Government does not enjoy the kind of freedom legislature enjoys in fulfilling political demands of the public. It has to maintain a balance between political aspirations of its own people and good international relations when the issue involves another country. Complexity of Tibet issue and involvement of world's most populous country with immense economic and military strength demands a cautious approach from the Government of United States. Despite all these limitations US Government has not failed to respond to initiatives taken by the Congress of the United States.

There are many aspects of the Tibet issue in which US Government has made important and meaningful intervention. Important among these are: status of Tibet, human rights, cultural and religious freedom, socio-economic development, political freedom and civil rights, population transfer, environmental issue, Panchen Lama controversy and assistance to Tibetan refugees.

**Status of Tibet:**

Since its rapprochement with the People's Republic of China in the early 1970s, United States has recognized Tibet as a part of China. Barring few exceptions due to congressional pressure US government has been quite consistent on its stand on the status of Tibet.
On October 28, 1991 President Bush signed the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for the fiscal years 1992 and 1993 declaring Tibet an "occupied country" whose true representatives are the Dalai Lama and the Tibetan Government-in-exile. This Act claimed that Tibet had maintained throughout its history a distinctive and sovereign national, cultural and religious identity separate from that of China and that United States recognized Tibet's right to self-determination and the illegality of China's occupation of Tibet."1 China strongly objected to the signing of this Act. Wu Jiamin, a Chinese foreign ministry spokesman said in Beijing on November 7, 1991 that the 1992 and 1993 State Department Authorization Act of the US contains contents, which interfere in China's internal affairs. "In contravention of historical facts, it goes so far as openly calling Tibet and some parts of Sichuan, Yunnan, Gansu and Qinghai provinces an occupied country and asserts that the Dalai Lama is its real representative” Wu Jiamin said.2

While explaining US Government's policy toward Tibet in his testimony before the Committee on Foreign Relations of US Senate on July 28, 1992, Mr. L. Desaix Anderson, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, said "The United States, like all other governments throughout the world, considers Tibet to be a part of China, with the status of an autonomous region. No country recognizes Tibet as independent of China. The United States has never taken the position that Tibet

1 International Resolutions and Recognitions on Tibet (1959-1997), DIIR, CTA, Dharmasala, 1997, pp. 73-74.

2 Tibet Press Watch, Volume- 3, No. 5, p. 8
is an independent country, nor has it recognized the Dalai Lama as leader of a
government-in-exile.\(^3\)

A US State Department’s report mandated by the Foreign Relations
Authorization Act for the fiscal years 1994-95, titled ‘Relation of the United
States with Tibet’ says “Historically, the United States has acknowledged
Chinese sovereignty over Tibet. Since at least 1966, United States policy has
explicitly recognized the Tibet Autonomous Region or TAR as part of the
People’s Republic of China. This longstanding policy is consistent with the
view of the entire international community, including all neighbors of China.
Because we do not recognize Tibet as an independent state, the United States
does not conduct diplomatic relations with the self-styled ‘Tibetan
government-in-exile.’\(^4\)

Testimony of Jeffrey Bader, Deputy Assistant Secretary for East Asian
and Pacific Affairs, before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on May
13, 1997 again reiterated this US policy on the status of Tibet. “This long
standing policy is consistent with the view of the entire international
community, including all China’s neighbors.

\(^3\) Testimony of L. Desaix Anderson, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for East
Asian and Pacific Affairs, before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States
Senate, Document No. 142, DIIR Documentation Center, CTA, Dharmsala, India

\(^4\) “Relations of the United States with Tibet” Report mandated by Section 536 (a) (2) of Public
United States acceptance of China's claim of sovereignty over Tibet predates the establishment of the People's Republic of China. For instance, in 1942, we told the Nationalist Chinese government then headquartered in Chongqing that we had "at no time raised question" over Chinese claims to Tibet.

Because we do not recognize Tibet as an independent state, the United States does not conduct diplomatic relations with the representatives of Tibetans in exile. However, the United States does try to maintain contact with a wide variety of representatives of differing political groups inside and outside China with views on Tibet. This includes contacts with individuals in Dharmsala, Tibetans in US, and visits to Tibet by Embassy and Consulate General Chengdu staff.5

**Human Rights:**

United States has ideological commitment for the promotion and protection of human rights worldwide. While testifying before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the US Senate on July 28, 1992, Mr. L. Desaix Anderson, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian And Pacific Affairs, said "The United States stands for the protection of human rights throughout the world. China is no exception. Human rights is a central

---

item on our bilateral agenda with China and an important aspect of our policy of comprehensive engagement."  

