

Mandates of the Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights; the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances; the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression; the Special Rapporteur on minority issues and the Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief

Ref.: AL CHN 14/2025
(Please use this reference in your reply)

15 July 2025

Excellency,

We have the honour to address you in our capacities as Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights; Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances; Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression; Special Rapporteur on minority issues and Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 55/5, 54/14, 52/9, 52/5 and 58/5.

In this connection, we would like to bring to the attention of your Excellency's Government information we have received concerning the right to freedom of religion or belief of Tibetan Buddhists, particularly regarding the succession of the 14th Dalai Lama, and the alleged interference in the 'reincarnation' of the 14th Dalai Lama and in his role on his succession, through the 2007 legislation on 'Measures on the Management of the Reincarnation of Living Buddhas' and the 2017 Religious Affairs Regulation passed by China to assert State control over this process, as well as through the ongoing enforced disappearance of Gedhun Cheokyi Nyima, the 11th Panchen Lama recognised by the 14th Dalai Lama.

Special Procedures mandate holders have previously raised their concerns with your Excellency's Government concerning human rights violations against the Tibetan minority, including CHN 15/2024, CHN 8/2023, CHN 6/2022, CHN 7/2021, and CHN 14/2018. The case of Gedhun Cheokyi Nyima was previously raised with your Excellency's Government in CHN 13/2005, CHN 12/2007 and CHN 12/2020. We thank your Excellency's Government for the substantive replies received to all these communications. However, we remain concerned about the rights of the Tibetan Buddhists community.

According to the information received:

Succession of the 14th Dalai Lama

The reincarnation system is at the heart of Tibetan religious identity. According to the Tibetan Buddhist belief and practice system, reincarnation is not only a theological concept but rooted in the Tibetan Buddhist understanding of the continuous cycle of birth, death and rebirth.

For centuries, the recognition of reincarnate lamas (tulkus) has served as a spiritual and societal foundation, providing leadership, education, moral guidance, and cultural continuity. Among these, the institution of the Dalai Lama holds a unique role for Tibetan Buddhists. From the Fifth Dalai Lama in

the 17th century, reincarnate lamas had been the core of the Buddhist establishment of Tibet.

To Tibetan Buddhists, the Dalai Lama represents the spiritual embodiment of Avalokiteshvara or Chenrezig, also known as the Bodhisattva of Compassion and the patron saint of Tibet. In their view, the spiritual authority of the 14th Dalai Lama transcends borders. His teachings are followed in many countries around the world.

The appointment of a future Dalai Lama is viewed by Tibetan Buddhists as a sacred process essential to the integrity of their faith, their culture, and their very existence as a distinct people, and is fundamental to the survival of Tibetan Buddhism.

In September 2011, the 14th Dalai Lama made a formal written declaration concerning his succession. In his statement, the Dalai Lama declared that “the purpose of reincarnation is to fulfil the previous [incarnation’s] life task” and will be identified through authentic Tibetan Buddhist methods. Tibetans and Buddhists worldwide would reject any candidate selected for political purposes. The Dalai Lama stated that “the person who reincarnates has sole legitimate authority over where and how he or she takes rebirth and how that reincarnation is to be recognized.”

On 2 July 2025, in a video message played during prayer celebrations ahead of his 90th birthday, the 14th Dalai Lama reaffirmed that the institution would continue after his death. He declared that the Gaden Phodrang Trust, which manages his affairs, would oversee the search for his reincarnation, stating that “no one else has any such authority to interfere in this matter”.

Laws determining religious freedom

The Constitution of the People’s Republic of China, adopted in 1982 and amended in 2004, states that citizens have the right to freedom of religious belief. Article 36 of the Constitution provides, “Citizens of the People’s Republic of China enjoy freedom of religious belief. No State organ, public organization or individual may compel citizens to believe in, or not to believe in, any religion; nor may they discriminate against citizens who believe in, or do not believe in, any religion. The State protects normal religious activities.” It prohibits coercion or discrimination based on religion and protects “normal religious activities” yet also allows authorities to restrict religious freedom if it disrupts public order, impairs the health of citizens, or interferes with the educational system of the State. Additionally, the regulation prohibits “foreign forces” from influencing religious groups.

