of nationalism.
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America’s “imagined community” are their ‘white’ citizens. The Japanese felt the exclusion “If you think you are citizens, just try to walk out of the ‘camp’ past the sentry line. If the sentries don’t shoot you, I’ll believe you are a citizen.” Japanese Americans were demoted from citizens to ‘enemies of the state.’ Japanese American wanted the government to recognize them as who they were, citizens of the United States. While conversely the Uyghurs want China to realize they are not citizens of China, they seek independence.

Since China does not have a policy of recognizing separate indigenous peoples with certain rights to land. China's policy of ethnic designation specifically avoids the issue of “indigeneity” and attachments to specific places or lands, thanks to strongly held Chinese beliefs that all the lands of China have been in the hands of Chinese since the Han Dynasty. Therefore, all Han Chinese are as indigenous as any local ethnic group to the lands of China. Hence, China’s minority policy is one of minority nationality recognition and autonomous administration, not one that designates indigenous peoples or rights. This logic being as flawed as Christopher Columbus discovering America therefore the settlers who came after had the same, more rights than the Native Americans. An example of a much later time, but a useful way too understanding the claim China is trying to make. Understanding the origins of China’s overall policy on nationalism opens the door into understanding why China is forcing the Uyghurs to forget about their heritage and the force acceptance of being part of China’s ‘imagined-community’.
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Using this logic, ‘othering’ has been justified, simply because being the ‘other’ cannot exist within this framework. Just as America calls itself a melting-pot and therefore, diverse, covering up the peoples’ denial of inequality.

China claims ownership over the region of Xinjiang, people of this region speak a different language and are of Turkic descent. In this regard Japanese Americans, spoke an ‘alien’ language, looked different and were therefore easier to be “othered.” Although some believe that assimilation is to key to maintaining stability within a nation, it seems as though in both of these cases, actual assimilation was not at least the immediate goal.

The nation is imagined to be sovereign since prior to the invention of nationality, the world and its people were categorized according to their religious beliefs\(^\text{104}\). When each religious belief was thought of as a distinctive community, however because religion is a belief all the world shares and is subjected to an individual, it would be impossible for each religion to occupy a specific geographical territory. As such, the concept of a nation is imagined to be sovereign as it was a means of breaking away and gaining freedom of said higher power\(^\text{105}\).

A Nation is a form of self determination, but there is an ambivalence to said self-determination but it being in accordance to a higher entity or state. And it becomes the state, the nation that becomes the self determining entity. Nation is “\textit{imagined} as a community,” in addition to it being a sovereign form of self determination because “regardless of the actual inequality and exploration that may prevail in each, the nation is always conceived as deep, horizontal comradeship.”\(^\text{106}\) Different forms of institutional structures, some extremely hierarchical and
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 unequal in terms of what they let different members of the nation do, but the concept of nation-ness intuitively implies sort of brotherhood of the nation.

Ultimately it is “this fraternity that makes it possible, over the last two centuries for so many millions of people, not so much to kill, as willingly to die for such limited imaginings.” Therefore making the point of nation-ness, why loyalty to the nation is so mobilizable in war.

Even facing day to day racism and inequalities, Japanese Americans still felt themselves to be a part of this “fraternity” of America- they were willing to die for it in World War II, not to prove their loyalty but to fight for a nation they believed in even if said community did not believe in them.

An internee at the Heart Mountain ‘camp’ in Wyoming, Frank Emi, stated “We would gladly sacrifice our lives to protect and uphold the principles and ideals of our country as set forth in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, for on its inviolability depends the freedom, liberty, justice, and protection of all people, including Japanese Americans and all other minority groups. But have we been given such freedom, such liberty, such justice, such protection? NO!!” How could America ask incarcerated Japanese Americans to fight for a country who does not consider them lives at all, just pawns in the game of war.

But there were still believers of America:

Marion Konishi, a high school valedictorian at Amache Relocation Center in Colorado, 1943, supports this point in her speech:
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“Sometimes America failed and suffered. Sometimes she made mistakes, great mistakes. America hounded and harassed the Indians, then remembering that they were the first Americans, she gave them back their citizenship. She enslaved Negroes, then remembering Americanism, she wrote out the Emancipation Proclamation. She persecuted the German Americans during the First World World, then recalling America was born of those who come from every nation, seeking liberty, she repented. Her history is full of errors, but with each mistake she has learned… Can we the graduation class of Amache Senior High School believe that America still means freedom, equality, security, and justice? Do I believe this? Do my classmates believe this? Yes, with all our hearts, because in that faith, in that hope, is my future, our future, and the world’s future.”

Nationalism commands such a profound “emotional legitimacy,” giving someone a sense of belonging. America did not believe Japanese Americans felt such emotions. Even questioning the legitimacy of Japanese Americans willing to fight and die for their country. In contrast, one could venture to say that the Uyghurs lack or even go so far as to say they have no such “emotional” attachment to or of ever wanting to belong to China.
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Waves of Nationalism

Nationalism is generally grounded in ideology or ethnic foundations, or often the mix of the two. The rise and fall of these different types of nationalism can be understood as a cycle of waves, an oscillation if you will. Nationalism grounded in ideological forms brings with it the assumption that as long as you believe in the nation’s values, ethnicity is irrelevant. Ethnic nationalism, however, is nothing if not totally dependent on ethnicity.

The type of nationalism prevalent at any period of time is largely dependent on the type of government, and the ideology of the person or party who is in the position of power. For example, the Obama era brought with it liberal, ideological nationalism. Today, the era of the Trumpian rhetoric of white supremacy and white nationalism signals the shift from ideological nationalism towards ethnic nationalism. This shift in nationalism is not exclusive to the United States; they have and continue to exist in China and parallels can be drawn between the two. It is interesting to imagine that both countries have shifted to the right with with doctrines which claim to be the rightful successors of earlier supposedly more benevolent eras. Maoism112 and Democracy to Han-Chauvinism113 and White Supremacy: Xi Jinping and Trump.

While Chinese nationalism consist of many competing discourses, it is safe to say China has become more ethnocentric since the 1990s, with Han chauvinism being at the center of the narrative. China continues to oppress intellectuals and human-right activist all in the spirit of a so
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called Neo-Maoism. Undoubtedly, the mass detention centers are a reflection of the Xi Jinping government, a nationalistic, hardline regime that often glorifies the practices of the Mao years\textsuperscript{114}.

The Han-culture has been touted to be the \textit{authentic} character of the nation and to deviate from the identity will only tarnish Chinese exceptionalism. Han-centrists have significant influence within both the policy-making as well as the public sphere in China, as seen in the creation of the ‘camps’.

“Minorities of all kinds can and do voice their cultural claims. Not on the basis of explicit theories of cultural but in the name of historical authenticity. They enter the debate not as academics — to not only as academics— but as situated individuals with rights to historicity. They speak in the first person, signing their argument with an “I” or a “we,” rather than invokes the ahistorical voice of reason, justice, and civilization.”\textsuperscript{115}

\textbf{Defining Terrorism}

To date there is no standard definition for what constitutes a ‘terrorist’, therefore there is much room for interpretation. The problem, I believe is the common phrase “one man’s terrorist is another man’s freedom fighter.”\textsuperscript{116} Japanese Americans were neither a freedom fight nor terrorist— they were only seen as one from the years of distrust of Asians. While Uyghurs separatist groups in recent years have had some incidents, does not make their whole population
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‘terrorist’. Uyghur separatist are a threat to their government, therefore as a whole is considered a terrorist organization, or legally defines them as such, so they can act outside the bounds of usual human right provisions. Governments legally make the distinction depending on what fits their agenda.