Despite this claim US Government’s treatment of human rights violations in Tibet has not been consistent. There have been widespread human rights violations in Tibet ever since Chinese occupation. A classified report, obtained from the CIA through the Freedom of Information Act was highly critical and found that the occupation measures of the Chinese Government had made Tibetans “Second Class” citizens. The detailed 22-page report written in late 1970 said that Chinese attitude towards Tibetans is characterized by superiority and ridicule of Tibetans. Relations between Beijing and Washington were good at that time and the conclusions reached by CIA report were not translated into policy or statements by the administration as it would have jeopardized Sino-US relations.

President Bush visited China in February 1989. Despite congressional initiative in the form of a letter addressed to him, the President’s visit left an impression that he had failed to press the matter of human rights violations in Tibet by the Chinese authorities with sufficient personal vigor. However, Mr. Redman, the State Department Spokesman, claimed that the Secretary of State

---

6 Testimony of Mr. L. Desaix Anderson, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of State before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate, July 28, 1992.

7 Tibet Press Watch, Vol. 3, No. 5, p. 3.

James Baker accompanying President George Bush had raised US concern over human rights in Tibet with the Chinese Foreign Minister, Qian Qichan.

The State Department published the Country Report on Human Rights Practice for 1989 in February 1994. The Report mentioned the situation in Tibet in great detail. Important findings are: "Human Rights climate in China deteriorated dramatically in 1989. Arbitrary interference with the privacy, family, home or correspondence continues. The where about and status of many prisoners detained during demonstrations in Lhasa remain unknown. There have been convincing report of torture of those detained or arrested. Tibetans are compelled to submit to abortion or sterilization. There is no organization within China, which specifically monitor or comment on human rights conditions."

These reports are of great importance for the Tibet movement. They authenticate the claim of human rights violations in Tibet and help publicize these cases of violations. Apart from this, these reports go on to become basis for governmental actions. The State Department, in its annual review of human rights abuses worldwide claimed that there were persistent abuses in Tibet and the government tightly controlled and monitored Tibetan Buddhism. The 1991 report reflects the more critical tone the State Department had adopted since 1987. The report covered torture and imprisonment, citing "frequent credible reports from Tibetan refugee" on these issues. The report further said that there was limited dialogue on human rights with foreign critics. Several foreign

---

delegations were allowed into Tibet, but that there were no organization within China, which monitored or commented on human rights conditions.\textsuperscript{10}

The Bush administration once again demonstrated its willingness to sacrifice human rights and its inclination to acquiesce to Chinese pressure. In mid-March a broad coalition at the United Nations Commission on Human Rights supported European Community sponsored statement condemning the Chinese occupation and oppression in Tibet. When this coalition sought much needed support from the United States, Washington waited until the final hour and submitted a watered-down version of the resolution that the United States knew would fail.

As predicted original supporters defected and last minute delay tactics by the United States guaranteed that there would be no time to resurrect Tibetan hopes.\textsuperscript{11} The Bush administration's record on Tibet had been sadly mixed. Despite having invited the Dalai Lama to address a full meeting of the Senate and Congress in 1991 and despite his signing the Senate resolution sponsored by Senators Claiborne Pell and David Boren, President Bush betrayed the Tibetan people by employing a wrecking strategy, insisting the resolution be extended to include human rights abuses in China as well.\textsuperscript{12}

\textsuperscript{10} Ibid, p. 3.
\textsuperscript{11} Christian Science Monitor, March 25, 1992
\textsuperscript{12} South China Morning Post, November 19, 1992
US Department of State report mandated by the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, for the fiscal years 1994-1995, titled 'Relation Of The United States With Tibet' has given in detail the state of relations between United States and Tibet. It also deals with the conditions in Tibet and United States support for human rights in Tibet. The report says, "increased protection of human rights is an important element of United States policy toward China. We have placed particular emphasis of the need for improved human rights performance in Tibet, and that increased respect for human rights in Tibet will foster a climate in which Sino-US relations might improve. In our conversation with

the Chinese, we have called for an end to the detention of prisoners of conscience, to the abuse and torture of prisoners and for a general improvement in prison conditions. US worked assiduously, but as yet without success, to include references to Chinese government practices affecting the human rights of Tibetans and other minorities in annual resolutions on China at the UN Human Rights Commission."¹³ Overall language used was relatively tough, but at a number of places the report soft-peddled issues for political or other reasons, failed to adequately address the current human rights situation in Tibet. The report of the Department of State demonstrated that the strategy projected by the Secretary of Commerce Mr. Ron Brown, as "commercial engagement" might be good for commerce but not for human rights of people in China and Tibet.

