

**far
east**

Reporter

**THE REAL
TIBET**

by **SUSAN WARREN**

25 cents



**Muslims in Lhasa clearing the ruins
of their mosque burnt by the rebels**



At the victory rally in Tibet

*Stills from the documentary film "Quelling the Rebellion in Tibet"
now drawing packed houses in Peking.*

THE REAL TIBET

by SUSAN WARREN

Published by FAR EAST REPORTER, Maud Russell, Publisher

1959

New York 17, N. Y.

THE REAL TIBET

INTRODUCTION

Events on the "roof of the world" have evoked a spate of fevered journalism—most of it straight from the bottom of the barrel. Tibet to which no serious attention had ever been paid in the American Press has had its brief moment in the spotlight. But the view of Tibet presented to the American public has been compounded of part Hollywood Shangri-La and part dream sequence from a State Department production. The fewer the facts, the purpler the prose. On the same day that it carried an article deploring the difficulties of obtaining news from so remote an area as Tibet, the *New York Times* reported an interview with Thubten J. Norbu, the Dalai Lama's brother who has resided in New York since October, 1955, in which the latter gave a detailed count on every monk slaughtered, every lamasery desecrated, and how many women and children were machine-gunned by the Chinese Reds. While the more conservative Herald Tribune conceded that "Until now the Red Chinese have at least in part bowed to the unreadiness of the Tibetans for Communist 'reforms' . . .", Max Lerner, *New York Post* columnist from whom one might dare to hope for at least a "scholar's" respect for the facts, rushed into print with "They (the Chinese) find in the Dalai Lama and his people a stubborn refusal to accept the new 'communes' and the New Order."

If Lerner led the way the *U.S. News and World Report* was not far behind. With flawless logic and in its own special brand of journalese it summed up in a brief paragraph every forlorn hope of the State Department. "What started as guerrilla fighting and passive resistance now has flared into a real war, with all Asia looking on. Tibet, on March 26, denounced a 1951 treaty that attached the country to Communist China. That converted the uprising into a Tibetan campaign against a "foreign invader!" And in real gutter press style a worm's eye view of world politics was provided by the *New York World Telegram's* Robert C. Ruark. This lionized author of a vile, chauvinistic novel slandering the Kenya people's long battle for freedom wrote of Prime Minis-

ter Nehru's reiteration that Tibet was part of China and an internal affair; "Being a simple bush baby, not to mention a peasant, I'm not hep to the over-all politico-military complexion of the world, but I can tell you one thing: I can smell chicken, I can smell fear and I can smell uneasy self assertion. If ever a guy chickened himself out of a self chosen leadership for peace it is our friend Mr. Nehru of India in the Tibetan affair. Gone the great world leader of the uncommitted peoples. Gone the settler of all the world's problems that come to the United Nations. Instead we have just one more Wahidi who can be terribly brave everywhere on other people's time but when it comes to his own back yard—chicken."

And from that intransigent tory, Joseph Alsop, came a rare glimpse into the hearts and mind of that "happy few." "Among the tiny number of Americans who know the factors in the problem," he writes, "there is almost breathless excitement about the rebellion in Tibet. It can, they say, shake the Chinese Communist regime vastly more profoundly than the rebellion in Hungary shook the Soviet regime. . . . Certain results are easily predictable. . . . The strain of the Communes plus the strain of Tibet can just imaginably equal a general explosion." Then, in a sudden recall to reality, Mr. Alsop strikes a more wistful note. "This sounds like day-dreaming. But it is sometimes useful to contemplate the other side's troubles when the Western alliance has so many troubles of its own."

To wrap up this bundle of unreality it only remained to hear from Chiang Kai-shek. With a straight face the *New York Times* reported that the "Generalissimo," "told the Tibetans today that they would have the right to choose their political future when the Nationalists reconquered the mainland." The dream had come full circle!

These effusions did not affect events in Tibet. The day has long since passed when China's affairs could be manipulated by the West. Now, the hullabaloo dead of its own weight, they are instructive as one more case of wholesale deception of the American people who deserve at least the facts.

SOCIAL AND POLITICAL SYSTEM

In Tibet there has persisted a social order of the darkest

feudal serfdom in the world. To understand events in Tibet it is necessary to know something about this social system—not in the manner of describing some archaic, quaint and remotely fascinating museum piece with the nostalgic romanticism peculiar to writers who will never have to live in it—but with a grasp of the dynamics of a social order characterized by the absolute rule over body and soul of an interlocking clerical-lay nobility, and the same brutality, superstition, disease, filth, ignorance and stagnation as characterized Europe's Dark Ages.

Although there are about 4,500,000 Tibetans, only 1,200,000 live in Tibet. The others are mainly found in the adjacent provinces of Szechuan, Chinghai, Kansu and Yunnan. Of the 1,200,000 Tibetans in Tibet "proper" some 700,000 are agricultural serfs and 300,000 pastoral serfs. One hundred and fifty thousand—or about one man in four—are monks. Thus at least one-eighth of the population has been withdrawn from production—and reproduction. This has been one of the factors in a steadily declining population. The nobility, merchants, artisans and beggars account for another 50,000. Of the latter 170-200 families are of the rich nobility and 10,000 could be classed as well-to-do people who are not noble but may be merchants or distant relatives of nobles. The largest social group in Tibet is the land peasantry. They, with the herdsmen, form the basis of Tibetan society and they are all serfs tied to the land or their leased herds. Commoners are governed by their overlords—monastery, government or noble—and *these are the only land owners*. The nobles and the monasteries each hold about 30 per cent of all the land in Tibet. The rest, approximately 40 per cent, belongs to the feudal government. These three kinds of land and serf owners account for only 5 per cent of the population.

For the right to cultivate the land of the overlord (with their own draught animals and farm implements), or lease a herd, the serfs return close to 70 per cent of the produce of their work. They must also do other specified work without pay, such as gathering fuel and water, repairing or building houses. All these gratuitous services are known as "ula" and are infinitely varied. One of the most hated forms of "ula" is the obligation to supply animals and men to anyone bearing a government order entitling him to free transport. A part

of the estate of the serf owners is set aside for service to the feudal government. Serfs are assigned to cultivate this land and do various forms of corvee for the government. Military service is also borne by some of the serfs on such land. In return the lords allot a small, inferior piece of their vast manorial holdings (about three-tenths of the land of the lord) to the serfs. Whatever the needs of this land the serf must drop everything and hurry to perform "ula" whenever called upon.

The nobility rarely go near the estates. They are satisfied so long as the bailiffs continue to turn over the traditional quantity of produce and take no interest in how it happens. In such a primitive economy, without hope or incentive, the serfs scratch the soil with light, wooden plows tied to the horns of two yaks. Debt is a specter which haunts the life of every peasant family for a single bad harvest may plunge it into bottomless arrears. The average interest rate charged by the monks—who were formerly the only lenders of money—was about 20 per cent a season, or six months. Flight from such crushing debt became so widespread that the former Tibetan army was largely occupied in tracking down runaway serfs.

