

BOOK REVIEW OF

HISTORICAL STATUS OF CHINA'S TIBET

BY WANG JIAWEI AND NYIMA GYAINCAIN

A COMPILATION OF A SERIES OF PROGRAMS

ON

RADIO FREE ASIA TIBETAN SERVICE

BY WARREN W. SMITH



The Historical Status of China's Tibet

The Historical Status of China's Tibet is the title of a Chinese Government propaganda publication that attempts to substantiate China's claim that Tibet is an inalienable part of China. This book was originally published in Chinese and distributed widely within China. It was awarded the Excellent Book Award in 1996. It was published in English in 1997 in order to publicize China's version of Tibetan history to an international audience. The book is said to describe the close relations between Tibet and China, showing that Tibet has been a part of Chinese territory since the Yuan Dynasty. It claims to forcefully disprove the entire ideological system of "Tibetan Independence" and to systematically refute the theories put forward by the "Dalai Clique."

The introduction to the Historical Status of China's Tibet (hereafter, China's Tibet) begins with the claim that "China is a unified country with 56 nationalities." It claims that the Tibetan Empire of the 7th to 9th centuries maintained frequent contact with Tang Dynasty China, without saying that the nature of that contact was usually conflict. It says that Tibet was incorporated into China by the Mongol Yuan, a dynasty that supposedly featured unprecedented national unity. It does not mention that the Mongol Yuan Dynasty was an empire, not just a Chinese dynasty, and that it included both China and Tibet within the Mongol Empire, not Tibet under China or Tibet as a part of China. It claims that the Ming Dynasty continued Chinese rule over Tibet, a claim that is not supported by history. It claims that the Qing Dynasty granted the title Dalai Lama to Sonam Gyatso, when it was actually Altan Khan who did so without any reference to China. It blames bad relations between China and Tibet exclusively on British influence. However, it says, that despite British attempts to foster Tibetan independence, China retained its sovereignty over Tibet.

China's Tibet makes the usual Chinese claim that Tibet was peacefully liberated in 1951. It says that the big family of the Chinese motherland was formed on the basis of equality, unity, fraternity, and cooperation. Following the revolt in Tibet in 1959, feudal serfdom was overthrown, serfs and slaves were freed, and Tibetans became the masters of their own fate. It does not mention the fact that actually the Chinese were now Tibet's masters. It admits that "mistakes were made" during the Cultural Revolution, without mentioning that the mistakes involved the destruction of Tibet culture and religion and that the Chinese Communist Party was responsible. It says that economic development since then has more than made up for the losses of the Cultural Revolution.

The introduction claims that this version of Tibetan history is unalterable fact. It maintains that everyone in the world accepts that Tibet is part of China. It also tries to make the case that not only the Han are Chinese but that Tibetans are also Chinese because they belong to the Chinese state. It says that the use of the term Chinese to refer only to the Han does not correctly reflect the relations between the various nationalities within the larger Chinese family. It demands that everyone should refer to Tibetans as Chinese in accordance with the international practice that all the people of all ethnic groups of any country are referred to by the name of the whole country. Thus foreigners should respect the PRC's usage of Han Chinese and Tibetan Chinese to refer to Han and Tibetans. However, to say that Tibetans are part of the larger Chinese family implies much more than that Tibetans are just part of the current Chinese state; it implies that Tibetans are part of the Chinese race.

China's Tibet is part of a propaganda offensive intended to reverse China's failure to convince the world of the legitimacy of its rule over Tibet. Despite the fact, often repeated by China, that no country in the world recognizes Tibetan independence, the legitimacy of China's conquest and rule over Tibet is questionable on the grounds of Tibet's right, as a nation separate from the Chinese nation, to national self-determination. Despite China's best propaganda efforts, Tibet is generally regarded in world opinion as having been a country separate from China in the past and of having been unwillingly made a part of China at present. China's "peaceful liberation" of Tibet is regarded as an invasion. China's destruction of Tibetan culture and abuses of Tibetan human rights are well known. Also well known is the fact that the Chinese invasion and occupation of Tibet resulted in the deaths of hundreds of thousands of Tibetans and the exile of many thousands more, including the rightful ruler of Tibet, the Dalai Lama.

This article uses the original chapter titles of China's Tibet as subheadings.

Relations between the Han and the Tibetans during the Tang and Song Dynasties

China's Tibet claims that the Tibetan Empire of the 7th to 9th centuries maintained frequent contact with Tang Dynasty China. It emphasizes the friendly periods in Tibetan-Tang relations, particularly the two marriage alliances, and criticizes those Tibetan and foreign historians who say that Tibetan relations with China were primarily unfriendly and that Tibet had stronger relations with India than with China. It claims that the two marriage alliances had enormous influences upon Tibetan culture, implying that the Chinese princesses introduced not only Buddhism but such basic aspects of culture as agriculture, rope-making, and pottery and weaving of cloth, all of which undoubtedly previously existed in Tibet. It implies that Tibetans had practically no culture at all before the Chinese princesses came to Tibet.

China's Tibet claims that the Tibetan Empire's foreign relations were primarily with Tang China because Tibetan kings admired the culture and technology of China. It says that Tibetan kings invited Chinese experts and administrators to Tibet to teach Tibetans all the arts of science, culture, and political administration of the time. However, it ignores the fact that Tibet during this same time acquired its written language not from China but from India. Tibet also acquired the most distinguishing characteristic of Tibetan civilization, Buddhism, from India at the same time that China claims that Tibet's predominant relations were with China. It even makes the claim that the second diffusion of Buddhism in the tenth century, which derived from India, owes as much to China as to India simply because Buddhist monks from parts of Amdo that owed allegiance to the Chinese Sung dynasty also played a role in reviving Buddhism in Tibet. However, just because some areas of eastern Tibet may have had relations with China does not mean that the second diffusion of Buddhism had anything to do with China.

China's Tibet describes Tibetan society during the Tibetan Empire period as a slave society. This is based upon the Marxist characterizations of society as progressing from slave to feudal to capitalist to socialist and finally to communist. The Chinese Communists adapted this system to Tibet, characterizing Tibet as a slave society mostly only because they thought Tibet more primitive than Chinese society of the time, which they described as feudal. The Chinese have no other evidence that Tibet was a slave society during the Tibetan Empire other than their Marxist doctrine. In regard to Tibet this now discredited doctrine simply allows the Chinese to denigrate Tibet as more

primitive than China.

The book does not claim that Tibet was a part of China during the Tibetan Empire period. It only claims that friendly relations were established that ultimately and inevitably led to a natural “merging of nationalities.” It criticizes those who emphasize the conflict between the Tibetan Empire and Tang China, saying that they must have an ulterior motive to cause dissension rather than harmony between nationalities. It implies that harmony between nationalities and the ultimate unification of nationalities are good things that should be promoted. However, what China regards as an inevitable and beneficial unification of nationalities Tibetans may regard as China’s imperialist conquest of Tibet. Harmony between nationalities implies freedom of choice in relations, something that Tibetans have not been allowed. China’s propaganda is intended to promote a harmony between nationalities that did not and does not exist in reality.

Relations between the Tibetan Empire and Tang China were most often characterized by conflict, not harmonious relations. China wants to pretend that harmonious relations between the Tibetan Empire and Tang China set a pattern that ultimately led to Tibet’s unification with China. This pattern still prevails, or should prevail, the Chinese say, between the Han and Tibetan nationalities within China today. This theory of the ultimate and beneficial unification of nationalities is based upon Marxist theory and China’s traditional method of expansion by assimilation of frontier peoples. However, Marxist theory is mostly discredited and China’s assimilation of frontier peoples is regarded as natural and beneficial only by the Chinese, not by the non-Chinese people being involuntarily assimilated. Tibetans have never had a free choice in their relations with China. China’s propaganda about the harmonious relations between Chinese and Tibetans, past or present, is intended to obscure the fact that Chinese rule was imposed upon Tibetans by force.

Relations between the Emperor of the Yuan Dynasty and the Prince of Dharma of the Sagya Sect of Tibetan Buddhism

China’s Tibet challenges the claim of Tibetan and Western scholars that relations between Tibet and the Mongol Yuan Dynasty were characterized exclusively by the chos-yon relationship in which religion takes precedence over politics. In other words, those relations were primarily religious, and did not imply the political subordination of Tibet to the Mongol Yuan dynasty. The Chinese authors maintain that Sakya Pandita made a political submission of Tibet to Godan Khan in 1246 and that his nephew Pagspa made a similar submission to Kubilai Khan in 1252. Furthermore, when Kubilai became Khan of all the Mongols in 1260 he appointed Pagspa as State Tutor. In 1264 Kubilai moved the capital of the Mongol Empire from Mongolia to Beijing. In 1271 Kubilai declared the Yuan Dynasty of China. Kubilai was therefore both Emperor of China and Khan of the Mongol Empire.

During the reign of Kubilai, Pagspa played the role of an official of the Yuan as well as the administrator of Tibet. Other Tibetan officials played similar roles during the later Yuan Dynasty. In addition, the Chinese authors cite evidence that the Yuan Dynasty exercised some direct administrative role in Tibet. All this evidence of Tibetan political subordination to the Mongol Yuan is cited by the Chinese authors as proof that Tibet thereby became a part of China. They say the evidence is irrefutable that Tibet’s relationship with the Mongol Yuan was not only religious but also political and that therefore no one can deny that Tibet became a part of China during the Yuan.

The Chinese authors of China's Tibet are correct in their contention that Tibet's relations with the Mongols were not solely religious. They are right that the relationship was not without any implications of political subordination. The relationship between the Mongol Khans and the Mongol Yuan emperors and Tibetan lamas did imply the subordination of the latter. Sakya Pandita did offer the political submission of Tibet to Godan Khan. Pagspa and other Tibetan lamas served as officials of the Mongol Empire and the Mongol Yuan Dynasty of China. The Mongol Yuan did have some actual administrative role in Tibet. However, the Chinese are wrong that Tibet therefore became a part of China.

