

On the So-called "Statement of the Dalai Lama"

by HSIHUA POLITICAL REPORTER

Following is a commentary by a Hsinhua News Agency political reporter, which was released on April 20. — Ed.

THE so-called "statement of the Dalai Lama," issued through an Indian diplomatic official in Tezpur on April 18, is a crude document, lame in reasoning, full of lies and loop-holes.

Disregarding the fact that China is a unified country made up of the Han, Tibetan, Mongolian, Uighur and dozens of other nationalities, the statement from the very beginning beats the drums for the so-called "independence" of the Tibetans. Actually, Tibet's political and religious systems were all laid down by the central government at Peking over the hundreds of years between the thirteenth and eighteenth centuries. Not even the title, position and powers of the Dalai Lama were laid down by the Tibetans themselves. In modern history, the so-called Tibetan independence has always been a scheme of the British imperialists for carrying out aggression against China, and first of all against Tibet. The fact that the statement starts out with a mention of the so-called independence of Tibet proves that its author is reflecting the will of the imperialist aggressors and is utterly opposed to the 1951 agreement on the peaceful liberation of Tibet. That agreement starts from the affirmation that Tibet is part of the People's Republic of China, but the statement does not say a single word on this point. This fact alone makes it impossible to believe the statement's claim that the former local government of Tibet "tried their best to adhere to the seventeen-article agreement."

The statement alleges that the seventeen-article agreement of 1951 on the peaceful liberation of Tibet was produced "under the pressure of the Chinese Government" and that after the Chinese People's Liberation Army entered Tibet and took up its position there "the Tibetan Government did not enjoy any measure of autonomy" and that even the Preparatory Committee for the Autonomous Region of Tibet "had little power and decisions in all important matters were taken by the Chinese authorities."

The facts are that this agreement was concluded after repeated negotiations and full consultation between the representatives of the Central People's Government and the local government of Tibet, lasting from late April to late May 1951. After the signing of the agreement, in his October 1951 telegram to Chairman Mao Tse-tung, the Dalai Lama referred to the agreement as one concluded "by the delegates of both parties, on a friendly basis," and said that "the local government of Tibet and the Tibetans, lamas and laymen, unanimously support the agreement." Since entering Tibet, the People's Liberation Army has been carrying out the seventeen-article agreement with complete fidelity. Neither the political system existing in Tibet nor the original position and powers of the Dalai Lama have been changed. Lama and lay officials at all levels remained at their posts as before. Religious activities and the customs and habits of the local people were respected, and Tibetan currency continued to circulate. The agreement's provisions that the local government of Tibet should carry out reforms of their own accord and

that the Tibetan army should gradually be reorganized into People's Liberation Army units have never been put into effect. At the end of 1956, the central authorities announced to the local government of Tibet that it was permissible not to institute democratic reforms before 1962. In a word, in the past eight years, the political, social and religious systems in Tibet remained as they were before the peaceful liberation. There was hardly any internal matter in Tibet which the former local government of Tibet (the *kasha*) was not responsible for carrying out. With the aim of introducing regional autonomy in Tibet in accordance with the Constitution, the central authorities set up the Preparatory Committee for the Autonomous Region of Tibet in April 1956 with the Dalai Lama at its head. The fact that the Preparatory Committee was ineffectual was precisely because of obstructions by the former local government of Tibet, who did not want regional autonomy at all but instead wanted the same "Tibetan independence" that the imperialists wanted. They painstakingly plotted to sabotage the seventeen-article agreement, proceeding from directing the rioting of the Khamba rebels to openly launching an all-out armed rebellion themselves on March 10.