"Shangri-La"

A Tibetan serf had no political rights whatsoever. Their overlords were traditionally privileged to amputate the hands or feet, hamstring or gouge out the eyes of a peasant who ran away. Such mutilated victims of the master's displeasure could be seen throughout Tibet. The serf does not even possess elementary freedom of movement. If he or she should want to marry a man or woman from another estate, take a journey or in any way change the status of his relationship to the overlord it could only be done with the latter's permission. Heinrich Harrer, author of "Seven Years in Tibet" speaks of his "shock" when Tibetan friends "offered me servants as gifts." "Class distinctions," he adds, a little superfluously, "count a great deal in Tibet." So much do they count that serfs are required to avoid contaminating the presence of nobles and if they do come in contact with them to bow and stick out their tongues in an expression of extreme awe. When they

speak to the more exalted they must follow a prescribed pattern of speech with no slips tolerated.

In that mythical Tibet receiving such wide currency today we are asked to believe that a veritable heaven of peace and tranquility reigned before the advent of the Red Chinese. The truth is that a hell of feudal violence was the rule. Until recently all peasants and clan members were mobilized by their overlords to fight bloody clan battles that led to the annihilation of whole groups.

In the recent rebellion of the serf owners of Tibet for the right to perpetuate these barbaric abuses the then Acting U.S. Sec. of State, Christian Herter, saw reflected the "indomitable spirit of man" and expressed the State Department's profound shock and grief at the "Communist's suppression of human liberties."

There is no doubt that the Tibetan people are a devout people and that religion pervades every tissue of the life of this feudal theocracy. In the seventh century King Songtsan Gambo, the unifier of the scattered tribes of Tibet, and the greatest individual figure in Tibetan history made Buddhism the official religion. Prior to this the ancient religion of Tibet had been that of Bon, a form of nature worship. King Songtsan married the Chinese Tang Dynasty princess Wen Chang and a Nepalese princess both of whom were Buddhists. What actually developed and exists in Tibet today is a blend of Buddhism with the witchcraft of Bon.

Until the roads built by the People's Liberation Army (PLA) no wheel outside the prayer wheel turned in Tibet. Tibetans believe that the world is peopled with innumerable mischievous spirits, malicious devils that bring down upon mankind all its miseries and sorrows and have to be placated at every step of the way and in every life situation. Terror of these spirits and fear of what might happen in the endless cycle of transmigration are the twin driving forces of religious observation. Lamaists (Buddhists of Tibet and Mongolia) believe that each soul is reborn endlessly in a variety of different bodies unless, by means of a devout life, it earns the right to Nirvana or absorption into the divine. People are rich or poor, sick or healthy, serf or noble not because of the way life is arranged on earth but because of behavior in previous lives. Disease or accidents do not have natural causes but

result from the activities of evil spirits. A sick person pays a monk to pray for him. Only through this intercession can he get help in sickness or acquire a safe transmigration. Virtue, especially devoutness and giving to the monasteries is extolled as the way to rebirth on a higher plane. These beliefs, frozen and institutionalized into a complex dogma sustain the priestly power.

The "Big Three"

Three monasteries known as the Lhasa "Big Three"—the Depung, Sera and Gaden—dominate the scene. They have enormous prestige and power. Most of the monk officials come from them and the Dalai Lamas study at them. They have traditionally had their own arsenals and private armies which have been used to enforce the will of the ruling monks on the surrounding country-side and the Tibetan government. The exploitation of the serfs by the monasteries through usury and trade is even harsher than that by the officialdom or the nobles. The attitude taken by the high officials of these three monasteries has for long been politically decisive.

Outside the monasteries there is a lay nobility kept to numerical strength by the elevation of the families of the Dalai Lamas and occasional rich merchants. This produces that peculiar alliance and interdependence of clerical and lay nobility with the church holding decisive power. Most monk officials are scions of the rich nobility who take the cloth and have special training to fit them for official positions. Monks who are commoners, while a cut above laymen, are debarred from holding all except the lowest offices. In practise this often means acting as menials to the monks of the higher echelons. Army officials of the regimental rank upwards must also be nobles.

Under the Dalai Lama as head of the government are two governing bodies, one clerical and the other a mixture of lay and clerical. The latter, the Kashag, has six members (Kaloons), four of them lay and two monks. The other body directly under the Dalai Lama is the Yik Tsang, or Secretariat. This represents clerical power and has no laymen on it. All appointments of monks to any post go through the Secretariat. This is of great significance *for a monk or lay noble*

are appointed to every major position; the monk being the chief and the layman his deputy. Moreover, the Secretariat holds the Dalai Lama's seal, (an interesting item to note in view of later statements made in the name of the Dalai Lama) which must be affixed to all documents of importance. This appears to confer ultimate power on this clerical body, subject to the will of the Dalai Lama. And the will of the Dalai Lama is a most interesting subject to which we will return.

Chinese Emperor Confers Dalai Lama Title

In the fourteenth century Tsong Kaba, the second most illustrious figure in Tibetan history introduced a series of religious reforms. These prescribed celibacy for the monks. The sect he formed was known as the Geluba ("those on the way to virtue") Sect and its members wore yellow hats to distinguish them from the Sagya Sect. The Yellow Sect prospered and grew powerful and though celibacy presented them with the difficult problem of succession this was solved in an ingenious manner. On the death of its leader his soul was said to have passed into the body of a child who then became the Grand Lama.

By the time of the Fifth Grand Lama or "Great Fifth" as he became known, the Yellow Sect was in a position to make a bid for supreme power. In 1652 the "Great Fifth" personally went to Peking from Tibet to ask the Chinese Emperor to bestow titles of honor upon him. In 1653 Emperor Shun Chih gave to the "Great Fifth" the title of Dalai Lama.

It was also the "Great Fifth" who, informed by divine revelation that he was himself the reincarnation of the guardian god of Tibet—Chenresi, became the first god-returned-to-earth—the first God-King of Tibet. He had, at the same time, another revelation that his old tutor was also a god; the reincarnation of Opame, the other aspect of Chenresi. The tutor and his successors became the Panchen Lamas. Succession was by the same method. Since Chenresi and Opame are different aspects of the same god, their reincarnations are equal in a religious sense. Traditionally the Panchen Lama has come to be more associated with spiritual matters and the Dalai Lama with temporal affairs. Tibetans make no distinction calling them by the collective title, "Gyalwa Yapse" meaning "Father and Son."

The present Dalai Lama was born in June, 1935, near

Lake Koko Nor in China "proper." It is significant that the "Living Buddha" is invariably found on Chinese soil. He came successfully through the prescribed tests applied to prove that the soul of Chenresi had entered into the child's body. All the members of his family were immediately ennobled and made rich with enormous grants of government land. The Tibet Local Government called upon the Central Government of the Kuomintang to send a senior official to Tibet to preside over the ceremony of ascending the throne. On February 22, 1940, presided over by Wu Chung-hsin of the Kuomintang Central Government this ceremony of ascension was held for the present Dalai Lama, the Fourteenth, at the Potala Palace.

