

**A 60-POINT COMMENTARY**  
**on**  
**the Chinese Government Publication:**  
*A Collection of Historical Archives of Tibet*



**DIIR PUBLICATIONS**  
**2008**

Published by:  
The Department of Information and International Relations, (DIIR)  
Central Tibetan Administration  
Gangchen Kyishong  
Dharamsala - 176 215  
H. P., INDIA

Email: [diir@gov.tibet.net](mailto:diir@gov.tibet.net)  
Website: [www.tibet.net/](http://www.tibet.net/) [ww.tibet.com](http://ww.tibet.com)

© DIIR  
First Edition, November 2008  
2000 Copies

ISBN 81-86627-82-0

Printed at:  
Narthang Press, Gangchen Kyishong, Dharamsala - 176 215 (H.P.)

## PUBLISHER'S NOTE

This book is an English translation of the 60-point rebuttal in Tibetan by the Research and Analysis Unit of the Department of Security of the Central Tibetan Administration (CTA) issued on 13 January 2000 to counter the claims made in the Chinese government publication — *A Collection of Historical Archives of Tibet*.

Compiled by the Archives of the Tibet Autonomous Region and published by the Cultural Relics Publishing House of the People's Republic of China (PRC) in October 1994, *A Collection of Historical Archives of Tibet* is a voluminous collection of 107 historical documents and cultural relics gleaned from the archives of the Mongol and Manchu periods down to the present People's Republic of China. It seeks to prove that Tibet has always (or historically) been “a part of the big family of the Chinese motherland”. The Chinese government has — in so proving — resorted to actually re-writing history by churning out a concocted version of the past events that shaped Tibet's relations with the Mongols and the Manchus in the 13th and 17th centuries respectively, conveniently ignoring the fact that the Mongols and the Manchus were foreign powers who once conquered and ruled China. The Mongols ruled China from 1279 to 1368 and the Manchus from 1644 to 1911.

The Tibetan rebuttal — which is entitled **A 60-Point Commentary on the Chinese Government Publication, *A Collection of Historical Archives of Tibet*** — draws on these very Chinese sources to prove just the opposite: that Tibet was an

independent nation prior to the Chinese arrival in 1949-50; and that their presence in the country constitutes an act of aggression under international law.

It must be pointed out, however, that the current policy of His Holiness the Dalai Lama is not to restore the historical status of Tibet. Rather, he has come up with the Middle-Way Approach of finding a solution to the protracted issue of Tibet within the legal, or political, framework of the People's Republic of China — and that is *a genuine national regional autonomy for all Tibetans under a single administration*.

We sincerely hope that this English version of the book will serve as an additional resource for all those interested in understanding the vicissitudes — or for that matter the true nature — of the Sino-Tibetan relations, past and present.

Kesang Yangkyi Takla (Mrs.)  
Kalon *for* the Department of Information and International Relations (DIIR)

1 November 2008

## P R E F A C E

The Archives of the so-called Tibet Autonomous Region has been cited as having compiled a book titled *A Collection of Historical Archive of Tibet*, which was published in October 1994, bringing together a collection of copies of 107 reference materials and cultural items in Tibetan, Mongolian, Chinese and Manchu languages which encompass the period from 1277 to 1956. Throughout the modern world today, the human being's horizon of understanding has greatly broadened and the standard of intellectualism has reached high, so that cultural items and reference materials related to each period in history are greatly treasured and devotedly preserved. To see such historical documents compiled, published, and thereby preserved against the prevailing Communist mentality to "destroy the old and establish the new" is only to be expected of the learned and righteous to seek to accomplish. The effort deserves, on the face of it, to be lauded.

However, it turns out that from the available pool of documents, selections have been made of only those that could be used to serve one's own biased purposes. The book has, therefore, been rendered partial in view of the fact that the overall picture has not been presented. Besides, one could perceive numerous instances of explanations of historical events that are distortions of what had actually occurred. All these have happened because the manner in which reference materials have been used is bereft of any righteousness — the sense of shame has been eclipsed by a desire arising from the erroneous mentality of the expansionist.

With history in its actual version as witness, we have sought to point out and thereby vindicate what the truth is. We call upon the impartial intellectuals to draw their own conclusion after reading this book.

The Research and Analysis Centre  
Department of Security, Central Tibetan Administration  
Dharamsala

On the 7th day of the 12th month of the Earth-Rabbit Year in the  
17th rabjung (13 January 2000)

# A brief Chronology of China's Rulers

<b>Dynasties</b>	<b>Periods</b>
Xia Dynasty	from 21st century to 16th century BC
Shang Dynasty	from 16th century to 1066 BC
Zhou Dynasty:	
West Zhou	from 1066 to 771 BC
East Zhou	from 770 to 256 BC
Chun Qiu (Spring-Autumn) period	from 770 to 476 BC
Zhan Guo (Warring States) period	from 475 to 221 BC
Qin Dynasty	from 221 to 206 BC
Han Dynasty:	
West Han	from 206 BC to 8 AD
East Han	from 25 to 220 AD
San Guo (Three Kingdoms) period	
Wei	from 220 to 265 AD
Shu	from 221 to 263 AD
Wu	from 222 to 280 AD
Jin Dynasty:	
West Jin	from 265 to 316 AD
East Jin	from 317 to 420 AD

During the East Jin Dynasty period the kingdom splintered into 16 principalities	from 304 to 439 AD
South and North Dynasties:	
South Dynasties	from 420 to 589 AD
North Dynasties	from 386 to 581 AD
During the Sui Period the kingdom splintered into nine principalities	from 581 to 618 AD
Tang Dynasty	from 618 to 907 AD
Five Dynasties period	from 907 to 960 AD
Ten Kingdoms period	from 902 to 979 AD
Song Dynasty:	
North Song	from 960 to 1127 AD
South Song	from 1127 to 1279 AD
Yuan Dynasty	from 1271 to 1368 AD
Ming Dynasty	from 1368 to 1644 AD
Qing Dynasty	from 1644 to 1911 AD
Republic of China	from 1912 to 1949 AD
People's Republic of China	from 1949 AD ....



# CONTENTS

Publisher's Note

i) - ii)

Preface

iii) - iv)

Brief Historical Chronology of China

v) - vi)

Points 1 to 3, Commenting on the Terms and Title-Words

*Zhong Huá* and *Zhong Guó*

Pgs. 1- 10

Points 4 to 11, Analysis of the Yuan Dynasty Archives

Pgs. 11 - 22

Points 12 to 14, Analysis of the Ming Dynasty Archives

Pgs. 23 - 27

Points 15 to 35, Analysis of the Qing, or Manchu  
Dynasty Archives

Pgs. 28 - 87

Points 36 to 49, Analysis of the Republic of  
China (Guomindang) Archives

Pgs. 88 - 142

Points 50 to 59, Analysis of the People's  
Republic of China Archives

Pgs. 143 - 179

Point 60, Eight Sections of Concluding Summaries

Pgs. 180 - 184

Notes

Pg. 185

vii)

# Commenting on the Terms and Title-Words *Zhong Huá* and *Zhong Guó*

## Point No. 1

On the cover of the book *A Collection of Historical Archives of Tibet*, it is written: “Jiang Zemin said, “The splendid historical culture of the Tibetan nationality is an important component of the cultural treasure-house of the Chinese (*Zhong Huá*) nation.” It is also written that China (*Zhong Guó*) is a multi-national country and that the Tibetan nationality is one of the nationality groups within the great family of the Chinese nation. Thus, because the coverage of the term *Zhong Guó* is seen to have been continuously expanded beyond all limits to this day, it has become unavoidable for us to make a brief examination of the original Chinese records to find out about the source of this term and its ambit in the three points of this chapter. For this purpose, we have listed here a chronology<sup>1</sup> of Chinese history. In the Chinese language, *Zhong* means centre or middle, *Huá* signifies beauty, and *Guó* refers to nation.

1) Before about the 11th century BC, that is, over 3,000 years ago, during the Western Zhou dynasty, a tradition emerged of calling only the Chinese kingdom’s capital as *Zhong Guó*. Indeed, *Mao Zhuan*, a contemporary Zhou period work, says *Zhong Guó* means the capital.

2) Again, at about the turn of the eighth century BC, when the period of the Chun Qiu [Spring–Autumn] - Zhan Guo [Warring States] reign began, people who were not ethnic Chinese but who lived in the surrounding areas were called eastern Yi, southern Men, western Rong and northern Ti. In the middle

of all these, it used to be said, was the capital known as *Zhong Guó* of the Han people.

3) Scholar Lu Xi, who emerged in about the beginning of the second century AD, after the beginning of the Han dynasty, speaks of the existence of the practice of demarcating China into eastern, southern, western, and northern regions and of calling the central region as *Zhong Guó* because the king lived there. Because the Huaxia or Han ethnic Chinese lived in the north and south of the lower regions of Machu, these territories were called by such numerous names as *Zhong Guó*, *Zhong Tuo*, *Zhong Yuan*, *Zhong Zhao*, *Zhong Xia*, and *Zhong Huá*. But they were all said to be synonymous.

4) In Chapter no. 146 of *The Annals of Tang* authored by the Song dynasty writer Liu Xiang, it is written: “The territory called Tibet lies eight thousand *li*<sup>2</sup> to the west of the Tang capital Chang’an. In earlier times, during the Han dynasty, the territory was the habitat of a people called Xi Qiang, with their capital located near Machen Pomra. The name of the kingdom was T’ufa. After the passage of many years, T’ufa came to be pronounced as T’ufan.

Before the Tang dynasty period, during the Zhou and Sui dynasties, no contact could be seen to have developed between any of the principalities of the Qiang people and *Zhong Guó*. The kings of that kingdom are being called the Tsenpo.”<sup>3</sup>

5) In Chapter no. 141 of *The New Annals of Tang*, dealing with T’ufan Tibetan history and authored by Song dynasty minister Song Qi, it is written: “The people called T’ufan belonged to the Qiang ethnic group. It was made up of about 150 sub-groups. They were settled in the areas of Machu, Tsongchu, Drichu, and

Zungchu. Both the F'a Qiang and Tangmo Qiang groups had no contacts with *Zhong Guó*. They inhabited the region called Shizhi Shui located near Machen Pomra in the western Machu region. ...”

And it continues: “That land is located about eight thousand *li* from the capital of Tang dynasty. It had an army of about 100,000 troops. The kingdom is not only hit by frequent lightning, storm, and hail, but is also subject to heavy snowfall. The summer there is similar to spring in *Zhong Guó*. The place is very cold with its mountains being permanently covered in thick glaciers. The people are subject to little epidemic diseases. The king lived in Parbu Chuan (Yarlung) and Lhasa Chuan. Although having a palace and fort, he prefers to live in yak hair tents. The bigger of such tents could hold hundreds of people. ... Life expectancy was about one hundred years. For clothing, people wore leather and felt. ... The highest ranking officials were decorated with epaulets of finest quality turquoise. Those successively subordinate to him got decorated with epaulets of gold, silver, and copper and were thus distinguished from each other.”<sup>4</sup>

6) Page no. 16 of Chapter 50 of the Chinese historical annals called *T'ungchen*, which deals with relations between Tang dynasty and Tibet, records thus: “Those known as the T'ufan people are descendants of the Qiang people of earlier times. Their territory is situated in southwest of Drugu [a kingdom adjoining today's northern Tibet, Amdo province in the east and Xinjiang Uighur Autonomous Region in the west]. In later periods, it came to be known by the name of Tibet. In the Water-Snake Year that corresponds to 633 AD, Tibet's king Songtsen Gampo despatched an emissary to the Tang capital. Since then contact developed between Tibet and China. There was no evidence of any relationship between them before that. The kings of Tibet were referred to as

Tsenpo. Relatives of the king were referred to as *Shang* while officials in positions of power were called *Lon*. There was no practice of calling them by their actual names. Songtsen Gampo was a heroic person. He had an army of several hundred thousand troops under his command. Smaller kingdoms on all four sides lived in fear and awe of him.”<sup>5</sup>

7) On page no. 143 of *A Brief History of the People Living in China's Frontiers*, compiled and edited by Zhou Kuan Tan, which deals with Tibet, it is recorded: “Chapter no. 1. Regarding the name ‘Tibet’, during the Tang and Song dynasties, it used to be called T’ufan. During the Yuan dynasty, it used to be called both T’ufan and Sh’ifan. During the Ming dynasty, Tibet was called by the name of U-sitsang. During Manchu dynasty, Tibet was initially called T’ufan, but later came to be referred to as U-Tsang and eventually Xizang. Before the period of Tang dynasty, nobody inside China knew anything about the territory called Tibet. At that time Tibet was in a period of development. Relationship with Tibet began during the Tang dynasty.”<sup>6</sup>

8) In Part Four of Section Three of the book *A Brief History of the Chinese Nation, Volume II*, written by Fan Wen Len, it is stated under the title “T’ufan Tibetan Nation”: “Chapter 1. The Qiang people, living to the west of China, were a nomadic race in earlier times. ... The main habitat of the Qiang people was in the area of the western Lake (Tso-Ngonpo). From the year 265 to 317 AD, son Tu’u Ku Hun, Drugu, of chief Hriku of the local ethnic group inhabiting the Liu Tung (Eastern Manchuria) led a group of seven hundred families to emigrate westwards and settled in the area of Po Han (at Amdo Kachu in the Ningxia-Gansu region). Their descendants conquered the area’s Qiang principalities and brought

them under their rule, and thereby established the new kingdom of Drugu. In 618 AD, the Drugu kingdom broke into two — east and west — parts. Gradually the Drugu people got assimilated into the Qiang people.”

Likewise, it is stated: “One faction of the Qiang people left the Tso-ngon [Qinghai] region and spread out in the direction of U-Tsang. Another faction, after having moved out and settled within and outside the borders of Sichuan, gradually set out towards the U-Tsang region of Tibet. They gradually spread and diversified far and wide in the vast region to the west of China. During the Tang dynasty period, the splintered Qiang principalities were united and became one big kingdom called Tibet. It is thus revealed that the emergence of the nation called Tibet to the west of China was a majestically brilliant culmination ushered in through a process of civilisational development.”<sup>7</sup>

9) The sections dealing with histories of Tibet in the old and the new annals of Tang dynasty, and the *T'ungchen* reveal in their explanation of Tibet and its internal principalities in the old days that in the seventh century AD the Chinese knew it by the name of T'ufan. During that period Songtsen Gampo launched a military campaign in the Domey region and brought under his rule the principalities of Minyak, Sumpa, etc., of the Qiang people who inhabited them since ancient times. After that, it came into contact with China.<sup>8</sup>

10) In the Chinese annals titled *Ha'u Han Hru*, it is stated that during the ancient Han period in the BC years, the principalities in the Domey region of Tibet were referred to by the Chinese as Qiang. And it says the Qiang people lived mainly in the Machu, Tsongchu, Drichu, and Zungchu river valleys.<sup>9</sup>

A careful scrutiny of the Chinese archive materials cited in the above ten sections reveal that:

i) The name *Zhong Guó* was, over three thousand years ago, used briefly, during the Zhou dynasty, to refer to the kingdom's capital. The extent of its coverage was restricted only to the capital region. And it emerges as extremely clear that the term did not cover within its ambit peoples of other ethnicities living in the capital's neighbourhood. After Zhou dynasty, through the successive periods of the Qin dynasty, Han dynasty, the Three Kingdoms period, Jin dynasty, the Sixteen Principalities period, South and North dynasties, the Sui dynasty, Tang dynasty, the Five Kingdoms period, the Ten Kingdoms period, the Song dynasty, Yuan dynasty, and Qing dynasty, the term *Zhong Guó* was never used to refer either to the capital or the country. In view of this, the question obviously arises: would it be true to claim that the name *Zhong Guó*, used only briefly three thousand years ago, to refer to a specific place in China, and not even to the whole of China, now also applies to Tibet, which is located many thousands of *li* from it, and that the Tibetan people are but a component of the great family of the Chinese nation?

ii) Not only did the people of the Zhou dynasty period, who were the ones to use the name *Zhong Guó*, did not include Tibet within the ambit of the term, but people during it and in the Sui dynasty period were explicit that there was no contact between the people of the Qiang principalities and China. Documents cited in sections 4 and 5 above make this very clear. And the document cited in section 7 above says that before the Tang dynasty period, no one in China knew anything about a territory called Tibet. Do not these show with great clarity the fact

that Tibet and China were totally different from each other? Would it, therefore, not be a wild talk to claim that two places which never even had a contact with each other were one and integral parts of each other?

iii) In 1912, *Zhong Huá Min Guó* [Republic of China set up by the Guomindang], which had nothing to do with *Zhong Guó* that arose three thousand years ago during the Zhou dynasty period and of which Tibet was never considered a part, was founded; and in 1949, *Zhong Huá Renmin Gung Hua Guo* [the People's Republic of China] was established. If it is to be claimed that in both these instances the name *Zhong Guó* was employed only because it was in general usage to refer to the entire nation of China during those periods and Tibet could be considered part of it, the claim is exceedingly improper. Tibet was not something that newly emerged after 1912; it had existed for three to four thousand years before that, separated by thousands of kilometres from China to its west, on a high plateau.

The Tibetan people who inhabited it was traditionally referred to by the Chinese as Qiang. They were totally different from the Chinese in every respect, whether in terms of their attire or language or customs and in other respects. How, therefore, could such a radically different people be suddenly construed as a part of *Zhong Guó*, which is a newly coined name for China in the 20th century? This is nothing but a totally baseless, empty talk about a nation created to suit one's whim.

iv) Again, it might well be stated to be untrue that from the Qin and Han dynasties — after Zhou dynasty — to the Tang, Song, Yuan and Qing dynasties, the term *Zhong Guó* was never used to refer either to a Chinese capital or the Chinese



nation as a whole, and that the documents cited in sections 3, 4, 5, and 8 above, in fact, mention it. Regarding this, it may be pointed out that the respective authors of these different works used the term only for the purpose of examining whether or not there were any kind of relationships between the ancient Zhou dynasty and Tibet. They do not at all show that the name *Zhong Guó* was used to refer to China during the periods in which these works were written.

For example, scholar Lu Xi who emerged after the beginning of the Han dynasty and writer Liu Xiang of the Song dynasty period have, in their works, used the term *Zong Guó* to speak about a period during the Zhou dynasty. The reality was that both during the Han and Song dynasty periods China was never called by the name of *Zhong Guó*. If it was called so, the annals of those periods should record them; but they do not at all.

v) Does not the recordings in Tibetan, Mongolian, Chinese, and Manchurian scripts in the book clearly indicate that these four entities are totally different from each other in terms of their races, languages, cultures, costumes, customs, and in every other respect? If in that way they are indeed different peoples, how could the Tibetan culture be only a component of the Chinese culture?

vi) Again, without any discussion as to whether the cultures of the Mongolian and Manchu peoples are part of the culture of the Chinese people, what was the reason for claiming that the Tibetan culture is a component part of the Chinese culture?

vii) The Tibetans, Mongolians, and Manchurians are not peoples that newly emerged in later periods, but have existed

as neighbouring countries of China since ancient times. So, in which document is it written, by whom, and at what time, that these and the other peoples within today's People's Republic of China had been known by the collective names of *Zhong Huá* people and *Zhong Guó*? What proof exists that such collective names, if they existed, had been commonly accepted and used?

viii) To summarise, the obvious conclusion one can draw from an examination of the annals in the Chinese archives is that whatever early, middle, or later periods one looks at in regard to the use in China of the term *Zhong Guó*, not an iota of evidence could be found to prove that it had been used as being inclusive of Tibet or Tibetans. Claims designed to suggest that the culture of the Tibetan nationality is an important component of the cultural treasure-house of the *Zhong Huá* people; that *Zhong Guó* is a country with a vast territory and multi-ethnic population; and that the Tibetans are but a component ethnic group within the big family of the *Zhong Huá* people, and the like have no basis in reality. Rather, they are obviously inspired by an expansionist ideology.

## Point No. 2

Li Teiying has written: "Authentic documents, historical witnesses." As such, there should be no reason for dispute if one seeks the truth from historical evidences. However, it can never be proper to use falsehood as evidence and in the following pages we invite readers to scrutinise each of our examinations of how truth or falsehood has been employed in the book being critiqued here.

### Point No. 3

In the book's Foreword it is written: "*Zhong Guó* is an ancient, vast and multi-national country and as part of *Zhong Huá*, the Tibetan people's role has developed through history." Regarding this, we would like to point out two things:

- 1) As to when the terms *Zhong Guó* and *Zhong Huá* came into being and their ambits, we have already dealt with them briefly in our analysis in Point No. 1 above and leave that to suffice for the present purpose without repetition;
- 2) The underlying basis for the comment that "as part of *Zhong Huá*, the Tibetan people's role has developed through history" is the period of the Yuan dynasty. This being the case, we offer our explanation concerning it in the next point.

# Analysis of the Yuan Dynasty Archives

## Point No. 4

“During the mid-13th century, with the rise of the Mongolian nationality and the founding of the Yuan dynasty, Tubo became part of the Yuan Empire. From that time to the present era of the People’s Republic of China, a period spanning over 700 years, Tibet has remained an administrative division under a central Chinese government.” Regarding the claim thus being made in the book, our response is:

1) In the 13th century, it was the Mongols who conquered China and founded the Yuan dynasty. It was not the Chinese who conquered Mongolia and set up the Yuan dynasty. The Mongols, who were the conquerors, and the Chinese whom they conquered, were two completely different peoples. The relationship Tibet had with the Yuan dynasty was a Mongol-Tibet relationship. And because, in contradistinction to that, it was not a Tibet-China relationship, there is no basis whatsoever to talk about the existence of any Sino-Tibetan relationship during that period.

2) It is not at all true to claim, regarding the relationship between the Mongols and Tibetans, that “Tubo became part of the Yuan Empire”. The Mongols conquered most of the countries of Asia, including the principal one of China. However, Tibet’s status under Mongol conquest was uniquely different from that of all the other conquered countries in that no Mongol prince or army general was permanently stationed there. The Mongols did not even collect taxes in Tibet. All religious and political powers in

Tibet were held by the Sakyapas, with the result that the country remained a fully self-governed political entity. Moreover, Drogon Choegyul Phagpa of Sakya assumed the role of the religious tutor of the Yuan emperor Sechen, or Sechen Gyalpo [Kublai Khan]. And in that capacity, he even offered guidance and supervision in governmental affairs in numerous ways. A detailed account of this exists in the book *The Mongols and Tibet: A Historical Assessment of Relations Between the Mongol Empire and Tibet*, published by the Department of Information and International Relations (DIIR) in 1996. This book will enable one to gain a clear grasp of the state of Mongol-Tibetan relations through history.

3) Thus, Tibet remained in a state of being governed by itself, with the Mongols never having ruled it directly. So, how could it be claimed that “(f)rom that time to the present era of the People’s Republic of China, a period spanning over 700 years, Tibet has remained an administrative division under a central Chinese government”? And that, in view of this, it was under continuous possession of the Chinese government?

4) Moreover who among the ranks of impartial observers could accept this as true if China, which was the conquered, seeks to reap the benefits by citing the actions of Mongols, who were the conquerors?

5) If, for the sake of argument, it is to be claimed that the Mongols and the Chinese should be considered as one and the same, and that, in view of it, the countries and territories conquered by the Mongols should rightfully belong to China as their successors, it needs to be pointed out that the Mongol conquests during the Yuan dynasty also included Russia, eastern European countries, Korea, Burma [Myanmar], Vietnam, Cambodia, and

the islands of Indonesia. Because such vast and large numbers of countries were part of the Mongol Empire, did all of them, for the next more than 700 years, remain possessions of the presumed empire of *Zhong Guó* on a continuous basis? The question is, did the Chinese government indeed exercise such uninterrupted possession and control? China should make this very clear.

6) If the Chinese did not have the possession of and control over the territories in which Mongol princes or army generals, being permanently stationed there, actually set up administrations, collected taxes, and imposed laws, then there cannot be an iota of truth in the claim that Tibet, which the Mongols never directly ruled, was under the possession and control of China.

7) In our perspective, the Yuan dynasty was a Mongol dynasty; never, by any stretch of imagination, a Chinese one. As to the reason why, the emperors who ruled under the name of the Yuan dynasty were all Mongols. And the historical period was when the Mongols ruled over Mongolia as well as many countries of Asia, including China. During that period, conquered China was under subjugation and was a subservient subject of the Mongols. In that manner, it was a period when China's dynastic history had been obliterated.

### **Point No. 5**

It is stated in the book: "This book contains more than 100 cultural items and reference materials written in Tibetan, Mongolian, Chinese and Manchu which come from archives dating between 1277 and 1956." It is also stated: "Because these are faithful records of the march of human history, they are capable of adequately

verifying the fact that Tibet is a part of China's territory." Our answer, as regards this, is:

In our perception, far from verifying at all that these documents prove Tibet to be part of China, they show the opposite. We clearly feel able to prove that Mongolia and Manchuria were not subjects of China's rule but totally different from China. How? This book itself clearly records the different scripts and languages of the concerned different peoples. And these peoples, distinguished by their own scripts and languages, have their own respective ancient histories, costumes, customs and traditions, the totality of whose differences could clearly be seen as vibrant and extant.

The Yuan documents are related to the relationship between the Mongols and Tibetans. Such a kind of Yuan period relationship definitely existed in the case of other neighbouring countries too. To say that because of the nature of the relationship that existed during the Yuan period, all the concerned countries were parts of China would be grossly untrue and improper. It requires that other countries in the neighbourhood of China today too should be considered parts of it. Although there is no basis for referring to the relationship between the Mongols and Tibetans for answering the question whether Tibet was or was not a part of China, the book in question records some Yuan period documents. Because of this, we examine them briefly and offer our explanations below.

### **Point No. 6**

Regarding the Yuan documents that are numbered 1, 2, 3 and 5 in the book, they are edicts from the concerned emperors for the benefit of Lhaje Senge Pal, Riwoche monastery, the monks of Tashi Dhen and Kunchog Sangpo, exempting each of the concerned

monasteries from taxation and corvee labour obligations. Judged by the conceited attitude of those today who consider themselves modern and progressive in their intellect and hold the monasteries as particular objects of hatred, we feel that the gestures of the emperors during those periods were all the more praiseworthy.

### **Point No. 7**

Document Number 4 is an edict appointing Woese Gyaltzen as the Tripon [chief of ten-thousand households] of Markham and Document Number 6 is an edict appointing Yonten Gyaltzen to the post of a mayor. Both the edicts require the concerned subjects to follow their instructions.

Document Number 7 is an iron plate of authority issued by the emperor bearing Mongolian words inscribed in gold in the new Phagpa script.

### **Point No. 8**

Document Number 8 is a decree issued by Tisri [Imperial or State Tutor] Rinchen Gyaltzen to high priests Khonton and Rinchen Pal Sangpo, mandating that with regard to the monastic estates, religious endowments, monks, patrons and disciples within Ë-pa, whatever fields, estates, land, rivers and pastures may be under their ownership shall not be taken possession of; likewise, they shall not be subject to levies of horse-service and corvee-labour duties.

Document Number 9 is a decree issued by Tisri Sangye Pal to Rinchen Gangpa, mandating that no new corvee duties shall be imposed on the estates of Jhagang, Geding, Bhangrel, and



Thokar Pesar which provide services in the worship of Machig and within the area of Gurchung under the administration of Rinchen Gangpa.

Document Number 10 is a decree issued to High Priest Rinchen Gon by Tisri Kunga Lodroe Gyaltsen, mandating that no previously non-existent corvee duties be imposed on the estates of Chusang monastery, etc., which are under his jurisdiction within the Bodong Ę area.

Document Number 11 is a decree issued by Tisri Kunga Lodroe Gyaltsen to Wangyal, appointing him, in place of his father, as the Tongpon [chief of a thousand households] of Trom, and ordering that all the units of the people of Tritsha, Drengtsha, etc., should dutifully obey the commands of Tongpon Wangyal.

Document Number 12 is a decree issued by Tisri Kunga Gyaltsen to Yeshe Kunga, appointing him to the post of a mayor and ordering that everyone dutifully carry out his commands.

### **Point No. 9**

Document Number 13 is a decree issued by Empress Dowager Thaji to her uncle Dragpa Gyaltsen, ordering that all the properties possessed and owned by Rinchengang, etc., that are in the worship of Machig be not imposed with taxes and subjected to plunder.

Document Number 14 is a decree issued by Heshan Huaining, a prince of the Yuan emperor, exempting Shalu monastery from all taxes and corvee labour obligations.

Document Number 15 is a proclamation issued by an official named Dingzalu Sonwisi of the Yuan emperor, saying if it was true that the religious estates under the administrative jurisdiction of Khenchen Sonam Dragpa had for long been explicitly exempted from the taxes, military service obligations and

corvee duties, then all such duties and obligations shall not be imposed on these estates.

### **Point No. 10**

Document Numbers 16 to 22 are seals of Tisris and of administrative and religious chiefs.

### **Point No. 11**

We will now examine whether the 22 items and documents of the Yuan dynasty period listed above do, in fact, clearly prove that Tibet was a part of China, as suggested in the Foreword of the book. For this purpose, we need, first of all, to present a brief examination of the situation in the Yuan period and in Tibet during that period.

During the period of the Yuan emperor Kublai Khan, or Sechen Gyalpo, the territories at that time of what are Russia, Poland, Hungary, etc., today were consolidated into the kingdom of Chintsahen. The territories of today's Iraq and Iran were made into one kingdom called Yi Erhan. Today's territories of East and West Turkestan became the kingdom of Tsahothai. These kingdoms were placed under separate rules of different Mongol princes. In such manner were the Mongols in actual exercise of direct sovereign authority over territories up to the Mediterranean Sea, bordering western Europe.

In both Korea in the east and Burma in the south, the Mongols set up separate administrative authorities. Both civilian and military officials were permanently posted there to run the administration. Thailand, Vietnam, Cambodia, and others were

placed under the imperial jurisdictions of the Mongols. And with the Yuan Dynasty having set up its principal capital in Beijing, the Mongol emperors exercised direct rule over both China and Mongolia. To put it all succinctly, the Mongols during that period exercised sovereign authority over all the countries of the Asian continent in the east, except Japan and India.

In later periods, the Mongols conquered India too. In 1526, the Mongol descendant and follower of the Islamic faith, Babbar, and his grandson, Akbar, conquered India and ruled the country for over two hundred years.

Tibet's situation was completely different from that of any of these countries, with all its administrative and political authorities being totally vested in the Sakya rulers. No Mongol prince or military officer was ever permanently stationed at Sakya. From the year 1253, the monasteries in Tibet did not have to meet any tax obligations to the Mongols. Not only that, from the year 1260 onwards, the lay Tibetans too were exempted from any tax, military duty and corvee labour obligations to the Mongols. In 1321, when the Mongol emperor divided the entire territory under his rule into twelve provinces, Korea was clearly one of them. But Tibet was excluded from the list of twelve provinces; it was, instead, kept apart as a distinctly separate entity.

At that time the subjects of the Mongol Empire were divided into four classes. The Mongols were on top. On the second level were the Semu people. The Chinese were on the third level. The fourth tier was constituted by the people of the south. In none of these four categories were the people of Tibet ever included. In such a state of affairs, when the Yuan emperor set up his capital in Beijing and ruled over Mongolia and China, there was no national entity called *Zhong Guó* at all. The Mongols not only enslaved the Han people, they also periodically drowned hordes of them by driving them into lakes and rivers. Phagpa [Drogon Choegyul

Phagpa] had to intervene to save the Chinese. Such was the debasement and brutal ill-treatment the Chinese were being subjected to at that time.

