

PANCHEN LAMA'S 70,000 CHARACTER PETITION

A SERIES OF PROGRAMS FOR RADIO FREE ASIA

By WARREN SMITH

Based upon *A POISONED ARROW:*

THE SECRET REPORT OF THE 10TH PANCHEN LAMA

TIBET INFORMATION NETWORK

1997



PANCHEN LAMA'S 70,000 CHARACTER PETITION¹

In May 1962 the Panchen Lama, the then acting chairman of the Preparatory Committee for the Tibet Autonomous Region (PCTAR),² submitted a personal petition to Zhou Enlai, the premier of the People's Republic of China (PRC), expressing concerns about the results of the suppression of the 1959 revolt and the subsequent "democratic reforms" campaign. The petition became known as the Panchen Lama's 70,000 character petition because, although originally written in Tibetan, it was of that length in its Chinese translation. The full title of the petition is "A Report on the Sufferings of the Masses in Tibet and Other Tibetan Regions and Suggestions for Future Work to the Central Authorities through the Respected Premier Zhou." The Panchen's petition was couched in the most respectful language and it extolled the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) leaders' correct policies in Tibet. The Panchen wrote that he wished only to point out some mistakes by lower level cadres that had led to deleterious results for Tibet and Tibetans and he expressed his confidence that such mistakes would be corrected. In his report he was careful to praise the doctrines and policies of the CCP and to adhere to the political line that class struggle (between classes within Tibet) rather than national conflict (between China and Tibet) was the source of the revolt. However, he emphasized that Tibetan Buddhism and Tibetan national identity were threatened and that the loyalty of Tibetans to the Chinese Government was at stake.

The Panchen Lama's petition is the most significant document on the period after the revolt and one of the most important documents in modern Tibetan history. It reveals much about Chinese policies in Tibet in the years immediately following the March 1959 revolt. For many years its contents and its significance were only rumored, since the actual document was not revealed to the outside world. The text of the Panchen Lama's petition was finally revealed in 1996, when it was anonymously delivered to the office of the Tibet Information Network in London. The petition proved to be as significant as rumored. The Panchen Lama was unique in that he was educated both in Marxist and Buddhist ideologies. He, perhaps better than any other Tibetan, understood the ideological goals and actual results of Chinese policies in Tibet. No other Tibetan was able to understand or to describe in such detail the aftermath of the revolt and the implementation of the Democratic Reforms campaign. The period after the revolt was the time when Tibetan life was most radically changed, when the Chinese assumed full control over Tibet and proceeded to radically alter the fundamental nature of Tibetan society. The Chinese themselves regard this period as the most significant in the modern history of Tibet, when Tibetans were finally truly liberated and achieved their own democratic revolution.

The Panchen Lama was not entirely naïve in his hope that his petition would be well-received. He had previously expressed criticisms to some of the CCP's nationalities affairs officials and directly to Zhou about excesses in the repression of the revolt and the implementation of reforms. He reminded the Party leaders that after being informed, in 1960, of some mistakes in the work in Tibet, they had sent officials to correct the situation. The CCP had at that time admitted that collectivization had been begun too soon, that some people not guilty

of participation in the revolt had been unjustly repressed and that religion had been too severely repressed. He wrote that these corrections had allowed the people of Tibet to realize that the errors were those of lower level cadres and not of the central authorities or the Party. He also described his tour of southern China that he took after the 1 October celebrations in 1960 along with some nationalities affairs officials, including Li Weihan, the negotiator of the 1951 17-Point Agreement,³ and Wang Feng of the United Front Work Department.⁴ During this tour the Panchen had reported on the errors and mistakes made in Tibet. Li had encouraged him to make a written report and even to expand his report to include areas outside the TAR (or what was to become the TAR). After his return to Beijing he had made a similar report personally to Zhou and to Mao. His criticisms at that time were well received and all the officials to whom he spoke promised that corrections would be made in Tibet.

Despite the Panchen's optimism due to the favorable reception of his criticisms at that time, upon his return to Tibet in 1961 he found that his monastery, Tashilhunpo, had been subjected to Democratic Reforms,⁵ during which, "through voluntary withdrawal, under the policy of religious freedom," the monk population had been cut in half, from approximately 4,000 monks to 1,980. After this time, the Panchen Lama said that he began to devote himself to the preservation of Tibet's religious heritage. He took measures to repair Lhasa's temples and monasteries and to save their treasures, moving many artifacts from the now nearly depopulated Drepung, Sera, and Ganden to the Lhasa Jokhang. He also began a series of public religious sermons, attended sometimes by several thousand people, during which he instructed Tibetans to cooperate with the Chinese and accept their assistance, but emphasized that, as Mao himself had instructed, Tibetans had to develop and govern Tibet themselves. He assured Tibetans that CCP nationalities policy allowed religious freedom and encouraged them to practice their religion. He also offered prayers for the health of the Dalai Lama and for his eventual return to Tibet.

In April 1962 the Panchen was again in Beijing for the annual meeting of the National People's Congress (NPC), after which a conference on nationalities policies was convened. This turned into a month-long meeting during which Tibet policy was the primary topic and in which the CCP heard much criticism about its policy from Tibetan cadres. Despite the meeting having been convened by Li Weihan and approved by Zhou and Mao, and attended by Deng Xiaoping, Zhou Enlai and Zhu De, it turned into a repeat of the Hundred Flowers phenomenon when the Party invited criticism but then repressed those who criticized. Like the Hundred Flowers, the nationalities conference itself was characterized by openness, but the repercussions were to come later. On 18 May, while the conference was still in session, the Panchen submitted his petition, which he had been writing for several months.

Introductory Remarks

The Panchen Lama's petition began by praising the wisdom of the CCP leadership and its "correct" nationalities and Tibet policies. He also extolled the Chinese revolution and the "peaceful liberation of Tibet," achieved due to the "radiant illumination of the Party and the Great Thought of Chairman Mao." The Panchen Lama said that, despite the CCP having proceeded "consistently, steadily and carefully with the work in Tibet" and having "exercised forbearance, utmost tolerance and patience," and having given "patient instruction and assistance," the reactionaries among the upper class had attempted to "continue their life of

exploitation and oppression" and prevent the liberation of the Tibetan serfs and slaves and the elimination of the "cruel, dark and backward feudal serf system." The upper class reactionaries had launched an armed rebellion to "betray the motherland, betray the revolution, betray the people and betray democracy and socialism." To disguise their real intentions, the upper class reactionaries had deceived the masses by claiming that the CCP wanted to eradicate Tibetan religion and the Tibetan race. They said that all Tibetans who eat *tsampa*⁶ and practice Buddhism should unite to save the Tibetan religion and preserve Tibetan independence. These slogans deceived many Tibetans who then joined the rebellion.