Man Creates God

But in Tibet, no less than in other lands, the realities of power are not necessarily the same as the forms behind which they operate. We have already noted the structure of society and political organization in Tibet and seen where real power resides. A highly significant fact to be noted in the light of the role of the Dalai Lama in recent events is the required period of regency between the death of one Dalai Lama and the ordination of the next at the age of eighteen. Allen Winington in his excellent book "Tibet" remarks that for the Dalai Lama the period immediately before accession is the "moment of danger." Only the "Great Fifth," Seventh, Ninth and Thirteenth Dalai Lamas lived to a normal age. The present Dalai Lama's agreement with Peking in 1951, at the age of sixteen, had more than a little to do with his survival of the "moment of danger." The real center of power lies within the ruling group which makes up the regency. From babyhood on every move of the God-King is shaped, directed and controlled by those who created him. In 1947 an internal struggle for power within the ruling clique rocked Lhasa with a brief civil war. The father of the present Dalai Lama was poisoned in order to facilitate control over the Dalai Lama. Those who now put on pious airs and claim spurious atrocities against religious institutions by the Central People's Government did not, according to *Time* magazine, hesitate to "use howitzers to end the defiance of the monks of the Sera Lamastery."

The young, twenty-four year old Dalai Lama is forever surrounded by this entrenched clerical-feudal clique which made him, reared him, enriched and ennobled his family and can destroy him as long as it has power. In the reported party of ninety-two who "accompanied" the Dalai Lama to India not more than five were of his immediate family. The others were Cabinet Ministers and high officials both lay and clerical. The Dalai Lama's position today is undoubtedly complex, delicate and dangerous. The term "under duress" which Peking has consistently applied to his situation has, to anyone who politically speaking was not "born yesterday," meaning on many levels.

TIBET'S STATUS

On April 4, a most interesting letter appeared in the correspondents' column of the *New York Times*. Written by Mr. Tieh-Tsen Li, former adviser to the Nationalist delegation to the United Nations with the rank of Ambassador, and currently Visiting Professor at the University of Hartford it commented on the fact that the recent Lhasa uprising had stimulated much talk in the United States about Tibet's "independence." The writer undertook to point out some "incontravertible" facts "to allay any possible misunderstanding on the status of Tibet."

"The English recognized Tibet as a dependency of China as early as 1792. In June, 1904, the American Ambassador to the Court of St. James, Joseph H. Choate, was instructed to acquaint the British Foreign Office with the State Department's view on the British Military Expedition to Lhasa. He reminded the Marquess of Lansdowne that Great Britain had three times recognized Chinese sovereignty by negotiating with the Chinese Government on questions relating to Tibet and assumed that the British still regarded Tibet as part of the Chinese dominions!

Tibetans have enjoyed autonomy ever since Kublai Khan made Phagspa the first Priest of Tibet in the twelve hundred seventies. Their autonomy is clearly provided in the seventeen article agreement signed with the Chinese Communists. . . ."

In the late 1940's the United States refused entry to a Tibetan trade delegation until it had gotten proper visas from the Chinese Nationalist Government of Chiang-Kai-shek.

And speaking before the Lok Sabha (House of the People) on May 15, 1954, Prime Minister Nehru of India said, "I am not aware that at any time during the last few hundred years Chinese sovereignty, or if you like, suzerainty, was challenged by any outside country."

Since it is quite difficult to deny Chinese sovereignty in Tibet we are witnessing the birth of a number of new approaches to the same end. It has been discovered what was known all the time—that the "Tibetan People" are different from the "Han People" (the majority nation of China—the people commonly referred to as Chinese). Therefore Tibet is another "country" and should be "independent." China is a multi-national country and the Chinese people include Hans, Mongolians, Uighurs, Huis, Chuangs Miaos and dozens of other nationalities. Many other countries in the world today are composed of many nationalities—India not the least of them. Fierce battles in defense of the national rights of the Marathis, Gujeratis and Bengalis have frequently been front page news. India is currently engaged in suppressing insurrection by the Naga people of Assam whose leader Phizo and his National Council have declared the "Independence of the Nagaland." Has anyone heard of any Indian political figure or publication advocating the establishment of numerous independent countries in India?

There is another kind of "interesting" position which recognizes Chinese sovereignty in Tibet but arrogantly demands assurances of "autonomy" and even the "kind of autonomy" all the while fiercely protesting that it is strictly for non-interference in the affairs of other countries.

The fact is that the socialist People's Republic of China has always advocated autonomy for areas where national minorities live in compact communities and many national minorities have set up autonomous regions, autonomous chous, or autonomous counties in China. Autonomy, moreover, would long since have been fully realized in Tibet had the Tibetan reactionaries not sabotaged and obstructed it.

The present Chinese Government is the first to admit that relations in the past between Imperial Chinese regimes, the Yuan Shih-Kai and Kuomintang governments of China and Tibet often deteriorated. Those who brutally oppressed and exploited the Han people were not likely to do better by

the Tibetans. Besides the great national chauvinism practised, they wavered before foreign imperialist incursions into Tibet where they did not openly collude with it. They themselves played the same game of "divide and rule" which enabled Britain to exert a decisive influence in Tibet.

The "Abominable Salesmen" of Tibet

At the close of World War II Great Britain took the initiative in sending a letter to the Chinese Nationalist Government reaffirming that Tibet was part of China. The other great powers, including the United States, followed suit. But at that time India was directly controlled by the British and Chiang Kai-shek indirectly by the Americans. Under the circumstances Tibet was "safe" for the West. But with the Kuomintang debacle in 1949 the situation changed and so did the attitude toward Tibet. Reports were rife that the United States was preparing to recognize Tibet as a sovereign state and support a Tibetan application for membership in the United Nations. By August of that same year the American news-commentator Lowell Thomas and his son, Lowell Thomas Jr., arrived, in full electronic regalia, for a week's "adventure" in Tibet! Preparations were set in motion for the "big sell"—a world wide publicity campaign for the separation of Tibet from RED China. In his book, "Out of this World", describing the trip, Lowell Thomas Jr. advised that what was needed was "skillful guerrilla forces. . . . To create these, Tibet needs arms and advice, principally from the outside. Arms would include weapons especially adapted to guerrilla warfare, such as Garand rifles, machine guns, mortars, grenades and mines." On April 11, 1959, shortly after the rebel outbreak in Lhasa an American Emergency Committee for Tibetan Refugees made a hasty appearance on the scene. Chairman? Lowell Thomas!

The Communist victory in China in 1949 found Tibetan ruling circles divided on how to react to the altered situation. It was finally decided to open negotiations with the new People's Government. In February, 1950, a Tibetan delegation left Lhasa for Peking via India. *It did not arrive in Peking until over a year later.* In its "pasage through India" the delegation encountered many conflicting tugs, strains, cur-

rents and counter currents which just as today, in more intense form, reflect the different class interests in that country as well as outside pressures directed against it or operating within its borders.

Reacting to this delay the P.L.A. moved into Chamdo (at that time part of Sikang Province but since divided and included partly in Tibet and partly in Szechuan), where the Tibetans had deployed strong armed forces. A whole regiment of the Tibetan army crossed over to the P.L.A. The New York Times (3/29/59) also mentions a "Free Tibet Army" of 40,000 men under Geshye Sherap Gyantso which joined the P.L.A. These incidents are of great interest in that they dramatically expose the false and carefully cultivated picture of "one Tibet" united in devotion to a backward feudal hierarchy.

