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Special Report

County Government Threatens Self-Immolation Communities With Collective Punishment

In April 2013, a county-level government in an autonomous Tibetan area of Sichuan province announced interim provisions intended to deter Tibetans from self-immolating. The provisions could place at risk the access to housing, livelihood, or financial security of a family, community, village, or monastic institution if a member of that group committed self-immolation or was deemed to be associated with one. Such collective punishment is inconsistent with international standards, even international humanitarian law as applicable during wartime.

Background: Ten Ruo’ergai Self-Immolations

As of March 16, 2014, the total number of Tibetan self-immolations reported to focus on political and religious issues reached 124.\(^1\) The following list documents 10 self-immolations that reportedly took place in Ruo’ergai (Dzoegê) county, Aba (Ngabá) Tibetan and Qiang Autonomous Prefecture (T&QAP), Sichuan province. Seven of the 10 self-immolations took place over a three-and-one-half-month period (November 27, 2012, to March 13, 2013) prior to the April 2013 effective date of punitive provisions issued in Ruo’ergai (see below for provision details). Three of the self-immolations took place during the three-month period (April 25 to July 20, 2013) immediately following the provisions’ effective date. As of April 14, 2014, the Commission has not observed any additional reports of Ruo’ergai self-immolations. Each entry below includes the Commission’s summary list number.\(^2\)
Ruo’ergai Self-Immolations After April 2013

116. July 20, 2013. Konchog Sonam, male, age 18; monk of Sogtsang Monastery located in the seat of Ruo’ergai; self-immolated outside the monastery; deceased.3

112, 113. April 24, 2013. Two males, Lobsang Dawa, age 20, and Konchog Oezer, age 23; monks of Tagtsang Lhamo Monastery located in Ruo’ergai; self-immolated within monastery grounds; both deceased.4

Ruo’ergai Self-Immolations Before April 2013

106. March 13, 2013. Konchog Wangmo, female, age in 30s; married mother of one child; self-immolated overnight in Ruo’ergai; deceased. Chinese official media claimed that her alcoholic husband murdered her and then burned her body.5

101, 102. February 19, 2013. Two males, Rinchen, age 17, and Sonam Dargye, age 18; former schoolmates; self-immolated in Jiangzha (Kyangtsa) township, Ruo’ergai; both deceased.6

98. February 3, 2013. Lobsang Namgyal, male, age 37; monk, Kirti Monastery; self-immolated near the county Public Security Bureau office in the seat of Ruo’ergai; deceased.7

93. December 8, 2012. Konchog Phelgyal (or Konchog Phelgye), male, age 24; Sumdo Monastery monk studying at Tagtsang Lhamo Monastery (both monasteries located in Ruo’ergai); deceased.8

89. November 30, 2012. Konchog Kyab, male, age 29; father of two children; self-immolated in Hongxing (Shagdom) township, Ruo’ergai; deceased.9
85. November 27, 2012. Kalsang Kyab, male, age 24; nomad; Jiangzha township, Ruo’ergai county; deceased.10

The Ruo’ergai Provisions

Based on February 2014 Tibetan Centre for Human Rights and Democracy (TCHRD),11 China Digital Times (CDT),12 and International Campaign for Tibet (ICT) reports,13 on April 8, 2013, the Ruo’ergai County People’s Government, in Aba T&QAP, Sichuan, issued the Notice of Interim Anti-Self-Immolation Provisions [Guanyu fan zifen gongzuo zanxing guiding de tongzhi] (the Provisions).14 The CDT and ICT reports included translations and acknowledged Tibetan blogger Woeser as the source of images of the document; CDT included the Chinese text.15 TCHRD provided large images of the Chinese- and Tibetan-language versions of the document, and described the Provisions as “recently smuggled out of [Ruo’ergai].”16 The text of the bilingual official seal is best viewed on the Tibetan-language version. The provider of the document told TCHRD that village-level committees had posted the Provisions in public locations including government offices, commercial establishments, and police stations in Ruo’ergai.17

The Provisions contain 16 articles.18 Based on the analysis below, 15 of the articles stipulate punishment on a collective basis for groups that officials deem to be associated with a self-immolation; 1 article rewards citizens who provide information to authorities about a self-immolation.19 The Provisions target groups classified as “immediate family” (zhixiqinshu) Arts. 1–3, 9–11, 13);20 a “household” or “residence” (jiating, hu; Arts. 4, 6, 10);21 a “village” or “community” (cun, shequ; Arts. 5–9, 13);22 a monastic institution (simiao, a monastery or nunnery; Arts. 5–8, 13–15);23 and the monks and nuns who reside within a monastic institution (e.g. Arts. 13–14).24