In 2007, the Government issued the “State Religious Affairs Bureau Order No. 5 (Bureau Order)” that specifically laid down ‘Measures in Managing the Reincarnation of Tibetan living Buddha’.

Key provisions of Bureau Order No. 5 include:

- Mandatory approval: all reincarnations of living Buddhas must receive government approval, effectively granting state control over religious succession and invalidating those without approval of the State.
- Restrictions on foreign influence: reincarnations influenced by foreign entities are prohibited. Those leaving the People's Republic of China lose their status (article 2).
- Ban on 'unauthorised' groups and individuals: the law states any "no group or individual may without authorization carry out any activities related to searching for or recognizing reincarnating living Buddha soul children" (article 7).
- Application procedures: monasteries are required to submit applications for reincarnations to local religious affairs departments. Reincarnation with a significant impact requires higher-level approvals, up to the State Council for those with "great impact" (article 5).
- State unification requirement: reincarnations must uphold the "unification of the State" (article 2)

In 2016, the Chinese Government published an online database of the State approved Tibetan Buddhist reincarnations with over 1300 biographies of living Buddhas residing in the country as provided by the Buddhist Association of China.

The regulation of reincarnation has subsequently been enhanced in article 36 of the Religious Affairs Regulations 2017, which provides that: "the succession of living Buddhas in Tibetan Buddhism is to be conducted under the guidance of Buddhist groups and in accordance with the religious rites and historical conventions, and is to be reported for approval to the religious affairs department of people's governments at the provincial level or above or to a people's government at the provincial level or above".

Many Tibetan Buddhists have expressed their concerns about the regulation of reincarnation as it undermines the Tibetan religious traditions and practices while such regulation allows the State to interfere in the choice of their religious leaders. Any identification and appointment of the successor of the current (fourteenth) Dalai Lama against the Tibetan traditions and the wishes of Tibetan Buddhist communities will have no cultural, religious or community authenticity or support.

The enforced disappearance of Gedhun Cheokyi Nyima

The institution of the Panchen Lama is reported to be considered critical for the selection of the next Dalai Lama.

On 14 May 1995, Gedhun Cheokyi Nyima, then six years of age, was recognized as the 11th reincarnation of the Panchen Lama by the current Dalai Lama. Shortly after this date, Gedhun Cheokyi Nyima and his parents were reportedly taken away from their village by members of the Chinese Government.

17 May 2025 marked 30 years since the enforced disappearance of Gedhun Cheokyi Nyima. The Government of China has confirmed that he was taken away with his family but has refused to provide precise information on his fate and whereabouts despite multiple requests. The Government initially indicated he was being held in “Government protection,” and later stated that “Nyima is in good health and, just like other children, is leading a normal, happy life and receiving a good cultural education”. During this period, he has reportedly been deprived of the religious education in Tibetan Buddhism.

Following the enforced disappearance of Gedhun Cheokyi Nyima, the Chinese Government appointed a different individual as the 11th Panchen Lama. The attempt to regulate the appointment of Tibetan religious leaders goes against the intrinsic beliefs and religious traditions of Tibetan Buddhists.

Without prejudging the accuracy of this information, we express grave concern at the alleged interference by the Government of China into the eventual succession process of the 14th Dalai Lama. We are also particularly concerned that the regulation of reincarnation of ‘Tibetan living Buddhas’, including by restricting the legitimacy of any reincarnation who might have been born or reside outside of the territory of the People’s Republic of China, may interfere with and possibly undermine, in a discriminatory way, the religious traditions and practices of the Tibetan Buddhist community.

Over the past three decades, several Special Rapporteurs have raised concerns on the measures taken by the authorities to manage the search, identification and the reincarnation of Buddhist Lamas (for example in E/CN.4/1992/52, para. 22; E/CN.4/1996/95, para. 40; E/CN.4/2006/5/Add.1, paras. 94-95; A/HRC/7/10/Add.1, para. 61; A/HRC/18/51, p. 92; AL CHN 12/2020).