When the Tibetan delegation had still failed to leave India by the end of October, 1950, (In June, 1950, President Truman had ordered the American Seventh Fleet to encircle Taiwan [Formosa], El Salvador had been inspired to send up a trial balloon on the "Tibetan Question" in the United Nations in September, and on October 8 the United Nations passed a resolution authorizing MacArthur to cross the 38th Parallel in Korea and move toward the Chinese border), the P.L.A. announced that it intended to continue its advance into Tibet "proper." The Indian Government thereupon notified Peking that the Tibetan delegation had already left! Peking followed up with a note charging that the Tibetan delegation, under outside instigation, "had intentionally delayed its departure for Peking." It went on to say that the Chinese Government wanted to settle the Tibetan question in a peaceful manner but would not brook interference in an internal affair. India's reply raised the question of privileges (post and telegraphic installations) it had "inherited" from Britain, adding that "the Government of India are anxious that these establishments . . . which do not detract in any way from Chinese suzerainty over Tibet, should continue."

Panch Shila

China immediately welcomed the statement and replied that "As long as the two sides adhere strictly to the principles

of mutual respect for territory, sovereignty, equality and mutual benefit, we are convinced that friendship between China and India will develop normally and that problems of Sino-Indian diplomatic, commercial and cultural relations in connection with Tibet can be solved properly and to our mutual benefit through normal diplomatic channels." This solution of a crucial problem set the tone for future relations between India and China. The four points first developed in this exchange expanded into the five principles for peaceful coexistence, the Panch Shila, subsequently formalized in the 1954 pact between China and India recognizing Tibet as an integral part of China and pledging mutual non interference in each others affairs. These principles and the friendship of China and India became the core of the unity of Asian and African states at Bandung in 1955. This was a historic development which literally "shook the world" and whose effects continue to unfold with every passing day. It was a body blow to the world system of imperialism from which it can never recover. This Chinese-Indian friendship, this Asian-African unity was a prime target in the whipped-up Tibet hysteria.

THE 1951 AGREEMENT

The Tibetan delegation did finally arrive in Peking in April, 1951. On May 23, 1951, *after extended consultations and negotiations lasting a full month*, a seventeen point agreement known as the "Agreement of the Central People's Government and the Local Government of Tibet on Measures for the Peaceful Liberation of Tibet," was concluded. The Agreement opens with a declaration of the determination of the Tibetan people to unite and drive aggressive imperialist forces from Tibet. It puts on record the right of Tibet to national autonomy within the Chinese People's Republic, guarantees the functions and powers of the Dalai and Panchen Lamas, freedom and protection of religious beliefs, customs and institutions, no alteration in the existing political system and no compulsory reforms on the part of the Central Authorities. Reforms were to be carried out by the Local Government of Tibet when the people raised demands for them. It also provides for improvement of the livelihood of the Tibetan people based on existing conditions. Tibetan Officials would be per-

mitted to retain their positions in spite of past hostile associations. Foreign affairs were placed under control of the Central People's Government and the Tibetan Army was to be reorganized into the People's Liberation Army.

One of the "tallest tales" to come out of the recent Tibetan events is that Peking "scrapped" the 1951 Agreement or provoked the Local Tibetan Government to denounce it because of "persistent violations." This is the brand of journalism that studiously bypasses fact and analyses for "chrysalis gazing" where it unfailingly discovers just what it wants to see! No one has yet explained why, with overwhelming power which could have at any time *imposed* changes on all levels, the Tibetan political and social system and even its currency remained intact, all officials continued in office, the monasteries suffered no diminution in income, and territory taken by the Chinese empire centuries ago was voluntarily returned to Tibetan autonomy. The explanation has been offered that the Central Government was weak in 1951 when the Agreement was made and was only biding its time. Disregarding for the moment the merits of this assumption it still leaves unexplained the fact that as late as April, 1956, when the Preparatory Committee for the Tibet Autonomous Region was established it was announced that for another six years, the duration of the Second Five Year Plan, reforms would not be carried out and the Tibetan Army would not be reorganized.

In a telegram to Chairman Mao Tse-tung in October, 1951, the Dalai Lama referred to the Agreement as one concluded "by the delegates of both parties on a friendly basis" and added that "the Local Government of the Tibetans, lamas and laymen unanimously support the Agreement."

No Truth—No Evidence!

Any examination of even so dubious a document as that issued on "behalf of the Dalai Lama" in Tezpur, India, on April 18, shows that it is unable to go beyond the most generalized accusations completely devoid of documentation. Not a single fact testifying to any violation of the seventeen point Agreement by the Central People's Government is given. The closest it comes to a particular charge is that "By the end of

1955 a struggle started in the Kham Province and this assumed serious proportions in 1956. In the consequential struggle the Chinese armed forces destroyed a large number of monasteries." Of the Khamba rebels who have become the darlings of Western journalism, the newly discovered "freedom fighters," one would think the less said the better. *Time* magazine lifted a corner of the journalistic lid on these latest "defenders of man's noblest aspirations" in its issue of April 20: ". . . In the past Lhasa had its own troubles with the Khambas, who recognized the spiritual rule of the Dalai Lama but had a habit of killing his tax gatherers and robbing caravans." Those who thought Peking's statement that the Tibetan Local Government and the reactionary clique of the upper social strata colluded with imperialism and *gathered together rebellious bandits* was a "Communist stereotype" should find *Times* unwitting admission an eye opener. The Khambas, continuing an ancient pattern of anarchy and terror could always be found where the loot was largest. In the summer of 1955 when the Dalai Lama was returning from a meeting of the National People's Congress the ruling group in Lhasa made use of the Khambas to start a campaign of arson, murder and pillage as an adjunct to their own plans for rebellion and Tibetan "independence." Strictly speaking the P.L.A. counter operations against the Khambas' harassments did not even take place in Tibet "proper" but in the territory of the then Chinese province of Sikang.

As for the "large number of monasteries destroyed" we have already noted that these cynical hypocrites in the 1947 internecine struggle for power, cold bloodedly turned their guns on the Sera Lamastery, one of Tibet's oldest and most sacred. There is nothing new in counter revolutionary forces using lamasteries and monasteries as fortifications and bases for attack and then crying "desecration" when answered. That other world-renowned "freedom fighter," Francisco Franco, was a master of the technique. The "large number of monasteries" destroyed is a myth and it is significant that none were named.

If the statement of April 18 attributed to the Dalai Lama was a lame one showing, according to Shirob Jaltso, a leading Buddhist scholar who studied in Tibet for thirty-three years, internal evidences of non-Tibetan structure and style, and to

any observer replete with vague, undocumented generalities—what shall one say of the “prepared statement” read off by the Dalai Lama at a press conference in Mussoorie, India on June 20? It is “tailor-made” and “timed” to support a conspiracy to accuse China of genocide before the United Nations. It contradicts itself from one paragraph to another. It is a conglomeration of assertions that does not bring to bear one item of evidence to support a single claim. In its effort to counteract the powerful impact on world opinion of Peking’s exposure of the odious nature of the backward, feudal-clerical serf system which the rebellion fought to preserve, it attains the dimensions of broad farce. “. . . during the last nine years several reforms were proposed by me and my Government,” read the Dalai Lama, “but every time these measures were strenuously opposed by the Chinese in spite of a popular demand for them with the result that nothing was done for the betterment of the social and economic conditions of the people. In particular, it was my earnest desire that the system of land tenure should be radically changed without further delay . . . for distribution among tillers of the soil. But the Chinese authorities deliberately put every obstacle in the way of carrying out this just and reasonable reform.” *What particular proposals for reforms had the former Local Government of Tibet made which the Central People’s Government opposed?* Not a word. One can only conclude that here is the perfect answer to Anatole France’s suggestion in “Penguin Island” that absence of evidence is the best proof of an accusation because it is incontrovertible!