United States knows that its ability to promote respect for human rights by the Chinese authorities is closely related to the strength of its bilateral relationship with China. A serious disruption of US-China relations would gravely undermine any hope for the United States to foster greater respect for the human rights or ethnic Tibetans in China.

While testifying before Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on September 7, 1995, Mr. Kent M. Wiedeman, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs discussed US Government policy toward Tibet. Tibet and human rights section of the testimony said, “we have raised our concerns about Tibet consistently and vigorously during bilateral talks”. He enumerated US Government actions taken during the year. “Assistant Secretary John Shattuck raised US concerns in detail during his January visit to Beijing to conduct the seventh session of our bilateral dialogue on human rights matters. The Vice President raised China’s human rights practices with Chinese Premier Li Peng in Copenhagen in March. Secretary of State Christopher reiterated our views on this subject during talks in New York with Vice Premier and Foreign Minister Qian Qichen in April. The Secretary also discussed Tibet again with Vice Premier Qian in Brunei in July. Under Secretary Tamoff raised Tibet issues with his Chinese counterpart during his visit to Beijing in August.”

14 Testimony of Mr. Kent M. Weideman, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian Affairs before the Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Washington, D.C., September 7, 1995
In addition Mr. Weideman claims that the United States has also addressed its concerns about human rights in the Tibet through multilateral channels. “We worked with the European Union and other concerned countries again this year on passing a resolution at the United Nations Human Rights Commission in Geneva on the human rights situation in China, including Tibet. The resolution not only acknowledged the special concern of international community for Tibetans but also for 54 other minorities of China. The language of the resolution with respect to Tibet was acceptable to exile leaders. In a vote on March 7, the Commission—for the first time since 1990—defeated a Chinese-sponsored ‘no action motion’, permitting the resolution itself to go to the floor for a debate and a vote. Unfortunately, the resolution itself failed by a single vote on March 8. Nonetheless, it provided an opportunity for the international community’s scrutiny of China’s human rights practices.”

Testifying before the Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Mr. Gare Smith, Deputy Secretary of State designate for democracy, human rights and labor reviewed the human rights situation in Tibet and claimed “the State Department has repeatedly urged the Chinese government to respect the human rights of the Tibetan people and to take Tibet’s unique cultural and religious traditions into account when formulating its policies for Tibet.

15 Ibid.
These issues were discussed with the Chinese at length during the January 1995 human rights dialogue conducted by Assistant Secretary John Shattuck and they have been raised since then on several occasions at high-level meetings between Chinese and United States officials. You can be assured that we will continue to raise them at every appropriate opportunity in the future.”

US State Department’s Human Rights report for 1995 was released on March 8, 1996. This year’s section on Tibet report raised a number of new issues including rape, detention of foreigners and halting the spread of monasteries, which were never raised before by the Department. Report said that during 1995 Chinese authorities continued to commit widespread human rights abuses in Tibet. 16


On April 23, 1997 President Clinton sent a message to the Third World Parliamentarians Convention on Tibet held in Washington, D.C.

16 Tibet Press Watch, April 1996, pp. 7-9
Parliamentarians from around 30 countries attended this Convention. The message said, "We must continue to speak out whenever human rights are threatened or denied, and I am grateful for the continuing efforts of leaders like you, who have done so much to advance democracy, human dignity, and religion."\textsuperscript{17}

Testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on May 13, 1997, Jeffrey Bader, Deputy Assistant Secretary for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, explained the current US policy toward Tibet. Speaking about human rights he said, "Our policy seeks to improve respect for the human rights of ethnic Tibetans, and for all Chinese citizens. We have appealed for the release of Tibetan prisoners of conscience. We have called upon the Chinese government to cease using force against peaceful demonstrations in Tibet. Secretary Albright raised concerns over human rights, including Tibet, both during her visit to Beijing in February, and during Vice Premiere Qian Qichen's visit to Washington in April. We worked with like minded countries at the United Nations Human Rights Commission in Geneva this year to table a resolution on the human rights situation in China, including Tibet. Unfortunately, the Chinese countered with a no-action motion, which effectively blocked discussion of the resolution and a vote on its provisions. The effort that the Chinese put into defeating the resolution is a measure of