The Panchen Lama claimed that when the ordinary people of Tibet were told the truth about the crime of the upper class reactionaries' rebellion they supported the People's Liberation Army (PLA) in putting down the rebellion and demanded the implementation of democratic reforms: "The broad masses of the Tibetan working people demanded that democratic reform be carried out promptly in Tibet, and that under the leadership of the Party, all the shackles of the feudal system which had bound them should be cut off, in order to realize their urgent desire for freedom." Because of this urgent demand by the people of Tibet, the Panchen Lama spoke to the National People's Congress meeting in April 1959 about the need for Democratic Reform. The Panchen described a meeting with Mao and Zhou in which he received instructions and promises about how the reform was to be carried out. He was told that in addition to the repression of the "most reactionary feudal lords, their associates and counter-revolutionaries," monasteries and temples would also have to undergo democratic reforms "in order to completely get rid of the feudal system, exploitation and oppression, and to eliminate rebellious activity." The number of monks had to be "appropriately reduced." Monasteries, temples and religious believers who were patriotic and obeyed the law would be given protection, under the Party's principle of freedom of religious belief, and a certain number of monks would remain in monasteries to carry out religious activities.

The Panchen Lama described how, under the leadership of the Party, the Democratic Reform campaign was supposed to be carried out throughout Tibet:

Because of the mobilization of the masses, the broad serfs and slaves, who had endured tragedy and suffering ..., awakened and acquired revolutionary fervor and class consciousness... The liberated broad masses of the working people used their own hands to completely overthrow and eliminate the great burden of the system of feudal serfdom and rule by the three types of feudal lords They broke every shackle of the feudal system from their bodies, stood up and gained complete liberation and became masters of the new society and of the land. Under the leadership of the Party, each level of government of the working people was established and the people's democratic dictatorship was put into practice, enabling the old Tibet, which was still a feudal serf-owning society, to be transformed into a new Tibet, a democracy of the people with a glorious future. This was an extremely grand and glorious cause, and it was a very happy event in the development of humankind. For Tibet itself it was a turning point between the old and the new, darkness and light, bitterness and happiness, oppression and equality, poverty and prosperity; historically, this began a glorious new era. Tibet was walking down the road of democracy and socialism like all other nationalities of the motherland, and the light of prosperity and happiness shone out in all directions. ...

Therefore, the monastic and secular masses of all strata in Tibet have feelings of respectful love, support and gratitude towards the CCP and the great leader Chairman Mao, and will never forget it was they who saved them from the bitterness of the rule of the feudal serf-owning system and placed them in the happiness of the people's democracy....

After making this required eulogy to the Party's correct policies in Tibet, the Panchen Lama went on to say that it was understandable that during the Democratic Reform campaign, which was carried out in conjunction with the suppression of the rebellion, and which was a "large-scale, fast moving, fierce, acute and life-and-death class struggle, which overturned heaven and earth," it was possible that some "unavoidable errors and mistakes" might arise. In addition, "some unnecessary and disadvantageous mistakes were also made during the campaign." The Panchen Lama divided the problems that had arisen during the suppression of the revolt and the implementation of Democratic Reforms into eight sections: "On Suppression of the Rebellion; On Democratic Reform; On Production in Agriculture and Animal Herding and on the Livelihood of the People; On the United Front; On Democratic Centralism; On the People's Democratic Dictatorship; On Religion; and On the Tibetan Nationality."

On Suppression of the Rebellion

The Panchen Lama began by declaring that the policy adopted by the Party to subdue the rebellion was "entirely correct, essential, necessary and appropriate." He approved of the Party's policy of combining "military attack, political winning-over and mobilization of the masses" to suppress the rebellion. He said that the Party's policy was to distinguish between the leaders of the revolt and those who had been fooled or forced into following. The specific circumstances of each individual were to be determined and those found to have been fooled by the revolt's leaders and who had later repented their mistakes were to be treated with leniency. In regard to those people, the "Four Don'ts" policy was to be applied: meaning, do not kill, lock up, struggle, or condemn.

However, he said, this policy had not been followed and many who had "put down their arms and surrendered, having realized and regretted taking the wrong road," were "fiercely struggled against, arrested and imprisoned and met with severe attack." He complained that CCP cadres "adopted vengeful, discriminatory, casual and careless methods." He said that because of these deviations from policy and also because religion was a target of repression, the Party's reputation was harmed both domestically and abroad and "the work of political winning-over was not done well enough, which caused the rebellion to be large-scale, to involve many people, to last a long time, to be stubborn in its stance and to rebel to the end."

On Democratic Reform

The Panchen Lama said that the policy to be followed during Democratic Reforms was that only the most reactionary feudal lords, their associates, reactionary elements, and counterrevolutionaries were supposed to be struggled against and repressed. However, the Panchen Lama complained, no distinctions were made and all those who had any involvement or even any suspicion of involvement in the revolt had their property confiscated without

compensation and were subjected to *thamzing*⁷ and imprisonment. People who had merely given food or shelter to the rebels were considered supporters of the revolt. Even the Panchen Lama's own relatives, including his parents, had been falsely accused and subjected to *thamzing*. The Panchen Lama also complained that the confiscation and redistribution of land had been unfair and that land reform had not won the support of the people. Some of the middle-class farmers and herdsmen who should have benefited from the redistribution of lands and herds were also subjected to confiscation of their property and *thamzing*. In pastoral areas Democratic Reforms were supposed to have been conducted at a slower pace than in agricultural areas, but the Panchen Lama said that Party activists had "launched a fierce and acute struggle against very many herd owners."

The Panchen Lama wrote that class divisions should have been made carefully by investigation into each person's situation. However, Party cadres had not been discriminating about whether punishment was correct or not; the only thing that was important to them was the "scale and quantity of the attack." They had branded village headmen and monastic officials as feudal lords, some of whom had been elected to their positions by ordinary people. He said that the purpose of *thamzing* was supposed to be to mobilize the Tibetan people for the exercise of people's democracy, to expose the crimes of the feudal serf system and the serf-owners, and to eliminate the feudal system and create a new democratic and socialist society. However, in practice, people had been blamed for the sins of their classes without any individual distinctions. Many people had been falsely accused and unjustly subjected to *thamzing*. Overzealous activists had resorted to violence as a common method during *thamzing*. The result was that the people had not been mobilized as willing participants in democratic reform but had become alienated and oppressed.

The Panchen Lama particularly complained about the recruitment and motives of the activists and the methods they used to conduct *thamzing*. He said that many Tibetan activists had base motives for their political involvement. Many sought economic benefits or political privileges; some were criminals who sought to conceal their crimes; others sought to settle scores with their personal enemies. Tibetan activists were also encouraged with the promise that the more people they identified as exploiters, and who thus would have their property confiscated, would result in more property to be redistributed among the activists themselves. Because of these incentives many unworthy activists were cultivated. They tended to be arrogant with their newly acquired political power and to be abusive of the ordinary people. Both Chinese and Tibetan activists tended to be impatient and to forcibly subject Tibetans to *thamzing* without explanation to the people. Because of the impatience of the activists, *thamzing* tended to get violently out of control and activists mistakenly regarded violence as a measure of their success.