Sakya Pandita made his submission to Godan Khan as a representative of the Mongol Empire. Godan Khan had no allegiance to China. Pagspa's relationship with Kubilai was similarly with Kubilai as the Khan of the Mongol Empire. At this time Kubilai also had no allegiance to China. When Kubilai became emperor of China he was still Khan of the Mongol Empire. Pagspa's and Tibet's relationship with Kubilai predated Kubilai's conquest of China and his creation of the Yuan Dynasty. The Tibetan relationship was with Kubilai as the khan of the Mongol Empire, not as emperor of China. China was part of the Mongol Empire, as was Tibet. Tibet was subordinate to the Mongols, not to the Chinese. The Chinese, like the Tibetans, were subordinate to the Mongols. Tibet did not therefore become a part of China. When the Mongol Empire and the Mongol Yuan Dynasty of China collapsed there was no Chinese authority in Tibet.

The Chinese claim that Tibet became a part of China during the Yuan Dynasty is based upon Mongol authority over Tibet and a relationship between Mongols and Tibetans, not Chinese authority over Tibet or a relationship between Chinese and Tibetans. During the Mongol Yuan Dynasty, Tibet was a part of the Mongol Empire, not a part of China. The Chinese at this time did not have authority over China, much less over Tibet. If the Chinese did not even control China during the Yuan Dynasty how could Mongol authority over Tibet imply that Tibet became a part of China? The Chinese argument that Tibet became a part of China because the Mongols had authority over both Tibet and China is illogical in the extreme. China's claim that Mongol authority over Tibet was equivalent to Chinese sovereignty is simply a reflection of China's desperation to prove that Tibet was a part of China before the Chinese Communist invasion of 1950.

Ming Dynasty's Policy of Enfeoffment(s) and Tribute-Related Trade

China's Tibet says that when the Mongol Yuan Dynasty ended in 1368 the native Chinese Ming Dynasty continued Chinese rule over Tibet. It says that the Ming Dynasty did not pursue the same policy as the Yuan in exercising actual authority in Tibet. Instead, the Ming exercised its authority in Tibet by means of tribute relations. The tribute form of relations meant that Tibetans and others would bring presents of local produce to the Ming court for which they would be rewarded with gifts of value usually far in excess of those that they had brought. In addition, they were presented with titles, the meaning of which they may have been unaware, but which allowed the Ming to claim that those receiving these titles were officials appointed by the Ming who recognized the authority of the Ming over their own areas.

In fact the Chinese exercised no real authority over Tibet, but many Tibetans were happy to accept

their gifts and titles since the gifts were very profitable and the titles meaningless. The Ming actually had to limit the number of Tibetans allowed to come to the Ming capital to present tribute. Many Chinese of the time criticized the Ming Dynasty tribute as being actually tribute in reverse. The Ming claimed that it was receiving tribute from neighboring peoples in acknowledgement of Ming authority over their territories. In fact, the Ming was paying tribute to these peoples in exchange for the pretense of authority over their territories when none existed in reality. The Ming Dynasty practiced the tribute form of relations with the Mongols because the Ming feared a Mongol attempt to reconquer China and with the Tibetans because the Ming wanted to pretend to authority over Tibet. The early Ming emperors were also Buddhists and had an interest in patronizing Tibetan Buddhist lamas and in receiving their blessings.

China's Tibet cites numerous instances of Tibetan lamas going to China to pay tribute and says that this demonstrates Chinese authority over Tibet during the Ming. However, the tribute form of relations was essentially meaningless except in a commercial sense, a fact that was realized by many Chinese critics of the Ming during that time. The Chinese propaganda publication also says that the trade in Tibetan horses for Chinese tea demonstrates Chinese relations with and therefore authority over Tibet. However, the horse for tea trade was primarily private and commercial, as the book admits, and does not imply any Chinese authority over Tibet. Neither the essentially trade relations of the tribute system nor actual trade between Chinese and Tibet during the Ming has any implications of Chinese authority over Tibet.

The Chinese propaganda book says that Tibetans so greatly valued the titles and authority granted to them during the Ming that these took complete precedence over their Tibetan roles and titles. It says that the Ming established the Karmapa as the head of Tibetan Buddhism and that it later gave the title Dalai Lama to the head of the Gelugpa and made him the head of Buddhism in Tibet. However, the Ming title given to the Karmapa had nothing to do with his position within Tibetan Buddhism. The Karma Kagyu were the dominant sect in Tibetan Buddhism before the Gelugpa achieved dominance. The Dalai Lama's title was given to him by Altan Khan, a Mongol who was independent of the Ming. Dalai Lama is not actually a title at all; it is simply the Mongol translation of Sonam Gyatso, the Third Dalai Lama's name. China's claim that it gave the title Dalai Lama to Sonam Gyatso and appointed him head of Tibetan Buddhism is simply Chinese pretension to authority over both Altan Khan and Tibet when no actual authority existed in fact.

China is anxious to demonstrate Chinese authority over Tibet during the Ming because the Ming was a native Chinese dynasty. Without the Ming the Chinese have only the Mongol Yuan and the Manchu Qing dynasties to prove Chinese sovereignty over Tibet. The lack of any actual Chinese authority over Tibet during the Ming negates the Chinese claim that it has exercised continuous authority over Tibet since the Yuan dynasty. In fact, the only Chinese dynasties that exercised any authority over Tibet were the Yuan and the Qing, both of which were actually non-Chinese empires that included both China and Tibet. The authority of these non-Chinese empires over both China and Tibet has no implications of Chinese authority over Tibet.

The Sovereign-Subject Relationship between the Qing Dynasty Emperor and the Dalai Lama

China's Tibet says that when the native Chinese Ming Dynasty ended in 1644, another dynasty of foreign origin, the Qing dynasty from Manchuria, continued and strengthened Chinese rule over Tibet. The Qing is said to have exercised more effective Chinese rule over Tibet than either of the preceding dynasties, the Yuan and the Ming. The Chinese propagandists are correct that the Qing Dynasty exercised more direct rule over Tibet, but, like the Yuan, the Manchu were not Chinese and their rule over Tibet does not imply Chinese sovereignty over Tibet. Like the Mongol Yuan, the Manchu Qing was an empire that included both China and Tibet. The Manchu ruled over both China and Tibet, but this does not mean that China ruled over Tibet.

China's Tibet says that the Qing Dynasty established its authority over Tibet when the Fifth Dalai Lama visited Beijing in 1652. It says that the Dalai Lama came to submit to the Qing emperor in the same way that all frontier peoples came to submit. It emphasizes that the Dalai Lama was given a title of authority that was necessary for him to assume his role as Dalai Lama and to exercise authority within Tibet. It says that when the Dalai Lama met the Qing emperor in Beijing he was treated with respect but not as an independent sovereign. The evidence of this is the fact that the Dalai Lama's throne at their meeting was very slightly lower than that of the emperor.

However, the difference in height of the Qing Emperor and the Dalai Lama's thrones is so slight as to be almost insignificant. The Dalai Lama was obviously treated as something more than just a typical subject of the Qing Emperor. The Qing emperor's ability to summon the Dalai Lama to Beijing does imply some degree of subordination of the Dalai Lama to the Qing dynasty in Inner Asian political tradition. However, the Dalai Lama did not owe his title, either as Dalai Lama or as ruler of Tibet, to the Qing Emperor's decree, despite later Chinese pretensions to that effect. In addition, whatever was the nature of Tibetan relations with the Qing Dynasty, Tibetan relations were with the Manchu as rulers of China, not with the Chinese as rulers of Tibet. The Manchu rulers were Buddhists; Manchu relations with the Dalai Lama were primarily religious and only secondarily political. The early Manchu emperors did exercise some degree of authority over Tibet, but this authority was primarily based upon amicable relations of a predominantly religious nature.

In the later Qing Dynasty the Manchu did establish a greater degree of direct administrative authority over Tibet. However, the Qing Dynasty's representatives in Tibet, the Ambans, were always Manchu or Mongol and were never Chinese. In 1722 the Qing invaded Tibet to expel the Dzungar Mongols. At that time the Qing established a new system of government in Tibet. In 1791 the Qing again sent an army to Tibet because of an invasion of Tibet by the Gurkhas of Nepal. The Gurkhas were expelled and further reforms were made to the governmental administration in Tibet. From this time until the end of the Qing Dynasty in 1912 the Qing Ambans did exercise some authority in Tibet. The relationship between the Qing and Tibetans, however, involved Tibetans and Manchu or Mongols, never Chinese. No Chinese had anything to do with the administration of Tibet. Manchu Qing administration of Tibet thus has no implications of Chinese sovereignty over Tibet.

China's claim that China exercised sovereignty over Tibet from the Yuan Dynasty to the Qing relies entirely upon the relationships of Tibet with either Mongols or Manchu. China can

demonstrate no instance when Chinese had any authority over Tibet. At the end of the Qing Dynasty Tibetans felt that they owed no allegiance to China. Tibet was not a part of China; Tibet was entirely distinct from China and Tibetans did not regard themselves as Chinese nor did the Chinese regard them as anything but Tibetans. Tibet had not been assimilated to China in any way, either culturally or politically. Tibet remained a distinct nation.

British Invasion and the Birth of the Myth of Tibetan Independence

China's Tibet says that the "myth of Tibetan independence" is the product of the imperialist invasion of Tibet by the British in 1904. It says that the British invasion of Tibet was illegal because it infringed upon the territorial integrity of China and undermined China's unification. The subsequent imposition of Chinese rule over Tibet, on the other hand, was legal, according to the Chinese, because it helped maintain Chinese state sovereignty and was favorable for Chinese national unification. However, China's opinion that the British invasion of Tibet was illegal while the Chinese invasion was legal is based upon China's unilateral declaration of sovereignty over Tibet. China's claim to sovereignty over Tibet was simply an expression of China's ambition to dominate Tibet and did not take any account of Tibetans' wishes. China's invasion of Tibet was legal only in the point of view of the Chinese, not the Tibetans. At the time of the British invasion of Tibet, China did not exercise any actual administrative authority over Tibet, a fact that did not escape the notice of the British and which led to their invasion.

