

**The Institution of the Dalai Lama  
and its Impact on  
the Relations Between Tibetans and Mongols**

*Dissertation submitted to Jawaharlal Nehru University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the award of the degree of*

**MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY**

**LOBSANG TENPA**



**CENTRAL ASIAN STUDIES DIVISION  
CENTRE FOR SOUTH, CENTRAL, SOUTH-EAST ASIAN &  
SOUTH-WEST PACIFIC STUDIES  
SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES  
JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY**

**NEW DELHI**

**2009**



CENTRE FOR SOUTH, CENTRAL, SOUTHEAST ASIAN & SOUTH WEST PACIFIC STUDIES  
SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES  
**JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY**  
NEW DELHI - 110 067

Phone : 2670 4350  
Fax : 91-11-2674 1586  
91-11-2674 2580

March 12, 2009

### DECLARATION

I declare that the Dissertation entitled "**The Institution of the Dalai Lama and its Impact on Relations Between Tibetans and Mongols**", submitted by me in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of the degree of **Master of Philosophy** of Jawaharlal Nehru University, is my own work. This Dissertation has not been submitted for any other degree of this University or any other University.

**Lobsang Tenpa**

### CERTIFICATE

We recommend that this dissertation may be placed before the examiners for evaluation.

**Prof. P. Sahadevan**  
Centre for South, Central, South East  
Asian (Chairperson) Studies  
School of International Studies  
Jawaharlal Nehru University  
New Delhi-110067

**Dr. Sharad K. Soni**  
(Supervisor)  
Centre for South, Central, South East  
Asian and South West Pacific Studies  
School of International Studies  
Jawaharlal Nehru University  
New Delhi-110067

## **Acknowledgement**

This dissertation is the outcome of my being in constant touch with the issues related to Sino-Tibetan relations since my graduation, during which I came to understand that the studies on the relationship between the two great civilizations of Asia, the Tibetan and Mongol had been neglected. In this work, I have tried my best to bring out the main features of historical relationship, which was based on Buddhist tradition between these two civilizations. However, it cannot be claimed that the work is enough to be called final; it has taken me to a level of satisfaction for which I owe a debt to several teachers and individuals.

First of all, I pay my immense debt of gratitude to my supervisor Dr. Sharad K. Soni with whose inspiration and active guidance I could be able to finish this work. I am sure that without his efforts, this work would not have been completed and that too became possible with the forbearance by my supervisor on the repeated mistakes I made on contexts and sentence formation of the subject. Besides, his suggestions and inputs in every chapter were really enriching to me. This research work has really been a tough job but the experience I gained and the techniques and methods that I learned from my supervisor in writing this dissertation will be unforgettable forever.

I must also express my deep gratitude to Prof. K. Warikoo, the Director of the Central Asian Studies Programme (SIS) for his encouragement and support during my research. I would also like to convey my gratefulness to other faculty members of the Centre, particularly to the Chairperson of the Centre Prof. P. Sahadevan.

Taking this opportunity, I wish to convey my sincere thanks to Dr. Yeshi Choedon, Prof. S. Kondapalli, Ashang Thupten Yignyen and Tshering Choezom for their encouragement to understand the importance of this research work. I also owe a special thanks to all my friends Tenzin Dolma, Saket Bahuguna, Anish M. Sulochana, Chandra

Khemundu, Manas Kumar, L. Letkhomang Haokip (Mangcha) and Deepak for spending their valuable time and help throughout this work. My thanks are also due to my entire classmates as well as members of the *Tibet Forum- JNU* for making the work more enjoyable.

For the financial support, I owe a lot to the University Grant Commission for granting me the Rajiv Gandhi National Fellowship (RGNF), which took care of my necessities throughout my research work. I am also thankful to the staff of various Libraries including the Central Library of Jawaharlal Nehru University, Tibet House Library in New Delhi, Library of Tibetan Works and Archives and Department of Information and International Relations at Dharamshala, IDSA Library and Jawaharlal Nehru Memorial Museum and Library at Teen Murti Bhavan, New Delhi, for their cooperation during my studies there.

I would like to dedicate this work to the Great Spirit of Tibetans especially to those who are living in Tibet, who became the victims of geopolitics of the Great Game and the Cold War in the past and presently to the geo-economics, where they are struggling against the dominant forces and are facing tremendous hardships which are indescribable to the worldly materialists. Nevertheless, to my parents to whom I can never hope to pay back and to my sisters, brothers and relatives who have always been encouraging me to enter and work in the world of research.

At the end, I have come to the point of realisation that there may not be any end to mistakes, corrections and additions that I could have made. But, I must admit that due to my limited knowledge I present this work as it is and would take full responsibility for mistakes, if any, and negligence on my part.



Lobsang Tenpa

12/03/2009

## Contents

	Acknowledgement	ii
	Preface	v
1	Introduction	1-24
2	Origin and Development of the Institution of the Dalai Lama	25-61
	The Fifth Dalai Lama and His Regime	
	Political Nexus Between Tibetan Regent ( <i>Desi</i> ) Mongol Chieftains	
	Si-Kyong (Regency) and the <i>Amban</i> Era	
	The Thirteenth Dalai Lama and His Regime	
	The Government of the Ganden Phodrang Chokele Namgyal	
3	Buddhist Factor in Tibeto-Mongol Relations	62-87
	Contribution of Tibetan Buddhists and Monasteries	
	Mongol Monastic Institutions and Buddhist Masters	
	Impact of Institution on Pan-Mongolism and Pan-Tibetanism	
4	The Dalai Lama's Proclamation and Mongolia-Tibet Treaty	88-106
	The Downfall of Qing Dynasty and Proclamation of Tibetan Independence	
	1913 Tibetan-Mongol Treaty	
	The Significance of the 1913 Treaty and China's Response	
5	Conclusion	107-113
	Appendices	114 -141
	References	142-151

## Preface

The studies on relations between the two societies may differ in concept but the fundamental issue remains confined to the mutual benefit of each other, which ultimately leads to the emergence of peaceful and prosperous societies or neighbours in terms of co-existence. This is what one can witness while studying the relations between Tibetans and Mongols till the early years of the twentieth century. The peaceful co-existence of the Tibetans and Mongols owes much to the emergence of the Institutions of the Dalai Lama which played significant role in bringing the Buddhist world together so much so that in case of Mongols the movement of Pan-Mongolism as an offshoot of Pan-Buddhism included Tibetans also.

Historically, the earliest written sources on the contact between Mongols and the Tibetan Buddhist Lamas date back to the first half of the 13<sup>th</sup> century A.D. In 1244, the Mongol ruler Godan Khan summoned the reputed Tibetan ecclesiastical leader Sakya Pandita to his court. He along with his two nephews, Phagspa Lodro Gyaltsen and Chakna Dorjee arrived in Godan Khan's court in 1246. As a result, the Mongol had spared Tibetan plateau from plundering. The *Chos-Yon* (patron-priest) relationship between the Mongol rulers and Tibetan clergy formally started when Khubilai Khan, the founder of Yuan dynasty (1260-1368), granted the religious and secular leadership of Tibet to Phagspa Lama, who in turn became his spiritual advisor and appointed him as '*Chakravartin*' - the universal monarch. Thus the Mongol rulers provided security for the Tibetan state, while the Tibetan Buddhist clergy conferred spiritual legitimacy on Mongolian sovereignty. The Sakya-Mongol rule of Tibet ended in the mid-fourteenth century with the Pakmodrupa order of Kagyu led by Jangchub Gyaltsen gaining control of Central Tibet.

Although the Mongol rulers of the Yuan dynasty abandoned their ancestral Shamanism and adopted Tibetan Buddhism as the state religion, it remained mainly a

court religion and did not spread among the commoners. As a result, the fall of the Yuan dynasty in 1368, saw the reemergence of Shamanism as the chief religion with the trace of Buddhism also. This trend was reversed only in the second half of the 16<sup>th</sup> century A.D. when Buddhism began to spread among the ordinary people with the arrival of the third Dalai Lama in the court of Altan Khan in 1578. During this period, rivalry was strong between western and eastern Mongols for all-Mongol supremacy and therefore, Buddhism was again used to legitimize the ruling faction. The conversion of the leading Tumed Mongol prince Altan Khan set in motion a rapid adoption of Buddhism by most of the eastern Mongols.

Meanwhile in the 14th-15th centuries A.D. a new order, the Ganden better known as Gelug, was founded by Tsongkhapa Lobsang Drakpa, with the establishment of the monastery of Ganden, in the eastern part of Lhasa. The Gelug sect emphasized strict adherence to the monastic order (*Vinaya*) and rigorous programs of study based on the sustained practice of debate. They are popularly called the 'yellow hat' sect as they use yellow ceremonial hat. Tsongkhapa's student Gedun Drupa (1391-1474) who founded the Tashi Lhunpo monastery in 1447 was posthumously considered to be the first Dalai Lama. Upon his death, a tulku, Gedun Gyatso (1476-1542), was also considered as the second Dalai Lama. However, the title of these two Dalai Lama was recognized much later when actually the lineage of the Dalai Lama began.

Gedun Gyatso's immediate successor, Sonam Gyatso (1543-1588), grew up to be a brilliant teacher and his fame spread even to Mongolia. In 1577, Altan Khan, the powerful chieftain of the Tumed Mongol banner, invited him to teach in Mongolia. This was a remarkable event in the history of the Gelug order prevailing among both the Mongols and Tibetans. In 1578, Sonam Gyatso visited the Mongol Altan Khan at his capital near the Kokonor, thus continuing the tradition of relations between Tibetan religious leaders and powerful sponsors outside Tibet. The Khan and his people adopted the Gelug order of Tibetan Buddhism.

It was infact, Altan Khan who bestowed on Sonam Gyatso the title of 'Dalai Lama' or Ocean-like Lama (*wisdom as vast as ocean*). This was the beginning of the lineage of Dalai Lamas, although the title was later on conferred on the two predecessors of Sonam Gyatso, who thus came to be known as not the first but the third Dalai Lama. In return, Sonam Gyatso granted Altan Khan the imperial, the title of '*Choskyi rgyalpo lha'i tshangspa*' or King of Dharma, Brahma among the Gods. The Khan gained legitimacy of his rule over all Mongols, especially because he was recognized by the Tibetan Lama as the reincarnation of Khubilai Khan. The old relationship of patron-priest started by Khubilai Khan and Phagspa was thus revived. For the Dalai Lama, more important than titles was the practical support of a powerful prince. Hence, their new relationship would fundamentally alter the balance of power in Tibet itself.

Yonton Gyatso (1589-1617) who was born in Mongolia became the fourth Dalai Lama after the demise of the third Dalai Lama while he was on his second visit to Mongolia. Yonton Gyatso was the first non-Tibetan Dalai Lama but by the age of 28 he passed away. His predecessor, Sonam Gyatso had firmly established Buddhism in Mongolia and even had appointed a living Buddha known as Jetsundamba Khutukthu (Bogdo Gegen). Among the Dalai Lamas, excluding the present one, there had been two 'great' Dalai Lamas and the fifth Dalai Lama Lobsang Gyatso (1617-1682) was one of them. However, it is to be noted that, when the civil war among the ruling families on religious schools created much disturbances in Tibet, the Tsangpa ruler Karma Phuntsok Namgyal had sternly forbidden the reincarnation of the fourth Dalai Lama by declaring it unlawful. But in 1619, Sonam Rabtan alias Sonam Choephel discovered a child of ages two as an extraordinary one and with the confirmation by the Panchen Lama, the child Lobsang Gyatso became the fifth Dalai Lama.

The Mongol leader Gushri Khan visited Lhasa in 1638 upon the invitation of Gelugpa order and was enthroned in the name of 'Religious king and defender of Buddhism' *Tenzin Choskyi Gyalpo*. Within a few years in 1642, Gushri Khan firmly established his rule in whole of Tibet after defeating all the ruling families in east and



central Tibet but handed over the temporal power to the Dalai Lama and political authority to Desi Sonam Choephel in Shigatse. On returning to Lhasa that year itself, the Dalai Lama declared Lhasa to be the capital city and the government to be called as *Ganden Phodrang*, the Institution of Dalai Lama. With the firm establishment of *Ganden Phodrang*, the Fifth Dalai Lama visited China in 1652-53 after an invitation by Shunzhi emperor of Ming dynasty. The bilateral relations among the neighbouring kingdoms improved not only with China but also with the then states of Bhutan, Ladakh, Nepal (Newar) and Sikkim. In 1682, at the age of 68 years, the Fifth Dalai Lama passed away after reigning over Tibet for 40 years. After that, Desi Sangay Gyatso ruled the institution for about fifteen years when Tibet again faced the civil war. It happened because the Mongols and the Manchus began interfering in the political as well as domestic administration of Tibet from the period of 6<sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama to the 13<sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama.

Excluding the 7<sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama (1706-1758), who regained the temporal power in 1750 after the murder of Desi Pholanay Gurmey Namgyal by Chinese Ambans, all the other Dalai Lamas, 6<sup>th</sup> (1683-1706), 8<sup>th</sup> (1758-1804), 9<sup>th</sup> (1806-1815), 10<sup>th</sup> (1816-1837), 11<sup>th</sup> (1838-1856) and 12<sup>th</sup> (1857-1875) were not able to attain the age of power i.e. 18 or died after a short period of weak temporal power. Thus, with the system of *Ambanate* introduced by the Qing Emperor Yongzheng in 1727 until 1912 a total of 173 *Ambanate* or his deputy were appointed in Tibet. It is widely believed that during this period these Dalai Lamas were either killed or became powerless due to the strong position of *Ambans* who collaborated with the Desi in order to prolong their reign.

Besides the Great Fifth, another Dalai Lama who exercised strong power in Tibetan affair was the 13<sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama (1875-1933) also called the Great Thirteenth. He assumed power to head the institution of the Dalai Lama in 1895. He had a very firm policy of reforms as well as foreign relations agenda, especially with the Tsarist Russia. However, like Mongolia Tibet too became a victim of 'Great Game' between Russia, China and British India. Colonel Younghusband's military expedition in 1904 and General Chou Erh-feng's military campaign and expansion in 1907-1910 further

exposed the backward and weak position of Tibet, which led to two consecutive exile of the 13th Dalai Lama in Mongolia, China and British India during 1904-12. Meanwhile, following the fall of the Qing dynasty (1644-1911) the declaration of independence of Tibet in 1913 and subsequently the signing of the Mongol-Tibetan treaty in the same year proved to be an evidence of Tibet resembling the modern concept of sovereign nation in international relations. From 1913 to 1951, Tibet had really enjoyed the status of a sovereign nation in terms of self-determination and political rights. But the sudden demise of the Great Thirteenth in 1933, again led the ruling classes struggle for power. Though the fourteenth Dalai Lama (1935- ) assumed the temporal and spiritual power in November 1950, but due to the agreement of 1951 with People's Republic of China, Tibet lost its identity as a sovereign nation.

So, far as the role of the head of the Institution of the Dalai Lama in Tibeto-Mongol relations is concerned, it appears that the Institution remained intact but the Dalai-Lama became merely a religious figure and so religion played a major role. The Institution was named as *Ganden Phodrang Chokle Namgyal* in 1642 by the Great Fifth. The structure of the Institution was more or less within the aristocracy and monastery, but underneath the temporal and spiritual head was always the Dalai Lama. The day to day administration and political affairs were run by the Desi with the help of the council of ministers *Kashag*, while the assembly *Tsongdue* that included members from aristocrat families, traders' communities as well as high lamas was merely a functional one.

The monasteries especially, the Ganden Tegchenlin belonging to Yellow sect and the head of the Mongolian Buddhism Bogdo Gegen, Jebtsundampa Khutukthu the 8th one was Tibetan and had played a major role in the Tibeto-Mongol relationship. Moreover, the successive Bogdo Gegen are able to keep the Tibetan Buddhism in Mongolia intact so much so that he was considered third in rank after the Dalai Lama and the Panchen Lama. The influence of monastic culture and Buddhism led to the Mongols of Khalkha in Mongolia, the Buryats in Siberia and the Kalmyks in Volga regions to assimilate Buddhism as their Mongolian identity.

With the influence of the Buddhism, the concept of Pan-Mongolism developed among the intellectual especially through the Buryat Mongols on the basis of same religion, culture and the use of classical Tibetan language in monasteries. But the faction between the 8th Jebtsundampa and the 13th Dalai Lama, when the later was on his visit to Urga in 1905 was proved to be a setback to the concept. Besides, the Pan-Mongolian vision which included Pan-Tibetan idea also could not be realized due to the division of Mongols and Tibetans into Inner and Outer in early 20th century. In the process even a vision of Pan-Buddhist state was not able to be realized due to the outbreak of the October Revolution and ineffectiveness of the Institution of the Dalai Lama at that point of time.

It is on this background that this dissertation seeks to analyse the overall relation between Tibetan and Mongols especially after the establishment of the Institution of the Dalai Lama. While doing so it also examines the nature of interaction between the two sides during the period of this study, besides highlighting the impact of the Institution of the Dalai Lama on such interaction on the basis of following hypothesis: (a) if the institution of the Dalai Lama was not mixed up with religious school, the role of the institution might have been more effective; (b) instead of reincarnated child to become an adult to run the institution, the head of the institution has been hereditary or by nomination; and (c) emergence of the Pan-Buddhist concept and its influence on the princely Mongol states gave way to the development of Pan-Mongolism.

The scope of the study, which is limited to the period from 1642 when the Institution of the Dalai Lama came into existence until 1913 when the 13th Dalai Lama proclaimed the independence of Tibet and subsequently concluded a treaty with Mongolia. This signified the status of Tibet, as a sovereign state at that point of time. However, while not ignoring the pre-1642 period this study makes a critical review of the state of Tibeto-Mongol relations, particularly during the period of the Mongol Yuan dynasty of China (1260-1368) when *Chos-Yon* (Priest-Patron) concept developed for the first time. This highlights the changing dynamics of the Tibeto-Mongol relations

due to the emergence of the Institution of the Dalai Lama. As such the present study focuses on the following questions and tried to find out answers:

- \* What was the historical outline of Tibeto-Mongol relations prior to the existence of the Institution of the Dalai Lama?
- \* Did the Institution of the Dalai Lama play any role in the pacification of Warrior Mongols? If, so then how?
- \* Why did the *Ambanate* system turn up, if the Institution was really playing up to the policy of Qing emperor?
- \* What was the significance of the Institution of the Dalai Lama in bringing the Tibetans and Mongols closer?
- \* Whether the Pan-Mongol and Pan-Tibetan concepts came to be realized and what was the role played by the Institution?
- \* How did the religion influence the politics of the Institution?
- \* What was the significance and relevance of Mongolia-Tibet treaty of 1913?

Historico-analytical and descriptive methodology has been followed while examining the role of the Institution of the Dalai Lama in Tibetan-Mongol relations. Both the primary and secondary sources available in Tibetan and English languages have been used in this study. The Chinese language material translated into English has also been consulted. Primary sources include documents in the form of treaties and agreements as well as various governmental reports. Secondary sources comprise of books, journals, articles and newspapers apart from various websites on the internet.

The *Introduction* chapter, which is the first outlines the background of the functioning of relations between Tibetans and Mongols prior to the establishment of the Institution of Dalai Lama '*Ganden Phodrang Chokle Namgyal*'. Particular focus has been paid on discussing the state of their relations during the period of Yuan dynasty under which the *Chos-Yon* (Priest-Patron) concept was developed.

The second chapter, *Origin and Development of the Institution of the Dalai Lama* discusses with the beginning of the Institution of the Dalai Lama, with a focus on highlighting how the personal residence of the Second Dalai Lama 'Ganden Phodrang', became the name of the Institution in the 17th Century during the time of Fifth Dalai Lama. It also provides a detail picture of the structure and functioning of the Institution, besides recording various events signifying the development and importance of the Institution.

The third Chapter, *Buddhist Factor in Tibeto-Mongol Relations* focuses on the contribution of monasteries and the Tibetan Buddhist schools in developing relations among various princely Tibetan and Mongol states. It outlines the role played by Buddhist monastic Institutions as well as Buddhist masters in the Tibetan-Mongol relations. It also discusses the development of the concepts of Pan-Mongolism and Pan-Tibetanism and the impact the Institution of the Dalai Lama had on such concepts.