As regards the Yuan documents referred to above, they relate only to relations between the Mongols and Tibetans. And because they do not relate to relations between China and Tibet, they cannot be used as a basis to claim Chinese sovereignty over Tibet. If, however, it is to be asserted that because the decrees issued during the Mongol period referred to above show that tax concession had been granted and chiefs appointed in Tibet, and the question asked whether these do not indicate Tibet to be part of Mongolia, here are our answers:

1) The Mongols not only issued decrees to grant tax concession and appoint chiefs in Tibet, but also, in 1268, dispatched Mongol officials who, with the Sakya Ponchen [Tibetan Administrator established under the supervision of Phagpa] Shakya Sangpo, undertook a population census and, thereafter, established the system of Trikor Chusum<sup>10</sup> for the country. In 1281, Mongol troops were dispatched to Tibet and the Sakya Ponchen Kunga Sangpo was put on trial. Security was provided for the Sakya Khon lineage and troops posted to secure the western borders of Tibet. But the reason and objective of all this was to ensure as effective an administration as possible of Tibet by the Sakya Khon lineage who were spiritual advisors to the Mongols. It was in the fulfilment of obligations under the Priest-Patron relationship that the Mongol emperors provided services to their spiritual mentors. It was never to enable the Mongols to exercise direct rule over Tibet.

2) There was, therefore, nothing surprising about the Yuan emperors who had conquered the whole of eastern Asia merely issuing decrees in Tibet. What is really, greatly surprising is the

fact that Phagpa was not only the spiritual master to Sechen Gyalpo but also held position as political advisor to him. Moreover, after Phagpa's death, temples and statues were built in his memory and a tradition laid down to commemorate the event every year throughout the provinces of China. After Sechen, successive Yuan emperors looked up to the respective successive fourteen Sakya Khon lineage holders as their spiritual masters and greatly honoured and respected them, including bestowal of gifts.

3) Each of the spiritual masters or Tisris of the respective Yuan emperors had their own powers to issue decrees to both military and civilian personnel, including to Mongol officials.

4) Four persons having connections to Phagpa as relatives and belonging to the Khon ancestry were offered princesses of the Mongol king's lineage in marriage and granted the imperial rank of Bailan Wang. These Sakya Khon lineage princes were also respected and honoured by being given rank and privileges equal to that of the highest Mongol princes. What all these show are an unimaginable situation of wonderment within the Asian continent in general and within the Chinese society in particular at that time. If one could appreciate the historical reality of all these developments, one could easily discern how unique and special Tibet's position was at that time. Regarding this, the Department of Information and International Relations (DIIR) has published in 1996 a book titled *The Mongols and Tibet: A Historical Assessment of Relations between the Mongol Empire and Tibet* and interested readers are invited to look up this work.

If people wonder why the Mongol emperors gave such unique and special treatment to Tibet, the reasons could be seen in the fact that Emperor Godan received religious teachings from the Sakya Pandita [Kunga Gyaltzen], whom he made his spiritual

master, and Emperor Sechen, likewise, received religious teachings from Phagpa, whom also he made his spiritual master. They personally witnessed many manifestations of the wondrous eruditions of the Sakya Pandita — both uncle and nephew — and developed great and genuine devotion to them. It was in these circumstances that the emperor offered Phagpa unlimited honours and awards and allowed the Sakya leaders full freedom in their governance of Tibet.

With regard to the so-called Yuan Dynasty Archives, 14 documents related to that period have been selected and brought out. However, it turns out that an appreciably complete representative set of Yuan period documents and history have not been put together. For example, in 1253, Sechen Gyalpo presented to Phagpa the Tisri rank and successively conferred on him the status called “Jasa Bhende Shekyema” and “Jasa Mutigma”. In 1261, Phagpa was made the supreme head of all Buddhists in the Yuan Empire and appointed the Imperial Preceptor, in which capacity he was honoured with the new honorific name of (Ta’paopha Wang) Choegyal Norbu. In 1263, Sakya-pa Chagna Dorje was honoured with the imperial rank of Bailan Wang and, at the same time, empowered to be the government administrator of Tibet. In 1270, Phagpa was honoured with the presentation of the Six-Realm Crystal Seal and an Outstanding Jasa. He was also presented with an especially designed tribute which read, “Phagpa Tisri, Who under the Sky and on Land, is the Prince of Heavenly India, Miracle Buddha, Composer of the Script, Harmoniser of the Empire, and Scholar of the Five Sciences of the Mind”. The question arises why the facts about the conferment of such honours and tributes and numerous other similarly real and important instances of the existence of a Choeyon [Priest-Patron] relationship between the Mongols and Tibetans were not only ignored but, in fact, concealed in the book *A Collection of Historical Archives of Tibet*. Or, were the

above mentioned facts considered not important enough to deserve care and attention? Or are the facts mentioned above simply non-existent among the documents on the history of relations between the Mongols and Tibetans?

Whatever be the case, what emerges as obvious is that only those documentary items have been selected and recorded that have been found useful to serve one's own needs and purposes. On the other hand, documents that were seen as refutations of those needs and purposes were concealed, with the result that incidents that had really occurred in history have been entirely ignored. The book invariably attributes the actions of the Mongol conqueror of Asia in the 13th century as if they were actions of the conquered Chinese. And, yet, it has absolutely nothing to say about countries such as Korea and Burma which were also conquered and directly ruled by the Mongols during the period. Furthermore, it maintains that Tibet, which the Mongols had never ruled directly, inasmuch as it was administered, in independence, by its Sakya rulers, belong to China. On the basis of such instances, we perceive the book as a commentary that distorts and knowingly strays from the path of propriety. We insist that China — a vast territory in Asia with a huge population as well as a truly long history behind it — show a modicum of restraint and modesty for the sake of maintaining the dignity of their people and, likewise, for the reason that the people in the rest of the world too are human beings with capacities of speech and understanding.

# Analysis of the People's Republic of China Archives

## Point No. 50

Under the title “Archives from the period following the founding of the People’s Republic of China” it is written: “The archives include the ‘17-Point Agreement on Measures for the Peaceful Liberation of Tibet’, personal letters by Chinese party and government leaders, government decrees and an ode to Chairman Mao composed by the Dalai Lama. These documents reflect the profound historical process whereby China’s Tibet, under the leadership of the Communist Party of China, was peacefully liberated, after which it began to evolve into a new society.”

The communist government of China today has, unlike the other power holders of the Chinese governments before it, inflicted on the Tibetan masses unimaginable persecution in violation of every canon of every law to a degree unprecedented in history. The result of this is that the Sino-Tibetan dispute continues and the issue has become a major area of contention on the world stage today. In view of this, there can be no substantive gain for the Chinese in recording in this book a few historical documents that on the face of it look impressive and thereby seek to misinform other people who do not have real knowledge of the events. From the Tibetan side, however, there is not much reason for critiquing these documents. Because:

- 1) As could be very clearly seen in the actual history of the events explained above, the Guomindang did not have an iota of authority in Tibet. In view of this, it is all the more true that there



is no way the Communist Party of China could have any such right of authority there. This is a fact well known to analysts throughout the world. Nevertheless, on 1 October 1949, as soon as the Guomindang rule over China came to an end and the era of government by the Communist Party of China began, party Chairman Mao Zedong, out of sheer insatiable greed and being intoxicated by his ego, made a radio broadcast, expressing his intention to “liberate” Tibet and Taiwan. Against this, the Tibetan government issued counter radio broadcasts, outlining in detail the fact that Tibet and China were completely different. On the 12th day of the 9th month of Tibetan Earth-Ox Year, in 1949 [2 November], the Tibetan Foreign Affairs Bureau wrote an airmail to Chairman Mao Zedong, which was sent via India, asking for assurance that China would not attack Tibet and seeking discussions as soon as the internal turmoil in China would come to an end.

2) To hold peaceful dialogue with the communist government in China, the Tibetan government appointed as its envoys Tsechag Khenchung Thubten Gyalpo and Tsipon Shakabpa. As soon as they reached Kalimpong [India] on 7 March 1950, the two envoys contacted Beijing. A reply was received by them from Beijing on 8 April, saying Chinese envoys would be sent to hold discussions in Hong Kong. Another letter was received from Beijing after that, which said, “We have understood that the envoys have difficulty coming to Hong Kong. Now that we will be sending an ambassador to Delhi soon, you can hold the discussion with the ambassador.” Accordingly, the Tibetan envoys Thubten Gyalpo and Shakabpa, after waiting in Delhi, visited the Chinese embassy there on the 6th and 16th of September 1950 and held negotiations with ambassador Yuan Chung-hsien. But while negotiations between the Tibetan mission and the Chinese ambassador was going on, the communist Chinese army, in gross violation of international

law as well as the 1918 Sino-Tibetan treaty, which provided that the existing truce on the border between the two countries should not be violated by either side, invaded Chamdo on 7 October 1950. Domey Governor, Kalon Ngapo Ngawang Jigme, as well as all other civil and military officials there were taken into custody.

For this act of impunity by the Chinese, India's foreign ministry sent a letter dated 26 October 1950 to the Chinese government, stating, "Now that the invasion of Tibet has been ordered by Chinese government, peaceful negotiations can hardly be synchronised with it and there naturally will be fear on the part of Tibetans that negotiations will be under duress. In the present context of world events, invasion by Chinese troops of Tibet cannot but be regarded as deplorable and in the considered judgement of the Government of India, not in the interest of China or peace." The United States, the United Kingdom, and many other countries spoke up in support of the Indian position.

3) Because of such act of invasion in defiance of international law, the cabinet of the Tibetan government and the Tibetan National Assembly sent a joint petition to the United Nations from Kalimpong on 7 November 1950, appealing for support for the just cause of Tibet.

4) As requested by the Tibetan public throughout Tibet, on 17 November 1950, His Holiness the Dalai Lama formally assumed political power. In an effort to hold peaceful negotiations with China, he immediately sent a letter to the Chinese government through the top Chinese military officer in Chamdo. In the letter, the Dalai Lama stated that although Sino-Tibetan relations had been bad over the recent past, he, having now personally assumed state responsibility, wished to seek the restoration of friendly relations that had existed between the two sides in the past.

It clearly asked for the release of the detained Tibetan troops and for the withdrawal of the Chinese troops who had intruded into Tibetan territories.

5) As suggested by the Chinese, for the dispatch of Tibetan envoys to Beijing to hold negotiations, the Tibetan government sent a team of five envoys led by Ngapo. Nevertheless, denied an opportunity to hold discussions on the basis of equality, China issued on 23 May 1951 an announcement which said the Tibetan envoys had put their signatures on a so-called 17-Point Agreement.

6) Point 4 of the Agreement, written entirely by the Chinese to suit their own wishes, said: "The central authorities will not alter the existing political system in Tibet. The central authorities also will not alter the established status, functions, and powers of the Dalai Lama. Officials of various ranks shall hold office as usual." Although this provision was exceptionally clear, on 27 April 1952, the Chinese forced the two Prime Ministers to resign.

Likewise, Point 7 of the Agreement read: "The policy of freedom of religious belief laid down in the Common Programme of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference shall be carried out. The religious beliefs, customs, and habits of the Tibetan people shall be respected and the temples and monasteries will be protected. The central authorities will not effect a change in the income of the monasteries." And Point 11 of the Agreement provided: "In matters related to various reforms in Tibet, there will be no compulsion on the part of the central authorities. The local government of Tibet should carry out reforms of its own accord, and when the people raise demands for reform, they shall be settled by means of consultation with the leading personnel of Tibet." Nevertheless, the Chinese themselves violated the Agreement. Over the period of 1955-56, the religious beliefs and customs of the

people of Kham and Amdo were totally negated as Lamas and monks were derided and reforms imposed by force. Because of this, the Tibetan masses rose in revolt. The Chinese suppressed them by use of force, resulting in considerable numbers of Tibetans and Chinese being killed. In that way, the friendly relationship and faith between the two peoples was lost, and the sense of animosity and resentment between them enhanced.

7) In 1959, His Holiness the Dalai Lama was invited to a military theatrical performance. The Chinese notified beforehand that the personal security guards who usually accompanied him wherever he went were not to come along with him to the performance. Because of this, the Tibetan masses of Lhasa staged the spontaneous 10 March uprising. The Chinese crackdown was brutal. Using modern weapons, they killed or maimed tens of thousands of Tibetans; all the Tibetan government officials were captured and jailed. The Tibetan government power was wrested away. Such illegal acts of innumerable kinds and limitless gravity were unleashed by the Chinese.

8) In 1959, His Holiness the Dalai Lama fled to India, where he abrogated the 17-Point Agreement, saying it had long ceased to be valid and binding. And he announced to the whole world about all the atrocities committed by the Chinese invaders in Tibet. On the basis of petitions submitted to it, the General Assembly of the United Nations passed three resolutions on Tibet, namely in 1960, 1961 and 1965. These resolutions called for mandatory compliance with the Charter of the United Nations and the basic provisions of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights. They called for the cessation of all actions that had led to the denial of the Tibetan people's fundamental human rights, including their right to self-determination and their freedoms.

9) In 1959, the International Commission of Jurists carried out an investigation by interviewing large numbers of people on both the Tibetan and Chinese sides. And their final conclusion was that from 1912 onwards, Tibet remained a fully independent country, both in fact and in law. It further said, very clearly, that there was an attempt to obliterate the Tibetan people as a religious group, which it said was a violation of the international law concerning the genocide of a people. In that way, the communist government of China sought to carry out its policies of expansionism and colonialism. The fact that it continues such policy today has spurred many countries, parliaments, jurists and human rights organisations to research this aspect of Sino-Tibetan relations and to bring out all kinds of findings and opinions on a continuing basis to this day. In view of this, the big question today concerns the resolution of the Sino-Tibetan issue; no purpose will be served in debating petty issues.

Nevertheless, because the Chinese side has already published these documents, leaving them unanswered would not be comprehended as a show of broadminded tolerance on the part of the Tibetan side; rather, it would enhance the Chinese side's sense of conceited arrogance and there is no knowing what audacious lies they will tell next. Therefore, we offer gists of analyses of the above routine Chinese claims under the relevant points below.

### **Point No. 51**

Document Number 97 is titled as "Instructions Issued by the Dalai Lama to the Acting Prime Ministers Concerning the Holding of Peace Talks". The body of the document states:

"To the Acting Prime Ministers Lo and De,<sup>15</sup>

“The peace talks between Tibet and China is to be held in Beijing itself. For this purpose, the head of our government envoy, the Domey Governor and Additional Kalon Ngapo, accompanied by assistants Khenrim Thubsam, and such other officials as may be required should leave Chamdo immediately. From here assistants Dzasag Khemey and Kendrung Thubten Tendar will be sent via India, taking with them instructions on the points to be discussed and greeting-gifts to be presented to Chairman Mao and other Chinese leaders. Discuss these points carefully after you all gather in Beijing. The instructions for Ngapo and the copies for you to read have been sent through our pony express messenger. Adequate money for the expenses Kalon Ngapo and the others will require for the duration of their stay in Beijing should be arranged for by you. As soon as these are ready, send them, along with the instructions, for Ngapo in Chamdo by pony express messenger, accompanied by as strong a contingent of guard troops as may be needed.

“Issued from Drotoe Dhungkar Gon Tashi Lhundrub on the 16th day of the 1st month of the Iron-Rabbit Year.”

This decree bearing the Bugdham [seal] of the Dalai Lama had already been sent from Dromo to the two acting Prime Ministers at Lhasa. This once again shows how the Chinese government goes about manipulating facts. For example, in this case while it has produced an internal Tibetan government document in the book, it has entirely ignored a 1949 letter sent by the Tibetan Foreign Affairs Bureau to Mao Zedong through India, and the one sent by His Holiness the Dalai Lama in 1950, immediately after assuming state power in Tibet, through the top

Chinese military officer in Chamdo. Why have these documents, which have direct bearing on Sino-Tibetan relations, been entirely ignored? Are these documents not real documents dealing with Sino-Tibetan relations? Taking recourse to such improper acts of deception can never be becoming of the rulers of a country of over a billion people.

### **Point No. 52**

Document Number 98 is titled as “Notice from the People’s Liberation Committee of Chamdo Prefecture of the People’s Republic of China”. And the document’s text reads:

“Note from the office of the committee especially set up for the liberation of the people of the Domey region of the People’s Republic of China.

“In accordance with the cabled order from the Southwest Military and Administrative Commission of the People’s Republic of China, since the Domey region has recently been liberated, the People’s Liberation Committee of Chamdo Prefecture has been set up to render help and support for the protection of the life and property of the people of the region, to ensure respect for their religious belief, to protect the temples and monasteries, and to ensure public order and security under the new revolutionary order. The committee, which should assume responsibility for supervising both military and administrative matters, and for co-ordinating relations between the People’s Liberation Army and the local areas,

shall be made up of: Wang Qimei, Tashi Namgyal, Wooser Namgyal, Gao Heng, Xia Zhongyuan, Khargo Tulku, Lobsang Gyaltzen, Pamda Rabga, Pamda Tobgyey, Hui Yiran, Chen Jingbo, Tersey Chimey, Tsogo Sey, Horkhang Sey, Ngapo, Jedrung, Ngawang Gyaltzen, Loden Sherab Hothokkhetu, Norgye Lobsang Namgyal, Lobsang Konchog, Phuntsok Wangyey, Li Anzhai, Yu Shiyu, Phagpalha Lobsang Lungtog Hothokkhetu, Sherab Sengey, Zhiwalha Hothokkhetu, Wu Zhong, Yin Fatang, Kalsang Wangdu, Jampa Woegen, Tseyang Palmo, Chen Zizhi, Zhou Jaiding, Wogma Sonam Tsering, and Song Song. These are the 35 especially appointed members of the committee. Ten more members are to be appointed to the committee, consisting of one each from Dzayul, Shopado, Gojo, Lhozong, Tsawarong, and Tsakha, and two each from Powo [Bomi] and the 39 tribes. Wang Qimei is to be the chairman of the committee while Phagpalha Lobsang Lungtog Hothokkhetu, Ngapo, Loden Sherab Hothokkhetu, Pamda Tobgyey, Phuntsog Wangyey, Hui Yiran, Tseyang Palmo, and Kalsang Wangdu are to be the Vice-chairmen. In accordance with instructions received, the office of the new committee was set up on 1 January. Wang Qimei and the others assumed office on 1 January to serve the Tibetan people in accordance with the policies concerning nationality affairs issued by the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, and the notices released by the Southwest Military and Administrative Commission, the Southwest Military Area of the Chinese People's Liberation Army and its Tibet Front Headquarter. Announcement has accordingly been issued to the public.



“Chairman Wang Qimei; Vice-chairmen Phagpalha Lobsang Lungtog Hothokkethu, Ngapo, Loden Sherab Hothokkethu, Pamda Tobgyey, Phuntsog Wangyey, Hui Yiran, Tseyang Palmo, and Kalsang Wangdu; 1951”

What the above document shows is that the communist government of China, in flagrant violation of international law, launched an invasion of Tibet and then took credit for its evil action by announcing the setting up of the so-called People’s Liberation Committee of Chamdo Prefecture. If the announcement — which, in essence, says that the life and property of the people of the region will be protected, that their religious beliefs will be fully respected, that the temples and monasteries will be protected, etc. — had been properly implemented as promised, it would have been possible for the Sino-Tibetan relations to improve to a level better than it is now and the situation in the land would, likewise, have been better than it is now. Nevertheless, what the Chinese have done in Tibet since 1951 and what the consequences have been of those actions could be clearly seen from the indelible scars that blot the hearts of both the Tibetans and Chinese and also from the clear historical records.

### **Point No. 53**

Document Number 99 is titled as “Proclamation of the Southwest Military and Administrative Commission and the Southwest Military Area of Chinese People’s Liberation Army”. And the document’s content states:

“The following proclamation is issued by the Southwest Military and Administrative Commission and

the Southwest Military Area of Chinese People's Liberation Army.

“Deeply concerned about the Tibetan people who have long suffered from the unbearable oppression of the U.S. and British imperialism and the reactionary Chiang Kai-shek government, Chairman Mao Zedong of our Central People's Government and the Commander-in-chief Zhu De of the People's Liberation Army instructed our army units to move into Tibet in order to help the Tibetan people to rid themselves of this oppression once and for all. All our citizens in Tibet, lay or ecclesiastical, should unite as one both in mind and spirit to assist the People's Liberation Army to the best of their abilities to expel the forces of the imperialist nations with their evil designs. This will, no doubt, not only help the people of Tibet to realise regional national autonomy but should also contribute towards the establishment of a relationship of fraternal affection and mutual help with the people of all other nationalities in the country; and it will enable everyone to work together to build a new Tibet and a new China.

“After the People's Liberation Army moves into Tibet, the entire people there, both the lay and ecclesiastical, will have a patron-protector for their lives and properties, and for them to exercise their freedom of religious belief. All the monasteries, temples, etc., will not only be protected but also the people's living conditions will be improved by the initiation of developments in the fields of education, agriculture, animal husbandry, industry, and trade. The existing political system and military establishment in Tibet will not be altered. The existing strength of the Tibetan

army will become part of the border security force of the People's Republic of China. Religious and secular officials at all levels [of the Tibetan government] as well as tribal chiefs are allowed to hold office as usual. When undertaking any reform in Tibet, consultations will be held with both Tibet's citizenry and their leaders and final decision will be taken only on the basis of the fundamental wishes of the general Tibetan masses. Officials who were formerly pro-imperialist and pro-Guomindang may still hold office provided that they manifest clear signs of having broken off their relations with the imperialists and the Guomindang and that they are no longer involved in sabotage and resistance against us. There will also be no investigations of their past misdeeds.

“The People's Liberation Army is a highly disciplined force. It will definitely carry out the above-mentioned policies of the Central People's Government. In view of this, it respects the Tibetan citizens' freedom of religious beliefs, local customs, traditions and habits. They speak politely and conduct their buying and selling activities fairly. They are not allowed to take from the people even a single needle or a strand of thread. When needing to borrow anything, they seek prior consent from the owners thereof. In case of any damage or breakage, they are to pay compensation at the prevailing local market value. For the people hired as workers as well as for availing packhorse services from the people, appropriate payment must be made. There shall be no forced availing of foods, fodders and supplies. The People's Liberation Army is the army of the people of all nationalities in China, serving them with whole-hearted commitment. It is important for everyone to keep in mind

that the entire Tibetan people, whether they are engaged in agriculture, animal husbandry, industry, or trade, should remain at ease in their works and lives. They should not listen to rumours and thereby confuse and mentally disturb themselves.

“This proclamation is issued by Liu Bocheng, Chairman of the Southwest Military and Administrative Commission; He Long, Commander of the Southwest Military Area of the Chinese People’s Liberation Army; Deng Xiaoping, Political Commissar of the Southwest Military Area of the Chinese People’s Liberation Army.

“... 1950”

If one were to discuss Sino-Tibetan relations on the basis of the contents of this document alone under international law, one can clearly make out what is black and what is white. As to how, it could be seen that this document contains nothing but exaggerated lies and clear records of illegal conducts on the part of the communist Chinese:

1) This document actually states that “Our People’s Liberation Army was sent to Tibet to free the Tibetan citizens from the unbearable oppression they were long subjected to under the U.S. and British imperialism and the reactionary Chiang Kai-shek government.” Although the British, with their 1904 military expedition to Lhasa, etc., did oppress Tibet, they did not at all interfere in the country’s political and governmental affairs. As regards the U.S., they all the more did not at all interfere in Tibet’s affairs. The Guomindang also never exercised any political power in Tibet. Thus, even though such was the situation concerning

Tibet with regard to these powers, the communist Chinese have told such exaggerated lies and made such criticisms of these governments as stated in that document. It would be interesting to see how these three governments would respond to the allegations of unbearable oppressions the communist Chinese say they had inflicted on the people of Tibet.

2) The Communist Chinese claims that they especially sent their People's Liberation Army troops into Tibet to help free the people there from the unbearable oppression inflicted on the Tibetan people by these three countries. But this itself shows how nakedly illegal the sending of the Chinese troops into Tibet was. For example, previously, when Tibet faced an invasion by the Gorkha army from Nepal, the Tibetan government appealed to the Manchu government [of China] which sent its troops into Tibet. This was in conformity with the established practice for sending troops from one country into another. But in the case of the 1950 event, there was no request from the Tibetan government and the communist Chinese army had no right to be in Tibet. Therefore, if their presence in Tibet was not illegal, what was it?

3) The communist Chinese have claimed in this document that by expelling the forces of the imperialist powers, Tibet was put on the sure path of realising regional national autonomy. On that basis, which country does it claim was exercising foreign authority over Tibet before the arrival of the communist Chinese troops? The fact is that apart from some parts of Dotoe and Domey regions, which remained to be returned to Tibet after many years of being under the occupation of successive Han expansionists, the whole of the country was otherwise under the undisputed rule of the Tibetan government. This situation was obvious to the whole

world. Yet, the communist Chinese have been crazy enough to actually make such wild claims.

4) The communist Chinese have claimed in this document that they sent their People's Liberation Army troops into Tibet to help free its people from the unbearable suffering inflicted by the U.S. and British imperialists and the reactionary Chiang Kai-shek government, and that by expelling the forces of the imperialist powers out of it, they put the Tibetan people on the sure path of realising regional national autonomy. But as to what kind of freedom from suffering the Tibetan people came to supposedly enjoy after the arrival of the communist troops, and what kind of regional national autonomy they came to live under, the facts are obvious to everyone. The Tibetan people came to be deprived of all their human rights, were condemned to suffer oppression and discrimination under great Chinese nationalist chauvinism, denied all freedoms to preserve their own religion and culture, and came to see both their country and its rich diversity of natural resources plundered. All these resulted after the arrival of the communist Chinese troops in Tibet.

5) The question is, were the promises ever kept? That after the communist troops entered Tibet, there would be protection of life and property of the people? That there would be full freedom of religious belief and that the temples and monasteries would be protected? Far from protecting the Tibetan people's lives and properties, the opposite happened: over one-sixth of Tibet's population, amounting to over 1.2 million people, lost their lives. Far from protecting the Tibetan people's religious beliefs and their temples and monasteries, over 90 percent of the religious places, amounting to over six thousand of them, big and small, were

obliterated without a trace and the evidence of all this is writ large in Tibet.

### **Point No. 54**

Document Number 100 is titled as “The Agreement Between the Central People’s Government and the Local Government of Tibet on Measures for the Peaceful Liberation of Tibet”. As can be seen, this is the 17-Point Agreement.

1) If we examine the factors underlying the signing of this agreement between Tibet and China, we will notice that if Tibet was truly part of China, as wished by the communist Chinese government, there would have been no need for signing an agreement between the two sides on such matters because it will then be a matter of internal concern. Nevertheless, because Tibet, indeed, was not part of China, it became unavoidable for an agreement to be signed between the two sides.

2) Looked from another perspective, this agreement was designed as an attempt to put a mask of legality on Communist China’s invasion of Tibet — an invasion in flagrant violation of international law. But even then, this agreement was not concluded by mutual consent of the two parties; rather, one party coerced the other to accept it. In view of this, it was a second-time illegal act on the part of the Chinese. The agreement, therefore, can never be a basis for any legal course of action.

3) The fact that the agreement was signed under duress could be made out as obvious from a number of provisions within its terms. To cite just some examples:

a) At the very beginning, the Preamble of the agreement says: “The Tibetan nationality is one of the nationalities with a long history within the boundaries of China and, like many other nationalities, it has performed its glorious duty in the creation and development of our great motherland.” But if as written, the Tibetan nationality is just one of the many nationalities within China, what was the need to conclude an agreement with them? And what glorious duties, if at all, did the Tibetan people perform when, if ever, in the course of the creation and development of China?

b) Point No. 1 of the agreement says: “The Tibetan people shall unite to drive the imperialist forces of aggression out of Tibet and they shall return to the large family of the motherland — the People’s Republic of China.” How should the imperialist forces of aggression be driven out of Tibet when there was none at all? The contention that the Tibetan people should return to the large family of “their” Chinese motherland starkly exposes the claim in the Preamble that the Tibetan nationality is one of the nationalities with a long history within the boundaries of China as absolutely false and renders the two contradictory of each other. If the Tibetan nationality was, indeed, already a part of the large family of China, what was the reason for them to be needed to return to the family? It might be claimed, however, that there is no contradiction here because Tibet previously was part of China, but that it later got separated and existed separately due to alleged machinations plotted by the foreign imperialist powers. This too cannot at all be true.



The only presumptive basis for any claim that Tibet previously was part of China would relate to the period of the Mongol rule. However, far from Tibet being part of China during that period, it was Tibetans who, during the rule of the Mongol emperors over conquered China, held the positions of both political and religious imperial advisors and the powers over them. Tibet itself was a fully independent country. Regarding this, there is a book titled *The Mongols and Tibet: A Historical Assessment of Relations between the Mongol Empire and Tibet* published in 1996, which will facilitate a very clear understanding of the issue.

Besides, it is impossible that the Tibetan delegates could have ever employed such overbearingly phrased terms upon themselves — phrases such as that the imperialist forces of aggression “shall be driven out” or that the Tibetans “shall return” to the large family of the motherland. This being the case, it appears as extremely clear that the leaders of the communist Chinese government were unable to subdue their arrogant exertion of aggression and brought it out in the form of naked words to express them.

c) Point No. 2 says: “The local government of Tibet shall actively assist the People’s Liberation Army to enter Tibet and consolidate the national defence.” This point demands that the Tibetan side assist the aggressive entry into Tibet of the communist troops to enable them to carry out the wishes of the Chinese rulers. Who can ever possibly believe that a clause like this reflected a mutual agreement between two equal partners?

d) Point No. 8 says, “The Tibetan troops shall be reorganised by stages into the People’s Liberation Army and become a part of the national defence forces of the People’s Republic of China.” What this shows is that while China claims itself to be a country with many minority nationalities, and that the Tibetans are but one such minority nationality, the existence of an army of their own on the part of the Tibetans alone represents an unbearable pain in its heart. After all, having an army of its own is an important symbol of an independent country. In view of this, the Chinese set out to dissolve the Tibetan army in the manner of water being made to seep into sand, and, thereby, out of existence.

e) Another proof that China set out to militarily conquer Tibet irrespective of whether an agreement could or could not be finalised could be seen from the fact that while the discussions on the Sino-Tibetan agreement were going on in Beijing, Chinese army officer Luo Yuhung who was an observer there, records in his diary, that on 29 April 1951, during the first negotiation meeting in Beijing, “Ngapo said that the troops of the People’s Liberation Army in Nagchu and Xinjiang were continuing their assault march, rendering it difficult for the Dalai Lama to remain in Tibet. In view of this, he suggested that further march of the PLA troops be halted. He offered to send a telegram to the Dalai Lama in the name of the Tibetan envoys in the event that his suggestion is accepted. To this, comrade Li Weihuan replied that he would forward the request to the Central Government.”

Luo has also written that during the discussions in the meeting on 2 May 1951, “Ngapo put it

on the table that the issue of the advance of the PLA troops was a critical issue. To this, Li Weihan replied that the march of the PLA troops into Tibet was a final decision of the Central Government. Tibet is an inalienable part of China. The whole of China must be liberated. The march of the PLA troops into Tibet is beneficial to the Tibetan people; it is also beneficial to the whole country. ... There is no requirement for the Tibetans to locally supply provisions to the People's Liberation Army, so its entry cannot be a burden on the Tibetan masses."

However, while orally it was stated that there was no requirement for the Tibetans to locally supply provisions to the arriving People's Liberation Army, it is stated in the agreement that the local government of Tibet shall actively assist the People's Liberation Army to enter Tibet and consolidate the national defence. This is just another example of inconsistency in the Chinese position. Anyone who reads points a) to e) above cannot fail to clearly notice, at once, that the communist Chinese simply exercised power politics on the Tibetans and wrote into the agreement whatever they felt like writing.