China's Tibet cites the brave resistance of the Tibetan people against the British invasion as if the Tibetans were protecting China's sovereignty against foreign encroachment. In fact, Tibetans were protecting Tibet, not China, because they did not think of Tibet as a part of China. Before their invasion the British had attempted to persuade the Chinese, or the Qing Dynasty of China, to enforce British trade privileges in Tibet, which the British had negotiated with China without any reference to Tibet since the Qing Dynasty claimed authority over Tibet. However, the Qing were unable to force the Tibetans to recognize British trade privileges, demonstrating their lack of any real authority over Tibet. Only when the lack of any Chinese authority was demonstrated and the Tibetans refused to allow British trade privileges negotiated with the Chinese did the British invade Tibet.

Despite its claim to sovereignty over Tibet, Qing Dynasty China did nothing to defend Tibet against the British invasion. The Qing subsequently managed to persuade the British to recognize their pretensions to authority over Tibet, but this was only because the British did not wish to control Tibet themselves. Britain's only interest in Tibet was to keep its rival Russia from gaining influence there. Britain was willing to recognize China's nominal authority over Tibet in order to keep the Russians out and because Chinese authority did not exist in reality.

When the British invaded Tibet in 1904 the 13th Dalai Lama fled to Mongolia. He returned to Lhasa only in late 1909 after having visited Beijing in order to secure the support of the waning Qing Government for his return. In the meantime the Qing, or rather the Chinese of Sichuan, had been trying to consolidate their control over eastern Tibet. Chinese attempts to control the Tibetans of Kham had resulted in much Khampa resistance and many Chinese atrocities against them. The Qing also sent troops to reinforce the Chinese representative in Lhasa, the Amban. These troops arrived shortly after the Dalai Lama returned from his exile. The arrival of these Chinese troops led the Dalai Lama to once again flee Lhasa, this time for exile in India. While in India he cultivated

British Indian support for Tibetan independence from China. When the Qing Dynasty fell in 1912 the Dalai Lama returned to Lhasa and declared Tibetan independence.

China's Tibet maintains that the "idea of Tibetan independence" is simply an invention of the British imperialists. No doubt the British had some interests in Tibet, but these were primarily of a commercial nature. The British had no interest in controlling Tibet. Had they wanted to control Tibet they could have done so after their invasion of 1904. The Tibetans knew that Britain did not want to control Tibet but that the Chinese did. The 13th Dalai Lama therefore used British influence in order to preserve Tibet's independence from China. China's claim that Tibetan independence was invented by the British ignores the fact that the Tibetans also wanted independence from China. The "idea of Tibetan independence" was invented by Tibetans, not by the British. The fact that Tibet was able to achieve independence, at least temporarily, is evidence of their desire for national self-determination as well as China's lack of authority to prevent Tibetan independence at that time. China's propaganda about Tibetan independence being an invention of British imperialism attempts to disguise the fact that Tibetans themselves desired independence and simply used British influence in an attempt to achieve it.

Tibet Is Not an Independent Political Entity during the Period of the Republic of China

China's Tibet attempts to refute the claim of Tibetans and some Western historians that Tibet declared independence from China in 1912 after the fall of the Qing Dynasty. In late 1910, after Chinese troops entered Lhasa, the Dalai Lama fled into exile in India. From 1911, when the Qing Dynasty collapsed, until 1912, Tibetans fought with the Qing troops remaining in Tibet. In 1912 the Qing troops were finally expelled from Tibet, via India, and the Dalai Lama returned to Lhasa. Upon his arrival in Lhasa the Dalai Lama declared that the Qing Dynasty, with which Tibet had previously had a relationship, had fallen, and that Tibet was now independent. This declaration of independence signifies not only the Dalai Lama's rejection of China's attempts to control Tibet, but also the belief that Tibet's relations with China in the past had been exclusively with non-Chinese ruling dynasties, the Mongol Yuan and Manchu Qing, both of which were empires that included both China and Tibet. Tibet's relationship had never been with the Chinese or a Chinese dynasty and thus, with the fall of the Qing and the creation of a Chinese Government in Beijing, Tibet reverted to its natural state of independence.

However, China's Tibet claims that the 13th Dalai Lama and the Tibetan Government only wanted to expel the troops of the now fallen Qing Dynasty and that they did not intend to declare Tibetan independence from China. But China's claim is refuted by evidence that the 13th Dalai Lama did indeed intend to declare Tibetan independence from China. The only confusion about the Dalai Lama's declaration comes from the fact that he considered such a declaration almost unnecessary, given that Tibet would naturally revert to a status of independence after the fall of the Qing.

China's Tibet goes on to claim that the 1914 Simla Convention was invalid because Britain had no right to interfere in China's affairs in regard to Tibet. The Simla Convention was held in Simla, India, and it was intended as a negotiation between British India, China, and Tibet about the status of Tibet. China claims that the Simla Convention represented Britain's attempt to detach Tibet from China. However, Tibetans were more anxious to clarify their status than were the British. The

Tibetan negotiator at Simla firmly demanded Tibetan independence from China and forcefully demonstrated with tax documents and other records Tibetan administration over all territories inhabited by Tibetans. The British were much more willing to admit some degree of Chinese control over Tibet than were the Tibetans. The Chinese were also not unwilling to negotiate about Tibet's status, knowing that they had very little influence over Tibet and could probably get acknowledgment of some degree of Chinese control over Tibet more easily from the British than from the Tibetans. China was willing to acknowledge that Tibet was not a Chinese province and that Tibet had some rights to autonomy.

The Chinese accuse the British of attempting to gain control over Tibet at Simla by means of a division of Tibet into inner and outer zones, the inner zone to be under Chinese influence and the outer to be under British influence. The Chinese maintain that the British plan was to achieve British control over outer Tibet and then to use their presence there to achieve control over inner Tibet as well. The Simla Convention, according to the Chinese, was simply a British imperialist attempt to detach Tibet from China. However, the Chinese, knowing that they had little actual control in Tibet, were also willing to divide Tibet into inner and outer zones. Chinese imperialism was little different from British imperialism in this regard. The Chinese hoped to consolidate their control over inner Tibet, after which they would eliminate the independence of outer Tibet.

The Simla Convention was never ratified by China. However, the very fact that the Simla Convention was held demonstrates not just British imperialist interference in Tibet, as the Chinese maintain, but also China's attempt to achieve British recognition of its claim to authority over Tibet. The Simla Convention also undeniably demonstrated Tibet's desire for independence from China. At Simla, Tibetan negotiators clearly defined Tibet's claim to independence from China. Simla represents Tibet's clearest definition of itself as a nation with a distinct national territory and separate cultural and political identity. Tibet's claim to independence at Simla represents Tibet's legitimate aspirations, not those of the British sponsors of the Conference.

After the Tibetan declaration of independence and the Simla Convention, the British helped Tibet to train and equip a Tibetan Army. In 1918 the Tibetan Army was able to eliminate Chinese control over much of eastern Tibet up to Kandze in Kham. With the help of a British mediator, a truce was established between the Tibetan Army and Chinese Sichuan forces. Derge and other areas of Kham remained under Tibetan control.

China's Tibet claims that this truce was simply an internal affair within China and cannot be taken as evidence of Tibetan independence. It characterizes British assistance to Tibet as simply British imperialist interference in China's internal affairs. However, what the Chinese seek to deny is the evidence that Tibet sought British assistance of its own free will because Tibet was threatened by Chinese, not British, imperialism. The Chinese also ignore the fact that the territories of eastern Tibet recovered from the Chinese were entirely Tibetan, where Chinese rule had no legitimacy based upon the wishes of the Tibetan people. Even after the Tibetan territorial gains of 1918 many entirely Tibetan areas of eastern Tibet remained under Chinese rule.

The Chinese propaganda book goes on to claim that the Tibetan people were opposed to British influence in Tibet, that they did not want independence, and that they wanted closer relations with

China. The 13th Dalai Lama was therefore forced to reduce his contacts with the British and improve his relations with China. This is cited as evidence that the British were unsuccessful in trying to arouse anti-Chinese sentiments in Tibet, because the Tibetan people wanted to be a part of China. What the Chinese propagandists are referring to is the anti-British sentiment among some of the more conservative monastic elements that led to a restriction of modernization efforts in Tibet. This, however, had nothing to do with any desire for closer relations with China, except for some monasteries that wanted to preserve their patronage relationships with various Chinese sponsors. The Tibetan Government wanted good relations with both British India and China. The Chinese, for their own reasons, interpret Tibet's desire for good relations with China as a Tibetan desire to be a part of China.

China's Tibet also interprets the 9th Panchen Lama's exile in China from 1924 until his death in 1937, and his acceptance of Chinese titles and official positions, as evidence of Tibet's desire to be a part of China. However, the Panchen Lama accepted Chinese titles and assistance only in order to regain his position at Tashilhunpo. The 9th Panchen Lama fled Tibet in 1924 due to a dispute with Lhasa about the payment of taxes to support the Tibetan Army. The Panchen Lama, or mainly some of his entourage, interpreted Lhasa's request for taxes as an attempt to eliminate Tashilhunpo's traditional autonomy. This was unfortunate, since the Tashilhunpo authorities' wish to preserve their own local privileges inhibited the Tibetan Government in Lhasa from achieving national unity against the threat from China. Tashilhunpo's refusal to pay taxes also hampered the creation of an effective Tibetan Army. The Panchen Lama's exile in China permitted the Chinese to pretend that China exercised authority over Tibet at a time when China had absolutely no authority over Tibet in fact. The Panchen Lama also met with foreign diplomats in Beijing, which helped China perpetuate the fiction that Tibet was a part of China.

In 1930 the Tibetan Army advanced into Derge and Kandze in Kham in order to settle local disputes there. The Tibetans controlled this part of Kham until 1932 when they were repulsed by the forces of Sichuan Chinese warlords. The Tibetan Army also advanced to Jeykundo, then part of the domains of Muslim Hui warlords of Qinghai. The Tibetans took Jeykundo briefly but were then driven back by the Muslim Hui troops. China's Tibet presents these Tibetan advances as illegitimate Tibetan encroachment upon areas controlled by China. However, all of these areas were Tibetan and had been conquered by Chinese armies in the past. Tibetans regarded the Chinese conquest and control of these Tibetan areas as illegitimate. China continually tries to justify its control over Tibetan territory based upon conquests of the past and because of what the Chinese considered as a natural and justified expansion of Chinese culture and Chinese civilization.