\textsuperscript{17} Tibet Press Watch, July 1997, p. 7
their awareness and sensitivity on this issue."\textsuperscript{18} He concluded his testimony by saying that the treatment by the Chinese government in the 48 years since the founding of the People's Republic of China has been harsh, inconsistent with international human rights norms, and unacceptable. There have been moments, notably in the early 1950's, and the early 1980's, when it seemed a more enlightened policy by Beijing might prevail, but these moments proved short-lived. The US Government will continue to speak out, publicly and privately, about the abuses of human rights that marks PRC policy in Tibet.

The US Embassy in Beijing has frequently raised human rights concerns. It has raised the case of the Tibetan ethnomusicologist Ngawang Choephel, who was sentenced to 18 years imprisonment late last year on the charge of endangering China's national security. Embassy and Consulate General Chengdu personnel visit Tibet from time to time to discuss the situation there with local officials and observe conditions. Ambassador Sasser visited Tibet in the third week of April and made a strong presentation of US government's views on human rights in all his official meetings there.\textsuperscript{19}

President Jiang who visited the United States in October-November 1997 was unyielding and unapologetic on his country's stand both on human rights and Tibet. As reported in Newsweek he said "we could talk all night and in the morning and we would be no closer to an agreement." This stance earned

\textsuperscript{18} "US Policy Toward Tibet", Testimony by Jeffrey Bader, Deputy Assistant Secretary for East Asian and Pacific Affairs before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, (Washington, D.C., May 13, 1997).

\textsuperscript{19} Ibid.
him sharp rebukes from the US president and Congress. President Clinton said, “The United States recognizes that on so many issues China is on the right side of history but on this issue we believe the Chinese government is on the wrong side of history. There is after all now a universal declaration of human rights.”

Cultural and Religious freedom:

Tibet suffered terribly from the excesses of the Cultural Revolution, dating roughly from 1966 to 1976. Monasteries were destroyed, books were burned, and practicing Buddhists were thrown in jail.

The Chinese government began to reverse the reprehensible actions of that period in the early 1980’s when then party General Secretary Hu Yaobang visited Tibet and initiated a policy of reopening monasteries and reinvigorating Tibetan culture and society. The result was a revival of Tibetan Buddhism and a rebirth of the Lhasa monasteries. Displays of religious veneration toward the Dalai Lama was tolerated, and his photographs were prominently displayed in temples and, reportedly, even in some government offices.

However, after pro-independence demonstrations began in 1987, China’s new policy of greater cultural and religious tolerance was overlaid by increased efforts to repress displays of separatist sentiment. Chinese security forces have beaten and detained those, including Buddhist monks and nuns, who have demonstrated in Lhasa for independence. Such demonstrations are frequent, perhaps several times a month. United States has always condemned the persecution of peaceful demonstrators.
The US Department of State report mandated by the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, for the fiscal years 1994-95, said, "relations between Buddhists and secular authorities have been tense. Chinese government tightly controls Tibetan Buddhism and does not tolerate religious manifestations that advocate Tibetan independence." Realizing the fact that a serious disruption of US-China relations is unwarranted the report said "a vigorous bilateral relationship with China, in which advocacy of respect for Tibetan culture, religion and language is one important element, is essential to preserve and expand United States influence on issues relating to Tibet.


Panchen Lama succession controversy cropped up in 1995. Chinese Government rejected the Dalai Lama’s choice and announced the discovery of another child as “real Panchen Lama”.

US Department of State’s Human Rights Report for 1995 discussed in length this controversy but failed to condemn China’s domination of the reincarnation process.
However on May 8, 1997 the United States reacted strongly to the sentencing of Chadrel Rinpoche, head of the original search committee for the 11th Panchen Lama, by the Chinese authorities. State Department Spokesman Nicholas Burns said that the US was concerned by the Chinese action.

On July 22, 1997 the State Department of the United States issued an 86-page report on the state of religious freedom worldwide. With reference to Tibet, the report said that increased governmental concern about the potential impact of ethnic separatist movements had also led to restriction on the religious freedom of other believers. In Tibet, for example, the authorities tightened restrictions on the practice of Tibetan Buddhism, including public expression of reverence for the Dalai Lama.

Political freedom and civil rights:

The right to freedom of expression is universal right. No nation should deny this fundamental right to its citizens. United States has expressed its concern about those imprisoned in Tibet for the peaceful expression of their political views.