Terrorism as an idea has and always be will an ever changing constant, therefore, cannot have one perfect definition. The term has been interpreted differently depending on the time and which group or state is defining it. The definition changes throughout time, almost as a form of theater that keeps adapting to its new environment.

Critical terrorism studies (CTS), founded a series of powerful critiques of orthodox terrorism studies. Exemplifying that terrorism is not a new phenomenon,1 “terrorism is fundamentally a social fact rather than a brute fact; just as ‘races’ do not exist but classification of human-kind does, the same principle can be applied to the notion that ‘terrorism’ does not exist but classification of different forms of political violence.” According to their definition anyone can be a ‘terrorist’ under certain circumstances. Therefore, CTS refuses to define ‘terrorism’ either in ways that delegitimize some actors while simultaneously according the mantle of legitimate violence to others or that legitimates violence simply because of a particular circumstance. Terrorism is in fact a strategy and tactic of political violence either employed by both state and non-state actor during times of peace or war.117

Bruce Hoffman, an American specialist on terrorism defines it as: “(1) ineluctably political in aims and motives”; (2) “violent—or, equally important, threatens violence”; (3) “designed to have far-reaching psychological repercussions beyond the immediate
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victim or target”; (4) “conducted by an organization”; (5) “perpetrated by a subnational group or non-state entity.”

Hoffman’s analysis allows citizens, like the Japanese Americans and Uyghurs, to fit under a terrorist definition by not involving targeting of ‘non-combatants’ even though many authors have included it into their criteria. Important since terrorism studies actually provide an authoritative judgment about who may legitimately be killed, rendered or incarcerated by the state in the name of counter terrorism. His definition only encompasses groups or organizations and not people who are acting individually, as in for their own agenda. Individuals acting as a ‘lone-wolf” under the name of freedom for their people still doesn’t subject the whole community as ‘terrorist’.

Many terrorist scholars have expressed their dismay for the traditional dictionary definition because it offers little to no help in clarifying what a terrorist act or organization actually is/means. For instance, the Oxford English Dictionary, outlines it as “the unlawful use of violence and intimidation, especially against civilians, in the pursuit of political aims”119. While differs the U.S. Code of Federal Regulations, whom defines terrorism with more detail as "the unlawful use of force and violence against persons or property to intimidate or coerce a government, the civilian population, or any segment thereof, in furtherance of political or social objectives." Although the US government has a definition for “terrorism,” as stated above, there is actually no “standard” definition that fits all violent attacks on people or institutions- not one definition that fits all different forms of terrorism.
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Though officially Japanese Americans were not called called “terrorist,” particularly as the designation was not a part of the vernacular, the “fear of sabotage, of espionage, of fifth column activity”\textsuperscript{120} as carried out by them was enough for the American to classify them as such has such a designation existed. Since fifth column activity was defined as that which was carried out by “a group of people residing in a given country who work to actively support a wartime enemy of that country from within by engaging in espionage or sabotage or who engage in such activities in anticipation of war.”\textsuperscript{121} The labeling of Japanese Americans as a fifth column can then be said to have greatly contributed to their incarceration.

While China has manipulated the public’ consciousness into associating the words “Islam,” “Muslim” or “Uyghur” with “terrorist,” there were some controversial provisions, as China revised its definition of who and what actions would be considered ‘terrorism’. Their legal definition as it is leaves these activities rather open-ended and vague\textsuperscript{122}. According to a published draft of “Counter- Terrorism Law,” as seen in article 104, defining terrorism as “any thought, speech, or activity that, by means of violence, sabotage, or threat, aims to generate social panic, influence national policy-making, create ethnic hatred, subvert state power, or split the state.”\textsuperscript{123} Within this definition could be included anyone who is advocating for political change and could include human right campaigns. International bodies have urged the removal specifically of ‘thought’ forgetting the fact that ‘activity’ could mean anything at all. Peaceful dissent or even criticism has become illegal, and no one or no thought can be considered safe.
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The Chinese definition of ‘terrorism’ is too intertwined with the idea of “religious extremism.” Being vaguely defined by “distorting or attacking state policies, laws, and administrative regulations,” “using ethnicity or religion to … interfere in production or management,” and “forcing minors to take part in religious activities,” as well clauses that are up for interpretation such as “other conducts that disrupt the implementation of state policy, laws, administrative rules and regulations.” No wonder every single Uyghur has been either detained or been assigned a guardian, under these vague laws sneezing could land you in ‘camp’.

If a nation wants their people to believe in a system that does not serve them then it would need to use a specific vocabulary that unconsciously leads the people to believe one way. Thus, one could argue that “the capitalist class system is upheld not simply by unequal economic and political power but, by the hegemony- ideological domination- of bourgeois ideas and theories” that shape a reality of who is what. Language frames the discourse under which some groups will operate.

**Violence**

Violence has many forms of expression, representing a wide range of interpretations and variants, there is no universal definition of violence. Putting aside the common assumption that violence can only be categorized when force is executed. Roger Thornton's, theory on violence being temporal can be applied in a multitude of levels with in this framework.
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His perception of structural violence as he refers it to; acts of violence that have been accepted as being necessary for the maintenance of the overall established pattern or organization of society. This form of violence is used to protect and reinforce the hierarchical patterns of society, which determine the power relationships across all spectrums of society. The maintenance of structural violence is so important that it is rationalized and protected both physically (by the military and police) and psychologically (by dominating political ideology and philosophy). Therefore, in this context violence can be defined as a violation of human rights by someone in authority or the implementation of policies that work against certain groups by violating their fundamental human rights. (changed and “justified” because of the heightened sense of being at “war”).

The Universal Declaration of Human rights recognizes “violence” as a violation to the rights to life, liberty autonomy and security of the person; equality and non-discrimination; to be free from torture and cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment or punishment; to property; to privacy, and the right to the highest attainable standard of health.

America and China, by physically putting their citizens into concentration ‘camps’, controlling the media, and reinforcing the perceptions that the ‘others’ are “not-human” creates a disturbance in social relations and according to Thornton falls under the theme of violence.

With the historical racial biases embedded in both narratives, the violation of their human rights shaped by it, should come as no surprise. But because violence is a product of temporal “peculiarity”- In that moment the violation can’t be traced back to its origin. Examples, (1) it

---


127 Thornton

128 The universal declaration of human rights article 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 17, 25
wasn’t till the mid-1970s historians began to recognize America’s worst wartime mistake was instead a logical result of centuries of American racism. (2) Media only talks about the Chinese ‘camps’ as it being the first time China has used this form of control, even though it was persistent since the 30s. Further proving Thornton’s claim that violence is only ‘visible’ after the fact. Who knows if China will ever legitimately recognize their violence.