The Panchen Lama said that activists had mobilized the poorer people with the promise that they would benefit from the confiscation and redistribution of the property of the wealthy. This was all that many people understood about the purpose of democratic reforms. People were forced to participate in *thamzing* and to criticize others under the threat that if they did not they too would be labeled as reactionaries and would be subjected to *thamzing* themselves. Because people were falsely accused and subjected to *thamzing* without justification, the Tibetan people regarded the democratic reforms not as democracy or popular liberation but as unjust oppression. The Panchen Lama warned that the base motives of many of the activists were apparent to the

people and the injustice of very many innocent people being subjected to *thamzing* could not be concealed from the people.

The Panchen Lama claimed that during Democratic Reforms many people were struggled against even if they had not committed any serious crimes or mistakes. Activists and cadres fabricated accusations against such people without regard to right and wrong, so that people felt extremely fearful and scared and experienced suspicion and loss of hope. Some even fled to foreign lands or committed suicide. The Panchen Lama also criticized the practice of "repeated investigations." This refers to the process of continually making new class divisions and investigating people's class background and their loyalty to the old or the new government. The Panchen Lama also mentioned that the activists seemed to regard all monks and lamas as reactionaries and therefore subjected many of them to *thamzing*, resulting in a threat to the survival of Tibetan religion, a theme he would return to in a later section of his petition.

On Production in Agriculture and Animal Herding and on the Livelihood of the People

The Panchen Lama said that a "cooperative wind" had affected Tibet when Tibetans were only experiencing the "democratic revolution." Collectivization, in the form of mutual aid teams, was introduced when Tibetans were only just undergoing Democratic Reforms and were unprepared for Socialist Transformation. Having only achieved Democratic Reforms and acquired their own property, Tibet's former serfs were not enthusiastic about collectivization because they feared that they would lose their property so recently acquired. Some people did not want to join mutual aid teams but were required to do so and others who might have joined were not allowed to because of their bad class background. Mutual aid teams were therefore less than successful. At the same time, most private enterprise was restricted. The Panchen repeated this claim in a 1987 speech to the NPC: "In 1959 a large number of Chinese cadres were sent to Tibet. At that time the leftist influence became firmly rooted in Tibet. These cadres immediately introduced the commune system, long before Democratic Reforms were completed."⁸

The Panchen Lama wrote that in 1959, '60, and '61, the years of the Great Leap Forward,⁹ harvests in Tibet were good. Nevertheless, because cadres had inflated production figures in order to promote themselves, they were required to deliver a large portion of the Tibetan harvest to the state in the form of a variety of taxes. Tibetans actually suffered food shortages despite the fact that their own harvests were good:

During the big movement for competition in production [Great Leap Forward], because of a tendency to boast and exaggerate, there were false reports of increased production which were inconsistent with reality. There were those who in order to cover up their own lies took the falsely reported production indicators as the basis, and after the collection of patriotic public grain, apart from some seed grain, grain for everyday consumption, and animal fodder, bought up the majority of the remainder, and tapped past grain reserves [from estates and monasteries]. Because this was done too strictly, difficulties arose in the livelihood of the masses.

The Panchen Lama said that in the southern border areas many people had fled to Nepal and India due to excessive repression of the revolt. In pastoral areas there had been losses due to

the rebellion and the disruptions of democratic reforms. Some herdsmen had slaughtered their livestock rather than give them up. Also, exchange between agricultural and pastoral areas had been cut off, and although the state had distributed grain to the nomads, this had not been enough, and the nomads had been forced to slaughter more livestock in order to subsist. Nomads lacked grain while villagers lacked meat and butter. Handicraft industries had been restricted, resulting in shortages of necessary items. Subsidiary production in commerce and agriculture had been restricted by state emphasis on primary products such as grain, resulting in shortages of other items. Many private traders had been repressed or had fled the country, resulting in disruptions to commerce. Other trade activities had been restricted, particularly trade with India and Nepal. Merchants had been required to report all their assets so that the state could determine what was to be confiscated and what had to be paid in taxes. A few merchants had falsely reported their assets, resulting in the suspicion on the part of cadres that all merchants were trying to cheat the state. The cadres then levied unreasonable taxes on all merchants. The merchants were unable to pay the taxes and were therefore forced out of business, resulting in further disruptions in commerce and distribution.

Because the natural system of trade and commerce had been replaced with a system of state control, there had been disruptions, shortages, and inequality in distribution. Many people suffered shortages simply due to inefficient or irrational state distribution. Some people were refused grain rations based on cadres' belief that they were hoarding grain when they actually had none. As the Panchen Lama said,

Because at that time there was a shortage of grain, people who lacked grain could not obtain it from elsewhere. Consequently, in some places in Tibet, a situation arose where people starved to death. ... In the past, although Tibet was a society ruled by dark and savage feudalism, there had never been such a shortage of grain. In particular, because Buddhism was widespread, all people, whether noble or humble, had the good habit of giving help to the poor, and so people could live solely by begging for food. A situation could not have arisen where people starved to death, and we have never heard of a situation where people starved to death.

On the United Front

The Panchen Lama again raised the issue of many Tibetans who were unjustly repressed and subjected to thamzing after the revolt and during Democratic Reforms. United Front policy was that those in the upper class who were "anti-imperialist, patriotic and progressive" should "recognize the crimes of that class." If they did so they were not to be subjected to public thamzing and confiscation of their property without compensation. However, many of the upper class had been subjected to thamzing without regard to whether they had repented their own crimes and the crimes of their class. He complained that with a few exceptions of some important people, "many other of our friends encountered great difficulties, fear and anxiety during the Democratic Reform period." He said: "under the preferred method of arbitrary attack, the feudal lords and their agents and some well-off serfs were indiscriminately attacked, with no rational distinction being made between black and white, and those who attacked more fiercely being regarded as heroes." The Panchen Lama said that this nonadherence to the principles of

protection, unity, and winning people over had caused many people to become scared, discouraged, and dissatisfied, thus alienating them from the Party and even strengthening the forces of opposition.