China's Tibet goes on to describe the death of the 13th Dalai Lama in 1933. The Chinese maintain that the death had to be reported to the Chinese Government and that the Chinese Government had to send a representative to Lhasa to organize the search for the Dalai Lama's reincarnation. They also maintain that the selection of Reting Rinpoche as the regent had to be approved by China. However, China's supposed role in the process was mostly just pretension, intended to convey the illusion that China had some actual authority over Tibet. In fact, the death of the Dalai Lama was reported to the Chinese Government as a matter of courtesy, and the Chinese representative was allowed to come to Tibet simply to express condolences at the death of the Dalai Lama. The Chinese Government, however, tried to turn the condolence mission into a negotiation for the

submission of Tibet to the authority of the Chinese Government.

A representative of the Chinese Government, Huang Musong, arrived in Lhasa in late 1934. China's Tibet makes much of the official welcome accorded to Huang as if this demonstrated Tibet's subordination to China. However, it has to admit that the Tibetan Government refused to recognize Chinese authority over Tibet. Huang presented a title, a certificate of appointment and seal of office to the late 13th Dalai Lama, intended to demonstrate Chinese authority over Tibet. However, the very fact that the Chinese were unable to present such titles to the Dalai Lama during his lifetime demonstrated the lack of any Chinese authority over Tibet and the 13th Dalai Lama's refusal of any Chinese titles. Huang tried to persuade the Tibetan Government to acknowledge China's symbolic authority over Tibet, with Tibet to have full autonomy in all matters except foreign affairs and border defense. However, the Tibetan Government refused to acknowledge even symbolic Chinese authority over Tibet and it demanded the return of Tibetan areas in eastern Tibet under Chinese control to Tibetan jurisdiction.

China's Tibet maintains that it was only fear of British displeasure that kept the Tibetans from joining in China's so-called "harmony of five nationalities" and acknowledging that Tibet was part of China. However, this claim demonstrates China's unwillingness to believe that the Tibetan people themselves wanted independence from Chinese control. Despite the failure of this Chinese mission to Tibet, the book continues the pretense of Chinese authority over Tibet by saying that "Huang Musong's trip to Tibet helped expand the influence of the Chinese Government over Tibet and brought the local government of Tibet closer to the Central Government"

China's Tibet describes the search for, recognition, and installation of the reincarnation of the 13th Dalai Lama. It claims that the Mongolian and Tibetan Affairs Commission of the Kuomintang government helped the search team that went to Amdo to search for the reincarnation. It says that the Chinese Government facilitated the mission of the search team by allowing it to search in Qinghai and in arranging for it to communicate with Lhasa. It also admits that the Tibetan Government had to pay a huge bribe of 400,000 silver dollars (Da Yuan) to Ma Pufeng, the Hui governor of Qinghai. This bribe was paid by the Tibetan Government.

However, the book claims that the Chinese Government also paid another bribe of 100,000 silver dollars to Ma Pufeng, without which the reincarnation of the Dalai Lama would not have been allowed to leave Qinghai for Lhasa. The Chinese thus try to take credit for the Dalai Lama being allowed to proceed to Lhasa and they try to pretend that China had authority over both the search and the permission for the Dalai Lama to leave Qinghai for Lhasa. However, the necessity for both the Tibetan and Chinese governments to pay bribes to Ma Pufeng demonstrates the lack of Chinese central governmental authority over Qinghai. Not only did the Tibetan Government have to pay a bribe to Ma Pufeng but so did the Chinese Government. The Chinese Government did not have any authority over Tibet or even over the Hui governor of Qinghai.

China's Tibet goes on to describe the process of the recognition of the reincarnation of the Dalai Lama. The Mongolian and Tibetan Affairs Commission of the KMT Government demanded that the lot drawing ceremony instituted by the Qing Dynasty in 1792 should be followed. However, the Tibetan Government replied that the ceremony was not necessary since there was no un-

certainty about the reincarnation. The KMT managed to convince the Reting Regent to issue an invitation for the chairman of the Mongolian and Tibetan Affairs Commission to go to Lhasa, but the Tibetan Government affirmed the reincarnation before his arrival. This ensured that the Chinese could not pretend to have officiated over the selection of the reincarnation of the Dalai Lama.

Upon his arrival in Lhasa, having traveled from China to Tibet via India, the KMT official pretended to have authority over the confirmation of the selection already made by the Tibetan Government. He presented seals of authority to Reting and a certificate from the Chinese Government authorizing Reting and himself to jointly preside over the confirmation ceremony. The Chinese official, who had no actual authority over the selection already made by the Tibetans, thus pretended to have authority not only to confirm the reincarnation but to authorize Tibetan officials to do so. All this was just Chinese pretense intended to demonstrate Chinese authority over Tibet.

China's Tibet admits that the Tibetan Government and the Tibetan people did not accept the Chinese official's authority over the confirmation. However, it claims that their rejection of his authority was because they feared he would not accept the already confirmed candidate, not because they denied China's authority over the selection and confirmation process. The Chinese official nevertheless claimed to have approved the reincarnation and he sent a message to the Chinese Government requesting its approval, which was given. The Chinese thus pretended to have officiated over a process over which they had no authority. The Chinese official also pretended to have officiated at the installation ceremony. However, even one of Communist China's most loyal Tibetan officials, Ngapo Ngawang Jigme, who observed the installation ceremony, later disputed the Chinese claim to have officiated at the installation ceremony.

China's Tibet then describes the Reting Regent's abdication of the regency in favor of Taktra and Reting's unsuccessful attempt to reclaim the regency a few years later. The Chinese maintain that Reting was a patriotic regent, meaning patriotic to China, who tried to improve relations between Tibet and the Chinese Government. They do not mention that he accepted bribes from the Chinese Government and was not considered at all patriotic by Tibetans, who blamed him for allowing the Chinese to once again gain a foothold in Tibet after having been completely expelled during the time of the 13th Dalai Lama. The Chinese book says that Reting gave up the regency to Taktra because the British spread a rumor that if Reting remained as the regent it would adversely affect the health of the young 14th Dalai Lama. The actual reason that Reting had to give up the regency was because he had not been faithful to his vows of celibacy as a monk and was therefore not qualified to be the one to initiate the young Dalai Lama into monkhood.

Reting gave up the regency to Taktra on the condition that he, Reting, could resume the regency at some time after Taktra had administered the vows of monkhood to the Dalai Lama. Taktra, unlike Reting, was faithful to his vows as a monk. However, because Taktra was more popular as regent than Reting had been, there was no popular or governmental sentiment to see Reting return. Besides selling out Tibetan sovereignty to China for his own personal gain, Reting was known as an avaricious monk whose primary interest was in enriching his own labrang at the expense of the Tibetan Government and people. Taktra therefore did not allow Reting to resume the regency. He was also not allowed to assume a post as Tibetan representative to the Chinese National Assembly, which he had accepted without the approval of the Tibetan Government. When Reting was discov-

ered to be scheming with the Chinese in an attempt to gain their military support for his return to the regency he was arrested and died by poisoning in prison in Lhasa. The Chinese portray Reting as a good monk and patriotic to China, while they say that Taktra was a corrupt regent and was entirely controlled by the British. The Chinese of course blame Reting's downfall on British influence.

During the regency of Taktra the Tibetan Government set up a Foreign Affairs Bureau and required that all governments, including China's, should deal with Tibet through this bureau. However, the Chinese refused to do so, claiming that Tibet was a part of China, and blamed the setting up of the Foreign Affairs Bureau on the British, who they claim were scheming to separate Tibet from China.

China's Tibet goes on to describe the Tibetan participation in the Asian Relations Conference in India in 1947. At the Asian Relations Conference Tibet was represented as an independent country. Tibet's national flag was displayed and the official map of the conference showed Tibet as a country separate from China. The Chinese book says that Tibetan participation at the Asian Relations Conference was arranged and supported by the British, that the Tibetan national flag, which they say had not existed before, was invented just for this purpose, and that the Chinese delegation managed to have the map changed to show Tibet as a part of China. The Chinese say that this demonstrates British attempts to separate Tibet from China and the fact that Tibet did not exist as a separate state in reality. However, all that the Chinese arguments show is China's continual attempts to deny Tibet its legitimate right to independence and national self-determination.

China's Tibet describes the 1948 Tibetan Trade Mission and the 1949 expulsion of all Chinese from Tibet. The Tibetan Trade Mission, led by Tsepon Shakabpa, traveled to India, China, Great Britain, and the United States in 1947-48. The purpose of the mission was to establish diplomatic and economic relations with other countries in order to demonstrate Tibetan independence. The mission traveled on Tibetan passports, which was also intended to demonstrate Tibetan independence.

The mission was obstructed at every place it went by the Chinese, who insisted that Tibet was a part of China and that Tibetans should travel on Chinese passports. The Chinese insisted that the Tibetans be accompanied in Great Britain and the United States by the Chinese ambassador to those countries, but the Tibetan mission successfully resisted this. They met with officials of each of the countries they visited without any Chinese being present, as representatives of an independent Tibet. The mission was successful in demonstrating Tibet's actual independence of China and its intention to be independent. China's Tibet maintains that China did control all the activities of the Tibetan Trade Mission, thus demonstrating Chinese authority over Tibet. However, the only thing that the Chinese arguments demonstrate is that China was at this time unable to actually dominate Tibet and had to pretend to do so.

