

5/21/87

Dear Mr. Ryser,
Thought you
would find this new
journal of interest.

Sincerely,
Joseph E. Fallon

COMMON VOICE

Journal of the Allied Committee of
the Peoples of Eastern Turkestan,
Mongolia, Manchuria & Tibet
presently under China

CONTENTS

| | <i>Pages</i> |
|---|--------------|
| Message | iii |
| Introduction | 1 |
| Tibetan Buddhism, The Mongolian Religion <i>Sachin Jagchid</i> | 5 |
| Changes in the Uighur Script During the Past 50 Years <i>Abdullah T. Emiloglu</i> | 10 |
| Challenges to Political Legitimacy: Some Real-Life Case-Studies <i>Khantinger Kunggur</i> | 12 |
| Are We "Chinese"? <i>Thubten Jigme Norbu</i> | 16 |
| Is Eastern Turkistan a Chinese Territory? <i>Erkin Alptekin</i> | 19 |
| The Origins of Relations Between Tibet and Other Countries in Central Asia—I <i>P. T. Takla</i> | 24 |
| News | 30 |

Message

When I first met H. H. the Dalai Lama, the Spiritual and Temporal leader of Tibet, in Mussoorie, India, on April 14, 1960, we discussed the importance of uniting forces to highlight the activities of our respective communities, and increase awareness of our just struggle by bringing our peoples plight to the attention of the free world.

I am very happy to know that the representatives of the peoples of Eastern Turkestan, Manchuria, Inner Mongolia and Tibet living abroad have finally decided to publish the first issue of *Common Voice*.

I am certain that the peoples of these countries living at home and abroad will share my happiness.

Unfortunately, the free world knows very little about the real situation of Eastern Turkestan, Manchuria, Inner Mongolia & Tibet. They are fed mostly with distorted information by the communist rulers. Thus, the situation of these peoples remains a mystery. Worst of all, some observers have regarded us as accustomed to slavery, as flocks of animals, and our bravery as something to be overlooked for the sake of history. All this is nothing but the bitter consequence of slavery.

Our national struggle for independence will undoubtedly be carried out within the boundaries of our respective countries as it has been before. We, who are in exile, are not in a position to participate in this fundamental struggle so long as we are far from our homelands. However, we do not lack the energy to make contributions to the national struggle and this we regard as our patriotic obligation.

One of this obligation is to publish objective information that can cast light on the conditions of our peoples at home. In this way we can fight back at the treacherous propaganda of the communist rulers. We can also help support scholars who look for first hand information about our countries and those who seek to maintain goodwill.

Istanbul
Turkey.

Isa Yusuf Alptekin.

Introduction

According to the latest Chinese census, the present population of non-Chinese people in the People's Republic of China is almost 70 million. The non-Chinese people consist of 55 ethnic groups, constituting 6.7 per cent of the total population of China. Although the total number of non-Chinese people is small, they occupy 60 per cent of China's land area. Most of the non-Chinese people inhabit the border areas gradually incorporated into the Chinese territory.

Because of their historical background, cultural and strategic position, the Turkic Muslims of Eastern Turkestan (Uighurs, Kazakhs, Uzbeks, Tatars and the Tajiks), the Manchus, the Mongols and the Tibetans are very important. These people were not only independent until recent decades, but they also ruled China for many centuries and contributed to the enrichment of the Central Asian civilisation.

The Turkic Muslims of Eastern Turkestan, the Manchurians, the Mongols and the Tibetans who played an important role in the history of Central Asia for many centuries, are today faced with the danger of total assimilation and annihilation.

Before 1940, there were only 200 thousand Chinese settlers in Eastern Turkestan. Today, there are more than six million. Since 1979, every year, almost 200 thousand Chinese settlers are pouring into this Turkic Muslim land. Prior to 1949 the Uighurs constituted 75 per cent of the total population of Eastern Turkestan. Now their number has dropped to 45 per cent.

The total population of Manchuria is around 35 million. But only 5 million of this population is Manchu. The rest is Chinese. Only 100,000 of the five million Manchu can speak their mother tongue. Until a century ago, the Manchu rulers of China did not allow the Chinese to settle in Manchuria. Ironically, what was in fact incorporation of China into Manchuria in effect resulted in the incorporation of Manchuria into China because the military victory of the Manchus was not followed by an ethnical, linguistic or cultural victory. But this situation should not give the Chinese the right to deny the existence of a Manchu nation in China. The Chinese still do not accept the Manchus as a separate entity. They do not even have a so-called "Autonomous Region" on paper.

The total population of the so-called Inner Mongolian Autonomous Region is almost 20 million. But only 3.5 million of this population is Mongol. There are more than one million people living in Koke-Khota

(Hue-hut), the capital of the so-called Inner Mongolian Autonomous Region. But only 100,000 of this population is Mongol.

The situation in Tibet is another tragedy. The total population of Tibetans is six million, including the Tibetans living in the Tibetan territories incorporated into China. There are only 1.8 million Tibetans living in the so-called Tibet Autonomous Region. At present, there are over 1.2 million Chinese settlers in this region. Besides this, there are also 500,000 PLA troops in Tibet. In the past two years 60,000 Chinese settlers have entered and many more are on the way. A good example of the proportion of the Chinese influx is to be found in Lhasa, the capital of Tibet. Until the coming of the Chinese settlers the population was almost entirely Tibetan but, today, the Chinese greatly outnumber the Tibetans. There are already 350,000 registered and 270,000 un-registered civilian Chinese in Lhasa—with more steadily pouring in—whereas the Tibetan population is less than 100,000.

Last year, Hu Yaobang, the General Secretary of the Chinese Communist Party, said that the “western frontier regions could easily absorb 200 million Chinese settlers.” Most probably these Chinese settlers will be sent to thinly populated areas like Eastern Turkestan and Tibet. This is also the final aim of the Chinese. Now, Peking government is actively encouraging Chinese migration to non-Chinese (Eastern Turkestan) areas by offering them material benefits.

To speed up the sinicisation of non-Chinese people, the Chinese are sinicising the names of their country, language, and following a policy of forced marriage with the Chinese. For example:

Eastern Turkestan is “Xinjiang,” Manchuria became “Heilungjiang”, Tibet became “Xizang”. In Eastern Turkestan: the city of Urumchi became Tihua; Kashgar became Kashi, Yarkant became Soche, Aksu became Wensu etc.; In Manchuria: Mukden became Shen-yang, Kirin became Yungchi, Shulan became Chaoyangchen etc.; In Inner Mongolia Koke Khota became Hohot, Kalgan became Changchiakow, Jehol became Chengteh etc.; and in Tibet: Shigatse became Xigaze, Chushul became Qiuxu, Yamdrök Yamtso became Yamzho Yamco etc. Whether it is in Uighur, Manchurian, Mangolian or in Tibetan languages, all these cities have their meanings and legends behind them e.g. Tso in Tibetan means lake, whereas the Chinese mispronunciation, “co” has no meaning either in Tibetan or in Chinese. Whether it has a meaning or not the Chinese are only concerned about the sinicisation of these people and their culture.

Although the Turkic Muslims of Eastern Turkestan, the Manchurians, the Mongols and the Tibetans have long established and perfectly satisfactory words and expression in their language for every concept, however,

as it can be seen from the following examples, they were suppressed and replaced by Chinese words:

| | |
|----------|----------------------------------|
| Jun-Yang | Centre or Central Committee |
| Zhu chi | chairman or president |
| da sho | institution for higher education |
| Jioo shi | class-room |
| Fa yuen | court |
| Pin fen | to rehabilitate |
| Pi fang | to denounce a person |

In Eastern Turkestan, until 1979, there was a law in force which forbade the inter-marriages of non-Chinese people and Chinese. After 1979 this law was abrogated and intermarriage between the groups was encouraged. To encourage intermarriage the Peking government is offering material bonuses to the non-Chinese people. If, for example, a non-Chinese marries a Chinese, they receive 800 yuan (4000 dollars) each. Chinese girls born in non-Chinese areas who speak the local languages fluently, are sent to remote villages and given a stipend of 300 yuan (1,500 dollars) to try attract a non-Chinese spouse. Young non-Chinese males, who work in remote regions where the majority of the settlers are Chinese, are promised better jobs in the cities if they marry Chinese girls. In addition they are promised 200 yuan (1000 dollars) if such a marriage takes place. Some non-Chinese people who have married Chinese have tried to divorce their wives, but the Chinese have imposed heavy penalties for divorce. A non-Chinese, wanting to divorce his Chinese wife has to pay 4000 yuan (200 dollars) alimony, and as most come from poorer families, they are not able to meet such payments. Children born of these intermarriages are automatically registered as ethnic Chinese. They are normally educated by the mothers and are sent to Chinese schools.

At present, this policy is effectively practised in Eastern Turkestan. The Chinese have also established an institute called *Chung Tang* for the purpose of propagating and encouraging intermarriages between the two groups in Eastern Turkestan.

As for Manchuria, Inner Mongolia and Tibet, this practice of encouraging inter-marriages as a means to assimilate and effectively wipe out the national identity had been carried out ever since the Chinese gained control of these countries and has now been strengthened.

Eastern Turkestan is called "Xinjiang Uighur Autonomous Region", Tibet has been divided into six parts and when the Chinese talk of "Tibet" they only refer to the so-called "Tibet Autonomous Region" which consists of only about half the area of Tibet and has only about one third of the population. The major portion of north-western Tibet—traditionally known

as Amdo—has been turned into a new Chinese province called Qinghai. The rest of eastern Tibet have been sub-divided and incorporated into neighbouring Chinese provinces.

Inner Mongolia is called “Inner Mongolian Autonomous Region” but in reality no right of self-government is granted to the local people of these regions. The reins of government are completely in the hands of the Chinese.

Putting self-rule aside, today, the long promised equality in true sense has not been established among the non-Chinese people of Eastern Turkestan Manchuria, Inner Mongolia and Tibet and the Chinese.