4) Point No. 4 of the agreement says: "The central authorities will not alter the existing political system in Tibet. ... The officials of all ranks shall hold office as usual." Point No. 7 says: "The policy of freedom of religious belief laid down in the Common Programme of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference shall be executed. The religious beliefs, customs and habits of the Tibetan people shall be respected, and the Lamaseries shall be protected. The central authorities will not effect any change in the income of the monasteries." And Point No. 11 says: "In matters related to various reforms in Tibet, there will be no

compulsion on the part of the central authorities. The local government of Tibet should carry out reforms of its own accord, and when the people raise demands for reform, they shall be settled by means of consultation with the leading personnel of Tibet.” The question how the communist Chinese themselves went about totally ignoring and breaching these provisions of the agreement has already been dealt with in Point No. 50 above and let there be no need to repeat these here.

5) In particular, Point No. 15 of the agreement says: “In order to ensure the implementation of this agreement, the Central People’s Government shall set up a military and administrative commission and a military area command in Tibet, and, apart from the personnel sent there by the Central People’s Government, shall employ as many local Tibetan personnel as possible in the work. Local Tibetan personnel taking part in the military and administrative commission may include patriotic personages from the local government of Tibet, all districts and leading monasteries; the name list shall be drawn up after consultation between the representatives designated by the Central People’s Government and the various quarters concerned, and shall be submitted to the Central People’s Government for appointment.” It is thus seen that while from a general point of view consent to this agreement was obtained under duress, with threats of use of military force, in its specific terms, the task of implementing its provisions was assigned to a military and administrative commission and a military area command, both to be set up in Tibet. This very clearly shows that Tibet was, even from that time onwards, to be ruled by use of military force.

Although signing treaties and agreements between two countries is an established practice in international relations, there has never been a practice whereby one country sets up a military

and administrative commission in the other country for the purpose of implementing the same. It may be suggested, however, that because the military and administrative commission included Tibetan members as well, it was not a one-sided body. But this was merely for form's sake, for in substance it was entirely a Chinese commission. How?

Because it was not considered proper for the Tibetan members to be nominated by the Tibetan side, rather they were all to be selected by the Chinese government only. Also, at that time, although the Tibetan delegates had their own individual official seals with them, they, being not happy with the terms of the agreement, lied that they had not brought them with them. The Chinese simply had duplicates of the seals made in Beijing and affixed them to the agreement. Since the Chinese were not familiar with the Tibetan script, Sampho Tenzin Dhondub's name was misspelled in the duplicated seal. Thus even the lowliness of the quality of the communist Chinese dealings, designed to suit their own sweet desires, are also scripted on the document in question.

### **Point No. 55**

Document Number 101 is titled as "The Fourteenth Dalai Lama's Message Cabled to Chairman Mao Zedong, Expressing Support for the Agreement". And the document's content reads:

"24th day of the 8th month, the Iron-Rabbit Year

"Scrutinised, Iron-Rabbit Year

"The following is a copy of the actual document kept

at the Yigtsang and already telegraphed to the head of the people's government of China, Chairman Mao Zedong, bearing the seal and signature of His Holiness the Dalai Lama and expressing support for the Agreement.

“Your Excellency, Chairman Mao Zedong, the Head of the people's government of China

“This year the local government of Tibet dispatched a delegation of five representatives, led by Kalon Ngapopa, to hold talks for a peaceful settlement with the people's government of China; the delegates arrived in Beijing at the end of April 1951. Upon their arrival, the people's government of China at once appointed its representatives. On the basis of friendship between the two sides, the two delegations held their talks, the outcome of which was a mutually accepted Agreement on Measures for the Peaceful Liberation of Tibet. The terms of this agreement, which was signed on 23 May 1951, was accepted by the local government of Tibet as well as the entire people — both the ecclesiastical and the laity — of Tibet.

“I am writing this to inform you that on the basis of this acceptance and under the leadership of Chairman Mao and the people's government of China, we have been actively assisting the People's Liberation Army to enter Tibet to help consolidate the national defence and to drive out the coercive imperialist influences from here and to thereby safeguard the unification of the territory and the sovereignty of the country.

“Sent by the Dalai Lama of the local government of Tibet on 24 October 1951, corresponding to the 24th day of the 8th month of the Tibetan Iron-Rabbit Year.”

Firstly, an agreement like this was concluded under duress, without any question of a free consent, and with the Tibetan delegates having had no freedom to consult their own government. Secondly, with the communist troops already constantly streaming into Lhasa at that time in large numbers, the situation was so hopeless that the Tibetans had no alternative but to seek whatever little benefits they could hope to obtain under the agreement. It was because of this that His Holiness the Dalai Lama was forced to send the telegram, agreeing to respect the terms of the agreement, a fact that could very obviously be made out from the wording of that telegram. As to how this is so:

1) The agreement talks about the delegates from the two sides having held their talks “on the basis of friendship” and its outcome being “a mutually accepted agreement”.

2) It could be seen very clearly that without incorporating the phraseology of “under the leadership of Chairman Mao and the people’s government of China, we have been actively assisting the People’s Liberation Army to enter Tibet to help consolidate the national defence and to drive out the coercive imperialist influences from here and to thereby safeguard the unification of the territory and the sovereignty of the country” the telegram would not have been acceptable to the Chinese leadership.

As regards the question whether the discussions took place in a friendly manner or whether the outcome was, indeed, a mutually accepted agreement, the separate memoirs of Khemey Sonam

Wangdu and Sampho Tenzin Dhondup, who were among the Tibetan delegates to the talks, as well as that of Takla Phuntsok Tashi, who was the Tibetan translator there, written after they reached the free India, record everything with great clarity.

3) When Mao Zedong came to know clearly that neither His Holiness the Dalai Lama nor the Tibetan public accepted the agreement, he spoke about it on 6 April 1952. This could be seen on page 75 of Volume V of his Selected Works, where it is written in very explicit terms that: “Not only the two Silons [Prime Ministers], even the Dalai and most of his clique were reluctant to accept the agreement and are unwilling to carry it out inasmuch as they had no choice but to accept it. We do not, as yet, have a material base for fully implementing the agreement, nor do we have a base for this purpose in terms of support among the masses or in the upper stratum.”

As regards the reason why the Chinese have now recorded this telegram from the Dalai Lama, intimating his acceptance of the agreement, in this book, it is designed simply to mislead those in the international community who do not have an understanding of the issue.

Document Number 102 is titled as “Chairman Mao Zedong’s Reply Cable to the Dalai Lama”. And the document’s content states:

“Mr. Dalai Lama,

“I have received your telegram dated 24 October 1951. I wish to express my thanks to you for the efforts you are making in the implementation of the Agreement on Measures for the Peaceful Liberation of Tibet and also extend heartfelt congratulations to you.



“Mao Zedong

“26 October 1951”

This is but only a reply to the previous telegram.

### **Point No. 56**

Document Number 103 is titled as “Chairman Mao Zedong’s Letter to the Dalai Lama”. And the document’s content reads:

“Dear Dalai Lama,

“I was very pleased to receive your letter dated 6 July 1956<sup>16</sup>. You are always in my mind, and I still remember the happy times we spent together when you were in Beijing. When shall I be able to see you again? Probably after waiting for about three years, during the Second National People’s Congress, which I am sure you will again come to attend. I feel sure that the many works you have done since your return [to Tibet] have been all good. The Preparatory Committee of the Tibet Autonomous Region will soon be established and people of all nationalities are sure to feel immensely happy about it. Tibet is in a period of continuous progress. Of course, we should not be impatient and if there is some amount of progress each year that should suffice. Please take good care of your health. The situation here is good.

“We have made some mistakes and these are now being criticised and rectified. China is a large country; however,

at the moment, it is not that prosperous or strong. But we hope that with the combined efforts of all the nationalities and the completion of several five-year plans, China can become a strong and prosperous country. Tibet has a promising future and you should do your best to realise it. I was very pleased to see the Tibetan flower that you had enclosed in your envelope. I too am sending to you a flower in return. I look forward to continuing to receive more information from you. Write to me about whatever matter you may have in mind. It would be great if you would dispense with formalities in your writings. Please ask Comrade Zhang Guohua on any other matters. I have already told Zhang Guohua to earnestly seek advice from you.

“Best wishes for your health and happiness.

“Mao Zedong

“24 November 1955”

This is a reply from Mao Zedong to a letter sent by His Holiness the Dalai Lama following a journey he had undertaken to China in 1954 and after he returned to Tibet in 1955. But the Chinese action here is so perverted that it has not recorded in this book the important letter sent by the Dalai Lama.

As regards the general terms of affection used by Mao in his reply, they were undoubtedly influenced by the fact that during his stay in China, His Holiness the Dalai Lama met with Mao Zedong on many occasions, during which the latter gained firsthand knowledge about numerous and significant qualities of the former, such as the greatness of his knowledge, his adaptive

liking for revolutionary modern ideas, the nature of his concern for the well-being of the masses, and his attention to modern science and technology, which greatly impressed him. An indication that he was greatly impressed thus could be seen from the fact that as His Holiness the Dalai Lama prepared to return to Tibet from Beijing, Mao told him during their last meeting, “I appreciate your worldview and situation. Nevertheless, religion is poison. It suffers from two major defects. It will obstruct the population growth and national progress. Both Tibet and Mongolia are infected with religious poison.” This was a spontaneous outburst from Mao.

### **Point No. 57**

Document Number 104 is titled as “Prime Minister Zhao Enlai’s Letter to the Dalai Lama”. And the letter’s content reads:

“Dear Dalai Lama,

“We were very happy to receive your letter dated 28 May 1956<sup>17</sup>. After returning to Beijing, Vice-Premier Zhen Yi presented to us a report on the actual establishment of the Preparatory Committee of the Tibet Autonomous Region and the progress of the work on all fronts in Tibet. The establishment of the Preparatory Committee of the Tibet Autonomous Region is not a small accomplishment. It is owing to several years of work toward achieving unity and progress in Tibet on the part of yourself and the Panchen Erdini that these results have been achieved.

“The task of the Preparatory Committee for Tibet Autonomous Region is an arduous one. Nevertheless, we

remain confident that with the strengthening of internal unity within Tibet, anything could definitely be accomplished. The people of Tibet will definitely repose faith in it if in its future work the Preparatory Committee could demonstrate that it is taking into consideration in substantive measures the interests of the Tibetan people of all social strata. For the benefit of the Tibetan people, we should not rush too hastily into such endeavours. Rather, we must plan beforehand and proceed forth step by step. If you come across any difficulties in your work, please write or cable us at any time to discuss them with us and the Central People's Government will offer you all the help it can.

“Your elder sister Yabshi Tsering Dolma mentioned to me that you have been troubled that some of your family members have moved abroad. I can well understand your feeling. Nevertheless, I feel that there is no need for you to feel concerned because your situation is entirely different from theirs. You not only have faith in the nationality policies of the Central Government but have also personally witnessed the famed socialist construction works being carried out. Since the peaceful liberation of Tibet, you have not only taken a far-sighted stand on the relationship between the Central Government and Tibet and the internal unity of Tibet but have also played active role and made efforts in these. In view of this, the Central Government and Chairman Mao have firm trust in you.

“Concerning the matter of your relatives living abroad, it is a fact, according to our information, that American and British imperialists have been using them to harm the cause

of unity and progress in Tibet. These days, the American and British imperialist countries are setting up spy organisations with their base in Kalimpong and are constantly plotting various disruptive activities. We have to pay constant attention and be on the guard regarding this. Nevertheless, you need not rush in trying to persuade your relatives to return home. We notice that they have doubts about the unity of all the nationalities of our homeland and the progress Tibet has made in the past several years. They are, therefore, at the moment, hesitant to consider coming back to their country. However, you may, first of all, write to them constantly in an effort to make them understand the policies of the Central Government and the situation in Tibet. If, perhaps, they are in financial difficulties, you should find means to assist them. The main thing at present is that you should, through explanations, try to make them appreciate the existence of a state of happiness both in the motherland and at their homeland. Do not be impatient in your attempt to persuade them to return home or you will not succeed.

“Recently, both India and Nepal extended invitations to you to visit them and we are pleased with the replies you have given to them. (With regard to these matters of vital concern, the replies did not explicitly rule out visits, rather they stated that visits were not possible for the time being due to the fact that work at the Preparatory Committee of Tibet Autonomous Region was currently hectic.) In our view too, there was no better answer to give because, on the one hand, there is real need for you to preside over the work of the Preparatory Committee of Tibet Autonomous

Region while on the other hand we have to be earnestly cautious about the subversive activities of the American and British imperialist forces. Nevertheless, when it comes to the matter of your visits abroad, we must be very careful in our preparations. After we successfully concluded a trial internal air transport operation between Tibet and the Motherland, it has become more convenient for us to visit each other. The high altitude [of Tibet] is no longer a barrier that can stop us. You are always in our thoughts. In case I can find the time, I will certainly visit Tibet once and thereby fulfil my long-standing wish. I should be able to meet with you in Lhasa then.

“Thank you for the three fresh flowers you have sent me. I too have sent back fresh flowers to you. I wish you good health and success in your work.

“Zhao Enlai

“12 July 1956”

Here again, it is extremely unfortunate that only the reply is recorded, not the message that was sent on 28 May 1956. The fact is that although the contents of the letters from the Chinese leaders speak in extremely positive terms, the reality was that their actions were never in conformity with their writings. This was something like their routine nature. For example, in his letter, Zhao Enlai says, “The people of Tibet will definitely repose faith in it if in its future work the Preparatory Committee could demonstrate that it is taking into consideration in substantive measures the interests of the Tibetan people of all social strata. For the benefit of the Tibetan people, we should not rush too hastily

into such endeavours. Rather, we must plan beforehand and proceed forth step by step.”

Not only that, in 1956, when His Holiness the Dalai Lama visited India for the Buddha Shakyamuni commemoration ceremony, Zhao Enlai too had arrived in India and there met with His Holiness and promised to postpone the introduction of reforms in Tibet for five years. Nevertheless, the promise was broken in the Kham region of Tibet, so there were mass uprisings in many areas of it during 1956-57. Both Tibetans and Chinese needlessly lost lives in large numbers in these uprisings, an extremely tragic turn of events that are matters of common knowledge now.

### **Point No. 58**

Document Number 105 is titled as “Chairman Liu Shaoqi’s Letter to the Dalai Lama”. It is a reply-letter dated 24 August 1956. Document Number 106 is titled as “Vice-Chairman Zhu De’s Letter to the Dalai Lama”. This is a reply-letter dated 15 August 1956. Although both these two replies speak of letters dated 28 May 1956 having been received, none of these two letters have been included in the book.

In his reply-letter, Liu Shaoqi says: “At the inaugural meeting of the Preparatory Committee of the Tibet Autonomous Region, not only were consultations and discussion held on the works to be undertaken from now onwards in Tibet but also a resolution adopted. In view of this, even more favourable new conditions were created for the development and progress of the Tibetan people. We hope that you will take advantage of these to score even greater accomplishments than in the past. Still, even under these conditions, attention should be paid to ensuring the

continuance of equal good relations with the people from all sectors of society. In that way, works that need to be carried out should be sought to be accomplished on the basis of consultation with them so as to secure their approval and support. Social reform must be carried out step by step in accordance with the specific conditions in Tibet; hasty actions should be avoided.”

However, the question remains whether the actions from the Chinese side did conform to the letter’s contents. For example, in 1951, during the signing in Beijing of the so-called 17-Point Agreement, was there any consultation with the people from all sectors of society so as to secure their approval and support? Likewise, in the case of the initiation of social reform, there was, far from a step by step implementation, an approach of unnecessary haste and brutality. The result has been a permanent state of psychological trauma to the Tibetan people.

Zhu De’s reply says: “The establishment of the Preparatory Committee of the Tibet Autonomous Region has laid a more solid foundation for future development in Tibet. We are confident that the work in various fields in Tibet will progress and proceed even more smoothly and be more fruitful, if we can do more to unite every sector there and better co-ordinate the policies of the Central People’s Government and the specific characteristics of the Tibetan region on a step-by-step basis.”

An examination of what really took place, however, reveals everything totally different. As to how, in 1956, the Preparatory Committee of the Tibet Autonomous Region was established with its 51 members being made up of 15 appointees of the local Tibetan government, 10 each from Panchen Nanggang and the Chamdo Liberation Committee, 11 prominent scholars from the religious community and society, and five Chinese. What was the reason and design behind separating Chamdo and Panchen Nanggang



from the government of Tibet to which they actually belonged? If the contention was that Chamdo was an area already militarily liberated, what was the explanation concerning Panchen Nanggang?

These actions certainly did not show that the Chinese intended to lay a solid foundation for Tibet to progress and for its every sector to unite ever more; rather, they created an even more solid foundation for internally dividing up the Tibetan people and thereby use them for their own purposes. This could be clearly seen as very obvious in the actual conduct of the Chinese government.

### **Point No. 59**

Document Number 107 is titled as “Ode to Chairman Mao Zedong by the 14th Dalai Lama”. And the document’s content reads:

“The trinity of the Buddha, the Dharma and the Sangha — the Tri-ratna which bestows happiness on the world. Please protect us and let us bathe in your unparalleled, auspicious and everlasting brilliant glow!

“Chairman Mao, your honour and deeds are equal to those of Brahma who created the world, and those of the King of Universal Respect. Only a mass of boundless fortune could produce such a leader, one who shines upon the world like the sun.

“Your works are as valued as pearls, abundant and powerful like the tides of the sea

extending to the horizon.  
O, incomparably honourable Chairman Mao,  
may you live forever!

“People look on you as a loving mother and  
enthusiastically draw your picture.  
May you remain in this world forever to guide us down  
a road of eternal peace!

“Though the earth is vast, people struggle for breath  
in their bondage of darkness and pain.  
With a new radiance you have dispelled the darkness  
and broken the bondage, and people can now  
breathe freely and enjoy life.

“Your campaign of peace is like Mani’s white umbrella  
which shields the heavens, the earth and the  
people with pleasant coolness.  
Your fame is like the constant tinkling of a golden bell  
on the umbrella that for ever swings from the  
ceiling of the sky.

“Our enemy — cruel imperialism — is like a wriggling  
poisonous snake, an envoy from the devil.  
You are a fearless roc that overcomes it.  
May your might continue to increase forever!

“Culture and industry, which bring happiness and  
prosperity to the people and destroy the enemy’s armed  
forces, are like a wide sea swelling at every moment.  
They will be as perfect as the Kingdom of heaven.

“Shakyamuni’s religion of goodwill is like the clear  
and cool radiance of the infinite rays from  
the bright pearly moon.  
It is also like a pouch of Borneo camphor incense which  
we can now carry on our heads without restriction.  
This is truly something to be proud of!

“Your will is like a mass of clouds and your call is  
like the sound of thunder.  
A sweet rain constantly emanates from them to  
unselfishly refresh the world.

“As the Ganges is able to fill the land with its  
flood of precious sand,  
Peace and justice is able to bring happiness to  
all living beings.

“May this world become a place as full  
of content as Paradise!  
May the great leader, a torch for the world, shine forever!

“May the benevolence of Buddha, the supernatural  
power of Dharmapala and the true words of  
the God of Success make all my fine wishes come true!

“Besides having already wished to write an ode like this  
for you, I was last year asked to do so by Tulku Kalsang of  
Kagyur monastery in Inner Mongolia with gift offerings  
of a Mongolian style blue ceremonial scarf and a horse-  
hoof shaped Chinese silver ingot. Seizing this opportune  
moment, I penned the above ode for you, the splendidly  
fortunate born, the great master of humanity, the

outstanding Chairman Mao Zedong of the Central People's Government of China, for your long life and for the furtherance of your accomplishments.

“The Fourteenth Dalai Lama Ngawang Lobsang Tenzin Gyatso in the Kalsang Phodrang of Norbu Lingka Palace.”

The above was only in conformity with worldly customs in general and in keeping with the tradition of the Priest-Patron relationship between Tibet and China in particular. Especially, at that time, His Holiness the Dalai Lama was making efforts to ensure good relations with China, in addition to the fact that he had good perception of Mao's intentions. It was in view of these that His Holiness the Dalai Lama composed the ode, wishing for Mao's life, merits and renown to flourish and for all-round prosperity and happiness throughout the land.

## Eight Sections of Concluding Summaries

### Point No. 60

In the Foreword to the book *A Collection of Historical Archives of Tibet*, it is written, “China is an ancient, vast and multi-national country and the fact that the Tibetan nationality has become a part of the big family of the Chinese nation is a product of a long historical development.” We have already provided our brief explanation on this in the earlier part of this book. However, in keeping with the old saying about stressing what is important through repetitions, we are, in this concluding point, summarising the gist of it in the following eight sections.

1) From as far back as more than a millennium when Tibet’s king Songtsen Gampo took a Chinese Tang dynasty princess for his bride, there existed profound and extensive connections between the two countries in the fields of economy, culture, and other areas. However, it would be absolutely wrong to explain these as relationships within a single big family of a nation. During the reign of the Mewon Namsum [Tibet’s Three Great Kings, namely, Songtsen Gampo, Trisong Detsen and Tri-Ralpachen], the two countries were as much rivals at war as they were kinsmen at peace through marriages and, in that manner, existed as equal and independent countries. Evidence of this could be seen inscribed on a pillar in front of the Tsuglakhang in Lhasa. This pillar, inscribed with a treaty of “good relations between uncle and nephew”, was set up in the year 823 AD. At that time, there was no dispute at all in the nature of the relationship between China and Tibet.

2) In the year 845 AD, after the assassination of Tibet's king Lang Darma, the Tibetan kingdom disintegrated. The splintered Tibetan territories were ruled by his heirs, Woesung and Yumten, and their successive descendants. Some of the ministers also broke away with chunks of territories and ruled over them on their own. This state of affairs remained for over 400 years. In about the same period, the Tang dynasty's rule came to an end in China, which saw the beginning of rule by the Song dynasty. The Song dynasty, however, split into two: Southern and Northern. The power of the Northern Song dynasty was held by ethnic Manchu people and came to be known as Jin. The Southern Song dynasty power was held by Chinese. For a period of 346 years — from 881 to 1227 — a new nation called Minyag [Tangut] emerged between Tibet and China.

Thus, during the period the Tibetan kingdom remained in a state of disintegration; there was no relationship whatsoever between Tibet and China.

3) In the 13th century, when the Mongol emperors conquered almost the whole of Asia, there was no Chinese dynasty inasmuch as it was completely wiped out. Both Jin and Song rulers became ordinary subjects of the Mongol empire. The Sakya Drogon Choegyal Phagpa of Tibet became the imperial preceptor and political advisor to Kublai Khan, the founder of the Mongol [Yuan] dynasty. On that basis, the whole of Tibet came under the rule of the Sakyapas. Whatever relationship Tibet had with the conquerors of China during that period was a Tibet-Mongol relationship, not at all a Tibet-China relationship.

4) In 1368, China won its independence from the Mongol dynasty. The Chinese Ming dynasty took power and its successive

descendants held power till 1644, spanning a period of 276 years. During that period, Tibet was ruled successively by the Phagdrus, Rinpungpas and the Tsangpas. The kind of Sino-Tibetan relationship that existed during the period was in the form of some Lama chiefs presenting gifts to the Ming emperors who reciprocated by conferring on them complimentary titles and return gifts. These relationships were certainly ones between Tibet and China. However, they were merely a manner of conducting the kind of relationships that one routinely finds existing between neighbouring countries everywhere. They were not relationships of political or military character, or anything else of their kind inasmuch as such relationships never did exist during the period, when Tibet and China both remained independent, friendly and peaceful.

5) In 1644, The Chinese Ming dynasty lost its power and successive Manchu emperors ruled China until 1912, spanning a period of 268 years. During that period, Tibet was ruled by a succession of Dalai Lamas — from the Fifth to the Thirteenth — and their regents. With the Manchu emperors, the successive Dalai Lamas had a strong and special kind of Choe-yon relationship in the same way the Tibetans had with the Mongols during the Sakya rule in Tibet. In view of this, there was some amount of interferences in Tibet's political and military affairs by the Manchus. However, these were in the nature of assistances provided to carry out commitments flowing from the Choe-yon relationship and for the sake of ensuring good neighbourly ties. It was not at all because the Manchus had sovereign power over Tibet. There was no change at all in the basic situation of Tibet and the Manchus being equally independent and neighbouring countries. Besides, the relationship during this period was between Tibet and the Manchus, not at all between Tibet and China. During the period of the Manchu rule,

the Chinese rulers again stood eliminated, having become subjects of the Manchus.

6) In 1912, the Manchu dynasty came to an end and the Republic of China was established. Government power was held by a succession of military officers. This state of affairs remained for 37 years, until 1949. During this period, treaties were concluded between Tibet and China in 1914 and 1918; these obviously pertained to Sino-Tibetan relations. Politically, Tibet and China were equally independent, a fact well known throughout the world. The actual history, as stated above, was that throughout the period of Chinese Tang dynasty, Mongol dynasty, Chinese Ming dynasty, Manchu [Qing] dynasty and the Republic of China, Tibet retained all the attributes of an independent country. Given this fact, how could it be said that the Tibetan nationality has become a part of the big family of the Chinese nation as a product of the long historical development? There is no doubt that the truth will come out if the book *A Collection of Historical Archives of Tibet* — which is in fact a selection of documents that seek to prove Tibet to be a part of the big family of the Chinese nation — were presented for full discussion by both the Tibetans and Chinese under international law.

7) In 1949, as soon as they took control of China, the communist Chinese staked claim over Tibet and announced plans to “liberate” it. In 1950 the communist Chinese army, violating all norms of international law, invaded Tibet. In violation of the 1918 treaty, which provisionally fixed the Sino-Tibetan border, they seized Chamdo. In 1951, the Chinese compelled the Tibetans to sign the so-called 17-Point Agreement. Under the pretext of this agreement, the communist Chinese troops entered Tibet’s



capital, Lhasa. In 1959, China militarily suppressed Lhasa, and thereby seized complete control of Tibet. The Chinese action was outrageous and illegal and to this day remains a major basis for the Sino-Tibetan dispute internationally.

8) The level of international community's intellectual development in the 21st century has greatly advanced. As a result, it is no longer considered proper for one people to conquer and rule over another. In view of this, many peoples who had for long been suppressed under colonial rule have won their independence. In such a period, when these formerly colonially ruled countries enjoy their independence in the community of nations on the basis of equality, the communist Chinese have reverted to ideologies of around the 10th century AD in the name of revolution and advancement with a design to incorporate Tibet, an independent country for the past over one thousand years, into the communist ruled China. The Chinese actions have been nothing but naked exercise of colonial rule and expansionism, which the world community is actively resisting today.

In view of this, the Tibet issue is not just a subject of Sino-Tibetan dispute at a fundamental level, but also concerns the basic issues of truth and falsehood, legality, global peace and armed conflict. The United Nations Organisation (UNO), the global legal forums, the human rights organisations as well as the impartial and fair-minded figures should, for the sake of peace in the world in general and in Asia particularly, take earnest interest in the issue and ensure that the issues in dispute are fully resolved in a legally fair manner.

# Analysis of the Ming Dynasty Archives

## Point No. 12

Under the topic Ming Dynasty Archives, the book says, “The Ming dynasty archives reproduced here show that after it replaced the Yuan regime, the Ming court continued to exercise China’s sovereignty over Tibet. The difference in policy toward Tibet between the two is that the Yuan supported the Sakya-pa sect while the Ming fostered the Kagyu-pa sect. The Ming also adopted the special policy of creating as many fiefdoms as possible in Tibet and of bestowing honorific titles and rewards upon those who paid tribute to the court.”

1) If the Ming dynasty was indeed the successor to the Yuan dynasty, did the former exercise sovereign control over all the territories over which the latter did, or was it only over Tibet? And if the Ming dynasty indeed succeeded to all the territories of the Yuan Empire, could it be confirmed that, leave alone Russia and the other territories in general, did it set up offices and posted civilian and military officials even in Korea and Burma, as the Yuan dynasty did? If it was only with regard to Tibet that the Ming dynasty succeeded the Yuan dynasty, what was the reason?

2) During the Yuan period, it was the Sakya rulers who had complete governance authority over Tibet; the Yuan government never exercised any direct sovereign authority over it. Given this situation, the question obviously arises: inasmuch as the Yuan dynasty never exercised direct sovereign authority over Tibet, how could it be sought to be explained that the Ming dynasty, its

supposed successor, exercised such authority? This is nothing but an insane falsification of the most contemptible order.

3) Yet another matter out of order with the reality is the claim that the Yuan dynasty supported the Sakya-pa sect while the Ming dynasty fostered the Kagyu-pa sect. This is a baseless falsification. The Ming dynasty did not extend to the Phagdru rulers of Tibet the same level of government support the Yuan dynasty had extended to the Sakya rulers. The reason for this was that when Jhangchub Gyaltzen, the first Phagdru ruler, through assertion of his own power, established the Phagdru rule over Tibet in 1349, there was no Ming dynasty at all in existence. It was 19 years after Phagdru established his rule over Tibet that the Ming dynasty was finally founded in 1368.

4) During the Ming dynasty, many honorific imperial titles as well as awards and gifts were presented to the Lamas and leaders in Tibet in exercise of a special policy in regard to it. However, these practices were resorted to only as a means to maintain good neighbourly relations between the two countries, and the practice of exchanging honorific titles and gifts existed only with local level leaders. There was no significance, however, of any Ming dynasty sovereign authority over Tibet in these practices.

### **Point No. 13**

Document Number 23 is an edict issued by the Ming emperor Hongwu to someone called Choekun Kyab, granting him the title of Huaiyuan General.

Document Number 24 is an acknowledgement by Emperor Yongle of the gift of a horse presented to him by the Karmapa.

Document Number 25 is an edict from Emperor Yongle issued to the Sopa Chieftain Lhatsen Kyab, praising him for being a pious Buddhist and granting him the title and responsibilities of a Situ.

Document Number 26 is an edict issued by Emperor Yongle to Kashiwa Sonam Gon, praising him for his profound knowledge of the Buddhist doctrines and for leading the masses to the path of righteousness and, therefore, granting to him the responsibilities of the rank of Huaixenchenshi.

Document Number 27 is an edict issued to the Karmapa by Emperor Xuande, praising him for having always abided by religious discipline and devoting himself to teaching and spreading the Buddhist faith and, in view of this, bestowing upon him the responsibilities of the rank of Huaixenchenshi.

Document Number 28 is an edict issued by Emperor Zhengtong to the Karmapa, rewarding him with bolts of silk for working for the benefit of the sentient beings with compassion and kindness, as well as for his gifts of gold Buddhist images, horses, etc.

Document Number 29 is an edict issued by Emperor Chenghua to Namkha Tashi Gyaltzen Pal Sangpo, appointing him to succeed his father to the title and duties of Thu'u Kyu'u Wan [Assistant Prince of the Doctrine] and entrusting him to, henceforth, continue to disseminate, learn and practise Buddhist teachings and thereby propagate it.

Document Number 30 is an edict issued by Emperor Chenghua to the Karmapa, acknowledging the gifts sent by him through his envoys and rewarding him with bolts of silk.

Document Numbers 31 and 32 are two seals of the Karmapa, while Document Number 33 turns out to be the seal of the ruling chief, or Tripon, of the Drigung-pa.

## Point No. 14

1) Regarding the successive emperors of the Ming dynasty, they represented — unlike their predecessors, the Yuan dynasty, and their successors, the Qing dynasty — a history of real Chinese rule over China. On that basis, whatever relationship they had with Tibet represented the existence of a real relationship between Tibet and China. Let us examine the contents of the historical archives related to this period presented in the book.

