

Statement regarding my peer review process for the Xinjiang Papers transcripts and Adrian Zenz' associated reports

James A. Millward

24 November 2021

I was provided by the Uyghur Tribunal with a set of files consisting of pdf scans. Adrian Zenz provided me with transcripts of these documents, as well as a general introduction to the whole set, specific introductions to documents 01, 02 and 04, and an analysis of their contents for the Uyghur Tribunal. Based on Dr. Zenz' evidence and arguments in his general introduction to the Xinjiang Papers, I am convinced that the pdf files provided to me are scans of original Chinese government documents and that these are substantially the same as the cache of documents earlier obtained (but not published or otherwise made available) the *New York Times*.

My review work involved a few different tasks. I reviewed Zenz' written materials as I would peer review the manuscript of an academic article, that is, examining the evidence, considering the argument, correcting any errors I identified, challenging points if I deemed it necessary and offering suggestions on phrasing here and there to make sure that the author conveys his meaning clearly to the readers. Were I reviewing this work for publication in a journal, the key question would be whether to publish or not. I would definitively recommend publication, with only minor queries and suggested revisions for the author's consideration (that is, "publish," not "revise and resubmit"). This was not a blind peer review, of course, and due to the timing it was important for me to get my suggestions to Dr. Zenz based on early drafts, so in practice we had some back and forth with marked-up drafts. Zenz then took my suggestions under advisement and implemented some of them.

A second type of task, somewhat different from standard peer review (and more like reading a Ph.D. student's draft dissertation chapters) involved checking English translations of Chinese passages that Zenz quotes in his reports. These translations were overwhelmingly fine, but in one or two cases we discussed the meaning of a word or passage. I am confident of the accuracy of the translations in Dr. Zenz' reports. Moreover, he includes the verbatim Chinese in footnotes for virtually all substantive quotations, so readers who know Chinese can compare the translation to the original. Despite the convenience of these footnotes, I nevertheless checked the translations in Zenz' reports against the original documents, so in the process I also verified not only the translations, but the correctness of his Chinese transcriptions of key passages in the footnotes of his reports. I am confident that where Zenz employs verbatim language from the documents as evidence, those quotations are correct copies of the text in the original scanned documents.

Finally, regarding the transcriptions of the documents: although I did not conduct a line-by-line comparison of the entire corpus of the transcriptions against the original documents, I spot-checked each transcription. To do this, I chose at least three passages at random from each document and compared them with the corresponding passage as it appears in the transcriptions prepared by Zenz and his assistant. In doing this, I found one mistranscribed Chinese character, which I brought to Zenz' attention. (This was a substitution of the character 见 *jian* for 件 *jian* : a homonym for a homonym, and thus almost certainly a human or manual typing error. I saw no sign that the machine transcription

process created errors Zenz and his assistant used as a first step created errors by confusing characters visually similar to each other.) For documents 01, 02 and 04, for which Zenz prepared his introductions, my comparison of original documents to transcripts went beyond spot-checking, because checking quoted material and translations required reading substantial amounts of the relevant documents.