Unfortunately the rest of the world knows very little about the real situation in the above mentioned countries. Thus, the representatives of Eastern Turkestan, Manchuria, Inner Mongolia and Tibet who are living abroad, after lengthy discussion have solemnly resolved to unite in their struggle for Independence and the overthrow of the Chinese occupation forces, to establish an Allied Committee and to publish a periodical in order to make the plight of their people known to the world at large. We have also requested H.H. the Dalai Lama of Tibet to be our guiding spirit and our Spokesman.

This is our first issue, COMMON VOICE, will deal with the history, culture and the current problems of the peoples of Eastern Turkestan, Manchuria, Inner Mongolia and Tibet.

—Editor

Tibetan Buddhism, The Mongolian Religion

Sechin Jagchid

Regardless of what explanation monks or clergymen may give regarding religion, it is a phenomenon of human culture and society. As for the reasons why nations adopt a particular foreign religion, they may explain it as a destiny set by God, as the will of Heaven, or due to other affinities. Nevertheless, there are historical and cultural factors. These factors provide some explanation as to why the Mongols, at the peak of their power, adopted Tibetan Buddhism as their religious faith.

The Mongolian Khan's choice of this religion seems to have been based on cultural similarities between the Mongols and the Tibetans, and their mutual distance—geographical and cultural—from the Chinese. Both Mongolia and Tibet are high plateaus of Inner Asia, and their open steppes and cold, arid climate make them well-suited to nomadism. On account of similarities in their geographic circumstances, both Tibet and Mongolia developed a similar cultural style: Nomadic pastoralism. It was thus, easier for the Mongols to mingle with seminomadic Tibetans than with purely agricultural Chinese, who were far different in their social and cultural institutions.

Before the Tibetans were converted to Buddhism, their original religious belief was known as *Bon*, a faith similar to *Boe* of the Mongols. This historical background may also indicate that Tibetan Buddhism, that fit so naturally into the culture of the "land of Snows", was also more easily accepted by the Mongols than Sinicised Buddhism, which had naturally accommodated itself to an agricultural civilisation.

In 1240, the contingent of the Mongol forces commanded by Prince Koton¹ entered Tibet, and later in the year 1244, the Tibetan Buddhist master Sakya Pandita Kunga Gyaltzen, together with his nephew, Phagpa, came to the camp of Koton. Although they came to the Mongolian camp under pressure, the Pandita was able to discuss Buddhism with these high Mongolian authorities. Thereafter, Prince Khublai was on his way on a campaign against the Kingdom of Ta-li, in present-day Yunnan Province of China, when the young Phagpa was able to meet him and persuade this powerful Prince—later the Khan of the Mongol Empire—to take a sympathetic view of Buddhism. From then on Phagpa acted as a sort of court priest at Khublai's headquarters. These factors combined to further the spread of Tibetan Buddhism among the Mongolian nobles. In 1260, when Khublai became Khan, he conferred upon Phagpa the rank of *Kuo-shih*, the State Instructor. Later, after his *nirvana* he was promoted to the rank of *Ti-shih*, the Imperial Tutor. Although at that time Tibetan Buddhism was only the religious faith of the Mongolian imperial clan and the people of the higher

class, it had begun to greatly influence the thought of many Mongols.

After the Mongolian Yuan Dynasty had been established in China for almost a century, the Crown Prince, Ayurshiridara said, "A Chinese scholar taught me the Confucian classics for years but the meaning is still not too clear to me. Now I am hearing the Law of the Buddha from Hsifan (Tibetan) monk, and I am enlightened after only one night."² These works suggest how the Mongols' acceptance or rejection of outside cultural elements depended largely upon the cultural affinities of the Mongols to the Tibetans. There is considerable evidence that emotionally and psychologically the Mongols and the Tibetans had much in common. Be that as it may, as already mentioned, the Buddhism espoused by Khublai Khan and Phagpa, the Great Master of Sakya, flourished only among the Mongolian ruling class, failing to profoundly affect the masses. Consequently, following the collapse of the Yuan Dynasty (1368) and the isolation of Mongolian lands, Buddhism faded away along with other foreign religions, giving way to the revival of the old shamanistic religion. This period came to be known as the "dark-ages" in most Mongolian historical materials. And yet, when Buddhism flourished during the Yuan period, it subtly influenced Mongolia's traditional faith and culture, and consequently sowed the seeds for an eventual revival.

The decline of Mongolian power and the Buddhist religion did not last long. The Mongols were soon able to re-establish their position as a powerful nation against the Chinese Ming Dynasty. In the mid-sixteenth century, Altan Khan of the Tumed tribe on the south of the Gobi carried out a military campaign in Tibetan territory and re-established intimate ties between Mongolia and Tibet.

Altan Khan sent an emissary to Tibet in 1577 to pay respects to the Great Master of the Gelug sect, Sonam Gyatso. The following year a group of Mongolian patrons and this Tibetan master met on the bank of Lake Kokonor (Chinghai) to enact a ceremony for the promulgation of the Law of the Buddha. Altan Khan conferred on the master the title "Wachir-dara Dalai Lama" (commonly known as the Third Dalai Lama), the master conferred on Altan Khan the title "Tsadrawar Sechen Khan." Consequently, with the support of a powerful Mongolian Patron, the Gelug sect, centred in the Dalai Lama, achieved eminence above all others in Tibet. In addition, Altan Khan's prestige in Mongolia increased because of the blessings of the exalted religious leader of the "Land of Snows."

Altan Khan's conversion hastened the spread of Buddhism in Mongolia, and Tumen, the Great Khan, whose headquarters was then in the eastern part of Inner Mongolia, also accepted Buddhism as his faith. Both of these conversions had far-reaching influence, bringing about the conversion even of the leader of the Central Asian—Oirad Mongols, who were enemies of both the Great Khan and Altan.

After Altan Khan and other Mongolian nobles accepted Buddhism, the Third Dalai Lama appointed Dongkhar-Manjushiri *Khutughtu* as his representative, and stationed him at Koke-Khota, the capital city of Altan

Khan, there to expound the Law of the Buddha among the Mongols.

Altan Khan died in 1583, and in 1585 the Third Dalai Lama came to Koke-khota to pray for him and to propagate the Law of Buddha in the Ordos and other parts of Western Inner Mongolia. This made Koke-Khota the first centre of Buddhism in Mongolia. Abadai *taiji*, the leader of the Khalka Mongols of the north of the Gobi, also proceeded to the city to accept the Law from the Great Master.

The Third Dalai Lama died in Inner Mongolia in 1588, and the Fourth Dalai Lama was born in the family of Altan Khan. Thus, the "Golden descendants" (*altan uragh*) of Chinggis Khan were joined with the dominant orthodox line of Tibetan Buddhism.

During this period, those who went to Mongolia to spread Buddhism came not only from the Yellow Sect but also from others; the main one usually mistakenly known as the "Red Sect." The preaching of Tibetan Buddhism soon spread all over Mongolia, even reaching Manchuria, where eventually the Manchu imperial household was converted.

Buddhism mainly developed among the Khalkha Mongols on the north of the Gobi because of the knowledge of Buddhism there and its political links—that is the prestige it had among the household of the First Jebt-sundamba *Khutughtu*, who were members of the "Golden descendants" of Chinggis Khan. As a result, a unified system of leadership was established in the ecclesiastical world of Outer Mongolia. The dynamics of religious and political unification was very important to the history of Mongolia.

Religion sometimes has a more powerful influence on human life than does law. The conversion of a nation to a certain religion means that its people will accept that religion's principles as basic to their pattern of life. When the Mongolian-Yuan Khans were converted to Buddhism, the religion was common only among the upper class, and its influence was much weaker than in the late sixteenth century, when the whole Mongolian nation received Buddhism as its faith. After the collapse of the Yuan Dynasty, the Mongols suffered extensively from both foreign invasion and internal tribal wars. As a result, the people felt that life was vain and sorrowful. Following the second conversion of the Mongolian nobles, they began to regain hope for peace and gained a deep faith that provided them comfort. The desire of both nobles and the common people was to follow the law that would lead them to the realm of the Buddha. They changed their attitudes and behaviour, and worked for blessings. This psychological change brought peace and stability to Mongolia, but it also resulted in weakness and decline.

The Manchu rulers, as experts in the art of politics, did not neglect the potential power of Buddhism, and used it to manipulate the Mongols. Of this, Emperor Ch'ien-lung (r. 1736-1795) wrote openly in his work *La-ma-shuo* (on Lamas):

The Yellow Religion of the interior and the outside was generally governed by these two persons, the Dalai Lama and the Panchen Erdeni. All the Mongolian tribes whole-heartedly submit themselves. The development of the Yellow Religion is intended to pacify the

Mongols. This matter is not insignificant and therefore should be protected but is not a policy similar to that of the Yuan Dynasty, which deviously flattered the Tibetan monks.³

The measures taken towards Tibetan Buddhism by the Manchu Court were, as we see, aimed at strengthening their control over the Mongols. Even at the end of the Ching Dynasty, there still were those who openly praised the success of this Manchu policy to weaken Mongolia.

At the turn of the twentieth century, rapid changes in the Asian situation posed serious problems to the existence of the Mongols as a nation. By this time, Tibetan Buddhism had mingled with traditional Mongolian culture and had become an integral part of the Mongolian national character. Some have even said it was one of the main reasons for the decline of the Mongols as a nation. When Outer Mongolia declared its independence from China in 1911, many were concerned about the fate of the religion.

In 1921, the territories of Mongolia on the north of the Gobi desert came under the influence of the Bolshevik Revolution, and in 1924, following the death of the Eighth Jibtsundanba *hutugthu* and the founding of the Mongolian People's Republic (MPR), the ruling Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, under the direction of the Soviet Comintern started a so-called socialist revolution. Later in the Stalin era of the 1930's, except for the two famous temples of Gandan *Keid* and the Erderiin *juu*, most monasteries were destroyed and most of the lamas, accused as counter revolutionary elements, were dispersed and returned to a secular life. During World War II, following a change of the heavy-handed policy against religion in the Soviet Union, the government of the Mongolian People's Republic and the ruling party allowed the recovery of Buddhism although under official guidelines. Several years ago, when His Holiness the Fourteenth Dalai Lama was invited to Ulan-bator, tens of thousands of people, both old and young, came to pay homage to this famous spiritual leader. Right now Gandan *keid*, the old centre of Buddhist faith in Mongolia, is opened to the people for worship and some monks are allowed to perform religious ceremonies. Even a college of Buddhism has been opened in Ulan-bator. All these suggest that the roots of the religion in the minds and hearts of the people and the Buddhist tradition, as part of the national culture, remains today, even after seven decades of severe persecution.