China declared martial law in the Tibetan capital of Lhasa from midnight of March 6, 1989 following three days of antigovernment rioting. Foreign media and tourists were not allowed into Tibet. United States criticized China's use of force to quell demonstrations in Tibet. Charles E. Redman, the State Department Spokesman said, "we deeply deplore the violence and particularly the use of weapons, that has apparently resulted in numerous
deaths and injuries."\textsuperscript{20} Mr. Desaix Anderson in his testimony in 1992 claimed that United States urged the Chinese to exercise restraint in order to avoid future bloodshed. United States has consistently noted in public that prisoners of conscience seem to be treated more harshly in Tibet than elsewhere in China.\textsuperscript{21}

**Most Favored Nation issue:**

Linking of Most Favored Nation trading status to China with its human rights record could have been proved an important instrument for the United States, if used effectively, to protect and promote human rights in Tibet and China.

On May 24, 1990 President Bush recommended renewal of MFN trading status to China which came into effect automatically.\textsuperscript{22} US House of Representatives voted to impose stringent conditions when China’s trading status came up for renewal in 1992.

On May 28, 1993 President Clinton signed an executive order (No. 12850) renewing China’s MFN status for one year. However, it was conditioned on China’s making overall, significant progress with respect to human rights, including the protection of Tibet’s distinctive cultural heritage.\textsuperscript{23}

\textsuperscript{20} *South China Morning Post*, March 8, 1989.

\textsuperscript{21} Testimony of Mr. L. Desaix Anderson, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of State before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate, July 28, 1992.

\textsuperscript{22} *Tibet Press Watch*, Vol. 2, No. 6, p. 2.

Bill Clinton became the first president to make improvement of the human rights situation in Tibet a condition for renewal of the MFN trading status. For the first time in decades, Tibet was given a prominent place on the agenda of bilateral US-China relations and integrated into United States China policy. But this policy could not be continued for long. Efforts of American business lobby and confusing signals by administrative officials made China not to take it seriously.

On May 26, 1994 President Clinton abandoned this policy of using China’s Most Favored Nation trading status as leverage to promote the protection of Tibet’s religious and cultural heritage, and human rights in China. Instead he chose to renew China’s trading privileges and offer a slap on the wrist by sanctioning imports into United States of Chinese made guns and ammunitions. This extension was granted despite no sign of improvement in Tibet. In his announcement the President specifically cited lack of progress in Tibet, which he said was marked by “repression of Tibet’s religious and cultural traditions.”

In a statement following President Clinton’s MFN announcement, National Security Advisor Anthony Lake expressed administration’s disappointment that China refused to respond to the Dalai Lama’s efforts to begin negotiations and stated that the administration was disturbed by China’s actions in Tibet with regards to the Tibetan culture and people.

---

While the Administration had consistently pushed for negotiations over the past year, many senior officials had been publicly and privately advocating delinkage between MFN and human rights. This mixed message seriously undermined the efforts of the Administration to see real progress in China and Tibet as the Chinese government did not take the threat of MFN revocation as credible. In addition intense lobbying in the United States by the business community, who feared that revocation of China’s MFN status would result into closing of the Chinese market to American goods, convinced China that in the end the President would not have the courage to follow through with his own executive order.

In his May 26 statement President Clinton announced a set of new policy tools to promote human rights in China and Tibet. These include increased international broadcasting; support for NGOs in China; an expanded multilateral agenda; the development of a statement of voluntary principles for US businessmen to follow in China.

President Clinton explicitly stated his desire to stop the annual debate over MFN and human rights in China and to instead focus on increased contact with China, economically and politically. He contends that such contact will increase United States leverage with China.

Congressmen and Tibet support Groups strongly denounced delinkage of MFN and human rights.
President's decision lost a historic opportunity for the US to hasten fundamental change in China and Tibet through one leverage that was sure to catch the attention of the Chinese government.25

On June 2, 1995 President Clinton once again extended MFN trading status to China. The White House press statement did recognize that China's record on human rights was unacceptable. However, it concluded that the renewal of the MFN status would promote a range of US interests in China including human rights.26

**Dalai Lama's US visits:**

Because United States does not recognize Tibetan Government in exile and considers Tibet to be a part of China, for the most part of recent history the Dalai Lama has not been given official reception in the Washington. US has received the Dalai Lama as a religious leader and not as the head of state and Tibetan government-in-exile. Chinese sensitivity is one of the important factors making US to adopt such a posture.