This violence is caused by Xenophobia of the ‘other’ while both cases the governments are in fear of the ‘unknown’ that would be executed by the ‘other’, who is only ‘othered’ as they are unfamiliar. Thornton’s theory can also be applied to both FDR’s risk and probability gamble of Japanese Americans uniting and exciting the “next-attack” and China’s same gamble with the separatist movement in Xinjiang. Sticking to the paradox of predictability, “peculiar temporality of violence,” — violence being statistically probable but fundamentally unpredictable.

Yet, governments still attempt to “know the unknowable” and to “think of the unthinkable” or even “expect the unexpected”; In this context, preemption, precaution, preparedness, and resilience have all been described as privileged practices to make unexpected future events palpable and governable. After Pearl Harbor, the idea of the “next attack” is characterized as the worst case scenario or that which would radically disrupt the present. Imagination of the unthinkable is how counter-security both cases have shaped their policies.

There is no possible way to know the future but countries attempt to be one step ahead of the future by calculation of studying the past, imagining multiple scenarios, and practicing
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security drills. Security, I would argue has always been about anticipating your enemy and the need for certainty. When the stakes are so high, the “necessary” steps must be followed; 1) percussion - identify the threat, 2) pre-emption - attempts to deal with the “threat” before it materializes, and lastly 3) preparedness - how to deal with this threat. Both nations followed these steps in ignorance of whom they considered to be the enemy, putting their own people in concentration ‘camps’ as a preemptive action, became one of both cases’ most egregious civil rights violation to date.

“Claiming that preparedness exercises map the future in spatial terms, we argue that these practices enact a withdrawal of time, as the uncertainty of the future event is displaced on the management of space. The separation of space and time implies that actions are not focused on understanding the conditions of possibility of the disruptive event but on the management of spaces and behavior that are considered out of place.” I argue that both FDR and Xi Jinping’s preparedness practices enact a withdrawal of time, the uncertainty of the “next attack” as a future event is displaced on the management of space, therefore by putting those they consider to be the ‘other’ into ‘camps’ did they in actuality “prevent” them from attacking their nations?

The attempt to assume the future to secure the present only creates too much focus on what has not yet happened or may not ever happen and ignores the violations of humans rights-racial profiling then emerges from this attempt to control the “unknowable” since the idea of the future can only be deigned by past events (Pearl Harbor). Today, debates such as this still persist-as in, if America or now China should stop the prevention prosecution of terrorists? Attempting
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to be a set ahead of a future that can never be certain. Temporality of preemptive security creates a withdrawal from time, where temporal uncertainty of future events are displaced on the management of space- China views the Uyghurs through an Islamophobia lens, determining thus that at an uncertain point in the future all will turn into terrorists. Thereby justifying the act of putting them into ‘camps’ in order to control the future.

By stretching the definition of ‘terrorist’, China is and America was able to act between the lines of the law and legally suspending the rights of their ‘others’. Human Rights Watch stated, “Chinese courts convicted 1,419 people for threatening state security, inciting ‘spilttism’ and taking part in terrorism.” But the Chinese courts were unclear the actual number of people who were convicted of ‘terrorism’ nor specifics of what kind of offense.

Hateful sentiments rooted in xenophobia get pried out by the influence of wars. Even if one is bodily and spatially removed from the battlefield, war still effects an emotional response. Making one physically feel the tragedies of war and create an internal need to help anyway one can. The easiest way, punish those who remind one of the enemy.

“Racism and [Islamophobia] manifest themselves, not across national boundaries, but within them. In other words, they justify not so much foreign wars as domestic repression and domination.” Since Japanese Americans looked like the enemy of World War II and Uyghurs
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practice the same religion the ‘war on terror’ is tethered too, they are not seen as civilians but as combatants who can justifiably be made into casualties of war.

Propaganda

“Max weber (1991), who famously argued that military force is the raison d’être of the modern state, recognized war and military violence as profoundly social activities. He was aware that war makes states, societies, and individuals just as much as states—but also societies and individuals—make war Michel Foucault similar highlighted how the very notice of right, peace, and the law ‘were born in the blood and mud of battles’ and that war is not confined to the battlefield for this very reason.”\(^{141}\)

Just like the lazy Americans who only listen to the news outlet that will shape their perception of the world and not realizing their privilege to have the option of fact checking. The Chinese government regulated news media is the main and for some the only, outlet for information. Where the Chinese people gain a state sponsored understanding of Islam and Muslims and further ignorance about the people of Xinjiang is able to be propagated. “China's propaganda machine has been using their traditional methods, fomenting ethnic hatred, demonizing the Uighur image, depicting Uighur resistance as international terrorism, and

convincing the international community in many ways.”  \(^{142}\) But how China penetrates propaganda on Islamophobia is still very under-researched being one of the world’s most difficult media environments with limited or non-existent access to investigators.

China has always been smart with its censorship of media; journalists and Uyghur intellectuals have been navigating China’s restriction for decades, knowing if they crossed a certain line they would be jailed. The use of certain images and vernaculars, perpetuate stereotypes, ‘allowing’ the audience to then choose the image they relate to the most, furthering the relationship towards said ‘imagined community’\(^{143}\) That line became more blurred making the targeting of Uyghur intellectuals easier. Most of whom have been working for the state for three to four decades, are now being accused of being “two-faced”\(^{144}\) by “promoting separatism.” In the last couple years, the former director of the Xinjiang Education Supervision Bureau, the former president of Xinjiang University and many other Uighur professors and scholars have been detained under such accusations. Even though they have offered a moderate path, where Uyghurs could maintain religious and cultural practices without turning to extreme and isolationist ideas, China sees these hypothetical comprises as trying to hinder their efforts of rewiring and steer Uyghurs closer to ‘religious extremism’\(^{145}\).

Even scholars who are in support of the Party, like Mr. Jalaleddin who participated in a government led campaign to get Uyghurs to write open letters declaring their allegiance to the
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PRC. He too has been detained, January 2018. One of his school friends stated “So many moderate intellectuals have been detained now.” Rachel Harris said. “I don’t know how else to understand this, except as a deliberate policy to deprive Uyghurs of their cultural memory.”

There are religious affairs officials like Maisumujiang Maimuer who support Harris’s claim by stating: “Break their lineage, break their roots, break their connections and break their origins. Completely shovel up the roots of ‘two-faced people,’ dig them out and vow to right these two-face people until the end.”

China does not care for a moderate path anymore, this ‘last solution’ of re-education ‘camps’ to prevent any need for a separatist movement. By getting rid of the intellectuals, government can get rid of truth and history, and without these two bases there can be no identity to remember other than what the government has constructed.

This makes it clear that China is trying to erase Uyghur Culture. By detaining Uyghur intellectuals, China is able to control education, how this time today or the story of Uyghurs of yesterday will be written and remembered. They are also the ones in higher positions, holding the communities together. Just as Proclamation 2525 by FDR, to weaken the ‘other’ communities by going after the most “dangerous” first. Beijing believes that China can only reach its full potential once there are no more minorities and their culture and ethnic identities will disappear with them.

The illusion of war is kept alive through the media— I stress the word illusion since both cases claim to be at war but neither are bound territorially to the war they claim to be fighting.
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Since, all human concept of war is framed through imagery/text/discourse that is open to the public— the power of an image to gain sympathy.