In Inner Mongolia the negative influence of the Manchu religious policy, the occurrence of the Autonomous Movement in the 1930's, and Japan's occupation stirred up a considerable anti-religious movement among the intellectuals. Even so, their criticisms were mainly concerning the lightening of the discipline of the monks in the monastic institutions. Following the end of World War II and the Chinese Communist occupation, and especially during the period of the Cultural Revolution, the fate of Buddhism in Inner Mongolia was even worse than that of Outer Mongolia in the 1930's. Although now the situation is somewhat improved, the controls and interference from outside is still very heavy.

↑
Sovietization
of Mongolia

A world topic of the 1980's is human rights; however, both the peoples of Mongolia and Tibet are under alien regimes that dominated without the consent of the local people whose freedom of belief and speech are totally abused. Consequently, these two peoples of the same faith have no other choice but to cling to their national cultural tradition and their common faith to struggle together for the fulfillment of freedom from both physical and spiritual harassment from the enemies of their religion.

Notes :

1. Koton was a son of Ogodei Khan, the successor of Chinggis Khan. He was assigned as the commanding Prince of the Mongol force in the area of present Kansu Province. In the 1240's, his contingent under General Dordagh entered Tibet. The visit of Sakyapa to Koton's camp took place during the reign of Guyug Khan (1246-1248), the brother of Koton. However Prince Koton was usually recognised, mistakenly, as the Khan by most of Tibetan materials.
2. See *Yuan-shih*, 46, 8b.
3. These words were carved on the style in Yung-ho Kung, the grand imperial lamasery in Peking. Also see Ho-ning (revised), *Wei-tsang-tung-chih*, reprinted in Taipei, 1965, pp. 276- 28a.

Changes in the Uighur Script During the Past 50 Years

Abdullah T. Emiloglu

This report concerns the changes in the Uighur script which have occurred in the recent half century, and the historical background against which these developments took place.

Widespread use of the Arabic script among the Uighurs began in the 16th century. Before that time, while Uighurs who were followers of Islam used the Arabic alphabet for their own language, the remainder of non-Muslim Uighurs continued to use the old Uighur script.

Until the time of the so-called Djadid movement, which arose in Central Asia, the Arabic script, so similar to that of the Persians, was used throughout all Turkestan, and was called the "Chagatai" script.

The Arabic orthography makes no provision for writing vowels explicitly, therefore this defect in expression was also conspicuous in the Uighur script. By the third decade of this century, in order to meet the contemporary needs of modern Uighur writers, the traditional orthographic system of the religious schools, as well as the religious texts of these academies, written in a style based on Arabic grammar, were confronted with an absolute need for reform. At the same time, there was a widespread awareness that the Chagatai script was also no longer suitable to meet contemporary needs, and in a brief time, the reform call was taken up on all sides. At this time intellectuals of Ili organised the so-called Dernek Society, while activities of reformers in Tarbagatai were centred in the Association for Turan Studies, and these two groups simultaneously carried out the work of reform. More specifically, reformers of Ili followed the model of Turkey and the Central Asian reform movement, whereas those of the Tarbagatai group imitated the reformers among the Turks in the Volga-Ural area, and both these trends are to be seen reflected in the literature of the time. But at this time the general Uighur society of Kashgaria did not cease in its conservative attitudes nor did it abandon use of the script of the religious academies. Therefore, these trends of the 1920's favouring reform of writing failed to achieve any concrete results in regard to change of the Uighur script itself, before the following decade.

In the USSR, however, the decisive period in the reform of Uighur writing was the late 1920's. In the eleven years from 1918 to 1928, Uighur writers in the USSR continued to follow a middle path, using the Uighur script based on Arabic in such publications as SADAI TARANCHI (Alma Ata 1918), KEMBEGHELLER AWAZI (1922), QUTULUS: SARQ HAQIQATI, etc. At a scholarly meeting of Uighurs from all Central Asia, held in Samarkhand from 29 April to 4 May 1918, a proposal was raised favouring a reform which would adopt an orthography based on the Latin alphabet. From 1930,

the entire literary and publishing fields undertook use of this Latinised Uighur script.

In Eastern Turkestan, a compromise script was used, called Orta Imla. However, this orthography, unlike Latinised script mentioned above, was not the product of collective discussion and group agreement, but was rather the result of influences developed from the reform movement in the USSR. So even up to 1948, matters had not reached the stage of concrete results. In 1948, the author attended a meeting at Urumchi devoted to language reform. However, while there were some concrete ideas put forward at that time, nevertheless, due to the influence of political circumstances at the time, this meeting became just a transitory phenomenon.

After 1949, the Arabic style Uighur script continued to be used in Eastern Turkestan, but in 1958, a set of graphs for a new Uighur script was introduced at a so-called Second All-China Nationalities' Linguistic and Orthographic Conference held in Peking. In November of 1959 a draft proposal for a new Uighur script was adopted by the National Linguistic and Orthographic Conference of the Uighur Autonomous Region and was approved by the People's Committee of the Uighur Autonomous Region and in turn by the Central Committee for Nationality Affairs in Peking. In 1960 it began to be used experimentally, and then in March of 1964, on the basis of the results of this experimental period, a revised proposal for a Uighur and Khazakh orthography was approved. Thus the orthographic reform of the Uighur and Khazakh languages left the experimental stage and entered the stage of wide scale promulgation. However, the traditional script of the religious academies still continues in use among the Uighurs outside Eastern Turkestan.

Challenges to Political Legitimacy : Some Real-Life Case-Studies

Khantinger Kunggur

Today many scholars are trying to study the theories of individual and social change. Some of them have reached theories that could explain certain social phenomena in a quite logical and practical way. This paper is based mainly on the study of social influence and its relationship to individual and social change, a series of studies made by prof. Herbert C. Kelman of Harvard University and others.

I shall analyse certain contemporary social movements to exemplify their theories and present my opinions. Two cases adopted for this purpose are as follows:

- 1) The hostile attitude of the Tibetans towards the current Chinese Communist regime—the People's Republic of China.
- 2) The emergence of the Manchu Association as a modern ethnic group in Taiwan, Republic of China.

I shall analyse these two cases, through a social psychological approach. I have chosen them for my study, not only because of my personal involvement with them, but also because of their unique respective characteristics.

Some questions

- 1) What are the reasons behind the hostile attitude of the Tibetans towards the current Chinese regime?

It is well known that the Tibetan people have been trying to get independence from China for a long time. Many Chinese, however, believe that Tibet is part of China, since Tibet was part of the Ch'ing-Dynasty (A Manchu ruled Dynasty; the Ch'ing Dynasty began in the early seventeenth century, contemporary with the American colonies, and lasted until 1911). So, most Chinese believe that Tibet should continue to be part of China.

About three years ago, the brother of the Tibetan religious and political leader, the Dalai Lama, Prof. Thubten Jigme Norbu visited Taipei, Taiwan, Republic of China. According to the *Far Eastern Economic Review*, during his stay in Taiwan, at one point he corrected a highranking Chinese official's statement about Tibet. He said he should remind them that he was not Chinese, that Tibet is not part of China, and his beloved country was actually under foreign occupation. He said that Tibet had been part of the Manchu Empire, just as China proper had, but said that at the end of the Ch'ing Dynasty, Tibet became an independent state. In sum, he denied the legitimacy of any government other than a Tibetan one in Tibet.

Why do the Tibetans concede that they were part of the Ch'ing

Dynasty, but have changed their attitude now?

What is the possible reasoning behind their challenging of the current Chinese regime?

2) The emergence of the Manchu Association as a modern ethnic group in Taiwan, Republic of China.

As this paper mentioned in a previous section, the Manchus were the ruling class in the Ch'ing Dynasty, but soon after the end of the Ch'ing Dynasty in 1911, the whole of China was trapped in a period of chaos, from monarchy to warlordism followed by the Sino-Japanese war and finally the civil war ending in 1949.

No one in China could escape from these disaster, and of course the Manchus were no exception, but they were in a more difficult situation than the Chinese, because they were the group that was usually held responsible for anything that went wrong before 1911, very much like the "Gang of Four" in the Cultural Revolution period of China. Moreover, most of them have assimilated with the Chinese, and have not only forgotten their own Altaic language, but have also adopted Chinese culture. In short, you can hardly identify a person as a Manchu unless he identifies himself as one.

Why did there suddenly emerge a Manchu Association in 1981?

Is there any challenge to the legitimacy of government also?

My analysis

1) The Tibetan case

Beyond its historical relationship as a tributary state in the Ch'ing Dynasty, Tibet is actually in a quite different condition. The Tibetans have language, custom, social norms, history, culture and religion different from those of the Chinese. In history, they have always been a people with self-esteem, even in the Ch'ing Dynasty. The Tibetans kept their culture, social system, religious beliefs and practices, and military, so long as they paid loyalty and tribute to the Chin'g Government, and they had the privilege of sending missionaries to Mongolia, Manchuria and Peking, where they received honourable receptions.

Thus the positive attitude and action of the Ch'ing regime presented an irresistible opportunity for the Tibetans to become involved in the national system, both sentimentally and instrumentally. Sharing similar religious beliefs and ideas, the Tibetans also ideologically integrated in the Manchu Empire.

But when the Red Chinese Army occupied Tibet in 1959, the Chinese Communist regime imposed their ideas and system on the Tibetan people, ideas formed in China proper under very different social conditions. The Chinese Communist regime also destroyed many Tibetan traditions, obviously without their invitation. So, except for the vast number of Chinese Communist troops in Tibet, we can find very little reason for the Tibetans to commit themselves to the legitimacy of the Chinese Communist regime.