Should these allegations be confirmed, they would contravene international human rights law provisions, such as the prohibition against discrimination, the right to recognition as a person before the law and to its equal protection without discrimination, the right not be deprived arbitrarily of one’s liberty, the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion, the rights to freedom of opinion and expression and the right to freely participate in cultural life, which include the right to contribute to decision-making processes that have an impact on one’s cultural life, in accordance with articles 2, 3, 6, 7, 9, 16, 18, 22 and 27, read alone and in conjunction with article 2.3 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and articles 2, 3 and 15 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

We remain gravely concerned by the alleged enforced disappearance of six-year-old Gedhun Cheokyi Nyima and his family since 14 May 1995, following his recognition as the 11th Panchen Lama by the 14th Dalai Lama. Despite assertions by the

Chinese Government that he is living a normal life, no detailed and independently verified information has ever been provided concerning his fate, whereabouts, and the status of his physical and mental health. We further reiterate that, under international law, any failure or refusal by State agents—or by individuals or groups acting with their authorization, support, or acquiescence—to acknowledge the deprivation of a person’s liberty constitutes an enforced disappearance, irrespective of the duration of the deprivation of liberty or the manner in which the detention is concealed. Consequently, State authorities bear the obligation to take all necessary steps to ensure the effective protection of the rights of those deprived of liberty, as they are inherently responsible for protecting their lives and ensuring their physical integrity and overall wellbeing.

The ongoing enforced disappearance of Gedhun Cheekyi Nyima for the past 30 years contravenes the *jus cogens* absolute prohibition of this crime under international law, as well as several articles of the United Nations Declaration on the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearances,¹ including articles 2 and 7. We note that your Excellency’s Government has expressed on several occasions its support for the international community’s efforts to eliminate and prevent enforced disappearances, including at the Human Rights Council.

In connection with the above alleged facts and concerns, please refer to the **Annex on Reference to international human rights law and standards** attached to this letter which cites international human rights instruments and standards relevant to these allegations.

As it is our responsibility, under the mandates provided to us by the Human Rights Council, to seek to clarify all cases brought to our attention, we would be grateful for your observations on the following matters:

1. Please provide any additional information and/or comment(s) you may have on the above-mentioned allegations.
2. Please indicate further of the measures taken to ensure that the 14th Dalai Lama’s right to affirm his own legitimate authority on his succession according to the traditions and practices of Tibetan Buddhism, and the broader rights of Tibetan Buddhist reincarnate lamas to select and appoint their own respective reincarnations, free from State interference.
3. Please explain how the current regulatory framework—including the State Religious Affairs Bureau Order No. 5 of 2007, the Religious Affairs Regulations of 2017, and the online database of the State approved Tibetan Buddhist reincarnations—are compatible with the obligations to respect, protect and fulfil the right to freedom of religion or belief, and with the protection of religion or belief communities without discrimination under international human rights law. Specifically, how does the multi-tiered governmental approval process of reincarnated living Buddhas and the prohibition of independent religious identification procedures constitute limitation measures that meet the standard of necessity and proportionality required under

¹ [General Assembly resolution 47/133](#)

article 18(3) of the ICCPR, as interpreted by the Human Rights Committee?

4. Please explain how the implementation of current regulations distinguishes between legitimate transnational religious connections—inherent to Tibetan Buddhism as historically practiced across borders—and foreign interference or control (article 2 of State Religious Affairs Bureau Order No. 5 of 2007 and article 5 of Religious Affairs Regulations of 2017). How do these distinctions ensure that religious believers are not prevented from following religious authorities based solely on geographic location, in accordance with the principles of non-discrimination contained in the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and the 1981 Declaration?
5. Please indicate the measures undertaken by your Excellency's Government to ensure protection of the Tibetan Buddhists' right to hold opinions without interference, to take part in cultural life, which includes the right to contribute to decision-making processes that have an impact on one's cultural life, and to enjoy the right of freedom of expression without discrimination in accordance with international human rights. Specifically, please provide information on the mechanisms through which Tibetan Buddhist communities can freely express diverse views on religious doctrine and leadership, including different perspectives on reincarnation. How does your Excellency's Government ensure that religious leaders and practitioners can engage in religious discussions and practices without risk of sanctions or administrative penalties, in accordance with articles 18 and 19 of the ICCPR?
6. Please provide information on any existing policies and other measures undertaken by your Excellency's Government to ensure that Buddhists and other religious or belief communities in Tibet are not discriminated based on their religion or belief.
7. In line with your Excellency's Government repeated expressed support for the international community's efforts to eliminate and prevent enforced disappearances, including at the Human Rights Council, please provide prompt and detailed information on the fate and whereabouts as well as the state of health of Gedhun Cheokyi Nyima and his family.
8. Please indicate the measures taken by your Excellency's government to ensure that all religion or belief communities within China, including Tibetan Buddhists, can exercise freely their rights to train, appoint, elect or designate by succession, leaders or representatives as called for by the requirements of their own beliefs, freely and without interference.