“Every time the Japs over there for something bad, we over here (who have nothing to do with it— and who don’t like it any more than anyone else) get it in the neck. Phooey!”\textsuperscript{149} The images then define and solidify Japanese heritage as dangerous, only loyal to the Empire of Japan since all have a “herd like mentality.”\textsuperscript{150}

The subject then is produced and re-produced through the chosen images: Who is the enemy? Who is the external threat? Here in both cases a very aggressive affirmation was made about the ‘other’ — a certain idea of the ‘other’ subjectivity, amounting to a national self comprehension\textsuperscript{151} — naturally making it ok to subjugated the ‘other’ as less than human.

\section*{Appeal for Recognition}

How then does one get recognized as a life at all. The media makes it nearly impossible for the lives of the ‘other’ to be regarded as anything more than an enemy. “Instead, ‘there is a life that will never have been lived,’ sustained by no regard, no testimony, and ungrieved when lost.”

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{infamy} Dower, page 30
\bibitem{dower} Butler, 180
\end{thebibliography}
The ‘other’ ceases to exist whenever if the humans’ 5 senses show them to be human, the disregard of the ‘other’s’ life is parallel to the view of animals. For a life to be regarded as valuable, said life must first be regarded as grievable\(^\text{152}\).

Since human bodies are fundamentally “vulnerable”\(^\text{153}\) to destruction, humans are conditioned into being fearful of others who don’t belong to their imagined community. The norms that are preached in media determines whether or not the ‘other’ will be grievable.\(^\text{154}\) The ‘other’ being perpetrated in media as “uncomfortable terrorists” sets them outside the imagined community, leaving their lives ungrievable\(^\text{155}\). The continuation of “un-grievability” by the people made it impossible for certain living being to be seen as “living” and thereby exposed as being “non-life” from the start.\(^\text{156}\)

Due to the particular frames of the “us” and “them” narrative, are developed through societal norms of the ‘other’, and in these cases framed as “barbaric” and “uncomfortable” to American and Chinese norms. Thus, when killed or detained they “are not quite human, and not quite alive… [society does] not feel the same horror and outrage over the loss of their lives as [society does] towards those who bear the same national or religious similarities to [their] own”\(^\text{157}\). In some sense they are “socially dead”\(^\text{158}\) or already “lost”\(^\text{159}\) meaning from the start of said campaign of dehumanization the ‘other’ though alive is already considered dead.
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\(^{152}\) Butler, *Frames of War*, 22

\(^{153}\) Ibid, 33

\(^{154}\) Ibid, 64
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\(^{158}\) Ibid, 42

\(^{159}\) Ibid, 1
In America, office of censorship and the BPR helped coordinate this *illusion* by reviewing all photographs that would send a dual message to the public proving the inmates were confined securely enough to make sure they were no threat to American society and to show they were not being mistreated. Cameras were among the items Japanese Americans were required to give over to the authorities. The government saw the formerly innocuous camera as a suspicious instrument of wartime espionage.

The Chinese government carefully advocated harmony among different ethnic groups (minority groups) to avoid negative or controversial messages which might provoke contestation. In the new age of technology, China has been imposing regulations on the internet, publishing, and other new medias. It is hard to know without full access what is currently actually happening within its territory.

Both nations enacted censorship so that the public would know that the “dangerous” person is being taken care of in a humane fashion. “limit the power of an image in this instance also sought to limit the power of affect.” The U.S. government wouldn’t let evidence of this “un-American” practice be freely disseminated while China does not want to give the UN and other international bodies more evidence to shut down the 'camps'; Both knowing full well it could switch the opinions of their ‘free’ citizens thereby creating unrest.

95% of the U.S. doesn’t have any material connection to war. This illusion of being part of a war is created by a first person narrative. To the disadvantage to the audience, America and China are writing entirely from a single person’s point of view. Society then can only
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experience the war through the eyes of those in control. The nations are then interpreting the thoughts and feelings of the prisoners and their actions which are not mediatized to avoid negatively influencing public opinion.

Overall, the misrepresentation of the Japanese in media and of Islam in global media at the very least accentuating the fear of the rise of the yellow peril and Islamophobia. Helping both nations execute their plans smoothy. The Nations’ media adopting each of their definitions of the ‘other’ as a random “negative attitude or emotion directed” at the ‘other.’ For “fear is the root of prejudice against the [‘other’], and when it is extended and stoked by stereotypes, it leads to discrimination and racism.”

Ignorance is the origin of fear of the unknown, the foreign ‘other’, being misrepresented is a form a human violation—their agency castrated. In this day in an age, post 9/11, the Uyghurs, being muslim are seen as being “terrorists.” This is not new phenomenon while during post Pearl Harbor, being Japanese also meant being a terrorist.

Being labeled as such comes with intense implications, as it is used as a political tool to indoctrinate the public into believing said ‘other’ group is dangerous and deserves the treatment it receives. For, without the label the general public would see the ‘other’ as a grievable life, opposing the governments actions and could thereby end the incarcerations. That is the primary reason the government needs the public to feel the effects of war. For without the publics’ support there can be no war to be fought. Thus, by actively controlling the media, officials are able to overrepresent the ‘other’ as a “terrorist”, reifying the government’s ignoble acts.
News about any type of “terrorist” activity inside and outside the boundaries of the nation, only increase prejudiced attitudes towards the outgroup making the remainder of the citizenry more willing to cooperate; ostensibly for their own protection.

After the Xinjiang riots of 2009 any and all unrest began to be labeled as being the fault of the Uyghurs. The media outlets reaffirmed to the public that the iron fist of oppression is justified, while also linking global anti terrorist efforts to local politics, further amplifying legitimacy of the justifications.

L.R. Luquio and F. Yang, did a study of the anti-uighur narrative and its association to terrorism. They analyzed one state media outlet in china, CCTV.com, “the official website of Chinese Central Television.” Searching for keywords like ‘Islam’, ‘Muslim’ and ‘Xinjiang’ and through the use of questionnaires, they compiled instances of these words written or used in a negative tone. Although they expressed hardship in getting true results because of the “simplified reporting and lack of useful and accurate information”, found success through the questionnaires revealing that a high percentage of Chinese Muslims believed the media inadequately represents the religion with which they identify.

The Chinese government’s goal is to cast the illusion that the nation though diverse is a unified and harmonious society. As such, there is very limited coverage of ethnic groups and religious issues in the media. ‘Religion is the opium of the people’ a phrase coined by Karl Marx in 1843, meaning that organized religion can be harmful as it numbs and blinds a person from seeing reality. “An idea that has been propagandized” by the Chinese media and education system for decades and in theory, making people further uninformed about the concept religion, thereby making the Uyghur “unrecognized” as humans. Yet the same could be said of the Chinese
governments propaganda efforts which in effect ‘stupefy’ those being manipulated against the Uyghurs.

The racial cues in news stories only trigger stereotyped responses, punishing only the people who look like the *enemy*.