The fourth Chapter, *The Dalai Lama's Proclamation and Mongolia-Tibet Treaty*, highlights the genesis of the 13th Dalai Lama's Proclamation of Tibetan Independence (1912) following the fall of the Qing dynasty and various events that led to the signing of a treaty between Mongolia and Tibet (1913). It also discusses the significance of the treaty in international relations after the discovery of the original Tibetan text of the treaty and China's response to it since very beginning.

The fifth and final Chapter makes the *Concluding* observations on the overall impact of the Institution of the Dalai Lama on the relations between Tibetans and Mongols, besides highlighting the relevance of the Institution in the post-1913 period.

## **Chapter One**

### **Introduction**

After a period of political fragmentation and disintegration of the Tibetan empires for more than four centuries, the political centralization and cultural unification of Tibet took place only in the thirteenth century in which, the Mongol rulers had contributed significantly.<sup>1</sup> On this account, the earliest written sources particularly on the contact between Mongols and the Tibetan Buddhist Lamas date back to the first half of the 13<sup>th</sup> century A.D. Although extensive information from the Mongolian and Chinese sources is available on the Mongol conquest of other countries. But accounts of the Mongol conquest of Tibet are “relatively sketchy” in these sources (Wylie, 1977:103). As regards the Tibetan sources, these were considered to be *post facto* religious activities, yet almost all the historians agree that in 1244, the Mongol ruler Prince Godan, the Great Chinggis Khan's grandson summoned the reputed Tibetan ecclesiastical leader Sakya Pandita Kunga Gyaltzen (1182-1251) to his court. The latter along with his two nephews, Drogon Choegyal Phagspa Lodro Gyaltzen (1235-80) and Chakna Dorjee (1239-67) arrived in Prince Godan's court in 1246 and subsequently his submission of the authority of Tibet in 1247 led to the beginning of a new era in the relations between the Mongols and Tibetans (Smith, 1996:84). Not only the Mongols spared Tibetan plateau from plundering but also gave due recognition to Tibetan Buddhist leaders. The *Chos-Yon* (patron-priest) relationship between the Mongol rulers (1207-1368) and the Tibetan clergy formally started when Emperor Khubilai Khan (1216-1295) granted the religious and secular leadership of Tibet to Phagspa Lama, who in turn became his spiritual advisor and appointed him as ‘*Chakravartin*’- the universal monarch.<sup>2</sup> It is to be noted that the rule of Sakya School (1247-1350) started in 1253 with Phagspa Lama becoming the spiritual and temporal leader of Tibet.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Chinese historians Jiawei & Nyima Gyalcian (1997) have divided the Tibetan dynasty from Songtsen Gampo (618-641) in 630s as the foundation of *Tubo Kingdom* to till fragmentation of *Tsenpo* Dynasty in 842 after the death of Lang Darma, where as Tibetan historian recorded continuation of *Tsenpo* Dynasty from 127 BC to 842 AD (Jiawei & Nyima Gyalcian, 1997: 8).

<sup>2</sup> Usually we are informed that the *Chos-Yon* relationship was introduced with the Mongols ruler and Sakya School but according to Sperling (2000) it was accorded to a Kagyu Lama namely, Tashi Raspa Sherab Senge (a.k.a. ‘Gro-mgon Ti-shri Sangs-rgyas ras-chen) 1164-1236. He had served the Tangut Emperors of Xixia kingdom as ‘imperial preceptor’ (Sperling, 2000: 229). This means it was first the Tangut emperors and not the Mongols emperors whom the Tibetan clerics had served in spiritual matter.

<sup>3</sup> According to the Tibetan sources, the Sakya School's reign over Tibet lasted 114 years from 1236-1350, until it was overthrown by Jangchub Gyaltzen of Phakmodrupa dynasty from Tsang with the help of Kagyu School.

However, while dealing with the establishment of the Yuan dynasty (1271-1368) by the Mongol Emperor Khubilai Khan in 1271, the Chinese historians are of the opinion that “Tibet was officially incorporated into China during the Yuan dynasty”, whereas the fact remains that Tibet has been under an indirect rule by Mongol Khans since 1207 though with a limited power (Jiawei & Gyalcian, 1997:20).<sup>4</sup>

It is documented that in 1207 the Tibetans in eastern part came to know that Chinggis Khan was conquering the Tangut Empire of Xixia, which was Tibet’s close neighbour. Norbu (2001) states that the Tibetan leaders had submitted to the Khan on condition of tribute but he does not mention who the leaders were (Norbu, 2001:46). Further, he point out that “Tibet was saved from (Mongol) invasion”.<sup>5</sup> Historians like Petech (1990) and Shakabpa (1984) have also noted that in 1215 Tsangpa Dunkhurwa and his disciples had met Chinggis Khan, most probably in the Tangut empire (Petech & Shakabpa; 1990:6; 1984:61). But after the death of Chinggis Khan in 1227, the Tibetans had stopped paying tribute which ultimately led Prince Godan, the grandson of Chinggis Khan, to send his general Doorda Darqan to Central Tibet in 1239-40.<sup>6</sup> His expedition to Central Tibet sacked the monasteries of Reting and Gyal-lha-khang and an eminent monk of the Sakya was chosen as Sakya Pandita for carrying out negotiation at Liangzhou (Gansu). As a result, Tibet escaped the second Mongol invasion in 1240 and the credit goes to Sakya Pandita.

The most striking feature of the relations between the Mongols and the Tibetans during the 13<sup>th</sup> century was that, the Mongol rulers provided security for the Tibetan state, while at the Tibetan Buddhist clergy conferred spiritual legitimacy on Mongolian sovereignty. In his edict of 1244, Prince Godan’s message to Sakya Pandita was both the request as well as command. This is revealed in the following passage which has

---

<sup>4</sup> Wylie (1977) argued that, there was not much any substantive evidence to prove that Chinggis Khan had the control of Tibet in early 13<sup>th</sup> century (Wylie, 1977: 104). He had further stated that, the general Doorda Darqan’s military conflict in 1239-40, appears to be the first contact between the two countries.

<sup>5</sup> See Table 4.1 in (Dawa Norbu, 2001:46).

<sup>6</sup> It is written General Doorda ‘Nagpo’ in (Jiawei & Nyima Gyalcian, 1997: 21-22); instead of General Doorda ‘Darqan’. The name ‘Nagpo’ has been translated Dorta ‘the Black’ in (Kapstein, 2006:110)



been taken from Dege Edition of 'The Sakya's Lineal Descriptions' and translated by the two historians Jiawei & Gyalcian (1997:22):

To Sakya Pandit Kunga Gyaincian: to repay my parents and the Heaven and the Earth,  
I need to have a Master who can tell me which path I should take.  
I have decided to have you.  
Please come in total disregard of road hardships.  
If you find excuse in you old age (and refuse to come),  
How could you explain so many alms given by Sakyamuni for the benefit of all living things in the past?  
Don't you fear that I will answer the matter by sending troops stationed in the border area?  
Please come as early as possible.  
I will make you the leader of all monks in the West....  
Written on the 30<sup>th</sup> day of the eighth month in the Year of the Dragon.<sup>7</sup>

Having received the receipt of above command, Sakya Pandita as mentioned earlier, reached Prince Godan's court in 1246 and submitted his authority to the Khan in 1247. Soon after, Sakya Pandita wrote a letter to all the Tibetan temporal and secular leaders in Tibet, in which not only he mentioned his own negotiation with the Mongol but also appealed them to submit to the Khan:

Because the Mongols have accepted my submission, their troops have not attacked Tubo (Tibet) in the last few years. So long as you can abide by the Mongol decrees, you will benefit.<sup>8</sup>

In 1251, after spending four years in Godan's court Sakya Pandita passed away at the age of sixty-seven, while at same time the Mongol prince Mongke Khan ascended the throne. The western part of his empire including Tibet was assigned to his younger brother Khubilai Khan. But it was only in 1260 that Khubilai Khan assumed power of the Mongol Dynastic rule and appointed Phagspa Lama to the position of "State Tutor" and that after his declaration as the Emperor of whole of China in 1271 in Jinzhongdu

---

<sup>7</sup> The translated passage quoted here and passage available in other sources differed in uses of word and so, one has to refer the original text written in Tibetan. See also the translated passage available in Norbu (2001) and Shakabpa (1984).

<sup>8</sup> To read whole document of the 'Open Letter' written by Sakya Pandita to Tibetan Leaders in Tibet, read 'Letter of Sakya Pandit Kunga Gyaltsen to scholars and patrons in U and Tsang' in Dege Edition of "The Sakya's Lineal Descriptions".

(Beijing), the Lama was re-nominated to the position of “Imperial Tutor”.<sup>9</sup> In 1264, after the Khan moved his capital from Shandu in Mongolia to Jinzhongdu (Beijing) he took three initiations from Phagspa Lama for long life prayer for himself as well as his royal family and his court also.<sup>10</sup> After the first initiation it has been mentioned that the Lama earned the authority to rule the thirteen myriarchies (*k’ri khor cu-sum*), while after the second, he was given the authority to rule over three regions of Tibet: U-Tsang, Kham and Amdo, and possibly after the last initiation, he was conferred the title of *tishih* meaning “Imperial Tutor”.

Although, Khubilai Khan had already declared himself as the emperor of China in 1271, it took almost eight years for him to conquer the whole of China which he completed in 1279.<sup>11</sup> Earlier, following the relocation of his capital to Beijing, the Khan started devoting his time to look after the administration of Tibet and in the process he granted permission to Phagspa Lama to proceed to Tibet. The Lama returned to Central Tibet in 1265, though he was given the authority of being supreme leader of the thirteen myriarchies of Tibet to rule in 1264 itself.<sup>12</sup> In 1274, while Lama was on his second visit to Central Tibet, Emperor Khubilai Khan too accompanied him for several months of journey. Following passage describes the event:

When Phagspa prepared to return to Tibet 1274, the Khan decided to accompany him part of the way. Out of fondness for the Lama, he remained with him for many months, until they reached the upper bend of the Manchu (Yellow River) in the

---

<sup>9</sup> The date of conferment of the title *tishih* “Imperial Tutor” to Phagspa Lama differ in the accounts of Communist historians as well as Tibetan sources too. Shakabpa and Shu Zhisheng put the date of 1260 after the enthronement of Khubilai Khan to Mongol Khaghan (Shakabpa, 1984:64 & Shu Zhisheng, 2008:147). But Jiawei and Gyalcian put the date after his declaration as emperor in 1271 (Jiawei & Gyalcian, 1997:24). While the historians Furen & Wenqing (1984) states, that the conferment of title *tishih* was posthumous to Phagspa Lama, “later he was honoured with the posthumous title of “Imperial Tutor of the Yuan Dynasty” (Furen & Wenqing, 1984:62).

<sup>10</sup> See DIIR (1996), *The Mongols and Tibet*, Dharamshala: 14

<sup>11</sup> In 1260, Mongke Khaghan passed away while campaign against Sung China; immediate after that Khubilai Khan declared Khaghan at a *Khuriltai* held at Shangtu. But he was opposed by his relative Arigh Boke, who in turn was declared Khaghan at another *Khuriltai* at Mongol capital Karakoram but later on surrendered to Khubilai in 1264. Yet, he was still not accepted by all Mongols and in part of Transoxiana in Central Asia, Khaidu Khan, a grandson of Ogodei Khaghan declared himself as Khaghan in yet another *Khuriltai* in 1268. Bitter rivalry between the two Khaghans continues for decades and dichotomized the Mongols great warrior unity.

<sup>12</sup> Historians have not given much importance to the first visit of Phagspa Lama to Sakya in 1265. Only in the late last decade of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the first indirectly imposed Mongol authority in Tibet was shown by the western scholars.

Amdo region. A grand farewell party was given there for Phagspa by the members of the Mongolian court (Shakabpa, 1984:69).

According to the Tibetan documents, both the Khans- Godan and Khubilai converted themselves to Buddhism after taking initiation from the Sakya Pandita and Phagspa Lama respectively while placing Sakya Pandita at the highest order.<sup>13</sup> Prince Godan's edict of 1247 reads the following:

From now on Akawun (the leading shaman) and Lhapa-tso (the oracle) may not sit at the head of rows of monks during religious ceremonies. Instead the Supreme Lama (Sakya Pandita) will be seated at the head of rows.<sup>14</sup>

Even Khubilai Khan praised Buddhism and Phagspa Lama in his edict of 1254 in the following manner:

Like the sun, the Buddha Shakyamuni's splendour vanquished the darkness of ignorance and its environs. Like a lion, king of jungle, he vanquished all the demons and non-Buddhists. His characteristics, virtuous deeds and teachings have won the perpetual belief of me and Chabu (queen). Because of this, I became the patron of Buddhism and its monks. Even now, I have faith in the Lord Sakyapa and Master Phagspa.<sup>15</sup>

The above two edicts confirm that a *Chos-Yon* (Patron-Priest) relationship between Mongol rulers and Tibetan clergy firmly existed before the establishment of the Mongol Yuan Dynasty in China in 1271. Moreover, according to Kagyu School records, Tashi Raspa Sherab Senge (1164-1236) [a.k.a. 'Gro-mgon Ti-shri Sangs-rgyas ras-chen] had earlier served as "*Imperial Preceptor*" to Tangut emperors of Xixia kingdom much before the arrival of Sakya Pandita to Godan's court in 1246.<sup>16</sup> As regards Tibet being a province of China, while pre-1997 Chinese historians Furen & Wenqing (1984:60) consider Tibet as a principality of Khubilai Khan beginning from 1251, while taking a strong note from the *Marco Polo Travelogue* which has a mention

---

<sup>13</sup> Howorth (1927) stated that, the mother (queen) Toregene of Guyug and Godan was a Nestorian Christian and became regent for several years before the appointment of Guyug to Khaghan in 1246, when the Ogodei Khaghan passed away in 1241 (Howorth, 1927: 165). Hence, the possibility of summoning of Sakya Pandita on purely religious basis was ruled out by (Wylie, 1977:109). Even the mother of Khubilai Khan (Sorghaghtani) was a Nestorian Christian but it is accepted that his faith in Tibetan Buddhism developed later on (Wylie, 1977: 109).

<sup>14</sup> Cited in Norbu (2001: 49) from Sa-skyi gdun-rabs rin-chen ban-mzod and cited also in DIIR, 1996: 10.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid (2001:50) and also cited in DIIR, 1996:14.

<sup>16</sup> See footnote no. 2; also Sperling, 1987:31-50.

of “the Province of Tibet,” post-1997 historians are of the opinion that “Tubo (Tibet) was one of the 12<sup>th</sup> provinces of China during the Yuan Dynasty” (Jiawei & Gyalcian, 1997:30). Norbu (2001:48) has refuted Tibet as a province of Yuan Dynasty but says even if it was so then it would have been 13<sup>th</sup> province of China, whereas Verhaegen (2002) claimed that “Marco Polo does not mention the country in his writings” (Verhaegen, 2002:08). So, whether Tibet was a province or not during the Yuan Dynasty is a matter to be examined in the context of legal studies of geo-politics. But it is now confirmed that during that period Tibet remained under an ‘*indirect rule*’ of the Mongol Khaghan or Khan without any “*direct political domination*” (Norbu: 2001:48).

Without having any political fall out, the relationship between Tibetans and Mongols dated back to seventy-two years before Chinggis Khan’s successors conquered whole of China in 1279 or sixty-four years before the establishment of the Yuan Dynasty in 1271. And the concept of *Chos-Yon* only strengthened this relationship. Observing the pattern of contacts between the Tibetan clerics and Mongol rulers, Dawa Norbu sums-up the characteristics in the following words:

There was probably a mutuality of interests involved here: the warrior-turned-emperor needed a friendly philosopher guide and the Lama needed a powerful patron. Thus, their relationship, especially at the early formative stages, was characterized by mutual respect and the mutuality of enlightened self-interest on both sides.<sup>17</sup>

It has been discovered that before the appointment of Phagspa Lama as “State Tutor” in 1260, a number of other Tibetan Buddhist schools’ representatives were also patronized by the Mongol royal families (Kapstein, 2006:111). For example, the Drigungpa of Kagyu School by the Mongke’s court; the Phakmodrupa and Yazangpa by the Hulegu’s court; the Taklungpa by Arigh Boke’s court and the Sakya and the Tselpa by the Khubilai’s court. However, it was the Sakya School which got full patronage under the court of Khubilai Khan and of course; Phagspa Lama was instrumental in the formation of the Mongol-Sakyapa alliance. The biggest challenge faced by Sakya School came from Kagyu School’s branches of Karmapa and Drigungpa. In 1256,

---

<sup>17</sup> Norbu, 2001:48.

Karma Pakshi (1204-1283) reached the court of Mongke Khan and participated in the debates along with Chinese Taoists, Nestorian Christians, and perhaps Western Catholics also.<sup>18</sup> But after then, there is no evidence of the existence of Karma Pakshi's relations with Khubilai Khan. At the same time, the Drigungpa had good relations with Hulegu Khan, the Mongol ruler of Persia who had in 1285 rendered military assistance to the former against the Sakyapa.<sup>19</sup> The Sakyapa retaliated by asking Khubilai to send an army in 1287 and put the Drigung monastery to the ground in 1290 with a death toll of about 10,000 people (Wylie, 1977:125).

Excluding the military expeditions of General Doorda Darqan in 1239-40 and of Hulegu's and Khubilai Khan's armies in 1285-90; the whole of Tibet remained out of danger from the direct attack of Mongol armed forces. It has also been observed that from the time of Chinggis Khan's empire expansion in 1207 to the collapse of the Mongol dynasty, a Mongol General was placed as in charge of the conquered territory or country, such as Korea during, 1218-1368 and Burma during, 1271-1368. In some of the other conquered territories in Eurasia and the Middle East, the empire was run by several generations of Mongol dynastic rule; i.e., Batu Dynasty in Russian principalities up to 1480 was run by fifteen generations and Hulegu's Dynasty in Persia until 1526 by six generations. But in the case of Tibet, "it was not a Mongol governor who ruled but a Tibetan official called *Ponchen*" who was exempted from both the military service and the tax liability owing to Tibet being a Buddhist country (Norbu, 2001:51).

The '*Ponchen*', the Great Administrator, who headed the temporal administration of Sakya, was generally nominated or recommended by the *Tishih* "Imperial Tutor", and approved and appointed by the Mongol emperor. In 1264,

---

<sup>18</sup> Prior to the court of Mongke Khan, it was Khubilai Khan who had invited Karma Pakshi and he reached the court in 1255. Khubilai Khan was much impressed by the Lama's experience but the Lama declined to stay at the Khubilai's court. Kapstein (2006) has not mentioned sources of the participation by other religions clergies in the debates but it is confirmed that Karma Pakshi reached the court in 1256. Karma Pakshi's autobiography claims that of an imperial edict on him as well as conversion of royal family to Buddhism by him (Kapstein, 2006:113).

<sup>19</sup> Hulegu, the founder of Il-Khan dynasty in Persia, had already died in 1265 (Wylie, 1977: 130). May be Drigungpa had good relation with Hulegu at those time i.e. in 1260s. Hence, it is more historically indicate that, Khaidu Khan may have provided military supports to Drigungpa from Central Asia (Todhor). See footnote no. 11 also.

Phagspa Lama left for Tibet and reached Sakya in the middle of 1265 along with Chakna Dorjee where the latter was given the title of “Prince of Palen” with golden seal of authority also. This issues of authority of seal “set the precedence of Tibetans receiving the Yuan emperor’s appointment to official posts” (Jiawei & Gyalcian, 1997:25). Wang Jiawei and Nyima Gyalcian observe that Chakna Dorjee “took the charge of Tibetan affairs” in accordance with the emperor’s edict. According to these scholars, it was Chakna Dorjee who first received the emperor’s title and after that the title of “State Tutor” was conferred on Phagspa Lama.