The statement does not point to a single fact showing that the former local government of Tibet had made any effort to abide by the seventeen-article agreement. Nor does it mention a single fact testifying to any violation of the seventeen-article agreement by the Central People's Government. The only fact it mentions is the putting down of the rebellion in the former Sikang area in 1955 by the Central People's Government. But the whole world knows that the Sikang area was not part of Tibet at all. Formerly it was Sikang Province. Later, it became part of Szechuan Province. As is well known, it was precisely in the summer of 1955, when the Dalai Lama and his entourage were passing through Szechuan Province on their way back to Tibet after attending the National People's Congress, that the reactionary clique of the upper strata in Tibet hastily plotted to start a conflagration and directed the Khambas to rebel immediately. Their plan was to make the Khamba rebellion serve as the frontline, covering their own action to drive out the Han people and proclaim independence in the Tibet region itself. They overestimated the fighting strength of the Khambas and the inaccessibility of the terrain. Therefore, they made a prompt decision, calculating that it would be the wisest thing to do to incite the Khambas to rebel first. But contrary to their calculations, the rebellion was swiftly stamped out. In the fighting to quell the rebellion, of course, some lives were lost and some buildings damaged—and for this the rebels, and first of all those who directed the rebellion, must be held responsible. Aside from this, there was no such thing as large numbers of lamas being killed or many monasteries destroyed, as is alleged. The statement cites the rebellion in the Sikang area, which is not in the Tibet region at all, to accuse the Central People's Government of violating the seventeen-article agreement. This not only sheds light on the fact that the Central People's Government has fully adhered to the agreement, but precisely proves that

it is the rebel clique of Tibet that directed the Khamba rebellion.

The statement also distorts the truth where it refers to the course of development of the rebellion launched between March 10 and 19. Everyone knows that March 10 was the date when the rebellion was initiated. The rebel group chose this date, because the Dalai Lama himself decided to go on that day to the auditorium of the Tibet Military Area Command to attend a theatrical performance for which he himself had asked a month in advance. The statement dares not directly deny this fact, but on purpose says confusedly that the Dalai Lama "had agreed" to go to the performance, and the date of March 10 was "suddenly fixed." It does not dare say who fixed that date. But, it was clearly stated by the Dalai Lama in his letter of March 11 to General Tan Kuan-san, acting representative of the Central People's Government in Tibet. The letter said, "I decided to go to the Military Area Command to see the theatrical performance yesterday [namely March 10], but I was unable to do so, because of obstruction by people, lamas and laymen, who were instigated by a few evil elements and who did not know the facts." The fact that the statement avoids mentioning the Dalai Lama's three letters to General Tan Kuan-san is proof that its author dares not face the facts. The statement asserts that the People's Liberation Army sent reinforcements to strengthen the garrisons in Lhasa and Tibet before March 17, and that "on March 17 two or three mortar shells were fired in the direction of Norbu Lingka palace." This is a brazen, outright fabrication. The fabricator, however, leaves a backdoor open for himself: "Fortunately the shells fell in a nearby pond!" But if the People's Liberation Army really wanted to attack, why was it that it only fired two or three mortar shells and did not venture to fire one more shell after they fell in a nearby pond?

The way of referring to the Dalai Lama's leaving Lhasa in the statement also arouses attention. It says: "After this the advisers became alive to the danger to the person of the Dalai Lama and in those difficult circumstances it became imperative for the Dalai Lama, members of his family and his high officials to leave Lhasa." This paragraph demonstrates that it was not the Dalai Lama himself but the "advisers" who realized that they should leave Lhasa. This is also a disclosure of the actual fact of the abduction of the Dalai Lama from Lhasa, which cannot be covered up. The Dalai Lama's letter dated March 11 said: "Reactionary, evil elements are carrying out activities endangering me under the pretext of ensuring my safety." His letter dated March 12 further said: "Yesterday I told the *kasha* to order the immediate dissolution of the illegal people's conference and the immediate withdrawal of the reactionaries who arrogantly moved into the Norbu Lingka under the pretext of protecting me." This bears out the fact that after March 10 the Dalai Lama was encircled by the rebel armed forces and was abducted on March 17. The statement does not dare deny these facts. This brands as patently deceitful the statement that the Dalai Lama's departure from Lhasa was "of his own free will and not under duress."