In the summer of 1949 the Chinese Communist Party was on the verge of defeating the KMT and establishing the People's Republic of China. Because the Chinese Communists had already revealed their intention to annex Tibet, the Tibetan Government decided to expel all Chinese from Tibet because some of them were thought to be spies for the communists. This was done and most of the Chinese left Tibet via India for China. China's Tibet maintains that the expulsion of the Chinese from Tibet was undertaken at the instigation of the British. Otherwise, the Chinese say, the Tibetans would never have taken this step. However, the 1949 expulsion of the Chinese from Tibet was

undertaken by the Tibetan Government because Tibetans did not want any Chinese influence in Tibet. This is unmistakable and undeniable evidence that Tibetans rejected Chinese control over Tibet.

The remainder of this chapter reiterates the Chinese contention that Tibet was not independent during the period from 1912 to 1950. It maintains that Tibet was an integral part of China during this time and that, previous to this time, Tibet had been a minority region under the Chinese empire. It rejects any attempts to define Tibet's status under the Chinese Empire or the KMT as anything other than full Chinese sovereignty over Tibet. It rejects the idea that Tibet was autonomous during the period from 1912 to 1950 or that Tibet was not a full part of China during the Chinese Empire, although an empire implies that its constituent parts are conquered territories. It says that Tibet's relations with the Chinese Empire were unique to China, having no comparison with other empires in the world and their colonies and conquered territories.

Leaving aside the question of whether the Manchu and Mongol empires were Chinese, the assertion that Tibet's relationship with the Chinese Empire has no comparisons with any other empire in the world is unsustainable. Tibet's relations with the Mongol and Manchu empires had a unique religious character that was not present to the same extent in Tibet's relations with China, except perhaps to some extent during the Ming, when China had no real control over Tibet. Otherwise Tibet was a part of the Chinese Empire just like India was a part of the British Empire or Central Asian states were part of the Russian Empire. The basis of China's claim that Tibet is now a part of China because it was at one time a part of a Chinese empire is simply the rationale of imperial conquest.

The Founding of the People's Republic of China and the Peaceful Liberation of Tibet

This chapter attempts to refute the international contention that China's annexation of Tibet in 1950 was an invasion. China's Tibet maintains that China's entry into Tibet in 1950 was legitimate and legal because Tibet was already a part of China. The book describes the so-called peaceful liberation of Tibet in the following words. "From the winter of 1949 to the spring of 1950 the Central People's Government planned the peaceful liberation of Tibet. In the spring and summer of 1950 the Chinese PLA marched toward Tibet. After having overcome foreign obstructions, put to rout the resistance of Tibetan separatists and beaten the harsh highland environment, the PLA advance units arrived in Lhasa. China's five-star red flag fluttered over the Himalayas. China thus succeeded in the peaceful liberation of Tibet."

China claims that the so-called peaceful liberation of Tibet was welcomed by Tibetans with the exception of a few separatists who were supported by foreign imperialism. However, China has little evidence to support its claims of foreign imperialist influence in Tibet or its claim that its invasion of Tibet was welcomed by Tibetans. China's Tibet quotes the then 10-year old Panchen Lama's appeal to the Chinese to liberate Tibet and a similar appeal by a supporter of the former regent Reting. The appeal from the Panchen Lama was actually from his entourage who wanted only to regain their lost positions at Tashilhunpo. Similarly, the former associate of Reting was disgruntled at the downfall of his patron. These are the only examples the Chinese are able to cite of supposedly "patriotic" Tibetan officials who favored China's entry into Tibet.

China's claim that its so-called liberation of Tibet was peaceful is contradicted by its own admission that the PLA's entry into Tibet was opposed by Tibetans, even if those Tibetans are characterized as separatists. In fact, it was the legitimate government of Tibet that opposed the Chinese invasion of Tibet and opposed it with force; hence China's invasion was hardly peaceful. The 1956 to 1959 uprising against Chinese control over Tibet is also irrefutable evidence that China's imposition of its rule over Tibet was neither voluntary nor peaceful.

China also uses the argument that its invasion of Tibet was peaceful because the PLA invaded only the Chamdo region, which was a part of what China claimed as Sikang Province, and was therefore not "Tibet." China maintains that the PLA invasion of Chamdo stopped at Giamda, the border between Sikang and Tibet, and that its subsequent entry into central Tibet was negotiated by means of the 17-Point Agreement. Therefore, the PLA's entry into what the Chinese defined as Tibet was peaceful. However, China's ostensible Sikang Province, of which Chamdo was supposed to be a part, was a product of China's invasion of Tibet in response to the 1904 British invasion and it had long ago ceased to exist in fact. The Chamdo region was a part of Tibet and was administered by the Tibetan Government. When the PLA invaded Chamdo it invaded Tibetan territory under the direct administration of the Tibetan Government.

China's so-called peaceful liberation was also no liberation. Tibet's legitimate government was eliminated and a Chinese administration was forcibly imposed. China pretends that Tibet was already a part of China and that there is therefore no issue of the legitimacy of Chinese rule and Chinese administration of Tibet. However, for Tibetans, the legitimacy of Chinese rule over Tibet is the fundamental and essential issue. The Chinese prefer to obscure the issue of the legitimacy of Chinese rule over Tibet because the only basis for China's claim to sovereignty is Chinese imperialism.

China's Tibet describes the Chinese Communist Party's policies for nationality autonomy. The CCP's policies on minority nationalities were formulated even before the victory of the Communists because they had already conquered non-Chinese areas such as Inner Mongolia. The fundamental principles of the CCP minority nationality policies were that all nationalities, including the Han, were to be treated equally. All nationalities were prohibited from discriminating against any other nationality. All nationalities had to support national unity within China and none was allowed to separate or to advocate separation from China. All areas in which a particular nationality was in the majority were to be governed under a system of national regional autonomy. All nationalities were supposed to be allowed to keep their own language, culture, and religion and the CCP would help them develop in economy, culture, and education. The CCP hoped that these principles would be sufficient to convince Tibetans to voluntarily accept the entry of the PLA into Tibet, but if not, the PLA was instructed to prepare to invade Tibet by force.

The CCP's policy on minority nationalities promised equality but denied any nationality the right to independence or self-determination. The Chinese Communists realized that some nationalities, the Tibetans in particular, would very likely choose to be independent of China if they were given the choice. Minority nationalities were promised autonomy in language, culture, and religion, but the CCP also promised to assist them in the development of their culture and education, which meant that they would be educated according to Chinese Communist ideology.

China's Tibet describes the entry of the PLA into Kham and Amdo in 1950 and the policies that required the PLA to respectfully treat all the Tibetans that it encountered. The PLA was instructed to pay for all the supplies it received and to assist Tibetans in any way possible. The PLA supposedly put up with extreme hardships just so that it would not cause any inconvenience to Tibetans. This policy supposedly convinced the Tibetans that the Chinese Communists were "New Chinese" and that the PLA were unlike any army soldiers that the Tibetans had seen in the past. The PLA's policy of respectful treatment of Tibetans is said to have eliminated the animosities of the past between the Tibetans and Hans and to have created new equality and unity between the Tibetan and Han peoples. The PLA also united with those of the Tibetan upper class who were willing to cooperate.

Despite these policies and despite the claim that unprecedented harmony was created between the Chinese and Tibetans, the Tibetan Government and Tibetan Army still resisted the PLA's entry into the Chamdo area of Kham that was under the direct administration of the Tibetan Government in Lhasa. China's Tibet cannot explain why, if CCP policies were so successful in creating harmony, that the Tibetan Government still resisted the PLA's entry into central Tibet. It claims that the Tibetan Government was influenced by foreign imperialists, but this is an entirely inadequate explanation.

China's Tibet claims that the PLA was forced to "fight the Chamdo battle" because the "Tibetan Local Government" refused "peace talks." In May 1950, after the PLA had entered eastern Kham and Amdo but before it had crossed the Dri Chu (Yangtze River) into the Tibetan Government-controlled Chamdo district, the CCP proposed 10 principles for the so-called peaceful liberation of Tibet. Primary among these were that Tibet should expel the British and American imperialists and return to the Chinese Motherland, Tibet should enjoy autonomy without any change in the political system in Tibet, the religious system would be unchanged and religious freedom preserved, and the Tibetan language would be preserved and Tibetan culture and economy developed. This program supposedly met with the approval of several prominent Tibetans from the area of Kham already under the control of the PLA, including Geda Lama of Kandze Monastery, who was sent to Chamdo with the intention of proceeding to Lhasa to explain the PLA's proposals to the Tibetan Government. In Chamdo, however, Geda Lama was placed under arrest and then died of poisoning. The Chinese say that Geda Lama was poisoned by Robert Ford, a British radio operator at Chamdo, who the Chinese claim was a British spy.

Because the Tibetan Government had refused to negotiate Tibet's supposed peaceful liberation, had refused to receive Chinese envoys such as Geda Lama, and had sent reinforcements to Chamdo to resist the Chinese invasion of Tibet, the CCP decided that it would have to enter the Chamdo district by force. Mao reportedly instructed the PLA to attempt to capture Chamdo in the month of October 1950, so that the Tibetan Government would be compelled to send a delegation to Beijing to negotiate Tibet's peaceful liberation. China's Tibet says, "this clearly shows that fighting the Chamdo battle was aimed at winning the possibility for the peaceful negotiation for the settlement of the Tibetan issue."

The Chinese propaganda book claims that many Tibetans supported and assisted the PLA in its invasion of Chamdo and that Tibetans were happy with the PLA victory in Chamdo. No

doubt, the PLA did have its Tibetan collaborators, most of whom were lavishly paid for their support or promised high positions under a Chinese administration. Nevertheless, the Chinese cannot explain away the legitimate Tibetan Government's rejection of China's so-called liberation and its active resistance to Chinese control over Tibet. China's claim that the Tibetan Government was influenced by foreign imperialists is hardly sufficient to explain Tibet's popular and governmental rejection of Chinese control over Tibet and resistance to the forceful invasion of Tibet.

China's Tibet says that the fall of Chamdo in October 1950 weakened the pro-independence faction in Lhasa, leading to the stepping down of Taktra in favor of the young Dalai Lama. In fact, it was because of the Chinese threat to Tibet that the regency was ended and the Dalai Lama assumed political authority. The Chinese cannot explain why, if the pro-independence faction was weakened by the PLA's successes in eastern Tibet, that the Tibetan Government still took the decision to remove the Dalai Lama and most government officials to the border with India. The reason for taking this step was so that the Dalai Lama and the Tibetan Government could seek refuge in India if the Chinese continued their invasion of Tibet.