However, the “Prince of Palen”, Chakna Dorjee was ineffective in his administration and that too was cut short by his early death in 1267 at Sakya. It is recorded that although he was appointed as “*Khrim Dag*” Lord of the Law in the three regions (*Chol-kha*), his untimely death led to the appointment of Sakya Sangpo to “*Ponchen*” of Tibet in 1267.<sup>20</sup> In the same year, Phagspa Lama returned back to Beijing and got Sakya Sangpo approved as the “*Ponchen*” through the emperor. It was also in 1267, that with the rebellion by Drigungpa, the Mongol troops led by Ker-ke-ta crushed all resistance and in 1268 conducted the second Mongol census in Tibet.<sup>21</sup> The introduction of a new administrative structure and the division of Tibet into thirteen myriarchies on the basis of census “marks the real beginning of Mongol control over Tibet” (Petech, 1990:346). The “*Ponchen*” administration was run by the twenty successive leaders until one of the myriarchies had overthrown the Sakya School Dynasty in Central Tibet and established the nationalist government in 1350. The thirteen myriarchies, which slightly differ in different lists usually included: Lato South and North, Gurmo, Chumik, Shang and Zhalu in Tsang; Gyama, Drigung, Tselpa, Tangpoche, Phakmodru and Yazang in U; and Yamdrok which was located between of Tsang and U. There is not mention of Amdo and Kham, the traditional provinces of Tibet in the records of ‘*Sa-skyi gdun-rabs rin-chen ban-mzod*’ (The Sakya’s Lineal

---

<sup>20</sup> Cited in Petech (1990:345) from primary Tibetan sources. Wylie (1977) mentioned that “Phyag-na rdo-rje had been appointed as head of Tibet by Khubilai himself” (Wylie, 1977:131). Here, Sakya Sangpo was the same person, who was put in charge of Sakya in 1244, when Sakya Pandita along with the two nephews left for the court of Prince Godan.

<sup>21</sup> The Mongol rulers had conducted four household censuses in Tibet in 1260, 1268, 1287 and 1334.

Descriptions) but Tufan (Tubbat, Amdo) as a separate kingdom has been mentioned in Persian history as well as in the Mongol history.<sup>22</sup>

In early 1269, the new *Phagspa* script was declared as the official script and was widely used in the official documents during Khubilai Khan's reign but it never gained any widespread acceptance. Though in 1268, after the return of Phagspa Lama from Tibet the Khan personally requested him to devise a new script to be employed for both the languages of Mongolian and Chinese. Differing from the Tibetan sources, some historians argue that "partly as a reward for this invention, at the end of 1269 or at the beginning of 1270 Qubilai (Khubilai) granted him the exalted title of Imperial Preceptor (*tishih*)".<sup>23</sup> It is recorded that after being conferred the title of *Tishih*, Phagspa Lama didn't stay for long at the Mongol court and left for western part of China (Lintao in southern Kansu) in early 1271. But, his place at the imperial court was not taken over by any other Lamas. After three years, Phagspa Lama came back to the court but again left for Central Tibet in 1274. It was only in 1276, that Phagspa-Lama was able to reach Tsang (Central Tibet), and he had to stay for at least two years in Southern Amdo (Tufan) due to its war against the Imperial court on the border problems. The Imperial army under the General of Auruyci, the prince of Hsiping escorted Phagspa safely to Sakya. But Phagspa Lama suddenly passed away in 1280 at Sakya, while a civil war erupted among the thirteen myriarchies's leaders (*k'ri dpon*).

One of the attendants (*ne-gnas*) of Phagspa Lama sent a letter of request to Emperor Khubilai Khan to intervene in the civil war among the myriarchies. Khubilai Khan took the matter seriously and dispatched a strong 7,000 Mongol armies with reinforcements from Amdo to Central Tibet. After the accomplishment of stability in Tibet under the leadership of Sang-do, the armies were demobilized in Tibet, with the stationing of 160 men in Sakya and remaining to the border areas. This event was

---

<sup>22</sup> Cited in Petech, 1990:355.

<sup>23</sup> Here, Wylie's (1977:130) assumption is more applicable that from "considering the political realities of that period, it would seem more plausible that Phagspa Lama was rewarded by his sovereign for the successful implementation of the Mongol regency in Tibet".

described by Petech in the following words: “this was the first permanent occupation of Tibet by imperial troops, strategically distributed in the centre of the country and on its borders” (Petech, 1990:348). Earlier, the duties of “Imperial Tutor” were performed by Rinchen Gyaltzen (1238-1279) in the absence of Phagspa Lama. But in 1281, Khubilai Khan summoned Dharmapalaraksita (1268-1287) to his court and formally appointed him as the new *Tishih* in 1282. Since the new tutor was the son of late Chakna Dorjee, he was naturally chosen by the emperor without any further reference. Following the end of the tenure of second “Imperial Tutor”, Khubilai Khan appointed Yeshe Rinchen (1248-1294) as the new *Tishih* in 1286 that too did not belong to the *Khon* family but to the *Sarpa* family.

At the same time, all the *Ponchens* who served during Khubilai Khan’s period were appointed on the basis of recommendations made by the *Tishih*. The first *Ponchen* was Chakna Dorjee (1239-67), who was succeeded by Sakya Sangpo. Sakya successor was Taktsang Kunga Sangpo, who was one of the most efficient *Ponchens* but due to his high-handedness he was dismissed and replaced by Sangtsun. The next noteworthy and effective administrator was Kunga Sangpo, but due to the civil war among *k’ri dpon(s)* he was ‘put to death’ by Mongol leader Sangko in 1281. Till then, all the *Ponchens* had served under the spiritual and temporal leadership of Phagspa Lama. The next three *Ponchens* Jangchub Rinchen, Kunga Shunnu and Shunnu Wangchuk served under the new *Tishih* Dharmapalaraksita. During the tenure of *Ponchen* Shunnu Wangchuk, the codification of the laws in U-Tsang was carried out, apart from a census which was conducted in 1289-90. But Petech states that “the census did not touch Tibet” (Petech, 1990:350). Shunnu Wangchuk was succeeded by *Ponchen* Jangchub Dorjee who in turn was succeeded by *Ponchen* Aglen Dorjee Pal alias Anlen Tashi. It was during the tenure of *Ponchen* Aglen Dorjee Pal that the rivalry among the thirteen myriarchies extended to such a depth that Khubilai Khan had no option but to send Prince Temur Buqa under the command of *Ponchen* to disperse the troops of Tod-hor



(Central Asians) supporting the Drigungpa and Phakmodrupa.<sup>24</sup> Though the Mongol troops Prince Temur Buqa almost wiped out the *K'ri dpon* of Drigungpa, Phakmodrupa and Tselpa, they did not prefer to come back but to remain in Tibet until the establishment of Phakmodrupa Dynasty in 1350.

After the death of Khubilai Khan, Sangpopel (1262-1324) was the first *Tishih* to be appointed from the Khon family after Ratnabhadra, the only son of Dharmapalarakshita. It was the Khon family of Sakya who was about to be wiped-out that Sangpopel, the nephew of Phagspa Lama was reinstated as the new *Tishih* in 1297. Sangpopel, later on came to be known as *Daknyi Chenpo*, had six wives and thirteen sons, who fought among themselves to be his heir. The second son, Kunga Gyaltsen (1299-1327), finally became a *tishih*, who settled the heirs matter by dividing the family into four branches, called “hieratic residences” *Labrang* (Kapstein, 2006:116). This division led to the downfall of the Sakya School Dynasty in 1350 against the Phakmodrupa Dynasty. Before taking over the Sakya School Dynasty by the Phakmodrupa Dynasty, non-Sakyapa Schools had maintained relations with the Mongol rulers. The last Mongol Khaghan, Toghon Temur (1333-1370) gave patronage to the third Karmapa Rangjung Dorjee (1284-1339) but the emperor himself embraced Islam, thus clearing the way for the Ming Dynasty to takeover the Yuan Empire in 1368. The last *tishih* Namgyal Palsangpo also withdrew himself from the court, after the fall of the Yuan Dynasty to take shelter in Sakya monastery but rejoined the Ming capital in 1373.

The year 1350 marked the end of Sakya regime in Tibet, which lost its essence to the Nuedong myriarchy ruler *Tai Situ* Jangchub Gyaltsen (1302-64) of the thirteen myriarchies in U and Tsang. Nuedong has always remained under the unjust and neglected regime of Sakya-Mongol rulers from the Phakmodrupa order of Kagyupa School (Norbu, 2001:118). Prevailing with the existing Tibetan-Mongol relations, in 1354, the last Mongol Khaghan, Toghon Temur conferred the title of “*tai-situ*” and

---

<sup>24</sup> See footnote no. 19 regarding whether it was the Hulegu dynasty or the Khaidu Khan dynasty in (Tod-hor) Central Asia. Some historians have mentioned (Tod-hor) Central Asian military of Hulegu dynasty, which is chronologically not matching.

established the Phakmodrupa Dynasty (1350-1434) to form a new centralized government at Nuedong in Yarlung district.<sup>25</sup> The distinct innovation in the administration of *Tai Situ* Jangchub Gyaltsen was the creation of *dzong*, (forts or district) with the governor as *dzongpon* in place of Mongol introduction of *K'ri Khor*, (myriarch) to *K'ri dpon* as its ruler.

In 1578, with the arrival of the third Dalai Lama in the court of Altan Khan and the revival of *Chos-Yon* (priest-patron) relations between Tibetans and Mongols, the Ming emperors' stopped conferment of title to the Lamas.<sup>26</sup> And thereafter as mentioned in several records "Lamas rarely went to China". During the Ming Dynasty, especially in the first two centuries from 1368 to 1578, it has been observed that the emperors invited all the famous Lamas from Tibet and conferred lavish rewards and titles. This policy of Ming rulers was to "encourage nationalistic fragmentation among Tibetan lamas, and to discourage the restoration of the 'lama-patron' relationship between any one of them and the Mongols" (Wylie, 2003:471). The establishment of Phakmodrupa Dynasty in Nuedong was attributed to its becoming the "actual master of all Tibet, deliberately fostering a feeling of national unity and reviving the traditions and glories of the early kings" (Richardson, 1962:35). Historians, however defer on 'all Tibet'. The Chinese historians just attributed it to one of the thirteen myriarchies rule (*wanhu*) in Tibet and all of them "were reappointed with new patents" by the Ming emperors,<sup>27</sup> while Shakabpa (1985) says, "all of Tibet with the exception of Sakya" (Shakabpa, 1984:81). Norbu (2001) observes that "it included only U-Tsang and probably Ngari", while in the "Kham and Amdo (Do-Kham) regions whose lamas and chieftains carried on tribute-trade relations with the Ming Dynasty" (Norbu, 2001:57).<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> Jiawei & Nyima Gyalcian (1997:42) stated that, "Emperor Shundi sent an official to Tibet, granting Qamqu Gyaincian (Jangchub Gyaltsen) the official position of Education Minister". But no mention of the title of "Tai Situ" is made.

<sup>26</sup> It is recorded that, Ming emperor Shih-tsung (1522-66) had embraced Taoism and degraded and suppressed the Lamas and Buddhism. At the same time, the Tibetan monks had stopped visiting Ming court and consequently the relations between Mongols and Tibetans re-emerged with Altan Khan inviting the Third Dalai Lama to Mongolia.

<sup>27</sup> See Jiawei & Nyima Gyalcian, 1997:35

<sup>28</sup> In this tribute-trade relation; the exchange of tea for horse has been mentioned in large amount of literature. Ming emperors had attempts to control and monopolize the trade but it led to the development of large-scale smuggling enterprises also.

As mentioned above, the Ming Dynasty maintained a policy of conferring titles on every lama, and even on those who had never visited the court. In the case of *Desi* Jamyang Sakya Gyaltzen and *Desi* Dawa Gyaltzen, it has been found that neither of the two went to Nanjing or Beijing to receive the titles but the order was sent to them in the name of “*State Tutor*” in 1372 and 1406 respectively. The titles such as ‘*Ta Pao Fa Wang*’; ‘*Ta Ch’eng Fa Wang*’ and ‘*Ta T’zu Fa Wang*’ were conferred on almost all the high lamas who had visited Ming court regardless of their sect, while the Yuan emperors gave these titles mainly to Sakya lamas and only in the last decade of their rule to the *Tai Situ* Jangchub Gyaltzen (Wylie, 2003:468). The title with the word ‘*Wang*’ meaning king was conferred on around eight dignitaries of not only the Kagyupa ruler but also the Gelugpa master.

During the period of Miwang Drakpa Gyaltzen (1385-1432), the Phakmodrupa regime enjoyed the time of propitious and sectarian harmonies. In his period, two great masters of Tibetan Buddhism were conferred the title of ‘*Wang*’ by the Ming emperor: Fifth Karmapa Deshen Shekpa (1384-1415) in 1407 and Tsongkhapa’s disciple Choeje Shakya Yeshe (1354-1435) in 1418. These two great masters were invited by Emperor Yongle Chengzu. The Chinese historians have attributed it to just the ‘*renewal of appointment*’ made by the Mongol emperors. However, it is to be noted that, in the case of Karmapa, Karma Pakshi had earlier refused Khubilai’s offer of becoming a court lama and was not appointed to any position and was also not the leader of any of the thirteen myriarchies, so, how can it be a ‘*renewal of appointment*’. In the case of Choeje Shakya Yeshe, he was on his first visit to China during the Ming period and was also the first personal disciple of Tsongkhapa Lobsang Drakpa (1357-1419), the founder of Gelugpa. This lineage traced its origin back to the Kadampa tradition, which was yet to appear during the Yuan Dynasty and therefore, the title given during the period of Ming cannot be considered as a renewal. Moreover, no Lama was placed as an “Imperial Tutor” in the Ming court, instead Ming emperors Hung-wu Taizu and Yongle (Zhudi) Chengzu (1360-1424) had appointed court monks, such as Tsung-lo and Yao Kuang-xiao (Dao-yen) to look after religious matters (Sperling, 2003:475).

Although, the Fifth Karmapa's visit to Nanjing from February 1407 to May 1408 was a short one, it was considered to be a significant historical event. The invitation that the Emperor had sent to Karmapa reads as following: "formerly, when I was in the north, having heard of your excellent name, I thought to meet you (just) once", which shows the Emperor's desire to meet him not an order to summon.<sup>29</sup> The Karmapa's arrival at Nanjing can be, described in the following manner:

To welcome him there were greeters with numberless ornaments. And the, at the door of the palace, the Emperor himself came to greet him.<sup>30</sup>

It has been discovered that early Ming policy towards Tibet was not to subjugate or to rule, but to avoid any kind of Tibetan threat. Infact, there was no threat to Ming from Tibet but some of the emperor's close circles had threat perception in the light of "how much hardship the Tibetans had created for the Tang Dynasty" (Sperling, 2003:474). That may have been the reason that although Ming emperors did not even have indirect rule over Tibet as the Mongol emperors had, almost all the court visited or non-visited Tibetan Lamas were given titles. It was also thought that by giving titles the Lamas would not align with the Mongols and hence, would not pose threat to the Ming Dynasty. However, the founder of Gelugpa order of Tibetan Buddhism, Tsongkhapa Lobsang Drakpa (1357-1419) declined the invitation thrice to visit Nanjing personally but on the third time he deputed his disciple Choeje Shakya Yeshe to visit the Ming capital in 1414. Having declined the emperor's invitation, Tsongkhapa name was not 'appeared' or recorded in the official history of the Ming Dynasty (Wylie, 2003:470). Li gives the reason in the following words:

In china not only the emperor could do no wrong, but also his prestige and dignity had to be upheld at any cost. Had the fact been made known to the public that (Yongle) Ch'eng-tsu's repeated invitations extended to Tsongkhapa were declined, the emperor's prestige and dignity would have considered as lowered to a contemptible degree, especially at a time when his policy to show high favours toward lamas was by no means popular and had already caused resentment among

---

<sup>29</sup> The Chinese copy says, "the emperor heard that the Wu-suu-tsang monk, the 'esteemed teacher' Ho-li-ma (lama) was skilled in Buddhism and excellent in illusory transformations, and he wanted to meet him (just) one" (Sperling, 2003:475).

<sup>30</sup> Cited in Kapstein (2006:125) and for details see, dPa'-bo gTsug-lag Phreng-ba (1986) Chos-'byung mKhas pa'i dGa' sTon, Mi-rigs dPe-skrun khang, Vol. 2: 1004

the people. This explains why no mention of Tsongkhapa and the Yellow Sect (Gelug) was made in the Ming shih and Ming shih lu.<sup>31</sup>

But the question arises, why did the Ming emperor invite Tsongkhapa thrice even after he had rejected the first two invitations?<sup>32</sup> It may be noted that the fifth Karmapa had rejected the request to stay at the court and came back to Tibet the very next year which could be one of the reasons, or it was due to the reformist ideas and scholarship of Tsongkhapa that led the Emperor to invite him. In 1402, collaborating with Rendawa Shunnu Lodro (1342-1412), Tsongkhapa undertook revisions of the practice of the monastic code (*vinaya*) and became successful. His scholastic work led to monastic elaboration and with the patronage of Desi Drakpa Gyaltsen of Phakmodrupa, he started the famous festival of Lhasa, *Monlam Chenmo* (Great Prayer) in 1409 to commemorate Buddha's manifestation of miracles. In the very same year i.e. 1409, Tsongkhapa founded the Ganden monastery, from which his Gelug order was born. The order is popularly known as the 'yellow hat' (*shaser*) after the adoption of the yellow ceremonial hat instead of red by the master of Zhalu, Buton Rinchen Drup.

Not only Tsongkhapa, but even his immediate disciples like, Gyaltsab Darma Rinchen (1364-1432)<sup>33</sup>, Khedrup Gelek Palsang (1385-1438) and Gedun Drupa (1391-1474) posthumously the first Dalai Lama became famous for their scholastic works.<sup>34</sup> And the '*den-sa sum*' (the Three Seats of Learning) was established within a short

---

<sup>31</sup> See Li, 1960: 29.

<sup>32</sup> Jiawei & Nyima Gyalcian (1997: 35) it was "due to old age and physical weakness, and also because of efforts being made to build the three major monasteries". Old age may not be the reason, because Tsongkhapa was only 57 year old while in comparison to Sakya Pandita was 64 years old when he went to Prince Godan's court. Even, building of the three major monasteries: Ganden, Drepung and Sera was not a sufficient reasons. Tsongkhapa had already established the Ganden in 1409 before he received the invitation and at the time Karmapa was at the emperor's court. Where in, Drepung was founded by Choeje Tashi Palden in 1416 that is two years after Choeje Shakya Yeshe's arrival in the emperor's court in 1414 and Sera was established after Choeje Shakya Yeshe return from Nanjing and build in 1419 by the 'the Grand State Tutor' Shakya Yeshe himself before Tsongkhapa passed away in the same year.

<sup>33</sup> Shortly before his death in 1419, Tsongkhapa entrusted the abbotship of Ganden monastery to his senior disciple Gyaltsab (Rinpoche) Darma Rinchen and upon his death in 1432, it was succeeded by another immediate disciple Khedrup-je Gelek Palsang till his death in 1438. After that, followed the line of successive 'throne holders of Tsongkhapa' as *Ganden Tri Rinpoche* (Ganden Tripa) who were chosen on their scholastic; down to the present day. So, Gyaltsab Darma Rinchen was the first *Ganden Tri Rinpoche* and the present 102<sup>nd</sup> 'throne holder' presides in Ganden Monastery in Mysore in South India.

<sup>34</sup> It was only in 1415, six years after the introduction of Monlam Chenmo and founding of the Ganden monastery in 1409 that Gedun Drupa met Tsongkhapa at Tsang. At the time Gedun Drupa was only 24 years old but historically he has proven to be the most important and politically significant disciple.

period of time. The establishment of the Ganden monastery by Tsongkhapa himself was followed by the Drepung monastery in 1416 by Jamyang Choeje Tashi Palden and the Sera Monastery by Jamchen Choeje Shakya Yeshe in 1419. Twenty-eight years after the death of Tsongkhapa, Gedun Drupa founded the Tashi Lhunpo monastery in 1447 at Shigatse, which later became the seat of Panchen Lama.

The death of Drakpa Gyaltsen in 1432 marked the end of Phakmodrupa regime in central Tibet, where his nephew Drakpa Jungne's regime was short lived and within a few years in 1435 Dhondup Dorjee Rinpungpa established his own power at Samdruptse (Shigatse), thus began the Rinpung Dynasty (1435-1565). But they did not have a smooth run due to subsequent challenges posed by Tsetan Dorjee and Konchok Rinchen of Depa Tsangpa which led to the establishment of Tsang Dynasty (1565-1642).<sup>35</sup> In his analysis on Tibetan history till that period, Norbu (2001) states that during the absence of a centralized state power and a systematic structure of regime, the period provided an "opportunity for power struggles among the local political" elite and also in search of power and security for their local regime (Norbu, 2001:56). It was during those anarchic periods that there flourished "multiple sects and charismatic lamas". The moral support and legitimation of these monks were badly needed by the lords in their power struggle. These types of social and political conditions were existed during the post-Tsan (842-1247) and post-Sakya (1350-1642) eras.