On Democratic Centralism

This section was divided into two parts, one dealing with democracy and the other with centralism (perhaps an acknowledgement of the incompatibility of these two policies). The Panchen Lama said that Chairman Mao had described the political system of China as centralized, democratic, disciplined, and free. In the first part, on democracy, the Panchen Lama complained that Party cadres did not listen to the concerns of ordinary Tibetans but instead dictated to them and criticized their opinions as evidence of their lack of ideological education, or their "green brains." The Panchen Lama emphasized that neither Chinese nor Tibetan cadres should apply policies to Tibet without taking into account and making exceptions for Tibet's special characteristics.¹⁰

The Panchen Lama said that cadres had not listened to the people but had instead dictated to them and had branded their opinions as reactionary if they differed from Party policies. Many Tibetans had been subjected to thamzing just for expressing contrary opinions. Instead of learning to exercise "people's democracy," Tibetans had been taught that only unquestioning conformity to policies dictated from above would be tolerated. Meetings were held at which everyone was in seeming agreement but this was only because the people were afraid to say anything different or express any opinions or opposition. The Panchen Lama complained that this was not democracy and that the Party was alienating itself from the people by its dictatorial methods.

In the second part of this section, regarding the principle of centralism, the Panchen Lama complained that the principle of centralism did not allow any exercise of autonomy by the Preparatory Committee for the Tibet Autonomous Region, which, after the dissolution of the Tibetan Government was supposed to be the highest administrative organ in the TAR. The Panchen Lama said that the Preparatory Committee should "exercise leadership of organizations directly under its control and of all levels of government, allocate work and have proper control of working methods, investigate and report, praise achievements and put right errors and mistakes." However, many governmental organs and many prefectural officials "paid insufficient attention to the fact that the Preparatory Committee was their leadership organ." In addition, they had filed reports claiming that there were no problems when this was clearly not the case. The upper level administration was therefore deceived in thinking that work in Tibet was going entirely smoothly without any problems whatsoever.

On the People's Democratic Dictatorship

The Panchen Lama returned to his complaint that Tibetans had been indiscriminately arrested in large numbers after the revolt and had been imprisoned without any trial or any regard to their innocence or guilt. He reiterated that the repression of the revolt was supposed to be directed only at the leaders while all others should have been pardoned and reeducated to support the Party's policies. One of the Party's principles was that "dictatorship should only be exercised

towards rebels who obstinately stick to the wrong course, counterrevolutionaries and the most reactionary of the feudal lords and their agents." However, in Tibet "many good and innocent were unscrupulously charged with offences, maligned and categorized with criminals; this has astounded people of integrity."

The Panchen Lama said the number of people jailed or subjected to labor reform had "reached a percentage of the total population which has never been surpassed throughout history." In 1987, after his rehabilitation, the Panchen Lama gave a more detailed estimate of the numbers of Tibetans imprisoned after the revolt:

In my 70,000 character petition I mentioned that about five percent of the population had been imprisoned. According to my information at that time, it was between 10 to 15 percent. But I did not have the courage to state such a huge figure. I would have died under *thamzing* if I had stated the real figure. In Qinghai, for example, there are between one to three or four thousand villages and towns, each having between three to four thousand families with four to five thousand people. From each town and village about 800 to 1,000 people were imprisoned. Out of this at least 300 to 400 people died in prison. This means almost half of the prison population perished. Most of these people were completely innocent.¹¹

The Panchen Lama described how public meetings and *thamzing* were regarded by Tibetans with fear and apprehension. He said that when called to "study" meetings, people's "hearts palpitated with terror. ... people of integrity felt discouraged and disheartened." Others learned "the technique of keeping a considerable distance between what they said and what was in their hearts." One effect of such public assemblies was that there emerged many people who were "good at flattering with deceitful talk and brandishing their willingness to pander to others." This created a situation where "on the surface it appeared that achievements had been made, but underneath it was the complete opposite." Tibetans appeared to have reformed their ideology but in fact they had only learned to hide their true feelings.

The Panchen Lama complained that many Tibetans had died in prisons or labor camps due to poor treatment. He described how Tibetans were beaten in prison, overworked, underfed, and protected from cold only by thin cotton tents and blankets. Many Tibetans in their 50s and 60s had died due to the heavy physical labor and poor treatment. Many had been executed in prison for any resistance to reform or any expression of opposition to the Chinese. The Panchen Lama said that this indiscriminate treatment had brought sadness and grief to Tibetans, increased their opposition to the new government, and harmed the image of China.

On Religion

The Panchen Lama said that 99 percent of the Tibetan people had great faith, love, and respect for religion: therefore, this was a crucial matter and how it was handled was directly related to whether or not the Party would be able to obtain the sincere support of the people. The Panchen Lama said that Mao and Zhou had told him that the government would "continue to give the masses, both monastic and secular, freedom of religious belief, but also would protect law-abiding monasteries and believers, and that we could carry out religious activities including

teaching, debating, writing as before." At the same time, monasteries would be cleansed of the feudal serf system and the systems of oppression and exploitation that had stained religion and which were incompatible with the development of society. Because there were an excessive number of monks who did not participate in material production or human reproduction there was a need to reduce their number. However, there should remain in the monasteries a certain number of good monks to carry out religious activities.

The Panchen Lama wrote that he himself had made a study of the religious problem and agreed that there were many monks and lamas in monasteries who did not pursue the study of religion and who did not follow the religious doctrines. Some of these people would voluntarily enter the secular life in order to start a family; others who were unsuited to the religious life should be forced to secularize in order to increase production. Monasteries should undergo democratic reforms; they should be deprived of their estates and serfs, and their management should be democratized. For the good monks who were engaged in religion and for the elderly and ill monks who should be allowed to remain in monasteries, the state should provide some support while the monks should also engage in some productive labor. The Panchen Lama also emphasized that it was of utmost importance that proper protection be given to all those monasteries having historical significance. Protection should also be given to all Buddhist images, texts, and shrines.

However, the Panchen Lama said, "when work in religion and the monasteries was actually carried out, there arose many things which should not have happened, and which were inappropriate and unfortunate. This made people feel astonished and lose heart." He said that many monasteries and many monks had taken part in the rebellion, but not all of them had. Also, he said, religion itself was not to blame for supporting the rebellion. There should have been careful discrimination between those monks who supported the rebellion and those who did not, and that whole monasteries should not be condemned for the actions of a few of their monks. But because the monasteries had been labeled as one of the three pillars of feudalism, the entire monastic institution and religion itself were attacked. There were many activists who were infected with the leftist ideology that all religion was bad and who thought that Democratic Reforms offered the opportunity not to reform religion but to completely eliminate it.

The Panchen Lama said that during democratic reforms the Party's policies on religion had not been followed, but instead the cadres and activists had pursued a policy that the Panchen Lama called "doing away with religion, eradicating Buddhist images, sutras and shrines, and forcing monks and nuns to secularize." Monks and nuns who had refused to renounce their religion were subjected to fierce thamzing and often imprisoned. Almost all others were forced to secularize so that monasteries were virtually depopulated. In some places monks and nuns had been lined up on opposite sides of a courtyard and forced to select marriage partners from the opposite side. The Panchen Lama said that in many remote monasteries there were many extremely holy and otherworldly lamas who had no understanding of the demands of cadres and activists and so resisted reeducation and were therefore arrested and imprisoned as reactionaries. In spite of these forcible methods being applied, the cadres and activists had claimed that democratic reform had been carried out and that monks and nuns had voluntarily secularized and that therefore they had attained liberation and freedom of religious belief. As the Panchen Lama

said, "This statement does not fit with what is acknowledged as the thinking of more than 90 percent of the Tibetan people including myself."