CHANGE IN TIBET

However much the basic social system remained intact changes did inevitably come to Tibet. In a society where there had been not one yard of highway, no hospitals or other social services the P.L.A. had driven two major roads across the Tibetan plateau. One runs from the north across the desolate swampland and desert and the other, (Ya-an to Lhasa) 1413 miles long crosses fourteen mountain ranges and eleven big rivers. Tibetans call the road “The Miraculous Rainbow” or the “Golden Bridge.” Since the roads it is possible to move local products faster and at better prices without the losses

entailed by spoilage, accidents and the general hazards of perilous mountain trails. In two weeks with five trucks it became possible to transport what used to take two months with 500 yaks. Consequently there was a quicker turn over in capital and trade and new products began to appear on the market. Cloth, tea, salt, machines and medicines were selling at a fraction of their former price, while Tibetan merchants were getting more for wool, hides, leather and medicinal plants much of which once went to waste for lack of transport.

In Lhasa on an ordinary day the People's Hospital has an out-patient attendance of five hundred. Here there is no obeisance to rank. Sickness and the urge the recovery are great levellers. The monks, themselves, came to the hospitals and the people followed. According to Allan Winnington who visited Tibet in 1955, "Shaggy haired nomads wait their turn with gorgeously dressed nobles, grimy, barefooted servant monks may be in the queue ahead of the monk officials in soft garnet cashmere." There is a staff of 150, including twenty-two doctors, seventeen assistants, twenty nurses, seven mid-wives, seven pharmacies, four laboratory workers and three X-Ray rooms equipped with the latest German and Soviet instruments and its own power generator. Tibetan students work and study at the hospital. Some are in the Skin and Venereal Department for venereal disease, as in Europe's Dark Ages, has been one of Tibet's scourges with some estimates placing the incidence as high as 80%.

Education was previously non existant in Tibet except in purely religious form. For the serfs and artisans there was no education in any form. There are now new primary schools in Tibet and they are all administered by Tibetans. The teachers have been, and under existing circumstances could only have been, from the nobility and the monasteries. Here where tuition is free the children of the aristocracy sit side by side with the children of serfs. Leading monks from each of the great monasteries helped to arrange the curriculum. No subject is compulsory and the main purpose of these schools has been to make a start at raising the general educational level in Tibet. However, there are lessons in arithmetic, geography, general knowledge, music and art, all previously unknown in Tibet, and all taught in the Tibetan language. While editorial writers in the United States are livid with rage and

indignation that wicked Peking has "imposed" schools on the Tibetans, Khenchun Tuden, a member of the Dalai Lama's Secretariat and one of the three joint Presidents of the Lhasa Primary School told Allan Winnington that "We should have fewer worries if the demand were smaller or if we could double our size. We get twice as many applications as we can cope with."

New Look in Old Setting

There is also the Lhasa College of Social Education and its counterpart at Shigatse (the seat of the Panchen Lama). Here the students are graded according to educational level and have both Tibetan and Chinese teachers. All classes, however, even when taught by Chinese, are in the Tibetan language. The Lhasa College sends students to Peking and Chengtu for more advanced training. Simone de Beauvoir, French writer and novelist tells in her book "The Long March" of a visit to the National Minorities Institute in Peking. "I sat in a geography class where the students were Tibetan," she writes, "an interpreter gave a running translation of what the teacher was saying. I was struck by the look of keenest attention on all these faces, for the most part already marked by age." She further notes "Tibetan cooks have been brought in to serve home style meals for Tibetan students. I also saw the places set aside for various forms of worship; a Lamaist chapel with the usual images of Buddha, the incense burners and the incense, and the usual offerings."

Since 1951 the main changes in village life have been due to interest-free agricultural loans. County loan Committees distribute the loans which are financed by the People's Bank. Loans are usually distributed by a Committee consisting of the county chief, the village chief, and some leading monks. Mass meetings are called of three or four villages where almost everyone gets a loan big or small. These were the first public meetings ever held in Tibet and are run by the officials and monks. The People's Bank provides the loans and the Tibetans distribute them. A Tibetan serf could not accept such a loan without his master's knowledge and agreement.

Tibet previously had no working class, no tradition of working for wages—or even for payment. The first industrial

wage workers in Tibet were a small band of less than a dozen newly trained Tibetan printers who put out Tibet's first newspaper. Among them was a woman compositor! Now there is the beginning of modern industry with power stations, a small woolen and rug factory, a tannery and iron works. The payment of actual wages began to undermine serfdom.

Yes, there have been changes in Tibet. Since "the appetite grows by what it feeds on" the demand for more and wider changes was rising. The tremendous ferment and energy of China's "great leap forward" could be felt. Windows were opening on to the world—a perilous innovation for those who profit when the "people sit in darkness." Tillman Durdin, New York Times correspondent in Hongkong, wrote that while there had been no revolutionary social or political changes in Tibet, "The handwriting on the wall must have been clear to the Tibetans and their landed, religious aristocracy that for centuries held the reins of power in virtual isolation from the rest of the world."

Any honest examination of the realities of Tibet dictates the conclusion that the last thing the Tibetan Local Government which represented the pinnacle of clerical-lay, feudal power wanted was a *democratic* Regional Autonomy with the broad participation of the people. But this is just what the "handwriting on the wall" spelled out. The "autonomy" and "independence" they clamor for is independence from all encroachments on their special privileges. What they wanted and rebelled to preserve was the backward, dark, and cruel serfdom which was the source of their power.

THE REBELLION

The former Local Government of Tibet had six members. Two of the six remained staunchly loyal. One of these Sampo Tsewong Rentzen was wounded by the rebels on March 10. The other Ngapo Ngawang Jigme, popularly known as Apei, is today executive secretary of the new government. Of the remaining four, one, Yuto Chahsidongchu, had already turned against the Agreement and fled to Kalimpong, India. There Lokongwa Tsewongrouten, described by the *New York Times* as "Premier of Tibet" from 1949 to '54, was the king-pin of rebel organization. It was this same Lokongwa who led a

delegation to Prime Minister Nehru on March 31. The three kaloons remaining in Tibet at the opportune moment came out openly as leaders of the rebellion. Prior to this they had used their legal status as members of the government to muster, shield and support the rebel forces. These activities were of long duration and were known to Peking which refrained from taking direct action over the head of the Local Government but called upon it to deal with these provocations. It was this extraordinary patience and meticulousness on the part of the Central Government which helped to foster a false sense of security and power in the rebel leadership. Moreover, they were receiving help—and promises of more—from the outside. There are many historical precedents for a narrow, upper, reactionary strata fearful for its own power in the face of advances by the people betraying its own country in collaboration with foreign forces. General Chen Chengo, Kuomintang Nationalist Premier is quoted in the *New York Times* (much to the “consternation” of the U.S. State Department) as saying that Taipei had maintained “close contact” with Tibetan anti-Communist organizations since 1957 and that the Nationalists had been giving these organizations limited but continuous assistance.