Just two years before the foundation of the Qing Dynasty (1644-1911) in Beijing, in 1642 with the patronage of the Mongol leader Gushri Khan, the Qosot Chieftain and a follower of Gelugpa order; the Fifth Dalai Lama Lobsang Gyatso (1617-1682) established the *Ganden Phodrang Chokle Namgyal* (the Institution of the Dalai Lama) in Lhasa. The establishment of *Ganden Phodrang* was not a smooth transition of power. Prior to that, as Norbu has mentioned, there was a de-centralized regime in Central Tibet and all the leaders were trying their best to reach the top position with the help from charismatic lamas, though the post-Sakya regimes, Phakmodrupa, Rinpung and Tsangpa were backed by Kagyu School of Karmapa.

---

<sup>35</sup> For the details refer Shakabpa, 1984: 86-90.

As it is evident from the historical record, the Ming emperors during the close end of their Dynasty changed the court religion to Taoism. Emperor Shih-tsung (1522-66) was the first who degraded and suppressed the lamas in particular and Buddhism in general. Consequently, the visit of lamas to Ming court was stopped. The relations of Tibetan lamas with Mongols re-emerged with the Tumed Mongol Altan Khan's invitation to the Third Dalai Lama Sonam Gyatso (1543-1588).<sup>36</sup> *Namgyal*, the personal monastery to all of the Dalai Lamas was founded in 1573 by Sonam Gyatso and it is the still legacy of the Dalai Lama in India. Sonam Gyatso grew up to be a brilliant teacher and his fame spread even to Mongolia. Altan Khan was informed in 1576 by the Mongol chief Khungtaiji that he had heard that in Tibet, the incarnation of *Avalokitesvara* (i.e. Dalai Lama) had appeared and asked, "would it not be appropriate, following the example of Khubilai Khan and the Phagspa Lama to invite this new incarnation to Mongolia?" (Ahmad, 1970:88). Upon hearing that, Altan Khan sent two consecutive embassies to invite the Dalai Lama (Norbu, 2001:67). In 1578, Sonam Gyatso visited the Mongol Altan Khan at his capital near Kokonor. This was a remarkable event in the history of the Gelugpa prevailing among both the Mongols and Tibetans.

The conversion of Altan Khan to Buddhism set in motion a rapid adoption of this religion by most of the Mongols. Although the Mongol rulers of the Yuan dynasty abandoned their ancestral Shamanism and adopted Tibetan Buddhism as the state religion, it remained mainly a court religion and did not spread among the commoners. As a result, the fall of the Yuan dynasty in 1368 saw the reemergence of Shamanism as the chief religion with a trace of Buddhism also. This trend was reversed with the arrival of the Third Dalai Lama in the court of Altan Khan in 1578. Altan Khan's invitation of the Dalai Lama was analogous to Khubilai Khan's invitation of Phagspa Lama which aimed at reviving the *Chos-Yon* (Patron-Priest) relationship. Zehiruddin

---

<sup>36</sup> Chinese historians says that, Altan Khan was offspring of Chinggis Khan the 17<sup>th</sup> generation and was placed himself under the Ming Dynasty. He was granted the official title of Prince Shunyi in 1571 (Jiawei & Nyima Gyalcian, 1997: 44).

Ahmad analyses the revival of relations between Altan Khan and the Dalai Lama in the following comments:

We have said that Altan Khan invited the Third Dalai Lama because he wished to proclaim that he was a second Khubilai Khan. The Third Dalai Lama may, on his part, have accepted the invitation also to recreate the days of Khubilai Khan- but for his own purpose. He wished to recreate, in other words, the relationship which had existed between the Sakyapa Phagspa Lama and Khubilai Khan. This relationship the Sakyapa had used to establish hegemony in Tibet.<sup>37</sup>

It was infact Altan Khan who bestowed on Sonam Gyatso the title<sup>38</sup> of 'Dalai Lama' or Ocean-like Lama (*wisdom as vast as ocean*) and was given a seal with inscription "Dorjee Chang" (*Vajradhara*).<sup>39</sup> This was the beginning of the lineage of Dalai Lamas, although the title was later on conferred on the two predecessors of Sonam Gyatso, who thus came to be known as not the first but the third Dalai Lama. In return, Sonam Gyatso granted Altan Khan the imperial title of "*Chos-kyi rgyal-po lha'i tshangs-pa*" or "King of Dharma, Brahma among the Gods" (Dhondup, 2003a:07). Shakabpa (1984:95) mentioned about (the) prophesy by the Dalai Lama saying that "within eighty years the descendents of the Khan would become the rulers of all Mongolia and China".<sup>40</sup> Under the patronage of Altan Khan *Thegchen Choekhorling* was perhaps the first monastery in Mongolia founded by the third Dalai Lama Sonam Gyatso, who appointed there one representative namely Lama Yonten Gyatso, whose line continued to be the leading monk.<sup>41</sup> On his way back to Central Tibet in 1580 at Lithang he also founded the Lithang Jamchen Choskhor Ling and moved onward to Chamdo. He was again invited by Dhuring Khan (Sengye Dugureng Timur), the son

---

<sup>37</sup> See Ahmad, 1970:95

<sup>38</sup> The Dalai Lama had refuted on the title of "Dalai" (Dalai Lama, 1990: 13). He argued that, the third Dalai Lama's name was Sonam Gyatso; hence, the Mongols had simply translated the Gyatso 'ocean' into their own language as 'Dalai' and retained the Lama, the monk's natural title. However, the official Chinese historians maintained that Altan Khan "bestowed upon him the title of 'Dalai Lama' (Jiawei & Nyima Gyalcian, 1997: 44). And also "The 3<sup>rd</sup> Dalai paid tribute to the Ming imperial court through Altan Khan and requested the Ming offer him an official post"; but no mention has been made of any official post being granted to him. Kapstein also had discussed on the conferment of title (Kapstein, 2006:133).

<sup>39</sup> Cited in Jiawei & Nyima Gyalcian (1997:44) from "The Records of Ming Dynasty Emperor Shengzong, Vol. 191" says that, "the Ming Dynasty court also granted the 3<sup>rd</sup> Dalai Lama the title of Dorjechang, which means 'Holder of the Vajra'".

<sup>40</sup> Here, Norbu (2001:70) emphasized that the "this prophesy became significant later when the Manchus conquered China and became Qing emperors, ruling indeed both China and Mongolia and much else. According to Tibetan belief, Manchus and Mongols were closely related. So, within the span of 80 years from the prophesy date of 1578 in 1644, the Manchus started the Qing Dynasty; 66 years to be exact.

<sup>41</sup> Rockhill (1998:6) and Hoffmann (1979:161) mentioned of *Maidari Hutuhtu* in their sources.



and successor of Altan Khan. He left Chamdo in 1582 and reached Kokonor region in 1583. In honour of Tsongkhapa, the third Dalai Lama founded Kumbum Jampaling at his birth place in 1583 and by 1585 reached the court of Dhuring Khan. In 1588, while on his second return journey to Central Tibet, he passed away and his ashes were taken to Drepung in Lhasa.

Thus, Altan Khan gained legitimacy of his rule over all Mongols, especially because he was recognized by the Tibetan Lama as the reincarnation of Khubilai Khan. The old relationship of patron-priest started by Khubilai Khan and Phagspa was thus revived. For the Dalai Lama, more important than titles was the practical support of a powerful prince. Hence, their new relationship fundamentally altered the balance of power in Tibet itself. The maintenance of the balance of power was required not only in Tibet but the Dalai Lama was also able to put his influence over the Chahar Mongols in order to prevent them from invading Chinese territory on the request of Ming Dynasty.

The two posthumous Dalai Lamas, predecessors to Sonam Gyatso, were Tsongkhapa's immediate disciple Gedun Drupa (1391-1474) who founded the Tashi Lhunpo monastery in 1447 at Shigatse and upon his death, a tulku, Gedun Gyatso (1476-1542), was considered as the second Dalai Lama.<sup>42</sup> However, the title of these two Dalai Lamas was recognized much later when the lineage of the Dalai Lama began. Regarding the first Dalai Lama Gedun Drupa, he was attributed with the founding of Tashi Lhunpo and was considered as the leading scholar among the Gelugpa order. His scholastic and eminent position led to the invitation to assume '*the throne of Tsongkhapa*' at Ganden in 1450 but he declined and completed Tashi Lhunpo Monastery in 1453.<sup>43</sup> His successor Gedun Gyatso came at the peak of the rivalry between Gelug and Kagyu. During his time, '*Monlam Chenmo*' the Great Prayer festival of Tibet was halted for more than eighteen years from 1498 to 1518 due to

---

<sup>42</sup> During the foundation of Tashi Lhunpo Monastery in Shigatse, it was the centre of Karma Kagyu School but built with full support from the Governor, Chongyaspa Hor Paljor Zangpo.

<sup>43</sup> See Richardson, (2003:555); but the author has not mentioned the sources of his information.

political rivalry between Shigatse ruler Rinpungpa and Central Tibet ruler Phakmodrupa. The scene of the political dispute in the words of Tibetan historians from the Gelugpa point of view has been described as follows:

The Rinpungpa, in accord with their own perspective, and with firm and unalterable faith, became the worshipful patrons of the Gyalwang Karmapa and his disciples as well as of the glorious Jonangpa. In this, they do not seem to have excessively unworthy. And on our side, among the Gelukpa, it is hardly the case that there was never much sectarian bias and hatred to be seen. However, at some point the Gelukpa partisans came to hold up their heads with Mongol support from behind and as when a master is shaken up by bad servants, neither the Gandenpa [here, the central Tibetan supporters of the Gelukpa], nor the Tsangpa [who followed the Karmapa] could bear up [to what followed].<sup>44</sup>

But in 1518, with the help of Phakmodrupa ruler in Central Tibet, *Monlam Chenmo* festival was revived by the second Dalai Lama. It is recorded that:

At the Great Prayer Festival of that Tiger Year (1518) about 1,500 monks arrived from Drepung and almost 300 from Sera. At the miraculous Trulnang Temple of Lhasa, the Jokhang, the teaching was thereby promulgated, and pure prayers were performed for the benefit and happiness of beings.<sup>45</sup>

In the same year, Gedun Gyatso founded his personal residence adjacent to Drepung monastery, called “*Ganden Phodrang*”, the Ganden Palace.<sup>46</sup> This palace became the personal residence of the successive Dalai Lamas, but during the Great Fifth Dalai Lama it became the name of the Central Government of the Dalai Lama, as *Ganden Phodrang Chokle Namgyal*: the Institution of the Dalai Lama. Yonton Gyatso (1589-1617) who was born in Mongolia to a Chokhur tribal chief, a descendant of Altan Khan became the fourth Dalai Lama. Yonton Gyatso was the first non-Tibetan Dalai Lama who was brought to Lhasa in 1601 despite his parents’ refusal and his formal enthronement as well as official recognition was accorded. In Drepung, he was under the guidance of a learned scholar of Tashi Lhunpo monastery, Lobsang Choskyi

TH-17629

<sup>44</sup> Cited in Kapstein (2006:128-9) from Rag-ra Ngag- dbang bstan-pa’i rGyal-mtshan (1990), rgyal rabs chos ’byung shel dkar me long mkhas pa’I mgul rgyan, pp. 250-1, in Bod-kyi lo-rgyus deb-ther khag-lnga, Gangs-can rig-mdzod Series 9; Bod-ljongs bod-yig dpe-mying dpe-skrun-khang: Lhasa.

<sup>45</sup> Kapstein, 2006: 130

<sup>46</sup> Lhamo La-tso the sacred lake for the vision of next reincarnation of the Dalai Lama was attributed to the Second Dalai Lama and so, was the establishment of the Choskhor Gyal Monastery near the lake for meditation hermitage in 1511. Since then, every Dalai’s Lama ‘reincarnation vision’ depended on this lake. Historically, all the Dalai Lamas have visited this lake once in their life time, but it was put doubt as some of the Dalai Lamas passed away soon after their visit to the Lake.



Gyaltsen (1570-1662) who later became the '*Panchen*' (Great Scholar) and his reincarnation led to the beginning of the lineage of the Panchen Lamas of Tashi Lhunpo.<sup>47</sup> While the Dalai Lama was in Lhasa, a kind of misunderstanding appeared due to misreading of the 6<sup>th</sup> Shamarpa Rinpoche's message during a meeting between the Dalai Lama and Tsangpa ruler Karma Phuntsok Namgyal and that led to an extended rivalry between Kagyupa and Gelugpa again. In 1617, the death of the fourth Dalai Lama led to an open fight between Tsangpa ruler supporting Kagyu and Gelugpa with the support of Kyishod Depa Sonam Namgyal in Lhasa. With the victories of Depa Tsangpa over Gelugpa and ransacking of their monasteries the monks were given shelter by the Taklung Shabdrung Ngawang Namgyal (1571-1626). Later on, he secured permission from Depa Tsangpa to take back monks to their respective Gelug monasteries. The biggest upset for the Gelugpa monks was that the Tsangpa ruler Karma Tenkyong Wangpo had sternly forbidden the reincarnation of the fourth Dalai Lama by declaring it unlawful in 1618.

But in 1619, Sonam Rabtan *alias* Sonam Choephel, the chief attendant of the late fourth Dalai Lama discovered a child of ages two as an extraordinary one. With the confirmation by the Panchen Lama, the child Lobsang Gyatso became the fifth Dalai Lama. Still the rivalries among the ruling families continued with the moral support from the religious schools and military support from the Mongol Khans. The Mongol leader Gushri Khan visited Lhasa in 1638 on the invitation of Gelugpa order and was enthroned in the name of "*Tenzin Choskyi Gyalpo*" (Religious King and defender of Buddhism). Within a few years, in 1642, Gushri Khan firmly established his rule in whole of Tibet after defeating all the ruling elite in the east and central Tibet. At a ceremonial held in Shigatse, he handed over the spiritual and temporal power to the Dalai Lama and political authority to Desi Sonam Choephel. On reaching back to Lhasa that year itself, the Dalai Lama declared Lhasa to be the capital city and the government to be called as *Ganden Phodrang Chokle Namgyal*, the Institution of Dalai Lama.

---

<sup>47</sup> For details of the Panchen Lama: see Doboorn Tulku (1996).

So, being politically involved on the affairs of Tibetan administration since 13<sup>th</sup> century with the Sakya-Yuan Dynasty period, every Buddhist schools were trying to further their own interests (Tucci, 1988:40). For that, the master allied themselves with the hereditary nobility and also secured military support from the Mongols. In the meantime, the monasteries' power increased with economic stability as well as political entities that formed the Government of 'theocracy' from 1642 onwards.<sup>48</sup> In this 'theocratic' form of government, the Dalai Lama was the supreme leader in spiritual as well as temporal sphere. Excluding the present Dalai Lama, there have been two 'great' Dalai Lamas'- the fifth Dalai Lama Lobsang Gyatso (1617-1682) and the thirteenth Dalai Lama Thupten Gyatso (1875-1933).<sup>49</sup> After the death of the fifth Dalai Lama at the age of 68, Desi Sangay Gyatso ruled the institution for about fifteen years and Tibet again faced the civil war. The Mongols and the Manchus began interfering in the political as well as domestic administration of Tibet beginning from the period of the 6th Dalai Lama to the 13th Dalai Lama.

Excluding the 7<sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama (1706-1758), who regained the temporal power in 1750 after the murder of Desi Pholanay Gurmey Namgyal by Chinese Ambans, all the other Dalai Lamas, 6<sup>th</sup> (1683-1706), 8<sup>th</sup> (1758-1804), 9<sup>th</sup> (1806-1815), 10<sup>th</sup> (1816-1837), 11<sup>th</sup> (1838-1856) and 12<sup>th</sup> (1857-1875) were not able to attain the age of power i.e. 18 or died after a short period of a weak temporal power. Thus, with the system of *Ambanate* introduced by the Qing Emperor Yongzheng in 1727 until 1912 a total of 173 *Ambanate* or his deputy were appointed in Tibet. It is widely believed that during this period these Dalai Lamas were either killed or became powerless due to the strong position of *Ambans* who collaborated with the *Desi* in order to prolong their reign.

---

<sup>48</sup> In the argument of the 'theocracy' form of Government in Tibet, Wylie (2003) has differentiated it from 'hierocracy' form of Government of Sakya, on the basis that, the doctrine of reincarnation of a Lama as kind of 'living Buddha' who is in human form in the case of the Dalai Lama but not of Sakya Lama (Wylie, 2003: 467).

<sup>49</sup> The present Dalai Lama, the 14<sup>th</sup> (Tenzin Gyatso) has been excluded here due to the subject realities and present political situation of the Tibetan, Mongolian and Chinese in general. Of course, the revival of the Tibetan-Mongols relation in the last decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century deserved a special study of the relations.

As far as the role of the Institution of the Dalai Lama in Tibeto-Mongol relations is concerned, it appears that the Institution remained intact but the Dalai Lama became merely a religious figure and so religion played a major role. The structure of the Institution was more or less within the aristocracy and monastery, but underneath the temporal and spiritual head was always the Dalai Lama. The day to day administration and political affairs were run by the Desi with the help of the council of ministers *Kashag*, while the assembly *Tsongdue* that included members from aristocrat families, traders' communities as well as high lamas was merely a functional one. But the assumption of authority in 1895 by the Great Thirteenth to head the institution of the Dalai Lama had changed the scenario in general but he was not able to change political institution from religious schools to save the country from future uncertainty. All these facts we would see in subsequent chapters in order to understand clearly the impact of the Institution of the Dalai Lama on overall relations between Tibetans and Mongols.

## **Chapter Two**

# **Origin and Development of the Institution of the Dalai Lama**

Although in the introductory chapter, origin of the Institution of the Dalai Lama has already been traced besides discussing the Tibeto-Mongol relations prior to the establishment of the Institution; it now needs to be elaborated to get a clear picture of the structure and functioning of the institution. The *Chos-Yon* (Priest-Patron) concept of relations between the Tibetans and Mongols particularly during the Mongol Yuan Dynasty in China gave an impetus to further strengthening of such relations after the Institution of the Dalai Lama came into existence. The year 1642 is a land mark in the history of the Institution of the Dalai Lama as it was in this year that the Fifth Dalai Lama also known as the Great Fifth came to power and started running his government through different administrative machinery. Not only are the various administrative wings of the Institution but also various events that influenced the relations between Tibetans and Mongols until the period of the thirteenth Dalai Lama being discussed in the following paragraphs.

### **The Fifth Dalai Lama and His Regime**

In 1642, the Mongol leader Gushri Khan firmly established his rule in the whole of Tibet after defeating the Beri King Dhonyod Dorjee of Bon<sup>1</sup> in Kham and Tsangpa ruler Karma Tenkyong pro-Karmapa in U-Tsang.<sup>2</sup> Soon after, as mentioned in the previous chapter, he handed over the spiritual and temporal power to the fifth Dalai Lama and the political authority to *Desi* Sonam Choephel in Shigatse. In this context, Shakabpa's (1984:103) description is more relevant when he says:

The Mongol Khan then declared that he conferred on the Dalai Lama supreme authority over all Tibet from Tachienlu in the east up to the Ladakh border in the west. The responsibility for the political administration of Tibet would remain in the hands of Sonam Choephel, who was given the title of *Desi* (sde-srid).

---

<sup>1</sup> See Schwieger, 1999:247-260. It is the only among the research papers detailing fully on the biography of Beri King Don-yod rdo-rje. On his short remarks of the king, Peter Schwieger states: "He was promoter of the Bon religion and enemy of the Buddhists, especially of the dGe-lugs-pa. In 1640 his army was beaten by the army of Gosi Qan (Gushri Khan, 1582-1655). The king was then taken prisoner and executed."

<sup>2</sup> Historians Shakabpa (1984:105) and Dhondup (2003:20) mention that, the 5<sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama had objected to extensive retaliation on the basis of religious schools was disapproved. But his chief attendant *Desi* Sonam Choephel defied the Dalai Lama and brought down the Tsangpa ruler.

On returning to Lhasa that year itself, the Dalai Lama declared Lhasa to be the capital city and the government to be called as *Ganden Phodrang Chokle Namgyal*, the Institution of the Dalai Lama (Dhondup, 2003a:23). In continuation with Phakmodrupa dynasty's political administration of '*dzong and dzongpon*' (governor to district), the fifth Dalai Lama (1618-1683) retained the same political administration. But instead of the *Ponchen*, the Chief Administrator during the Sakya School the political authority was now given to *Desi*, the regent. According to Dhondup "selected intelligent and able ministers to form the first government", but the formation of ministerial administration has not been mentioned in other works (Dhondup, 2003a:24).