China's Tibet says that the PLA's respectful and friendly treatment of those Tibetans captured at Chamdo convinced many Tibetans that the PLA was a new type of army who the Tibetans should not fear and that the Chinese Communists were a new type of Chinese with whom the Tibetans should be happy to unite in order to improve their own lives. It says that the PLA officers at Chamdo spoke sincerely to captured Tibetans and convinced them that China's policies for Tibet should be accepted. It says that the Tibetan Government, seeing the strength as well as the leniency of the PLA and realizing that Tibet could not obtain any foreign assistance against China, decided to send delegates to negotiate with the Chinese Government in Beijing. It says that these delegates were fully empowered to negotiate on behalf of the Tibetan Government. However, it is well known that these delegates did not have full powers to negotiate on behalf of the Tibetan Government and were supposed to refer all matters to the Tibetan Government for decision.

The book says that the subsequent 17-Point Agreement was concluded by voluntary agreement on both sides and Tibet was thus peacefully liberated. However, the Tibetan Government had little choice but to agree to Chinese conditions since the PLA had already invaded Chamdo and threatened to continue to Lhasa if Tibet did not capitulate. China's Tibet says that the welcome the PLA troops received when they entered Lhasa proves that Tibet was not an independent country invaded by China but rather a part of China whose liberation by Chinese troops was welcomed by the Tibetan people. It says that the entry of the PLA troops into Tibet was accomplished in an utterly legal, reasonable, and just manner. It says that after its peaceful liberation Tibet would be free from imperialism forever. However, it does not mention that the Dalai Lama had been forced to agree to the 17-Point Agreement and Tibetans were thus forced to at least openly welcome the Chinese troops into Tibet. Tibetans hoped for the best under an involuntarily imposed Chinese rule and they hoped that the Chinese would respect their promises for Tibetan autonomy.

Armed Rebellion in Tibet Opposed the Democratic Reform through which Serfs Win Human Rights

This chapter says that Tibetan separatists attempted to obstruct and undermine the 17-Point Agreement and that they launched an armed rebellion aimed at defending the feudal system and opposing the Democratic Reform that was granting human rights to the Tibetan people for the first time in their history. It maintains that Tibetans enjoyed no human rights under their feudal overlords in old Tibet.

China's Tibet describes many instances of serfs in old Tibet being abused by their feudal lords. It describes the sympathy that PLA troops had for the serfs and their frustration that they could not intervene because the 17-Point Agreement had promised no changes in the social system in Tibet. No doubt, there were abuses in the social system in old Tibet and there was inequality between the social classes. However, China portrays the situation in old Tibet in the darkest light in order to justify the Chinese takeover of Tibet. China attempts to portray the issue of Tibet as a social issue or a class issue about the abuses and inequalities in old Tibet rather than as a political or a national issue about the legitimacy of Chinese rule over Tibet.

China's Tibet says that the CCP and Han workers in Tibet adhered to the agreement that social reforms in Tibet would be undertaken only voluntarily, when Tibetans themselves were ready for reforms and were demanding reforms. The Chinese congratulate themselves for cooperating with the former Tibetan ruling class in the United Front. Although this contradicted the CCP's policy on social revolution, the upper class in Tibet had its positions and privileges preserved. However, the book complains, despite this favorable treatment, many of the upper class still opposed all Chinese attempts to promote reforms in Tibet.

China's Tibet complains that when the political campaign known as Democratic Reform was introduced into Tibetan areas of Kham and Amdo outside the TAR, the upper class of those areas opposed those reforms and instigated revolt, even though those areas were not covered by the restrictions of the 17-Point Agreement and therefore should have known that they, unlike the TAR, were subject to such reforms. CCP policy was to confine the definition of Tibet to the TAR, to the exclusion of all Tibetan areas outside the TAR, even though those areas were designated as Tibetan autonomous districts. So they started their so-called Democratic Reforms there, supposedly at the request of the local Tibetans, but actually against the opposition of almost all Tibetans. The Chinese book says that the Tibetan upper class turned a social issue of "democratic reforms" into a political issue of the preservation of Tibetan national identity and independence against the Chinese when their real interest was the preservation of their own privileges.

China's Tibet claims that, during the March 1959 revolt in Lhasa, the Tibetan rebels kidnapped the Dalai Lama and forced him to flee Tibet because the American Central Intelligence Agency had told them that it would assist the Tibetan resistance only after the Dalai Lama had escaped from Tibet. It claims that the rebels needed the Dalai Lama on their side because they had little popular support, but they had to kidnap him because he was opposed to them. At the same time, it complains that both the CIA and the Tibetan Government were secretly supporting the rebels with arms and food.

China's Tibet gives a long list of the atrocities against the Tibetan people that it says were perpetrated by the Tibetan rebel army. These included numerous cases of murder of those who refused to support them, theft of food, animals, and supplies, and the rape of many women, including nuns. It says that the Tibetan Government received many complaints from Tibetans who had been abused by the rebels. It claims that the rebels had little public support. However, some reports of abuses, in particular reports of the theft of weapons, animals, and food, were actually attempts by Tibetans to protect themselves from reprisals by the Chinese. Some Tibetans gave food, animals, and supplies voluntarily to the Tibetan resistance fighters and then tried to protect themselves by claiming that the supplies were stolen. Tibetan Government officials also allowed the resistance to take weapons from Tibetan Army arsenals and then claimed that they were stolen.

Many of the atrocities that the Chinese blame on the Tibetan resistance were actually perpetrated by the Chinese themselves. The Chinese are known to have paid some Tibetans to abuse other Tibetans, rape women, etc., so that it would be blamed on the resistance fighters. The Chinese are guilty not only of many of the atrocities they blame on the Tibetan resistance but of great duplicity in organizing these atrocities in an attempt to defame the resistance.

China's Tibet says that the rebels forced ordinary Tibetans to shout slogans for Tibetan independence during the revolt. It says that the rebellion was crushed quickly because it had no popular support. It says that many of the Tibetans who fled to India were forced to do so against their will by the Tibetan rebels. However, Tibetans, the Dalai Lama included, were reluctant to flee their country but were forced to do so by Chinese oppression. Far from being forced by the rebels to flee, many Tibetans were arrested or killed by the Chinese in their attempts to flee Tibet.

China's Tibet says that the atrocities committed by the Tibetan rebels against Tibetan people prove that the revolt was directed not just against the Chinese but was directed by the serf-owners against ordinary Tibetans. It says that the rebels' atrocities against monasteries and monks and nuns prove that the supposedly "religion protecting army" was also anti-religious. However, this argument is intended to disguise the fact that the Tibetan revolt was a popular uprising of the Tibetan people against Chinese domination of Tibet. China cannot disguise the fact that many Tibetans opposed and resisted Chinese domination over Tibet and suffered greatly as a consequence.

Tibetan People Acquire Ultimate Human Rights through Quelling the Rebellion and Conducting Democratic Reform

The introduction to this chapter says, "Between the late 1950s and early 1960s the Tibetan Plateau saw earth-shaking changes. Feudal serfdom collapsed and was replaced by the people's democratic system, to the delight of the broad masses of serfs and patriotic personages from all social strata." China's Tibet maintains that the repression of the Tibetan revolt was just and legal while the revolt itself was unjust and illegal. This is because, it says, the suppression of the revolt was a class war to emancipate the serfs of Tibet. It was a war to preserve the unity of China and social order and was therefore just and legal.

The first section of this chapter is about the quelling of the armed rebellion. China's Tibet says that

the upper class reactionaries in Tibet, who resisted all the efforts of the Chinese Government to implement reforms, instigated an armed rebellion against the PLA troops stationed in Tibet. It says that many Tibetans in Lhasa were forced by the rebels to shout reactionary slogans about Tibetan independence and to take up arms against the PLA. It claims that many Tibetans in Lhasa actually opposed the revolt and supported the PLA in its repression of the revolt. These Tibetans supposedly celebrated when the rebellion was put down. However, it is well known that it was mostly the ordinary people of Lhasa who revolted against the Chinese, not the upper class. Both the Dalai Lama and the Tibetan Government attempted to avoid conflict with the Chinese. Many of the upper class cooperated with the Chinese, either because they were government officials and had to do so or because they had been cultivated by the Chinese and given positions with salaries and status. The revolt in Lhasa, like that in eastern Tibet, was a popular revolt of the people of Tibet against Chinese control over Tibet.

China's Tibet admits that the revolt was not fully suppressed in all areas of Tibet until March 1962, a full three years after the Lhasa revolt began and six years since the revolt had begun in eastern Tibet. The Chinese have to admit that the revolt, which they say had no popular support, took six years to suppress.

The book claims that only a few Tibetans were killed in the revolt, due to the PLA's policy of avoiding unnecessary casualties and trying to persuade rebels to lay down their arms. Any Tibetans who surrendered were supposedly treated leniently. It admits that some 90,000 Tibetans were "involved" in the revolt but says that only 23,000 were considered to be directly responsible. Even if these figures are true, 23,000 Tibetans being directly involved and another 67,000 supporters are huge numbers given the small Tibetan population and the fact that in central Tibet at least, the revolt was primarily confined to Lhasa. It is important also to remember that these numbers apply only to the TAR and not to the eastern Tibetan areas where armed resistance began earlier and was more severe and where there were more deaths than in the TAR, where the revolt was confined mostly to March 1959.

Of the 23,000 in the TAR who the Chinese held as directly responsible, many were killed or imprisoned, most of whom did not survive their imprisonment. Another 80,000 or so Tibetans escaped to India, meaning that at least 200,000 Tibetans so opposed Chinese control over Tibet that they revolted against that control and/or fled Tibet to escape Chinese control. Even given the Chinese estimates of the numbers of Tibetans who opposed Chinese control over Tibet, it is hard to deny that the Tibetan revolt was popular rather than being solely inspired by a few serf-owners. In fact the Chinese have every reason to minimize the numbers of Tibetans who were opposed to Chinese control over Tibet. The actual numbers were undoubtedly much greater within the TAR and greater still when Tibetan areas outside the TAR are included.