In Kalimpong, India, described by Elie Abel of the *Times* as “pulsing with undercover politics and espionage” Lokongwa continued his intrigue. The independent Indian publication *Jugantar* wrote “Anyone can pick up the file of any newspaper and know that all the reports of the Tibetan rebellion, campaign material for the rebel cause, falsehoods against People’s China and its Tibetan policy have emanated from Kalimpong. The well known British journalist Elizabeth Partridge proudly featured in her published stories in the foreign and Indian press an account of her meeting with the ‘Tibetan Resistance Council,’ somewhere in India.” Who will believe that other “interested parties” did not find their way to so fascinating a spot in the foothills of the Himalayas? With the U.S. Seventh Fleet in the Taiwan Straits, U.S. arms in South Korea, a U.S. supported, armed and advised South Vietnam and stepped up U.S. activities in Laos on China’s southern border is it likely that Tibet would be overlooked?

The rebellion was openly launched on March 10. The Dalai Lama was scheduled to attend a theatrical performance

at the Military Area Command on the date which he, himself, had designated a month earlier. Inspired word went out that the Dalai Lama would be "detained." Under cover of this pretext his palace was surrounded by rioting crowds and rebel guards were stationed inside. It was at this point that the much-discussed and extremely revealing exchange of letters took place between the Dalai Lama and General Tan Kuan-san, acting representative of the Central People's Government in Tibet. These letters, written in the Dalai Lama's own hand, which Prime Minister Nehru once thought "not authentic" and Lokongwa denounced as "forged" have since been acknowledged by the Dalai Lama in a conversation with Prime Minister Nehru. In the letter dated March 11, the Dalai Lama wrote: "Reactionary, evil elements are carrying out activities endangering me under the pretext of ensuring my safety." This same theme is repeated on the following day. "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 Linka (the Dalai Lama's summer place) under the pretext of protecting me." An AFP (Agence France Presse) report from New Delhi on April 24 lamented, "Now that the letters are found to be authentic . . . many people will believe that all the announcements made by Peking on the Tibetan issue are all true."

Attack and Consequences

According to Reuters (April 19) an official of the Dalai Lama's entourage who "refused to be named" said that a special meeting of the Tibetan Cabinet decided on March 17 to "spirit" the Dalai Lama and his senior officials out of Lhasa. Apparently the Dalai Lama had no part in the decision. The official further stated that the "State oracle was consulted and after going into a trance advised that the Dalai Lama should seek refuge in India."

On the night of March 19 the Tibetan reactionaries launched an all-out attack on the P.L.A. units stationed in Lhasa. The latter defended themselves but did not counter attack. At 10:00 A.M. on March 20, the troops of the Tibet Military Area Command were ordered to take punitive action. An order of the State Council of the People's Republic of

China dissolved the Tibetan Local Government and turned over its powers and functions to the Preparatory Committee for the Tibet Autonomous Region. It was announced that during the time the Dalai Lama was held under duress the Panchen Lama would act as Chairman.

The Central People's Government instructed the PLA units in Tibet to unite with all Tibetans who had not taken part in the rebellion, protect the lives and property of the peasants, herdsmen and people of the industrial, business, political and religious circles, respect the habits and customs of the local people and their religious beliefs, protect the lamaseries and cultural institutions and relics and safeguard the interests of the mass of the people. It forbade retaliatory action or any injury or humiliation to those taken prisoner or those who laid down their arms.

THE REVOLUTION IN TIBET

While on the one hand there have been many variations on such absurdities in the U.S. press as Lerner's theme that the Chinese were "imposing communes" on Tibet, there are also sincere friends of China who ask why Peking did not move earlier to eradicate the feudal serf system and render harmless the traitors in the former Local Tibetan Government of whose activities they were fully aware. Much has been written in a hostile American press about the Chinese—but no one has ever called them stupid. Not even in informed right wing circles is there any inclination to call them weak. Peking's policy in Tibet was neither weak nor uninformed. It was a principled policy, a socialist policy, a dialectical materialist policy which ended by "turning bad things into good things." It is a policy which has as its object the unification of China, unity within Tibet, national equality and the gradual realization of regional national autonomy and reforms. It started by taking into account the special historical conditions in Tibet. Advances could be made only at the tempo at which they were required, understood and demanded by the Tibetan people. They had to be carried out primarily by the Tibetan people themselves with the help of the Central Government.

History proves that a privileged, ruling class never voluntarily forsakes its power. If the extraordinary forbearance shown

the Tibetan obstructionists did not and could not convert the most reactionary, backward elements of the feudal serf owners, it made clear beyond the shadow of a doubt to the great mass of ordinary Tibetans who it was that stood in the way of democratic reforms and a better life. That is why when the rebellion came out into the open it could only muster some 20,000 supporters (many of these coerced serfs) from among 1,200,000 Tibetans. It would seem by a simple exercise in arithmetic that the serfs did not rush to swell the ranks of the overlords. If the Khambas who account for about one-third of the rebels are subtracted, the Tibetans who took part in the rebellion were only a little over one per cent of the Tibetan people. It would further seem that not even all of the upper social strata participated. One begins to suspect a truth carefully concealed by a rampaging press—namely that the great majority of the Tibetan people, including many forward looking, genuinely patriotic elements of the upper social strata would have no part of it!

With the defeat of the Tibetan reactionaries the Tibetan people are now for the first time in a position to shake off the fetters of serfdom and realize democratic autonomy and social progress. The feudal serf owners dug their own grave in full view of the whole Tibetan people. The harvest planted this spring on the estates of the rebel serf owners will belong wholly to those who tilled the soil—a harbinger of things to come. Tibet now stands on the threshold of a peaceful revolution—the real revolution in Tibet—the continuation of the great people's revolution which swept the Chinese mainland in 1949 and continues unabated. The back of the feudal power broken, it will be possible to carry out democratic reforms within the framework of a policy of unity with those of the upper classes who took no part in the rebellion and who accept reforms, much in the manner of the policy adopted in the Han areas toward the national bourgeoisie..

These are the enduring, meaningful facts of life in a changing Tibet. They are what will shape and determine the future. The hysteria, the momentary propaganda orgy, the hopeful predictions of “explosions in China,” “antagonisms and disunity in Asia” are the temporary aberrations and fantasies of a dying imperialism whose provocations become increasingly desperate, inept and futile.

THE AIMS OF THE REBELLION

The rebellion in Tibet had four primary aims; to guarantee the serf owners grip in Tibet, to make Tibet a massive military land base on China's Western border in the image of Taiwan on the east, to trigger disaffection inside China and to entangle China in friction and conflicts with her Asian neighbors, especially India.

The conspiracy in Tibet was one link in a chain of actions directed toward the reversal of the national liberation movement in Asia and Africa which is changing the world balance of power. The friendship of China and India is one of the cornerstones of that surging movement. To disrupt it is a matter of strategic importance to those who worked overtime to make Bandung fail, who have aggressive military pacts (SEATO), with "client" Asian governments, (Chiang, Rhee, Dinh Diem), who have cynically sabotaged the Geneva agreements on Indo-China and who, when rebellion broke out in Indonesia in 1958, said: "The United States would like to see in Indonesia a government which is constitutional and reflects the real interests of the people." The speaker, John Foster Dulles, intimated that the U.S. did not regard the government of Sukarno as entirely meeting the prescription. It turned out in Indonesia, as later in Tibet, that Taiwan, whose source of supply is no secret was providing aerial support to the Indonesian rebels. It will surprise no one that the Foreign Ministers of Pakistan, Thailand, Australia and President Garcia of the Philippines used the Tibetan events to urge India and the other Southeast Asian countries to abandon neutral policies and join SEATO!