The office of *Desi* was one of the main components of the Institution during the Great Fifth,<sup>3</sup> where the Dalai Lama was the supreme ruler, the Khan as the king<sup>4</sup> and the *Desi* as the regent. Being the political and civil administrator, the *Desi* was very effective in administration till it was abolished and replaced by the *Kashag*, the Council of Ministers (*Kalon*) in 1723 by Manchu-Chinese Emperor Kangxi during the time of the seventh Dalai Lama, Kalsang Gyatso. But the regency, from 1757<sup>5</sup> onwards came to be known as *Si-kyong* which replaced *Desi*. While the *Desi* "was head of the civil and political (but not of the military) administration, and exercised the temporal rights which belonged to the Dalai Lama, but could not be wielded personally by him", the *Si-kyong* only exercised "the secular and disciplinary rights of the Dalai Lama during the latter's minority" but he possessed a powerful authority that his decision could not be ignored (Petch, 2003:571).

---

<sup>3</sup> In all the Tibetan works on the Dalai Lamas, the 5<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> were recalled *lnga'-pa chen-po* and *bcu-gsum-pa chen-po*, the Great Fifth and the Great Thirteenth. Among the prominent achievements of the 5<sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama were; the unification of whole of Tibet (Tibetan ethnicity territories) and the building of Potala Palace in 1645 on the site of the palace already built by Songtsen Gampo (618-641) and it took 50 years to complete i.e. in 1695 by *Desi* Sangye Gyatso. Potala Palace became the seat of successive Dalai Lamas and main office of the Institution for more than 300 years.

<sup>4</sup> Norbu, (2001:80) regarded the Khan (king) as the '*Defence Minister*', who preferred to roam around the pastures of Dam, when Tibetans administration at Lhasa was in need of coordination; especially during "when the Dalai Lama was still a minor."

<sup>5</sup> See Petch, 2003:571, for further reading on the role of regency in Tibetan history.



The first *Desi* during the time of the fifth Dalai Lama was Sonam Rabtan *alias* Sonam Choephel, who was the chief attendant of the fourth Dalai Lama. He had successfully discovered the fifth Dalai Lama in 1618 despite the political and religious boundation forbidding the reincarnation of the fifth Dalai Lama by Karma Phuntsok Namgyal, the Tsangpa ruler. It was under his political decision that Gushri Khan came to Tibet and supported the Gelugpa School and went oppressive against the Kagyupa and others schools.<sup>6</sup> He served the regency from 1642 to 1658 for a period of sixteen years. After the death of *Desi* Sonam Choephel, the Dalai Lama himself took the responsibility of state for the next two years and after then he appointed *Desi* Thinley Gyatso (Jaisang Depa) in 1660 in the presence of Gushri Khan's princes but soon he also passed away in 1668.<sup>7</sup> In 1669, the third regent was appointed in the name of Lobsang Thutob but in 1675 he was dismissed from his post due to scandal with a nun of Sakyapa. The fourth next regent Lobsang Jinpa, a steward in the Namgyal Monastery in Potala, was appointed in October, 1675 but in 1679, he too resigned on the ground of religious retreat. The fifth and the last but one of the best regents of Tibet was *Desi* Sangye Gyatso (1652-1705). He was a nephew of the former *Desi* Thinley Gyatso and a close disciple (spiritual son) of the Dalai Lama.<sup>8</sup> He was installed on the post of *Desi* in July 1679 at the age of 27 and his reign lasted till his fate was cut-off by Qosot ruler Lhasang Khan, the last king of Tibet in 1705. Earlier, in his third year of reign when the Dalai Lama passed away in 1682, the *Desi* consoled his death in order to defer from the interference of the Mongols and the Manchus in Tibet's internal matter.

---

<sup>6</sup> Refer to the previous chapter page no. 18 and see also Verhaegen, 2002:63.

<sup>7</sup> The death of Gushri Khan in 1655 made it much easier for the Dalai Lama to choose *Desi* on his own, where both of Gushri's sons were not interested in ruling Tibet in the name of kingship. Later on after five years of Gushri Khan's death at Lhasa in 1660, both of his sons decided to divide the kingdom of Qosot Mongol realm. His princes Tashi Batur went to Kokonor and became the ruler of that region, while Tenzin Dayan Khan became the king of central Tibet.

<sup>8</sup> Quoting from Koros (1834:191), a number of contemporary scholars have argued on whether the *Desi*, Sangye Gyatso was the 'natural' or 'spiritual son' of the fifth Dalai Lama. Koros in his book, A Grammar of the Tibetan Language says that, "he is generally believed, in Tibet, to have been the natural son of" the fifth Dalai Lama. Petech (2003) had not accepted the statement, and further on stated that, "seems to be due to a misunderstanding (spiritual son); no Chinese or Tibetan text, and not even the contemporary accounts of the Italian missionaries, so full of gossip, know anything about it" (Petech, 2003: 580). Sangye Gyatso was born in 1653, at that time 5<sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama was in Beijing since 1651; so chronologically, it was not possible in a two years. See also Kapstein, 2006: 141. But, Hoffmann (1979: 175) states that the 5<sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama "broke his vows of celibacy" on the grounds of Nyingmapa connections.

At this point, the question arises that why did the Mongol Gushri Khan lend his support to the Gelugpa School? It is confirmed that it was not a sudden decision to support because the scholastic knowledge of Gelugpa's monks were well known in Mongols' court which led to the invitation of the third Dalai Lama in 1578 to Altan Khan's court. Moreover, it was the fourth Dalai Lama, who was born in Mongol royal family that had smoothened the relationship between the Gelugpa order and the Mongol warrior. In the words of Kapstein,

Yonten Gyatso's short life marks, in some respect, the coming of age of Mongolian Buddhism. From this time on, Mongol monks and scholars regularly assumed roles of authority among the Tibetan Buddhist leadership, while princes and warlords regarded the maintenance of patronage ties with the clergy as a cornerstone of their rule.<sup>9</sup>

But with the death of the fourth Dalai Lama in 1617, the Tsangpa ruler Karma Phuntsok Namgyal took over the regime of Lhasa and ransacked Gelugpa monasteries. He also forbade the next Dalai Lama's reincarnation (discussed in the previous chapter: 16). As a result, armed monks of Sera and Drepung in alliance with some two thousand Khalkha Mongols, revolted against the Tsangpa ruler. Whatever might have been the outcome of the revolts one thing which is clearly noticed is that in his active policy to give patronage to religious school, the Tsangpa ruler declared the tenth Karmapa Choeying Dorjee (1605-74) as the spiritual leader of all Tibet in 1618, thus establishing the Karma Kagyu as the religious order.

In 1620, even after the death of Karma Phuntsok Namgyal, his son Karma Tenkyong Wangpo retained the hard-line policy against the Gelugpa order. So, the chief attendant of the fourth Dalai Lama Sonam Choephel reached the court of the Mongol leaders for help in 1619 and by 1621 two thousand Mongol troops reached central Tibet and ousted the Tsangpa ruler Karma Tenkyong Wangpo.<sup>10</sup> In 1622, the fifth Dalai Lama was formally welcomed at the Drepung monastery, *Ganden Phodrang* where his formal education began to take place.

---

<sup>9</sup> Kapstein, 2006: 134

<sup>10</sup> Though the Manchus were yet to be enthroned to start the Qing Dynasty, in some of the sources such as Rockhill (1998:7) and Richardson (1962:43) it is mentioned that almost all the leaders from central Tibet had sought support from Manchus but the replies were not in favour from any 'side or sects'.

However, the Tsangpa ruler was again able to regroup and with the assurance of help from Khalkha Mongol leader, Tsoktu Taiji's son, Arslang led 10,000 troops to Tibet in 1635. But Arslang and his troops reached an agreement with the Mongol Gushri Khan and became the followers of Gelugpa. In 1636, Arslang met the fifth Dalai Lama in Lhasa and became his patron as well. In the very next year, before Tsoktu Taiji could launch any major offensive, his forces were defeated in Kokonor by Gushri Khan's forces. So, in 1638 upon his arrival at Lhasa, Gushri Khan was awarded the title of "*Tenzin Choskyi Gyalpo*" (Upholder of Doctrine, King of the Dharma) by the Great Fifth.<sup>11</sup>

In his further expedition against the non-Gelugpa order in 1639, Gushri Khan along with *Desi* Sonam Choephel came face to face with the forces of Beri King Dhonyod Dorjee at Markham battle. After victories in Markham, *Desi* Sonam Choephel turned towards the Tsangpa ruler, Karma Tenkyong Wangpo in 1641. And next year in 1642, the historic reunification of Tibet took place under a single regime after two centuries of internal civil war. Since then the institution of the Dalai Lama became a uniting force for all the Tibetan ethnicities under the leadership of the Great Fifth. Besides, Gushri Khan's appointment to the kingship of Tibet continued even by his successors for the next six decades or so. But one of his descendants who was the last appointed king of Tibet, Lhasang Khan again led Tibet to turmoil in its internal matters in the beginning of the 18<sup>th</sup> century.

What is significant to note here is that the Gelugpa repression against other sects was no more different than that of the previous regime of Kagyu order and others. After their victories, the Gelugpa leaders either forcibly converted or took away the possessions of the rival orders' monasteries. Some of the monasteries had been just been grounded or closed for ever as evident in case of *Jonang* tradition where only one nunnery was allowed to function. The reincarnation lineage of the master of *Jonang* order and famous historian Taranatha (1575-1634) was removed from the Tibetan tradition but his foremost *tulku* reincarnation became the master of Gelugpa in

---

<sup>11</sup> The title was conferred to Gushri Khan by the Gelugpa hierarchy; see also Shakabpa, 1984:01.

Mongolian monastery as Zanabazar (1635-1723). Zanabazar was the first among the eight first Jebtsundampa Khutuktu (Bogdo Gegen) also known as the 'Dalai Lamas of the Mongols' and they were all reincarnations in the Mongol tradition as well. Among all the Khutukhtus, the eighth one, by birth a Tibetan, was most successful in his reign. After his death in 1924, his reincarnation was forbidden by the communist state of Mongolia.<sup>12</sup>

Coming back to the events surrounding the fifth Dalai Lama, historians argue that the Great Fifth had not supported the repressive policy adopted by the regent, Desi Sonam Choephel and his 'defence minister' Gushri Khan particularly in 1640s. Besides, it was after the defeat of Tsangpa ruler Karma Tenkyong Wangpo that the fifth Dalai Lama was formally enthroned to be the supreme leader of the whole of Tibet. Under him the political system was based on the unique system of relationship between the religious and secular branches of the government known as '*Chos-si Nyi-den*'. The monastic monks as well as civilian aristocrat officials were both required and therefore they had to be involved in offices for the proper functioning of *Ganden Phodrang* Government of Tibet. After the Ganden Phodrang, it was the Tashi Lhunpo monastery, which exercised an enormous political power in Tibet from Shigatse. The fifth Dalai Lama's tutor, Lobsang Choskyi Gyaltsen (1567-1662), a distinguished scholar and a Gelugpa monk also rose in prominence during this time and from him the lineage of Panchen Lamas started.<sup>13</sup>

The Dalai Lama's visit to the court of Qing emperor, Shunzhi in 1652-53 in Beijing marked the beginning of a new relationship between Gelugpa and Qing emperors. The Manchus' patronage to the Sakyapa was thus shifted to Gelugpa more on the political ground because the whole of Tibet was under the regime of Gelugpa.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Mongolia was a communist state from 1921 to 1990. Hence, after the death of Jebtsundampa in 1924, the state had forbidden the incarnation, but the 9<sup>th</sup> Jebtsundampa successor was recognised in Tibet and the present incarnation is beloved by his followers.

<sup>13</sup> Lobsang Choskyi Gyaltsen was the tutor of the fourth Dalai Lama also. Being the tutor of the fifth and a distinguished scholar, he was called "Panchen" (a great Pandita), thus, his successive reincarnations were recognised and enthroned at Tashi Lhunpo. The Panchen Lama lineage was thus started but he was not the first Panchen Lama instead fourth in the line. His three predecessors were not the reincarnations

Same old relationship between Mongol and Sakya was also revived with the beginning of *Chos-Yon* (Priest-Patron) relations. Regarding the visit of the fifth Dalai Lama to the Qing court, some historians claim that he “went to pay tribute”<sup>15</sup> but the Dalai Lama’s own ‘memorials’ describe their meeting as being mutual respect for each other:

The Emperor sat on top of a wooden stool, which was on top of the Throne, which was as high as a man’s waist. I sat on a seat, which was a little lower than the Emperor’s Throne and which was situated not far from one whole fathom’s length from the Emperor’s Throne. When tea arrived, although he asked me to drink before he did, I submitted that was not proper, and he granted that we drink at the same time. Such and other showing of respect we did very much.<sup>16</sup>

Rockhill (1998) on the other hand observes that the Dalai Lama “had been treated with all the ceremony which could have been accorded to any independent sovereign, and nothing can be found in Chinese works to indicate that he was looked upon in any other light at this period of China’s relations with Tibet” (Rockhill, 1998:15). And Norbu (2001) goes on to say that all the other visitors had to “kowtow” before the Emperor for an audience but the Dalai Lama had not done so; as his ‘memorials’ noted:

From this spot, when I had covered the distance covered by four arrow-lengths, I dismounted from my horse. The Emperor descended from his Throne and advanced for a distance of ten fathoms (gzu-dom). He seized my hand with his hand. An interpreter was installed, and he (the Emperor) enquired about health.<sup>17</sup>

Verhaegen’s (2002) analysis on the Dalai Lama’s visit to Beijing is that, “the Emperor was hoping that the Dalai Lama’s religious influence would keep the Mongols

---

but a ‘Panchen’. Presently, the 11<sup>th</sup> Panchen Lama is yet to come out to the public due to Chinese Communist Govt. censor on him as he was recognised by the 14<sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama and has simply vanished or is under arrest since 1996. The Chinese Communist Govt. appointed its own 11<sup>th</sup> Panchen Lama. The Panchen Lamas were officially ranked second to the Dalai Lamas, yet it has been observed that there has always been rivalry between the two due to feudalism in the earlier period but later it became political.

<sup>14</sup> The invitation to the Dalai Lama was taken on political basis because; the Emperor knew that all the Tibetans and Mongols obeyed the words of the Lamas. But the Khalkha Mongols were yet to be submitted to the Qing Dynasty. So, Rockhill (1998) quotes the Emperor as saying, “if we do not meet him, after having invited him to come, he may go back (to Tibet) and the consequence will be that the Khalkha will not render their submission” (Rockhill, 1998:12).

<sup>15</sup> Wang Jiawei and Nyima Gyaincain (1997) say “out of his (emperor) far-sighted strategic consideration, Qing Emperor Shunzhi invited the 5<sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama to Beijing. And the latter went to pay tribute” (Jiawei & Nyima Gyaincain, 1997: 47). Question arises here, if emperor had invited the Dalai Lama, then why his visit to Beijing was view as (went to pay) tribute paying. So, if he had not visited, than can it be termed as no tribute relations at all.

<sup>16</sup> Cited in Norbu, 2001: 74 from Ahmad, 1970: 203, 295. .

<sup>17</sup> Cited in Norbu, 2001: 74 from Ahmad, 1970: 176.

away from invading Chinese territory” (Verhaegen, 2002: 66).<sup>18</sup> But, there wasn’t any threat<sup>19</sup> to the Manchu emperor from the Mongols at that time as the latter didn’t have any strategic plan.<sup>20</sup> The Mongol interference in the Tibetan administration turned up only after the death of the fifth Dalai Lama and that too with the initiative of the Qing Emperor Kangxi.<sup>21</sup>

### Political Nexus between Tibetan Regent (*Desi*) and Mongol Chieftains

The Tibetan regent (*Desi*) Sangye Gyatso was able to cover the death of the fifth Dalai Lama for more than fifteen years, though in 1685 he already had discovered a young Dalai Lama under heavy secrecy. The sixth Dalai Lama Tsangyang Gyatso (1683-1706) became “an unusual and unorthodox lama, he was found to be womanizing instead of meditating, writing love poems instead of commentaries on sutra” (Norbu, 2001:68).<sup>22</sup> Though, the Mongols and Tibetans had no complaint against him, as they took it to be a practice of tantric spiritualism. The relationship between *Desi* Sangye Gyatso and the sixth Dalai Lama Tsangyang Gyatso became worse in 1703, after the latter declined to take the final vows from the fifth Panchen Lama Lobsang Yeshe. Though he was the temporal leader, it was mandatory to take final vows of Buddhism to become a religious leader also. Instead he had renounced his novice vows and decided to become a layman. The *Desi* remained dependent, on the Mongol support for effective

---

<sup>18</sup> Even Shakabpa (1984) and Dhondup (2003) view same kind of a policy by the Qing Emperor, regarding invitation for the Dalai Lama (Shakabpa, 1984:114 and Dhondup, 2003a:28).

<sup>19</sup> Historians Shakabpa (1984), Bell (2000) and Snellgrove & Richardson (1962) say that, upon the intervention of Dalai Lama in 1662 the Mongols had stopped raiding Chinese frontier towns (Shakabpa, Bell and Snellgrove & Richardson, 1984, 2000, 1968: 119, 35, 199). Norbu (2001) noted that, “in the early 1670s, the Manchu emperor requested the Dalai Lama, ‘for a loan of Tibetan and Mongol troops’ to suppress a rebellion in China” (Norbu, 2001:70).

<sup>20</sup> Tibetologist Rockhill (1998) emphasises that, “with notwithstanding the advice of his Chinese councillors, who had intimated him that he was the lord paramount, the emperor fully realized that the Dalai Lama was the most powerful ally he could secure in establishing firmly Manchu rule among the Mongols” (Rockhill, 1998:15).

<sup>21</sup> For Lhajang Khan’s reports to the Emperor on *Desi* Sangye Gyatso activities and so on, see Jiawei & Nyima Gyaincain, 1997:53.

<sup>22</sup> See further reading on Tsangyang Gyatso’s poem edited by K. Dhondup, (2003b) “*Songs of the Sixth Dalai Lama*”, LTWA: Dharamshala and Tshangs-dbyangs rgya mtsho & Ngag-dbang lhun grub dar-rgyas (1981) “*Rig ’dzin tshangs dbyangs rgya mtsho’I gsung mgur dang gsang ba’I rnam thar*”, Mirigs dpe-skrun-khang: Beijing. His poems have expressed deep inclinations of his personal life and how he was groomed: here is one example, verse no. 24.

administration due to the Dalai Lama's unusual behaviour, which later turned the relations between the regent and the leader even worse. This finally led to the intervention of the Mongols. Thus, in 1703 Qosot Mongol ruler Lhasang Khan, the last titular kingship of Tibet dating back to Gushri Khan declared the sixth Dalai Lama to be "illegitimate and spurious" and in 1705 brought down the administration of *Desi Sangye Gyatso*.<sup>23</sup>

Tibetan historian Dhondup (2003a) says that it was the wish of the fifth Dalai Lama himself to conceal his death, so that his deception would be able to finish the Potala Palace<sup>24</sup> as well as to prevent the Manchu emperors and the Mongols from interfering in the administration (Dhondup, 2003a:5). Rockhill (1998) states here that the report of the death would have lost the influence of the deceased Lama:

The *Desi Sangye Gyatso*, unwilling to lose during the minority of his successor the great influence attached to the name of the deceased lama among both Chinese and Mongols and which insured in eastern Asiatic affairs, kept the death of Lozang Gyatso secret, and continued to rule in his name, announcing that the Lama had become a recluse (*sgon-chen*) and was living in seclusion in a high closed building in his palace of Potala.<sup>25</sup>

However, Jiawei and Nyima Gyaincain (1997) maintain that it was the policy of the *Desi* to "hide the news from the Qing imperial court solely for the sake of personal position and power" (Jiawei & Nyima Gyaincain, 1997:53). On the other hand, the Qing Emperor pursued the policy to keep the influence of Dalai Lama intact on the Mongols, so that the latter could not destabilize the empire. During the concealed death period of the fifth Dalai Lama, the *Desi* was able to hide the news from Emperor Kangxi when Emperor's Envoy came to Lhasa twice in 1690 and 1695 to ascertain the death of the Dalai Lama. But, the *Desi Sangye Gyatso's* influence on the Mongol rulers in the name

---

If I follow my girlfriend's heart,  
Life's religious wealth will run out;  
But if I adhere to single retreat,  
I will be running against my girl's heart.