China's Tibet claims that the Tibetan revolt was not a struggle between Chinese and Tibetans. Rather, it was supposedly a struggle between social and economic classes. The Chinese claim that the Tibetan revolt was a struggle between the broad masses of Tibetan people, led by the CCP, against a few reactionary separatists assisted by foreign imperialists. The Chinese book cites many instances of Tibetans who assisted the PLA in quelling the revolt. However, this is similar to the Chinese use of a few disgruntled former serfs to paint a picture of the evils of old Tibetan society. There were un-

doubtedly some Tibetans who sided with the Chinese during the revolt, whether because of financial incentives or because they had been cultivated by the Chinese as collaborators. There were also some Tibetans who had genuinely suffered in the past and who hoped to seek revenge against the former social system. They may have believed Chinese promises about social reforms and Tibetan autonomy. There were also some 3,000 Tibetan students educated in China who were returned to Tibet immediately after the revolt specifically to assist in the Democratic Reform campaign. China's Tibet says that the upper class reactionaries in Tibet resisted all the efforts of the Chinese Government to implement reforms and then instigated an armed rebellion against the PLA troops stationed in Tibet. After the revolt the Chinese Government dissolved the Tibetan Government and put the Preparatory Committee for the Tibet Autonomous Region in charge, though actually all power was in the hands of Chinese military officials in Tibet. The Chinese propaganda book says that after the revolt Chinese policy in Tibet changed from the previous United Front policy of cooperation with the upper classes to a campaign to mobilize the masses and implement Democratic Reforms. What this means is that China's attempt to cultivate the support of the Tibetan upper classes had failed and now the Chinese Government would repress the upper classes by means of the Democratic Reform campaign and try to cultivate support among the lower classes. What the Chinese called "democratic reforms" were actually the first part of "socialist transformation." They included the emancipation of the serfs, class divisions, "struggle" of class enemies and opponents, land reform, and redistribution of wealth. Struggle, or *thamzing* in Tibetan, was a means to identify and repress supporters of the revolt or opponents of Chinese control.

China's Tibet attempts to prove that Democratic Reforms were not imposed upon the Tibetan people, as some critics of China say, but rather was voluntarily requested by Tibetans. It says that Tibetans wanted Democratic Reforms because of their sufferings under the serf system and they were therefore implemented by the CCP in response to Tibetans' desires. It says that Democratic Reforms were implemented as part of a natural historical process in Tibet. The Chinese propaganda book attempts to show that Tibetan serfs had previously attempted to revolt against the serf-owners but had always been repressed. The Chinese say that this proves that Tibetans were already demanding "democratic reforms." However, the Chinese are able to find few examples to support their case. Nevertheless, they claim that there was plenty of evidence that social discontent was already existent in Tibet and that only the leadership of a revolutionary party like the CCP and the example of a revolutionary ideology like Marxism was needed in order to achieve social liberation.

China's Tibet claims that the naturally revolutionary situation in Tibet in the early 1950s was ripe for education and activism by the CCP among the repressed Tibetan serfs. It says that due to the Party's education and example, the number of Tibetans demanding the overthrow of the serf system increased year by year. It claims that the Tibetan desire for liberation from the serf system was manifested by opposition to the revolt of the serf-owners in 1959. The CCP was thus simply responding to their desires when it implemented Democratic Reforms. However, this is an attempt to justify the forceful and involuntary imposition of the so-called democratic reforms on the Tibetan people.

The real reason for the implementation of Democratic Reforms in central Tibet immediately after the revolt is revealed by the Chinese policy of combining Democratic Reforms with the suppression of the revolt. The Chinese used the Democratic Reform campaign to identify those who had supported the revolt or who opposed them in any way. Those Tibetans were then arrested or repressed

with “labels” as reactionaries or class enemies or with other restrictions. The Chinese promoted the process of denunciation of feudal exploiters supposedly as a means to liberate Tibetan serfs. However, the process was actually intended to reveal those who supported the Chinese and those who opposed. Only those who did not openly oppose the Chinese were rewarded by the redistribution of land and livestock. Democratic Reforms enabled the Chinese to identify and repress their opponents and were therefore an integral part of the repression of the revolt.

China’s Tibet maintains that Democratic Reforms were required to reform the Tibetan social system and that Tibetans themselves realized this and requested that the CCP implement this campaign and supported them in doing so. However, the Democratic Reform campaign was part of the Chinese repression of Tibetan resistance. Tibetans remember the *thamzing*, or “struggle,” process as one of the most traumatic in Tibetan history. Even those Tibetans who benefited in land and property redistribution during Democratic Reforms had their land and property confiscated a few years later when the Chinese implemented what they called Socialist Transformation, or collectivization. China’s so-called democratic reforms in Tibet were neither voluntary nor did they benefit Tibetans. Democratic Reforms were but another of China’s policies to transfer political power from Tibetans to Chinese and a means by which China repressed Tibetan resistance.

Tibet Institutes National Regional Autonomy and Needs No Self-Determination

The introduction to this chapter says, “In 1965 the Tibet Autonomous Region was founded. On the basis of the general democratic election conducted across the region and with ratification from China’s National People’s Congress, it convened its first people’s congress on 1 September to elect the people’s government. For the first time in Tibetan history, laboring people and patriotic persons became masters of their own affairs. The people’s government, working for the interests of the Tibetan people, enjoyed their warm support and was strong and vigorous.”

Despite the Chinese claim to have achieved Tibetan autonomy and democracy in 1965 by means of the inauguration of the TAR and supposedly democratic elections for local parliamentary seats, the reality is that there was nothing like a democratic election, and neither Tibetan laborers nor so-called patriotic personages, by which the Chinese mean their Tibetan collaborators, became the masters of Tibet. The Chinese were clearly the masters of Tibet, not Tibetans. The so-called people’s government had absolutely no legitimacy or support, nor did it have anything but a propaganda function, because it was simply a façade behind which Chinese officials exercised all political power.

The establishment of the TAR also instituted the PRC’s system of National Regional Autonomy that the Chinese Communists maintain eliminated the need for national self-determination of Tibetans or any other minority nationality within the PRC. China’s Tibet admits that the early CCP promised self-determination to Mongolians, Tibetans, and other nationalities within the territory claimed by pre-communist regimes of China. However, it says that this was promised only to free these nationalities from the oppression of imperialism and feudalism. With the victory of the Chinese Communists in 1949, they claimed that imperialism and feudalism had been overthrown both for the Chinese as well as for China’s so-called minority nationalities such as Tibetans. According to this logic, Tibetans and other minority nationalities were no longer in any need of self-determi-

nation because they had already been liberated, like the Chinese, from imperialism and feudalism.

The Chinese Communists recognize the exploitation of China by foreign imperialism and even the oppression of nationalities such as Tibetans by previous Chinese regimes. They also recognize the oppression of Chinese as well as Tibetans by feudalism. However, they are unable to recognize the fact that Chinese rule over non-Chinese people is regarded by those people as Chinese imperialism. Non-Chinese people also do not accept the excuse that the Chinese have liberated them from feudalism as justification for permanent Chinese rule. Non-Chinese people such as Tibetans may be assumed to have been perfectly capable of liberating themselves from whatever inequalities there were in their social systems. Chinese Communist assistance to non-Chinese peoples in their liberation from feudalism is insufficient justification for the imposition of Chinese rule over those peoples. In fact, a common Chinese slogan upon entering Tibet was that they were there only to liberate Tibetans from feudalism and would leave as soon as that was accomplished. Liberation from feudalism is thus revealed as an excuse for the imposition of Chinese rule over non-Chinese people such as Tibetans.

China's Tibet says, "Now, living in a big family of an independent and united multinational country and enjoying to the greatest extent more than 30 years of national regional autonomy, the Tibetan people really do not need self-determination or independence." This statement represents Chinese speaking for Tibetans rather than Tibetans speaking for themselves. As such, it is the very contradiction of the principle of self-determination. The Tibetan people have not been allowed to say whether they would prefer to live in China's so-called big family of nationalities or whether they would prefer independence. China has denied Tibetans that right, undoubtedly because China knows that Tibetans would choose independence. China claims that Tibetans enjoy self-rule and human rights and therefore do not need self-determination or independence. If this is true, then let Tibetans speak for themselves. China cannot let Tibetans speak for themselves because it knows that Tibetans would reject Chinese rule over Tibet.

The 14th Dalai Lama's Illegal Government in Exile Is a Destabilizing Factor for Asia

The introduction to this chapter says, "The 14th Dalai Lama's Government in Exile has been launching various activities that infringe on the motherland, the Chinese people and Tibet. They have vigorously agitated for Tibetan independence all over the world, wantonly slandered the Tibetan people's revolution and construction under the leadership of the CCP, and viciously sowed dissension between China and other countries, endeavoring to internationalize the Tibet issue with support for foreign anti-China forces."

China's Tibet says that the Tibetan Government in Exile is illegal because it is not recognized by the Chinese Government, is not accepted by Tibetan people either inside or outside Tibet, and is not recognized by any government in the world. The Chinese Government claims that it alone has the authority to recognize the legitimacy of any government of Tibet. This authority is said to derive from the Qing dynasty's establishment of the Kashag Government in Tibet. This government was dissolved by order of the Chinese Government after the revolt in Tibet in 1959; therefore, the Kashag Government set up by Tibetans in exile is illegal. This Chinese argument denies the Tibetan people any right to set up a government for themselves. China claims that only it has that right,

which is an obvious denial of Tibetans' right to national self-determination.

China's Tibet claims that the Tibetan Government in Exile is not accepted by Tibetans in Tibet because they have become the masters of their own country and need no representation by any government in exile. Tibetans have supposedly democratically elected their own government in the TAR, as well as in Tibetan Autonomous Districts outside the TAR, which exercise their autonomous rights. However, if China is so sure about Tibetans' preferences in regard to their political representation then it should allow a referendum among Tibetans to decide what sort of government they prefer.