This communication and any response received from your Excellency's Government will be made public via the communications reporting [website](#) within 60 days. They will also subsequently be made available in the usual report to be presented to the Human Rights Council.

While awaiting a reply, we appeal to your Excellency's Government to ensure the rights of Tibetan Buddhists' to freely practice their religion, traditions and culture without interference, which includes the selection and appointment of their religious leaders, and urge that all necessary interim measures be taken to prevent any irreparable damage to the life and physical and psychological integrity of Gedhun Cheokyi Nyima, halt the alleged violations, and prevent their re-occurrence. In the event that the investigations support or suggest the allegations to be correct, we also urge to ensure the accountability of any person(s) responsible for the alleged violations.

We may publicly express our concerns in the near future as, in our view, the information upon which the press release will be based is sufficiently reliable to indicate a matter warranting immediate attention. We also believe that the wider public should be alerted to the potential implications of the above-mentioned allegations. The press release will indicate that we have been in contact with your Excellency's Government's to clarify the issue/s in question.

Please accept, Excellency, the assurances of our highest consideration.

Alexandra Xanthaki
Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights

Gabriella Citroni
Chair-Rapporteur of the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances

Irene Khan
Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression

Nicolas Levrat
Special Rapporteur on minority issues

Nazila Ghanea
Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief

Annex

Reference to international human rights law and standards

China signed the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) on 5 October 1998. The Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, acceded to by China on 3 September 1997, states that as a signatory, a State has an obligation not to carry out conduct that would defeat the object and purpose of the Covenant.

Article 18 of the ICCPR states that that “Everyone shall have the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion. These rights shall include freedom [...] either individually or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in worship, observance, practice and teaching.”

As established by the UN Human Rights Committee (CCPR), the freedom of religion or belief includes “acts integral to the conduct by religious groups of their basic affairs, such as the freedom to choose their religious leaders, priests and teachers,” and therefore, the right to determine religious leaders in accordance with one’s own religious traditions and practices, as guaranteed by article 18 of the UDHR. Article 6(g) of the 1981 UN General Assembly Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief² also provides the freedom to “train, appoint, elect or designate by succession appropriate leaders called for by the requirements and standards of any religion or belief”. In addition, Human Rights Committee general comment 22, paragraph 4, further clarifies that “the practice and teaching of religion or belief includes acts integral to the conduct by religious groups of their basic affairs, such as the freedom to choose their religious leaders, priests and teachers [...]”.

Paragraph 8 of general comment No. 22 of the CCPR notes that “article 18(3) permits restrictions on the freedom to manifest religion or belief only if limitations are prescribed by law and are necessary to protect public safety, order, health or morals, or the fundamental rights and freedoms of others. In interpreting the scope of permissible limitation clauses, States parties should proceed from the need to protect the rights guaranteed under the Covenant, including the right to equality and non-discrimination on all grounds specified in articles 2, 3 and 26. Limitations imposed must be established by law and must not be applied in a manner that would vitiate the rights guaranteed in article 18. The Committee observes that paragraph 3 of article 18 is to be strictly interpreted: restrictions are not allowed on grounds not specified there, even if they would be allowed as restrictions to other rights protected in the Covenant. Limitations may be applied only for those purposes for which they were prescribed and must be directly related and proportionate to the specific need on which they are predicated. Restrictions may not be imposed for discriminatory purposes or applied in a discriminatory manner.”