<sup>23</sup> Cited in Norbu, 2001: 68 from Petech, 1972:15.

<sup>24</sup> In 1695, the Potala Palace was constructed and in 1696 he announced the death of the fifth Dalai Lama along with the discovery of the sixth Dalai Lama. Later on, he forwarded the news to the Qing Emperor.

<sup>25</sup> Rockhill, 1998: 18. Here, Malik (1984) says, "Sangye Gyatso saved his country from possible foreign intervention" (Malik, 1984:26).

of the Dalai Lama also caused more hindrance in the later part of his regime. Being the head of the institution in the absence of the Dalai Lama, in 1676 he had entered into an alliance with the Dzungar Mongol chieftain Galden (1644-1697).

Meanwhile, the political rivalry between Dzungars in western Mongolia and Khalkha's Tushetu Khan along with the Jebtsundamba Khutuktu in Central Mongolia caused major threat to the border of the Qing Empire. However, it was in 1686 under the name of the fifth Dalai Lama that *Desi* Sangye Gyatso was able to bring a settlement between Dzungars and Khalkhas due to the influence of Lhasa Lama which was brought in after Emperor Kangxi made request in 1684. In the words of Rockhill "in 1686 it was unquestionably through the influence of Lhasa that the Khalkha ended for a while their internal feuds" (Rockhill, 1998:19).

The Dzungar leader Galden's aim to become a chieftain of all the Mongols did not vanish even after his humiliating defeat in 1690 at the battle of Ulang-putang and subsequently a compromise with the Emperor. So, in 1695 the Emperor himself led the expedition against Galden which resulted into the fleeing of Galden and his followers to the west in 1697. At about the same time, the enthronement of the Sixth Dalai Lama in Lhasa also took place during which as the Chinese sources claim, that the Empire was represented by Changkya Khutuktu Lobsang Chosden with rich presents for the Panchen Lama and other Lamas (Rockhill, 1998:23).

After the Dzungars, the trouble period for the *Desi* came from the titular king Lhasang Khan, Qosot Mongol ruler in Kokonor. It is to be noted that although, the sixth Dalai Lama was already enthroned in 1695, the Institution was still functioning under the *Desi*. In 1700, Lhasang Khan assumed the authority in Kokonor and allied with Emperor Kangxi in order to re-enforce his kingship in Tibet more effectively than his immediate predecessor.<sup>26</sup> Lhasang Khan reached Lhasa in 1701 and began to assume power along with the *Desi*, but there wasn't any mutual agreement between them on this issue that led their enmity to turn into an open conflict in 1703 during *Monlam*

---

<sup>26</sup> Lhasang Khan's father, the King Dalai Khan passed away in Tibet.



*Chenmo*, the Great Prayer festival. This enmity also led to the resignation<sup>27</sup> of *Desi* Sangye Gyatso in that very year with the mediation of Jamyang Zhepa after an intense battle between the Khan and the *Desi* at Damshung, a nomadic district to the northwest of Lhasa.<sup>28</sup>

But in 1705, the rivalry between the *Desi* (regent) and the king turned up again due to *Desi's* attempt to poison the king and his minister Sonam Gyalpo Kangchen twice and it was again Jamyang Zhepa who saved them (Shakabpa, 1984:131). In this second rivalry between the two leaders, Lhasang Khan was in no mood to compromise. And it was considered that after capturing the *Desi*, Lhasang Khan handed him over to his Tibetan queen Tsering Tashi who (may have) ordered to behead the *Desi* in 1705.<sup>29</sup>

Lhasang Khan put the institution of the Dalai Lama into backyard and took over the kingship of Tibet under his full command.<sup>30</sup> In 1706, he expelled the sixth Dalai Lama from Lhasa, who was to be taken to Beijing under an order issued by Emperor Kangxi. But while on his way to Beijing he (Tsangyang Gyatso) died in Amdo (Qinghai) near Kokonor, though Chinese and Tibetan official records maintain that he died of illness. Yet it is presumed that he was murdered, because his body was never recovered, probably it was under the order of Emperor Kangxi that “(his) body should be dishonoured”.<sup>31</sup>

The death of the sixth Dalai Lama became a mystery in Tibetan history and it is believed that he escaped his fate to become the teacher of a “*lama from Dakpo*”; while rumours were also circulated that he had finally settled in Mongolia and propagated Buddhism there with his adapted practice of secret tantric cult. This mystery of “Tsangyang Gyatso” story came to be known as the ‘*Secret Biography of the Sixth*

---

<sup>27</sup> *Desi* Sangye Gyatso named his son Ngawang Rinchen to the *Desi* post and retired himself to a place called Gongkar, nearby Lhasa.

<sup>28</sup> Jamyang Zhepa (1648-1721) a native of Amdo was said to be a personal teacher of Lhasang Khan.

<sup>29</sup> The Tibetan queen Tsering Tashi was said to be the once mistresses of the *Desi* Sangye Gyatso so, she might have ordered to kill the *Desi* in order to take revenge from him.

<sup>30</sup> Chinese sources mention he was given the title of *I-fa Gung-shun Han* (Religious & Helping, Submissive Khan); See also Shakabpa, 1984: 132.

<sup>31</sup> See Snellgrove & Richardson, 1968: 208 and Petech, 1972:13.

*Dalai Lama*' (Kapstein, 2006:146).<sup>32</sup> But, after his death, Lhasang Khan brought in place of Dalai Lama his own son, Yeshe Gyatso who was at that time a student of Chakpori Tibetan Medical monastery.<sup>33</sup> The hope of Tibetans remains in the poem written by Tsangyang Gyatso before he was deported to Beijing from Lhasa. The poem, as Dhondup (2003b) quotes, reads the following:

White Crane!  
Lend me your wings.  
I will not fly far;  
From Lithang, I shall return.<sup>34</sup>

It was indeed the sixth Dalai Lama who suffered the most due the political nexus between the *Desi Sangye Gyatso*, the Administrator and Lhasang Khan, the King (Defence Minister) for the power struggle in order to strengthen the Lama's influence in the East Asiatic region. Yeshe Gyatso, the imposed sixth Dalai Lama in place of Tsangyang Gyatso, was neither accepted nor respected by the Tibetans and even by the Mongols. Meanwhile, the news of a Lithang boy born to be the next Dalai Lama also challenged his authority in Tibet. Lhasang Khan though declared that the boy Kalsang Gyatso (1706-1757) was fraud, he dispatched twice his trusted officers to check out the authenticity of the news. Finally in 1716, he was enthroned at Kumbum monastery under the supervision of Qosot Mongols and Manchu guards.<sup>35</sup>

Following the death of Tsangyang Gyatso, Lhasang Khan's mismanagement and interference in the Tibetan administration were not liked particularly by the Dzungar Mongols and even by the Mongols in Kokonor. Tsewang Rabten, the new chieftain of Dzungars decided to take revenge from Lhasang Khan for the death of the sixth Dalai Lama Tsangyang Gyatso and the *Desi Sangye Gyatso*. The Dzungars under the command of Tsering Dhondup penetrated into central Tibet and tried to enthrone the seventh Dalai Lama but it was unsuccessful. In 1717, the Dzungar army again reached

---

<sup>32</sup> This "Tsangyang Gyatso" is believed to be historical individual in Mongolia.

<sup>33</sup> Yeshe Gyatso was said to be the natural son of Lhasang Khan. See also Shakabpa, 1984: 133 and Petech, 1972:13.

<sup>34</sup> See Dhondup, 2003b:113.

<sup>35</sup> Tibetan General, Norbu Ngodup in the second investigating team had alerted the family about safety of family. And from there it was recorded that the eighth Dalai Lama and his family were under the captive of the Qing Empire. Initially the family was under the protection of Dege King.

Lhasa but without the eighth Dalai Lama.<sup>36</sup> Though this time the Dzungars were able to defeat and kill the Qosot chieftain Lhasang Khan,<sup>37</sup> the Dzungars were not able to win the support of the Tibetan masses due to the ransacking of cities upon the failure of their mission to enthrone the seventh Dalai Lama.<sup>38</sup>

Meanwhile, the Dzungars appointed a new *Desi* from the Tibetan aristocracy family called Lhagyal Rabten Tagtsepa, who basically became the puppet of the Dzungars. This political development in central Tibet bitterly led to the fight among and against the Tibetan nobility: one who supported the Dzungars and others who supported the Qosot. Lhasang Khan's supporters Pholanay Sonam Topgyal (1689-1747) and Kanchenay Sonam Gyalpo organized the Tibetan resistance against the Dzungars and were soon able to secure the whole of Tibet except the Dzungar controlled Lhasa and central Tibet (Shakabpa, 1984:138).<sup>39</sup> With the arrival of the troops under the command of Emperor Kangxi's 14<sup>th</sup> son Prince Yinti along with the seventh Dalai Lama in 1720, the Dzungar Møngols abandoned their stronghold in Lhasa for the Manchus to take over the power in Tibet (Kapstein, 2006:148).<sup>40</sup> In the same year, the seventh Dalai Lama was enthroned in Lhasa.<sup>41</sup> Jiawei and Nyima Gyaincain (1997) mention that the seventh

---

<sup>36</sup> The Dzungar plan to enthrone the eighth Dalai Lama at Lhasa was to win the Tibetan supports. But the Dzungar armies were defeated in their attempt to bring the Dalai Lama from the Kumbum monastery against the captive of the Manchu and Qosot troops.

<sup>37</sup> The death of Lhasang Khan in 1717 ends the kingship of Qosot Mongols in Tibet since 1638. The kingship was started by Gushri Khan with obtaining of the title of 'Tenzin Choskyi Gyalpo' from the fifth Dalai Lama in 1638.

<sup>38</sup> The Dzungar expedition had greatly damaged the cultural heritage of Tibet in 1717-20. Though the Dzungars claimed to be Buddhist especially the Gelugpa, they ransacked the Potala Palace and whole of Lhasa and Shigatse cities. Not only that, the Dzungars had brought hostility amongst the different sects by destroying more than 550 monasteries of Nyingmapa and murdered monks also. Hence, Petech (1972) says, "now these strangers from the northeast, more Lamaist than Lamas, imported into Tibet a full-dress religious intolerance and persecution" (Petech, 1972: 53).

<sup>39</sup> Both of them were Governors most probably from the time of Lhasang time. Pholanay was the Governor of Tsang where as Khangchennas was the Governor of Ngari Khor-sum (western Tibet).

<sup>40</sup> In 1718, the Emperor Kangxi had sent an expeditionary force to Tibet against the Dzungars, but that was completely wiped out by the Dzungar armies. So, in the 1720 expedition, the Emperor dispatched and ordered a larger number of army that too under the command of his own son. Chinese sources do not mention the command that was under the Emperor's son or the complete wipe out of its first expedition against the Dzungars (Jiawei & Nyima Gyaincain, 1997:54).

<sup>41</sup> Shakabpa (1984) says that initially Kalsang Gyatso was enthroned as the sixth Dalai Lama by the Chinese edict; which means the official had not accepted Tsangyang Gyatso as the sixth Dalai Lama (Shakabpa, 1984:138). But Richardson (1962) says, Manchus had conceded the Tibetans wishes and later on Kalsang Gyatso was considered the 7<sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama (Richardson, 1962: 49).

Dalai Lama was granted the title of “the Dalai Lama, the Propagator of the Buddhist Doctrine to Awaken the Public” and was given the Grand “Golden Seal” by the Qing Emperor Kangxi in 1720 (Jiawei & Nyima Gyaincain, 1997:54).<sup>42</sup> But, the title of “*Dalai*” Lama was already in use since 1578 by the third Dalai Lama Sonam Gyatso, who was granted this title by the Mongol chieftain Altan Khan during the Ming Dynasty.

In 1721, in the first direct interference in the Tibetan administration by the Qing empires, Emperor Kangxi abolished the *Desi*, the most powerful official position in the Tibetan administration and replaced it with *Kashag* (cabinet) administration of four *Kalons* (ministers). Kanchenay was the first serving *Kalon* among the four *Kalons* with the support of Pholanay. In the same year, Emperor Kangxi also opened a garrison in Lhasa with his representative posted there. This garrison was removed in the very next year in 1722 but the representative stayed there. This representative became famous as the *Ambans* in Manchu language. The *Ambanate* system formally started by Emperor Yongzhen in 1727 that lasted until 1911 during which a total of 173 *Ambanate* or his deputy served in Tibet under various terms. And the Chinese historians say, “the Qing imperial court decided to install two High Commissioners in Lhasa (Jiawei & Nyima Gyaincain, 1997:55).<sup>43</sup>

The struggle for power among Tibetan elites always brought instability in the administration. Often it happened on the ground of religious sects as out of the four *Kalons*, Ngabo Dorjee Gyalpo, Lumpanay and Byaraba were staunch Nyingmapa’s supporters.<sup>44</sup> While Kanchenay was a staunch Gelugpa supporter, Pholanay was secular in nature. In 1728, Pholanay came to be victorious and became chief administrator after defeating the rest of the *Kalons*. This political turmoil again brought the Qing Emperor Yongzhen to send troops to central Tibet, where the *Ambans* supported Pholanay

---

<sup>42</sup> The Grand Golden Seal bears inscriptions written in three languages Tibetan, Han Chinese and Manchurian. It was called the Grand Golden Seal of authority by the Tibetans.

<sup>43</sup> See appendix no. 2. For detail of those *Ambans* and his deputy. The Chinese historians say, “the Qing imperial court decided to install two High Commissioners in Lhasa” (Jiawei & Gyaincain, 1997:55).

<sup>44</sup> For detail see Dhondup, 2003a:77.

Sonam Topgyal.<sup>45</sup> Miwang Pholanay, Sonam Topgyal was one of the most remarkable administrators in the Tibetan history. Dhondup (2003a) mentions that he “ignored the person and the institution of the Dalai Lama out of political necessity” but ruled central Tibet till his last breath in 1747 (Dhondup, 2003a:70). In between, Pholanay sent the Dalai Lama to exile for seven years under the command of Qing Emperor Yongzhen due to the politically motivated reasons specially, the ambitious father of the Dalai Lama, Sonam Dargyal. In 1735, the Dalai Lama returned to central Tibet after spending more than seven years in exile in Lithang and Garthar, a town of Chinese garrison.<sup>46</sup> But Pholanay allowed him to indulge only in religious matter.

With the death of Pholanay in 1747, his son Gyurmed Namgyal succeeded to throne but he was not diplomatic like his father in terms of dealing with the Manchu *Ambans* and their garrison. His dislike to the Manchu presence in Tibet and the interference of *Ambans* in the administration forced him to make alliance with the Dzungar mission in 1748.<sup>47</sup> Though the religious mission of the Dzungars was granted by the emperor himself, it created a great amount of suspicion in Lhasa’s *Ambans*. The tension of civil war was again turning up between the two brothers, Gyurmed Namgyal and Yeshe Tsetan, the governor of Ngari.<sup>48</sup> Gyurmed Namgyal thought that his brother was going to replace him by the help of *Ambans* and so he murdered his brother to keep high his hasty nationalistic aims. He was able to convince the Emperor to reduce the number of troops in Lhasa but was not able to send Gelugpa missionary to the regions of Kokonor which once was a stronghold of Gelugpa. Moreover, his inexperienced and

---

<sup>45</sup> After the victories of Pholanay, the Manchu’s *Ambans* and troops reached (Jiawei & Nyima Gyaincain, 1997:55). The *Ambans* and their troops had put the trial of three rebellion *Kalons* and had executed them as where Pholanay had already spared those *Kalons* under house arrests after the mediation from the seventh Dalai Lama as well as the abbots of the three monasteries in Lhasa. See for further details in Shakabpa, 1984:143.

<sup>46</sup> Kapstein (2006) mentions that the Dalai Lama was accompanied by more than 500 religious, civil and military representatives, who were sent by the Emperor Yongzhen and the Chinese official delegation was led by Changkya Rolpe Dorjee (1717-1786) (Kapstein, 2006:150). Changkya Rolpe Dorjee was the head lama of the Mongour (Tuzu) people in far Eastern Qinghai of the monastery of Gonlung in Xining, Kansu. His predecessor, Changkya Ngawang Chosden (1642-1714) was a close disciple of the fifth Dalai Lama.

<sup>47</sup> Norbu (1985:69) states that, the “Dzungars missions of 1743, 1747/8 and 1750 were essentially religious in nature but were misinterpreted by the sinicized Manchu mandarins in Beijing. See also Dhondup, 2003a:93.

<sup>48</sup> See Shakabpa, 1984: 147 and Dhondup, 2003a: 93 for further reading.

hasty decision to oust the Manchu presence in Lhasa was understood by the *Ambans* Fu Qing and Lhabudain who killed Gyurmed Namgyal in 1750 before the imperial forces could come and intervene.<sup>49</sup>

After the death of Gyurmed Namgyal, the seventh Dalai Lama Kalsang Gyatso took over the administration of Tibet<sup>50</sup> and appointed *Kalon* (Doring) Duke Pandita (1721-92) as his chief administrator.<sup>51</sup> In his major reshuffle of the *Kashag* in 1751 which lasted till 1959, the Dalai Lama invested responsibility on the *Kalons* but kept the major power in secular as well as spiritual field under his decision. The seventh Dalai Lama Kalsang Gyatso passed away after a short period of reign in 1757. After his death at the age of 50, the institution of the Dalai Lama remained just as a namesake for around 140 years until the thirteenth Dalai Lama's reign started in 1895.

### ***Si-kyong* (regency) and the *Amban* Era**

After the death of the seventh Dalai Lama in 1757, a new regent administration came into existence in the Tibetan history known as *Si-kyong*. The *Si-kyong* or *Desi* to be appointed was the sixth Demo Jampel Delek Gyatso (1723-77).<sup>52</sup> The new regency, chosen after the death or minority of every Dalai Lama, was to be only a monk and that too chosen from only within the circle of ecclesiastical but not from the three major monasteries of Gelug i.e. Sera, Drepung and Ganden.<sup>53</sup> The *Si-kyong* exercised the temporal and spiritual rights of the Dalai Lama during the latter's being of minor age or in his absence, which led to serious misuse of powers for vested interests (Shakabpa,

---

<sup>49</sup> Both the *Ambans* were also killed by the Tibetan mobs on the very same day.

<sup>50</sup> Changkya Rolpe Dorjee played intermediary role between the Dalai Lama and Emperor Qianlong and was able to convince emperor to allow the Dalai Lama to assume the leadership in Tibet in 1750.

<sup>51</sup> Duke Pandita had served as a *Kalon* during the Pholanay Sonam Topgyal as well as Gyurmed Namgyal along with Dokhar Tsering Wangyal and Thonpa Sichod Tsetan. Dokhar Tsering Wangyal (1697-1763) was reinducted in the *Kashag* by the seventh Dalai Lama.

<sup>52</sup> A Chinese source mentions of 'Prince' Regent as a new term, which was not available in any earlier historical documents. The other historians have been found using *regent* only (Jiawei & Nyima Gyaincain, 1997:61).

<sup>53</sup> The *Si-kyong* was usually from these three monasteries, namely, Reting, Tengyelinga and Tsomoling; though there are six monasteries in the list. The head of the monastery was normally selected. See also Bell, 1946:184.

1984:153). The trend of this *Si-kyong* administration continued upto 1895 when the thirteenth Dalai Lama assumed leadership, and again from 1933 to 1941 till the present fourteenth Dalai Lama took over temporal and spiritual leadership of the Tibetans.

The eighth Dalai Lama Jampel Gyatso (1758-1804) declined to assume the temporal leadership in 1777 after the death of *Si-kyong* Jampel Delek Gyatso on the ground that he was yet to complete his formal education. So, Tsemoling Ngawang Tsultrim was appointed as *Si-kyong* till 1786.<sup>54</sup> At the same time, the Panchen Lama Palden Yeshe also became a “remarkable character, learning and ability” who in 1774 received the British representative George Bogle at Tashi Lhunpo for trade and diplomatic relations (Richardson, 1962:65). As Emperor’s imperial preceptor Tsemoling was serving *Si-kyong* in Lhasa, the Panchen Lama was invited to Beijing in 1780 by Emperor Qianlong and was given full state honour but in the end of that very year he passed away due to smallpox (Doboom Tulku, 1996:06).