This explains the extremely hostile attitude held by the Tibetans towards the Chinese Communist regime today.

2) The Manchu case

In 1981, just one month before the organisation of a Manchu Association, Miss Pamela Crossly, a then Ph.D. candidate in Chinese History from Yale University, in Taiwan, Republic of China, asked a Chinese official, who was also a historian in Taiwan, about the situation of contemporary Manchu. The official replied that Manchus no longer existed in China because they had all assimilated with the Chinese. Miss Crossly told me all this (I was the Secretary General and a member of the Standing Board of Directors of the newly organised Manchu Association then). She was subsequently invited to meetings held by the Manchu Association. After attending our meetings, she said she accepted the existence of the Manchu people, and showed sincere respect to the Association.

The Manchu Association in Taipei, after almost 70 years silence in China, now functions as a cultural promotion organisation. As I mentioned earlier, unless a Manchu identified himself as a Manchu, it was very difficult to tell his identity. Even so, in the past 70 years, they have suffered somewhat different treatment, not in everyday life, but in education, in history textbooks, from grammar school to college. The Chinese not only hold the Ch'ing Dynasty responsible for social wrongs but also ascribe many ills to the Manchu. While they emphasize the Chinese culture, they claim that the Manchu, Mongolian etc are barbarians, and have no culture. This kind of attitude and statement makes Manchus feel ashamed of their own culture, and feel that their culture was merely a substandard version of the Chinese culture. This also puts Manchus in a very embarrassing situation, with a choice of either hiding themselves in the crowd but letting their offsprings receive education humiliating their ancestors, or speaking out with possible inconvenience in real life.

On the other hand, Manchus feel proud of their historical involvement with China in the past 1000 years in three dynasties. Under the Manchu rule, China enjoyed rather a long period of stable and prosperous life and many great cultural achievements made in the preceding Ch'ing Dynasty.

This dilemma was finally settled by some Manchus through organising the Manchu Association in Taipei, Taiwan, for the following reasons:

- 1) As time has gone, the hostile attitude held by Chinese has lessened.
- 2) With over 30 years stability, people acquired extra interests and economic conditions to be able to do this kind of social work.
- 3) It is hard for a man to tolerate unfair judgements on his culture and ancestors, especially when he has reached a certain social status in the society he considers himself integrated in.

So as to fit better into the social system, Manchus have to clear this out. They organised to protest, in a hope through the protests the political

authority may change its attitude towards Manchus and correct its historical criticisms, and release Manchus from the suffocation of inconsistent relations between their ideological, role-participation, and normative integration.

If not, there will always be a missing element in every Manchu's commitment to the national system.

REFERENCES

- Kelman, H.C. The role of action in attitude change. In H.E. Howe, Jr., and M.M. page (Eds), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation 1979, Beliefs, attitudes and values*. Lincoln: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1980.
- Kelman, H.C. Three processes of social influence. In *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 1961, 25, 57-58
- Kelman, H.C. The rights of the subject in social research: An analysis in terms of relative power and legitimacy. *American Psychologist*, 1972, 27,
- Kelman, H.C. Patterns of personal involvement in the national system: A social psychological analysis of political legitimacy. In J. Rosenau (Eds), *International politics and foreign policy: A reader in research and theory*. New York: Free Press, 1969.
- Kelman, H.C. A Social-Psychological model of political legitimacy and its application to Israeli Palestinian relations. *International Interactions*, 1979, 99-122,

Are we "Chinese"?

Thubten Jigme Norbu

It appears that having lost our homes and our country, we Tibetans are about to suffer a further insult: in a perverse twist to the tragedy that has befallen us we are being denied our very identity.

For centuries Tibetans and non-Tibetans have never had any doubts about who we are as a people and as a nation. Now we suddenly find ourselves being classified as "Chinese," and this by many who ought to know better. What is the basis of this? Simply the modern theory propounded in China to the effect that Tibetans, Mongols, Uighurs, and all others who find themselves living within the borders of present People's Republic of China are "Chinese". So often has this proposition been repeated that it is now taken as correct in more and more forums. But is it?

"Chinese" is an ethnic term, this much is undeniable. It refers to a particular group of people who are the heirs to a specific culture and native speakers of a specific group of languages. This means that there is a definite ethno-linguistic connection between the peoples thus identified. But those of us who are Tibetan or Mongol, for example, clearly don't fit into this definition, and yet we find ourselves being classed time and again as "Chinese." The reason for this is the purposeful dissemination of a new definition "Chinese" which is meant to pervert its original meaning for political purposes and to create in the minds of people the idea that at bottom all of the peoples within the People's Republic of China are ethnically Chinese.

To phrase this in a simpler form, the rulers of the Peoples Republic of China have opted for the use of an *ethnic* term to express what ought to be a *political* reality (i.e., that the peoples whom we have so far mentioned are today under the rule of the Peoples Republic of China). The calculated result is that many people now mistakenly assume that this term expresses an ethnic reality (i.e., that the above-mentioned peoples are actually ethnically Chinese), an error which carries with it any number of further false assumptions. As "Chinese," one would have to assume that Tibetans, Mongols, and Uighurs speak Sinitic languages, have similar cultural heroes as the Chinese (i.e., Confucius, etc.), and follow life-styles similar to theirs as well. All of this is patently untrue, yet the myth that we are all Chinese is still being successfully bandied about.

As further substantiation for this linguistic perversion, the powers that be in China have entered upon the use of "Han," a synonym for "Chinese," to describe themselves. This further creates the impression that the term "Chinese" applies to us as much as to the Chinese. In reality this is simply an act of linguistic legerdemain, for the terms "Han" and "Chinese" have always meant the same thing, at least until recent decades, when China's

rulers began to create a reality of their own. If we check any of the traditional Chinese lexicographic works, we will see that "Han" is simply defined as another term for "Chinese." And this is how the term has generally been understood by the Chinese themselves. Ultimately there is no basis to the postulation that the "Han" people are ethnically related to the Tibetans, Mongols, Uighurs, etc., and that they are just the constituent branches of an ethno-linguistic group known as the "Chinese" people.

It is ironic, in a sense, that Tibetans now face the prospect of having our identity assimilated into that of the Chinese. Ironic, for it is the Chinese who have ruled Tibet for the shortest time among all who have at one time or another dominated the country. The Mongols held sway over Tibet for over a century during the era of their world empire. Similarly the Manchus controlled Tibet for close to two centuries during their imperial period. But the Chinese only came to dominate Tibet in the 20th century. It cannot be doubted by anyone that Tibet manifested all that one would expect of an independent country during the period between the Manchu collapse and the Chinese invasion. We Tibetans had our own government, one which had declared itself (through the voice of the thirteenth Dalai Lama) to be independent, and which comported itself in a way fully commensurate with that declaration. Tibet maintained its own Foreign Office, postal system, currency, and full administration. So too, we held to a strictly neutral position in World War II, in spite of both Chinese and British participation, and granted asylum to two Austrian mountaineers who requested the Tibetan Government not to return them to Allied detention. More to the point, when the Tibetan Government in 1949 (desiring to maintain neutrality and even-handedness between the factions in China's civil war) ordered all Chinese out of Lhasa, including the Kuomintang representatives accredited to the Tibetan Foreign Office, the Chinese all complied according to accepted international norms.

The only foreign powers that ever really dominated Tibet before the Chinese were the Manchu and Mongol empires, huge entities in which several other states apart from Tibet were conquered and ruled. Within these empires Tibetans and Chinese were equally considered subject nations. These were clearly not, as historians well know, "Chinese" empires. Tibetans never considered Manchus or Mongols to be Chinese. For they were not. However, now the same distortions that the Chinese have been utilising to pervert the general perception of our history are being used to create the illusion that Tibet has been "Chinese" for centuries. For if the Chinese succeed in giving life to the myth that the Manchus and Mongols were "Chinese," then surely there can be no grounds for asserting that Tibetans themselves have never been anything but "Chinese."

It is up to us speak out as forcefully as we can against this perversion of language, for it is more than simply that. It is a device for denying us our rightful identities and for subsuming us in that of the Chinese. Sadly, though, we can see a growing number of people—journalists and others—referring more and more to the Chinese as "Han Chinese," and thereby tacitly accept-

ing the new Chinese dictum that the Han are but one variety of Chinese, there being others (presumably "Mongol Chinese," "Tibetan Chinese," etc.). We must begin now, for the situation has been ignored for far too long. If we ourselves don't come forward to assert the truth regarding this issue assuredly no one else will do so. And if our national identity fades from history we will have no one to blame but ourselves.

Is Eastern Turkestan a Chinese Territory?

Erkin Alptekin

During an interview with the correspondent of the Beijing Review, Wang Enmao, first secretary of Eastern Turkestan Party Committee, claims that:

"In the early days of liberation, some people suggested we copy the Soviet method of establishing a union of republics in China. But our circumstances are different from those of the Soviet Union, which became a union of republics only after the October Revolution with the gradual merging of 14 republics with Russia. China has been a united state since ancient times. How could it go backwards to a federal system to establish a union of republics?"¹

It is true that in the early days of the so-called liberation, the people of Eastern Turkestan pleaded that they might be permitted at least to form a federated republic in China. While doing this, they were relying on the promises of the Chinese Communists made before seizing power in China.

The Provisional Constitution of the Chinese Worker-Peasant Democratic Republic, approved by the First All-China Congress of Workers and Peasants Deputies in 1931, proclaimed:

"In such regions as Mongolia, Tibet, Sinkiang... the nationalities have the right to determine by themselves whether they want to secede from the Chinese Soviet Republic and form their independent states, or to join the Union..., or to form autonomous regions within the Chinese Soviet Republic."²

At the Seventh Congress in 1945, Mao Tsetung, in his report on coalition government, having denounced the Kuomintang's oppressive policies as those of great chauvinism, said that the Communists fully endorse the nationality problem, which was to grant them "self-determination" after the Communist takeover in China.³

But after he seized power in China, Mao completely denied his "self-determination" promises.