In regard to Buddhist statues, scriptures, and shrines, the Panchen Lama said that there had been massive destruction: "Innumerable Buddhist images, sutras and shrines have been burnt to the ground, thrown into rivers, demolished or melted. There has been a reckless and frenzied destruction of monasteries and shrines. Many Buddhist statues have been stolen or broken open for their precious contents." Tibetans' religious sentiments had been intentionally insulted by using holy Buddhist scriptures for toilet paper and as an inner lining for shoes. *Mani* stones (stones carved with the Buddhist mantra Om Mani Padme Hum) had been used to construct toilets or for walkways so that Tibetans would have to desecrate them by walking on them. Some of the cadres claimed that all of this had been done voluntarily by Tibetans whose political consciousness had been raised by Democratic Reforms. However, the Panchen Lama said, "This is sheer nonsense which comes from a complete lack of understanding of the actual situation in Tibet." All of this had been done, he said, "in a situation in which Han nationality cadres provided the idea, Tibetan cadres mobilized the people, and activists with no common sense carry out the destruction." As to the destruction of monasteries and religion, the Panchen Lama wrote:

Before Democratic Reform in Tibet there were over 2,500 large, medium and small monasteries in Tibet [TAR]. After democratic reforms, only 70 or so monasteries were kept in existence by the government. This was a reduction of more than 97 percent. Because there were no people living in most of the monasteries, there was no one to look after their Great Prayer Halls and other divine halls and the monks' housing. There was great damage and destruction, both by men and otherwise, and they were reduced to the condition of having collapsed or being on the point of collapse. In the whole of Tibet [TAR] in the past there were a total of about 110,000 monks and nuns. Of those, possibly 10,000 fled abroad, leaving about 100,000. After democratic reform was concluded, this number of monks and nuns living in the monasteries was about 7,000 people, which is a reduction of 93 percent.

Of those monks and nuns remaining in the monasteries, the Panchen Lama said that they were "generally of low quality." The high-level religious practitioners and scholars that he had hoped would be allowed to remain in monasteries and continue religious practice and tradition had instead almost all been subjected to *thamzing*, arrested, and imprisoned. The Panchen Lama said, "the monasteries have already lost their purpose and significance as religious institutions." The remaining monks and nuns were forced to engage in labor and production to the extent that they had no time for religious activities. The actual result of Democratic Reforms was that the religious life in monastic and secular society had been eliminated. People had to take down the prayer flags from their roofs and cease to wear their protective amulets. They had to hide statues of the Buddha, scriptures, or other religious objects. They could no longer chant Buddhist mantras or turn prayer wheels. They could not burn juniper incense or make offerings at holy places. They could not sponsor Buddhist rituals, even for the dead. As the Panchen Lama said, "The number of religious activities are as scarce as stars in the daytime. The passing on of the knowledge of the three precious gems [*kunchok sum*, the Buddha, the *Dharma*, and the *Sangha*, or the religious community] has been abandoned." The Panchen Lama declared that he spoke

truthfully and that 90 percent of Tibetans agreed with him, despite the fact that none but he were willing to speak out due to the pervasive fear of being criticized as reactionaries.

On the Tibetan Nationality

The Panchen Lama began by describing the CCP's policy of equality for all nationalities and the importance of the unity of nationalities. Although Tibet had been "under the jurisdiction of the motherland for several hundred years," Tibetans still "strongly perceive themselves as Tibetan, and only have a weak perception of the motherland." The Panchen Lama said that because the rebellion in Tibet was widespread and because it was anti-Party, anti-revolution, and anti-motherland, many Han nationality cadres had been of the opinion that the Tibetan nationality as a whole should be blamed and repressed.

The Panchen Lama complained that all aspects of Tibetan national identity were being suppressed: in particular, religion, language, and national dress and customs. All aspects of Tibetan dress and national customs that distinguished Tibetans from Chinese were being repressed and eliminated. Because of the resentment of what they regarded as the Tibetans' betrayal of the motherland, Han cadres had denigrated all aspects of Tibetan culture, including Tibetan dress and language. Tibetan cadres had been prohibited from wearing Tibetan dress. Despite the regulation that all government documents should be in both Chinese and Tibetan languages, only Chinese was used. This meant that Tibet was allowed no autonomy because all business was conducted by Han cadres in Chinese and Tibetan cadres were not even consulted. Tibetan language had been altered and was being replaced in government and education by Chinese. The Panchen Lama criticized those who said that the Tibetan language was unable to adapt to new terminology. He said that attempts to simplify the written language by making it correspond to the spoken language in each area had damaged it and the nationality by eliminating a common written language for all Tibetans. He warned that language and customs were the identifying characteristics of a nationality, and that if those characteristics disappeared then the nationality itself would disappear or change into another nationality.

The Panchen Lama said that so many Tibetans had been killed during the rebellion or imprisoned during Democratic Reforms and had died in prison that there had been great damage to the Tibetan nationality by serious reduction in the population: "In regions which have been affected comparatively seriously, on looking at the inhabitants, it can be clearly understood that only women, infants and the elderly are left; those of youth and middle age and knowledgeable people have become fewer." The Panchen Lama said that the situation in Kham and Amdo was even worse than in the TAR and that conditions were still bad there.¹² There had been so many deaths in Kham and Amdo that the Tibetan nationality and religion were in danger of extinction in those areas. Since these were areas of Tibetan nationality, these conditions affected the Tibetan nationality as a whole. Although the Panchen Lama was required to refer to only the TAR as Tibet, he said that the degree of success or failure of the work done in any area of Tibetan nationality had an influence the other areas: "So any victories and achievements obtained by brother Tibetan areas are like victories and achievements obtained in Tibet itself. Disasters and losses created by errors and mistakes in the work in brother Tibetan areas are, similarly, like disasters and losses created by errors and mistakes in the work in Tibet itself." Because of this interrelationship between Tibetan areas, the Panchen Lama said that he thought it appropriate to

make some comments about Tibetan areas outside the TAR, based upon his tour of Kham and Amdo in 1961. He wrote that he had been encouraged by some Chinese nationality officials to inspect these areas and he hoped his comments would not be regarded as interference in the affairs of neighboring provinces.