The death of the Panchen Lama gave way to the eighth Dalai Lama to take a bigger role in the administration. So finally in 1781, he assumed the temporal and spiritual leadership of Tibet but till 1786 he was assisted by the *Si-kyong* Tsemoling. One of greatest achievements of the eighth Dalai Lama was completion of the *Norbulingka* Palace (Jewel Park), the Summer Palace which was initially started by the seventh Dalai Lama.<sup>55</sup> The regime of eighth Dalai Lama was more troublesome than expected. Firstly, it was his ineffectiveness in administration that in 1788 and 1791 the war between Tibet-Nepal broke out on the pretext of Tibetans violating trade terms. Tibet lost the war and had to pay an annual tribute to Nepal besides bearing heavy loss and destruction from the Gorkha warriors’ tribes in 1791, who brought their troops upto the city of Shigatse.

---

<sup>54</sup> Tsemoling Ngawang Tsultrim was appointed *Si-kyong* in 1777-1786 and again in 1790-1791. Before that he had been Imperial Preceptor for more than fifteen years. In 1778, he was elected to the throne of Ganden Tripa or the Tri Rinpoche (the head of Gelugpa). In 1786, *Si-kyong* Tsemoling Ngawang Tsultrim returned back to Beijing upon the request from the Emperor for imperial preceptor

<sup>55</sup> Shakabpa says the Palace was started and completed by the Eighth (Shakabpa, 1984: 156). But, the Dalai Lama and Rahul mentioned that the work had been started by the Seventh (Dalai Lama, 1977:58) and (Rahul, 1969a:504).

In 1789, the Emperor appointed Kundeling Tenpai Gonpo as vice *Si-kyong* after the Gorkha's 1788 war but the new *Si-kyong* was recalled back to Beijing in September 1789 due to his favours to the Dalai Lama's brothers. Tsemoling Ngawang Tsultrim again took over the post of *Si-kyong* in January, 1791 but passed away in April, 1791 itself. The sudden death of *Si-kyong* Tsemoling provided opportunity for the Kundeling Tenpai Gonpo to be again re-appointed to the post of *Si-kyong* from September 1791 to 1810.<sup>56</sup>

The eighth Dalai Lama Jampel Gyatso was "very pious and well read in the sacred texts, but too credulous in front of others and without authority and wisdom" (Petch, 2003:574). His lack of confidence and wisdom to take decision again led to the interference of Emperor Qianlong. In 1792, Qianlong brought a decree of '29 Administrative Reforms Provisions' which severely affected the independent governing of the institution of the Dalai Lama right upto 1911 when the down fall of the Qing Empire took place. Out of 29 laws, one was the '*Golden Urn*' a re-introduction of the selection of *Lamas* from a public lottery under state observation in order to avoid the high rate of *tulkus* from noble families (Goldstein, 1989:44). Cited in Kapstein (2006), the Emperor edict reads the following:

For this reason I have had a golden urn cast and sent to Tibet. Whenever a Khubilghan is to be elected, the names of all eligible persons shall be written and placed in the urn. (The person to be appointed) shall be determined by the lot. Although by doing so I cannot entirely eliminate abuses, it seems to be somewhat fairer than by following the former method when one person asserted his will.<sup>57</sup>

An other mandated decree was about the 'equal in rank' among the Dalai and Panchen Lamas and the Ambans. According to this decree, the Dalai Lama was required to report to *Ambans* in order to reach the Emperor. Interestingly, Tibet became a closed border to foreigners. Scholars, however, are reserved in their opinion on this. Shakabpa (1984) says, pressure from the monasteries may have instigated to do away with foreign influence on Buddhism or probably due to the ecclesiastical threat of losing their power (Shakabpa, 1984:173). And Norbu (2001) argues that southern

---

<sup>56</sup> For further details see Petch, 2003:567-583.

<sup>57</sup> See Kapstein, 2006:159.



borders were closed due to the British imperialist annexation of “culturally related states” in Himalayan corridor from Ladakh to eastern Tawang ranges (Norbu, 2001:151).

It was during the *Si-kyong* Kundeling Tenpai Gonpo’s reign that in 1806, the ninth Dalai Lama was born in Kham province. The *Si-kyong* declared the Kham boy Lungtok Gyatso (1806-1815) as the true incarnation and bypassed the ‘Golden Urn’ lottery selection system. Demo Thubten Jigme Gyatso became *Si-kyong* after the death of Kundeling Tenpai Gonpo in 1810. In the very next year in 1811, the second British trade expedition led by Thomas Manning reached Lhasa and met the young ninth Dalai Lama twice (Markham, 1971:285-8).

But the sudden death of the ninth Dalai Lama in 1815 as well as *Si-kyong* in 1819 again put the administration into the backlog. The appointment of new *Si-kyong* Tsemoling Jampel Gyatso in 1819 and his short-sighted compromise with the *Ambans* made the Chinese edicts to proclaim that the tenth Dalai Lama Tsultrim Gyatso (1816-1837) would be the first Dalai Lama to be recognised by the ‘Golden Urn’ lottery method.<sup>58</sup> Initially, the previous *Si-kyong* Demo had already declared that the boy born in Lithang was the true reincarnation leaving the other two candidates.<sup>59</sup> But, the imperial regime rejected this declaration in 1818 and asked to use the lottery method with the help of *Ambans*. Thus, in order to please the Emperor, the *Ambans* were able to convince the *Si-kyong* Tsemoling to compromise and declare the tenth as decided by the ‘Golden Urn’.<sup>60</sup>

In 1837, when the tenth Dalai Lama was about to resume his temporal and spiritual leadership of Tibet, he passed away. The *Si-kyong* Tsemoling along with the

---

<sup>58</sup> Shakabpa (1984) stated that this short-sighted decision of the *Si-kyong* had compromised the Tibetan ‘sovereignty’ and were the Chinese claims of sovereignty on Tibet also (Shakabpa, 1984: 174). See also Petech, 2003:575.

<sup>59</sup> The death of *Si-kyong* Demo from small-pox was under suspicion due to the *Si-kyong*’s unwillingness to compromise with the *Ambans* and to observe the decrees of Emperor Qianlong on the selection of the tenth Dalai Lama. Because he favoured “the immediate and unconditional recognition of the Lithang Boy” as the tenth one (Petech, 2003:575).

<sup>60</sup> See further details in Jiawei & Nyima Gyaincain, 1997:72.

*Amban* Yu-lin were suspected, especially the *Si-kyong* of involvement in Dalai Lama's death (Rockhill, 1998:55). The death of the adult Dalai Lama provided ample time for the *Si-kyong* to extend his authority. In the prolong reign of the *Si-kyong* Tsemoling, the eleventh Dalai Lama Khedrup Gyatso (1838-1856) was born in 1838 in Kham province and his selection was usually considered to have been declared by the 'Golden Urn' but Shakabpa (1985) does not give any details (Shakabpa, 1984:176).<sup>61</sup> The eleventh Dalai Lama's period was marked by the wars against Ladakh/Dogra in 1841 and the third war with Gorkha of Nepal in 1856. Tibet went into treaties with both Ladakh/Dogra as well as the Gorkhas without any interference either from the Manchu Ambans, who were posted at Lhasa or from the imperial troops. Tibetans, however, had to give annual tribute to Nepal since 1856 till 1955 in accordance with the treaty of 1856.<sup>62</sup> After the war between Ladakh and Tibet improved their relations, the *Lochak* and *Chaba* trade missions were started which continued till 1959.<sup>63</sup>

In 1844, after the war against Ladakh/Dogra the *Si-kyong* Tsemoling was removed from his post due to malpractice of power. The post of *Si-kyong* taken over by Reting Tsultrim Gyaltzen in 1845 under the guidance of the Panchen Lama but in 1854, the Panchen Lama passed away. Hence, in the next year (1855) the young Dalai Lama at the age of 17 assumed the temporal and spiritual power but he too passed away in that very year. The same year, the *Si-kyong* Reting also retired but he had to resume the *Si-kyong* post in 1856 again. But in 1862, *Kalon* Wangchuk Gyalpo Shatra removed and deposed *Si-kyong* Reting on the pretext of misuse of power in handling the selection of the twelfth Dalai Lama Thinley Gyatso (1857-1875).<sup>64</sup>

Due to the unusual circumstances what happened next was that in 1862, *Kalon* Wangchuk Gyalpo Shatra himself became the *Si-kyong* who ruled for two years before he passed away in 1864. Then the tutor of the twelfth Dalai Lama Khenrab Wangchuk

---

<sup>61</sup> Mullin says the 12<sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama was the only one, who was selected by the 'Golden Urn' method of lottery, out of two candidates (Mullin, 1985:246). See also Petech, 2003:575.

<sup>62</sup> See details in Shakabpa, 1984:181-02.

<sup>63</sup> See details in Shakabpa, 1984:176-180.

<sup>64</sup> The twelfth Dalai Lama was also selected through the 'Golden Urn' method but Shakabpa (1984) says, "the name of the candidate already selected came up first" (Shakabpa, 1984: 183).

was appointed to the *Si-kyong* post but in 1872 he also passed away after giving an effective regime. In the following year in 1873, the twelfth Dalai Lama assumed the temporal leadership but after two years of his reign he fell sick and passed away. The leadership came to the new *Si-kyong* Kundeling Choskyi Gyaltzen who was appointed in 1875.

The thirteenth Dalai Lama (1876-1933) was discovered in 1876 and was named as Thubten Gyatso by the eighth Panchen Lama Tenpai Wangchuk. His senior most tutor was the *Si-kyong* Kundeling but he passed away in 1886 and Demo Lobsang Thinley was appointed as the *Si-kyong* in the same year to remain till 1895. The enthronement of the thirteenth Dalai Lama took place in 1879 which, the Qing Emperor had not objected despite not using the method of the 'Golden Urn' to select the Dalai Lama. So, one of the two Great Dalai Lamas, Thubten Gyatso formally assumed the temporal and spiritual leadership of Tibet in 1895. After thirty-eight years, in 1934 the *Si-kyong* post was held by Reting Yeshe Gyaltzen following the death of the thirteenth Dalai Lama in 1933. But *Si-kyong* Reting had to retire in 1941 due to his involvement in religious malpractices. The *Si-kyong* Taktra Tenpai Gyaltzen was the last *Si-kyong* in the history of Tibet before the temporal and spiritual leadership of Tibet was taken over by the fourteenth Dalai Lama Tenzin Gyatso (1935) in November 1950.

It is to be pointed out that the *Si-kyong* (regent) was officially appointed or chosen by the *Tsongdu* (assembly) and later on approved by the Qing Emperor. But, majority of them remained to be inefficient. As Rahul is of the opinion that, "the regent never presumed to make any drastic administrative or political change, as they felt that the Dalai Lama alone was competent to make it" (Rahul, 1969b:73). Moreover, during the *Si-kyong* (regency) period, the Qing Emperors and the *Ambans* in Lhasa found it easier to control the *Si-kyong* rather than the Dalai Lama. As regards *Ambans*, their "status changed from consultative to supervisory and finally to commanding officials in Lhasa" (Norbu, 2001:83). The Gelugpa's Rinpoche(s) as the *Si-kyong* ruled Tibet or had been in power of the institution of the Dalai Lama for around 140 years. The regency period is important in the history of the Institution of the Dalai Lama as almost all the

Dalai Lamas were either in a short period of power or died at the minor age. Historians may argue that at least one or two may have been killed by the regent, so that the latter could prolong his power. Or may be with the collaboration of the *Ambans*, the Dalai Lamas may have been poisoned, most probably during their visit to the sacred Lhamo Lhatsoi Lake. The reason may be anything, but the absence of the Dalai Lama to exercise his active power in the whole of nineteenth century adversely affected the Tibetan administration and Tibet which was already divided on region basis, and had not been able to unite under a single administration even at the time of the thirteenth Dalai Lama.

### **The Thirteenth Dalai Lama and His Regime**

The assumption of spiritual and temporal leadership of Tibet in 1895 by the thirteenth Dalai Lama (1876-1933) has been considered as the greatest achievement in the history of Tibet in general and the Institution of Dalai Lama in particular. The institution under his administration brought about much needed reforms which produced positive results and effectiveness in the governance that lasted till 1933.

The Government or the Institution and its policies saw rapid reforms and changes initiated by the Dalai Lama. The reforms initiated by him for the Tibetan society were carried out even at the risk of his own life. Even then he successfully reduced the power of the monasteries and tyranny of the Lamas over the people. He asked the monks to focus more on proper religious practices than interfering in policy matters of the government due to their lack of training in the political affairs. He abolished the tyrannical custom of *Ulag*, which required peasants to provide free transport to all officials during endeavors and fixed the charges to be paid to those supplying horses, mules, and yaks for the use of officials. He abolished capital punishments involving the mutilation of the body except for the crime of treason. He fixed the salaries of the lay ministers of the *Kashag* and senior military officials and put an end to bribery and corruption. But he had to face a revolt from the monks' authorities and monasteries as well as from some aristocrat families. The ninth Panchen Lama and

his monastery's high lamas disliked his reformed policy and considered it as an encroachment upon their privileges.

The emissary of the Dalai Lama Agvan Dorjiev's (1853-1938) three visits to St. Petersburg and Moscow in 1898, 1900 and 1901 opened new relations between the thirteenth Dalai Lama and the Russian Czar. In his mission of 1901, he was received at St. Petersburg by Czar Nicolas II with a letter from the Dalai Lama. His autobiography written in Buryat language about his experience with the Dalai Lama and Tibet says:

I was officially appointed in 1901 as the plenipotentiary of Tibet at the Government of Great Russia by the Tibetan Government and Tibet's Supreme Ruler, the Dalai Lama; I was unable to do much for the sake of the actual national independence of the great Tibetan people.<sup>65</sup>

With the Russian subjects of Kamluks and Buryat Mongols, the period was not unfortunate due to the era of the 'Great Game' between the Russian Czarist and British imperialist expansionist policy on Central Asia.<sup>66</sup> In order to check the Russian influence on Tibet, in 1904 the British military expedition under the command of Colonel Francis Younghusband reached Lhasa and the Dalai Lama had to flee to Mongolia and later on to Beijing in 1908-09.

In 1904, before the Dalai Lama left Lhasa for Urga, the capital of Mongolia, he appointed Ganden Tripa as the acting *Si-kyong* for the time being. Tripa signed the 1904 Treaty with British, which later on named as Lhasa Treaty and he himself became the figure of Tibetan activities due to the reason of Tibet being a 'separate' country.<sup>67</sup> While the Dalai Lama was in Urga, his mission was a success in terms of re-establishment of relations with Czarist Russians but it couldn't bring out any result. Moreover, due to the differences with the Mongolian spiritual leader Jebtsundamba Khutuktu, he had to leave Mongolia in 1907 and finally came down to settle in Kumbum monastery in Amdo. In the Same year the Anglo-Russian treaty on non-

---

<sup>65</sup> Cited in Andreyev, 2003:360.

<sup>66</sup> For detail see Hopkirk, 1995:03.

<sup>67</sup> Norbu quoting from Petech and Ahmad identifies separate country "in a concrete territorial and administrative sense" (Norbu, 2001: 78).

interference in Tibet was signed in St. Petersburg while the Dalai Lama was still in Urga. This treaty had for the first time given a backup to the Chinese claims of sovereignty over Tibet considering the then scenario of the world geopolitics.<sup>68</sup>

Hence, the Dalai Lama's visit to Beijing became much publicized for the Chinese claim of sovereignty on Tibet.<sup>69</sup> It is to be noted that in 1908, when he reached Beijing, he had to wait for the audience with Emperor, as he was asked to do *kowtow* before the Emperor Guangxu.<sup>70</sup> Though he was again asked to attend the funeral of late Emperor Guangxu, he attended only the enthronement of the last Qing Emperor Puyi (1906-67) in 1908. The Dalai Lama during his visit to Beijing hoped that he will be able to review the *Chos-Yon* (Priest-Patron) relationship established by the fifth Dalai Lama (Shakabpa, 1984:221). But it did not yield positive results. On his way back to Lhasa, he spent considerable time at Kumbum monastery, which was built by the third Dalai Lama besides reestablishing the priest and disciple relations started by the former Dalai Lama in those regions.<sup>71</sup> But within two months of his arrival in Lhasa in 1910, the Qing Empire decided to annex Tibet fully under his regime. This was because the British imperialist influence in Tibet posed a danger to the western part of China.

Qing General Zhao Er-feng's<sup>72</sup> military campaign in 1910 forced the Dalai Lama to go on his second exile to India in 1910-1912.<sup>73</sup> While in exile, he came to realize the actual situation of Tibet in the world and particularly in Asia and threat from its immediate neighbours. Thus, his exile period was an excellent experience to know the

---

<sup>68</sup> Van Praag notes that, since then for first time Chinese foreign ministry statements mentioned of Tibet as under the sovereignty of China (Van Praag, 1987:37).

<sup>69</sup> Verhaegen states that the British and Russian officials had advised the Dalai Lama not to visit Beijing and refuse the request from Emperor of China (Verhaegen, 2002: 113).

<sup>70</sup> Bell says that the Dalai Lama bent one knee to the ground while greeting the emperor (Bell, 1998:73).

<sup>71</sup> Dalai Lama says that while the thirteenth Dalai Lama was on his way back to Lhasa in 1909, he had blessed the house where he was born and praised the house of its beauty in the village of Taktser (Dalai Lama, 1977: 72).

<sup>72</sup> Before the death of the Emperor Guangxu under the influence of empress Dowager Cixi, General Zhao Er-feng was named to be the 'Imperial Commissioner' of Tibet, who was expansionist by view and cruel by heart also. His merciless murders in those years from Kham to U-Tsang made him to be called Butcher Zhao in Tibetan sources.

<sup>73</sup> In his second exile to India, the Dalai Lama had appointed Tsomoling Rinpoche as an acting *Si-kyong* but had not given him any authority to take decision. This time, the Dalai Lama had taken his Golden seal along with him also. See also (Rahul, 1969b:24)

contemporary affairs in diplomacy as he realized the importance and need of having foreign relations for Tibet. In early 1913, while he returned back to Tibet after the fall of the Qing Dynasty in 1911 and consequently the deportation of Qing troops from Lhasa, he made the foreign affairs as his prime concern and carried out modern reforms in Tibet.

His proclamation for declaration of Tibet's independence in 1913 continued to be the testimony at least upto 1951 and was considered to be a "legally proven *de facto* independence in international law" (ICJ, 1959:07). The immediate response from the neighbouring country Mongolia was accomplished in the 1913 treaty concluded between Mongolia and Tibet recognizing each other's independence.<sup>74</sup> Thereafter, the 1914 tripartite Shimla conference among Britain, China and Tibet on Sino-Tibetan boundary issue took place. As a result, the commitment to a positive relationship between Tibet and British India became the policy of the government of the thirteenth Dalai Lama who had now a firm commitment to an independent Tibet as well. He initiated reforms in the administration of the government and its policy and also changed the structure of the government by introducing new departments like foreign affairs. But, his death on 17 December 1933 was a tragic loss to the Tibetan people. Before he passed away, he had composed a political testament, which turned out to be an everlasting guidance for the Tibetan people and the government. He warned against the way laid ahead in future in a strict manner, which is as follows:

Unless we now learn how to protect our land, the Dalai Lama and the Panchen Lama, the father and the son, the upholders of the Buddhist faith, the glorious incarnations, all will go under and disappear and leave not a trace behind. The political system inherited from the Three Great Kings (i.e. Songtsen Gampo, Trisong De-tsen, and Tri Ralpachen) will become a matter of mere history. All beings will suffer great hardship and pass their days and nights slowly in a reign of terror.<sup>75</sup>

But Tibetans never took this wise prophetic sermon on time and when it was realized the events had already overtaken the course. So, in a short period of early twentieth

---

<sup>74</sup> Regarding the 1913 Treaty, the details of the treaty and its implications has been discussed in Chapter IV.

<sup>75</sup> Bell, 1998:376.

century, the institution of the Dalai Lama gained sovereignty to rule Tibet, yet circumstances never allowed it to come out of the theocratic system except reforms and modernization which were rightly approached.

### **The Government of the Ganden Phodrang Chokle Namgyal**

In 1642, with help of the Mongol Gushri Khan, the Ganden Phodrang Chokle Namgyal headed by the 5<sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama Lobsang Gyatso (1617-1682) came into existence. The subsequent Dalai Lamas remained the secular and temporal head till 1959 even during the period when they were in exile. The administration was found to be mostly under the *Desil Si-kyong* (regent) and later on from 1757 onwards, the *Kashag* (cabinet) consisted of four *Kalon* (minister) was also introduced, which was represented by the monks. The structure of the government remained under *Dzong* (fort/district) but the government and its policies were bound with the land system, even with the social life. The government, aristocracies, and monasteries owned most of the land and properties, and that they shared the power and responsibilities of administration, till the Chinese army fully took control of the state in 1950s.