President Bush, disregarding Chinese objections held a private meeting on April 16, 1991 in the White House with the Dalai Lama. After the meeting the Dalai Lama said that he told Bush about the situation in Tibet.

---

25 Ibid.

White House Press Secretary Martin Fitzwater said that the Dalai Lama was invited "as the religious leader of his country". The White House meeting had been opposed by the Chinese, who consider Tibet an integral part of China and label any foreign contact with the Dalai Lama an interference in internal affairs of China. President Bush became the first US president to meet the Dalai Lama. Although the White House continued to insist that Tibet was a part of China, this meeting signaled a shift from the position the administration had taken two years earlier, when Bush had declined to receive the Dalai Lama.

During the Dalai Lama’s US visit in April 1993 Vice President Al Gore received the Tibetan leader in his office. President Clinton arranged to drop in casually for few minutes while the Dalai Lama was there so China would not take offense at an official audience with the United States head of state. The Dalai Lama’s spokesman said Clinton promised to help the Tibetans, but White House attempted to play down the meeting, claiming that Clinton had merely expressed his support for greater respect for human rights in China while noting the United States government’s position on Tibet’s status as a part of China.

On April 28, 1994 Vice President Al Gore met with His Holiness the Dalai Lama to discuss issues concerning China including Tibet and other regional questions.

27 The Washington Post, April 17, 1991
As he did last year, President Clinton joined the meeting to pay his respects to the Dalai Lama, to discuss efforts to initiate a dialogue with the Chinese leadership and to inquire about efforts to preserve Tibetan religion and culture. Chinese authorities protested to the Administration about the meeting with Dalai Lama, saying that such meeting was an "interference in China's internal affairs." The Dalai Lama also met with the National Security Advisor Anthony Lake in this visit.

On September 13, 1995 President Clinton, Vice-President Al Gore and the National Security Advisor Anthony Lake met the Dalai Lama. As on two previous occasions, the President again saw the Dalai Lama in the office of the Vice-President. The White House issued a relatively strong statement following the meeting which said that the meeting was to discuss a range of international and ethical issues and not private or religious in nature. China's denunciation of the Dalai Lama's meeting with the President differed this year. It stressed that the US was covertly helping Tibet, conniving with the Dalai Lama, rather than treating him as a religious figure.

On April 23, 1997 President Bill Clinton and Vice President Al Gore received the Dalai Lama at the White House in the afternoon to discuss "issues concerning Tibet and China." The Dalai Lama had his most official reception in Washington with first ever-formal meeting with a US Secretary of State Madeline Albright and substantive meeting with the President and the Vice President. Talks focused on ways to initiate dialogue with China, with the

---

Dalai Lama urging the US to take a proactive role in implementing the US policy of supporting negotiations to solve the Tibetan problem. The White House gave the Dalai Lama’s meeting with President Clinton this time a greater priority. President Clinton, however was unwilling to give an Oval office reception. The White House statement said the United States continued to urge for high level talks between the Chinese government and the Dalai Lama or his representatives. Unwillingness to give an Oval office reception to the Dalai Lama proves how much importance the United States gives to the sensitivity of the Chinese government on this issue.

American public, media and Congress have expressed their dissatisfaction for this kind of reception. The Boston Globe writes “if it is honorable for President Bush to muster the diplomatic, economic and military powers of the United States in defense of Kuwait’s national survival, then it is hypocritical for the President to refuse to meet the Dalai Lama.”

Economic development and population transfer:

Mr. Desaix Anderson in his testimony explained the US perception of the economic development and population transfer in Tibet. Beijing’s economic and aid efforts in the Tibetan Autonomous Region have produced greater prosperity over the past ten years.

---

30 Tibet Press Watch, July 1997, p.1

A side effect has been an influx of Han Chinese and Hui (Chinese Muslims) traders and small businessman, fueling Tibetan fears of being overwhelmed in their homeland.\textsuperscript{32} It is very difficult to judge the degree of immigration of Han and Muslim Chinese. A majority of Han Chinese has been created in the Tibetan autonomous region with parts of the provinces of Sichuan, Qinghai, and Yunnan, in which Han Chinese and Tibetans have lived for hundred years.