He wrote that initially he had great difficulty in convincing Tibetans in those areas to voice their true opinions. Once he had gained their confidence they revealed that the areas of Tibetan nationality outside the TAR had suffered all of the same problems as the TAR but that the problems were "longer in duration, more serious and more leftist than in Tibet." This was because reforms had begun earlier there and with little or no preparation. He said that the problems in regard to nationality and religion in Kham and Amdo had been due to extreme leftist deviation, and that there was absolutely no democratic life in those areas. The cadres had been so dictatorial, he said, that if anyone said anything that even slightly conflicted with the opinions of the cadres they were immediately labeled as counterrevolutionaries and severely attacked. He said that the Tibetans in Kham and Amdo described to him a life of unbearable suffering.

The Panchen Lama said that in Kham and Amdo most people believed that the Chinese Communist Party was intent upon destroying Tibetan religion and nationality. The rebellion was crushed with excessive force, he said, resulting in indescribable disaster and endless suffering to the Tibetan nationality. He said that there should not have been such severe military repression. Even Tibetans who gathered together for religious rituals were thought to be rebels and were attacked. The indiscriminate attacks on Tibetan religion and nationality had intensified the rebellion and increased its duration and had turned it into a conflict between the Han and Tibetan nationalities.

The Panchen Lama said that most of the men in Kham and Amdo had been killed during the revolt or arrested and imprisoned after the revolt. The revolt and imprisonment of Tibetans had resulted in a "huge number of abnormal deaths, creating a phenomenon where not all of the prisoners' corpses could be buried. Therefore, hundreds of thousands of parents, wives, children, friends and relatives of those who died of abnormal causes were extremely grieved, their tears welled up, and they wailed and cried bitterly." This situation occurred everywhere, he said, and was difficult to describe:

Because rebellions occurred in most of the Tibetan areas, many people were lost in battle. Second, many people were arrested and imprisoned during and after the period of suppression of the rebellion, which caused large numbers of people to die abnormal deaths. Third, for a period, because the life of the masses was poverty-stricken and miserable, many people, principally the young and old, died of starvation or because they were physically so weak they could not resist minor illnesses. Consequently, there has been an evident and severe reduction in the present-day Tibetan population. Needless to say this was not only harmful to the flourishing of our Tibetan nationality, but it was also a great threat to the continued existence of the Tibetan nationality, which was sinking into a condition close to death.

Because so many people had been killed and imprisoned, agricultural and pastoral production had suffered. At the same time, the people's communes were started in Tibetan areas

outside the TAR before the proper economic and ideological conditions were prepared. Property was collectivized and some was confiscated by the state, with the result that agricultural and pastoral production was severely damaged. Unrealistic production targets were set and taxes were collected based upon those targets even though they were not met. Tibetans were left with insufficient food for survival. Communal grain rations had to be supplemented with wheat husks, grasses, tree leaves, and roots. Even this was in limited amount and could not satisfy hunger:

Because the anguish of such severe hunger had never been experienced in Tibetan history and was such that people could not imagine it even in their dreams, the masses could not resist this kind of cruel torment, and their condition declined daily. Therefore, in some places, colds and other such minor infectious diseases caused a percentage of people to die easily. In some places, many people directly starved to death because the food ran out; therefore, in some places, there was the phenomenon of whole families dying out. The mortality rate was critical. Those abnormal deaths were all caused by the lack of food, and in fact they all should be counted as having starved to death.

The Panchen Lama said that the numbers of monasteries and monks in Kham and Amdo had been reduced by 99 percent. The most learned lamas had been attacked and now the only remaining monks were political activists unworthy of the religion. Monasteries had ceased to exist, religious culture was disappearing, and "the future of religion has in reality been destroyed; therefore, in fact religion has no future."

Conclusions

By way of conclusion to his report, the Panchen Lama wrote that the main cause of Tibetans' suffering was the revolt itself. Many Tibetans had revolted because they were deceived by the use of slogans in regard to religion and nationality; however, the Panchen Lama also blamed the revolt on the misapplication and abuse of CCP nationalities policies by cadres in Tibetan areas. He complained that many Han cadres were unfamiliar with conditions in Tibetan areas and that they tended to regard themselves as superior to Tibetans. Tibetan cadres tended to be enthusiastic but barely educated in basic knowledge or in the Party's nationality policies. The Panchen Lama said that he had written his report in the spirit of "benefiting and enhancing the reputation, esteem, glory and prestige of our patron, the CCP, the great Chairman Mao and the motherland." Also, he said, he had done it in the spirit of the saying: "Uncomfortable words are found in the mouths of those who love you." He said that his concerns could be summarized as about three problems: religious freedom, the repression of the rebellion and the fate of the Tibetan nationality, and the livelihood of the Tibetan people.

In regard to the freedom of religion he said that the Party needed to counteract the opinion among many both at home and abroad that the CCP wanted to destroy religion and would not permit religious belief. Tibetans must be allowed to believe in religion and to practice their religion. They must be allowed to join monasteries and the monasteries must be allowed to maintain Buddhist rituals and scholarship. The democratic management committees in the remaining monasteries must be composed of genuine monks who want to preserve religion and

not activists who want to destroy it. He asked for the patronage of the state in regard to the support for monks and monasteries.¹³

In regard to the suppression of the rebellion, he wrote that it was inevitable that the revolt and its suppression would arouse animosities between nationalities. Tibetans, even those not guilty of supporting the revolt, felt that their nationality and their religion were being attacked because of the revolt; therefore, "doubts, panic, anxiety, fear and great hatred arose in the minds of many Tibetan people of all strata." These feelings "harmed the affection" between nationalities, which could not be repaired by a few words. Instead, there must be a rebuilding of what was destroyed, compensation for those who suffered, true equality of nationalities in the great family of the motherland and assurance that Tibetans "would not be changed into another nationality." Tibetans needed to be convinced that the mistakes made in Tibet were the errors of lower-level cadres and not of the CCP and its leaders. This was necessary if Tibetans were to regain their loyalty to the Party. In regard to the livelihood of the people, he wrote that work should proceed cautiously and that requisitions from the masses should take their burdens into consideration. He also asked that the lives of Tibetans in areas outside the TAR, who were "sinking into a miserable plight," should be considered, in order to prevent people from leading such "poor, bitter and indescribable lives," and to ensure that "nobody dies of starvation." If this was done and there were a good harvest then the ideological basis would be created in those areas for Tibetans to "advance in the direction of the revolution."

The Panchen Lama said that he wrote his petition on behalf of the Tibetan people, all of whom shared his concerns. He declared his loyalty to the Party and to its leaders, who he said had helped him to achieve a "certain revolutionary viewpoint." He said that he had "done a little work" for the Party and the revolution and had never done any harm. He felt that his report was "another good and significant thing which I have done in my history." He asked that the leaders to whom his report was addressed would "exercise magnanimity and a holy and pure spirit" when examining it:

If only the CCP Tibet Work Committee knows about errors and mistakes in the work in Tibet and, no matter whether they are serious or not, carries out both the special characteristics of the CCP [to make self-criticisms] and the CCP's wise and good work style with sufficient courage and makes prompt and clear reports to the central authorities, without hiding or concealing anything and to the letter, then this will enable the central authorities to see the victories and achievements in the work in Tibet and to be acquainted with the errors and mistakes.