Faced with this situation, the people of Eastern Turkestan pleaded that they might be permitted at least to form a federated republic. But Mao rejected this request on the following grounds:

"For two thousand years Sinkiang has been an inalienable part of an indivisible China; therefore, there would be no sense in dividing China into federated republics; this is a demand hostile to history and to socialism."⁴

Wang Enmao, the first secretary of Eastern Turkestan Party Committee, is now repeating the same argument. This is not something new. In order to justify their domination of Eastern Turkestan, the Chinese have always claimed that this country was annexed to China two thousand years ago,

*Indivisible China
for two thousand
years.*

that the Chinese dwelled in this territory and therefore, Eastern Turkestan is an indivisible part of China.

This distorts the historical facts. If we examine neutral historical sources we come to a completely different conclusion than that given by Chinese sources which are mostly written from a Chinese point of view to protect Chinese interests.

The well-known western scholar and sinologist Prof. Wolfram Eberhard claims that the Chinese sources give one-sided information, so it is necessary to check other sources before coming to a final conclusion concerning the history of China's neighbouring peoples in ancient times.⁵

It is true that in order to control the Silk Road, China staged invasions of Eastern Turkestan in 104 B.C., 59 B.C., 73 A.D., 448 A.D., 657 A.D., and 744 A.D.⁶ But the first invasion was thwarted by the peoples of Eastern Turkestan in 86 B.C., the second in 10 B.C., the third in 102 A.D., the fourth in 460 A.D., the fifth in 699 A.D. and the last one in 751 A.D.⁷ Thus, over a period of 855 years Eastern Turkestan was invaded six times by the Chinese, and if we add up these six invasions, the total period of Chinese occupation of Eastern Turkestan was only 157 years. It must also be said that during these 157 years China could not establish a complete control over Eastern Turkestan because of continued resistance.⁸ Outside of these 157 years of Chinese occupation, Eastern Turkestan remained a free and independent country for 698 years.⁹

After the last defeat of the Chinese by the combined forces of Arabs, Turkic peoples and the Tibetans in 751 A.D., a period of 1,000 years passed until the conquest of Eastern Turkestan by the Manchus, if we discount Mongol rule in Eastern Turkestan.¹⁰ Mongol rule cannot be accepted as a Chinese domination of Eastern Turkestan, because the Uighurs, a Turkic people, voluntarily joined the Mongol Empire, maintained their sovereignty, and played an important role throughout the empire's history.¹¹ On the other hand, during Mongol rule a racial law was adopted, according to which the Chinese were treated as the lowest caste in the empire with no rights whatsoever.¹²

The Manchus, who set up a huge empire in China, invaded Eastern Turkestan in 1759, and dominated it until 1862. During this period the people of Eastern Turkestan revolted 42 times against the Manchu rule with the purpose of regaining their independence.¹³ In the last revolt of 1863, the people of Eastern Turkestan were successful in expelling the Manchus from their motherland, and founded an independent state under the leadership of Yakub Beg Badavlat. This state was recognised by the Ottoman Empire, Tsarist Russia and Great Britain.¹⁴

In the fear of a Tsarist Russian expansion into Eastern Turkestan, large forces under the overall command of General Zho Zhung Tang attacked Eastern Turkestan in 1876. After this invasion, Eastern Turkestan was given the name Sinkiang, and it was annexed into the Manchu Empire on 18 November 1884.¹⁵ This means, Eastern Turkestan was conquered during the rule of the Manchus. But before conquering Eastern Turkestan

they conquered China. The Manchus were foreigners not only to the Eastern Turkestanis but also to the Chinese. When the Manchu rule in China was overthrown, Eastern Turkestan should have become free also. But the Chinese raised claims on Eastern Turkestan, though it had been conquered by their own conquerers.

It must also be said that long before the Chinese invasion took place, in 539 B.C., Eastern Turkestan was invaded by the Iranian peoples; in 330 B.C. by Alexander the Great; and twice in 670 A.D. and 789 A.D. by the Tibetans.¹⁶ Obviously, this means that none of the historic and forgotten invasions constitute a base for territorial claims today. Otherwise, the, Turkic peoples, Tibetans and the Mongols could raise territorial claims on parts of China as well.

It is a historical fact that pre-historic dynasties like the Shang (1450-1050 B.C.) Chou (1050-247 B.C.) and Chin (247-206 B.C.) were founded by non-Chinese peoples such as proto-Turk, proto-Tibetan and proto-Mongol peoples.¹⁷ This means that in ancient times, China was ruled by non-Chinese peoples for 1203 years.

In the Middle Ages, that is between 220 A.D. and 1280 a total of 1060 years China was ruled for 740 years by Turkic, Mongol and Tungusic peoples.¹⁸ During this period the Chinese were able to rule their own country for 540 years, but were unable to control the whole of the Chinese territory because of wars with non-Chinese peoples, as well as interior rebellions and court intrigues.¹⁹

In more recent times, that is between 1280 and 1911—which is a total of 631 years—the Chinese were able to rule their own country for only 276 years.²⁰ In this period, the non-Chinese peoples ruled China for 355 years.²¹

Only during the reign of the Han dynasty (206 B.C.—220 A.D.) were the Chinese able to rule themselves; but they were constantly threatened by the Hsing-nu or the Hun, against whom the Chinese erected the Great Wall. With this Great Wall, for the first time in history the boundaries were marked between the Chinese—the settled people—and the non-Chinese—the nomadic people.²² The Great Wall is the best proof that Eastern Turkestan was always outside Chinese territory. One of the western gates of the Great Wall is named Yu Min Guang. This gate faces Eastern Turkestan. Eastern Turkestan is famous for its precious stone, Jade. In the *New China Atlas*, which was published in 1939 in Shanghai, it is clearly indicated that during the Ch'in Dynasty (256 B.C.—206 B.C.), during the Han Dynasty (206 B.C.—220 A.D.) and during the Tang Dynasty (618 A.D.—907 A.D.) the Jade gate was accepted by the Chinese as their westernmost border.²³

Thus over a period of 3361 year of Chinese history, the Chinese ruled their own country for only 1242, and for the remaining period of 2119 years China was ruled by non-Chinese peoples such as the Turkics, Tibetans, Mongols and the Manchus.

The ancient Chinese emporors regarded themselves as the "sons of heaven." Thus, all countries in the world were Chinese "sovereignities". Under

these circumstances, no "boundaries existed" for the Chinese.²⁴ The later Chinese rulers could not disengage themselves from this view.

One of the first Chinese traveller, Fa Hsien, who visited the cities of Turfan, Karashehir, Kucha, Hoten and Charkalik in 399 A.D., writes in his memoirs that during his trip to Eastern Turkestan he met no Chinese.²⁵ Another traveller, Hsuan Chang, who followed the same route in 629 A.D. confirms Fa Hsein's words, and writes in his memoirs that during his trip to Eastern Turkestan he met only three Chinese monks.²⁶ This suggests that until the conquest of Eastern Turkestan by the Manchu rulers of China in 1759, there were no Chinese settlement in the country. Even if there had been Chinese settlements, this should not have justified territorial claims on Eastern Turkestan. Today there are millions of Chinese living in the United States, Europe and South East Asian countries. Does that mean that these countries belong to China?

Pan Ku, the great historian of the Han Dynasty (206 B.C.—220 A.D.) writes the following:

"As for clothing, costume, food and language, the barbarians are entirely different from the Middle Kingdom... Mountains, valleys and the great desert separate them from us. This barrier which lies between the interior and the alien was made by heaven and earth. Therefore, the sage rulers considered them as beasts and neither established contact with them nor subjugated them... the land is impossible to cultivate and the people are impossible to rule as subjects. Therefore, they are always to be considered as outsiders and never as citizens... Our administration and teaching have never reached their people..."²⁷

Not only do these words prove that during the Han Dynasty, Eastern Turkestan was not under Chinese "administration", but the people of Eastern Turkestan was always regarded as "outsiders", not as "citizens" and the Chinese "teaching" never reached them.

China should not justify their possession of this land by distorting historical fact.

NOTES

1. *Beijing Review*, December 17, 1984.
2. *East Turkic Review*, No 4, Munich 1960, p. 94.
3. Mao Zedong, *Selected Works*, Moscow 1953, p. 549-555.
4. Narinbayev, *Kommunizm Tugi*, August 1, 1974.
5. Wofram Eberhard, *Cinin Simali Komsulari*, Ankara 1942, p. 2.
6. *Ibid*, *History of China*, Ankara 1947, p. 93-109; Owen Lattimore, *Pivot of Asia*, Boston 1950, p. 45-46; Jack Chen, *The Sinkiang Story*, London 1977, p. 21, 23; M.E. Bugra, *Dogu Turkistan Hırriyet Davasi ve Cin Siyaseti*, Istanbul 1955, p. 24.
7. *Ibid*.
8. *Ibid*.
9. *Ibid*.

10. *Ibid.*
11. von Gabain, *Das Leben im Uighurischen Königreich von Qoco*, Wiesbaden 1973, p. 19.
12. Wolfram Eberhard, *Ibid.*, p. 259-270; Henry Schwarz, *Chinas Development Experience*, New York 1976 p. 196.
13. M.E. Bugra, *Ibid.*
14. I.Y. Alptekin, *Dogu Türkistan Davasi*, Istanbul 1973, p. 126-128.
15. Owen Lattimore, *Ibid.*, p. 50.
16. von Gabain, *Ibid.*, p. 20.
17. Wolfram Eberhard, *Ibid.*, ip. 31, 33, 78.
18. *Ibid.*
19. *Ibid.*
20. *Ibid.*, p. 257-258.
21. *Ibid.*, i
22. Owen Lattimore, *Studies in Frontier History*, London 1962, p. 59.
23. *Chinas New Atlas*, Shanghai 1939 p. 51; also see: Herman Albert *Historical and Commercial Atlas of China*, Harvard University Press, 1935.
24. Wolfram Eberhard, *Ibid.*, p. 41.
25. von Gabain, *Ibid.*, p. 20; I. Musabay-P. Turfani, *Türk Dnyasi El Kitabı*, Istanbul 1976, p. 1226; Herman Albert, *Ibid.*
26. *Ibid.*
27. Pan Ku, "The Account of Hsing-nu," *Han-shu*, 94, sect. 2 p. 32 a-b.