While the press likes to speak of "India" as though all Indians had identical interests—for instance top industrialist Birla at whose home in Mussoorie the Dalai Lama is staying, and the legions of landless peasants, the untold millions of unemployed, the mill workers receiving nine cents a day in wages, to name only a few—readers of this publication will hardly have to be persuaded that it is otherwise. India's big bourgeoisie has both areas of conflict and areas of interest with the West. It desires to develop its national economy in a peaceful international environment and this creates profound contradictions with imperialist and colonialist forces. On the

other hand there are those who lean to the West, have long standing and deep rooted economic ties with Western monopoly (British and American), and are to a certain extent dependent on foreign capital. As burgeoning Indian monopoly capitalists they have expansionist views of their own which at times coincide with overall strategic plans of the West. Tibet was one of those times. Above all they fear the example of China to the impoverished, increasingly restive Indian masses. They have powerful spokesmen in Indian public life. Among the most vociferous are some leaders and former leaders of the Congress Party and the Praja Socialist Party. They have often been referred to in the Indian press as India's "American Lobby." The Indian publication *The National Herald* described these agitators for interference in Tibet as "representing only people who get excited over anything that happens under Communist regimes. This is not a correct attitude and certainly not the attitude which the people and the Government have been following in international affairs."

But it is only their point of view which has been presented in the American press. Elie Abel, *New York Times* correspondent in India and himself a prodigious planter in the vineyard of Asian disunity—has done yeoman service. Half reporter, half newsmaker, he writes on Indian reaction to Tibet: "Thus India's brush with Chinese imperialism on her own doorstep is likely to have a lasting effect. Already there is a sharp questioning in the newspapers about the hollowness of Panch Sheel as a substitute for a realistic policy. A columnist in the *India Express* suggested this week that 'mere neutrality between the power blocs will no longer serve as a protective shield for nations of Southeast Asia! He went on to advocate in carefully obscure language (this being a generally unpopular point of view in India—ed), that India might find it necessary and feasible to work out understandings of a limited scope and in relation to specific contingencies with the United States."

The Policy of "Strategic Silence"

So invaluable has been this fronting position to the U.S. State Department that the latter went to the unheard of

length of imposing upon itself a policy of "strategic silence" on Tibet. Recognizing that its own voice and deeds are suspect in Asia the Department, in the words of a U.P. dispatch from Washington, believes "one word from uncommitted Asians would be worth thousands of anti-communist words by the U.S. Government.

There was something both ludicrous and shameful in this heavy-handed pretense. For the "strategic silence" was more official than real. Robert S. Allen's *New York Post* column "Inside Washington" disclosed that the United States was planning to submit the Tibetan issue to the United Nations and ask the Dalai Lama to go personally to the United Nations to make a "plea." The story further claimed that Christian Herter said that the "Dalai Lama will be welcome in the United States whenever he wants to come."

The Press Trust of India reported that when the Dalai Lama passed through Tezpur, India, on April 19 he was handed two "sealed letters" from President Eisenhower. This would appear to be confirmed by a report from Georgia, USA, as published in the *Times of India* on April 22. The report stated that the vacation headquarters of the President admitted on April 21 that Eisenhower had sent these sealed letters to be delivered to the Dalai Lama.

The "Genocide" Conspiracy

Most significant was a speech made by Henry Cabot Lodge, Chief U.S. Delegate to the United Nations before the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations. He cited the rebellion in Tibet as supporting the U.S. stand against restoring to China her seat in the United Nations. This "act of Communist savagry justified anew everything we have done to keep Red China out of the United Nations." He promised that the U.S. would "once again leave no stone unturned" to see that this policy "prevails." The possibility that the U.S. may be outflanked and outvoted on the question of China's representation in the U.N. has become an increasingly real and haunting one. When it happens the whole creaking edifice of U.S. China policy will, like the fabled Walls of Jericho, "come tumbling down. There would be something almost amusing (if it were not so evil) watching the cynical, stale old game replayed. All of the pieces are arranged to fall into their ap-

pointed places. On June 6 the International Commission of Jurists obligingly reads a report for the United Nations charging the Chinese Government with "genocide" and calling on it to take "appropriate action." (Algeria, South Africa, Nyasaland, Kenya—all leave the eminent jurists strangely unmoved!) On June 20, the Dalai Lama in a press interview is reported by the *New York Times* to have said "complete absorption and extinction of the Tibetan race is being undertaken" and that the case may later be brought before the United Nations. Lest anyone should fail to draw the required conclusion the *Times* editorializes on June 22 that "the very least that can be done . . . is to make it abundantly plain to Peiping that such an evil regime has no hope of entering the comity of nations unless and until this wicked wrong is righted." The old claims of aggression used to deprive China of her legitimate place in the U.N. were wearing thin. Something new was needed. Something new has been added!

What has not been so liberally presented in the American press—as a matter of fact what has not been presented at all—is the reaction of the great majority of Indian and Asian peoples who recognized that a new form of "brinkmanship" was being practised against them through the Tibetan hysteria. They stood in danger of being pushed into the trap of collaboration with imperialists and colonialists. *Milap*, an Urdu daily of Delhi wrote that "If the Praja socialist brothers feel so much worried about freedom and democracy then where were they when democracy was being trampled upon in Pakistan and a military dictatorship was installed. At that time they did not start any agitation. Then why are they so worried today? Is it because the Western powers so desire?" And *Jugantar*, the Bengali daily edited by the highly regarded Sri Vivekananda Mukherjee, explained that "The aim behind this propaganda is to agitate the people of Tibet and India against China and to make India's Prime Minister recede from the historic panch shila declaration and take his stand against China. Needless to say we are emphatically against this plot, because India's freedom and peace will be gravely threatened by this. . . ."

India's Prime Minister, though caught in the cross currents of agitation and conflicting interests has steadfastly maintained that the Tibetan rebellion is an internal affair of

the Chinese people. The Indian Government, headed by Prime Minister Nehru, has played an important part in opposing war and colonialism and safeguarding peace and has unquestionably been a good friend to China. At the same time it permitted the undeniably "political" statements attributed to the Dalai Lama to be made on Indian soil and in one case even to be distributed by an Indian diplomatic official. The "propriety" of such actions by a friendly government, all the while acknowledging China's sovereignty in Tibet, protesting its devotion to the principle of non-interference and maintaining that the Dalai Lama would not be permitted to exercise any temporal functions while in India, is certainly questionable. The Government of India has allowed itself to be compromised by such activities of the Dalai Lama and his entourage which defy every accepted international standard of behavior becoming their claimed status of exile and refugees.

Nehru has differences with the Chinese on Tibet. On April 27 he made a full and systematic statement of his views in the Indian Lok Sabha. The full text of this statement, without editorial comment, appeared in the leading and widely read Chinese *People's Daily* on April 30. The whole Chinese people were called upon to read and discuss Nehru's remarks. On May 6, the Editorial Department of the *People's Daily* published its own analysis under the heading of "The Revolution In Tibet and Nehru's Philosophy." The editorial is warm and friendly in tone but penetrating and critical in analysis of both the facts and philosophy underlying Nehru's views on Tibet. It is based on the conviction that when honest, decent people have differences arising from different world outlooks it is not only possible but necessary and beneficial to combine sincere friendship with criticism of an ally. It ends on a note affirming Sino-Indian friendship as "of long duration" and "resting on a solid foundation" of common interest. It recalled Prime Minister Nehru's words of October, 1954, during his visit to China. "China and India are great countries facing similar problems who have set out resolutely on the road to progress. To the extent that they will understand each other shall depend the well being of the whole world. The tensions in the world today demand that we should work jointly for peace."