To begin with, it could be stated at once that there is no conclusive evidence of any kind to prove that the Ming dynasty exercised direct sovereign authority over Tibet. The contents of most of the decrees issued by the Ming emperors, as presented in the book, deal with praises showered for religious deeds and with exchanges of gifts between the two sides. As regards the presentations and acceptances of the titles and the seals referred to in these archives, it should be noted that in those early periods, showering praises and exchanging gifts was an established practice for maintaining good relations between neighbouring countries. There was no sense or implication whatsoever that the recipients of the titles and seals were, therefore, under the sovereign jurisdiction of those making the presentations. Successive dynasties in China had adopted this practice not only with Tibet but also with all the neighbouring countries.

2) During the Ming dynasty, Tibet and China lived in harmony and friendship with each other, and there were no conflicts between them. There was no situation at all of officials of the Chinese Ming dynasty being permanently posted in Tibet; neither did the Chinese at that time exercise any kind of control or sovereign power over neighbouring Tibet. Tibet and China

thus remained as equally independent countries, at peace with each other.

3) As stated already, a considerable number of documents pertaining to the relationship between Tibet and the Yuan dynasty have not been seen included in the book *A Collection of Historical Archives of Tibet*. In the case of the relationship between the Ming dynasty and Tibet too, a number of significant documents pertaining to the period have not been included in the Ming dynasty section of the book. For example, in the early part of the period of its rule over China, when Tibet was being ruled by the Phagdrus, the Ming dynasty bestowed on successive Phagdru rulers numerous titles of praise and gifts. Likewise, when the Ming emperor invited him to visit China, Je Tsongkhapa declined it and, instead, designated Shakya Yeshe, one of his disciples, to undertake the journey. The Ming emperor duly appointed Shakya Yeshe his spiritual master and bestowed on him praises and titles. In the same vein, when the fifth Phagdru ruler Wang Dragpa Gyaltzen was invited to visit China, he declined it.

The question is, why these and other similar important events in relations between Tibet and China have not at all been mentioned in the book. The reason is simple: what else could it be but due to a nagging feeling that if the whole history was recorded, it would emerge as obvious that Tibet was fully independent at that time, being not subject to any sovereign decrees and orders from the Ming dynasty emperors. Whatever be the case, the fact remains that there is no way the real events of history can be concealed by anyone. We feel that in order not to render oneself an object of ridicule by the impartial observers, one should adhere to the path of truth and propriety.

# Analysis of the Qing, or Manchu, Dynasty Archives

## Point No. 15

Under the topic Qing Dynasty Archives, the book says: “From the emperors’ decrees, regulations, and notices in the Tibetan, Manchu, Mongolian and Chinese languages cited below it could be seen that the Qing government not only inherited the common system of sovereign administration of Tibet set up by the Yuan and Ming dynasties, but further strengthened its rule of Tibet with respect to politics, the economy, military affairs, personnel, diplomacy, religion and culture with the introduction of further improvements.”

1) As already examined and explained earlier, during the Yuan period, the emperors did not exercise direct sovereign authority over Tibet; rather, it was the Sakya rulers who independently governed the country. And during the Ming period in China, the emperors never had even an iota of say over the governmental affairs of Tibet. Nevertheless, it is being claimed that the Qing government inherited the Yuan and Ming dynasties’ common system of sovereign administration over Tibet. Such a claim betrays absence of shame borne of greed and is nothing but an all too often repeated claim totally lacking in truth.

Although the fourth Manchu emperor Qianlong [Namkyong or Lhakyong], in latter times, did interfere much in the affairs of Tibet, there was a proper reason for it. The Manchu government, being patrons, was simply discharging its obligation to serve the successive Dalai Lamas by extending co-operative assistance to them to ensure that the government of Tibet being

run by them flourished without any cause for decline. It was simply that, and did not amount to the Manchu government exercising sovereign authority over Tibet. Regarding this, the relevant matters have been explained in their own places in the following points.

2) The Qings or Manchus were, in language, tradition, and in every other respect, totally different from the Chinese; they were foreign invaders who subjugated China. There is absolutely no basis whatsoever for Tibet and China to dispute over this issue. Nevertheless, for as long as the Manchus ruled over China, there were many events in their relations with Tibet and they are dealt with in the passages that follow.

### **Point No. 16**

Document Number 34 is an entreaty issued by the Manchu emperor Shunzhi to the Panchen Lobsang Choegyen. It states:

“Decree from His Majesty the Emperor, who reigns by the mandate of heaven.

“Obeisance to the Panchen Huthugthu Tulku. I believe all is well with you. We are also well. In the interest of all living beings, I wait in earnest to meeting with the Dalai Lama in the seventh month of the year of the Dragon. Envoys have already been sent to extend a cordial invitation to him. I urge you to request the Dalai Lama to make the journey soon. ...

“The 2nd day of the 4th month of the 8th year of Shunzhi (1651).”



Document Number 35 is a letter of request from Emperor Shunzhi to the Fifth Dalai Lama. It says:

“Shunzhi’s decree.

“His Majesty the Emperor sends this decree to the Dalai Lama, the Supreme Dispenser of the greatest of Buddhist Benevolence in all the western lands, the All-Knowing, Vajradhara [Dorje Chang] Dalai Lama.

“By the grace of the gods in Heaven, we are keeping well. I felt extremely glad to learn that you, the All-Knowing Dalai Lama, are in good health. Despite such a great distance that separates us, I have been unceasing in my desire to honour you. In view of this, I have, at this time, dispatched Lama Sherab and Gelong Samten to extend my greetings to you.

“Shunzhi.

“The 24th day of the final (6th) month of summer of the 14th year of Shunzhi (1657).”

1) An examination of the contents of these two documents issued by the first Manchu emperor Shunzhi provokes one to ask the obvious question: do they patently justify the claim made by the compilers of the book being examined here in their preface under the section titled Qing Dynasty Archives that the Manchus exercised sovereign authority over Tibet? The reality was that it was because he obviously did not have any power to subject the sovereign ruler of Tibet, the Dalai Lama, to his commandments

that the Manchu emperor, offering respectful greetings, with accompaniment of gifts, beseeched the Panchen Lama to request the Dalai Lama to visit him. Likewise, in his appeal letter, the Manchu emperor praises the Fifth Dalai Lama with the titles of the Master of the Buddhist Faith and the All-Knowing Vajradhara; he says that even though separated by a vast distance between them, he remained unceasing in his desire to honour the latter.

It is, thus, obvious that the Manchu emperor viewed his connection with the Great Fifth Dalai Lama in the context of a Priest-Patron relationship between and of the two countries being of equal status. From the fact that the emperor held the Dalai Lama in such high esteem in these contexts, it could be clearly discerned that the Manchus, in issuing these documents, did not exercise any sovereign power over Tibet.

2) Just as in the previous comments, when it was shown that the book had concealed and omitted some significant documents pertaining to the periods of the Yuan and Ming dynasties, so also in the case of the Manchu period, important historical facts and documents have been concealed.

For example, take the case of the period when the Fifth Dalai Lama ruled over Tibet. In 1639, Ta'i Tsung, the second Manchu emperor, dispatched to Tibet Tsakhen Lama and a delegation led by him with the mandate to offer greetings to the Fifth Dalai Lama and to extend invitations to important Lamas. And in 1642, when Sechen Huthugthu, Dechen Dorje, and the delegation led by them sent by the Fifth Dalai Lama arrived at the Manchu Capital Shenyang, the emperor personally arrived at the guesthouse outside the palace gate to greet them. Again, in 1643, when the envoys departed for Tibet, the Manchu princes and senior ministers gathered at the imperial army training ground to organise

a grand ceremony to see them off. Praises and gifts were showered, which showed the Manchus and Tibet to be countries at equal level. Why has the historical facts about such events not been mentioned in the book?

3) If it is to be considered that the above developments relate to a period before the Manchu conquest and rule of China, then it should be noted that in 1644, when the Manchu emperor Shun Zhi conquered China, the Fifth Dalai Lama delegated Opashikhiya Theiji to offer congratulatory gifts to him. In 1648, the Manchu emperor Shun Zhi dispatched a delegation led by Sherab Lama to present an invitation to the Dalai Lama to visit China. In 1650, the Manchu emperor again invited the Dalai Lama to visit China, sending a delegation led by Nomchi Lama as his envoys for the purpose. In 1652, when the Great Fifth Dalai Lama left Lhasa and set out for China, the Manchu emperor especially dispatched a succession of top civil and military officials to extend truly grand receptions for him over long distances. And when he was at a distance of going from and returning to Peking in two days' time, the Ujhing Chingwang cavalry, made up of three thousand horsemen, which was especially designated by the emperor, accorded him an extremely grand welcome with displays of all kinds of weaponry, parasol, Gyaltzen [a religious ornamental display of multicoloured fabric item attached to a pole], and banners, with the playing of musical band.

The Manchu emperor Shun Zhi himself, while ostensibly on a hunting expedition, especially arrived at a place called Khothor to personally welcome the Great Fifth Dalai Lama. At the first meeting between the priest and the patron at the palace, the emperor walked forward over a distance of about 40 cubits [about 60 feet] and greeted the Great Fifth Dalai Lama by holding him

by his hands. They then walked together to sit on their respective seats. They had tea together. Within the vicinity of the emperor's palace in Peking, a magnificent palace called the Yellow Palace, resembling in splendour to a celestial garden place, including a courtyard enclosed by residential quarters, had especially been newly built for the Great Fifth Dalai Lama's residence. During successive meetings and banquets, Emperor Shun Zhi conferred on the Great Fifth Dalai Lama numerous official honours and titles befitting the latter's high status. And as the Great Fifth Dalai Lama travelled to Taika from Peking for his return journey to Tibet, Emperor Shun Zhi conferred on him the title of "Great, Good, Self-Existent Buddha of the Western Heaven, He Who Rules over the Buddhist Faith in the Empire, the All-Pervading Dorje Chang Dalai Lama." A gold seal and a royal proclamation depicting this title were issued by the emperor, along with other — including gift — offerings, and delivered to the Dalai Lama through officials who were especially designated for the purpose.

The Great Fifth Dalai Lama, in his turn, conferred on the Manchu emperor a poetically rendered proclamation along with a presentation of accompanying gifts. Events like these only show how the Manchus were in sovereign authority over China. And although the above was a very important event in the historical relationship between Tibet and the Manchus as countries, the book *A Collection of Historical Archives of Tibet* does not at all refer to it; why?

Concealing such real and important politically significant event in history, on the one hand, and distorting and greatly exaggerating other, minor aspects of the same history, on the other hand, remains an extremely erroneous mentality on the part of the occupying Chinese authorities at all levels. In view of this, they should consider totally eschewing such a vicious habit, take note

of the high standard of knowledge and practice attained by the 21st century intellectuals elsewhere and bring themselves up to their level. This would require them to realise that the common interest of themselves and others depend on adopting such a course of practice. It would be pertinent for them to thereby fully embrace fairness and righteousness for the common good of all.

### **Point No. 17**

Document Number 36 is a decree from the second Manchu emperor Dekyi [Kangxi] to Panchen Lobsang Yeshe, conferring on him the title of Panchen Erdini. Document Number 37 is again a decree issued by Emperor Dekyi to one Chogthu, rewarding him with the title of the First Level Theiji for his role during the suppression of the Mongol Jungarian rebellion.

The reason for praising the Panchen Lama with the title was for his predecessor's role in propagating and advancing the Buddhist faith and to greet him with an award and praise again out of a feeling of happiness. And the reason for rewarding Chogthu with the rank and title was that at that time the Manchus and the Jungars were in a continued state of belligerence and the action was a move to win friendship and alliance in that situation.

### **Point No. 18**

Document Number 38 is titled as "Kangxi's decree. Communication to the Sixth Dalai Lama, Promoter of Buddhism and Saviour of all Living Beings". It is a reply from Emperor Dekyi to the Sixth Dalai Lama for the greeting he had sent to him through his delegation

led by envoy Khenpo Lobsang Nyendak. It is sent on the 60th year of Emperor Dekyi in 1721.<sup>11</sup>

Document Number 39, also titled as “Kangxi’s decree. Communication to the Sixth Dalai Lama, Promoter of Buddhism and Saviour of All Living Beings”, is in similar terms as Document Number 38. It is a reply with gifts from Emperor Dekyi to the Sixth Dalai Lama for the greeting he had sent to him through his delegation led by envoy Tshendrog Khenpo Gendun Dhondup. It is sent on the 61st year of Emperor Dekyi in 1722.<sup>12</sup> It says:

“You have also said that you are grateful to me for being the great saviour of the entire subjects of Tibet from the fears as if from a torrent of inferno and for thereby enabling them to live in peace. You have offered a wish for me to live long and expressed a sincere desire for this to come true. On the basis of this fortunate development, I also wish for you, the Lama, to live long to continue the tradition of the Fifth Dalai Lama and thereby be of benefit and source of comfort to both the Buddhist faith and all living beings. In this milieu, I pray that we, the patron and the priest, be able to perform righteously positive deeds of rising magnitude. ...

“In reply to your well-composed offering of long-life wish for me, I am sending through your delegation led by envoy Tshendrog Khenpo Gendun Dhondup a fine selection of gifts put together in a box.”

Document Number 40 begins with “Decree of Emperor Yongzheng Who Reigns by the Mandate of Heaven. To the Sixth Dalai Lama, Promoter of the Buddhist Faith and Saviour of All

Living Beings.” This document is a decree sent by the Manchu emperor Yongzheng in the first year of his reign, in 1723, to the Seventh Dalai Lama Kalsang Gyatso, presenting him with an award of a title and a gold seal. This document states:

“You, the Lama, are to be commended for benefiting and ensuring the well-being of the Buddhist faith and of all living beings, while being in good health and untiringly applying yourself to the study of the scriptures. But then, what else can one’s expectations about these be? By the grace of Heaven, I too am in good health. In order to ensure harmony among the peoples living in the hundreds of lands I reign over, I accord equal treatment to all, whether they be within or outside. By ensuring in them faith in the law and counsel, I have secured the well-being of all living beings. To all those who single-mindedly remain committed to their ordination vows and properly follow the law of the land I offer praise and regard. In order to exemplify them, I confer honours and titles.

“You, the Lama, have been an object of affectionate attention by my emperor father who, in order to ensure the flourishing of the Yellow Hat sect and thereby to bring harmony to the Tibetan subjects, conferred on you the title of the Promoter of the Buddhist Faith and Saviour of All Living Beings, the Sixth Dalai Lama, along with a golden seal and a royal proclamation for it. Since I had these delivered to you in the West [Tibet] and you were enthroned, you have been diligent in the pursuit of your studies, have been very bright and intelligent, and, from a young age, have followed the tradition of fully devoting yourself to the interest of the faith and of all

living beings, as well as stringently adhered to your discipleship and religious vows. On this account, you are being held in highest degree of faith by both the leaders and subjects. I too hold you to be deserving of the highest level of praise.

“In view of all this, I, for the purpose especially of flourishing the Yellow Hat sect, and for ensuring a sustained era of happiness for the Tibetan subjects, offer praise to you, as was offered to the Fifth Dalai Lama. Accordingly, I have conferred on you the honourable title of the Lord of the Western Paradise, the one who has Supreme Command over all the Buddhist Doctrines on Earth, the All-Knowing Vajradhara Dalai Lama in the form of a golden seal, a royal proclamation and a decree as a manner, once again, of holding you in high esteem.

“All efforts on the affairs of Tibet will turn out to be highly beneficial and the subjects too will live in happiness if in all your important dealings henceforth on Tibet you will, as during the Fifth Dalai Lama’s period, confer well with all the Kalons responsible for all aspect of government functions. In that way, you should act in consonance with what I regard as of highest importance and make greater efforts at providing counsel and guidance to people to take them on the right path, as well as promoting and spreading the Buddhist faith ever more. It is important that you persevere and make the effort without distractions.”

Document Number 41 is a letter from Emperor Yongzheng in the fourth year of his reign to the Seventh Dalai Lama, Kalsang Gyatso. It states:



“This is my response to the petition you have sent to me, expressing greeting and the highest level of admiration and respect for me. Your letter speaks about the need for me to dispatch an official representative to attend to issues such as the well-being of the Tibetan subjects and their loyalty. However, previously, when troops of the Jungar marauders caused excessive disturbances in Tibet, killing and dispersing the Lamas, and causing wanton destructions, my emperor father did not hesitate to spend many tens of thousands of silver coins by dispatching a military expedition to annihilate the troops of Jungarian marauders. You, the Lama, was enthroned in its aftermath, so that peace was brought on the land and happiness and well-being prevailed over both the lay and ecclesiastic population of Tibet.

“Thereafter, when Lobsang Tenzin raised a disturbance, I, fearing that he might bring harm to Tibet, dispatched troops led by Chungsing Kuan Jing and Jhargoche Yigkhan to protect it. Now that Lobsang Tenzin has been suppressed and the whole area of Tso-ngon is tranquil, so that there are no causes for troubles there, I have withdrawn Chungsing Kuan Jing and Jhargoche Yigkhan. Prior to receiving your appeal, I had — by especially holding high in mind the greater interest of your Tibet, and perceiving an indispensable need for the government ministers to be in need of a responsible leader amongst themselves — issued a royal proclamation appointing Peisi Khangchen-ney to assist Ngapopa for the purpose of working in amicable co-operation with all the other ministers. Khangchen-ney has, in every manner, always held to the highest esteem the gratitude he owes to our emperor father.

He fought the troops of the Jungarian marauders, undertook such tasks as defending the border, and has been fully devoted in his service to the school of Buddhism founded by the Jamgon Lama [i.e., the Yellow Hat Sect, of which Jamgon Lama or Je Tsongkhapa is the putative founder], facts that are known not only to you, the Lama, but also to the entire Tibetan masses, among whom there is none that do not know him as surely as they know their own mothers. A person of such reliability entrusted to maintain the integrity of Tibet would be no different from a minister who may be sent by us from here.

“At this time, today, the West and our Sichuan and Yunnan countries share common borders. In view of this, there is incessant exchange of envoys between the two sides every year and there is, therefore, no possibility for misunderstanding or failure to convey messages. Nevertheless, whenever there would be needs to designate envoys for any such purposes, I intend to make the appointments accordingly. With this decree, I sent . ...”

Examining the issues covered in the above four decrees presented to the Seventh Dalai Lama Kalsang Gyatso by the Manchu emperors Dekyi and Yongzheng, the following points emerge:

1) Document Numbers 38 and 39 are replies with gifts from the Manchu emperor Dekyi to the Seventh Dalai Lama for his presentations of letters of greetings accompanied by gifts.

Document Number 40 is seen to be about the presentation of a golden seal and a royal proclamation to confer the title of the Lord of the Western Paradise, the One Who has Supreme Command

over All the Buddhist Doctrines on Earth, the All-Knowing Vajradhara Dalai Lama, along with words of praise and presentation of gifts in accordance with the practice established during the Fifth Dalai Lama.

Document Number 41 is a reply from Emperor Yongzheng to the Seventh Dalai Lama for his request for the dispatching to Tibet of an envoy from the emperor. The reply speaks of the emperor appointing for the Dalai Lama Khangchen-ney as the principal minister and Ngapopa as his deputy, keeping in mind his recognition that the issues concerning Tibet are both difficult and of high importance.

In the Foreword of the book *A Collection of Historical Archives of Tibet*, it is written: "Because these are actual records of the march of human history, they are capable of adequately verifying the fact that Tibet is a part of China's territory." However, there is nothing in these documents verifying any such claim. On the other hand, they verify with great clarity the fact that Tibet and Manchuria were different nations, and we show this below.

2) The moot question, in regard to Document Number 39, might be stated thus: Does not the fact that the emperor's compliance with the Dalai Lama's praise of him, in his letter, as the great lord saviour of the entire subjects of Tibet from the fears as if from a torrent of inferno and one who thereby enabled them to live in peace amount to acknowledging the emperor as the lord of Tibet who had assumed the responsibility to save the Tibetan subjects from the dangers as if from a torrent of inferno and thereby brought peace on the land? The answer is, not at all. The meaning of saving the Tibetans from the fear as if from a torrent of inferno simply meant the defeat of the Jungar troops.

The Manchus had three reasons for suppressing the Jungarians. One was — as per the practice prevailing among

neighbouring nations throughout the world — to help Tibet and to ally with it, a neighbour of the Manchu Empire. Secondly, the Manchus were simply discharging their obligation as the patron to serve their spiritual teacher, the Dalai Lama. Thirdly, the Jungarians were, at that time, a powerful enemy of the Manchus. The Manchus intervened to pre-empt a greater danger that might come to them from the Jungarians after gaining strength in Tibet. It was to suppress the Jungarians for this reason, rather than in view of Tibet being under its sovereign control, that the Manchu intervention took place.

As regards the statement about the Manchu emperor being the great sovereign, it was just a clerical embellishment and carried no implication whatsoever of Tibet being part of the Manchu sovereignty. In general, it was a cliché in those early times to speak of the great sovereign emperor. It would, therefore, be highly improper to pick and raise arguments on words like these. For example, in Document Number 41, which is a decree from the Manchu emperor Yongzheng, it is stated, “I rule over all the lands under the sky and steer their destiny.” If, as written, one is to accept the claim that the Manchu emperor was to be deemed to rule over all the lands under the sky, and to steer their destiny, one should ponder to consider whether or not this would become a laughing matter.

3) In Document Number 40, which is a decree from Emperor Yongzheng, offering praise to the Dalai Lama, it is stated, “All efforts on the affairs of Tibet will turn out to be highly beneficial and the subjects too will live in happiness if in all your important dealings henceforth on Tibet . ... you confer well with all the Kalons responsible for all aspect of government functions.”

If, on this basis, it is to be claimed that with regard to the affairs of Tibet, the emperor exercised a supervisory power, and on

the basis of Document Number 41 it is to be claimed that the Manchu emperor, by appointing Khangchenpa-ney to the position of chief Kalon and Ngapopa as a joint administrator with him, exercised sovereign authority over Tibet, our answer is, not at all. The reason for this is that it is a common practice throughout the world for neighbouring countries to seek each other's help and to provide such kind of guidance in that milieu. For example, although the government of the communist China had received numerous kinds of instructions as well as guidance from the Soviet Union, there is no contention that the former was, therefore, part of the latter's sovereignty. The particularity of the relationship between the Manchus and Tibetans was that it transcended the usual neighbourly relations between two countries; it was a unique tie of great importance.

This could be explained by the fact that the Manchu empire was in danger of being invaded by the Mongols. And only the successive Dalai Lamas had the requisite influence to stop the Mongols from undertaking an invasion. Because of this critical fact, the Manchus had a special governmental interest to serve the successive Dalai Lamas. Therefore, if the governance of Tibet ruled by the Dalai Lamas could be sustained with stability on an enduring basis, the Manchus stood to benefit. It was for this reason that when there were disturbances in Tibet, the Manchus sent in troops to suppress them, provided positive suggestions for attaining governmental objectives, and awarded praises and titles on leaders of Tibet. That these are, indeed, the reasons become extremely clear from the contents of the decrees issued by the Manchu emperors themselves.

The Manchu emperor's decree constituting Document Number 41 says:

“(P)reviously, when troops of the Jungar marauders caused excessive disturbances in Tibet, killing and dispersing the Lamas, and causing wanton destructions, my emperor father did not hesitate to spend many tens of thousands of silver coins by dispatching a military expedition to annihilate the troops of Jungarian marauders. You, the Lama, was enthroned in its aftermath, so that peace was brought on the land and happiness and well-being prevailed over both the lay and ecclesiastic population of Tibet. Thereafter, when Lobsang Tenzin raised a disturbance, I, fearing that he might bring harm to Tibet, dispatched troops led by Chungsing Kuan Jing and Jhargoche Yigkhan to protect it. Now that Lobsang Tenzin has been suppressed and the whole area of Tso-ngon is tranquil, so that there are no causes for troubles there, I have withdrawn Chungsing Kuan Jing and Jhargoche Yigkhan.”

As stated above, the Manchu emperor set out to accomplish peace in Tibet, which was ruled by his spiritual master, the Dalai Lama, by faithfully carrying out his obligation as a patron duty-bound to help accomplish governmental objectives there. He sent troops to secure and stabilise the country; after having accomplished these, he withdrew the troops. What this shows is that Tibet did not belong to the Manchus, and that the Manchus did not rule Tibet. This fact has been shown extremely clearly through actual course of actions undertaken by the Manchus.

4) Moreover, the letters from the Manchu emperors clearly show that there was a Priest-Patron relationship between the Tibetans and Manchus, and that the two represented separate countries. These have been shown in the following manner.

In the petition letter from the Manchu emperor Dekyi to the Seventh Dalai Lama Kalsang Gyatso, which is Document Number 39 in the archives collection book, it is stated: “On the basis of this fortunate development, I also wish for you, the Lama, to live long to continue the tradition of the Fifth Dalai Lama and thereby be of benefit and source of comfort to both the Buddhist faith and all living beings. In this milieu, I pray that we, the patron and the priest, be able to perform righteously positive deeds of rising magnitude.” This very clearly shows a Priest-Patron relationship between the Dalai Lama and the Manchu emperor.

In Document Number 41, which is a letter from the Manchu emperor Yongzheng to the Seventh Dalai Lama, it is stated: “At this time, today, the West and our Sichuan and Yunnan countries share common borders. In view of this, there is incessant exchange of envoys between the two sides every year.” By clearly speaking of the border between the West and “our Sichuan and Yunnan” countries, it is shown extremely clearly that Tibet in the west was not under the sovereign control of the Manchus. What more conclusive proof can be needed to show that Tibet and the Manchus were separate political entities? If Tibet was indeed under the sovereign rule of the Manchus, what was the need to speak about the common borders between the West and “our Sichuan and Yunnan” countries?

The letters of the successive Manchu emperors show with such clarity that the relationship between the Tibetans and Manchus was that between a priest and a patron, and the two were separate sovereignties. And yet, those who occupy the seats of power in China today unabashedly spin a tale about the Manchus being the inheritors from the Yuan and Ming dynasties of a presumed common system of governance over Tibet, and draws a specious conclusion about these documents being “actual records

of the march of human history, capable of adequately verifying the fact that Tibet is a part of China's territory". That we are still constrained to try to respond and pick discussion with people making such claims only shows the extremity of the very difficult circumstances in which we, the people of the Snowland, find ourselves today.

5) Additionally, we feel it pertinent to make the following further comments in regard to the book *A Collection of Historical Archives of Tibet*.

In 1694, the Manchu emperor Dekyi cemented relationship with Tibet and praised its administration by presenting to Desi [Regent] Sangay Gyatso, a royal proclamation written in Tibetan, Chinese and Mongolian languages on twelve plates of gold and offering him a gold seal proclaiming him "The Holder of the Dorje Chang Dalai Lama's Spiritual and Political Legacy, Lord Adhi Buddha Who Governs to Flourish the Buddhist Faith".

In 1697, at the time of the Sixth Dalai Lama Tsangyang Gyatso's ascend to the Golden Throne in the Potala Palace, Emperor Dekyi sent envoys consisting of Changkya Ngawang Lobsang Choeden and others to make formal presentations, including of gifts, on his behalf at the ceremony.

To Ngawang Yeshe Gyatso, whom Lhasang had put on the throne of the Dalai Lama, Emperor Dekyi presented "The Seal of the Sixth Dalai Lama Under Supreme Protection of Royal Decree". To Lhasang himself, the emperor offered the title and seal of "The Protector of the Faith Kunrhun-han".

In the Iron-Rat Year of the 12th Rabjung [a sixty-year cycle in Tibetan calendar], corresponding to 1720, when the Dalai Lama Kalsang Gyatso was staying in Kumbum, Emperor Dekyi sent Prince Changchun Wang with a retinue of officials and



attendants to present to him a seal and a letter proclaiming him “The Promoter of the Buddhist Faith, Saviour of All Living Beings, the Sixth Dalai Lama”.

In 1750, when the two Chinese Ambans [Resident Commissioners] in Lhasa murdered Tibet’s ruler Gyurmey Namgyal and the latter’s followers took revenge by killing the two Ambans, Emperor Qianlong, or Namkyong, offered a series of praises in letters sent to the Seventh Dalai Lama, suggesting ways to bring peace and stability in the country.

In the Iron-Sheep Year of the 13th Rabjung, in 1751, Tsongthu Tsering, Asakhen Amban, and others from Sichuan arrived in Lhasa, sent by Emperor Namkyong to conduct an investigation on the state of affairs in Tibet. On the basis of its report, the emperor issued the following order:

“Although under the orders of the Great Emperor, leaders in Tibet had until now conducted its political affairs, they have failed to fulfil the wishes of the Dorje Chang Dalai Lama. Not only that, there have been numerous cases where actions had been undertaken which were at odds with the interest of the government. Neither did the masses of Tibetan subjects benefit from it all. If the entire political and temporal leadership of Tibet are henceforth assumed by the supreme Lama himself, the Yellow Hat sect and the greater governmental interests will be immensely advanced and, in view of this, the affairs there must be so arranged. Appoint four Kalons for providing assistance.”

As thus ordered, after Phola and his son, the Seventh Dalai Lama Kalsang Gyatso came to assume direct rule over Tibet in both its religious and temporal affairs. For a long period of time until then, Tibet was ruled by Phola-ney and his son Gyurmey

Namgyal and suffered great decline in its legal system. So, on the 16th year of Emperor Lhakyong's rule, in 1751, in order to revive the legal order, the four newly appointed Kalons conferred with each other, consulted with the emperor, and presented to the Dalai Lama a 13-point code which was established as the basis for the conduct of Tibetan government affairs from that time onwards. The book *A Collection of Historical Archives of Tibet*, does not record the numerous actual occurrences of historical events like these. The reason for this is obvious. It is no other than a device employed to deceive the general readers who have no detailed awareness of the actual history about these events and to ensure that they do not become informed of the whole story.

6) The reason why the decrees issued by the Manchu emperors Dekyi and Yongzheng to the Seventh Dalai Lama Kalsang Gyatso refer to him as the Sixth Dalai Lama was to show their refusal to accept the Sixth Dalai Lama Tsangyang Gyatso. However, the real history took place in the following manner.

When the Sixth Dalai Lama Tsangyang Gyatso was enthroned in the Potala Palace, the Manchu emperor Dekyi had especially sent envoys consisting of Changkya Ngawang Lobsang Choeden and others to make formal presentations and representation on his behalf at the ceremony, thereby signifying his recognition thereof. Later when Lhasang put on the throne of the Dalai Lama the White Lotus Holder Ngawang Yeshe Gyatso, Emperor Dekyi presented to him "The Seal of the Sixth Dalai Lama Under Supreme Protection of Royal Decree". The true historical fact about all this is that Tsangyang Gyatso was the Sixth Dalai Lama and Kalsang Gyatso the Seventh Dalai Lama. Irrespective of what the Manchu emperor's recognition was, this was the Tibetan public's resolute acceptance of the facts as they were. Indeed, it was because of this that Jampal Gyatso, who

succeeded Kalsang Gyatso, came to be established as the Eighth Dalai Lama as a matter of mere routine. As indicators, these historical developments verify with extreme clarity the fact that the Manchus never exercised sovereign rule over Tibet. How?

During the period when Desi Sangay Gyatso ruled Tibet, the Manchu emperor Dekyi offered him praise and a golden seal, declaring him “The Holder of the Dorje Chang Dalai Lama’s Spiritual and Political Legacy, Lord Adhi Buddha Who Governs to Flourish the Buddhist Faith”. Not only that, when the Regent held the ceremony for the enthronement of the Fifth Dalai Lama’s successor Tsangyang Gyatso, the Manchu emperor sent envoys to make presentations of gifts. Later when Lhasang ruled Tibet, the Manchu emperor Dekyi not only presented to him the title and seal of “The Protector of the Faith Kunrhun-han” but also presented to Ngawang Yeshe Gyatso, put on the Dalai Lama’s throne by Lhasang, “The Seal of the Sixth Dalai Lama Under Supreme Protection of Royal Decree”. But because Tibetans did not at all transfer their faith or acceptance on Ngawang Yeshe Gyatso, the Manchu emperor Dekyi had to present to His Holiness Kalsang Gyatso a golden seal, declaring him “The Promoter of the Buddhist Faith, Saviour of All Living Beings, the Sixth Dalai Lama”.