“The terms by which we are recognized as human are socially articulated and changeable. And sometimes the very terms that confer “humanness” on some individuals are those that deprive certain other individuals of the possibility of achieving that status, producing a differential between the human and the less than human. These norms have far-reaching consequences for how we understand the model of the human entitled to rights or included in the participatory sphere of political deliberation”

Butler examines recognition vis a vis intelligible. When “subjects are constructed through [stereotypical] norms, which in their reiteration, produce and shift the terms through which subjects are recognized”

Judith Butler, argues, through this citation of norms (which i argue to be constructed by the ‘the majority’, the ‘one’ becomes “viable” and the body is then qualified for life within "the domain of cultural intelligibility.” This is not merely a matter of social regulation, but involves a psychological process defining who is qualified for life.

The schema of recognition is determined from the social domain of the “imagined community” where the ‘other’ has been excluded, exemplified through the matrix of intelligibility through laws or by media. While the recognition in laws serves as a source of
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power that is able to denounce humans based on the classifications the government has put on them—exclusionary laws exemplified by the U.S or non-recognition of the indigenous by the Chinese — framing the ‘other’ as un-worthy lives.

The media as a source of news therefore is a form of education, propagating stereotypes socially constructed where “subjects are constituted through norms which, in their reiteration produce and shift the terms through which subjects are recognized ”166, the over misrepresentation of the ‘other’ in both cases encapsulates them into categories set by the falsely constructed identifications through a xenophobic narrative. As a result, the ‘other’ gains no recognition of legitimacy. The lack of legitimacy keeps the ‘other’ from becoming a norm— they are seen as outside any acceptable norm and pushed further outside the imagined bounds of their imagined community.

At the most simplistic level, the media is designed to dehumanize the ‘other’, creating a larger chasm between ‘us’ and ‘them’ essentially perceived as unbridgeable.167

The way humans are capable of being recognized in our culture is through regular positive exposure. Americans learn much about European history, and Europe then does not seem to be a world away, while the existence of the ‘other’ is never properly taught or reinforced to the public in the same light, further distancing the ‘other’ from obtaining a category in the normative discourse.

The dependance of fitting among the social landscape involves operating under a mutually exclusive binary; ‘us’ or ‘them’. The fact there can be no identity unless comparable to
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another does not mean one cannot grieve for one another. Though normative discourse creates the identity of each where one seeks recognition and to be reasoned intelligibly as one conforms to those normative discourses. Expanding further my claim regarding the upmost importance of education. Thus executed properly, education erases the various stereotypes differentiating the ‘other’ and without the ability to draw comparisons, the binary of difference disappears as well.

The nations then define humanness by the production of what the nation sees as tradition. In American’s case that to be “white is right” or for China, “Han is right.” Similarly, the nations’ morphological policies that define humanness in terms of certain ideas about what a citizen should look like. Producing a situation where anyone outside the framework is designated the ‘other’, who therefore is considered to be a threat to said traditions. Consequently these “others” will then not be considered as lives at all, but only as a threat to life and the very existence of the nation(s).

Butler reminds us that any regulatory ideal of humanness produces exclusions - how then does one refer to these beings that appear human but are not? The history of oppression in both cases preceded the creation of the ‘camps’, producing a clear distinction of human or non-human. 168

Concentration 'Camps'

A concentration ‘camp’ is a place where people are imprisoned “not because of any crimes they committed, but simply because of who they are.” According to the encyclopedia, the

168 frames of war, 31
term refers to a ‘camp’ which people are destined or confined, usually under harsh conditions and without regard to legal norms of arrest and imprisonment that are acceptable in a constitutional democracy.” This defines exactly what happened to Japanese Americans in 1942 when the people in power removed a minority group from the general population and the rest of society let it happen.169

In 1942 the U.S., determined that “citizens of a country with which the U.S. is at war” who are “identified aliens” that are “considered to be a threat to national security” will be “imprisoned” in 'camps' by the Department of Justice.170 When referred to as an internment ‘camp' or to use a softer term relocation ‘camp', the cruelty which took place of uprooting and isolating Japanese Americans against their will becomes diminished.

China has come up with strategies to re-educate these “infect” people and save their souls. The government has build around 180171 Orwellian ‘camps’ where they have detained over one million. But it has been proven very difficult to actually know what is going on in these ‘camps'. But the ones that have been able to escape have stated they are incurred physical and mental torture.

A Human rights watch report in 2018 uses the term “political education ‘camps’”172 only to refer to those facilities in which people are barred from going home for days, months, or years; it does not include other forms of forced political indoctrination programs.

---
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paper will not focus on. But in reality it is a concentration ‘camp' that could evolve into something much worse.

Uyghurs and other minorities without criminal charges of any sort. In these “political education ‘camps’ people are forced to learn mandarine, study Xi Jinping thought, ….. “Guided by the overall goal of social stability and long-term stability, and strive to build a socialist Xinjiang with Chinese characteristics.”

Civilians become obsessed with the perception of the ‘other’ uniqueness and nature of evil. Pearl Harbor and the global ‘war on terror’ movement, only gives the government justification for oppression against the ‘other’. Many people don’t understand or care why these ‘camps’ were an outright human right violation. Nor how the use of terminology that obfuscates the truth designs how history will be perceived. Even a simple change of words has a huge effect on the humans psyche of how certain event is perceived.

In her memorandum submitted to the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians (CWRIC) in 1981, Aiko Herzig-Yoshinaga, herself an internee called her work: “a position statement supporting the need to discuss, study and identify terms that will help us expunge euphemisms and support the use of accurate terminology regarding the incarceration of Nikkei people into American concentration ‘camps’ during World War II.”

Her memo titled Words Can Lie or Clarify: Terminology of the World War II Incarceration of Japanese Americans began with this summary of her findings:
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A search of archival documents reveals that most government authorities, Congressional officials, as well as the public at large, referred to the 1942-46 “relocation centers” as concentration ‘camp’. The following are examples which show that there was no question that high government officers, and even President Roosevelt himself, considered them as concentration ‘camps’ [emphasis author].

**Assimilation**

Singing a national anthem does not seem like a big deal but as Anderson points out, “no matter how banal the words and mediocre the tunes, there is in this singing an experience of simultaneity. At precisely such moments, people wholly unknown to each other utter the same verses to the same melody. The image: unisonance, for the echoed physical realization of the imagined community…. Nothing connects us all but imagined sound.”¹⁷⁶ Something about singing in unison to the same song that echoes a sense of community and pride and for your nation has been proven to bring comradery and seen as a sort of nationalism and patriotism.

Uyghur identity can be understood to be primarily ethnolinguistic, reasoning for the forced Mandarin education, is for the same reasons Joseph II, the Holy Roman Emperor, switched the language of state from Latin to German in the 1780’s¹⁷⁷, and “were not led in their efforts by any nationalistic point of view, but their measures were discoed by the intent of unification and universalism of their empire.”¹⁷⁸ The ‘re-educational ‘camps' of China can be

¹⁷⁶ Benedict Anderson, Imagined Communities, 145
¹⁷⁷ Ibid, 84
¹⁷⁸ Ibid, 84
seen in the same light. Since the 1990s, the Chinese government has pushed for what it
euphemistically calls “bilingual education”\(^{179}\), but in reality is the attempt to prioritize Mandarin
while marginalizing the Uyghur language.

