

NOTES & TOPICS

SIMLA CONVENTION 1914

In 1950 autumn People's Republic of China invaded Tibet and completed its occupation by 1951 spring. Since Tibet was not then a region of China, this occupation was an annexation of a small country by a big country. To legalise this conquest China called the Tibetan leaders to Peking and made them surrender Tibet's independence. The treaty signed at Peking on 23rd May 1951 was called "Agreement on Measures for the Peaceful Liberation of Tibet". Tibetans ever since have called this "Agreement for Violent Destruction of Tibet's Identity and Independence".

Tibetans point out the bilateral treaty with British signed at Simla on 3rd July 1914 as sufficient proof of Tibet's independence. People's Republic of China was in the beginning silent and broke their silence sometime after India agreed to accept Tibet as Tibet Region of China (Sino-Indian Agreement, Peking 29 April 1954). Chinese leaders sometimes challenged the signatures on Simla Convention, sometimes denied Tibet's right to sign such agreement. This "heads I win or tails you loose" was Chinese propaganda till a few years ago. The current propaganda is that Tibet was never independent in the past -- and not in 1914.

In summer this year Beijing has come out with enormous and flamboyant handouts to challenge Tibet's independence. To answer this we could locate a brief and precise statement by an Indian scholar published in 1974. The facts and arguments in this article of 1974 stand equally good in 1987. The author, N.C. Sinha, has kindly added some notes for the general readers.

We acknowledge with compliments that the article was first published in Presidency College Magazine (Calcutta 1974)

BODHIPATHA PRADIPA

Bodhipatha Pradipa composed by Srijnana Dipankara Atisa during his residence in Tholing Gompa (Western Tibet) and available in authorised and authenticated Tibetan translation by the author himself is rightly celebrated in Tibet and Mongolia as the most important book of the great saint scholar.

As an exposition of the central philosophy of the Dharma Bodhi-sattvayāna -- it is prized for its presentation of deepest thoughts. The book is reproduced in this issue of the Bulletin and shortly a detailed critique (in English) will be published.

We now refer to a controversy raised by a lama that Atisa did not preach Kalachakra Tantra as recorded in Kadampa and Gelugpa works (vide Bulletin 1985 Nos. 1 & 2 and 1986 No. 2).

A Tibetan scholar from Dharamsala has drawn our notice to verse 63 of Bodhipatha Pradipa where the Kalachakra work Adi-buddha-maha-tantra is cited with great respect. This work will be reproduced from KANJUR in our next issue, with full comments. We thank the Dharamsala scholar for drawing our notice to this reference.

J.K. RECHUNG