The Origins of Relations Between Tibet and Other Countries in Central Asia*—I

P. T. Takla

Before the beginning of the Christian era, some of the Tibetan tribes migrated to neighbouring states, or, may be, they had immigrated to Tibet from the outflanking regions. According to the Chinese annals, *fHan Hru*¹, the state of Tokharai (the Indo-Scythians) stretched from north of the Tunhuang Caves to the Chi-ling Mountains north of Lake Koko Nor. Hiung-Nu, a tribal king, in a battle with the tribes of Tokharai, killed the Tokharain king and used his skull as a bowl for drinking *chang*. Led by the queen of the dead king, the remnants of the court and many followers fled to the west in the region of Amu Daria river and settled there. The same annals state that others of the tribe fled across the mountains in the south and settled in the area of the Jangrig people (a Tibetan people who once formed the kingdom of Nanchao, presently in Yunnan province). This happened around 200-300 B.C.

According to *Wu Hriu*², the facial features of the people of Khotan were dissimilar to those of the rest of the Horpa nomads of Drugu (Uighurs belonging to the Turkic people) and similar, to an extent, to the Chinese. Khotan in the north-west was called Li-yul by the ancient Tibetans. Since Khotan was territorially contiguous with Tibet, there are reasons to believe that the inhabitants of Khotan had originated from Tibet. In those days, the Tibetans used to graze their herds in the summer in Tibet and in the winter in the warmer climes of Khotan. In ancient times all the tribes of Central Asia were nomads, who roamed across the grasslands. This was also done by the Tibetans.

According to the Japanese scholar, Ao-ki Bunkuo³ in his book, *The Need for Research on Tibetan Culture*, the Horpa nomads of northern Tibet were the descendants of the immigrants of other regions. According to him, before the Christian era, these tribes were able to bring the whole of Central Asia under their domination and made inroads into Europe, Mongolia in the east, India in the south and Tibet. He also states that the centre of the settlement of most Tibetans was in Eastern Turkestan.

According to the researches of Sir Aurel Stein on the origins of the people of Khotan, most were the descendants of the Aryans. They also had in them Turkic and Tibetan blood, though the Tibetan blood was more pronounced. He discovered ancient documents at a place called Nye-yar in Khotan and he has stated that the script of these documents contained no

*Translated from the Tibetan.

Pali, Arabic (Muslim) or Turkic terminology. All were Tibetan terms and phrases.

According to another Japanese scholar, Ukei Ryotai⁴, most of the people of Khotan had Tibetan blood in them. They not only had Tibetan blood in them but their ancient documents and literature reflected strong Tibetan influence. Consequently the ancestors of the people of Khotan had either migrated from the east or from Tibet. The author has suggested that this needed further research.

According to the Chinese *Han Hrui* annals, on the basis of the research on the inhabitants of the western region, it is evident that the areas of settlement of the ancient Tibetans were the regions west of Eastern Turkestan. As such I feel that more research on this aspect of our common historical experience should be carried on. It is evident from the above facts that the Horpa nomads of northern Tibet are dissimilar in some respects to the majority of the Tibetans. When the Horpas set out on distant journeys or returned home from one, they greet their family members and friends by hugging and kissing on cheeks. This custom is not prevalent among the other Tibetans. Among the Asians, this custom is unique to the Central Asian peoples. Similarly, the word *Horpa* was used in the ancient Tibetan documents for peoples inhabiting the areas north of Tibet like Drugu (the region inhabited by the Uighurs) and A-sha (Chin: Tu-yu-hun). These areas were also known collectively as Hor-yul, 'the land of the Horpas'.

In the 12th century at the time when Genghis Khan brought the whole of Central Asia, including Tibet, under his domination, the Tibetans referred to the Mongols as Horpas, or Mongol-Horpas. Whatever the case, the region north of Tibet was called Hor-yul and its inhabitants were known as Horpas. Based on the above facts, we come to the conclusion that one section of the Tibetans was probably descendants of the inhabitants of Tokharai and Khotan. Similarly, from the 7th to the 9th centuries, there was a lot of interaction between Tibet and Drugu. Gedun Chopel⁵, the famous Tibetan scholar, researching on the Tun-huang documents, thought that Khotan previously contained a settlement of Newaris (Nepalese). The inhabitants of some of the countries occupied by Tibet were shifted to other regions. Many of the people of Drugu, north of Tibet, were forced to emigrate to Mon-yul in south Tibet (an area roughly covering Tawang in present-day Arunachal Pradesh in India), according to the Tang chronicles. Accordingly Gedun Chopel concluded that many Newaris might have been forced to settle in Khotan. During this time there was the Tibetan policy of shifting people rebelling against Tibetan rule to distant regions.

In 842⁶ two tribes of Drugu fought each other and one of them escaped and sought refuge in Tibet. This is recorded in the *Tang Hrui*. At this time, the Uighurs of Tibet were able to bring the whole of the south-east region under their domination and at the time when the region of the Tun-huang Caves became the centre of culture and commerce, Uighur Chi-musa⁷ (present-day Pething, Chin: Huyuen district in Gansu province), one tribe of the Uighurs were forced to immigrate to north Amdo (Ga-yul, Chin: Kantru).

The Tibetans refer to this particular tribe as the Uighurs of the east. Gushri Khan, Tenzin Gyatso, was a descendant of the younger brother of Genghis Khan. He was the chieftain of the Qosot Mongols, one of the four tribes of the Oriat Mongols. In 1630 Gushri Khan⁸ invaded Amdo and established the priest-patron relations with the Great Fifth Dalai Lama. Later he put himself at the service of the religious and secular rule of the Dalai Lama of Tibet. He and his descendants ruled as the kings of Tibet for three generations and the Mongols who followed him were assimilated in Tibet. The Mongol army which Gushri Khan led into Tibet used to camp at Damshung, near Lhasa, in the summer months. Gradually they settled in the area and since then till now they have been nomads, and as the years went by they shed their Mongolian customs and took to Tibetan social habits. It is possible that the higher aristocracy of the Tibetan government like the family of the new Horkhang were descendants of the Horpa nomads of Hor-yul. How they came and at what time needs further research but it is certain that they are not of Mongol stock.

During the 1959 political turmoil in Tibet, more than 200 families from northern Tibet crossed over to Eastern Turkestan and settled in the south of the region. In 1984 when we visited China, the Panchen Lama clearly stated that based on the above facts, it was clear that even before the start of the Christian calendar, there was a tradition of the Tibetan people and their neighbours crossing over to each others' countries. This tradition of seeking refuge in the neighbouring states was particularly strong during times of natural calamities like famine and political upheavals of civil wars and invasions. Particularly since the 7th century when Tibet brought the neighbouring states of Shang-shung, Minyak, A-sha and the southern tribes of Chiang under its domination heralding the dawn of a new age of Tibetan political strength, economic prosperity and cultural vitality and the cycle of invasion turned a circle to enable the Tibetans to launch their domination of Central Asia, the practice and the subsequent tradition of shifting whole populations to distant regions was started and maintained.

War and Peace between the Tibetans and the Uighurs

In the 7th century "the roof of the world" came under the domination of Songtsen Gampo. Gradually, the nations, principalities and dependencies of the whole of Central Asia—Shang-shung in the west, Drusha (Gilgit Sumpa) in the north-east, A-sha and the various tribes of the Chiang people etc.—came under the domination of the Tibetans. In 658, after bringing A-sha under its domination, Tibet despatched "the point of the spear of its military strength" against the Uighurs in the north, and the Uighurs, unable to match Tibetan military strength, became fearful. According to Chinese *Tang Hrui* annals, in 658, the A-sha (Chin: T'u-yu-hun) tribes rose up against the Tibetan occupation. Gar Tongtsen was despatched to put down the rebellion. Su-hai Kob, one of the ministers of the A-sha tribes, fled to Tibet and having learnt defence secrets from him, Tibet was able to defeat the

military forces of A-sha. The king of A-sha, Mo-tung Hri-po and his queen, Hungha Kongsho (one of the Tang princesses) with the remainder of their followers fled to the north of Lake Koko Nor. A-sha was brought under Tibetan domination during the reign of Songtsen Gampo. Again, according to the Chinese *Tang Hui* annals, in 668 the A-sha tribes migrated from the region of present-day Lanzhou (the capital of the present Chinese province of Gansu) and settled in the region on the southern mountains. Because of this upheaval in A-sha, the emperor of China came to know of the threat of Tibetan military expansion. The destruction of the state of A-sha by Gar Tongtsen forced the tribes of A-sha to surrender to Tibet. But Tang China, apart from helping in the re-settlement of the A-sha tribes, did not assist them militarily. It was after this that Tibet came face to face with the Uighurs (Drugu). The continuous expansion of Tibetan military activities during the reigns of Songtsen Gampo's successors resulted in the advent of Tibetan military strength in the region of Drugu, and in collaboration, the Tibetan and Uighur armies were able to overthrow the imperial Chinese domination of the region. In 670 the Tibetan army, in collaboration with the kingdom of Khotan, conquered the Po-hen fortress of the city of Chig-tsi. According to the *Blue Annals*, on the twenty-first reign of Mangtsong Mangtsen in 670 the Tibetan army made an assault on Tang China and four tribes of the An-shi Uighurs came under Tibet. The relation between Tibet and Khotan were firmly established during the reign of Songtsen Gampo.