The analysis below demonstrates how the Provisions set out to punish collectively the members of a self-immolator’s family or household, or the residents of a community, village, or monastic institution associated with a self-immolation by targeting, among other things, housing, employment, business activity, and financial arrangements; and how the Provisions seek to establish an intimidating political and legal environment.
Provisions that would collectively punish the members of a family or household include the following:

- Restricting career, employment, and housing opportunities for a self-immolator’s family members by canceling (quxiao) their eligibility to apply for national-level government or military employment (Art. 1);\(^25\)

- Obstructing the ability to maintain housing for persons officials deem to have been “actively involved” in a self-immolation by canceling household benefits for three years and social benefits for one year (Art. 4);\(^26\)

- Preventing or obstructing the ability of a self-immolator’s family members to secure a livelihood by revoking (shouhui) the right to use land for farming or grazing (Art. 9);\(^27\)

- Preventing or obstructing the ability of residents of a village where a self-immolator lived to secure a livelihood by freezing (dongjie) the right of villagers to use land for farming or grazing (Art. 9);\(^28\)

- Preventing or obstructing the ability of a self-immolator’s family members and the households of persons deemed to have been “active participants” in a self-immolation to secure a livelihood by withholding approval (buyu shenpi) to conduct business activity for three years (Art. 10);\(^29\)

- Preventing the ability of a self-immolator’s family members and the households of persons deemed to have been “active participants” in a self-immolation from accessing full use of real estate by only confirming (que quan) (rural) land and building rights, but not issuing certification (zheng) (Art. 10);\(^30\)

- Imposing financial and other hardships on households of persons officials deem to have been “actively involved” in a self-immolation by designating the households as “untrustworthy” (buchengxin) and withholding the grant (buyu fafang) of new loans for three years; and by only receiving (zhi shou) payments on existing loans but not disbursing (bu fang) funds from the loans (Art. 6);\(^31\)
• Preventing a self-immolator’s immediate family members from obtaining certain positions of political influence by canceling their eligibility to seek election to a people’s congress at any level or to the Chinese People’s Political Consultative Conference, or to serve as a village-level Party cadre (Art 2); and

• Restricting the freedom of movement of a self-immolator’s immediate family members by withholding approval to travel abroad or to the Tibet Autonomous Region for three years (Art. 11).33

Provisions that would collectively punish the members of a community, village, or monastic institution include the following:

• Imposing financial and other hardships on a village, community, or monastic institution associated with a self-immolator by canceling or postponing (zanhuan) national-level investment in that village, community, or monastic institution (Art. 5);34

• Imposing financial and other hardships on a village or community associated with a self-immolator by halting (tingzhi) “all investment and civil society capital projects” (Art. 5);35

• Imposing financial and other hardships on a community, village, or monastic institution associated with a self-immolator by designating them as “untrustworthy” and withholding the grant of new loans for three years; and by only receiving payments on existing loans but not disbursing funds from the loans (Art. 6);36

• Imposing financial hardships and imperiling function by requiring a community, village, or monastic institution where a self-immolation takes place to pay a “security deposit” (baozhengjin) of 10,000 to 500,000 yuan (US$1,600 to 80,000) that would be returned if another self-immolation does not occur within two years. If another self-immolation occurs, the security deposit would be placed in the national treasury and payment of an additional security deposit would be required (Art. 7);37
• Imposing financial hardships and imperiling function by linking self-immolations to financial support provided to community and village Party cadres, Democratic Management Committee members, and “responsible religious leaders” (zeren jingshi) (Art. 8);\(^{38}\)

• Imposing financial hardships and imperiling function in monastic institutions associated with a self-immolator by ordering their businesses to close down (tingye) (Art. 15);\(^{39}\) and

• Imposing a reduction in religious function in monastic institutions associated with a self-immolator with temporary “strict limitations” (yang xianzhi) on monks’ and nuns’ activities, and on large-scale Tibetan Buddhist activities across an undefined broader “area” (Art. 14).\(^{40}\)

**Provisions that would establish an intimidating political and legal environment** targeting families, households, communities, villages, or monastic institutions include the following:

• Implementing a “strike hard” (yanda) campaign anywhere that a self-immolation takes place, and imposing the “strictest” (zui yanli) comprehensive (zonghe) administrative law enforcement (xingzheng zhifa) and corrective punishment (zhengzhi) (Art. 12);\(^{41}\)

• Intimidating categories of employees including civil servants working in national-level government offices, career staff, and support staff by requiring them to “strengthen” the education of their family members and threatening to “severely deal with” (yansu chuli) an employee if a family member self-immolates (Art. 3);\(^{42}\)

• Requiring residents of villages, communities, and monastic institutions where a self-immolation takes place to attend “legal study classes” (fazhi xuexi ban) (Art. 13);\(^{43}\) and

• Requiring family members and others linked to a self-immolation by “minor evidence” or “actions that do not constitute a crime” to attend a minimum of 15 days’ “legal education classes” (fazhi jiaoyuxue ban) located at a “different place” (yidi) (Art. 13).\(^{44}\)
Questions on the Provisions

Have the Provisions resulted in actual application of collective punishment? As of April 14, 2014, the Commission had not observed a report of a specific collective punishment of a family, household, community, village, or monastic institution. The Commission has no basis to determine whether such reporting is unavailable because information has not reached international news media and advocacy groups, or because it has not happened.