The claim that Tibetans outside Tibet do not accept the Tibetan Government in Exile is equally specious. China's Tibet claims that the Tibetan Government in Exile is accepted only by Tibetans of U-Tsang and of the Gelugpa Buddhist sect while Tibetans from Kham and Amdo and from different religious sects do not accept it. It claims that because Tibetans who escaped into exile from Kham and Amdo had never been under the jurisdiction of the Lhasa government, they now hold no allegiance to the Tibetan Government in Exile. It also claims that certain Tibetan organizations in exile, such as Chushi Gangdruk ("Four Rivers, Six Ranges," the name of the Tibetan Resistance) and the Tibetan Youth Congress have their differences with the Tibetan Government in Exile. It says that because of the dissensions within the Tibetan Government in Exile many Tibetans have become disillusioned with life in exile and have decided to return to Tibet. For these reasons, it claims, the Tibetan Government in Exile has little support from Tibetans and must rely upon the support of foreign anti-China forces. However, in reality, almost all Tibetans in exile are loyal to the Tibetan Government in Exile and to the Dalai Lama and there is much evidence that most Tibetans within Tibet also remain loyal to the Dalai Lama.

The claim that no government in the world has recognized the independence of Tibet or the Tibetan Government in Exile is true. Not until the twentieth century did Tibet attempt to achieve international recognition of its claim to independence. Before that time, Chinese patronage, or rather that of Mongol and Manchu conquest dynasties, had been advantageous to Tibet, or at least to its religious establishment, and Chinese control was minimal. When Republican China tried to turn the traditional patronage relations with Tibet of the Manchu Qing Dynasty into Chinese sovereignty over Tibet, Tibetans rejected that claim and declared their independence. However, Tibet's attempts to achieve international recognition of its independence of China during the first half of the twentieth century were hampered by foreign countries' reluctance to damage their relations with China by recognition of the actual fact of Tibetan independence. China used its coercive power to force foreign countries to recognize Chinese sovereignty over Tibet. China also used its monopoly over information about Tibet to obscure the fact that Tibet was actually independent and China had no actual control or administration there. Tibet failed to achieve international recognition of its independence not because Tibet was not independent in fact but because of Chinese coercion and obfuscation of the reality of Tibetan independence. This is another example of China's denial of Tibetans' right to national self-determination.

Achievements in Construction and Development

The introduction to this chapter says, “Since the peaceful liberation of Tibet in 1951, especially since the Democratic Reform in Tibet and the reform and opening up program introduced throughout China, great progress has taken place in economics and culture. Living standards have been considerably improved and religious beliefs have been respected and protected. These are facts universally recognized.”

However, contrary to Chinese propaganda, Chinese economic development in Tibet is not universally recognized as primarily benefiting the Tibetan people nor has Chinese policy preserved Tibetan religion and culture. In any case, economic development is not a sufficient justification for Chinese rule over Tibet. If China were solely concerned about economic development in Tibet it could have provided economic and development assistance as foreign aid to an independent Tibet.

China's Tibet says that China has helped preserve and develop Tibetan culture. It admits that certain mistakes were made, especially during the Cultural Revolution, when not only Tibet but all of China suffered cultural destruction. However, it claims that CCP policy has always been to preserve and promote Tibetan culture. It cites as an example the travel of Tibetan drama troupes around the world. However, these tours are mostly intended to demonstrate that all is well in Tibet. Even the songs and dances are altered by the Chinese to remove references to Tibet as an independent country and to promote the idea that Tibet is a part of China.

China's Tibet promotes the usual Chinese propaganda line that China has preserved Tibetan culture and has no reason to repress any aspect of Tibetan culture. However, the reality is that all aspects of Tibetan culture are threatening to China because Tibetan culture is intimately associated with Tibetan national identity. China cannot tolerate a separate national identity in Tibet and therefore has repressed all aspects of Tibetan culture. Tibetan culture has suffered tremendous destruction under Chinese rule, not just because of certain so-called accidents such as the Cultural Revolution but as an integral part of Chinese policy in Tibet.

China's Tibet also claims, incredibly, that China has preserved Tibetan Buddhism. It attempts to make the case that the number of monks and nuns was drastically reduced after Democratic Reforms because monks and nuns realized that they were being exploited by the upper class lamas. They also supposedly opposed the lamas who had supported the revolt. However, this is simply a rewriting of history to cover up the destruction of Tibetan religion and culture. Chinese propaganda credits the destruction of Tibetan monasteries to the chaos of the Cultural Revolution, but in fact many if not most monasteries were closed and looted and many were destroyed during Democratic Reforms as an intentional policy of the CCP.

After the 1959 revolt and during the subsequent Democratic Reforms, monks were forcibly secularized and lamas subjected to *thamzing* and arrest. Monasteries were then looted of their precious jewels and valuable metal statues, which were trucked to the Chinese interior where statues were melted down for their metallic content, which was then turned into more proletarian implements like hoes and rakes. This confiscation of Tibet's artistic and cultural heritage was justified under the “redistribution of wealth” theme of Democratic Reforms. Tibetan wealth collected in Buddhist

monasteries was taken from the theoretical exploiters, the monasteries and the religious establishment, and then redistributed to the “people,” by which was meant not just the Tibetan people but all the Chinese people. Less valuable articles like thangkas (scroll paintings) and wood blocks for printing texts were burned while clay statues were smashed. Religious texts were burned or used for toilet paper.

Many monasteries that had supported the revolt or that had revealed their opposition to Chinese rule over Tibet were destroyed at this time, their timbers and stones being used for other construction including PLA barracks, many years before the beginning of the Cultural Revolution. Most of the remaining monasteries were destroyed during the Cultural Revolution, but the monasteries were already empty shells, the monks having departed and the interiors having been looted. Tibetan religion had been severely repressed long before the Culture Revolution.

Tibet’s Panchen Lama corroborated this systematic destruction of Tibetan religion and culture in his famous 1962 70,000-character petition to the Chinese Government, which was finally revealed to the West in 1997 when it was published by the Tibet Information Network. The Panchen Lama said that during Democratic Reforms the Party’s stated policies on religion had not been followed but that the cadres and activists had instead pursued a policy that he 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 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 was 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.

What the Panchen Lama could not say was the reason for the Chinese destruction of Tibetan religious monuments and repression of religion and culture. Tibetan Buddhism was a major component of Tibetan culture and national identity and the monastic establishment was also a major component of the Tibetan Government. Tibetan monasteries were depopulated and destroyed because they represented a Tibetan identity and government separate from China and because they opposed Chinese control over Tibet.

China still allows only a limited practice of Tibetan religion. It restricts Tibetan devotion to the head of Tibetan religion, the Dalai Lama. It requires monks and nuns to denounce the Dalai Lama. Still, China claims that Tibetans have complete religious freedom. Given the history of China's destruction of Tibetan religion and its continuing repression of Tibetan religious freedom, this claim is simply preposterous.

Concluding Remarks

The concluding remarks are about what the Chinese call the nonissue of "Tibetan independence." The introduction to this chapter says, "Tibetan independence is an illusion. It is both theoretically and practicably impossible. The attempts to make Tibetan independence a reality are doomed to failure."

China's Tibet says that there have been four stages in the history of the Tibetan independence movement. The first stage was from the time that the 13th Dalai Lama declared Tibetan independence in 1912 until he supposedly reconciled with China in 1924. The second stage was from the regency of Reting to that of Taktra. The third was from the so-called liberation of Tibet in 1951 until the beginning of the revolt in 1956. The fourth was from the repression of the revolt in 1959 until the revival of the Tibetan independence issue in the 1980s.

China's Tibet says that in each case the independence forces were defeated. In the first case the 13th Dalai Lama had to reconcile with China because the pro-British modernist forces threatened to overthrow the system of religious rule in Tibet. In the second case the pro-Chinese Reting was overthrown by the pro-British Taktra, but then Tibet was peacefully liberated with the support of patriotic Tibetans. In the third case the reactionary forces that rebelled were defeated by the PLA

with the support of patriotic Tibetans. In the fourth case the revived Tibetan independence movement has been unable to achieve any results, while China has prospered and become stronger.

China's Tibet says that the Tibetan independence movement has always failed because it is not supported by the Tibetan people. It says that China's unity is supported by the Tibetan people while separatism is not. It says that Tibet has always been an integral part of China and that if Tibet did not separate from China when China was weak it will surely not do so now when China is strong. It also repeats the usual claim that the goal of Tibetan independence is simply an attempt to restore the feudal serf system.

Despite China's claim that Tibetan independence has not been achieved because it is not supported by the Tibetan people, the real reason is that Tibetan independence has been prevented by China. The 13th Dalai Lama did not reaffirm China's sovereignty over Tibet as the Chinese claim. China did not "peacefully liberate" Tibet. Instead, China's takeover of Tibet was achieved by force and coercion and Tibetans were forced to cooperate. The 1959 revolt was not suppressed with the assistance of Tibetans; instead, almost all Tibetans sympathized with the revolt. Again, the failure of the revival of the Tibetan political issue in the 1980s to achieve independence is not because it is not supported by Tibetans but solely because of Chinese repression. The history of the Tibetan independence movement is not evidence of Tibetans' lack of a desire for independence but of China's repression of Tibetans' right to self-determination.

China cannot answer the question of why it has denied to Tibetans their right to self-determination. Chinese propaganda that Tibetans do not want independence is contradicted by the testimony of almost all Tibetans who are able to speak freely, either within Tibet or in exile. If China is so sure that Tibetans do not support independence then let China allow a referendum among Tibetans on the issue. China's knows that the outcome of such a referendum would be in favor of Tibetan independence; therefore, it will never allow Tibetans to freely express their opinions. Chinese propaganda that Tibetans are loyal to China is simply Chinese speaking for Tibetans rather than Tibetans speaking for themselves. China's Tibet thus utterly fails in its purpose of convincing the world of the legitimacy of Chinese rule over Tibet. The essence of the issue of Tibet is Tibetans' right to self-determination, a right obviously denied by China.