According to a school of Tibetan history, monks and nuns of Khotan started coming to Tibet to meet with Songtsen Gampo. Again, according to the old annals of *Tang Hui*, the Tibetans in collaboration with the Uighurs of Khotan brought the area of An-shi (the Tun-huang Caves) under their control. Based on the evidence of the above facts, Gar Tongtsen died in 668 and his sons, Gar Tsen-nye and Gar Tri-dring brought greater administrative and economic improvement in the region of Khotan. According to the Tibetan documents of the Tun-huang Caves,⁹ in 676 the Tibetan king stayed at Dragki Shara in the summer and in the winter he suffered from fever and died at Trima Lung-gung, and a son, Tridu Tongdrik, was born. Minister Nyadru went to Khrom (Byzantium) and brought it under Tibetan control, which he subjugated. According to the same documents, in 687¹⁰ the king was at Nyenkar and Minister Tri-dring brought Zen-yul, a principality of Khotan under Tibetan control. In 689 while the king was staying at Rana, Tri-bang, the king's daughter, was sent as a bride to the A-sha king, and Minister Tri-dring returned from Khotan.

While staying in Khotan for two years, Gar Tri-dring was able to establish cordial and friendly relations with the various tribes and principalities of Khotan. Ten years later, the king of Khotan, Tanya Gokha Khan, came to Tibet to offer tribute to the Tibetan King. According to the Tun-huang documents, the king moved in the summer to Nepal at a place called Dri-wu Thang in 696¹¹ and was met by the imperial Chinese envoy, Jiu Shang-sho, who offered tribute to the Tibetan king, just as the

king of Khotan, Tanya Gokha Khan did. In the following year, Tanya Gokha Khan returned to his country and was given a lavish farewell. Since then the relations between Tibet and the Uighurs of Khotan characterised by intermittent war and peace became one of friendship, soon cemented by marital ties. In 734, the princess Jewa Dronma Wojawa, the daughter of the Tibetan king, Tride Tsugten, was given in marriage to the king of Khotan, Gagen Dur. According to the Tun-huang documents,¹² in 734 while the king was at Drangyar Drogna, a Chinese imperial envoy again paid his respects and tribute to the Tibetan king, which was the same year in which Jewa Dronma Wojawa was sent as a bride. Since then the relations between Tibet and the Uighurs of Khotan were characterised as one between family members.

In 763 with Tibetan military assistance, the various tribes of the Uighurs of Khotan assaulted Tang China and the Chinese emperor fled his capital. However, soon the Chinese hit upon the policy of causing dissension and started a whispering campaign to disrupt the unity between the Tibetans and the Uighurs. However, the other Uighur tribes remained faithful allies of the Tibetans. For example, according to the *Blue Annals*¹³, in the mid 9th century when the Tibetan king Langdharma started proscribing and then persecuting Buddhism and the monastic order, the Tibetan Buddhist scholars like Mar Sakyamuni, Yu Gejong and Tsang Rabsel fled to western Tibet. Unable to stay there, they took the northern route through Hor-yul (Li-yul or Khotan) and sought the protection of Trihor Gye-nyen Sakya Sherab. After some time, they fled to north-eastern Tibet. Similarly in the 11th century, the descendant of the Tibetan emperors, the second son of Mang-yul, O-del Tride fled through Khotan to north-eastern Tibet and was able to bring most of the region under his rule. This event is recorded in *Bo Cho-jung*¹⁴, *Dome Cho-jung* and in the chronicles of *Sung Hruì*. According to the above information the relations between the Uighurs of Khotan and Tibet withstood the vicissitudes of time. After this all the tribes of the Drugu Uighurs embraced the Islamic faith, and in order to prevent the spread of Islam, it is recorded that Tibet assisted some of the Uighur tribes of Khotan with military aid. According to the Japanese author, Ukei Ryotai's book *The Buddhism of Western (Central Asian) Countries*,¹⁵ in 1009, the ruler of Kashgar Abdul Hussain Nasrilik Gara Khan and his brother, Yusuf Quadr Khan, together assaulted the ruler of Khotan. The ruler of Khotan, Jaqala Khalkhalu, was given military assistance by both Tibet and other Uighur tribes of the region. The war went on for 24 years and finally, having lost, the war, Jaqala Khalkhalu had to embrace the Islamic faith, and Yusuf Quadr Khan became the new ruler of Khotan. Since then Buddhism was finally eliminated from the region and Islam became firmly established. From the above facts we can at the most guess that the Tibetan ruler was Nyima Gon who was ruling western Tibet and was a descendant of Songtsen Gampo. Because of the close physical and cultural proximity between western Tibet and Khotan and because of the Tibetan king's deep Buddhist faith, Nyima Gon was compelled to come to the support of the Buddhist faith

in Khotan. However, I have not had the opportunity of seeing any mention of this in any other documents.

Footnotes

- 1) *Han Hsui* (Chinese Han annals) on Tayac hri state
- 2) *Wui Hsui* on the origins of Khotan
- 3) Page 30 of chapter 4 of Aoki Bunkuo's *The Need for New Research on Tibet*
- 4) Page 200 of the Japanese scholar, Ukei Ryotai's *The Buddhism of Western Countries* (Central Asia)
- 5) Page 40 of Gedun Chopel's *White Annals*
- 6) The old Tang annals on the history of the Uighur Turks
- 7) Bulletin of the Institute of China Border Area Studies (no. 8); *The Verification and Explanatory Note on Hsiu Tang Shu Uighur Chuan* by Liu Yi-tang
- 8) Page 190 of the Great Fifth Dalai Lama's *The Songs of the Queen of Spring* (published and reprinted by Nationalities Press, Peking, 1981)
- 9) *Tibetan Documents from the Tun-huang Caves* edited by Wang Yao (Nationalities Printing Press, Peking)
- 10) *ibid*
- 11) *ibid*
- 12) *ibid*
- 13) Page 89 of *the Blue Annals* authored by Go Lotsawa Shonu Pel and reprinted at the Sichuan Nationalities Printing Press
- 14) Mentioned in *Debther Gyatso* by Drago Kunchok Tenpa Gyalrab and in the Sung annals
- 15) Page 234 of Ukei Ryotai's book, *The Buddhism of Western Countries* (Central Asia)

NEWS

CHINA HOPING TO INCREASE SETTLEMENT IN WESTERN REGIONS

HONG KONG, JAN. 18 (SPECIAL/REVZIN)—CHINA, which expects to have another 200 million people by the turn of the century, hopes that rural towns and the sparsely populated western areas of the country will absorb most of the population increase.

An article in the recent issue of *PEKING REVIEW* magazine says that, despite efforts to encourage each couple to have only one child, China's population will reach 1.2 Billion by the end of the century.

China, the world's most populous nation, already has about one Billion people. The expected size of the increase—200 Million—is almost equal to the present population of the United States.

China's Population Planning Policies have resulted in a dramatic decrease in the rate of growth. But the one-child policy has run into opposition, especially in the countryside. In many areas, rural families can now have two children.

The *PEKING REVIEW* article said "The Distribution Of China's Population Is Extremely Uneven."

It said that if a line were drawn from Inner Mongolian province along the Soviet border in the northeast to Yunnan province near Vietnam in the southwest, only a 6 per cent of the population would be west of the Line.

The population density of the western half of China is less than eleven people per square kilometer. In Shanghai, a city in the east of 12 million, the density is 1,913 per square kilometer.

The entire eastern province of Jiangsu has a density of 590 per square kilometer.

PEKING REVIEW says, "Past experience has proved that the sparsely populated remote areas welcomed the migration of people from other parts of the country to effect economic development."

It pointed out that, in 1949, China's three northeastern province had a total of 30 million people. By 1982 there were 100 million in that region, and 30 million to 40 million of the increase was a result of migration.

Said the magazine, "Calculated according to this growth rate, the population in the four western provinces and autonomous regions can accommodate an increase of 60 million in the next three decades."

But some migration to remote areas of China has been because of job assignments. American journalist Fox Butterfield, in his book "Alive In The Bitter Sea," comments on that situation.

"The Left-Wing magazine *CHENG MING* in Hong Kong once estimated there are eight million people in China who have been forced to live separated

from their spouses because of their jobs, two million of them cadres and six million ordinary workers and office employees. There is no official rationale for it, except that is the way Labour offices have decided to assign people, for the convenience of state," Butterfield said. It would not be a simple matter to encourage workers to voluntarily move to some of the rugged, remote regions of Western China.

The PEKING REVIEW article also notes the uneven distribution between urban and rural areas.

"The population is concentrated in a few big cities, while the rural towns around them, which are the commodity distribution centres in the countryside, have not developed as they should," the article says.

It noted that since 1978, with the rapid increase in agricultural production, the "Towns have received new vitality as political, economic and cultural centers and their populations have increased rapidly too."

The PEKING REVIEW estimated that, if each rural town could double its population 40,000, they could accommodate 130 million people by the year 2000—some 70 million more than they do today. Another 53 million could be absorbed by smaller rural towns, it estimated.

China is making a major effort to increase service-related industries and light industry in rural areas. This is partly due to the fact that the Decollectivization of Agriculture has left millions of peasants under-employed.

TURKIC STUDENTS HOLD PROTEST

Peking, Dec 23 (AFP)—Four hundred students from China's Eastern Turkestan Region have staged a protest here, petitioning Chinese officials to end nuclear tests in their remote western homeland, student sources said today.

The protesters, members of ethnic minorities studying at four Peking universities, marched around Tiananmen Square in the heart of the capital yesterday carrying banners proclaiming their demands.

They then gathered in front of Zhongnanhai, headquarters of the Chinese Communist Party, where an official received their petition, protest participants said.

Students said they had called for an end to nuclear testing in Eastern Turkestan and presented seven other demands:

- Democratic election of minority people to replace Han Chinese officials assigned by Peking.
- An end to coercive family planning among minority people in the region.
- Increased support for ethnic education in the region and more opportunities to study abroad. (Students said only 20 Turkic people were sent to study abroad this year, compared to an estimated 20,000 Chinese from the rest of the country.)
- Economic self-determination.
- Political self-rule.

- A proclamation of their support for the student movement in itself.
- An end to the practice of sending convicted Chinese criminals to Turkic.

The students said they had been stirred to action by recent protests in Urumchi, capital of the 'Autonomous Region,' where they said between 4,000 and 10,000 students protested the tests and other issues two weeks ago.