Information as to respect for the rights of religious minorities under article 27 is also necessary for the Committee to assess the extent to which the freedom of thought, conscience, religion and belief has been implemented by States parties.

² [General Assembly resolution 36/55](#)

Article 19 of the ICCPR guarantees the right to freedom of opinion and the right to freedom of expression, which includes the right “to seek, receive and impart information and ideas of all kinds, either orally, in writing or in print, in the form of art, or through any other media”. This right applies online as well as offline and includes not only the exchange of information that is favourable, but also that which may criticize, shock, or offend. In its [general comment No. 34](#), the Human Rights Committee stated that States parties to the ICCPR are required to guarantee the right to freedom of expression, including “political discourse, commentary on one's own and on public affairs, canvassing, discussion of human rights, journalism, cultural and artistic expression, teaching, and religious discourse” (CCPR/C/GC/34, para. 11). The Committee further asserts that there is a duty of States to put in place effective measures to protect against attacks aimed at silencing those exercising their right to freedom of expression (para. 23).

Any restriction on the right to freedom of expression must be compatible with the requirements set out in article 19(3) ICCPR. Under these requirements, restrictions must (i) be provided by law; (ii) pursue one of the legitimate aims for restriction, which are the respect of the rights or reputations of others and the protection of national security or of public order, or of public health or morals; and (iii) be necessary and proportionate for those objectives. The State has the burden of proof to demonstrate that any such restrictions are compatible with the Covenant, proving “in specific and individualized fashion the precise nature of the threat, and the necessity and proportionality of the specific action taken, in particular by establishing a direct and immediate connection between the expression and the threat” (CCPR/C/GC/34, para. 35). The Human Rights Committee recalled that the relation between right and restriction and between norm and exception must not be reversed. In this regard, the Human Rights Committee stated that the restrictions must be “the least intrusive instrument among those which might achieve their protective function” ([CCPR/C/GC/34](#), para. 34).

Article 27 of the ICCPR guarantees minorities, *inter alia*, the rights of everyone to enjoy his or her own culture and to profess and practice their own religion. Moreover, article 1 of the 1992 Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities establishes the obligation of States to protect the existence and identity of religious minorities within their territories and to adopt the appropriate measures to achieve this end, while article 2 recognizes that persons belonging to religious minorities have the right to profess and practice their own religion without discrimination and article 4 requires States to ensure that persons belonging to minorities, including religious minorities, may exercise their human rights without discrimination and in full equality before the law.

Article 2(1) of the 1981 United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief (A/RES/36/55) states that “[n]o one shall be subject to discrimination by any State, institution, group of persons, or person on grounds of religion or other belief.” In article 4(1), the 1981 Declaration states that: “All States shall take effective measures to prevent and eliminate discrimination on the grounds of religion or belief in the recognition, exercise and enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms [...]”.

Article 22 of the ICCPR protects the right to freedom of association, including the rights of everyone to associate with others and to pursue common interests. Freedom of association is closely linked to the rights to freedom of expression, to peaceful assembly and to take part in cultural life and is of fundamental importance to the functioning of democratic societies. These rights can only be restricted in very specific circumstances, where the restrictions serve a legitimate public purpose as recognized by international standards and are necessary and proportionate for achieving that purpose.

According to article 15 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) on the right of everyone to take part in cultural life, ratified by China 27 March 2001, and general comment No. 21 of the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights relating to this right, States must refrain from interfering with the exercise of the right of everyone to seek, receive and impart information and ideas of all kinds and forms, including art forms, to access their own cultural and linguistic heritage and that of others; they have obligations to respect and protect cultural heritage in all its forms and must adopt appropriate measures or programmes to support minorities or other groups in their efforts to preserve their culture (E/C.12/GC/21, paragraph 44, 48, 49 and 52.f). The Committee stated that “The obligation to respect includes the adoption of specific measures aimed at achieving respect for (...) the right of all persons to express their cultural identity freely and to exercise their cultural practices and way of life.” The Committee also stressed the right to take part in the development of the community to which a person belongs, and in the definition, elaboration and implementation of policies and decisions that have an impact on the exercise of a person’s cultural rights (para. 15.c).