In the ethnically more homogeneous area of the Tibetan Autonomous Region, most non-Tibetan migrants are temporary residents, including ethnic Han security forces, who are most prominent in Lhasa, and who rotate back to their home bases. The increasing numbers of Han small businessman and traders who have moved to Tibet in search of economic opportunity have benefited from China’s nationwide policies of relaxed travel restrictions and encouragement of private enterprise. There does not appear to be a conscious Chinese government policy of attempting to Sinicize Tibet. US State Department report mandated by the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, for the fiscal years 1994-95, titled ‘Relation of the United States with Tibet’ said “Chinese Government development policies have helped raise the living standards of Tibetans, but also have disrupted traditional living patterns. Chinese Communist Party’s avowed policy of boosting minority representation in the Government and the CCP has led to some increase in minorities in leadership positions.

\textsuperscript{32} Testimony of Mr. L. Desaix Anderson, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of State before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate, July 28, 1992.
This increase has failed however, to alter the reality that ethnic minorities are effectively shut out of all but a few positions of real political and decision-making power.

American broadcast in Tibet:

Foreign Relations Authorization Act for the financial years 1990 and 1992 provided for Voice of America Tibetan language programming for the people of Tibet. Tibetan Service of the Voice of America broadcasts two hour-long programs in the Tibetan language each day. Often, it interviews ethnic Tibetans, and has interviewed the Dalai Lama on at least five occasions. VOA Tibetan Service signals have been subjected to interference, with mixed success, almost from the first VOA Tibetan language broadcast signals.


The RFA signal is rated as fair or good, and no jamming has been noted. The Chinese Foreign Ministry in Beijing and Embassy here formally protested at the time of RFA’s initial broadcast operations, terming the broadcasts a relic of cold war mentality and interference in China’s internal affairs.

Clinton Administration replied that RFA is a nonprofit organization of US, which receives grant funds from the Broadcasting Board of Governors, part of USIA, the purpose of which is to provide accurate and comprehensive news and commentary, not propaganda.

Aid and assistance to Tibetan refugees:

United States has been consistently providing aid and assistance to Tibetan refugees settled in India, Nepal, US and other parts of the world. This has proved very helpful to these displaced Tibetans.

On February 16, 1990 the President signed into law the 1990 and 1991 Foreign Relations Authorization Act. This Act provided for not less than 30 scholarships for Tibetan refugees. Section 134 of the Public Law 101-649 of the United States dated November 29, 1990 provided that 1000 immigrant visas should be made available to the qualified displaced Tibetans.

Mr. Desaix Anderson in his testimony explained the US policy on assistance to Tibetan refugees. He said, "the United States is providing assistance to Tibetan refugees in India and funding for the UN High Commissioner for Refugees to assist Tibetans transiting Nepal. The United States Embassy in New Delhi has begun to issue the 1000 special immigrant visas for displaced Tibetans that were authorized by the Immigration Act of 1990.


The first of these Tibetans have already arrived in the US and the United States Information Agency is providing scholarship for 30 Tibetans per year to study in the United States. 36

The US President signed an Act on October 6, 1992 providing not less than $1.5 million for Tibetan refugees. On September 30, 1996 President Clinton signed Conference Report on H.R. 4278 Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations for FY 1997, which recommended that $1 million be provided to assist Tibetan refugees in India and Nepal.

Most of the US Government funding to the refugees in India goes to the Tibet Fund, a US private voluntary organization, to underwrite assistance programs for Tibetan refugees in India. These programs support reception centers, preventive health care, income-generating projects, and supply of basic food, clothing and clean water. 1000 displaced Tibetans, who were issued special immigration visas as part of the Immigration Act of 1990, have since settled throughout the United States. The United States Information Agency provides scholarships for Tibetan students and professionals to study in the United States. Almost all have returned to India and Nepal upon completion of their studies to contribute to the welfare of the Tibetan refugee communities there. A rough estimate shows that 90 percent of the officials working for the Central Tibetan Administration are Fulbright scholars who have studied in various universities and institutes of United States.

36 Testimony of Mr. L. Desaix Anderson, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of State before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate, July 28, 1992.
Dialogue between China and Dalai Lama or his representatives:

Dialogue between China and the Dalai Lama or his representatives have remained stalled for years, with no negotiations currently scheduled or even planned.

Chinese government has put conditions for negotiations to start. “We are ready to negotiate with Dalai Lama if he abandons his activities for 'independence of Tibet in disguised form, shows willingness to safeguard the unity of the motherland and promote solidarity among nationalities, and makes contributions to the development of Tibet. But the negotiation, which is a matter between the Chinese Central Government and the Dalai Lama, brooks no meddling by any foreigners. We are firmly opposed to any activities aimed at internationalizing the question of Tibet.”