“Human beings…are very much at the mercy of the particular language which has
become the medium of expression for their society … The fact of the matter is that the ‘real
world’ is to a large extent unconsciously built up on the language habits of the group.”\(^{180}\)
Essentially killing the Uyghur identity by forcing them to forget their language.

China has been trying to unify Xinjiang and universalize their empire so Uyghurs would
have no reason to want to be independent. China’s old tactics failed and now their only option
they see fit is unification throw assimilation, assimilation throw becoming nationalistic.

Language, according to Anderson, enabled a mutually unified form of communication
soon adopted by regimes, thus setting the ground for the appearance of a new form of imagined
communities - nationalism. Anderson example of the unification of norther and southern France,
can be applied to what China is attempting to today. If someone in the north of modern day
Xinjiang and someone in the South could converse easily, read the same books, same news
outlet, abide by the same laws, answer to the same courts and eventually serve in the same army
against people whose language they cannot understand, they begin to understand themselves as
brethren, being part of the community which is still, imagined. The nation being "conceived in
language, not in blood, one could be “invited into” the imagined community.”\(^{181}\)


\(^{181}\) Anderson, 145
Though the question of Japanese American and Uyghur assimilation which led to their incarceration are similar but the resulting ‘answers’ are remarkably different. The Japanese American were put into ‘camps’ since the ignorance of the American government only saw the color of their skin as a ‘primordial’ allegiance to Japan. The descriptors of “yellow peril” stereotypes, the “agitation attacked a number of ethnic Japanese cultural traits or patterns which were woven into a bogus theory that the ethnic Japanese could not or would not assimilate or become ‘American.’”\textsuperscript{182}

This “bogus theory” is not specified but could be associated back to primordialism, since during World War II that was the dominate theory, as it “argues that implanted ethnic identity through kinship persists even when assimilation progresses (Glazer and Moynihan 1975).”\textsuperscript{183} Although incorrect by today’s standards, if looked at through the lens of the time appeals to the notion that Japanese Americans would never assimilate.

China is forcing assimilation onto the Uyghurs by claiming to be ridding them of any “extremist” thoughts. Denying all claims of holding people against their will since they claim everyone who comes and goes in the ‘camps' do so “voluntarily” since it is a “vocational training facility,” designed to provide job training and get rid of “extremist” tendencies.\textsuperscript{184} Even though, they are not allowed to leave the ‘camp' until one has learned 1000 Chinese characters or have been deemed to have become a “loyal” Chinese subject.\textsuperscript{185}

\textsuperscript{182} Report of the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians, Personal Justice Denied. Part 1 page 4
It could be said, as messed up as it is, that the Japanese American ‘camps’ rushed the desire to “assimilate” so the American government would never see them as “untrustworthy” individuals ever again. An unintentional result China could be hoping to replicate…

Japanese Americans residing in military zones 1 and 2 on the west coast were curtailed by a strict 8:00pm to 6:00 am curfew, and a travel restriction prohibiting movement beyond a 5-mile radius from their homes. And that “at all other times all such persons shall only be at their place of residence or employment or traveling between those places or within a distance of not more than five miles from their place of residence.”

These restrictions are not dissimilar to China’s orders to the residents of Xinjiang demanding they surrender their passports to the police in order to completely control their movement to and from the region. Attempts, to leave the country will result in being forbidden from ever leaving. If one wishes to travel abroad, one must go through the local authorities for permission; all in an effort to restrict and control the movement of the Uyghur population.

Sophie Richardson, China Director for Human Rights Watch, stated “authorities have given no credible reason for taking away people’s passports, violating their right to freedom of movement. Doing so across an entire region is a form of collective punishment and fuels resentment toward the government in a region where tensions are high.” This notion of collective punishment was also practiced by the American government after the attack on Pearl
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Harbor towards the Japanese people for a ‘crime’ nothing more egregious than looking like the enemy.

**Camp Life**

The biggest difference between the two cases is not in the technological advances which have been made between the time of Japanese American incarcerations and now of the Uyghurs but the actual fundamental events taking place within the ‘camps’. My great-aunt, Keiko, experienced the authorities trying to make her life as “normal” as possible at the Rohwer Relocation Center, not “re-educate” her.

For a family of 13 they had three army barracks and the toilets, showers and facilities for washing clothes were separate in a central building. They had three meals a day, whenever they heard the bell ring to meet in the “mess hall.”

The kids attended classes and the teachers were recruited from various places. Their curriculum was supposed to be modeled after schools outside the ‘camp'. Sometimes they had teachers who were trained and others only relied on the answer book to teach them. They had typing classes with “cardboard cut-out of the keys of a typewriter” which only goes to show how much education actually mattered to the U.S. government.

Life was “normal,” Keiko rarely interacted with the guards, in fact, she does not remember if they often left their posts but she recalls being aware of their presence. She recalls the guards as respectful and very helpful when she and her mother had to visit a sick relative in Jerome, another nearby ‘camp' in Arkansas. She and her sister, Masako, became aides to the two
English teachers who were, as she told me, “young and attractive”, who took them to dinner and a movie in a nearby town— with permission of course and GI guards as chauffeurs.

While life in the Chinese ‘camps’ are still censored, and most people too scared to speak about their own time or that of someone they knowin the ‘camp’. There are people in exile who have managed to get out of Xinjiang spreading stories in an attempt for recognition

A teacher and writer, Abduweli Ayup\textsuperscript{190} was detained for 15 months in three different facilities in Urumqi, Xinjiang. He speaks about the violence he endured during his time there:

They stripped me of my clothes, slapped my buttocks and then they abused me... more than 20 Chinese guys. The next day, police asked me, 'One day, if you guys are in power, what will you do to us?' I said, 'Look, I'm a human being, I'm not an animal like you.'\textsuperscript{191}

His story however similar to others\textsuperscript{192} differs from those experienced during Executive Order 9066. Being as no official stories of physical coercion during that time, if there is I apologize for not doing better research as such but for now it can be said to have been nothing comparable to the unspeakable rape Ayup endured as a political tool to delegitimize his agency\textsuperscript{193}, to make him feel subhuman, a tool to preserve the idea into him— that he is nothing until the government says he is but in the meantime he is what the government labels him, a “terrorist.”

\textsuperscript{190} For more information about his case please visit https://uyghuramerican.org/article/sentencing-uyghur-linguist-abduweli-ayup-politically-motivated-and-highlights-chinese

\textsuperscript{191} Chao, Al Jazeera, Al Jazeera, 1 Feb. 2019

\textsuperscript{192} I was not able to rightfully do justice to the victims like Ayup nor expand on the other horrible acts being committed within the walls of the ‘camps’ in China. Please visit the following news site for more information https://www.rfa.org/english/news/special/uyghur-detention/

\textsuperscript{193} Banwell, Stacy, “Rape and Sexual Violence in the Democratic Republic of Congo: A Case Study of Gender-based Violence” Journal of Gender Studies 32.1 (2012) page 52
The rape being a form of ‘coercive control’ to get Ayup to admit he is a “terrorist.” Ayup was taken into custody for raising money for the Uyghurs’ schools after China made it illegal for children to be taught the Uyghur Language since he knows by limiting their language, china is limiting the children's association to their heritage, virtually deleting Uyghur from their memories. He states “They want Uyghurs to believe the Chinese Communist Party is God.” Something the American government did not impose onto the people in their ‘camps’.