The essence of these series of historical developments was that the Manchu emperors conferred titles and seals and showered praises on successive rulers of Tibet as devices to win them over as allies on their side. They show with extreme clarity the fact that although they endorsed the reincarnations of the Dalai Lamas on the basis of the choices made by and in the presence of the rulers of Tibet, the Manchu emperors never had any say either in the selection process or the final recognition of the reincarnations. The fact that the Manchu emperor successively endorsed three reincarnations of the Sixth Dalai Lama show the absence of an iota of truth in the claims made in the Foreword of the book *A Collection*

*of Historical Archives of Tibet*, where it is stated, “Because these are actual records of the march of human history, they are capable of adequately verifying the fact that Tibet is a part of China’s territory,” and in the Preface of its section Qing Dynasty Archives, where it is stated, “It could be seen that the Qing Government not only inherited the common system of sovereign administration of Tibet set up by the Yuan and Ming dynasties.”

As to why, the reason is easily explained by the fact that if Tibet was indeed under Manchu rule, then it would have been proper to expect the Manchu government to present at least an appearance of acting with sovereign fairness in dealing with a matter of such crucial importance as the recognition of the reincarnation of the Fifth Dalai Lama. But the reality was that in total variance with the exercise of such presumptive power, the emperor totally subjected himself to the wishes of the rulers and subjects of Tibet. The historical facts show this very clearly.

### **Point No. 19**

Document Number 42 is a decree from Emperor Lhakyong in 1762, the 27th year of his ascension to the throne, to Panchen Palden Yeshe, consenting to the bringing of the Dalai Lama’s reincarnation (Jampal Gyatso) from Nyethang Dewachen to the Potala Palace for the purpose of being enthroned there. It speaks of the emperor having especially dispatched Tseten Kyab, with the title of Khal-ha Wang, and others with relevant instructions. And it asked Panchen Palden Yeshe to take charge of the newly arrived Dalai Lama reincarnation’s proper education in an all-round and detailed way in keeping with the existing tradition.

Document Number 43 is, like the previous one, a decree from Emperor Lhakyong in 1762 to the child Eighth Dalai Lama

Jampal Gyatso, mandating his enthronement and reiterating the emphasis on his proper education. (The note in the book speaks of Emperor Lhakyong, while the original document refers to Namkyong, but they are different aliases for Qianlong, the emperor's real and original name.)

It can be seen that by the issuance of the above two documents, the Manchu emperor sought to fulfil his obligation as the secular patron with appropriate instructions concerned with the young Dalai Lama's enthronement and educational upbringing.

## Point No. 20

Document Number 44 is a joint letter from the Gaden Tripa Tsemonling Ngawang Tsultrim, the head of the Yellow Hat sect with the title of Palden Nominhan and who was also the head of the secular administration of Tibet and the Kalons [Ministers] to the Manchu Ambans in Lhasa. The letter says:

“This letter is concerned with the need that has arisen to fill the vacancy to the post of a Kalon, following the acceptance of the resignation of Kalon Dzasag Dharhan Khenpo Kalsang Tenzin Namgyal. The 13-point code which has been laid down in accordance with the order of the emperor says as follows: From amongst the Lamas well-versed in the Yellow Hat sect's doctrine, a choice should be made to appoint a Kalon; he should be given the title of a senior Dzasag Lama. If a Lama appointed in such manner works in co-operation with the other Kalons, both the lay and religiously ordained populace would be greatly

benefited. This system should be followed for as long as possible without any dereliction. In such manner the code provides that the selection should be made from amongst the Lama aides of the Dalai Lama in accordance with the established tradition for this purpose.

“The person named Drung-yig [Secretary] Kalsang Namgyal is well-versed and experienced in all kinds of work, big or small. He is well-liked by the current Dalai Lama as well and is part of his inner circle of personal attendants in his capacity as a senior abbot. He undertakes all kinds of duties, big and small, such as being the secretary and catering manager to the Dalai Lama, with selfless dedication and commitment. He is a person of just mental disposition and is skilled in both writing and calculation for any kind of work. He is profound in his wisdom and is given to carrying out orders without demur. In view of all this, we request you, at this time, that in place of Dharhan Khenpo Kalsang Tenzin, a new Kalon be appointed of Drung-yig Kalsang Namgyal as we find him alone the most suitable candidate for the post; we urge you to definitely consider this proposal with sympathy.

“As basis for requesting this, and considering the above responsibility as of great importance, I, the Gaden Tripa Erdini Nominhan, have carried out a thorough examination, held detailed discussion with Kalon Gung Pandita and the others, and being all of one mind on this matter, we have decided accordingly. We await your precious co-operative response to this in the coming days.

“The Ninth Month of the Earth-Dog Year, 1778.”

Document Number 45 is a collective petition in the form of a memo from the Kalons to the Sikyong Trichen [or Sikyong meaning Tibet's ruling throne-holder, or the Regent] Nominhan. The petition refers to the emperor's dispatch of troops to deal with the Gorkha intrusions in Nyanang, Dzonga, Kridrong and Saga; the Tibetans' readying of grain supplies for the army; and the attempt, at present, by Tashi Lhunpo and Sakya to achieve a good peace treaty between Nepal and Tibet. It urges the Gaden Tripa to take, as in the past, the broadest possible view of the situation to ensure that these developments do not present basis for misleading the emperor with wrong kinds of information.

As shown by the document numbered 44, for those who wonder why the emperor needed to be informed about matters pertaining to the appointment of a Tibetan Kalon, the practice had its origin in the granting of the title of Wang to the Phola-wa and his appointment by the emperor as the ruler of Tibet in the aftermath of a dispute among the Kalons of Tibet. If the question then arises as to whether the appointment of a Kalon by the emperor does not amount to Tibet being ruled by him, the answer is no. Because: 1) The appointed Kalon was a Tibetan, not a Manchu; 2) The Tibetan Kalon was proposed by people responsible for running the Tibetan government; he was not someone selected and appointed by the emperor in any specific terms; 3) In addition, the candidate needed to be someone who enjoyed the trust and confidence of Tibet's political and religious sovereign authority, the Dalai Lama; 4) The sole criteria for determining the choice of such candidate for a Kalon proposed by the Tibetans and endorsed by the emperor and for him to be conferred an imperial title was that he should be qualified to be beneficial to the Dalai Lama's

government, rather than being effective for administering Tibet for the emperor. This is clearly recorded in the 13-code regulations.

Document Number 45 is a collective internal petition by the Kalons of Tibet to the head of Tibet's administration on governance matters and there is obviously no need for any discussion on it.

### **Point No. 21**

Document Number 46 is a letter from General E Hui of Chengdu and others to Tibetan government minister Tenzin Paljor and others. The letter says:

“Henceforth a force of eight hundred Tibetan troops should be deployed at Lhasa while four hundred Tibetan troops should be deployed at Shigatse. For a period of forty-five days — from the 16th day of the 9th month to the 30th day of the 10th month every year — there should be, by enforcement of as much restrictions as possible, trainings involving the use of bows and arrows, guns, and swords, besides foot and skill racings by use of traditional Tibetan methods for those deployed at their respective posts. ...

“For the one hundred and fifty Chinese troops deployed in Shigatse too, barracks for their accommodation should be repaired with emphatic care in compliance with the directive already issued. From Lhasa to Tashi Lhunpo, there are twelve pony express postal stations, for each of which five Tibetans, other than those mentioned above, should be posted. ...



“They should be paid by the government without any shortfall. In particular, troops stationed at the Saga, Shelkar, Lhatse, Shigatse, and the other pony express postal stations will be supervised by the commander of the Green Banner troops stationed in Tibet and their commands should be ensured being carried out. ...

“On the 25th day of the 6th month of the 54th year of Emperor Namkyong’s reign (1789).”

The reason for the occurrence of the events of 1789 was that from 1787, when the Gorkhas from Nepal invaded Tibet on successive occasions, the Manchu emperor sent military assistance into Tibet, and finally, in 1793, the Manchu and Tibetan troops jointly drove out the Gorkha troops. It is true that from that time onwards, the Manchu interference in Tibet’s affairs, especially in military matters, became particularly more intrusive than before. This is a fact. However, all this is only in keeping with the practice of dependence on mutual assistance between neighbouring countries prevalent throughout the world.

In the case of Tibetans and the Manchus, in particular, this was a carrying out by the latter of its obligations under the Priest-Patron relationship with the former. It was not at all a case of the Manchus seizing sovereign control of Tibet. For example, in 1950, tens of thousands of Chinese troops were sent into North Korea to provide military assistance there, remaining stationed in the country for three years. Nevertheless, it was impossible that Korea thereby came under sovereign Chinese rule.

Document Number 46 is in similar terms as these; it only constitutes suggestions from the Manchus for the Tibetans in the matter of war preparation.

## Point No. 22

Document Number 47 is a decree from Emperor Lhakyong in the 55th year of his reign, in 1790, to the Eighth Dalai Lama. It states:

“I am touched and deeply gladdened by your having especially dispatched, with utmost devotion, envoys to wish me your prayers for my long life on my 80th birthday. Your relative and Chagdzoë [Manager, or Treasurer] have been deceiving you, the Dalai Lama, and this fact has become a subject of complaints within the entire Tibetan public. Not only that, they are, therefore, of no beneficial service to you. In view of this fact, I have to summon them to the Palace. Henceforth, you, the Lama, should guard yourself against people of such low repute and apply yourself to promoting the Buddhist faith and to diligently receiving teachings and learning the religion, educating yourself, etc. You are the high Lama upon whom the hopes of all sentient beings and the Buddhist faith rest. Learn everything that one needs to understand without any shortcomings and follow the example of the life of your holy predecessor, devoting yourself to the cause of sentient beings, spreading the Buddhist faith, and thoroughly carrying out his wishes with the Yellow Hat sect as the principal basis of it.”

As thus stated, “I have to summon your relative and Chagdzoë to the Palace” meant that earlier, during the discussion in Kyidrong of the treaty between Gorkha and Tibet, the Dalai Lama’s paternal uncle Jedrung Lobsang Phuntsog had told the Tibetan peace talk representative Kalon Doring Tenzin Paljor:

“We owe gratitude to the Great Emperor for having sent a large contingent of heavenly troops for the sake of the Buddhist faith and sentient beings of Tibet. However, if despite this our officers and soldier remain in a prolonged state of withdrawal like this without pointing their weapons at the enemy, there are dangers of permanent losses of the government’s stores and subjects. It is unavoidable, therefore, for the districts and the estates to pay levies of up to 400 Dotse,<sup>13</sup> should that prove sufficient, but otherwise even if it should be as high as about 500 dotse.”

This letter was faulted and for that reason the summons to appear before the palace was issued. These developments constituted, at that time, major interferences by the Manchu emperor in the political affairs of Tibet. Nevertheless, it could hardly be stated, on the basis of these developments, that Tibet thereby came under sovereign rule of the Manchus. Why? Because, in 1781, a proclamation of a decree from Emperor Lhakyong sent to Tibet through his emissary, Gomang Huthugthu Dzasag Khenpo Ta'lama and others read thus:

“You, Dorje Chang Dalai Lama, have now come of age. And the fact that your mind is now fully enriched with an ocean of knowledge of both sutra and tantra is a source of great succour and well-being. In particular, you are now fully conversant with the teachings of the Yellow Hat school, the essence of Buddha Shakyamuni’s faith, and you fully comprehend their meanings. You govern over all sentient beings as if over one’s own children, without any bias. Even in the matter of punishing evil persons, you are fully aware that the general happiness and well-being of everyone lie in upholding the legal system. You are no

different from your predecessor His Holiness the Dalai Lama. I, the Emperor over all under the sky and on land, also act in conformity with the feelings as if of the parents of all sentient beings. I have brought bliss among all sentient beings in the sunset western region. To confer on you, Dorje Chang Dalai Lama, the supreme power over the religion and government of Tibet, with offerings of praise, I have sent through my especially appointed emissary Ta'lama Huthugthu Dzasag Khenpo and senior ministers a proclamation in gold, a seal, and a vast array of gifts. Please accept them.”

The gold seal contained the inscription: “Seal of the Omniscient, Dorje Chang Dalai Lama, the Master on Earth of the Buddhist Faith over the Entire Western Realm of Supreme Bliss”. After that, in the Fire-Horse Year in 1786, there arrived a decree from the emperor which read:

“In place of my seal-bearing Lama Changkya Huthugthu who no longer survives but has left for the Buddha realm, Trino Minhan should come to the palace to be the seal-bearing Lama. The Dalai Lama has already mastered all the sutras and tantras of Buddhism. He has also fully absorbed all the knowledge pertaining to political actions. In conformity with my wishes, he should now assume greater responsibility in the political and religious affairs and set out for great accomplishments that would be beneficial to all sentient beings without any manifestation of partiality.”

The primary responsibility for running both the political and religious affairs of Tibet already rested at that time with the

Eighth Dalai Lama, so the emperor's decree did not change anything. In the book *A Collection of Historical Archives of Tibet*, it is written that in the governance of Tibet's religious and political affairs, the Manchu emperor Lhakyong provided praises and assistance on successive occasions to the Eighth Dalai Lama. Yet, not even a hint of these and other crucially important events in historical relations between Tibetans and the Manchus are included. Scraping together in this book bits and pieces of information about some minor actions in Tibet by some Manchu officers and soldiers is an entirely inappropriate action for a country that has the longest of history among all the Asian countries as well as the largest territory and population in the world. It is, therefore, exceedingly clear that this work simply carries out a preconceived agenda of deceit.

### Point No. 23

Document Number 48 is a letter sent by the Manchu Resident Commissioners in Tibet, with the Amban Song Yun in the main, to the estate of Tashi Lhunpo monastery in the 60th year of the reign of Emperor Lhakyong in 1795. Its purpose relates to the transfer of Tibetan people, taxation, and other matters.

Document Number 49 is a letter of support sent the same year by the Resident Commissioners in Tibet to the Tibetan subjects living in the Tsang region, expressing appreciation for the compassionate reduction of their taxes by the Panchen Lama and instructing them to faithfully pay their reduced taxes.

It is conceivable that the Ambans, who were the Resident Commissioners in Tibet, were involved in all kinds of petty matters such as these; but we see no useful purpose being served in especially going into them.

## Point No. 24

Document Number 50 is a 29-point regulation laid down for a proper future conduct of Tibet's affairs and issued during the 58th year of the reign of Emperor Lhakyong in 1793. It was issued after the Gorkha army was defeated and the Manchu General Fu K'angan returned to Lhasa from Tibet's border with Nepal.

The first point of it is about conducting the recognition of Tulkus [reincarnations of Lamas] through lot drawing from a golden urn.

The second point is about the need to inform the Ambans and to obtain travel permit from them in all cases where foreigners wish to carry on trade and to enter or leave Tibet for such and other purposes.

The third point mandates that the Tibetan currency, Tramka, should be made of pure silver, without any adulteration.

The fourth point is about Tibet being required to set up a permanent standing army of three thousand troops.

The fifth point is about the appointment of Rupon [head of a brigade], Gyapon [head of hundred troops] and Dingpon [leader of 25 troops] in the Tibetan army.

The sixth point is about the ways in which troops should be paid their salaries in grains and money.

The seventh point is about the means by which the army should be armed and the troops trained.

The eighth point says that because the incomes and expenses of the Dalai Lama and the Panchen Lama have been handled entirely by their relatives and attendants, there are always risks of accounting errors and embezzlements. So, in future, all such matters should be regularly audited by the Tibet resident Ambans.

The ninth point is about the ways in which tax rebates should be granted to the people in the regions of Kyidrong, Rongshar, Nyanang, et al, who had suffered on account of the war with the Gorkhas.

The tenth point says that while Yamen [Permanent Office] of the Tibet resident Ambans should hold regular consultations with the Potala Palace in all important matters that may arise, in all other matters, the Dalai Lama, the Panchen Erdini and the Tibet resident Ambans should confer together on the basis of equality. All officials working at all levels of government departments, including the Lamas, headed by the Kalons must faithfully carry out whatever instructions may be issued by the Amban. Likewise, it says, in all matters pertaining to the affairs of the Tashi Lhunpo monastery, the Tibet resident Amban must be informed beforehand, and the Amban, in turn, shall examine them during his rounds of visits there.

The eleventh point says that in the matter of appointing replacement Kalons, selection shall be made by the Tibet resident Amban and the Dalai Lama from amongst the Dapons [Generals in the Tibetan army], the Tsipons [the four heads of the Revenue Bureau] and the Chagdzoes on the basis of their levels of knowledge and accomplishments. It requires the Tibet resident Amban and the Dalai Lama to jointly submit to the emperor a report with names of two candidates for selection and appointment by him. In the case of appointments to other official posts not required to be referred to the emperor, the Ambans and the Dalai Lama are to appoint officials by issuing authorisation letters.

The twelfth point says that so long as the Dalai Lama and the Panchen Erdini are alive, their close friends and relatives shall never hold any position of government responsibility.

The thirteenth point requires the two Tibet resident Ambans to take turns every spring and autumn to make rounds of the Tsang region and to observe the military trainings.

The fourteenth point deals with such matters as the Amban being required to be forwarded with all correspondences from Nepal, Bhutan, Sikkim, Tsongpa and other foreign countries, with the replies to them being required to be given only in accordance with his instructions.

The fifteenth point says that since the border regions of Kyidrong, Nyanang, Rongshar, Kharta, Saga, and Khumbu in Tibet are at short distances from the territories of Nepal, border markers should be erected at once. It further says Nepalese and Tibetans are to be debarred from freely travelling into each other's territories.

The sixteenth point is about selecting good candidates to serve as the governors of the remote and distant districts.

The seventeenth point allows the promotion of soldiers who are knowledgeable and skilled in warfare to the ranks up to that of Dapon even though the candidate may not belong to a family of hereditary lay officials in the Tibetan government.

The eighteenth point deals with the appointment of the Lamas of the major monasteries in Tibet and says that it should be carried out on the basis of discussion among and selection made by the Dalai Lama, the Tibet resident Amban and the Jedrung [Title of monk officials from aristocratic families] Huthugthu [title of the highest ranking Lamas].

The nineteenth point deals with the issue of government tax levies and the determination of monetary payment to be made in the settlement of barter trade deals.

The twentieth point prohibits Kyidrong, Nyanang, and others from raising tolls and customs on rice, salt and other items beyond the amounts of the traditional levies.



The twenty-first point says such things as that the destitute subjects in Tibet were over-burdened with such obligations as being required to provide corvee labour, riding-horses, pack-animals, etc., while the rich had been issued decrees that exempted them from such tax obligations. Henceforth, all such decrees are required to be withdrawn and a uniform system of tax obligation introduced, it says.

The twenty-second point requires the numbers and names of all the Lamas and monks in all the monasteries, big or small, in Tibet to be prepared in a detailed list. Likewise, it requires the Kalon to prepare a list of all the subjects of the Huthugthu. Copies of these books have to be provided to the Tibet resident Amban and the Dalai Lama so that it would be easy to check up on them; no one should leave without a written authorisation.

The twenty-third point says that until now Chieftains in Tso-ngon, etc., when inviting over Lamas, had, in some cases, taken permission from the Tibet resident Ambans, but not in some other cases. Henceforth, it says, in all such cases the Ziling (Xining) Amban should transmit information to Tibet and on that basis, the Tibet resident Ambans should issue travel permit to allow the visit.

The twenty-fourth point says that although previously the Dalai Lama used to issue the travel documents that authorise the availing of corvee labour services, etc., later on Dapons, Kalons and people close to the Dalai Lama and others have also taken to issue such documents entirely on their own, ordering the provisions of pack-horses and collecting of essential food supplies. Such practices should be stopped forthwith and such travel documents should be issued only for necessary governmental purposes on the basis of obtaining permission from the Tibet resident Ambans and the Dalai Lama, it says.

The twenty-fifth point is about ensuring fair adjudication in all cases of fighting, murder, theft, robbery, etc.

The twenty-sixth point is about the ways to make arrangements for obtaining ammunition for the training of officers and soldiers.

The twenty-seventh point is about the requirement for the Kalons and Dapons to transfer to their successors whatever residential houses and trusteeship of estates had been granted to them by the Dalai Lama as per the tradition as soon as they relinquish their posts.

The twenty-eighth point says that Lamas, monks and others should be paid in time whatever salaries they are entitled to and that any advance payment or receiving thereof is debarred.

The twenty-ninth point says that whatever amounts of taxes and rents and other levies-in-kind that the Tibetan subjects are liable to pay should be collected in a timely manner. It says that nothing should be collected in advance and that outstanding dues thereof from people whose family lineages have become extinct should not be imposed on their villages.

1) On the basis of the supervisory role in a large number of areas of Tibet's affairs this Document Number 50 assigns to the Amban, the Preface to the section titled Qing Dynasty Archives says that the government of the Manchu dynasty not only inherited the Yuan and Ming dynasties' system of unified administration over Tibet, but further strengthened its rule of Tibet with respect to politics, the economy, military affairs, personnel, diplomacy, religion, culture and in every other sphere of Tibet's affairs and that these have become evident. Nevertheless, the issues referred to in the 29-point regulations were attempts designed solely to render more effective the conduct of Tibet's affairs; they were not

aimed at the exercise of Manchu's sovereign authority over Tibet. In view of this, the above points cannot be interpreted as leading to any conclusion that the Manchus exercised sovereign authority over Tibet.

2) The practice of rendering this kind of help was universal, embracing the whole world. For example, when the communist government was in the process of being established in China, both civilian and military personnel from the Soviet Union set themselves up there and took to issuing instructions, formulating plans and providing guidance in such diverse areas as governance, industry, economy, military affairs, etc. Nevertheless, no one discourses, on that basis, that Russia exercised sovereign authority over China.

3) In particular, a matter that is particularly pertinent in this case, and deserves to be explained clearly, is that Ya Hanzhang says in his book:<sup>14</sup>

“After Fu K'ang-an arrived in Lhasa, he told the Eighth Dalai Lama: The objective behind the imperial army's undertaking of the long journey to defeat the [Gorkha] plunderers was to ensure security for both the lay people and clergy of the U-Tsang region. Now that the plunderers have confessed to their crimes, it is impossible that they will raise a disturbance again.

“Nevertheless, Tibet is totally lacking in system and procedure for conducting its affairs effectively. As far as the Dalai Lama is concerned, he is preoccupied in his retreat practices, and has no in-depth acquaintance with the affairs of the external world. The Kalons and the others are lost

in their games of cunningness and deception. As a result, there is total lack of defensive and security capability when a foreign aggression comes. Hence, the regulations must be finalised and put down in writing and everyone should be made aware of their obligations under it.

“The Emperor has, for the present purpose, issued detailed instructions to me, the Great General, to discuss all the points, one by one, in great length. This demonstrates the Emperor’s concern that Tibetans come to no harm and that their welfare is ensured in perpetuity. There is no doubt that the Dalai Lama, acknowledging his gratitude to the Emperor, will accept these suggestions once all the points are discussed and agreed upon. However, if the Tibetans insist on clinging to their age-old habits, the Emperor will withdraw the Ambans and the garrison after the troops are pulled out. Moreover, if similar incidents recur in the future, the imperial court will not intervene to resolve matters. The Tibetans should, therefore, decide for themselves what is beneficial to them and what is harmful to them, and what is heavy and what is light, and make a choice.”

The above submission by General Fu K’ang-an to the Eighth Dalai Lama very clearly prove that the claims made in the Foreword of the book *A Collection of Historical Archives of Tibet*, are false claims doctored to suit one’s own wish. The Foreword says that for a period spanning more than 700 years, Tibet has remained an administrative division under a central Chinese government, and that, in view of this, it has, for all times, been continuously administered by the Chinese government. The reason for the falsity

underlying this claim is obvious in the General's submission that if the suggested regulations designed solely to benefit the Tibetans are not implemented, and, instead, the age-old habits continue to be stubbornly clung on to, General Fu K'ang-an will withdraw his own troops, to be followed by the emperor's withdrawal of the Tibet resident Ambans and the garrison. He has spoken of the emperor having decided not to intervene in case similar incidents recur in future in such a case.

Thus, the suggestion that in future Tibetans themselves should assume responsibility to carry out Tibet's affairs very clearly shows that Tibet was never under the administrative jurisdiction of Chinese government and that China never had a sovereign authority over the country. If Tibet was, indeed, under the administrative jurisdiction of the Manchus, it could never have been the case that the Manchu government would, at that time, threaten to withdraw all the help it was extending to Tibet, and to vow never to come to its aid again in future.

### **Point No. 25**

Document Number 51 is a letter sent by Kunling Jedrung Huthugthu, who was presiding over Tibet's affairs at that time, and the Kalons collectively to the Ambans, proposing the names of some Rupons as candidates to fill the post that had become vacant as a result of the passing away of Tsang Dapon Changchen Tsering Dorje.

Document Number 52 is a letter from the Tibet resident Amban, during the 13th year of the reign of the Manchu emperor Jiaqing in 1808, to Jedrung Huthugthu, intimating the emperor's appointment of the main candidate Chagdzoepa Dechen Gyatso

to the post of Chikhyab Khenpo [the highest monk official in Tibetan government].

These documents represent implementations of the provisions of the 29-point regulations, providing for the rendering of the Manchu's co-operative assistance to Tibet.

## Point No. 26

Document Number 53 is a decree from Emperor Ngagmon or Jiaqing, in the 13th year of his rule in 1808, to the Panchen Lama, and relates to the subject of the recognition of the reincarnation of the Eighth Dalai Lama Jampal Gyatso. The decree says:

“Emperor’s Decree: This is to instruct the Panchen Erdini.

“You have, earlier, submitted a petition to me which said that you and the Jedrung Huthugthu were of one mind that the son of Tenzin Choekyong had, since his birth, been associated with a variety of auspicious omens, making it appropriate for him to be recognised as the reincarnation of the Dalai Lama. In view of this, I too, in an especially unrivalled gesture of benevolence, agreed to go along with your plea to this effect by accepting the son of Tenzin Choekyong without resorting to lot drawing from the golden urn. For this you have submitted a petition to me, wishing for my good health and expressing deep gratitude, accompanied by Khatag [ceremonial scarf] and gift of a statue of the Buddha. I welcome this as a gesture of praise of the highest order. Also, later on, I have especially dispatched Harchenshog Ghiwang Manju Chutso to carry

out the enthronement on the 22nd day of the ninth month this year. At this time, the Dalai Lama is extremely young. He therefore, obviously, needs to still rely on you, the Lama, for guidance in matters of administration, tutelage and others. To be in conformity with my supreme desire for the flourishing of the Buddhist faith, I want you, the Lama, to provide good guidance to the Dalai Lama Tulku, ensuring that he devotes himself fully to the pursuit of religious knowledge.”

As thus stated, the prescription of lot drawing from a golden urn laid down in the 29-point regulations of 1793 was dispensed with and the recognition of the Ninth Dalai Lama carried out thereby.

### **Point No. 27**

Document Number 54 is a letter from the two Tibet resident Ambans, in the 14th year of the reign of Emperor Jiaqing in 1809, to the Kalons collectively, on the subject of the candidate to be sent to take up Dzungdoe [governor's] posts at several districts. The letter says that as proposed by the Kalons recently, Wangyal Norbu, the Dzungdoe of the border district of Tsona, should be transferred and appointed as the Dzungdoe of Markham. The letter also says that following consultation amongst “us two Ambans and the Jedrung Huthugthu,” it was decided that Ragtsib should be appointed the Dzungdoe of the large district of Chonggye. In that way, the Dzungdoes of five districts are shown to have been finalised.

## Point No. 28

Document Number 55 is a decree issued by Emperor Jiaqing in the 14th year of his reign in 1809, to the Ninth Dalai Lama. It is a reply, with gifts, to the Ninth Dalai Lama who had sent a greeting to the emperor through Khenpo Trinley Rinchen. It instructs the young Dalai Lama to devote himself diligently to the study of entire sutras and tantras of Buddhism.

Document Number 56 is a letter from the two Tibet resident Ambans, in the 19th year of the reign of Emperor Jiaqing in 1814, to Demo Huthugthu, confirming first candidate Rupon Ngapopa as the replacement for Dapon Pema Dhonden.

## Point No. 29

Document Number 57 is a decree from Emperor Jiaqing in the 25th year of his reign in 1820, confirming Tsemonling Ngawang Jampal Tsultrim as the Sikyong of Tibet. It says:

“Emperor’s Decree: Instructions to Gaden Shrigethu Samathipagshi’s Tulku Ngawang Jampal Tsultrim, the Khenpo Lamas of the major monasteries, the four Kalons, the Depons, and the territorial chiefs.

“Previously, when the Dalai Lama left this world, I decided upon and appointed Demo Huthugthu to preside over the affairs of the government of the Dalai Lama-ruled Tibet. At this time, however, there is still no indication of the appearance of the Dalai Lama’s Tulku. On the other hand, the Demo Huthugthu has also left this world. Therefore,



until such time as the Dalai Lama's reincarnation emerges, it would be beneficial for both the religious and secular subjects of all U-Tsang if a Lama of highest learning takes charge and handles its affairs. Since you, Ngawang Jampal Tsultrim, are intelligent in addition to being knowledgeable, all the lay and religiously ordained people of U-Tsang should greet your appointment for supervising and administering the affairs there as the fulfilment of their wishes. Thus I have been apprised with deliberate care by the meritorious people, who reside in the U-Tsang region with the responsibility to evaluate the situation. I am extremely pleased with this.

“Today, I am doing this special favour to you by appointing you — with the granting of the title of Ertimthu Nominhan, and entitling you to hold the seal thereof — to be the ruler of Tibet with power of final say over the affairs of all the lay and religiously ordained people of U-Tsang until the arrival of the Dalai Lama's reincarnation. You, Ngawang Jampal Tsultrim, by following the example set by Demo Huthugthu, should conform to my compassionate wish for the good of all living beings under the sky by promoting the spread of the Yellow Hat Sect, and by effectively handling all matters so that all the lay and religiously ordained people of U-Tsang should find their own happiness and well-being.

“Also, the Khenpos, Kalons, Depons, territorial chiefs, and the others should, by diligently carrying out their respective duties, render co-operative assistance to Ngawang Jampal Tsultrim. As during the times when the Dalai Lama lives, all matters should be conducted on the basis of consultation

with the Ambans and other influential persons and in accordance with the tradition. Every one should work diligently and without veering towards negligence. These are my instructions.”

On examining the contents of Document Number 57, one sees it clearly emerging that when it comes to Tibet, it is the dominion of successive Dalai Lamas. There is not an iota of implication in what is stated there that Tibet was a territory over which the Manchus exercised sovereign rule. If the Manchus did exercise sovereign rule over Tibet, it would have been proper for the Ambans to exercise control over Tibet's affairs during the absence of the Dalai Lamas, and there would have been no need at all for the imperative to appoint a Lama to administer the country.

If, however, it is then asked why the emperor appointed Tibet's administrators and, why, towards the end of the letter, it is stated that all matters should be conducted on the basis of consultation with the Ambans and other influential persons, the reason is as already explained in the successive points above. To mutually rely on and provide guidance to each other between neighbouring countries is a practice found everywhere in the world. Particularly, in the case of Tibet and the Manchu dynasty, there was a unique Choe-yon relationship which was the basis of the circumstance described above. It does not at all describe a situation in which Tibet was a sovereign part of the Manchu dynasty and, because of it, the latter having ruled over the former.