Summary

Despite the Panchen Lama's hope that his criticisms might be well-taken, they reportedly aroused the resentment of senior Chinese cadres responsible for Tibet who began to plot against him. Temporarily, however, under the leadership of Zhou, the CCP formulated new policies for its work in Tibet in the light of the Panchen's criticisms. These included revival of the United Front policy of cooperation with the former upper class people who were loyal to the Party, more respect for freedom of religion, more discrimination in regard to who should be accused of

having supported the revolt, and more discrimination in the selection of cadres and activists. However, these policies were never implemented because Mao resumed control of the CCP after being relegated to a background role after the disasters of the Great Leap. Mao reacted far differently to the Panchen's criticisms than Zhou. Mao described the Panchen's petition as a "poisoned arrow aimed at the heart of the Party by reactionary feudal overlords," and criticized the Panchen personally, reportedly saying that he was not destined to be a leader of the Tibetan nationality.

Mao and other CCP leaders were reluctant to believe that conditions in Tibet were as bad as the Panchen Lama claimed, especially since he was the only one voicing such complaints. They preferred to think that his complaints merely reflected the discontent of the former upper class at having lost their former status and privileges. In response to the Panchen Lama's criticisms, Chinese officials in Tibet mounted a propaganda campaign to discredit him. In late 1962 Chinese officials demanded that he denounce the Dalai Lama, which he refused to do. After this his public appearances and his political role were diminished, but he retained his official position. In August 1964, in conjunction with a "new leftist wind" implemented by Mao, known as the Socialist Education Movement, the Panchen Lama was denounced as a "rock on the road to socialism," deprived of his position as head of the PCTAR and subjected to 17 days of *thamzing*. He was accused of being a "reactionary enemy of the State" and a secret supporter of the Dalai Lama. During his *thamzing* the Panchen Lama was accused of many preposterous crimes, including "attempted restoration of serfdom," murder, planning to launch a guerilla war against the State, illicitly cohabiting with women, "criticizing and opposing China in a 70,000 character document," "declaring open support for the Dalai Lama and misleading the masses," and "theft and plunder of images and other property from monasteries."¹⁴ Meetings were held all over Tibet to denounce the Panchen Lama to Tibetans who wondered how someone so loyal to the Chinese until then could now be such a traitor.¹⁵

In December he was taken to Beijing where he lived under house arrest until the beginning of the Cultural Revolution, when he was subjected to *thamzing* at the Minority Nationalities Institute. In 1968 he was imprisoned, where he was to remain for nine years and eight months until his release in October 1977. The Panchen Lama was allowed to return to Lhasa only in July 1982. In 1987 the Panchen Lama revealed that he had been accused in 1964 of "turning against the motherland" and "trying to start a secessionist rebellion." He said that Mao had warned him that "Even if the whole of the Tibetan population is armed, it will only make over 3 million people. We are not scared of this." The Panchen Lama said that "On hearing this, I felt very sad and realized how it is to be without freedom."¹⁶

What the Panchen Lama's petition revealed was that the CCP was repressing all Tibetan opposition to Chinese rule with little regard to the niceties of nationality autonomy policies. The Panchen repeatedly complained about the indiscriminate repression of Tibetans for any expression of opposition or even the suspicion of opposition. An unjustifiable number of Tibetans had been killed during the revolt or in prisons and labor camps. Because the religious establishment was identified as one of the three pillars of feudalism, it was attacked without regard to the promise of religious freedom. Monasteries almost without exception were being deprived of their lands, their monks were being forcibly secularized, and their material possessions were being confiscated as part of the redistribution of wealth of democratic reforms.

Religious practice was repressed and Tibet's religious culture was practically eradicated. Most of the former aristocracy were purged due to their class status, and the United Front policy was essentially abandoned. Despite Tibet having experienced good harvests during the years of the Great Leap, exactions by the state had resulted in widespread famine, especially in Tibetan areas outside the TAR. The peoples' democracy that was supposed to be created by Democratic Reforms had instead produced tyranny, fear, conformity, and despair. China's repression of all aspects of Tibetan culture and national identity led the Panchen Lama to fear for the survival of the Tibetan nationality. His frequent mention of the danger of Tibetans being "changed into another nationality" reveals the assimilationist pressures experienced by Tibetans after the revolt and during Democratic Reforms.

The Panchen Lama submitted his petition in the belief that the Party would correct its mistakes in Tibet because it would adhere to its own policies about nationalities' autonomy and religious freedom. He also imagined that the CCP valued the loyalty of Tibetans and particularly that of the Panchen himself. He may have thought himself immune from purge since he was the only remaining Tibetan in the Chinese administration who commanded any traditional respect among Tibetans.¹⁷ However, what the Panchen Lama's complaints reveal is that the revolt was of an undeniably nationalist character and that the Party was carrying out the suppression of Tibetan resistance in an equally nationalist manner. The Panchen Lama found himself in an impossible position in trying to follow the Party line on the non-nationalist character of the revolt when the CCP was using the suppression of the revolt and the subsequent Democratic Reforms campaign to eliminate all Tibetan opposition to Chinese rule. Despite their doctrine that nationality issues were really disguised class issues, the Chinese in Tibet reacted to the Tibetan revolt as treason against China and suppressed all Tibetan opposition as anti-Chinese. The Panchen Lama was also having difficulty understanding the necessity for the repression of religious leaders and the religious establishment that he saw taking place all around him. He obviously believed that the Party was sincere in its policy on freedom of religion and he did not fully understand the incompatibility of Marxism and religion.

The Panchen Lama was lured into expressing his criticisms not only by his idealistic belief in CCP nationalities doctrine but by the intricacies of CCP politics at the time. The Panchen's criticisms in 1960 and 61 received a favorable response from the most liberal of the Party's leaders, including Li Weihan, Deng Xiaoping, and Zhou Enlai. These leaders were in actual command of the Party after Mao had been forced to allow them to repair the results of his Great Leap. However, once Mao regained control he reverted to his own leftist inclinations, one of which in regard to nationalities policies was that the national issue was in essence a class issue. What this meant was that the upper classes of any nationality would use nationalism to preserve their own status and privileges. Nationalism then, according to a strict Marxist reading, had no real meaning, and national identity, including minority nationality identity, had no value and no reason to be protected or preserved. In pursuit of a class-based revolution, nationalism of all types had to be eliminated, although in Tibet the Chinese were much more intolerant of Tibetan nationalism than of Chinese (Han) nationalism.