Nehru, a world leader and statesman of the Asian-African Liberation movement understands that Sino-Indian friendship and the five principles of panch shila are decisive to the development of that movement and to India's leading role and prestige in world affairs.

Speaking to the Lok Sabha on May 8, Prime Minister Nehru once more confirmed that India regards her 1954 agreement with China, setting out the five principles of coexistence as still in force.

A Study in "Lessons"

The *New York Times* asked editorially on April 29 if "it is too much to hope that Mr. Nehru and others in positions of responsibility in the neutralist nations will learn the full lesson of Tibet and adjust their policies accordingly?" The "full lesson" learned may not be the one *The Times* would teach. The neutral governments understand that approving foreign interference in Tibet would open the door to interference in the internal affairs of Indonesia, Burma, Ceylon, Cambodia, Nepal, Iraq and many other countries in Asia and Africa. Former Burmese Prime Minister U Nu told the press in Hongkong that putting down the rebellion in Tibet would not affect Burma-Chinese relations because "this is China's internal affair." Asked whether developments would change Burma's attitude toward joining SEATO, U Nu replied briefly and to the point: "Burma has no intention of joining SEATO." U Thein Pe Myint, a member of the Burmese Parliament as well as the Presidium of the Burma National United Front, at a seminar in Rangoon held to commemorate the fourth anniversary of Bandung, pointed out that the imperialists were trying to regain the influence which they had lost in Asia and Africa and that they incited the rebellion in Tibet and armed revolt in Indonesia. At a similar reception in Djakarta Vice Premier Hardi of Indonesia delivered a speech appealing to the Asian and African people to be on their guard against those activities detrimental to the unity of the Asian and African countries.

From Tillman Durdin the *Times* own correspondent came the answer to the *Times* own question: "While the Western committed anti-communist governments have denounced Pei-

ping over Tibet, none of the neutralist governments has indicated change in policy toward Communist China as a result of Tibet."

TIBET AND HUNGARY

In the plethora of cliches, catchwords, fantasies and worse which have characterized the cold war reporting on Tibet the most glib and likely to boomerang upon its makers is the frequent reference to Tibet as a "Second Hungary," "Mao's Hungary," "Asian Hungary," etc. ad nauseam. As we have seen, the lessons learned are not always those the self-appointed pedagogues set out to teach. The not-so-hidden persuaders have built themselves a Frankenstein. It is conceivable that in the long run the Tibetan revolt which actually has few mysteries, and as the clamor dies down can more and more clearly be seen for what it was—a revolt of serf owners against reform—will reveal more about Hungary than the other way round. Outside of the U.S. State Department the world has long since made up its mind about Chiang Kai-shek. Chiang boasts of his long contact with the Tibetan reactionaries, of his airdrops of light weapons, ammunition, technical advisers and radio operators into Tibet. Since this is a "Second Hungary" perhaps the Hungarian's claim that the October '56 counter revolution in that country was supported by "imperialist agents" anxious to foment a new hot bed of war in Europe was not a "Communist cliché" after all!

Once more in Tibet, as in Hungary, the world witnessed a cynical willingness to incite others to bleed and die for a momentary field day of cold war propaganda. This was crassly laid on the line by a *New York Times* editorial: "It was not thought likely that Tibetan tribesmen could undermine or overthrow the Peiping regime or even spearhead the anti-communist revolution on the mainland. But it was realized . . . that it would eventually reverberate throughout the Buddhist and anti-Communist world."

The Uprooted

But "reverberations" in the cause of feudalism and reaction tend to have a short and hollow ring. Realities begin to

assert themselves. The 8000 Tibetan refugees alleged to have entered India since the short lived rebellion will, like their Hungarian counterparts, discover how fleeting is the glory of a "freedom fighter" to those for whom he has outlived his propaganda value. Tillman Durdin, *New York Times* correspondent, reported on May 19 that "reporters have been forbidden to interview the Tibetans (refugees) except through officially approved interpreters" and many "already are said to be expressing impatience with sitting around the camp all day." Many serfs drawn into the maelstrom by coercion or hostile slander combined with alluring but mendacious promises will not have long to wait before learning how huge and monstrous was the whole deception. For such Tibetan commoners the loud expressions of "sympathy" will prove to be but "the painting of a sorrow—a face without a heart." Left to waste in the barracks of refugee camps it soon becomes painfully clear that freedom is a "sometime thing." Abstract freedom is nowhere to be found. It is at all times and in all places mightily bound up with the questions of freedom for whom and for what. It is safe to predict that many of the Tibetan refugees in Misamari, no less than the Hungarians before them, will return to their homes, their people and their country in the knowledge that building socialism, however difficult, is the only basis for real freedom and democracy in these our times.

Hungary had its Cardinal Mindszenty and Tibet its Dalai Lama. The individual roles and fate of these two may differ in detail, but both have become the highly exploited symbols behind which support for clerical feudalism masquerades as "religious freedom" and morality. Are they not, in truth, only more recent additions to that long list beginning with Chiang Kai-shek, Bao Dai, Syngman Rhee et alia, support of whom has reduced American policy to:

"Come weal, come woe
Our status is quo."

But the only "status quo" possible in our world is the one which recognizes revolutionary change. In Tibet where lately no wheel turned, the wheel of history cannot be reversed.

FAR EAST REPORTER PUBLICATIONS

	Pages	Price
"Two Americans From China" Excerpts from Prisoners of Liberation" — Rickett	20	20c
"How China News Is Made" — Excerpts from Assignment China" — Schuman	24	20c
"Once More About The Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat" (Historical Document from China)	44	15c
"New China As We Saw It" 2 Canadian Missionaries Revisit China	28	25c
"Land Reform in China"—R. N. Pritt Reprint from New World Review	24	10c
"Democracy in China"—Israel Epstein	7	05c
"President Sukarno: Speech to US Congress"	20	15c
"India's Progress"	68	35c
"Letters from China"	64	35c
"China 'Uncivilized'?!—Millenium of Contribution to the West"	20	20c
"Bandung: Asian-African Conference" documents	64	35c
"China: Visitors Welcome"	12	10c
"Constitution of the People's Republic of China"	32	20c
"Formosa" — S. Warren, Reprint, N.W.R.	.10	05c

BOOKS available at special price

	Reg. Price	Special
"Prisoners of Liberation"—Rickett	\$4.75	\$3.50
"Assignment China"—Schuman	4.00	3.00

NOTE CARDS — CHINESE DESIGNS

Folded 4 1/2 x 3 1/2 6 designs		
Set of 12 cards with envelopes	per set	60c
SUBSCRIPTION to FAR EAST REPORTER		\$1.50

FAR EAST REPORTER

Making available significant facts and analyses contributed by competent writers on the Far East

Maud Russell, Publisher

P.O. Box 1536 - Grand Central Station - New York 17, N. Y.