### **Point No. 30**

Document Number 58 is a decree in reply, with accompanying gifts, from Emperor Srisel or Daoguang in the second year of his

reign, in 1822, to a message of greetings from Tibet's Regent Tseling Ngawang Jampal Tsultrim.

Document Number 59 is a reply, with presentations of accompanying gifts, from Emperor Srisel or Daoguang in the third year of his reign, in 1823, to a message of greetings from the Tenth Dalai Lama.

Document Number 60 is a communication from the Tibet resident Amban in the year 1828 to Tibet's Regent Nominhan, informing him of the confirmation of the first candidate, the monk Lobsang Yeshe, as replacement to fill the post left vacant at Radreng monastery by the passing away of one of its officials, the grand Lama Ta'lama Tashi Jungney.

Document Number 61 is a communication from Emperor Daoguang in the 21st year of his reign, in 1841, to the 11th Dalai Lama, informing him about people having been dispatched to enthrone him with offering of gifts sent by him after he had been chosen by lot drawing from the golden urn.

Document Number 62 is a petition from the Garrison Commander of Lhasa to the Kalons collectively in 1842, recommending Ministers, Dapons, Rupons, Gyapons, etc., for promotions with presentations of head decorations of buttons and peacock feathers for their deeds of heroism at the Lasing [Kashmir] battlefield.

No special need arises to deal with these, as they represent implementations of the 29-point regulations.

### **Point No. 31**

Document Number 63 is a decree from Emperor Kunkhyab Phelgye or Xianfeng in the eighth year of his reign, in 1858, instructing Achithu Huthugthu Ngawang Yeshe Tsultrim, the Radreng Lama,

to assume temporary charge as the Regent of Tibet during the minority of the Dalai Lama who, he says, is still very young of age. The decree is sent to the Radreng Huthugthu, Abbots of monasteries, and the Kalons collectively.

Document Number 64 is about people having been despatched to enthrone the Twelfth Dalai Lama chosen by lot drawing from the golden urn. It is a decree sent by Emperor Xianfeng in the 10th year of his reign, in 1860, to the Dalai Lama.

Document Number 65 is a communication from Jedrung Huthugthu and the Kalons collectively to the Tibet resident Amban, recommending eligible candidates to be appointed to posts in districts.

These also represent implementations of the 29-point regulations.

### **Point No. 32**

Document Number 66 is a decree from Emperor Guangxu in the 5th year of his reign, in 1879, to His Holiness the Thirteenth Dalai Lama, offering gifts at the time of the ceremony for his enthronement. It is not only a universally recognised fact, but His Holiness the Great Thirteenth Dalai Lama himself has also clearly stated in his Water-Money Year Testament, that his recognition was done without recourse to lot drawing from the golden urn. Yet, this document says, “His [i.e., the child Thirteenth Dalai Lama’s] name was written on a lot and put in the golden urn, whereby he became the Dalai Lama Tulku.”

It cannot be that the emperor wrote thus in his decree by faithfully recording a claim made by the Amban about the recognition having been carried out by lot drawing from the golden urn. At this point, it is necessary to note, however, that the original

decree itself is worn out, rendering it incomplete and necessitating further scrutiny. If the emperor's decree indeed records about lot drawing from the golden urn having been carried out — although this had never happened in reality — then forget about those with a heavy responsibility of running the state even an ordinary folk would not do such a thing. For, it would amount to an astonishingly heinous misconduct.

### **Point No. 33**

Document Number 67 is a communication in the year 1891 from the Tibet resident Amban to Demo Huthugthu, regarding the promotion or transfer of officials to 14 posts at different levels of the Tibetan government.

Document Number 68 is an edict issued in the year 1891 by the Tibet resident Amban and Demo Huthugthu on the subject of the circulation of silver coins.

Document Number 69 is a joint correspondence in 1907 from the Tibet resident Ambans, Zhang and Lian, to the officials appointed to take up posts at the nine new bureaus to be established for highways, mining, etc.

Document Number 70 is an edict issued jointly by the Tibet resident Amban and Demo Huthugthu in the year 1907, ordering the implementation of a new regulation on salt tax to raise fund for the soldier's pay.

### **Point No. 34**

Document Number 71 is a photograph of the gold seal presented by Emperor Yongzheng to His Holiness the Seventh Dalai Lama.

Document Number 72 is a photograph of a royal jade proclamation presented by Emperor Lhakyong to His Holiness the Eighth Dalai Lama, conferring on him a Cholo [imperial title].

Document Number 73 is a proclamation of praise inscribed on a plaque presented by Emperor Lhakyong to the Potala Palace.

Document Number 74 is a photograph of a royal gold proclamation presented by Emperor Srisel or Daoguang, conferring a Cholo on His Holiness the 11th Dalai Lama.

Document Number 75 is an inscription of praise written on a plaque presented by Emperor Daoguang to Mindroling monastery.

Document Number 76 is a plaque containing an inscription of praise presented by Emperor Tongzhi to Tashi Lhunpo monastery.

Document Number 77 is a letter on a painting presented by the Empress Dowager Cixi Taihu to His Holiness the Thirteenth Dalai Lama.

Document Number 78 is a portrait of Emperor Guangxu.

Document Number 79 is a portrait of the Empress Dowager Cixi.

1) Regarding the cases of the presentations of the above mentioned Cholos and seals, they are merely a continuation of the customary practices of successive emperors of China to confer praises upon the main religious and political figures in its neighbouring countries for the purpose of maintaining good relations. There were no other significances to them. In particular, the gold seals and the imperial titles presented to the successive Dalai Lamas were all in recognition and praise of their contributions in the field of religion.

2) To present two examples in this case, the jade imperial proclamation presented by Emperor Qianlong or Lhakyong to the Eighth Dalai Lama says:

“Decree of His Majesty, the Emperor, who reigns over all land by the mandate of heaven.

“May the precious Yellow Hat faith propounded by Jetsun Tsongkhapa spread from strength to strength and the Buddhist religion very greatly flourish and advance thereby. You, the Dalai Lama, are the principal spiritual son of Gyalwa Tsongkhapa, and the eighth Tulku in the line of successive reincarnations of Gedrun Drub. In wisdom and knowledge, you already have the omniscient accomplishment attained through a succession of numerous previous rebirths so that your sense of altruism is supreme in being entirely unassailable. In this milieu you have been the saviour numerous times of sentient beings in all spheres of existence. Earlier, too, during the ancestral king E-yeper Jasagchey, His Holiness the Fifth Dalai Lama met with the Emperor at the great national palace and was presented substantial gifts. During the period spanning four generations from that time until now, you have received all available offerings of counsel in the area of government administration and have, with a single-minded devotion, pursued the path of great compassion in spreading far and wide the Yellow Hat doctrine.

“You, the Dalai Lama, are the great Lama master of the Yellow Hat School. On that basis, you have, over many lifetimes, brought to the path of definite spiritual

betterment and awakening all sentient beings on earth. Such and other admirable accomplishments are undoubtedly of great merits in the field of government administration and are deeds of joy. You, the Lama, have exhausted all limits of knowledge; and wherever you are, and at all times, you are devoted to spreading and advancing the precious Buddhist religion.

“Having been immensely gratified by all this, I am sending to you, at this time, rewards of the finest quality jade imperial proclamation (Jasa) and a sealed letter. Please accept these and hold regular prayer services in the Potala Palace. In cases of concerns of great importance to governmental well-being, affix the seal I have granted to you now to your petitions. Otherwise, and in cases of minor petitions and other communications, use the old seal. At this time, please accept the reward I am presenting to you, the Lama, and work for the spread of the Yellow Hat doctrine and to draw all sentient beings to a state of happiness and well-being, and in other respects, and thereby conform to my wishes thereon.

“As per the tradition followed by the preceding Dalai Lama, you should govern in an exceptional manner by keeping in mind the broadest possible perspective and with positive hopes. Thus, by granting the best of everything to all sentient beings, ensure that for the tens of thousands of years the Manchu dynasty government would exist, the uninterrupted situation of pure happiness endures.

“These are my instructions.”



As thus stated, the highest of accolades and praises were showered on His Holiness the Dalai Lama for his deeds. In particular, a very special point that needs to be explained at this moment is that the reign of Emperor Lhakyong or Qianlong was the pinnacle of the Manchu dynasty's power and influence. During that period, as a result of successive Gorkha invasions of Tibet, the Manchus sent troops to repel the invaders; it was, therefore, a period when the Manchus exercised the greatest amount of influence over Tibet's affairs. Nevertheless, Emperor Qianlong offered the Eighth Dalai Lama Jampal Gyatso such deep obeisance and high level of praise. Not only that, he tells the Dalai Lama, "As per the tradition followed by the preceding Dalai Lama, you should govern in an exceptional manner by keeping in mind the broadest possible perspective and with positive hopes. Thus, by granting the best of everything to all sentient beings, . . ."

Therefore, even though the emperor has irrefutably, in a letter inscribed on jade, asked the Eighth Dalai Lama to govern Tibet by continuing the tradition followed by the Seventh Dalai Lama, the Chinese leaders of today entirely ignore it and, instead, maintain that the Manchus exercised sovereign rule over Tibet. The totality of the falsity of their claim is fully proved by this piece of documentary evidence alone. If the Manchus had, indeed, exercised sovereign rule over Tibet, how could it have been possible for the Dalai Lama to rule Tibet?

Again, in the Iron-Ox Year in 1841, Emperor Daoguang says in his royal letter of proclamation sent to the Eleventh Dalai Lama:

"His Majesty the Emperor, who rules by the mandate of Heaven, decrees. Instructions to the Dalai Lama.

“I have been proclaiming that for the purpose of ensuring the enjoyment of happiness by all sentient beings over all land, in an environment of compassion, proper instructions should be imparted of what to accept and what to avoid; and that the foundational source of happiness is the spread of, and the flourishing of, the Buddhist religion over all land. I hope that by pursuit of such noble course, a permanent state of well-being could be ensured for all sentient beings. Anyone who spreads the system of the Yellow Hat doctrine in all the ten directions and thereby help overcome all the negative effects of the state of ignorance prevailing there and guide them to the path of righteousness surely deserves to be praised and rewarded.

“In the particular case of the present moment, the wisdom to discern what to avoid and what to accept is profound and extensive in you, the Lama. I remain greatly convinced that from young age you have been endowed with all the criteria of the religion, have been properly observing the vows, were a worthy object of refuge for all sentient beings, etc., in conformity with my wishes. In view, particularly, of this, I have conferred on you, as in the case of the previous Dalai Lamas, the honourable title of the Lord of the Western Paradise, the one who has Supreme Command over all the Buddhist Doctrines on Earth, the All-Knowing Vajradhara Dalai Lama in the form of an especially designed royal plaque. As indeed you, the Lama, are already spreading very wide the Yellow Hat doctrine, and thereby very virtuously ensuring the observance of the canons of the Buddhist faith concerned with the community of monks

and the religious subjects, etc., henceforth, too, you should maintain yourself as an object of refuge for everyone.

“Let there be no end to the telling of what would need repeatedly to be told. And in all matters concerned with the conduct of Tibet’s affairs, let all matters be properly decided according to law on the basis of discussion with the Kalons. On that basis, let there be detailed intimations [to me] of everything through regular reporting of them to the Ambans in Tibet. Additionally, let all the sentient beings of Tibet flourish in happiness and their desires seen to be fulfilled in accordance with the wish for religious conformity.

“Presently, in accordance with the custom for the conferment of praise in the form of the royal plaque proclamation, please accept, my Lama, the following items of one silver mandala (mendel), one silver religious offering bowl (choekong), one hand-held vase of silver coated with gold, a full set of yellow throne cushion complete with back curtain, a set of fifty ceremonial scarves of different sizes, a set of ten ceremonial scarves of different colours, a set of nine yellow robes, a set of nine maroon robes, a set of nine soft fur-lined robes, a set of ten crystal bowls, and a set of ten porcelain bowls. Preach the extremely marvellous doctrine without decline for the tens of thousands of hundreds of thousands of aeons of the kingdom’s governing life.

“The ... day of the eighth month of the 21st year of the Srisel, the Iron-Ox Year.”

3) It is of utmost importance for the truly unbiased researchers to examine why — rather than translating into Chinese and English documents such as letters chiselled on a gold plaque and letters in gold written on jade offered by the Manchu emperors to successive Dalai Lamas — publicity has been undertaken of some tattered texts that carry communications of petty character between Ambans and Kalons by translating them into Chinese and English.

### **Point No. 35**

In the section titled Qing Dynasty Archives dealt with above, it is claimed that the government of the Manchu dynasty not only inherited the Yuan and Ming dynasties' system of unified administration over Tibet, but further strengthened its rule of Tibet with respect to politics, the economy, military affairs, personnel, diplomacy, religion, culture and in every other sphere of Tibet's affairs and that these have become evident. Apart from the above refutations of this claim, there are still further evidences that refute this claim as absolutely false. The period when the Manchus exercised the strongest of its influence over Tibet's affairs was during a short time in the reign of Emperor Qianlong. Even in that short time, the Manchus did not exercise sovereign rule over Tibet. Rather, as already explained briefly and sequentially, they only upheld their policy of promoting good neighbourly relationship and, also, faithfully observed the sanctity of the terms of their Choe-yon relationship with Tibet.

In the 18th century, China itself came under a succession of numerous kinds of intrusions from the West. As a result, the sovereign authority of the Manchus who directly ruled over it suffered a major disruption. Because of this, it became impossible

for the Manchus to interfere in affairs within Tibet's territory. For example:

a) Concerning Tibet's internal affairs, in the year 1844, when Sikyong Tsemonling Ngawang Jampal Tsultrim resigned the regency, he was temporally replaced by the Panchen Lama Tenpey Nyima, who thereby ruled over the country. And in the year 1862, after the confrontation between Regent Radreng on one side and the Gaden and Drepung monasteries on the other side came to a head, Shedra Wangchuk Gyalpo was appointed the Regent of Tibet. After Tibet's Regent Demo Huthugthu was permitted to resign, His Holiness the Great Thirteenth Dalai Lama, in 1895, assumed political and spiritual leadership of Tibet upon popular appeal by the government as well as both the lay and ecclesiastical sections of the Tibetan citizenry. Thus, in vital political developments such as these, the Tibetan people took their own final decisions and the Manchus did not have any say in regard to them.

b) In the case of Tibet's foreign relations, we may note that in 1858 and 1876, separately, the Manchus and the British concluded treaties whereby the latter were given the right to travel into Tibet. But in 1885, when British travellers arrived at Gampa Dzong [District], the Tibetan government rejected the Manchu-British treaties and turned them back from the district. In 1890, the Manchus and British India concluded a treaty at Calcutta on the question of the border between Tibet and Sikkim. In 1893, in order to implement that treaty, an agreement was signed at Darjeeling between the Manchus and the British, providing for the setting up of a market at Dromo and permitting British subjects to do business there and for British officials to be posted there. Nevertheless, neither the treaty nor the agreement could be carried out because the Tibetan government refused to accept them.

c) In the case of Tibet's military affairs, in 1842, when during the Lasing War the entire three regions of western Tibet (Ngari Korsum) came under invasion; and again in 1855, when the Gorkhas invaded Tibet, ignoring the provisions of their 1793 treaty with the Manchus; the Tibetans, in each case, dealt with the situation entirely themselves, without any involvement of the Manchus. Particularly in 1904, during the British invasion of Tibet, the Manchu government — far from coming forward to help stop it and providing security — had its Tibet resident Amban hosting a reception and providing gifts to the invaders upon their arrival in Lhasa. In each of the above cases of foreign invasions, it was entirely the Tibetan government which handled the situation, whether in militarily facing the invaders or holding peace negotiations with them, and in every other respect. There was not an iota of Manchu involvement in any of them.

Thus, although history is abundantly clear that in such critically important matters as Tibet's internal affairs, foreign relations and military matters, it was entirely the Tibetan government which decisively resolved the issues — and the fact of these are universally known — it is still being insisted that Tibet was under the sovereign authority of the Manchus and that the Manchus actually ruled Tibet. Such blatant claims are nothing but self-evident betrayals of the absence of even a particle of feeling of shame.

d) It might be claimed, however, that even though it is a fact that it was the Tibetan government which handled Tibet's internal affairs, foreign relations and military matters as mentioned above, it was not the case that the Manchus had absolutely no say in Tibet's affairs. Examples might be cited, in this connection, that in the years 1906 and 1908, the Manchus and the British concluded two documents concerned with the subject of Tibet.

Likewise, it might be stated that the 1904 treaty concluded at Lhasa between Britain and Tibet provided for Tibetans to pay war reparation to Britain and that it was the Manchus who made that payment to the British. However, the fact remains that the 1906 Beijing treaty between the Manchus and the British was an improper and illegal deal and could never be acted upon as a legally valid document. How?

Because this treaty provided for the amendment of the powers given only to China and no one else in Clause 4 of Article 9 of the 1904 Lhasa treaty between Tibet and Britain. If the provisions of a treaty between Tibet and Britain were to be amended, it was only these two countries that could have done it together. Britain could not do it unilaterally; and as regards the Manchus, they had absolutely no basis to do so. In view of this, it is extremely obvious that the 1906 treaty between the Manchus and Britain was entirely illegal.

As regards the 1908 Calcutta treaty between the Manchus and Britain, it dealt with such matters as the size of the land for the proposed trading mart to be set up by Britain at Gyantse; the manner in which trading was to be carried out; the setting up of a garrison for protecting the mart, etc. But the authorization for Britain to set up a trading mart at Gyantse was derived from the 1904 Lhasa treaty between it and Tibet. In view of this, it would not have been impossible for an agreement also on the size of the land for the trading mart, the manner in which trading should be carried out and the setting up of a garrison for protecting the mart, to be concluded with Tibet through negotiations. Nevertheless, the Manchus and the British concluded the agreement. Likewise, need it require any mention that the 1908 treaty between the Manchus and Britain too was illegal?

As for the Manchus' payment to Britain of Tibet's war reparation determined under the terms of the 1904 Lhasa treaty

between Britain and Tibet, it can be easily explained. Since Tibet directly concluded a treaty with Britain, with the Manchus not getting any right of any say in the matter, the latter felt greatly embarrassed. Because of it, and in order to make a point of showing to the outside world the existence of a unique relationship between it and Tibet, the Manchus took upon themselves the obligation to pay the latter's war reparation to Britain. Thus, it was something that they entirely brought upon themselves. Tibetans did not appeal to the Manchus for it.

e) In 1904, as a result of the British invasion of Tibet, His Holiness the Thirteenth Dalai Lama had to leave Lhasa and lived in Mongolia and Kumbum in Amdo, north-eastern region of Tibet. During that period, the Manchu emperor dispatched successive emissaries to offer greetings and to present gifts to him. And in 1908, on invitation by the emperor, he visited Beijing and met with the emperor's mother as well as Emperor Guangxu himself. The emperor presented him a royal plaque with the inscription, "The Great Compassionate Buddha Being of the West". In reply, His Holiness the Dalai Lama composed an eulogy, incorporating a prayer in it, and presented it to the emperor. Although it does not require any mention that such courses of interactions between the top leaders of different countries have great historical value, they are not included in the book *A Collection of Historical Archives of Tibet*, and the question arises why?

f) The last set of actions of the Manchus and their consequences were that in 1906, Manchu troops, led by Chao Erfang, entered Chamdo, after having attacked Ba, Lithang, Tsalho and Dzogang. And in 1909, using the pretext of coming to the protection of the British trade marts in Tibet, Liu Qun led a large Manchu army into Lhasa. Immediately on arrival there, it killed, maimed,



or took into custody a number of prominent figures in the Tibetan government. In 1910, when the Manchu emperor resorted to such heinously illegal and indiscriminate actions of inestimable gravity as issuing a proclamation announcing that he had deposed the Dalai Lama, both the lay and ecclesiastical sections of the Tibetan public delivered protest letters to both the civil and military Manchu officials posted in Tibet. Everywhere in the country, the Tibetans refused to provide corvee horse transport facility to the Manchu civil and military officials, putting them in immense difficulties of unbearable situation.

Because of this, Chinese official Lo Ti'tai especially travelled to Darjeeling in India to inform His Holiness the Dalai Lama that the situation in Tibet was now back to normal and so he should return. The plea was accompanied by a written petition. To this, His Holiness the Dalai Lama gave a written reply, which, after recording details about the recent Manchu actions, said that there was now no hope for future relations between the two sides being restored to the previous state. The letter suggested that a peaceful negotiation be held between the two sides as soon as the British government is ready to act as the mediator.

When in 1911, garrison troops of the Tibet resident Manchu Amban launched an assault on Sera monastery, the Tibetan government, army, officials, merchant community and public fought back the enemy for more than a year in what came to be known as the Water-Rat Year Lhasa war. The final outcome was that the Manchus, both the generals and troops, were thoroughly defeated. Because of this, the Lhasa resident General Tung-ying and the Amban sent a joint petition to His Holiness the Thirteenth Dalai Lama, who was at that time staying at Samding monastery in Yamdrok. In the petition, the Manchus offered surrender of their officers and troops and sought protection for them. It urged

immediate dispatch of an envoy to negotiate the terms of the surrender. The Dalai Lama responded by sending a delegation led by Lonchen [Minister] Changkhyimpa and Tsawa Tritul of Sera Mey College to Lhasa as his envoys. With a Lhasa resident Gorkha official as mediator, the manner of the surrender of arms by the officers and troops of the Manchu army, their repatriation to China, the Tibetan government's provision of supplies for them for their return journey, and protection to be afforded to them were agreed upon and concluded in a three-point deal signed on 12 August 1912 and in a nine-point deal signed on 14 December 1912.

On these basis, the Manchu officers and troops in Lhasa were sent back to China via India with the Tibetan government's provisions of supplies, riding horses and protection. With regard to the contingents of Chinese troops in the Kham region, General Kalon Jampa Tendhar drove them out gradually. The relationship between the Manchus and Tibet was, thereby, decisively terminated. However, such a real historical development of great significance is not at all mentioned in the book *A Collection of Historical Archives of Tibet* and the question obviously arises, why?

Irrespective of whether it is out of deception on the part of the Chinese leaders today that these facts have not been mentioned in this book or not, the whole of the outside world knows the fact that in 1912 the Tibetans expelled the officers and troops of the Manchu army from their country, and thereby decisively terminated their connections with the Manchus. There is no way such a historical fact of universal knowledge could ever be concealed.

## Analysis of the Republic of China (Guomindang) Archives

### Point No. 36

In the section titled Archives From the Period of the Republic of China, it is stated: “The items in this section, which include a letter from Chiang Kai-shek written by him to the Dalai Lama, title-conferring documents and decrees issued by the government of the Republic of China, the last will and testament of the Ninth Panchen Lama, a telegram from Wu Zhongxin, credentials issued to a National Assembly delegate and photos, prove beyond any historical doubt that after the Qing dynasty, the Central Government of China continued to exercise sovereign jurisdiction over the Tibet region.”

We will deal with the remaining points in the pages to follow under the concerned sections. However, as clearly explained under the preceding Point No. 35, in 1912, the entire body of officials and armed forces of the Manchu dynasty was expelled to China without any trace of them being allowed to remain in Tibet. Although this fact is a matter of universal knowledge, one cannot help wondering — given what the current Chinese government says in this book — how the government of the Republic of China still came to continue to exercise sovereign jurisdiction over Tibet? To be reduced to deal with a situation in which one has to engage in a debate with such shameless liars is a special problem confronting the Tibetan people today. In view of this circumstance, it is all the more vital that international tribunals and the truly impartial specialists study the issue with in-depth research and come out with their findings of the truth and falsehood, and thereby arrive at conclusions thereon.

## Point No. 37

Document Number 80 is titled as “Decree from the Provisional President of the Republic of China Granting Approval for the Establishment of the ‘Mongolian and Tibetan Committee for Unified Political Reform’”. Its content states:

“Decree from the Provisional President.

“The trio of the Dalai Lama, the Panchen Erdini and the Jetsun Dhampa Huthugthu residing in Tibet and Mongolia respectively have become masters of the Gelug school of Tibetan Buddhism. They have held their leadership through successive generations of reincarnations and are repositories of limitless reverence by everyone. Our Tibetan and Mongol peoples have continued their past traditions to defend the northern and western regions and have remained peaceful, while reposing their constant allegiance to the central government. In the past several years, however, there have been a few instances of governors of border regions engaging in oppressions unbecoming of them. One governor even engaged in exploitative abuses of power by forcibly seizing properties on false pretexts, thereby earning revulsion from everyone and inflicting shock among the people. Thinking of these, I feel unable to hold back my anger.

“At present, the political order has changed to that of a republic and all the five big nationalities have become equals. I, as the President, have pledged to be unwavering in my determination to put an end to all the evil politics and actions of the old system and to introduce reform in

regard to them. In particular, I will, after carrying out a thorough investigation, ensure the securing of the order and stability in the Tibetan and Mongolian regions on the basis of their actual situations.

“On examination of the request by the Dzasag Lama, who presently lives in capital Nanjing, and others for the establishment of a Mongolian and Tibetan Committee for Unified Political Reform, it has been found to be aimed at the promulgation of the concept of equality among the five big nationalities; it also embodies the assertion of the rights of our Tibetan and Mongolian peoples. In view of this, it has been decided to approve beforehand the establishment of this committee.

“All the hitherto reported cases of oppression in the respective Leagues and Banners of Inner and Outer Mongolia as well as in the Tibet region should be clearly investigated and gradually remedied. Not only that, I remain hopeful that the nobility, the Huthugthus, the Lamas, and others will offer their suggestions as and when they feel necessary from their own perspectives on matters pertaining to the administration of the central government or the undertaking of new initiatives and reforms to be carried out in the different localities so that we may make use of the positive contributions flowing from them. All the public and private rights of the Mongolian people should be thereby definitely brought up to the level enjoyed by the people in the other areas. In that way I hope that a state of common happiness will prevail for the benefit of everyone. It is with this end in view that I issue this decree.

“25 March 1912, the first year of the Republic of China, corresponding to the 7th day of the 2nd month of Water-Rat Year under the Seal of the President.”

1) Examining the year in which this document was issued, we notice that the so-called decree of the president bears the date of 25 March 1912, the 7th day of the 2nd month of Water-Rat Year, and is issued under seal on that day. Regarding the manner in which the Manchu officials and troops were expelled from Tibet to China, there is the three-point agreement signed at Lhasa on 12 August 1912 between the two sides with a Gorkha representative as witness and, in the same way, a nine-point agreement dated 14 December 1912.

In accordance with the terms of these agreements, the Manchu officials and troops were repatriated from Lhasa via India at the end of 1912, thereby bringing to a conclusive end the relationship between Tibetans and the Manchus. In view of this, the claim that a so-called Mongolian and Tibetan Committee for Unified Political Reform was set up in Beijing in China at the beginning of 1912 would be an impossibility from the side of the government and people of Tibet. Any impartial observer of the developments of that period cannot fail to make this out at once.

2) An examination of the decree reveals the following comment: “Our Tibetan and Mongol peoples have continued their past traditions to defend the northern and western regions and have remained peaceful, while reposing their constant allegiance to the central government.” This piece of writing by the Chinese is nothing but a reflection entirely of their own wish. There is no way Tibetans and Mongolians could have said such a thing. As to the reason why, the answer lies in the fact that there has never been a tradition by which Tibetans and Mongols defended the

western and northern borders of China. As regards the claim that the Tibetans and the Mongols had remained peaceful, while reposing their constant allegiance to the central government of China, the impossibility of it emerges at once on a mere reading of the above mentioned history of the Manchus.

What happened in reality was that several months after the above letter was written in China, the entire body of Manchu leaders and subjects in Tibet was expelled. Thereafter in 1913, His Holiness the Thirteenth Dalai Lama proclaimed Tibet's complete independence. In fact, China was itself, in the 13th century, conquered by the Mongols and for several centuries after their rule ended, remained its adversary. On 28 December 1911, Mongolia proclaimed itself an independent country. Not only that, on 29 December 1912, corresponding to the 4th day of the 12th month of the Tibetan Water-Rat Year, Tibet and Mongolia concluded a nine-article treaty at Urga. This treaty provided for the two countries to recognise and respect each other as independent countries of equal status and to conduct good relations between them on that basis.

In view of all this, one wonders how a Mongolian and Tibetan Committee for Unified Political Reform could have been set up in Beijing without any knowledge of it in Lhasa and Mongolia where the principal Tibetan and Mongolian governments were based. How could a document such as this be ever accepted as a primary reference material for a government? Tibet, Mongolia and China were neighbouring countries. They had, through the vicissitudes of their histories, undergone all kinds of good and bad relations. In view of this, it was not impossible that there were some Tibetans and Mongolians living in China at that time. If China had used such people for this purpose, it is impossible that documents based on it can be used as a legally valid piece of reference material.

## Point No. 38

In 1912, the Manchu rule came to an end in China and there was some contact between the first president of the newly established Republic of China, Mr. Yuan Shikai, and His Holiness the Thirteenth Dalai Lama. In 1914, there was a tripartite convention between Tibet, China and Great Britain at Shimla in India. In 1918, two agreements were successively concluded at Chamdo and Rongpatsa, respectively, between Tibet and China as temporary truces to enable the delineation of the border between the two countries and to provide for ending the fighting between them, and thereby facilitating the withdrawal of their armies. In 1932 and in 1933, Tibet signed temporary truces with Sichuan and the Chinese army led by Ma Pufang, respectively. None of the documents pertaining to these events are seen to have been included in the book *A Collection of Historical Archives of Tibet*.

1) Regarding the contact made by the Chinese president Yuan Shikai with the Thirteenth Dalai Lama, let us quote Jurist Michael C. van Walt van Praag's book on page 49-50:

“The Dalai Lama made his stand unmistakably clear to the President of the new Chinese Republic when the latter sent communications to the Dalai Lama at the end of 1912 ‘to announce and explain the Republic and ask for its acceptance by Tibet’. The Tibetan ruler sent the Chinese president a telegram, which, the British Minister remarked, ‘though courteously worded, is recognised as distinctly hostile to the Republic’. The Dalai Lama telegraphed as follows: ‘The Republic has only just been proclaimed and the national foundations are far from strong. It behoves the President to exert his energies towards the maintenance



of order. As for Thibet, the Thibetans are quite capable of preserving their existence intact and there is no occasion for the President to worry himself at this distance or to be discomposed. The reason why the Thibetans do not approve of the Central Government is entirely due to the excessive ill-treatment inflicted upon them by the Chinese troops in Thibet. Their indignation has been roused. How many, to take an instance, of the temples and shrines have been set on fire or demolished by the Chinese troops, while the officers in command have been quite powerless! How could the Thibetans fail to oppose China?’

“When the president, expressing regret for the excesses of the Manchu regime, announced the ‘restoration’ of the rank and titles taken from the Dalai Lama by the Manchu emperor in 1910, the Dalai Lama and his Cabinet replied that he did not desire any rank or titles from the Chinese government, that he had resumed both temporal and spiritual rule of his country, and that ‘although Tibet and China were previously on terms of mutual friendship, on account of the relationship of the Priest and the Lay [Patron], lately they have not been on good terms. The Tibetans have now regained their power’.”

As thus stated, asking Tibet also to accept the Republic on the basis of the proclamation of a new Republic of China was only in accord with a general practice among neighbouring countries and did not, in any way, show Tibet to be part of China. When the Chinese president expressed regret for the excesses committed by the Manchu regime and, at the same time, offered to restore to the Dalai Lama the rank and titles taken by the Manchu emperor in 1910, the Thirteenth Dalai Lama replied that he did not desire to

take any rank or titles from the Chinese government and that he had resumed both temporal and spiritual ruler over Tibet. This shows beyond all doubt that China had no power to interfere in the national affairs of Tibet.