The CCP imagined that because it was a revolutionary party it was free of nationalism itself, even in its pursuit of the liberation of non-Chinese peoples such as the Tibetans. All of the Chinese Communists believed in an ultimately assimilationist solution to the minority national

question. The only debate was over the rate of assimilation. The most liberal favored a gradual policy of respect for nationalities cultures and autonomy until the nationalities voluntarily and inevitably chose assimilation themselves. The most leftist and revolutionary found it hard to tolerate the United Front policy and preferred a more coercive assimilation. The latter group prevailed in the history of the CCP in its policies in Tibet after the revolt as they had after the Hundred Flowers debate, and as they would in every instance in the future when minorities demanded the autonomy they had been promised.

The purge of the Panchen Lama signified that after the 1959 revolt and the elimination of the former Tibetan Government and after the Democratic Reform campaign, the Chinese Communists no longer felt any need for a figurehead leader representing Tibet's previous political system. The purge of the Panchen marks the end of China's respect for Tibetan autonomy based upon the 17-Point Agreement. Now that China had total control in Tibet there was no longer any need for any cooperation with the representatives of the previous system or even any pretense of cooperation. The United Front policy fundamentally conflicted with the doctrine that the former upper class members were enemies of the revolution and enemies of the people. It also conflicted with the need to eliminate nationality leadership in favor of Chinese control. The Chinese were able to dispense with the upper-class United Front collaborators because they had by now cultivated many lower-class collaborators and activists. The disregard for the role of the Panchen Lama was all the more obvious because his purge was not necessary. His petition could have remained a Party secret much as the text actually did for the next 34 years. However, so offended was Mao at the Panchen's criticisms and so little did the CCP see any remaining need for a figurehead in Tibet that the Party preferred to make an example of him. This also served the Party's need for constant lessons to Tibetans about the perils of opposition to Chinese rule, even from the highest official of the supposedly autonomous administration of Tibet.

The purge of the Panchen Lama and the abrogation of the type of autonomy promised in the 17-Point Agreement also set the stage for the subsequent Cultural Revolution, when there was not even a thought given to any of Tibet's supposed autonomy. Even before his purge the Panchen Lama revealed that there was no autonomy in Tibet. He complained that the PCTAR, of which he was the head, was not really in charge of administration. Instead, the Chinese were administering Tibet through CCP organizations and the PLA. As was the case in all of the PRC, an atmosphere of conformity was pervasive due to past purges of critics of Mao's campaigns. No one, with the exception of the Panchen Lama, dared to report to Beijing any problems in the administration of Tibet. Beijing therefore tended to think that anyone expressing any complaints about conditions in Tibet must be an opponent of the new regime.

1. Panchen Lama, *A Poisoned Arrow: The Secret Report of the 10th Panchen Lama*. (London: Tibet Information Network, 1997). This article is based upon a preliminary translation of the Panchen Lama's report that was kindly sent to me by Robbie Barnett before the final translation and publication of the report. Some wording of the Panchen Lama's quotes may therefore slightly differ from the final published version, but meanings are unchanged.

² The PCTAR was created in 1956 to prepare for the ultimate award of autonomous status to what was to become (in 1966) the Tibet Autonomous Region. In fact, the PCTAR immediately assumed many of the functions of the Tibetan Government, thus violating one of the promises of the 17-Point Agreement that the political system in Tibet would not be altered. The Chinese rationalized this change by means of a clause of that agreement that specified that

changes might be made “with the approval of the Tibetan people,” an ostensible approval they secured by pretending that the PCTAR, which was headed by the Dalai Lama, was voluntarily created by Tibetans themselves.

2. The Seventeen-Point Agreement on the Peaceful Liberation of Tibet was the treaty by which Tibet “returned to the Chinese Motherland,” and was incorporated within the People’s Republic of China. It has many of the characteristics of an international treaty and was negotiated after the invasion of eastern Tibet by the PLA and the threat of further invasion of central Tibet if the Tibetan Government did not capitulate.

⁴ . The United Front Work Department was the organization under the CCP in charge of “uniting” with the remaining democratic political parties in China as well as the minority nationalities.

⁵ Democratic Reforms, along with Socialist Transformation, or collectivization, were the two stages of the CCP’s program for the transformation of Chinese society and economy. Democratic Reforms included class divisions, redistribution of property and the “struggle” of upper-class exploiters and others, determined by the struggle process itself, to be opponents of the new regime.

⁶ Ground, roasted barley flour, the staple of the Tibetan diet.

⁷ *Thamzing*, or “struggle” in Tibetan, was the politically cathartic process by which the lower classes were supposed to confront their former oppressors of the upper classes and thereby experience class awareness and personal political liberation. The process in Tibet often degenerated into violent denunciations and beatings of the subjects, encouraged by Party cadres, sometimes resulting in death or leading to imprisonment or sentencing to “reform through labor.” *Thamzing* was also a way to expose opponents of the new order since all were required to participate and express their opinions. Those thus identified were in their turn subjected to *thamzing* and to punishments determined by CCP cadres.

2. “The Panchen Lama Speaks: Text of the Panchen Lama’s Address to the TAR Standing Committee Meeting of the National People’s Congress held in Peking on 28 March 1987,” (Dharamsala: Department of Information and International Relations, Central Tibetan Administration of His Holiness the Dalai Lama, 1991).

⁹ The Great Leap Forward was Mao’s attempt to increase agricultural production by means of precipitous collectivization. Its disastrous result was the death by starvation of an estimated 30-40 million people.

3. “Special characteristics” was, and still is, a code phrase for Tibet’s cultural characteristics that differ from those of China and that theoretically justify Tibetan autonomy.

4. “The Panchen Lama Speaks.”

¹² Kham and Amdo, or eastern Tibet, were two of the three traditional provinces of Tibet. Only central Tibet, or *U-Tsang*, along with the western part of Kham, was incorporated into the TAR.

5. This last request appears to reflect the Panchen’s belief that the Chinese Communist government would play a role in regard to Tibet somewhat within the tradition of imperial patronage for Tibetan Buddhism.

6. Kunsang Paljor, *Tibet, the Undying Flame* (Dharamsala: Information Office of His Holiness the Dalai Lama, 1977), 29. The basis for the last charge was apparently the Panchen’s attempts to save some of the treasures of Ganden, Sera, and Drepung by moving them to the Jokhang.

7. Palden Gyatso, *Tibetan Monk*, 105

8. “The Panchen Lama Speaks.” The Panchen Lama is speaking of Amdo, or Qinghai, which is outside the TAR.

9. The Panchen Lama assured two British socialist journalists in late 1962, after the opposition to him was already gathering, that he was actually in charge of government in Tibet: “As a cadre of the People’s Republic of China, I am performing my duties in accordance with the policies of the Chinese Communist Party and the Central People’s Government. There is no question of any misunderstanding between me and them.” Stuart and Roma Gelder, *The Timely Rain: Travels in New Tibet* (London: Hutchinson, 1962).