Chapter 4 - Legacy

“Without grievability, there is no life, or, rather, there is something living that is other than life. Instead, "there is a life that will never have been lived," sustained by no regard, no testimony, and ungrieved when lost. The apprehension of grievability precedes and makes possible the apprehension of precarious life. Grievability precedes and makes possible the apprehension of the living being as living, exposed to non-life from the start.” - Judith Butler

For many Japanese Americans like Keiko and her family Post-War, proved to be more difficult than life in the ‘camps'. Re-integrating into a more “normal” life after being away for 3 years was hard for most. The stereotypes that were created of the Japanese Americans were then
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seen as proven since they had been forced into ‘camp’. One example, the landlord who rented the land my family farmed had become extremely anti-Japanese, making it very difficult for them to find a place to live or work in Lodi, California. Their story though sad, was not uncommon “as [other] American Japanese returned to their homes after the war, a few found that their neighbors had helped preserve their businesses and farms. Far more were still treated as enemies. Most of the evacuees, having lost everything, became residents of shoddy towns, trailer parks, and abandoned army barracks”  

Because of the sense of hopelessness and non-recognition the suicide rates or Japanese Americans were four times higher than that of pre-incarceration times. The numbers in Xinjiang are still unknown but exiles have commented on witnessing numerous suicides taking place within the ‘camps’. There are also reports of people in high power positions who committed suicide rather than sent to the ‘camps’. The number can only go up from here, who knows what will be left of Uyghurs. Since the Uyghurs have not been relocated it is hard to draws parallels of the material lost, only the sense of hopelessness of eroded identities.

---
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Conclusion

"Orientalism has faded, only to be replaced by fear of Islamism”\textsuperscript{201} - El-Aswad, 2013

In summary, this case study done between events taking place in a liberal democracy and a socialist one if that, aims to exemplify the natural occurrence of exclusion within nationalism, inevitably leading to human right violations, varying little though 70 years separate their occurrence.

In each case the ‘other’ has a history of regulatory restrictions depriving them of their daily life before their forced time in ‘camp’. The polarities of their incarcerations though may differ, paradoxically exhibiting the similarities of nationalism being embraced as a political tool.

The Issei Japanese came to America, committed to doing anything in their power to belong, were evidently and most cases completely refused the opportunity to do so. While for the Uyghurs, a China came to them, forcing them to be a part of a nation not their own and not of their own volition. Paradoxically, China can be seen as land grabbing while America attempted to stop the Japanese Americans from taking and owning land. Expelling the people who tried to conform into American ideals, while in the process attempting to erase them from the American landscape. While China only dreams of Uyghur conformity and their supposed complete integration through the erasure of identities ties to Islamic traditions.

The \textit{imagined community} the nations have created through their media platforms, allows peoples’ exclusionary sentiments towards one another to be validated. By the repetitive rhetoric

of negative stereotypes giving validity to the government actions of incarceration. Nationalism allows the creation of these subjective norms deeming the ‘outsider’ of such imagined community as being “lose-able”\textsuperscript{202}, since they are framed in such a way of having been “already lost or forfeited”.\textsuperscript{203} Oftentimes through the violent stereotyping by the media, connecting said imagined community, the ‘outsider’ is casted as “threats to human life”. The community comes to know them as such rather than “as living populations in need of protection from illegitimate state violence,”\textsuperscript{204} producing a distorted logic of the loss of their lives being necessary for the safety of the “living.”\textsuperscript{205}

The ‘other’ are not seen as a human at all, but vassels of the Empire like Japan or some Islamic terrorist organization. Truly differentiating them as the something less than citizen, less than a worthy life.

I reemphasize Butler’s point that none of this is “new but bears repeating”\textsuperscript{206} since it seems like nothing has changed in the last 70 years; When one grieves for the ‘other’ they are recognizing them as equals—as humans. Without said sympathy for the sufferings of the ‘others', theirs lives do not matter not constituting as to be living in the first place. In this sense, because of the lack of available information or common education attempts were and are being made on Asians or of Muslims equating them to be “socially dead”.\textsuperscript{207} As a result, their mistreatments are not seen as anything more than the effects of natural selection.

\textsuperscript{202} Frames of War, 31
\textsuperscript{203} Ibid
\textsuperscript{204} Frames of War, 31
\textsuperscript{205} Ibid
\textsuperscript{206} Ibid, 64
\textsuperscript{207} Ibid, 42 Orlando Patterson used this term to describe the status of slaves as not being seen as living at all.
If violence is only visible after the fact then it only expands further onto the notion of unrecognized which Bulter presents to us. By this I mean, the others’ divisibility is the incarcerator’s raison d'être. And since the ‘other’ is not seen in a normative light— education, actions, literature… the divisibility creates more violence since humans are naturally scared of the unknown.

Presidential Historian Robert Dallek, author of, Franklin D. Roosevelt: A Political life, raises parallels between the presidencies of FDR and Trump. It might be said that Trump was following in FDR’s footsteps when he issued the Muslim Ban. If Trump had it his way Muslims would have been simply incarcerated without a fair trial or due process.

I yodel from the top of the highest mountain of the utmost importance of the notion of visibility. If the ‘other’ is not seen as anything more than an ‘other’ or talked about in such terms how will the Japanese Americans or Muslim Uyghurs ever be able to be seen as the normative white European American or Han-Chinese. The kids who are in school today could hold powerful jobs tomorrow which shape the narrative of the nation, maybe if Trump was taught any other than Anglo-European history or the true atrocities America has committed against their own citizens weren’t white-washed, he would not be so racist and rash as to put in the Muslim Ban of 2017. An event in many ways mirroring and at the very least evocative of executive order 9066, both in the name of national security and the fight against ‘terrorism’.

This misconception of ‘war’ having a specific point or origin, comes from a long history of colonial and mistaken European discourse, thinking of ‘war’ only in binary terms— either one is in a time of war or a time of peace — canceling any inequities of one’s previous actions.

Whereby, periodizing the actions carried out by America and China demanding only a beginning and an end to their constructed temporal notion of “war”\textsuperscript{209}, I would argue, ignores the prevailing prejudice against the “others” preceded by the medicalized internments. Thus, psychological warfare begins between the ‘other(s)’ and said nation(s) before any official ‘time of war’ proclamation. For, if the ‘other’ is treated as unworthy and lives during a ‘time of peace’ inevitably turning to a ‘time of war’, when are they ever safe.

The psychologically destructive, that which demeans, damages, or depersonalizes others\textsuperscript{210} clearly being a form of violence, leaves and left the Uyghurs and Japanese Americans with no agency or identification. Nations today, with their focus on the rule of law and human rights, in reality are constructed upon a constitutive and permanent state of exception, in which no rights are guaranteed\textsuperscript{211}.

By reason of constructed legitimacy, those in power are privileged to constitute when a “war” begins and ends. Giving them the capacity to write a narrative fitting their agenda. Just as China’s shocking readiness to actively join the U.S. post-9/11 ‘war on terror’\textsuperscript{212} comes by no coincidence of coinciding with their Uyghur separatist movement, putting billions of dollars China has invested in the pipelines in jeopardy. This shows to even the simplest of minds, the power of controlling show historical markers in ‘times of war’.