2) In 1914, in order to establish good relations among the nations of Asia, a tripartite convention was held at Shimla in which plenipotentiaries of equal status representing Tibet, China and Great Britain held detailed discussions and concluded an 11-point agreement. Nevertheless, on 3 July 1914, when it was time for the plenipotentiaries to put their signatures on the agreement, the Chinese representative, all of a sudden, withheld from doing so. Because of this, only the Tibetan and British plenipotentiaries put their signatures on it and thereafter issued a formal declaration which stated that the accompanying treaty signed between Tibet and Britain would be fully respected by the governments of these two countries. It further stated that China was precluded from claiming the privileges accruing to it from the agreement so long as she withheld her signature from it.

Again, on 3 July 1914, Great Britain and Tibet annulled the Trade Regulations agreement signed between them in 1893 and 1908 and agreed to replace them with a set of new Trade Regulations based on articles 2, 4, and 5 of the 1904 treaty signed between them. On the basis of this, a new 11-point Trade Regulations was signed between Great Britain and Tibet. Not only that, the new set of regulations was fully implemented.

3) On 19 August 1918, a 13-article agreement for the cessation of fighting between Tibet and China and delineating a provisional boundary between the two countries was signed at Chamdo by the Tibetan representative Kalon Lama Jampa Tendhar, who was the military commander and civilian Governor for Domey

region and the Chinese government representative General Liu Jiantin, while British representative Mr. Eric Teichman acted as the intermediary.

Thereafter, on 10 October 1918, a four-point truce, providing for the manner of the withdrawal by Tibet and China of their respective troops was signed at Rongpatsa by Han Kuongjun and Chagla Gyalpo as Chinese representatives and Tsangda Khyungram and Tethongpa as Tibetan representatives, with the British representative Mr. Eric Teichman as the intermediary.

Again, in 1931, Chinese warlord Liu Wen-hui of Sichuan sent his troops to Horkhog and Nyarong, resulting in a battle between Tibetans and Chinese. And in 1932, Xining's Chinese Muslim governor Ma Pufang sent his troops into Denkhog, resulting in fighting with Tibetan troops there. In both the above cases, Tibetan troops fought back the invading Chinese army, resulting finally in a mutually agreed treaty for the cessation of hostilities between Tibet and Sichuan in 1932, with Tsangda Khyungram leading the signing as Tibet's representative.

Likewise, in 1933, the Tibetan General Surkhang Zurpa led the Tibetan delegation in a ceremony to sign a truce with a military delegate from the Xining Governor Ma Pufang.

Such series of agreements as well as the related political and military developments of great significance between Tibet and China have, however, not found any mention in the book *A Collection of Historical Archives of Tibet*. What else could the reason for these omissions be but the fear of such naked truths about Tibet's real status of equality with China being revealed? At this time towards the beginning of the 21st century when international politics is undergoing a sea-change, such a stubborn recourse to deception only exposes one's own character to the whole world; there is no possibility of it bringing any real benefit to oneself.

## Point No. 39

Document Number 81 is a letter from Chinese President Chiang Chung-cheng [Chiang Kai-shek] of the Guomindang [Chinese Nationalist government] to His Holiness the Thirteenth Dalai Lama. It reads:

“To the Great State Tutor, His Excellency the Dalai Lama, at his religious throne:

“Recently, I met your envoy Mr. Koen in the garrison area of Kueti [Guid] and he delivered to me your precious letter, in which you have spoken about your sincere allegiance to the Central Government and about your undying affection for me. Along with this, you have delivered for me gifts of such precious items as Khatags, photographs, gold bowls and carpets. I accepted these with great respect and they gladdened me to no limits.

“Although Tibet and China have historically been a single family, there have been very few correspondences, etc., between the two sides in recent times because of developments during the period. But now I, Chiang Kai-shek, have, as per the wishes of Tsung Li [Sun Yat-sen], not only given equal rights to all the nationalities within the country but have also been determined especially to come to the aid of the Tibetan people. I have already spoken about this to you last year in an internal memo sent through Koen Khenpo who returned to Tibet from here. Because he had conveyed this message well, Koen Khenpo and others were instructed to come to the capital to discuss the affairs of Tibet.

“The Central Government made an eight-point proposal and the responses received for a substantial number of them show profound appreciation of the facts and a realisation of affection having been showered on a constituent region of a common national family. It brought limitless joy to me. I have instructed Mr. Ma U-Yuanzhang, Chairman of the Mongolian and Tibetan Affairs Commission, to sincerely and honestly hold an in-depth discussion with representative Koen Khenpo and the others and thereby help dispel the resentments that have arisen in the recent past and restore our previous era of friendship. This is my earnest hope.

“In view of this, I desire that you, the State Tutor, also instruct your envoy Koen Khenpo and the others to take view of the overall interest in working with Chairman Ma U-Yuanzhang for successfully reaching a peaceful settlement that would address all our outstanding issues. It is naturally not just a matter that would reflect personally on you, the State Tutor, and I, the President, that the sovereignty of Tibet should be consolidated day by day, that the precious Buddhist religious works be seen to flourish ever more, that a state of happiness be established in Tibet, and that the motherland be safeguarded. More than that, they will help bring to an end in the near future the states of war that still remain at places, and by cleaning up, as if by the sweep of a broom, the reactionaries, peace and stability could then be at once restored throughout the land.

“Under the high level of merits flowing from your kindness towards me, I, Chung-cheng, have been in good health as before. For this, I am once again expressing my gratitude

to Your Holiness, while contunuing to pray for your good health and for your success in carrying forward your good deeds.

“Sent by Chiang Chung-cheng.”

Although this letter does not bear a date, the envelope in which it was dispatched bears the receiving date of “the 24th day of the 9th month in the Tibetan Iron-Horse Year”, scribbled in red ink in His Holiness’s handwriting. It was a reply to an earlier communication sent by His Holiness the Thirteenth Dalai Lama on the 15th day of the 4th month of Tibetan Iron-Horse year, in 1930, to Chiang Kai-shek through the Yunggon Khenpo, Konchog Jungney, along with accompanying gifts, and also his answers to the questions contained in the eight-point proposals received. A set of handwritten copies on Tibetan handmade paper of the communication and the answers to the eight-point proposals are available. However, its title section is worn out and torn so badly as to be legible. Nevertheless, the replies to the eight points of proposals that follow it are clearly legible. They read, “For the eight points of issues proposed for ensuring enduring good relations between China and Tibet, I offer replies as under:

“Reply to Point Number One: To your question, how might the traditional relations of Priest and Patron between Tibet and the Central government of China be restored, my reply is that as the Central government of China genuinely desires these days to restore the traditional relations of Priest and Patron between Tibet and China, we too have made, and will also continue to make, our sincere efforts in this direction.

“Reply to Point Number Two: Your question is, how shall the Central government of China exercise administrative power over Tibet. My reply is that in order to ensure a fundamentally stable basis for ensuring the religious and political well-being in this central region, discussions should be held and a treaty gradually finalised, for an arrangement thus reached will surely be sustainable.

“Point Number Three: Your question is, what degree of governmental independence would best serve Tibet’s interest. My reply is, until now, because of the relationship of Priest and Patron between Tibet and China, and the genuineness of the two sides’ adherence to this bond, Tibet has been able to enjoy such degree of independence as it does now. This should remain. But on top of that, if the territories in the upper and lower regions which have historically indubitably been parts of Tibet but have recently been lost to the outside were restored to their original status, the benefits will be enduring.

“Point Number Four: You suggest that I, the Dalai Lama, and the Panchen Lama, come to visit the Chinese Guomindang. Regarding this, I would like you to understand that I, the Dalai Lama, am already of advanced age. In particular, not only is the multitude of duties on me of “keeping, defending and spreading” the Buddhist faith and in temporal affairs in Tibet great, but also the process of taking the consensus of the lay and ecclesiastical population of Tibet, including the Three Great Seats of Sera, Drepung and Ganden, the two tantric colleges of Gyutoe and Gyumey, the monk and lay officials of the government, have not yet been completed. As a result,

I am not able to undertake the journey at this moment. As regards the Panchen Lama, who continues to be living in China, he, apart from administering the affairs of Tashi Lhunpo monastery, never had any say in the temporal and spiritual affairs of the Tibetan government. Therefore, even if he were to visit you, there is no way he will be able to hold discussions on matters pertaining to both the current and long term interests of Tibet and take final decisions thereon.

“Point Number Five: Your question is, whether the powers of the Tibetan government and of the Panchen Lama with regard to the temporal and spiritual affairs of Tibet should remain the same as before, or they should be changed. My reply is, it has been the tradition for the temporal and spiritual affairs of Tibet to be governed by the Tibetan government. As regards the Panchen as we know, it should be noted that the Tashi Lhunpo monastery was founded by the Dalai Lama Gendun Drub. Later, when moving to Lhasa, he entrusted its administration to the Whensapa (i.e., the reclusive) Lobsang Choegyen who at that time ran only a small hermitage. He was conferred the honorary title of the Panchen Lama through his successive reincarnations. Although that was the fact, because of the relationship of teacher and disciple developed between him and His Holiness the Great Fifth Dalai Lama, the Panchen Lama came to be entrusted to continue to run the Tashi Lhunpo monastery through successive reincarnations. Both the lay and ecclesiastical population of Tibet will be agreeable to this pre-existing situation being allowed to continue.



“Point Number six: You ask how the Panchen Lama will be received back in Tibet and how the Central Government of China should escort him. My reply is that attendants at all levels under the Panchen Lama have always been employing all kinds of fancy terminologies to sow discord and distinction between U [Central Tibet] and Tsang regions. In particular, they both disobey the orders of the government and even instigate rebellion against it, with the result that in the past Wood-Dragon Year when the British arrived in Tibet [in 1904], the Panchen went to India to submit allegiance to the British side. When the plot did not work out, he returned to Tashi Lhunpo and stayed there as before. Later, in the Iron-Dog Year when Chinese troops arrived in Tibet, he especially came to Lhasa and exchanged gifts with the Chinese Amban Lien and other Chinese officials in a conspiracy to seize the spiritual and temporal powers from the representative of me, the Dalai Lama, and the Tibetan government in all sorts of manners. Nevertheless, the lay and ecclesiastical masses of Tibet, including the Three Seats, the Lamas and Tulkus, the monasteries, and the lay and monk officials of the government were not happy with it. They repeatedly apprised Amban Lien of the basis of the plot, making it extremely difficult for him to act for its success. With his plot thus rendered a failure, the Panchen returned to Tashi Lhunpo and stopped complying with the established practice of contributing one fourth of the supplies of the Tibetan army. He continues, to this day, to adopt such and other practices based on time and circumstances with impunity. Had the offenders been punished and the fines and the taxes collected as per the laws of the land that combines religion and politics, this state of affair, of course,

would not have come to such a pass. Since the Whensapa Lobsang Choegyen and His Holiness the Great Fifth Dalai Lama developed a close relationship of teacher and disciple, the two came to be renowned throughout the land as Gyalwa Yabsey [the supreme spiritual father and son]. It was in acquiescence to this special spiritual bond between the two that utmost tolerance and consideration was shown, to which, however, the only response received was one of ingratitude, not contentment or appreciation. The administration (“keeping, defending and spreading”) of the Tashi Lhunpo monastery was completely abandoned, with the Panchen Lama fleeing to the land of others. In view of this, a letter was dispatched urging him to return, with explanations provided in detail of the chronologies of the circumstances underlying the development. However, the response received was not positive. When first leaving Tashi Lhunpo, a plan was hatched with the Tibet-arrived Jhaptrue Khenpo of Urga to enter into a conspiracy with the Russian Communists in the presence of the Khalka Jetsun Dhampa, and, with this end in view, they [Panchen Lama entourage] journeyed northwards. However, when they were about to reach Urga, Khalka Jetsun Dhampa passed away, while, at the same time, the group lost its way. A [new] plan was then decided upon to involve China in the plot. A telegraphic message was dispatched and the group journeyed through Gansu province and its allegiance gradually shifted to China. I, the Dalai Lama, being the supreme spiritual leader of all Tibet, irrespective of sects, officially appointed a Dzasag Lama for Tashi Lhunpo as well, and gradually, a hierarchy of officials under him for the most effective administration of the faith and the monastery in every possible way without any cause for

neglect. In view of all these developments up to now, I see no reason to welcome back the officials of the Panchen Lama who — being responsible for creating so much bad blood between me and the Panchen Lama — have abandoned their own country and, instead, adopted another country until they provide clear and convincing explanations for their conduct thus far.

“Point Number Seven: You have written that if the Tibetan government desires to set up an office in Nanjing, the matter could be discussed and that the monthly salaries for the staff of this office will be borne by the national government. As regards this, the Government of Tibet is, for the moment, immediately setting up offices in Nanjing, Peking and Dhartsedo (or where the Chinese government telegraphic wire runs). Thereafter, as and when offices are felt needed to be set up at more places, applications will be made to discuss the same in the days ahead.

“Point Number Eight: You ask that whatever other expectations Tibet has from the Central Government of China be clearly stated. Regarding this, we seek supplies of arms to defend ourselves from external aggressions. For the purpose of ensuring permanent happiness in the land, let me offer my suggestions in the days ahead.

“Submitted by the Dalai Lama, on the 15th day of the 4th month of the Tibetan Iron-Horse Year.”

Examining carefully the replies given by His Holiness the Great Thirteenth Dalai Lama to each of the eight questions asked by the Chinese President Chiang Chung-cheng in his letter, it

emerges as extremely clear that both Tibet and China concur — based on the fundamental position of the either side to maintain a genuine relationship of Priest and Patron between them — on Tibet's status as an independent country.

Of the claims made by the editors of the book *A Collection of Historical Archives of Tibet* that the Guomindang Central Government of China continued to exercise sovereign jurisdiction over the Tibet region, no historical evidence of any kind could be discerned even in the eight questions. If one was truly driven by genuine commitment to seek truth and intellectual integrity, it was only to be expected that one would hold truth as fundamental and, based on it, hold discussion by bringing to the table all the correspondences between the two principal figures in the affairs of Tibet and China, as well as all the documents pertaining to the treaties between the two sides concluded during that period.

### Point No. 40

Document Number 82 is a 1934 [it is written “1933” in the original Chinese book] decree, conferring a posthumous title of “The Great Lord of All Sentient Beings, the Enlightened Wide Source of Well-being and Happiness to Everyone, One Who Thereby Protects the Nation in a Manner Deserving of Exaltation” on His Holiness the Thirteenth Dalai Lama in order to honour and commend him, sent through Huang Mu-sung who was especially dispatched by the Guomindang Chinese Government to Lhasa to take part in religious offerings during the memorial ceremony on the passing away of the Thirteenth Dalai Lama.

Document Number 83 is a decree (from the government of the Republic of China) issued in 1931, conferring the title of “The Great Master Who Protects the Nation by Spreading Wide

the Buddhist Faith, the Supreme Saviour of all Sentient Beings” on the Ninth Panchen Lama.

Document Number 84 is a citation given by the Guomindang government of the Republic of China to the Ninth Panchen Lama in 1933, honouring him for his remarkable deeds.

All these are merely related, in a general way, to the reaffirmation of commitment to the Priest and Patron relationship between Tibet and China.

### **Point No. 41**

Document Number 85 bears a title which says “Telegram sent by Huang Mu-sung to Radreng and others on the subject of the discovery of the reincarnation of the Dalai Lama”. The telegram’s content, translated into Tibetan, reads:

“To the Venerable Buddhist Master Radreng, the honourable Prime Minister and the Council of Ministers,

“Careful investigation has shown that the Dalai Lama and the Panchen Erdini are the highest Lamas of the Gelugpa faith. Because since the Tsongkhapa-Buddha’s time, until now, there have been successive recognitions of the genuine reincarnations of the Dalai and the Panchen, it is assured that the Buddhist faith will endure for as long as this aeon lasts. Previously, in the 57th year of the reign of Manchu emperor Lhakyong, the system of lot drawing from the golden urn was established for the purpose of strengthening the recognition process. The intention underlying this was to ensure that Buddhism would flourish and its doctrines preserved through successive generations. Both the monk

and lay population was satisfied with the system after its implementation. At this moment, when the reincarnation of the Dalai Lama is in the process of being discovered, I would like to express hope that you will keep in mind the need to reaffirm your adherence to the system previously established by the Manchu emperor out of great respect for the religion, which he wished to see flourish, and be most careful in the selection so that no cause would remain for criticisms by others and the Buddhist faith would be safeguarded. Not only that, for the purpose of submitting a report to the authorities above with a view to obtain their instructions thereon, please keep me informed from time to time about your progress in this matter.

“Drafted and sealed by Huang Mu-sung.

“Written on 12 October 1935, the 24th year of the Republic of China.”

To examine this document as thus written:

- 1) With regard to a Morse coded telegraphic message sent from China to Lhasa, of which a photographic copy is printed in the book under examination, we cannot help doubting very much how Huang Mu-sung could be said to have drafted it and put his seal to it, or how he could have sent such a sealed letter by telegram.
- 2) If it is claimed to be true, nevertheless, that the telegram was sent, the question arises whether the Tibetan government did or did not send a reply to it. And if a reply was sent, what is the reason for not including it, along with the above telegram, in the book. This must be explained.

3) If no reply was sent to the telegram, it could be concluded as evident that regarding this matter the Tibetan government ignored it entirely because the Guomindang government of the Republic of China did not have a right of any say in it.

### **Point No. 42**

Document Number 86 is titled as “The last will and testament of the 9th Panchen Erdini”. And the body of the document says:

“To the Chairman of the Mongolian and Tibetan Affairs Commission.

“A translation of the last will and testament of the Panchen Rinpoche is being submitted herewith.

“This is the last will and testament of me, the Panchen Rinpoche. To be loyal to the Central Government of China and to promote the Buddhist faith, to work for ensuring unity and friendship among the five nationalities, to strive for safeguarding the efforts for the nation’s prosperity has been my greatest, life-long aspiration. Over the past 15 years, wherever I travelled within different parts of the country, the Central Government of China took great care of me. By that I saw the Central Government of China to be genuinely faithful to and respectful of the Buddhist religion, and that it treats the Tibetan people with equality. These have made me feel all the more comfortable and ever more convinced in the position I have taken. Though at this moment, I have, on being urged to (spiritually) pacify the sentient beings in the western frontier regions,

decided to return to Tibet, my desire remains unfulfilled on account of my passing away while being still en route to it. In view of this, there are several points I would like to state and I am writing these down in this letter.

“Regarding the political affairs of the Tsang region, they have previously been entrusted to Lobsang Gyaltzen who has been appointed as the Dzasag Lama there with duties to attend to the spiritual needs of the people. For the moment this arrangement should continue, with him discharging these roles in a representative capacity. Until Lobsang Gyaltzen arrives to take up these responsibilities, the official seal should be handed over for safekeeping to the Tingkye Lama. At the same time, the Nangma Gang [or Nanggang, the highest office in the Panchen Lama’s administrative set-up] and the six-member Return-to-Tibet Planning Committee should work together, with the arrangements about this being reported to the Central Government of China and its instructions awaited. All the firearms with the Nangma Gang, save in the case of those required for the guard regiment and the self-defence of the attendants, should be presented to the Central Government of China to help it deal with national difficulties. I request that these be later returned to me after my reincarnation.

“Plans should be initiated to ensure the restoration, at the earliest, of the powers traditionally enjoyed by the successive reincarnations of the Panchen Lama. The people of Tibet, both lay and clergy, and officials and subjects, should accept the Central Government of China’s establishment of the republic of five nationalities and strive



for achieving friendship between Tibet and China. In particular, the Dzasag Lama and the Khenpos should strive to carry forward as best as possible my desires and carry them to completion and thereby ensure a meaningful accomplishment of the objectives of this my last will and testament.

“I am especially sending this telegram in the knowledge that from a long distance there is continuing concern for my well-being.

“From the Secretariat of the Office for the Dissemination of Buddhism in the Western Border Region. Sealed on 5 December.

“Sent on 7 December 1937 in the 26th year of the government of the Republic of China.”

To analyse the document as thus provided:

- 1) According to the Tibetan custom, a last will and testament is called so only if it is written either on the dictation of a person or is written personally by that person before his death. There has never been a custom in Tibet of recognising a document written after the death of a person by some other person as the last will and testament of that person.
- 2) This document says, “Though at this moment, I have, on being urged to (spiritually) pacify the sentient beings in the western frontier regions, decided to return to Tibet, my desire remains unfulfilled on account of my passing away while being still en

route to it. In view of this there are several points I would like to state and I am writing these down in this letter.” As thus written, this letter was drafted after the Panchen Lama passed away. And, also, the name of the sender of this letter is written as “the Secretariat of the Office for the Dissemination of Buddhism in the Western Border Region”. A document like this can never be recognised by anyone whatsoever as the last will and testament of the Panchen Rinpoche.

3) But irrespective of the question whether this document can be taken as the last will and testament of the Panchen Rinpoche, the reality is that this was a matter between the Guomindang Central Government of the Republic of China and the Panchen Nangma Gang. As regards the question whether the Panchen Rinpoche indeed had any right of say in matters pertaining to Sino-Tibetan relations, the actual situation was as very clearly outlined by the Thirteenth Dalai Lama in his reply to the Eight-point proposal from the Chinese President Chiang Kai-shek, something we have already dealt with above. There is no need to repeat all that here.

### **Point No. 43**

Document Number 87 is titled as “Decree from the National Government Dispatching Wu Zhongxin to Join Radreng in Presiding over Matters Pertaining to the Birth of the [Fourteenth] Dalai Lama”. And the content of that decree says: “Decree from the National Government. This decree is issued to especially dispatch Wu Zhongxin, Chairman of the Mongolian and Tibetan Affairs Commission, to join with Radreng Huthugthu to preside

over matters pertaining to the birth of the Fourteenth Dalai Lama. Issued on 28 December 1938, the 27th year of the Republic of China.”

Document Number 88 is titled as “Decree from the National Government to the Executive Yuan on the Dispatch of Wu Zhongxin to Join Radreng in Presiding over Matters Pertaining to the Birth of the [Fourteenth] Dalai Lama”. And the body of the decree states:

“Decree to the Executive Yuan.

“Ref: Your report (Chongqing Document No. 10664) dated 24 December in the 27th Year.

“We have received your report containing the decision of the Executive Yuan that an order be issued to especially dispatch Wu Zhongxin, the Chairman of the Mongolian and Tibetan Affairs Commission, to undertake the mission of presiding over matters pertaining to the birth of the Fourteenth Dalai Lama along with Radreng Huthugthu. Please note by this decree that we have already issued a special decree in clear terms to dispatch Mr. Wu to undertake the mission.

“Issued on 28 December 1938, the 27th year of the Republic of China.”

1) Regarding Document Numbers 87 and 88, they are about the government of the Republic of China especially dispatching Wu Zongxin with an order to jointly undertake the main responsibility with Radreng over matters pertaining to the birth

of the Fourteenth Dalai Lama. But the Fourteenth Dalai Lama had already been born at that time, with the date of his birth being 6 July 1935. One wonders what other matters needed to be presided over in relation to the Dalai Lama's birth.

2) And if Wu Zhongxin had been dispatched at that time, it needs to be stated as to where he was sent; when did he reach there; when did he meet with Radreng Rinpoche, with whom he was supposed to undertake the main joint responsibility; what discussions took place between them, and what the accomplishments were on the basis of these discussions. But nothing like these has been mentioned. In the absence of any mention of these matters, such doctored stories about correspondences within the Government of the Republic of China cannot relate to Sino-Tibetan relations, whether positively or negatively.

### **Point No. 44**

Document Number 89 is titled as "Decree of the Government of the Republic of China Pertaining to the Confirmation of Lhamo Dhondup as the Fourteenth Dalai Lama". And the body of the document states:

"Decree of the Government of the Republic of China.

"The great reincarnation Lhamo Dhondup, born in the Qinghai region, is profound in wisdom and extraordinary in intelligence. Since the investigation has been completed and you have been confirmed as the reincarnation of the Thirteenth Dalai Lama, there is no need to go through

the process of lot drawing from the golden urn. In view of this, a decree is issued herewith to authorise your appointment, on special consideration, as the Fourteenth Dalai Lama. The concise order is hereby issued for the formal appointment of 'The Fourteenth Dalai Lama' Lhamo Dhondup. For the purpose of the enthronement ceremony, the Ministry of Finance, upon instruction from the Executive Yuan, is allotting 400,000 yuan to meet the entire cost. This order is issued as symbolic of a special consideration from us.

“Issued on 3 February 1940, the 29th year of the Republic of China.”

1) The above successive documents pertaining to His Holiness the Fourteenth Dalai Lama incarnate and recorded in the book *A Collection of Historical Archives of Tibet* have no factual basis whatsoever. They were issued by a section of the Chinese political leadership to suit their own wishful thinking, seizing an opportune moment, without any consideration of the actual circumstances. Their vicious design of the vilest nature was to use such numerous kinds of documents, if and when the opportunity arises in future, as evidential basis for arguing as if they reflected the truth about the situation at that time. This is the only possible explanation for the existence of these documents, the writing of which is so characteristic of such Chinese leaders; but they have absolutely no bearing on the truth.

2) For example, after His Holiness the Dalai Lama incarnate, Lhamo Dhondup, was born on 6 July 1935, the 5th day of the 5th month in the Tibetan Wood-Pig Year, the discovery team of

Serje Keutsang Tulku and his retinue left Lhasa towards the end of 1936. En route at Kyegudo, the group met with the Panchen Rinpoche. At the beginning of 1937, the group entered Amdo. Of the three names given by the Panchen Choekyi Nyima as possible candidates for the reincarnation of the Thirteenth Dalai Lama, one had already passed away. The other two were sought out and put under examination. The final result was that the Chija Tagtser born holy precious child Lhamo Dhondup, without any hesitation, recognised and picked the personally used possessions of the Thirteenth Dalai Lama. Not only that, in the Lhamoe Latso [a sacred lake] at Choekhor Gyal, Regent Radreng Rinpoche had a vision of the Tibetan letters “A”, “Ka” and “Ma”, as well as of a three-storeyed temple of turquoise coloured roofs, with the topmost of it being a gilded roof. The very conspicuous road towards the east from that temple ended at the foot of a hill. Directly facing it was the vision of a single-storeyed house with a blue coloured roof. Keutsang Tulku and his team, having witnessed all these with bewildering clarity of reality, sent a detailed report of the same to Lhasa by a secret telegraphic message. The telegraphic reply from Lhasa said that although the holy reincarnate child in Chija Tagtser had exhibited such marvellous signs over a period of time which, no doubt, conformed to the Regent’s lake visions, further tests in the form of divinations, prophecies, etc., were once again sought from Lamas and deities and the outcomes were uniformly the same. In view of all this, the Chija Tagtser born holy child Lhamo Dhondup was finally confirmed for all purposes as the genuine Dalai Lama incarnate. Given this fact, efforts were made to ensure his immediate travel to Lhasa.

In 1937, the Tibetan government internally finalised in clear terms the reincarnation of the Thirteenth Dalai Lama. On the 28th day of the 6th month in the Earth-Rabbit Year, at a

grand session of the Tibetan National Assembly at the Deden Khyil residence in the Potala Palace, a proclamation was issued of the Chija Tagtser born holy child Lhamo Dhondup having been fully confirmed as the reincarnation of the Thirteenth Dalai Lama. That being the case, the claim that on 3 February 1940, the Guomindang government of the Republic of China issued a decree authorising the appointment of the Qinghai born holy child Lhamo Dhondup as the Fourteenth Dalai Lama without recourse to the process of lot drawing from the golden urn on special consideration emerges very clearly as an astonishingly audacious act of deceit and lie.

3) As stated above, although the Tibetan government already fully confirmed the Fourteenth Dalai Lama internally in 1937, the same was not publicly announced until 1939. Instead, a pretence was maintained through announcement that the Tagtser born child was just one of the many candidates in the list. The reason for this was to pre-empt possible problems seen likely to be encountered in bringing him to Lhasa. But even when it was stated that the holy child Lhamo Dhondup was only a candidate, bringing him to Lhasa had to be postponed for two years on account of constant arguments from the Xining Chinese Governor, Ma Pufang, demanding high amounts of monetary and large quantities of goods as ransoms.

4) As regards the fact that the Guomindang government of the Republic of China had absolutely no say in the political affairs of Tibet, it could be seen as very evident from the Chinese president Chiang Kai-shek having had to send an eight-point proposal to His Holiness the Thirteenth Dalai Lama and from the latter's replies to each of them.

## Point No. 45

Document Number 90 is titled as “Telegram from Dai Chuanxian to Radreng, Congratulating Lhamo Dhondup on His Confirmation as the Fourteenth Dalai Lama”. The content of the document reads:

“To the personal attention of Radreng Huthugthu, the Great Meditation Master who assists the nation and (spiritually) pacifies all sentient beings, at Lhasa through Chairman Wu Liqing.

“The exalted Lhamo Dhondup is the reincarnation of the Dalai Lama, who rules the country and whose compassion is so great as to benefit everyone, the all-knowing great master of all sentient beings. He is extremely bright in wisdom and intelligence and is a refuge of faith for all sentient beings. In view of this, the Guomindang Government of the Republic of China granted in clear terms a decree on the 5th, permitting him to succeed as the Fourteenth Dalai Lama, filling everyone everywhere with feelings of joy. Since that time the rays of Buddhist sunshine has spread ever brighter and the wheels of its teachings have forever kept turning. This is a matter of joy for all of Tibet; it is also a source of merit for the nation. For this reason I am sending this congratulatory telegram to you. You, the Meditation Master, yourself have carried out your administrative work with great honour, disseminating the Buddhist faith, benefiting the sentient beings, and safeguarding the legal order, with your achievements having been most praiseworthy. In view of all this, I offer you my joyous obeisance and praise from the depth of my heart. I also offer you my greetings.



“Sincerely yours on the 6th,

“Dai Chuanxian,

“6 February 1940, the 29th year of the Guomindang Government of the Republic of China.”

As thus written above, when it comes to the enthronement or installation of a nation’s top religious or political leader, offering congratulatory messages to each other is an established practice in the conduct of good relations among nations.

### **Point No. 46**

Document Number 91 is titled as “Telegram from Wu Zhongxin to the President of the Republic of China and Others on the Subject of the Ceremony for the Enthronement of the [Fourteenth] Dalai Lama”. And the body of the document states:

“Chongqing

“To: Mr. Lin, President of the Government of the Republic of China and Mr. Jiang, Chairman of the Executive Yuan

“Confidential. The ceremony for the enthronement of the Fourteenth Dalai Lama was held this morning at six at the Potala Place. I, Zhongxin, personally attended the event and presided over the ceremony. It was an extremely solemn ceremony. I am sending this report of it by telegram.

“Sincerely yours,

“Wu Zhongxin (Seal) on the 22nd

“22 February 1940, the 29th year of the Guomindang Government of the Republic of China.”

The reincarnation of His Holiness the Thirteenth Dalai Lama was discovered and confirmed by the Tibetan government. Besides that, regarding the claim that the Guomindang government of the Republic of China dispensed with the requirement of compliance with the lot drawing from the golden urn procedure, as well as the claim about Wu Zhongxin having presided over the enthronement ceremony, Ngapo Ngawang Jigme, Vice-Chairman of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference National Committee, said in his lecture in 1988 at the inauguration of the first congress of the scholars of The Tibetan Cultural Research Institute:

“The most critical issue is history, and if we are not careful in researching our history, [we neglect] an area of pivotal importance. As to the reason why, what we say about the ‘advanced’ and the ‘backward’ is very real. For example, the Chinese people are advanced, and the Tibetan people are backward. ... The advanced people have developed economy and culture etc. Those who are backward have a slightly less capability in these areas. However, what is distinctively characteristic of the backward is that they record faithfully and nakedly what had actually happened [in history]. That is why it could be seen that all the old histories of Tibet would appear to be true accounts of what had actually happened. As regards those written in Chinese, because it is advanced, it is written cleverly, with the degree of cleverness being commensurate with the level of the advance. On the world stage too, countries like the USA

are clever. Because of it, they have more capability to deceive others in that way. So, by being advanced and cleverer, they keep taking in those aspects that are beneficial to oneself while abandoning those aspects for which one finds no use. This being the case, it would not be right to base one's research only on texts written in Chinese. Neither would it be right to base one's research entirely on Tibetan language texts. Both should be studied together.

