

represented by one of the small stars on China's national flag, had been dumped by Mao by the summer of 1952. There is no doubt that the CCP has attempted to use the various united front groups from time to time, including groups of religious believers, and that the concept of a united front has enjoyed something of a revival in the 1980s. Yet, the theme of "seeking the common ground" implies something of a two-way street, and there is scant evidence that such has been the aim of the CCP or of the Chinese government at any point up to the present.

Even with these reservations, however, Wickeri has given us an impressive piece of work. Anyone interested in the story of the Protestant Christian churches in China under communism would do well to read this book and to ponder its implications.

JAMES T. MYERS

*Tibet. The Facts. A Report Prepared by the Scientific Buddhist Association for the United Nations Commission on Human Rights.*  
By PAUL INGRAM. [Dharamsala, India: Tibetan Young Buddhist Association, 2nd edition, 1990. 384 pp. £7.50.]

For 287 pages of text (supplemented by an additional 96 pages of endnotes) Paul Ingram recounts in some detail the situation of Tibet and its people since 1949. The story he tells is a searing indictment against Chinese rule detailing cases of racial discrimination, mass arrests, torture of prisoners, ecological disaster, social policies designed to deprive Tibetans of their most basic rights, forced starvation, cultural genocide and the murder of millions of people. "If there is a name synonymous with the very worst horrors of 20th Century oppression," he concludes, "that name is *Tibet*, a country whose people have been dragged to the depths of human misery" (p. 244).

That some of these events have occurred is beyond question; even the Chinese leadership have criticized Chinese rule in Tibet, as has the Panchen Lama who declared, days before his death, that Chinese rule in Tibet was more negative than positive for Tibetans, and organizations such as Amnesty International. But the problem here is how to separate the facts (i.e. events which everyone agrees occurred) from the political embellishment. Ingram's frequent use of hyperbole (he habitually equates China with Nazi Germany) and his disregard for the historical scholarship which questions some of his assertions, raises doubts about his credibility.

Like a prosecuting attorney he brushes aside all those who disagree with him (like this reviewer, whose book is criticized in a separate appendix, and the British government and the Dalai Lama for a willingness to negotiate with the Chinese) and lays out his case in a highly polemical fashion. So sure is he that only his version of the "facts" is acceptable that he relies almost exclusively on sources from

the Tibetans in exile. Of more than 400 endnotes less than 10 are Chinese sources; even alleged Chinese statistics are quoted from Tibetan refugee sources.

As anyone who has compared the Dalai Lama's two versions of his autobiography (written 25 years apart) knows, history changes. Moreover, political considerations in cases such as this are often more important than historical ones. Referring precisely to the sources Ingram is so unquestioning of, *The New York Times* admitted recently (7 October 1990, p. 4:3), "...many diplomats and other experts regard the anti-Chinese propaganda from the Dalai Lama as little more reliable than Chinese propaganda about Tibet."

In addition, Paul Ingram's detailed knowledge of Tibetan culture is flawed by his apparent lack of understanding of Chinese culture. This may also have to do with his sources; he recommends highly to his readers *Chinese Characteristics*, an 1894 book by American missionary Arthur H. Smith for giving "an insight into the psychology of the Chinese" (p. 377).

Paul Ingram's goal of exposing Chinese misrule in Tibet and rallying support for Tibetan independence have been hindered in this book by his fixed polemical vision and his intolerance of the available scholarship. It adds nothing to what is already known about Tibet and it will be convincing only to those already convinced.

A. TOM GRUNFELD

*Die Chinesische Tibetpolitik.* By CATHERINE HOOL. [Bern: Peter Lang, 1989. 197 pp.]

The declared aim of this book is to examine Chinese government policy towards Tibet and the Tibetans between the death of Mao and the Dalai Lama's "Strasbourg Speech" of June 1988. This forms the subject of chapter five; the preceding chapters give an account of previous Chinese policies (communist and pre-communist) towards minorities in general and the Tibetans in particular. The work was motivated by a personal visit to Tibet during which the author was struck, as so many others have been, by the marked discrepancy between official Chinese accounts of the situation in Tibet and observed conditions there. The author evidently speaks and reads Chinese fluently: many Chinese sources are quoted and some reproduced in the original and in translation in the appendices. Although she has consulted Tibetans and their published works, there is no evidence that she speaks or reads their language.

Chapters one to four serve as a useful introduction to the politico-legal problem of Tibet, albeit brief and mainly from secondary sources. Probably wisely, the author makes no attempt to adjudicate between the cases for and against Tibetan independence, saying that any judgment is, in the final analysis, "subjektiv." Some of the same difficulty is also apparent in chapter five, where on many issues all