Are provisions on collective punishment in effect in other Tibetan autonomous areas? The Commission has not observed reports of other local governments in other Tibetan autonomous areas issuing similar provisions. Based on the substantial interval between the April 2013 issue of the Provisions and the February 2014 media and advocacy group reports, the Commission cannot determine whether the absence of reports about similar provisions in other locations indicates that none exists, or that reports on them have yet to leave China.

Does the PRC Constitution provide support for collective punishment? Commission research failed to locate any article within the Constitution that appears either to explicitly permit the collective punishment of families, households, communities, villages, or monastic institutions irrespective of individual activity; or that explicitly protects citizens from collective punishment. Based on Commission analysis, the Constitution does not establish an explicit requirement that the government must adhere to a legal process when punishing citizens, or that explicitly provides citizens the right to appeal against punishment. The 2004 amendment of Article 13 states that “citizens’ lawful private property is inviolable” and that “the state . . . protects the rights of citizens to private property.” The Provisions, however, could have the capacity to impose financial peril on a family, community, or monastic institution by preventing or obstructing the rightful use of property that may include “private property” (e.g., see Arts. 6, 9, 10, and 15 above).

Are collective punishments in line with relevant Chinese laws? The preamble of the Provisions characterizes the “necessary punishment” detailed in the Provisions as a means to “combat these crimes”—a reference to self-immolations. The Provisions, however, provide no information on the legal basis for collective punishments outlined in Articles 1–15. Based on
Commission research, the PRC Criminal Law and PRC Criminal Procedure Law do not contain language addressing the notion of collective punishment of communities, villages, or institutions based solely on proximity to an action the government treats as illegal, or based solely on a family relationship with a person who committed such an act. The Provisions contain no reference to any means by which a family, households, community, village, or monastic institution facing collective punishment may appeal against a punishment.

**What level of oversight or approval would the Provisions have required?** The PRC Constitution subordinates a local government to the local congress at the same level, and the PRC Legislation Law provides higher legislative authority to a local congress than to the local government at the same level. Based on the Constitution and PRC Regional Ethnic Autonomy Law (REAL), if the Ruo’ergai County People’s Government issued a “decision” or “order” (jueding, mingling), it would have been required to “report” the action to the Ruo’ergai County People’s Congress and to the Aba T&QAP People’s Government. The Constitution and REAL do not explicitly require either body to formally approve the local government’s work. In comparison, if the Ruo’ergai County People’s Congress had passed a “special decree” (danxing tiaoli), also translated as “separate regulation”) on the punishments, the PRC Legislation Law and the REAL both would have required approval by the standing committee of the provincial-level people’s congress—in this case the Standing Committee of the Sichuan Province People’s Congress. The REAL also requires that approval of a “special decree” be reported for the record to the Standing Committee of the National People’s Congress.

**What legal conventions address the use of “collective punishment”?** Commission research suggests that the use of collective punishment is addressed principally by international humanitarian law, such as the Geneva Conventions, that focuses on the conduct of war. The 1949 Geneva Conventions state, for example: “No protected person may be punished for an offence he or she has not personally committed. Collective penalties and likewise all provisions of intimidation . . . are prohibited.”

Precedent for banning collective punishment extends back more than a century to the 1907 Hague Conference, which resulted in a convention stating: “No general penalty, pecuniary or otherwise, shall be inflicted upon the population on account of the acts of individuals for which
they cannot be regarded as jointly and severally responsible.”58 Based on such language the 
Ruo’ergai Provisions appear to apply punishment in a manner that would be impermissible even 
in time of war, let alone to “effectively maintain a harmonious and stable social environment,” as 
the Provision’s preamble states.59

For more information on Tibetan self-immolation protests, see the Tibet sections of the 
Commission’s 2013, 2012, and 2011 Annual Reports, and the following Commission reports:

• “Tibetan Property Protests Result in Self-Immolation, Detention,” 8 February 13;

• “Official Opinion Urges Criminal Prosecution of Persons Linked to Self-Immolations,” 
18 January 13;

• “Special Report: Tibetan Self-Immolation—Rising Frequency, Wider Spread, Greater 
Diversity,” 22 August 12; and

• “Special Report: Tibetan Monastic Self-Immolations Appear To Correlate With 
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