An official of the Students Association at Eastern Turkestan University reached in Urumchi by telephone confirmed that there had been a protest but said it had lasted only one day and involved only 2,000 students.

China has carried out 30 nuclear tests in the remote desert region since it exploded its first atom bomb there in 1964. The last atmospheric test was carried out in October 1980 and tests have since been underground.

Three times the size of France, Eastern Turkestan is home to only 13.3 million people, including 46 mostly Moslem minority groups who language, temperament and way of life differ greatly from that of China's Han majority.

Turkic-speaking Uighurs who now account for 6.1 million of the population, were formerly the majority. Chinese now account for 5.4 million, followed by smaller ethnic groups, including Kazak, Hui and Mongolians.

Participants in the Peking protest said *they presented their petition* to the head of the *United Front Department*, the Communist Party office responsible for managing relations with non-party groups.

The officials reportedly told them politely that their grievances would be attended to as quickly as possible. The United Front Department refused to accept reporters' inquiries about the protests.

In Urumchi, the students association official, Ma Jianhaa, said Song Hanliang, party general secretary (as received) of Eastern Turkestan, had told demonstrators there that their methods were wrong and that there would be no answer to their demands.

Since that protest on December 12 and 13, students in Beijing had not received mail from their friends in Urumchi, the student sources here said.

The Peking students said that police and university authorities had not so far taken action against the protesters, who did not heed an appeal yesterday by their college principals to return to their campuses—the National Minorities Institute, Beijing University, Beijing Normal University and Beijing Pedagogical Insitutute.

The hour-long protest follows a series of student demonstrations against poor student living conditions, rising prices and corruption but is the first to criticise government policies towards minorities or China's nuclear program.

Smouldering ethnic tensions in Eastern Turkestan have occasionally broken into open violence, most notably in 1981, when the killing of a Uighur by a Han youth sparked disturbances in the city of Kashgar.

KALMUK-MONGOLS' PROTEST TAIWANESE INTERFERENCE

The Kalmuk-Mongols Conference in USA issued the following statement on April 17, 1984:

"The Government of the Republic of China in Taiwan has consistently pursued for the past 20 years a policy aimed at bringing the Kalmuk Mongolian communities in the U.S.A., France and West Germany under their political control.

Presently two Chinese officials of the Republic of China Mr. Donald Burin-Wu and Mr. Hsueh Jen-Yang, Chairman of the Mongolian and Tibetan Affairs Commission in Taiwan are in charge of carrying out that policy.

The "Taipei Club" of the Mongolians in the U.S.A. is organised by the Republic of China representative to recruit, select American Kalmuk-Mongols who will follow their self-serving political ideology. Every year for the past 20 years the "Taipei Club" has selected American Kalmuk-Mongols to participate in official political Chinese meetings, Chinese celebrations of October the 10th in Taiwan.

These American Kalmuk-Mongols chosen by the "Taipei Club" are presented to the Chinese public as "representatives of overseas Chinese Mongolians" supporting the Republic of China in their political activities.

A special budget is allocated by the Government of the Republic of China to fund these all expense paid trips to Taipei, and also to fund other political activities of the "Taipei Club" in the U.S.A.

Mr. Hsueh Jen-Yang, Chairman of the Mongolian and Tibetan affairs Commission, in his letter of January 9, 1984 to Mr D. Burin-Wu evaluates the "Taipei Club" activities.

It shows that the policy of the Republic of China has colonialistic overtones when it comes to deal with Mongolian and Tibetan communities.

Such propaganda, conducted in pro-Chinese terms, does not serve the moral, legal or national interests of Mongols in their historical struggle for their freedom from China, and is a cynical distortion of the historical truth: Kalmuks and Mongolians are not Chinese.

This policy and propaganda definitely interferes with the internal life of the American and European Kalmuk communities.

This policy plans to organize and control the American and European Kalmuk communities along their self-serving Chinese ideology.

This policy plans to dictate to our American communities which political line to follow.

The silent majority of the Kalmuk-Mongols in the U.S.A. and Europe ask respectfully the government of the Republic of China to liquidate the "Taipei Club", financed by the Chinese authorities and cease their disruptive activity in the U.S.A.

We do not have any animosity against The Republic of China and its people.

We do respect The Republic of China—as an independent nation.

We do expect that The Republic of China respect equally the self-determination and independence of the Mongolian and Tibetan peoples".

ALPTEKIN'S PLEA TO THE WORLD

Following is the full text of a statement issued by Isa Alptekin, former General Secretary of Eastern Turkestan, in Turkey in July 1985 on the occasion of CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK.

On the 26th anniversary of Captive Nations Week, we are witnessing great technological progress everywhere in the world, and also, in sharp contrast, an almost total lack of success in bringing freedom to captive nations.

Methods of genocide and assimilation are being applied both in Soviet Russia and in Red China. The Free World, and the Islamic World, giving very limited help to the victims of hunger in Africa, ignore totally the sufferings and fate of the victims of the victims of Red China's genocide policies in Eastern Turkestan.

Red China is trying to establish friendly relations with America, Turkey, and various Islamic countries. But these attempts serve to cover up the policy of digesting and destroying the 30 million Muslem inhabitants of Eastern Turkestan: a land of 1,828,000 square kilometers.

Chinese statesmen, and statesmen from Turkey, exchange visits with increasing frequency. That is a good thing for the progress of friendship between the two countries. But it should not be permitted to destroy essential national interests.

It is a good thing for journalists from Turkey to learn more about China and Eastern Turkestan, by visits there. But some reports tend to give a picture of a handful of "Uygurs", who are living in relative comfort (as contrasted with before) in a corner of China.

This is a totally false picture. Eastern Turkestan is a great land, the home of 30 million Muslims, a country where great Empires flourished, and great scholars lived. It is an ancient and eternal homeland of the Turks.

Today, this country is under foreign occupation. Let us remember, also, the Muslim Turks of Western Turkestan, Azerbaijan, Caucasia, Crimea, Bulgaria, etc., all under foreign occupation. And let our readers think: Is there anywhere else in the world today, a situation comparable in magnitude to this ?

Even the Press of Turkey is not sufficiently informed about the facts on Eastern Turkestan. During 1863-1877, for 15 years, Eastern Turkestan lived as an independent state. In 1933, and again in 1944, Eastern Turkestan rewon her independence, by successful revolt, and was independent for a brief time, before her life was extinguished by force of Russian and Chinese arms.

Today, the rulers of China insist fanatically on using the name "Sin-Kiang", instead of the ancient name "Turkestan" for this land, and are working hard to make the rest of the world call it "Sin-Kiang", too. But we are confident that this ancient Turkish-Islamic land shall one day regain her independence, and that the Chinese settlers, forcibly settled on this land,

shall return home. We hope that the world, including Turkey, the Islamic World and the Free World, will at least understand and respect this belief of ours.

DALAI LAMA'S CALL TO SRI LANKAN BUDDHISTS

His Holiness the Dalai Lama, in a message on the occasion of Buddha Purnima this year, called upon the Buddhists in Sri Lanka to take the initiative in finding a peaceful solution to the ethnic crisis in that country. He said this was in the long-run interest of both the Sinhalese and the Tamils. Following is the full text of the message:

“On the occasion of the Buddha’s Birth, Enlightenment and Parinirvana, I send my warm greetings to my fellow Buddhists.

Today, in spite of the great material progress humanity is faced with many problems. I have no doubt that the teachings of the Buddha, like all major religions of the world, have great value and relevance in the present situation.

It is easy to talk about these high principles but the real test to practise them comes when one is faced with a difficult situation. There are bound to be differences of opinion and conflict of interests in human affairs. However, we cannot hope to find a just and lasting solution to these problems by sheer use of force. The only way, I believe, is by widening areas of human understanding and good will. I would, therefore, like to take this opportunity to remind my fellow Buddhists of our special responsibility towards this as members of the human family.

For some time now I have been following the situation in Sri Lanka with great concern and distress. The present ethnic problems is very unfortunate, especially when we consider the fact that the two communities involved are followers of two ancient religions which are quite like the waters of the same river. Steps are being taken by all concerned to find a solution. I would like to appeal to all my fellow Buddhists of the Sangha to take the lead in defusing the situation peacefully.

Our master has shown us the path of non-violence, tolerance and compassion. Despite the great injustices my people had suffered under the Chinese occupation, my attempt has always been to find a peaceful solution. In the case of Sri Lanka whatever may be the differences or the final outcome of the present conflict the reality is that the two communities share many things in common and they have to live together in the future. It will, therefore, be in the long run interest of the two communities to try to find a peaceful solution through tolerance, goodwill and trust instead of hatred and violence.

I hope and pray for an early solution to the present unfortunate situation.”

**Allied Committee of the Peoples of Eastern Turkestan, Mongolia,
Manchuria and Tibet**

Permanent secretariat: Zurich, Switzerland

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Chairman | Isa Alptekin |
| Co-Chairman | P.T. Takla Sechin Jagchid Khantinger Kunngur |
| Vice-Chairman | Abdullah T. Emiloglu Thubten J. Norbu |
| General Secretaries | Lodi G. Gyari Erkin Alptekin |
| Executive Secretary | Kelsang Gyaltzen |
| Common Voice | |
| Editor | Lodi G. Gyari |
| Editorial Assistant | Bhuchung K. Tsering |

The Allied Committee of the Peoples of Eastern Turkestan, Mongolia, Manchuria and Tibet is an organisation set up to fulfill the aims of the people of the above countries. The committee considers His Holiness the Dalai Lama of Tibet as its guiding force and common spokesman.

Common Voice is the bi-annual bulletin of the Committee. It endeavours to highlight the activities of our different communities and to create public awareness of our struggle.

Annual Subscription: Foreign £ 3 or \$ 5. India Rs. 30. Payment should be made in favour of *Common Voice*.

Opinions expressed by the contributors are not necessarily that of our Committee.

Editorial Office: Gangchen Kyishong, Dharamsala 176215, H.P. INDIA.