China hides behind the official globalized “war on terror,” while at the same time engineering one of the worst human right violations against its own citizens. While America
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watches its own history repeat right in front of their own still ignorant eyes. A repetitive war between the cries of human recognition and xenophobia. Just as George Orwell once said “war is war,” violent in its nature, for anything goes in a ‘time of war.’ Socially constructed or not, those in power define the meaning behind such terms as “war”, “terrorist”, “alien” by benefitting from legitimizing such claims.

Under Executive Order 9066, the “threat” was specially separated from the public, put into popup 'camps’ surrounded by barred-wire and 24/7 guards who also remained within the bounds of the ‘camps’, but rarely interacted. This physical concept of 'camp' life has now bled into the streets of Xinjiang in an extreme Orwellian fashion. Barbed-wire serves no purpose for the landscape acts as a natural geographical prison, the “threat” physically separating the “threat” from mainland China. Though they are structural ‘camps’, the new installments of city wide continuous surveillance equipped with facial recognition software and biometrics data, with Communist state officially living inside the homes of Uyghurs, redefines the notion of ‘camps’.

After the 1944 reunification law was passed, 5,725 Nisei feeling betrayed formally renounced their U.S. citizenship. Among them, 5,409 changed their minds and sought to restore their citizenship, proving they didn’t have loyalty to Japan in the first place.

Both nations dismissed their own people by marking artificial differences of race and religion and imprisoning them for these ‘attributes’.. The government targeted the ‘other’ in acts

of violence that contradict the values it claims to have. People were physically and psychologically harmed in this way during and after World War II. In an ongoing war between the “Yellow” and the “White,” the “Muslim” and the “Chinese,” justifying their racist tendencies under the veil of fear and protection; explicit acts of violence lifted the veil, exposing the xenophobia.

Imagining the ‘other’ as “terrorist” or “nonconformist” prevails on the nation’s sense of a just war of retribution against these ‘other’ whom it views as subhuman.

Other people are not bound by the categories that we place them in. Criticizing nationalism is just the first step towards identities reinforcing one another and the necessity of imagining and bringing to fruition ways to build solidarity across identities. Because simply put, merely investing oneself in one's own national identity will not help in the long run.

In America, students do not know nor really learn anything about this forced internment of American citizens in their official studies—maybe because the country is still embarrassed by its past actions or it has chosen do everything to preserve the image of the morally all high nation. Most Americans don’t even know about the human-rights violations which took place in their own country let alone those taking place in China nor do they care.

Xenophobia is very prevalent in America, people probably do not even notice that they are biased against others who are not Euro-American. This is because the American education system does not have much focus on the history of Asia or any Asian country per se. The American history curriculum is designed to be biased towards learning about American and European history since they are apparently so intertwined with those who “discovered” America,

---

the land of our white forefathers. Because of this Asians are still considered the ‘other’, ‘unknown’, and for the most part a completely different “kind of people”, to overcome this, one must fix the educational system so future generations can be better informed as well as more involved in international problems and not just to the burning of Notre Dame.

In the end, History is a violent oscillation, a repeating wave of oppression and violence, with undertones of racism as a persistent theme. China and even America still see and treat some of their citizens as if they were citizens of a different country and not of its own. It is also safe to say that these themes will surface repeatedly whenever society sees or even perceives to be under attack by an “external” threat by those “others” different from itself.217 Labeling the ‘other’ as terrorist is a form of othering, helping one distance themselves from inhuman acts against the ‘other’ since then the ‘other’ are seen as not-human. Though Butler is talking about the problems within gender only seen as a due function it can also be related to a nationhood. “If someone doesn’t comply with either the [us] norm or the [them] norm, their very human-ness is called into question.” The way nationalism is produced is being loyal to one set of beliefs, identifying with more than one seems unnatural and untrustworthy of the individual.

---

Figure 2- “The skull was autographed by her lieutenant and 13 friends”
Life magazine, 22 May 1944, page 35

FIGURE 4 - CIVILIAN EXCLUSION ORDER INSTRUCTIONS, 1942
HOW TO TELL JAPS FROM THE CHINESE
ANGRY CITIZENS VICTIMIZE ALLIES WITH EMOTIONAL OUTBURST AT ENEMY

In the first discharge of emotions touched off by the Jap
wave onslaught on their nation, U.S. citizens have been doc-
umenting a distressing ignorance on the delicate question
of how to tell a Chinese from a Jap. Innocent victims in cities
call over the country are many of the 70,000 U.S. Chinese,
whose homeland is over-stretched already. So serious were
the consequences threatened, that the Chinese consulates
had weeks prepared to tag their nationals with identification
bands. To dispel some of this confusion, LIFE here addreses a
rule-of-thumb from the anthropometric conformations that
distinguish broadly Chinese from enemy aliens.

To physical anthropologists, devoted defenders of race
myths, the difference between Chinese and Japs is measure-
able in millimeters. Both are related to the Siamese and
North American Indians. The modern Jap is the descendant
of Mongoloids who invaded the Japanese archipelago back
in the mists of prehistory; and of the native aborigines who
possessed the islands before them. Physical anthropology,
in consequence, finds Japs and Chinese as closely related
as Germans and English. It can, however, set apart the spec-
ial types of each national group.

The typical Northern Chinese, represented by Ong Wen-
han, Chungking’s Minister of Economic Affairs (left, above),

FIGURE 5 - DIFFERENTIATING PEOPLE CHINESE (TOP) AND JAPANESE (BOTTOM)

LIFE MAGAZINE DECEMBER 22, 1941 ISSUE PAGE 81

FIGURE 6- CHINESE REPORTED DIFFERENTIATING HIMSELF FROM BEING MISTAKEN AS JAPANESE -
- LIFE MAGAZINE, ISSUE DECEMBER 22, 1941. PAGE 81
Figure 7- designated military zones

Figure 8- LOCATION OF CAMPS
Figure 9 - A map showing some Belt and Road Initiative land routes that run through China’s Xinjiang


Figure 10- Interview: ‘I Did Not Believe I would Leave Prison in China Alive’
Figure 11- Uyghur and Kazakh refugees in Turkey organized a demonstration under the leader of Isa Yusuf Alptekin (second person from left), and protested against to the oppression of China’s Communist regime at their homeland (mid 1960s, Istanbul)  

Figure 12-  
Uyghur dancing group from Kayseri were performing traditional Uyghur dance at an art festival in Istanbul (in the end of 1960s)  

Five Uyghur inmates in a widely published photograph of scores of men sitting in a political re-education camp in China’s Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region (XUAR) have been identified by friends and acquaintances, who confirmed their names and occupations to RFA’s Uyghur Service.
Radio Free Asia, Uyghur Inmates in Iconic Xinjiang Detention Camp Photo Identified April 26, 2019-May 01, 2019
My great-grand father on my dad's side.

Jitsuro Hiramoto

"Alien Registration ID card"

Equivalent to a green a card

WRA list of internees

My Family number 30016
88

My grand-mothers absentee voter ballot sent to her in the Sacramento Assembly Center. Where they were held both being sent to the ‘camps’.

Irony being that incarcerated American citizens were still given the chance to vote.
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