“One should know that true history has but only one truth; there is no way for there being what one might call two truths. Although this is the case, the fact is when it comes to telling it, one finds two, three, four, five or even more versions being talked about. ... For example, Wu Zhongxin of the Guomintang government came to Tibet to take part in the ceremony for the enthronement of the present, Fourteenth Dalai Lama. But all the Guomintang documents say he came to Tibet to conduct the discovery and that Wu Zhongxin picked a specific boy to recognise him as the Dalai Lama and, on that basis, organised the enthronement ceremony. The Guomintang documents talk only such things. But, surprisingly, that was not how it all was. The fact is, Wu Zhongxin only came here as representative of the Guomintang government of the Republic of China to take part in the enthronement ceremony. He never came here to conduct the discovery. But no matter how much it was pointed out that the discovery did not take place in the way it is told in the Guomintang documents, no one ever listens. Thus, in 1981, when marking the 30th anniversary of the signing of the 17-Point Agreement, a statement was issued stating

once again that Wu Zhongxin conducted the discovery as claimed above.

“At that time, I pointed out that this was not true; that such a thing should not be stated; and that it will never accord with true history. How was Wu Zhongxin supposed to conduct the discovery? There was no way this could ever have happened. There was no request at that time to the Guomindang government to come, or a Guomindang government representative coming, or anything else like that, to conduct the discovery. When I said all this, no one liked it at all. ... Later on, the story was repeated in every detail in a film on Tibet in its section on Wu Zhongxin. When I again pointed out that this was never how it happened, they remained stubborn in their resistance. After that, Tian Jeguon of the United Front Work Department told me that I should not be insistent on this matter; that the accounts about Wu Zhongxin having conducted the discovery could be seen in many documents. I replied that no matter what he would or would not tell me, I would never withdraw my objection on this; that I will remain resolute to the bitter end. As to what to do or not to do about it, I told him, the power was with them to do as they pleased. ‘I have no power to censor these,’ I said. ... When matters like these come up, the controversy is great. That is why those who are more advanced are cleverer and those who are backward more foolish. (At this point, the Panchen Rinpoche interjected to say that those who are more advanced tell more lies, making everyone laugh). Keeping this in mind, when you research on these matters henceforth, fully apply your analytical mind. In a nutshell, this is what I wanted to tell you.”

Again, on 31 July 1989, at the second session of the Fifth Tibet Autonomous Region People's Congress, Ngapo once again explained on this matter thus:

“Although on the basis of the matters explicated above, it could not be said that the local government of Tibet did not have any kind of relationship with the Guomindang Government of China, the fact was that the Guomindang did not make any direct interference in the internal political affairs of Tibet. Nevertheless, according to the propaganda of the Guomindang Government, the strength and closeness of the relationship between the Guomindang Government of the Republic of China and the local government of Tibet was the same as that during the earlier period of the Manchu rule in China, etc. But if one looks at the actual history, one finds that their habit of stating things like these do not accord with the facts. For example, with regard to the issue of the Chairman of the Mongolian and Tibetan Affairs Commission, Mr. Wu Zhongxin, having been sent to Tibet to preside over the ceremony for the enthronement of the Fourteenth Dalai Lama, the Guomindang Government had made some distorted representations, with such claims as that because the Dalai Lama incarnate was exceptionally intelligent, the need to make the selection by lot drawing from the golden urn was dispensed with. These claims were simply not factual.

“After the Thirteenth Dalai Lama passed away, Regent Radreng went to the Lhamoi Latso to seek divine visions. The visions he had there consisted of the three Tibetan alphabetical letters ‘A’, ‘Ka’ and ‘Ma’. Apart from these three letters, he had visions of a temple with turquoise-

coloured roof and a footpath leading to a small family house. Based on these visions, Keutsang Rinpoche, Khemey and others were dispatched to the Tso-ngo region to search for the reincarnation of the Thirteenth Dalai Lama. Later on, the reincarnation of the Thirteenth Dalai Lama was recognised from the Hongzhuang [Tibetan: Kumbum] in Tso-ngo region. That reincarnation is the Fourteenth Dalai Lama of today. If the question is why the reincarnation was sought to be discovered in the Tso-ngo region, the reason was that of the three letters from the lake vision, the first one, 'A', stood for Amdo. And the temple with turquoise coloured and gilded roofs was considered to signify Kumbum Jampaling monastery. On the basis of these determinations, the decision was made to undertake the discovery in the Amdo (Tso-ngo) region. After the discovery was made, the team sent a report of it to the local government at Lhasa and Regent Radreng. After thorough discussions of it in Lhasa, an internal final decision was arrived at, endorsing the boy already recognised as the reincarnation of the Thirteenth Dalai Lama to be the present Fourteenth Dalai Lama.

“Although the final determination was thus made, it was outwardly stated that the boy thus recognized was only a candidate for the final selection. This claim was made only in order to overcome external obstacles facing the discovery team — it was designed to avoid all kinds of possible objections and obstructions expected to come from Ma Pu-fang who ruled over Tso-ngo at that time. On the basis of the stated decision thus of the Tso-ngo boy being only a candidate for the final determination of the reincarnation of the Thirteenth Dalai Lama, the discovery

team was instructed to hold discussions with Ma Pu-fang. During the discussions, Ma Pu-fang raised all kinds of objections and created numerous problems. Although agreement was finally reached to allow the reincarnate and his parents as well as siblings to travel to Tibet, the Tibetan government was compelled to agree to pay Ma Pu-fang three million Chinese silver dollars.

“At the time of actual start of the journey for the reincarnate, however, Ma Pu-fang demanded to be paid an additional three million Chinese silver dollars. But because the local government of Tibet was at that time not in a position to pay three million Chinese silver dollars immediately, Regent Radreng, the Kashag [Tibet’s Cabinet] and the monasteries of Sera, Drepung and Gaden wrote a joint letter to the Mongolian and Tibetan Affairs Commission of the Guomindang government as well as another one directly to President Chiang Kai-shek. The letters urged the Chinese government at Nanjing for help, informing that in the matter of inviting the Dalai Lama incarnate to Lhasa, a candidate for the recognition of the reincarnation of the Thirteenth Dalai Lama had been discovered in Tso-ngon but that, in view of it, Ma Pu-fang was raising all kinds of objections and creating numerous obstacles.

“Since I have not personally been involved in this work, I especially visited Nanjing in 1985 and there urged the Jiangsu Provincial (party) Committee and the Provincial government for permission to see the archival documents of the Guomindang government pertaining to the discovery of the reincarnation of the Thirteenth Dalai Lama

and the enthronement of the Fourteenth Dalai Lama. The comrade-heads of both the Jiangsu provincial (party) committee and the provincial government readily agreed to my request in every respect. Not only that, they issued instructions to the officials of the archives office. The responsible comrade-official at the archives office showed me all the relevant Chinese and Tibetan language documents. The reference documents that I needed were all in the second archives filing unit. Among them was a copy of a document written in Tibetan language, giving a detailed account of how Regent Radreng had his visions from the lake. However, instead of Tibetan handmade paper, it was written on Chinese paper. It was also not an actual document of the Tibetan government. The content of this document was a copy of a letter presented by Regent Radreng to the Select Tibetan National Assembly. The letter says that of the three letters of the Tibetan Alphabet of which he had a vision in the lake, Regent Radreng felt that 'A' could stand for either the Amdo region or Ari [ie, Amey Kyeri, a peak]. As regards the additional [vision of the] temple with turquoise coloured and gilded roof he felt that this might have indicated Kumbum Jampaling monastery in the Amdo region. With the inclusion of a report also of a vision of a footpath leading to a small family house, Regent Radreng had asked the assembly of delegates of officials for their examination. Thus it is written there.

“Looking at the copied letter’s calligraphy, it appeared very likely to have had been taken down by a person from the Amdo region. The Guomindang government had treated this copied letter as if it was some kind of a precious jewel and had preserved it in the archives with the care deserving



of such an item. It turned out that the Guomintang government had treated this copied letter as the actual letter from the local Tibetan government, reporting to it on how it was making progress in the work for the discovery of the reincarnation of the Thirteenth Dalai Lama. But the truth was this copied document was neither an actual report nor is it written on a traditional Tibetan handmade paper. Not only that, the document is not even stamped, rendering it just a general kind of a copied letter.

“Regarding the claim that there are two other actual reports in connection with the same matter, I have already referred to these two letters above. They are the two sealed collective letters written by Regent Radreng, the Kashag and the monasteries of Sera, Drepung and Ganden — one to the Mongolian and Tibetan Affairs Commission and the other to President Chiang Kai-shek. These two documents turned out to be authentic. They are written on quality Tibetan handmade papers and bear the seals of Regent Radreng, the Kashag, and of the monasteries of Sera, Drepung, and Ganden. A mere look at their calligraphy show that one was written by the Kadrung [Kashag Secretary] Marlam and the other by Monkyi Ling. These two documents state that a candidate for the recognition of the reincarnation of the Thirteenth Dalai Lama had been discovered in the Tso-ngon region, that while the discovery team prepared to proceed back to Tibet with the reincarnate candidate, Ma Pu-fang raised all kinds of objections and created numerous obstacles. In view of this, the team sought the Guomintang government for help, keeping in view its concern for the relationship between the Tibetan and Chinese peoples.

“There was yet another document in the archives, a newspaper clipping with a red-inked headline, which spoke about the process of lot drawing from the golden urn being not needed to be complied with because of the reincarnation of the Thirteenth Dalai Lama being exceptionally intelligent. This newspaper clipping spoke about Wu Zhongxin having presided over the ceremony for the enthronement of the Fourteenth Dalai Lama and carried a photograph of him taking part in the ceremony. However, this photograph was taken in the Dalai Lama’s bedchamber. There is also a photograph of a watch presented by Wu Zhongxin to the Fourteenth Dalai Lama. On the basis of the Dalai Lama’s manifest expression of great excitement as he held the watch in his hand, Wu Zhongxin reported to say that the Dalai Lama, being exceptionally intelligent, could be given confirmation as such without recourse to the process of lot drawing from the golden urn, so the newspaper clipping said, adding the permission was given as per the report’s recommendation. As regards the claim that Wu Zhongxi presided over the ceremony for the enthronement of the Dalai Lama, it is based entirely on the newspaper’s coverage saying that Wu Zhongxin presided over the ceremony for the enthronement of the Fourteenth Dalai Lama on the basis merely of this photographic depiction.

“But, in reality, there was no incident of any kind whereby it could be said that Wu Zhongxin presided over the ceremony for the enthronement of the Fourteenth Dalai Lama. Nevertheless, today, even some comrades of the Tibetan nationality, when writing about that period, have made claims about Wu Zhongxin having presided over

the ceremony for the enthronement of the Fourteenth Dalai Lama. It is impossible for anyone to write such a thing unless he knows absolutely nothing about Tibetan customs. Among those seated here today are many who have been aristocrats in old Tibet. As you all know, during the ceremony for the enthronement of the Dalai Lama, there is no one presiding over it. It was not like in the meetings of the Chinese people when someone is needed to preside over it. It would not be surprising if the comrades of the Chinese nationality, not being familiar with Tibetan customs, write such a thing. But if some comrades of the Tibetan nationality too write it, there can be no reason for excuses for it.

“Last year, during the meeting of the Institute of Tibetology, I spoke about this matter and about my having looked up the relevant Guomintang archives on it. What reason is there for us communists to follow the footsteps of the Guomintang, to continue telling lies on this matter just like they did? The fact of the matter is, on the question of Tibet being an inalienable part of China, there is such a wealth of evidences we can state as proofs. It is not as if we can prove this only by saying that Wu Zhongxin presided over the ceremony for the enthronement of the Fourteenth Dalai Lama. That is not at all the case. At that time, comrade Jiang Ping of the Central Committee of the United Front Work Department said, ‘henceforth we should not be saying that Wu Zhongxin presided over the ceremony for the enthronement of the Fourteenth Dalai Lama.’

“Comrades Dorje Tseten and others had found a document. But that is a thank-you letter from the local government

of Tibet to the Guomintang government of the Republic of China. In its content, the Guomintang government is thanked for sending Wu Zhongxin to take part in the ceremony for the enthronement of the Fourteenth Dalai Lama. By relying on this document, the Guomintang government claims that Wu Zhongxin presided over the ceremony for the enthronement of the Fourteenth Dalai Lama. What matter can this claim elucidate? ‘Taking part’ in a ceremony and ‘presiding’ over it have entirely different meanings. Thus, even though, in reality, there was absolutely no one presiding over the ceremony for the enthronement of the Dalai Lama in the way it is being told by the Chinese, still stubbornly adhering to the claim that Wu Zhongxin’s participation in the ceremony was presiding over the ceremony for the enthronement of the Fourteenth Dalai Lama, does not at all accord with the history of that time.”

As thus explained [by Ngapo], in 1940 the Guomintang government, with evil design in mind, fabricated history. After that the government of the Communist Party of China, while paying only lip service to its claims of being revolutionary and advanced, only repeats Guomintang’s claims. Against this, Ngapo Ngawang Jigme, a person holding high-level rank in the Communist Party of China, provided explanations of the actual history on successive occasions as pointed out above. Nevertheless, these were left entirely unheeded as in the book *A Collection of Historical Archives of Tibet*, these fake Guomintang government documents have, with stubborn repetitiveness, once again been included. These do not relate to events that had taken place many centuries ago. People who have actually been part of those historical events are still alive and have offered numerous explanations based

on their personal knowledge. However, they were resoundingly ignored and instead recourse was taken to actions that actually reveal insanity induced by falsehood.

The result of all this is, as it is said, if one tells a lie even once, one will be doubted even when one tells the truth later on; the communists' actions do not fall short of the meaning of this dictum. In view of this, the communist Chinese leaders of today have debased to the depth of depravity the dignity of the Chinese people who have such a long history behind them. And in the eyes of the unbiased intellectuals of the world, they amount to such extreme disgrace of the Chinese leaders as to render them too ashamed to show their faces. Nevertheless, in reality, it is impossible that such falsehoods will ever turn into truths.

### **Point No. 47**

Regarding Document Number 92, its title reads, "Reply from Lhamo Dhondup to the Guomintang Government on His Recognition as the Fourteenth Dalai Lama". However, while this is what the title states, the document's actual content reads:

"For the Attention of President Lin of the Guomintang Government at Chongqing.

"Recently, on 5 February, you have issued an instruction to Chairman Wu of the Mongolian and Tibetan Affairs Commission, stating that because the reincarnate candidate Lhamo Dhondup from the Qinghai region exhibited exceptionally amazing qualities during examination, leading to undoubted conclusion that he is the true reincarnation

of the Thirteenth Dalai Lama, he may be confirmed as the Fourteenth Dalai Lama without resort to the Zendril process [a religious lottery where names are put in balls of Tsampa dough and shaken in a bowl until one pops out]. Along with this, you have granted a substantial amount of money needed for the conduct of the enthronement ceremony. Besides that, you have, on 15 February of the Chinese national calendar, presented to me through Chairman Wu substantial gifts of an edict, a gold seal and a medal called Tselyul for which I express gratitude. Please be assured that I remain in continuous prayers for the national progress of the Central Government of China and on that basis for the further advancement in relations between China and Tibet.

“By Tibet’s Regent Radreng Huthugthu on the 9th day of the 1st month of the Tibetan Iron-Dragon Year.”

As thus becomes clear, this letter has the appearance of having been sent by Regent Radreng; it has certainly not been sent by Lhamo Dhondup. And this document does not contain any of the big or small seals of the Regent. It refers to a letter received [from the Guomindang government], saying the process of selection by Zendril method could be dispensed with. The meaning of this might be as explained clearly and in detail under Point Numbers 44 and 46. That is, in 1937, Lhamo Dhondup was confirmed as the true Dalai Lama reincarnation. In 1939, this was announced to Tibet’s National Assembly. On 23 September 1939 Regent Radreng Rinpoche conducted his hair-cutting ceremony in front of the Jowo Shakyamuni statue in the Tsuglakhang, Lhasa, and was given a new name. On the 27th day

of the 10th month of the Tibetan Earth-Rabbit Year, proclamation was issued for the holding of the enthronement ceremony at the Potala palace on the 14th day of the 1st month of the Tibetan Iron-Dragon Year, corresponding to 22 February 1940.

Thus, both in the matter of the confirmation of the Dalai Lama reincarnate and of the ceremony for setting up the throne, the Tibetan government finalised everything without any kind of consultation with or consent from the Guomintang government. It was only after all these were accomplished that on the basis of a permission sought beforehand from, and granted by the Tibetan government, Wu Zhongxin arrived in Lhasa to attend the final enthronement ceremony. And yet Document Number 89, brought along by Wu Zhongxin, and dated 3 February 1940, states, “this decree is issued to authorise your appointment as the Fourteenth Dalai Lama on a special consideration without the need for recourse to the process of lot drawing from the golden urn.” Likewise, Document Number 90, bearing the date of 6 February 1940, and being a letter from Dai Chuanxian to Regent Radreng Rinpoche, says, “The Guomintang government issued, on the 5th, a clear decree authorising the accession of the Fourteenth Dalai Lama.”

Such unimaginable fabrications of facts have been recorded on the basis entirely of one’s own desires. Nevertheless, at the fundamental level, there was no basis for the works in connection with the final confirmation of the Dalai Lama reincarnation, having already been completed by the Tibetan government, from being changed. Wu Zhongxin was, at that time, only a foreign invitee to the enthronement ceremony. The case undoubtedly was that Regent Radreng Rinpoche, having considered it a worthy occasion for strengthening relations with China, did not join issue with the wording of the letter from the Guomintang government and allowed the matter to rest there.

## Point No. 48

Document Number 93 is titled as “Credentials Issued to Thubten Sangpo as Delegate to the Guomindang National Assembly”. And the document’s content reads:

“To the Mongolian and Tibetan Electoral Affairs Office of National Assembly Delegates and Legislative Yuan Members.

“This is to certify that as a result of the election held in accordance with the provisions of the laws concerning the election and recall of National Assembly delegates and regulations framed under it, Mr. Thubten Sangpo has been elected to represent the region of Tibet in the National Assembly. These credentials are issued to Mr. Thubten Sangpo in line with Article 31 of the Law Concerning Election and Recall of National Assembly Delegates and Article 55 of the related enforcement regulations.

“Xu Shiying, Supervisor

“24 March 1948, the 37th year of the Republic of China.”

1) Thubten Sangpo was a person appointed by the Government of Tibet as its representative in its Nanjing office. If it was lawful and true that such a person took part as a delegate from Tibet in the National Assembly of the Guomindang, the relevant person, Thubten Sangpo, surely must have a document issued by the Tibetan government, authorising him to do so, and, likewise, the office of the National Assembly of the Guomindang must have



received a letter from the Tibetan Government, introducing Thubten Sangpo. But on the basis of the fact that no such documents exist, it appears certain that the so-called credentials of delegate to the National Assembly of the Guomintang issued to Thubten Sangpo was a fabricated piece of work, designed to suit one's own sweet will and filed in the archives thereafter.

2) It is also extremely doubtful whether Thubten Sangpo at all knew about these things, or had accepted the authenticity of these descriptions. The reason why we say this is because nowhere on the document is there a signature of Thubten Sangpo; and instead of being delivered to him, the credential is kept in the Chinese archives.

3) As explained in detail in Point Number 47 above, in 1937, the Tibetan government finalised the confirmation of the Dalai Lama reincarnation and without any limitations on material and monetary expenses, and overcoming considerable troubles, brought him over to Lhasa. And, after the date for the enthronement ceremony was announced, the Guomintang government said in its February 1940 letter that it was authorising the confirmation of the Dalai Lama reincarnation and that it was permitting this without the need to undergo the process of confirmation by recourse to lot drawing from the golden urn. Judging from the fact that the Chinese at all dared to record such lies, the possibility appears certain that they had lured few Tibetans living within China with material and monetary temptations, besides exercising custodial coercive on some, to carry out all kinds of improper actions. It is certainly not impossible to speculate that such incidents did take place.

## Point No. 49

Document Number 94 is titled as “Telegram from the Mongolian and Tibetan Affairs Commission to the Kashag, Concerning the Enthronement Ceremony for the Reincarnation of the Panchen Erdini”. And the document’s content reads:

“To the Council of Kashag

“Your telegram dated 22nd day of the seventh month, the Earth-Rat Year, has been received here. As stated in it, the fact that the candidates for the reincarnation of the Panchen Lama could not be finalised and had to be postponed has a great bearing on every aspect of the immediate religious and political future of Tibet. The Central Government of the Republic of China, of course, too continues to have an obligation with regard to the protection of the religious order in Tibet. With regard to the question of the recognition of the reincarnation, the Central Government of China should take the administrative responsibility in the way established by past practices. Otherwise, beware of the problems it will lead to, with everyone finding it difficult to maintain faith and respect [in the outcome]. Even a slight bit of indiscretion in the matter could give rise to very serious disputes, which would be unfortunate to the sentient beings of Tibet. Please keep in mind our earlier telegram sent on the 9th of January in the 36th year of the Guomintang Republic of China, and, on that basis, immediately fix a date for the lot drawing ceremony for the purpose of seeking confirmation of the

genuine reincarnation of the Panchen. The Central Government of China should thence be forthwith informed of the outcome so that it will then issue a proclamation of a decree for the purpose. For this purpose, an official of high rank will be especially dispatched to join the spiritual and temporal leader of Tibet to preside over the lot drawing and enthronement ceremonies. The Central Government of China can also dispatch an official to Tibet to lead the team that would meet and escort the chosen candidate to Tashi Lhunpo. This telegram has been especially sent for your attention. Also, please send a reply telegram immediately.

“From Xu Shiyong, Chairman of the Mongolian and Tibetan Affairs Commission

“12 October ....”

Document Number 95 is titled as “Letter from the Presidential Palace to the Mongolian and Tibetan Affairs Commission on the 10th Panchen Erdini’s Telegram Thanking Him”. The letter’s actual content states:

“The Acting President has handed us a telegram dated 11 [August] from the 10th Panchen Erdini in Xining, expressing gratitude for the presents he had received and affirming his loyalty to the Central Government of China. The Acting President has ordered us to send a telegraphic reply of encouragement. Provide a duplicate copy each to the Executive Yuan and Mongolian and Tibetan Affairs Commission. Accordingly, we have enclosed a copy of the telegram received by the Acting President and his reply to

it to you, the Mongolian and Tibetan Affairs Commission.  
Please check them.

“From the Second Bureau of the Presidential Palace

“18 August 1949, the 38th year of the Republic of China.

“Encl. Duplicate 1

“Extra Urgent

“Canton

“To Acting President Li,

“The successive reincarnations of me, the Panchen, have been receiving boundless amounts of favours and special treatments from the nation. This time, too, His Excellency, the Acting President Li, has issued a special decree in explicit terms, authorising my succession to the religious lineage of the 9th Panchen. In addition, I am indebted to you for sending special envoy Guan Jiyu and deputy envoy Ma Bufang to Qinghai to preside over my enthronement ceremony and for sending me generous gifts of precious items, which I received with great respect. I have also been greatly moved by it. On 10 August the enthronement ceremony was held at Kumbum monastery. In future too I will, with a single-minded devotion, remain true to your wish for me to follow the successive Panchens’ tradition of all-round loyalty to the Central Government and of not abandoning sentient beings from protection. On that basis, I will, with great diligence, seek to accomplish my duties

and thereby hope to be able to honour and repay your kindness and infinite concerns for me. I am sending this telegram to thank you. With respect, I pray that you remain in good health.

“Sent by the 10th Panchen Erdini (Seal)

“11 August

“Encl. Duplicate 2

“Xining

“To the Panchen Erdini,

“Confidential. I have read your telegram dated 11 [August] and have noted its content. I am happy and elated beyond limits that the great enthronement ceremony has been accomplished successfully. I remain hopeful that you will propagate widely the Buddhist faith, uphold your religious vows, and provide religious help and support in the political affairs. In gratitude.

“Li Zongren, Second Bureau of the Presidential Palace

“16 August”

Now to analyse Document Numbers 94 and 95:

1) In Document Number 94, which is a letter sent to the Kashag by the Mongolian and Tibetan Affairs Commission, it is stated, “Your telegram dated 23rd day of the seventh month, the

Earth-Rat Year, has been received here.” Unfortunately, Document Number 94 does not include the reply sent by the Kashag. If this reply had been reproduced in all its details, it would be possible to make out clearly the feelings of both the Tibetan and the Chinese sides at that time. However, in view of the despicable Chinese behaviour of rendering Document Number 94 incomplete, it is impossible to analyse it.

2) The essence of the content of Document Number 94 is the demand that the reincarnation of the Panchen Rinpoche must be selected through the lot drawing process and that for conducting it a representative of the Guomindang government will be dispatched. In Document Number 95, which is a letter sent by the 10th Panchen to Acting President Li of China, it is stated, “Acting President Li has issued a special decree in explicit terms, authorising my succession to the religious lineage of the 9th Panchen. In addition, I am indebted to you for sending special envoy Guan Jiyu and deputy envoy Ma Bufang to Qinghai to preside over my enthronement ceremony ... On 10 August the enthronement ceremony was held at Kumbum monastery.”

Although the Guomindang government did not at all have even an iota of right of say in the affairs of Tibet, it interfered in the matter of the recognition of the reincarnation of the Panchen Lama, demanding, at first, in 1947, that the lot drawing process must be undertaken. Thereafter, in 1949, the existing reincarnate was confirmed without recourse to the lot drawing ceremony and thereby brazenly enthroned. Thus, without any sense of care and concern for the actual state of Sino-Tibetan political relations, words previously uttered were entirely negated by subsequent actions. That the Chinese resorted to such utterly whimsical actions only betrayed infatuation with their ethnic chauvinism of the worst degree, and perversions manifest in the greedy use of the Panchen

Lama institution in every conceivable manner. What makes all this obvious is that at the end of the Guomindang telegram in reply to the one from the Panchen Rinpoche, it is written, “I remain hopeful that you will ... provide religious help and support in the political affairs.” Such a naked recording of their wish clearly revealed the true intention of the Chinese.

Document Number 96 is described as “The Seal of Radreng Huthugthu, the Great Meditation Master Who Assists in State Affairs and Pacifies All Sentient Beings.” As per this description, the document is a photocopy of the shape and inscriptional face of a seal presented by the Guomindang government to Tibet’s Regent, Radreng Huthugthu, through Wu Zhongxin. The seal’s inscription contains the fake and deceiving wording “... Who Assists the Nation”. It only shows very clearly the long-term aim of the Chinese and nothing else. Nevertheless, no matter how much the Chinese made efforts to devise such deceiving wordings, it was impossible that these would help it to achieve its unjust ambitions. For example, even though from the year 1911 onwards, Nepal stopped sending to Beijing its annual tribute mission, its successive kings and prime ministers continued to receive at Kathmandu titles and ceremonial costumes through envoys sent by the Guomindang government. The question then is, could it be said on the basis of the above events that Nepal accepted being part of China? On the basis of these events which took place during the period of the Guomindang rule in China, do the Communist Chinese government today argue that Nepal was therefore part of China?

To state everything in essence and brevity, how could the Guomindang government of China have exercised sovereign rule over Tibet, which was in a state of complete independence? For example, During World War II, when the government of British India and Guomindang-ruled China collectively requested the

Tibetan government for permission to transport war materials through its territory, the latter replied that Tibet, being neutral in the war, could not allow it and, therefore, turned it down. Tibet thereby very clearly showed to the whole world that it was an independent nation and it exercised its right flowing from this status to maintain a policy of neutrality, rather than joining in the war.

From another perspective, in 1959, the International Commission of Jurists, having researched the Sino-Tibetan relations, clearly concluded in its report titled *The Question of Tibet and the Rule of Law*, that from 1912, Tibet was, both in fact and in law, a fully independent country. That being the case, during that period, there was not even a token of Chinese authority over Tibet with the result that Tibet's status as an independent country is manifest to the whole world.

Additionally, what needs to be pointed out is that in 1945, after World War II came to an end, the Tibetan government dispatched a Victory Congratulations Mission to the USA, the UK and China, consisting of envoys Dzasag Thubten Samphel and Dzasag Khemey Sonam Wangdu, along with staff. As instructed, the Tibetan government mission of the two Dzasags arrived in Nanjing, where it met with President Chiang Kai-shek. They offered President Chiang a letter and gifts. In the letter, the Tibetan government stated, among many other things, that Tibet should continue to remain a fully independent country as it was until then under the rule of successive Dalai Lamas. It said Tibet and China should maintain friendly relations between them. The letter also urged that indisputable Tibetan territories that had over the years fallen under Chinese control should be returned to Tibet. These are actual events that have occurred in the history of Sino-Tibetan relations. Nevertheless, documents related to such



important events as these have been ignored in the book *A Collection of Historical Archives of Tibet*. What is the reason for the concealment by omission of such documents?

The fact is that the Chinese are afraid that if documents like these are recorded in the book, everyone would gain a clear understanding of the state of Sino-Tibetan relationship during that period. It is undeniable, therefore, that they deliberately omitted such documents as a pre-emptive measure out of knowledge of their guilty intentions. But such kind of trickery in presentation cannot, in any way, enable the Chinese to get away with it in the progressive 21st-century world today. It would therefore be proper if they show a bit of honesty in such matters.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> *Shes-bya'i Rnam-grangs Kun-btus Tshig-mdzod*, a Tibetan-Chinese dictionary, p. 837

<sup>2</sup> Chinese distance measure equivalent to about 0.5 km.

<sup>3</sup> *Rgya'i Yig-tshang Las Bod-kyi Rgyal-rabs Gsal-ba'i Me-long*, translated from Chinese to Tibetan by Phuntsok Tashi Takla, Dharamsala 1973, pp. 1-2

<sup>4</sup> *ibid.*, pp. 65-67

<sup>5</sup> *ibid.*, p. 137

<sup>6</sup> *ibid.*, p. 241

<sup>7</sup> *ibid.*, pp. 271-277

<sup>8</sup> *ibid.*, p. 443

<sup>9</sup> *ibid.*, p. 444

<sup>10</sup> The rule of thirteen myriarchies or administrative districts, each of which was putatively made up of ten thousand families

<sup>11</sup> Actually, the letter was in response to the letter sent by the Seventh Dalai Lama, Kalsang Gyatso

<sup>12</sup> Here too, the letter was actually a response to the letter sent by the Seventh Dalai Lama, Kalsang Gyatso

<sup>13</sup> Unit of Tibetan currency equal to 50 Sang, with one Sang equalling 10 Zho and one Zho equalling 10 Kar, the basic unit

<sup>14</sup> Biography of the Dalai Lamas *in Bod Kyi Lo-rgyus Rag-rim Gyu Yi Preng-ba*, Vol. 2, published by Tibet Institute of Social Science, Lhasa 1991, p. 316

<sup>15</sup> Lo is Lobsang Tashi and De is Dekharwa Tsewang Rabten, the two prime ministers

<sup>16</sup> Although the event took place in 1955, the actual document has this year. In addition, there are all kinds of writing mistakes and varieties of spellings used; these have been left unchanged

<sup>17</sup> The Tibetan text says 1952, wrongly