The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights further specified that article 15, paragraph 1(a), of “the Covenant also includes the right of minorities and of persons belonging to minorities to take part in the cultural life of society, and also to conserve, promote and develop their own culture. This right entails the obligation of States parties to recognize, respect and protect minority cultures as an essential component of the identity of the States themselves. Consequently, minorities have the right to their cultural diversity, traditions, customs, religion, forms of education, languages, communication media (press, radio, television, Internet) and other manifestations of their cultural identity and membership” (general comment 21, para. 32).

In this connection, reports of successive Special Rapporteurs in the field of cultural rights have recommended that States recognize and value the diversity of cultural heritages present in their territories and under their jurisdiction, and acknowledge, respect and protect the rights of individuals and groups to feel associated (or not) with specific elements of cultural heritages; to access, enjoy and continuously (re)create the cultural heritages that are meaningful to them; and to transmit this heritage to future generations.

The absolute prohibition of enforced disappearance has attained the status of *jus cogens*. In this regard, we wish to recall that the United Nations Declaration on the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearances establishes that “all acts of enforced disappearance shall be offences under criminal law punishable by appropriate penalties which shall take into account their extreme seriousness (article 4), no order or

instruction of any public authority, civilian, military or other, may be invoked to justify an enforced disappearance (article 6). Furthermore, no circumstances whatsoever, whether a threat of war, a state of war, internal political instability or any other public emergency, may be invoked to justify enforced disappearances (article 7).

Moreover, articles 9 to 12 of the Declaration further spell out the rights of detained persons to a prompt and effective judicial remedy to determine the whereabouts of persons deprived of their liberty. Access by competent national authorities to all places of detention must be ensured and any deprivation of liberty be held in officially recognized places of detention. Detainees have the right to be released also in a manner permitting verification of whether their human rights have been fully ensured. Article 13 further stipulates that any person having knowledge or a legitimate interest that a person has been subjected to enforced disappearance has the right to complain to a competent and independent State authority and to have that complaint promptly, thoroughly and impartially investigated by that authority. The Declaration also establishes that States should take any lawful and appropriate action to bring to justice persons presumed to be responsible for acts of enforced disappearance (article 14), and that the persons responsible for these acts shall be tried only by ordinary courts and not by other special tribunal, notably military courts (article 16); not benefit from any amnesty law (article 18); and the victims or family relatives have the right to obtain redress, including adequate compensation (article 19).

In its General Comment on the right to recognition as a person before the law in the context of enforced disappearance, the Working Group noted that when a person deprived of liberty is not acknowledged by the State, the legal rights of this person are placed in a legal limbo, a situation of total defencelessness. The crime of enforced disappearance puts the detainee outside of the protection of the law, denies the person of legal existence and prevents the enjoyment of their rights, including due process rights and judicial safeguards, and other fundamental rights and freedoms. In this regard, in its general comment on the right to life, the Human Rights Committee observed enforced disappearance as an extreme and life-threatening form of arbitrary detention, that violates the rights to liberty, security and life. It removes individuals from legal protection, placing their lives at constant risk and making the State accountable. Failure to uphold procedural safeguards under article 9 of the ICCPR can also lead to violations of the right to life under article 6 and the prohibition of torture under article 7. States must take effective measures to prevent disappearances, investigate promptly and impartially, prosecute perpetrators, and ensure victims and their families receive full reparation ([CCPR/C/GC/36](#) paras. 57-58).

Furthermore, in its study on enforced disappearances and economic, social, and cultural rights, the Working Group noted that the enforced disappearance of individuals actively engaged in promoting these rights is often employed as a tool of repression. Such actions aim to discourage the legitimate exercise, defence, or advancement of these rights. Given their collective nature, these disappearances not only violate the rights of the individuals targeted but also infringe upon the rights of others involved in similar efforts, as well as the broader community that depended on the disappeared individuals to advocate on their behalf ([A/HRC/30/38/Add.5](#)).

Additionally, given that Gedhun Cheokyi Nyima disappeared when he was six years old, we wish to emphasize the particularly grave and severe lasting impact that

the separation of children from their families has on their mental, physical and moral integrity, as observed by the Working Group in its General Comment on children and enforced disappearances ([A/HRC/WGEID/98/1](#)).