United States has been consistently encouraging both the parties to come to negotiating table. Mr. L. Desaix Anderson in his testimony said, “It is our hope that the Chinese leadership will actively seek progress in its dialogue with the Dalai Lama’s elder brother who visited China earlier this month at Beijing’s invitation. We believe the only way to resolve the differences between Tibetans, including those in exile, and the Chinese government is through dialogue. Our hope is that such talks could result in an agreement for increased Tibetan participation in the governing of Tibetan affairs.”

37 NPC Foreign Affairs Committee Issues Statement On US House Resolutions On So Called Tibet Question” XINHUA, May 19, 1989
38 Testimony of Mr. L. Desaix Anderson, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of State before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate, July 28, 1992.
In 1992, US Undersecretary designate for political affairs of newly formed Bill Clinton administration, Peter Tarnoff called for a dialogue between the Chinese government and the Dalai Lama. He told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in his confirmation hearing “there have been countless incidents of repression in Tibet, which should be laid at the door of the authorities in Beijing. Very clearly, the role of the Dalai Lama as the leader of his people has to be recognized by the People’s Republic of China. We hope dialogue between the Dalai Lama and the authorities in Beijing will be ensured.”\textsuperscript{39}

In a statement following President Clinton’s MFN extension in 1994, National Security Advisor Anthony Lake expressed the Administration’s disappointment that the China refused to respond to the Dalai Lama’s efforts to begin negotiations and stated that the administration was disturbed by China’s actions in Tibet with regards to the Tibetan culture and people.

We have consistently asserted that any questions surrounding Tibet and its relationship to Chinese authorities in Beijing should be resolved by direct dialogue between the Tibetans, in particular the Dalai Lama, and the Chinese.”\textsuperscript{40}

\textsuperscript{39} Hindustan Times, March 7, 1993
\textsuperscript{40} “US Policy Toward Tibet”, Testimony By Jeffrey Bader Deputy Assistant Secretary for East Asian and Pacific Affairs before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Washington, D.C., May 13, 1997.
Jeffrey Bader's testimony before Senate Foreign Relations Committee on May 13, 1997 once again demonstrated United States desire for a negotiated settlement of the question of Tibet. He said, "The United States encourages China and the Dalai Lama to hold serious discussion aimed at resolution of differences at an early date, without preconditions.

Secretary of State Albright called for a dialogue between Beijing and the Dalai Lama when she visited Beijing in February 1997 and again during Vice Premiere Qian Qichen's visit to Washington in April 1997.

United States perceives that challenge to Chinese sovereignty or resort to violence can not improve the situation. "No Chinese government for centuries has been prepared to accept the idea of an independent Tibet. The Dalai Lama has shown courage in accepting the impracticality of insisting on independence, whatever his views on Tibet's historical status, and calling for an autonomous Tibet within China. Chinese spokesmen have responded by stating their willingness to engage in a dialogue with the Dalai Lama if he renounces independence and pro-independence activities. The gap between the stated positions of the two sides would appear to outside observers to be bridgeable."41

41 Ibid.
Special Coordinator for Tibetan Affairs:

Initiative taken by the US Congress in form of congressional resolution demanding appointment of a special envoy for Tibetan affairs was well responded by the US government. In a significant breakthrough for Tibet, the United States announced its decision to appoint a Special Coordinator for Tibetan Affairs.

Conveying this in a letter to the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on July 29, 1997, Secretary Madeleine Albright said, "central objective of this position will be to promote substantive dialogue between the Government of People’s Republic of China and the Dalai Lama and his representatives. The Special Coordinator will also vigorously promote the US policy of seeking to protect the unique religious, cultural and linguistic heritage of Tibet, and pressing for improved respect for human rights."42

Mr. Gregory B. Craig was appointed as the first Special Coordinator for Tibetan Affairs on October 31, 1997 by the Secretary of State. There could not have been a better time for Tibet supporters as Chinese President Jiang was still on US soil.43

Thus, the United States has made certain timely and needed intervention in the question of Tibet.

Although these efforts have been appreciated by Tibetans and Tibet supporters worldwide, they expect a more active and supportive role from the United States.

Next and concluding chapter summarizes the thesis and makes certain broad generalizations regarding United States policy toward Tibet issue.