There are indications in the statement which arouse suspicions as to whether it is indeed a statement by the Dalai Lama himself. Firstly, the content of the statement entirely contradicts the many statements and articles issued, published or released by the Dalai Lama personally in the past eight years, including the three letters written by the Dalai Lama himself after the outbreak of the March 10 rebellion. Even when the Dalai Lama was surrounded by a bunch of reactionaries during his previous visit to India in 1956, in his personal talks with Premier Chou En-lai, he never once expressed such ideas as breaking away from the motherland and currying favour with the foreign aggressors, as are contained in the statement. Secondly, the statement has been published as if it were issued by the Dalai Lama himself, but not a single "I", the pronoun of the first person, can be

found in it. In every case, "he", the third person pronoun, is used. This is definitely not the Tibetan style of writing, but a European or a near-European style. Some concepts and phrases used in the statement are also of foreign origin, for example, the allegation concerning so-called "Chinese suzerainty" was a creation of the British imperialists, and it was under cover of recognizing so-called Chinese suzerainty over Tibet that British aggression against Tibet was carried out. Such terms were never used in the documents of the Chinese Central People's Government or those of the local government of Tibet. The members of the present gang of Tibetan rebels were entirely trained by the British. Indian expansionist elements inherited this shameful legacy from the British. And that is why the members of this gang were of a mind to join with foreign forces from within our country, with their faces turned to India and their backs to their motherland. See how intimate they are with each other! Calling each other sweet names and reluctant to part! Some phrases of the statement are quite similar to those used by certain foreign newspapers and statesmen commenting on the rebellion in Tibet, such as "the Tibetan people are different from the Han people of China," the Dalai Lama is the "spiritual head" of all Buddhists in Tibet, etc. Judging from the various points mentioned above, one has reason to suspect that the statement was not by the Dalai Lama himself but was imposed on him by some person or persons.

The statement however does tell a truth: the Tibetans are different from the Hans. This truth applies equally to the Mongolians, the Manchus, the Uighurs, the Huis, the Chuangs in Kwangsi Province, the Miaos and the Yaos in the southern provinces, and dozens of other smaller nationalities. All of them are different from the Hans. However, none of these smaller nationalities ask for independence, but have established autonomous regions, autonomous *chou* and autonomous counties within the big family of their motherland. Tibet in the past several centuries has never been an independent state, and there has never been a country in the world that has recognized Tibet as an independent country or established diplomatic relations with it. And now, all of a sudden it is claimed that it wants independence. What is meant by independence here is in fact to turn Tibet into a colony or protectorate of a foreign country.

The publication at the present moment of this so-called "statement of the Dalai Lama," which harps on the so-called Tibetan independence, will naturally cause people to ask: Is this not an attempt to place the Dalai Lama in a position of hostility to his motherland and thus block the road for him to return to it? Is this not an attempt to create a situation for compelling the Indian Government to permit the Tibetan rebels to engage in anti-Chinese political activities in India?

Observers in Peking point out that the statement made public at Tezpur, India, will have no influence on the situation in Tibet except that it will enable the Tibetan people to see more clearly the true colours of the Tibetan traitors. The statement expresses the hope that "these troubles will be over soon without any more bloodshed." This hope does conform with reality. The rebellion which broke out more than a month ago will be ended before long. The People's Liberation Army units have not only promptly smashed the rebellion in the Lhasa area, but also rapidly crushed the rebel group in the area south of the Yalutsangpo River. The units of the People's Liberation Army have won great victories in suppressing the armed rebellion, and have in the past few days taken control of our whole frontier north of the Himalayas. Only a small batch of Khamba rebels have fled to India. In the fighting to put down the rebellion, all of the local Tibetan people stand by the side of the People's Liberation Army. Those who were intimidated to join have deserted the rebels en masse and returned to their homes to take part in productive work. Not only the bloodshed, but also the backwardness, darkness and brutality of the old Tibet will become a thing of the past.