The major functionaries and key departments, offices and sections run by the Ganden Phodrang, the Institution of Dalai Lama or the Government of Tibet are outlined as follows:

#### **The Dalai Lama**

Being the spiritual leader of the Tibetan Buddhist communities as a whole and spiritual and temporal leader of the Tibetans in particular, the Dalai Lama is the supreme head of the state and his subject. Since the enthronement of the 5<sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama in 1642 by the Mongol King Gushri Khan, the head of the Ganden Phodrang has always been the successive Dalai Lamas. The 5<sup>th</sup>, 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> have been effective in exercising their power and hence they are called as the Great Dalai Lamas. The 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> Dalai Lamas' administration was long enough but remained ineffective, while the 6<sup>th</sup>, 9<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup>,



11<sup>th</sup>, and 12<sup>th</sup> Dalai Lamas passed away at a very young age or shortly after they took over their reign.

The Dalai Lama is chosen or rather discovered in accordance with ancient traditions and integrity of the religion and that is why he has never been elected. The Dalai Lama is considered as the reincarnation of the *Bodhisattvas Avaloketeshawara (Phagspa Chenrezig)*. Most of the Dalai Lamas have been discovered from the peasant families who took the responsibilities of the government after becoming an adult. The assumption of spiritual and temporal leadership of Tibet at the age 16 on 17 November 1950 by the 14<sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama made him the youngest ever in the history of the institution of Dalai Lamas. His followers also address him with other titles as *Kyabgon Rinpoche, Yeshi Norbu, Kundun, Gyalwa Rinpoche, and Thamche Khenpa* etc.

#### **The *Desi / Si-kyong* (Regent)**

Most of the *Desi / Si-kyong* (regent) in Tibetan history were found to be ineffective in their administration. The *Desi* is referred to an administrator in secular position who had to work under the secular and temporal leadership of the Dalai Lama, whereas the *Si-kyong* stands for the deputed sovereign who was appointed or selected in the absence, or/and during the minority age of the Dalai Lama to look after the administration. The regents were appointed or selected by the mutual agreement of the *Kashag* with the decision taken by the *Tsongdu* (assembly). The *Si-kyong* title was changed from the *Gyaltsab* after a reincarnation of the Dalai Lama was discovered.<sup>76</sup> The spiritual lamas (*Rinpoche*) of Kun8deling, Tengyeling, Tsechokling and Tsomoling known as *Lingshi* (four monasteries) as well as Reting and Detruk monasteries were chosen and appointed to the post of regent.<sup>77</sup> These monasteries were established near by Lhasa and were affiliated to the three monasteries (*densa-sum*) in Tibet, known as Sera, Drepung and Ganden.<sup>78</sup>

---

<sup>76</sup> After the death of the Dalai Lama, the *Si-kyong* or whoever was appointed for post of administrator became *Gyaltsab* till the discovery of the next reincarnated Dalai Lama.

<sup>77</sup> Rahul states that, "no regent was ever chosen from Tsechokling" (Rahul, 1969b: 23).

<sup>78</sup> Detruk, Kundeling and Tengyeling were affiliated to Drepung, while Reting and Tsomoling were affiliated to Sera.

Among all the regents, *Desi Sangye Gyatso* (r.1679-1703) emerged to be a great statesman, scholar and administrator with his secular rule during the 5<sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama's reign. After then it was the rule of *Si-kyong* which came into prominence. Only one *Si-kyong* was layperson out of fifteen *Si-kyong*, who was known as *Si-kyong Wangchuk Gyalpo Shatra* (r.1862-1864). The rest of the *Si-kyong* were chosen among the above-mentioned spiritual heads of the monasteries. *Si-kyong Demo Jigmed Gyatso* (r. 1810-1819) came to be known as a tough regent because he had straight forwardly opposed the Qing Emperor Qianlong's decrees of 'Golden Urn' lottery method to select the ninth and tenth Dalai Lamas.

### ***Choe-kyong Srungma (State Oracle)***

The Oracle of Nechung is considered as the chief state oracle and the government or the Dalai Lama consult him for taking decisions in important matters and also in emergency. Only a monk is to become a state oracle who communicated the view of the deity Choekyong Gyalpo and take action upon his guidance.

### ***Kashag (Cabinet)***

The council of ministers consists of four *Kalons* (ministers) and one of them had to be a monk and it was mandatory. Monk minister was known as *Kalon Lama* and was normally senior in rank at the *Kashag* and other ministers were called as *Shape*. The *Kashag* administrative system was introduced in 1727 and till 1750 all the *Kalons* were layman. But during 1751-1757, the system of one monk and three laymen as *Kalons* was introduced by the seventh Dalai Lama. Yet it has been found that from 1757 to 1894, "there does not seem to have been a monk minister" (Rahul, 1969b:25). In 1894 after the petition from monks official the post of monk *Kalon* was made reserved, which continued till 1959 when at least one monk as *Kalon* represented in *Kashag*.

The *Kalons* didn't hold any portfolio but conducted all the official affairs jointly. They had control over all the administrative affairs such as administration

including political, financial and judiciary matters.<sup>79</sup> The *Kashag* was a subject to the Dalai Lama or the regent in the absence or minority of the Dalai Lama who was responsible in the removal, transfer, or appointment of *Kalons*. The council of four *Kalons* was traditionally called *Chiyikawashi* (Four Outside Pillars) in the Tibetan administration. The 'Black Square Seal' of the *Kashag* presented by the seventh Dalai Lama was never changed or replaced. The *Kalons* were appointed by the Dalai Lama or *Si-kyong / Tsongdue* during the absence or minority of the Dalai Lama from among the eligible list submitted by the *Kashag*. In 1926, the thirteenth Dalai Lama founded the *Silon* (Prime Minister) office and appointed his eldest brother to the post but the office could not run for long and vanished soon.<sup>80</sup> With the appointment of Lobsang Tashi and Dekharwa as joint-*Silon* on 19 December 1950, the *Silon* post in the *Kashag* was reintroduced by the 14<sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama.

The administration of the *Kashag* was run with the help of *Kadrung* (cabinet secretaries) and *Kashag-Shopa* (cabinet clerk) both of them were the lay officials of sixth and seventh ranks. The ranks of the officials were known by their title and the post they had held. The highest rank was held by the *Kalon*, followed by *Dzasa*. Both the lay and monk official could become a *Dzasa* (Mongol word literally means 'chief'). The *Thejis* title was only for the lay officials and then followed by the rank of *Senampas* (sons of the noble). *Khenchen* and *Khenchung* titles were given to the monks of fourth rank and its equivalent *Rimshhi* title was for the lay official. *Letsampas* officials were fifth in rank followed by the *Lejepas* rank meant for the sixth and seventh rank officials of *Kadrung*, *Kashag Shopa*, *Rupons* and *Gyapons*.

### ***Chikhyab Khenpo* (Head of the Monastic Establishment)**

The rank of *Chikhyab Khenpo* was equal to a member of the *Kashag* and was always taken by monk official who served as a link between the Dalai Lama and *Yiktsang* (ecclesiastical office). The direct access to the Dalai Lama brought the

---

<sup>79</sup> The *Kashag* did not have power to decide any political matter without consulting or passed by the Tsongdue (Assembly). So, all the political matters were referred to Tsongdue whenever necessary.

<sup>80</sup> Presently, the Exile Government of the Tibetans in Dharamshala is using *Kalon Tripa* (Chief Cabinet) for the prime minister post.

*Chikhyab Khenpo* to power so much so that he had influence in decision making. He also had to supervise the caretaker of Norbulingka and the two '*Chippon Chemos*' (caretakers of stables) of sixth rank. The office of the *Chikhyab Khenpo* was created during the reign of the eighth Dalai Lama (Rahul, 1969:27).

### ***Yiktsang* (Ecclesiastical Office)**

In the *Yiktsang* there were four *Drungyig Chenmo* (chief monk secretaries) who were officially known as *Khendrung*. They belong to the fourth rank and had great influence in the administration. They looked through the affairs of monasteries, monk officials, and general monk rules and regulations. The above-mentioned four were known as *Nangikawashi* (Four Insider Pillars) who were counterpart to the *Chiyikawashi* (Four Outside Pillars) at the *Kalons*. The senior most among them was called *Ta Lama*, the great lama and their offices were located at Potala, hence, commonly known as *Tse Yiktsang* also.

*Tselobtra* (college) for the training of monks in the government services was conducted by *Yiktsang* and around thirty students passed out every year after studies of three to four years and got the rank of *Tsedrung*. The two *Tshenshung* (registers) of Government official list were divided into *Tsedrung* and *Shodrung*. While *Tsedrung* maintained the monk civil-servant, *Shodrung* maintained lay civil servant. It was introduced (Rahul, 1969:28) during the reign of seventh Dalai Lama.

### ***Tsikhang* (Finance Office)**

The four *Tsepon* (Comptrollers of finance) were of the fourth rank and equivalent to the four *Drungyig Chenmo*. Only lay officials were holding this office and were assisted by the four accountants of the 6<sup>th</sup> rank of lay officials in the title of *Lejepas* and were directly subordinate to the *Kashag*. *Tsikhang* had separate school for the *Tsepon* training and every year, six or seven boys passed for the *Tsepon* post out of twenty to twenty-five students enrolled for training. *Tshenshung* was maintained by both the office of the *Kashag* as well as the *Tsikhang* department, which was the counterpart of the *Tsedrung* of *Yiktsang*. Collaborating with *Drungyig Chenmos* of

*Yiktsang* department, four *Tsepons* conducted the processes of both the *Tsongdu* (assembly) and its drafting. The office of the *Tsikhang* department was established by the eighth Dalai Lama (Rahul, 1969b:29).

### ***Tsongdu* (Assembly)**

The *Tsongdu* of Tibetan assembly was consisted of two chambers lower and greater assembly. The resolution or policy passed by the greater assembly could not go against even by the Dalai Lama. The *Tsongdu Duepa* (lower assembly) and *Tsongdu Drimbul Gyezom* (greater assembly) were simply called *Tsongdu* in general term. Excluding the ranks of *Kalons* and *Chikhyab Khenpo*, all the other ranks of above mentioned five were allowed to attend the *Tsongdu*. In the procedure of the *Gyezom* (greater) assembly, except the *Kalons* and *Chikhyab Khenpo* all the monk and lay officers, the abbots of Sera, Drepung and Ganden used to participate. Besides, the nine *Thumis* (representatives) of these three monasteries as well as the representatives of soldiers, traders, artisans, and boatmen were allowed to participate. But usually, the monk officials spoke more than the lay officials (Rahul, 1969:32). Collaborating with *Drungyig Chenmos* of *Yiktsang* department, the *Tsepons* conducted the process of both the *Tsongdu* (assembly) and drafted resolutions to submit for approval to the *Kashag* and then to the Dalai Lama for their implementation.

The appointment of the *Si-kyong* (Regent) and the matters related to the foreign policy as well as relations with neighbouring countries were subjects often discussed in the assembly. The degradation of the (Regent) *Si-kyong* Tengyeling in 1895 and the abortion of *Tengyeling* monastery in 1912 took place by the resolution of assembly.

### ***Chigyal Lhenkhang* (Foreign Office)**

After the conclusion of Tibeto-Nepalese Treaty of 1856, the *Gorship Lekhung* (Office for Gorkha Affairs) was added to the *Kashag* with official of fourth rank of *Khenchung* and *Rimshhi* as incharge of this office. This very office was upgraded to the *Chigyal Lhenkhang* in 1913 after the Dalai Lama's two consecutive exiles period of around nine years in Mongolia and China as well as British India from 1904 to 1912.

The department came into existence after the establishment of the government in 1913 due to the importance of foreign relations considered by the Dalai Lama during his exile. Apart from already existing representatives' offices of the Ambans, and the Gorkha Nepalese; later on the representatives' office of the British India was also opened but no representative office from Mongolia, Bhutan, Sikkim and Russia were opened.<sup>81</sup>

Parkhang Gyaltsen Phuntsok and Kheme Shappe were the first to assume the office of foreign relations but from 1914 onwards, the Dalai Lama himself had taken charge of the office for around twelve years. In 1927, *Drungyig Chenmo* Gedun Choedar along with Phunkhang Tashi Dorjee assumed the charge upto 1932 and 1938 respectively. The *Si-kyong* Taktra Rinpoche had reestablished the foreign office in 1942 and the first diplomatic mission went to China and British India in 1946.

### ***Dzod (Treasury)***

The treasuries of Tibet were accumulated from direct taxes, collected in cereals and animal products and taxation on the traders. Monasteries and monks were exempted from paying taxes to the government but they owned a large amount of properties through taxes paid by the people. Tax-paying was quite small while the rate of taxation was high. The treasury offices were divided into three sections under the finance office in the following:

The *Labrang Dzod*:- The main treasury of the government was located in the Tsuklagkhang. Three *Chagzopa* (treasurer) of a *Shodrung* and two *Tsedrung* of fourth rank were the caretakers. The wealth was received in kind largely in gold from mines in Kham and Ngari and precious stones were also kept there. Loss of revenue in districts was remitted from the *Labrang Dzod* and advanced loans were provided to those who could pay the double substantial revenue. The finance section of *Labrang Dzod* was established by the seventh Dalai Lama.

---

<sup>81</sup> In Shaumian, there is a mention of the establishment of Russian Consulate in Kandin (Datsxinlu) in 1904 under Buddu Rabdanov but it was dissolved in that very year due to the military expedition of Colonel Francis Younghusband at Lhasa as well as the arrival of the Dalai Lama at Uрга (Shaumian, 2000:38-45).

The *Thede Chagzo*:- The Private treasury of the Dalai Lama in Potala palace was under the care of three *Chagzopa* (treasurer) of a *Shodrung* and two *Tsedrung* of fourth rank. A certain portion of Ngari mine's gold reached directly to the treasury, besides donations from pilgrims. Some of the expenses of the Dalai Lama were drawn through this treasury which had been given special consideration among other treasuries.

The *Namse Gangzo*:- The reserve treasury of the Government and its wealth was meant only for national emergency. It always remained in surplus and its works were initiated in the presence of the members of the *Kashag* and the *Chikhyab Khenpo*. Only silver from the treasury was given as loans, that too on double sureties. Besides, there were also the treasury of *Phokkhang* (Army treasury) and respective monastery's treasuries.

### ***Mipon* (Judiciary)**

The judiciary was commonly known as *Mipon* which acted as magistrates. This post was held by two officers of fifth rank, *Shodrung* of *Tsikhang* office. These officers handled the common people's cases of normal types but case of monk; jurisdiction lied under *Yiktsang* handled by four *Drungyig Chenmos* (chief monk secretaries) of fourth rank. The conviction according to the crime of seriousness included expulsion to remote areas or amputation of leg or hand, taking out the eyes, and making him/ her to sit in public street to disgrace. The official court of the *Mipon* was known as *Nangtseshar* and it remained suspended for three weeks during the *Monlam Chenmo* (the Great Prayer) and law of civil administration would be taken over by *Dobdob* (monk police) of Drepung monastery till the prayer.<sup>82</sup>

### ***Dzongpon* (District Head)**

Whole of the Tibetan regions were covered under *dzongpon* administration and each *dzong* had its own *dzongpon*, with the officer belonging to the rank of fourth or

---

<sup>82</sup> Since 1959 the Tibetan Govt.-in-Exile has changed the word *Mipon* to *Khrimshib* for the term judiciary.

fifth. Shigatse *dzongpon* always held the (highest) post of fourth rank in terms of land portion. Most of the *dzong* were run under two *dzongpon* in the rank of *Shodrung* or *Tsedrung*. *Dzongpon* held the post for three years and had full authority in the administration of the district in judiciary, tax collection, and maintaining the law and order.

### ***Maga Rukhak (Military Organization)***

The military organization was the poorest in all the sectors of Tibet, although during the time of the thirteenth Dalai Lama establishment of new unit and military upgradation was sanctioned but could not match to the modern period. The factor may be the strong opposition from the ecclesiastical side as well as lack of fund. Whatsoever, the thirteenth Dalai Lama introduced the modern military unit and the first Commander-in-Chief (*Magchi*) was conferred to Tsarong from 1913 to 1925. *Magchi* post continued till 1933. During Tsarong time, he improved the military organization and also equipments and training system. It followed the pattern of British and trained by Japanese Yajima Yasujiro, ex-soldier of Russo-Japanese war of 1904-5 (Rahul, 1969b:70).

The regiments which existed permanently during the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries included, the *Drapchi Maga* which was stationed near Shigatse, Gyantse, Dingri, Nyarong and Chamdo. The *Drapchi Maga* was the only regular regiment of Tibet. Besides, the occasional regiment like *Yulmaga* and *Chogye Dukchu* regiments were in existence but never gone through any military training.<sup>83</sup> Both of these were dissolved after the reorganisation of the army in 1913. *Kusung Maga* (security guard) regiment was the only regiment stationed at Lhasa and the other regular regiment like *Drapchi Maga* was posted outside Lhasa. Before the introduction of the *Magchi* in 1913, the previous military head was called *Chikhyab Dapon* (Chief of Arrow Officers) who ranked fourth in the Government official. The seventh Dalai Lama reorganised military based on six *Chikhyab Dapon* at different locations with five hundred soldiers to one

---

<sup>83</sup> Chogye Dukchu regiment was in name only but in case of emergency it became a levy and those who were between the ages of eighteen to sixty had to serve for the national cause.



*Dapon*. These *Dapon* were posted outside Lhasa and took part in the civil administration also. The *Phokkhang* (army treasury) was situated in Lhasa with the officials called *Phokpon* from the rank of fourth but, it was usually under the monk and one lay officer. The military personal were paid twice in a year, that too by the visit of *Phokpon* himself but the other necessary arrangements were met by the local administrators.

To sum up, with the establishment of the Institution of the Dalai Lama, which was named as *Ganden Phodrang Chokle Namgyal* in 1642 by the fifth Dalai Lama, Tibet witnessed the beginning of a new reign in its history. Since then the Dalai Lama has been both the spiritual and temporal head of the Tibetans. But the administration of the institution and its policies were fully based on religious and political considerations and so, it was intermingled with both the ongoing politics as well as the role played by the monasteries. In short the politico-religious character of the Institution has been rooted in a feudal theocracy. The ruling elite mostly belonging to the patrician families permanently based in Lhasa and nearby, was found to be running the administration with the monastic officials who were thought to be secular and peace loving but in reality they were just the opposite. It is almost clear from the historical sources that there were hardly any common people who made their contribution to the origin and development of the institution. Gradually, this very foundation of the institution came to the ground when the crisis struck on the national sovereignty, which caused dearly to the people as well as the nation. Thus, the structure of the government and its policies were in such scenario that the centuries old tradition had to be changed in order to reach the modern stage.

In the early twentieth century the governance and policies of the institution seems to have implemented new methods to bring Tibet to the modern period, such as the initiatives taken by the Great Thirteenth. He issued a political testament to set right the institution's backwardness and to keep observing the coming danger to Tibetan political scenario in order to safeguard the religion and the nation. But it was already late when the danger was realized. The institution remained handicapped for almost two

centuries due to intervention by the *Ambans* and *Mongols* during the periods from the seventh to thirteenth Dalai Lamas. The Dalai Lama, the spiritual and temporal leader of Tibetan Buddhism was coined into *tulku* (incarnation) tradition, while other schools followed the hereditary or nominative system to choose their own spiritual leaders. The 13<sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama's reign was indeed significant in terms of his foresightedness about the future of not only the Institution but also Tibet as a nation. That is why he, as part of his reform policy, changed the structure of the government by introducing new departments, such as foreign affairs. This proclamation of 1913 declaring Tibet as an independent nation was considered to be a "legally proven de facto independence in international law". It is more so because a treaty concluded between Mongolia and Tibet in the same year further confirms the independent existence of the two "sovereign" nations. Overall, in a short period of early twentieth century, the Institution of the Dalai Lama was found to have gained sovereignty to rule Tibet.

## **Chapter Third**

# **Buddhist Factor in Tibeto-Mongol Relations**

The arrival of Buddhism in Tibet dates back to the 4<sup>th</sup> century AD (367 AD) during the reign of the 28<sup>th</sup> Tibetan King Lhatho Thori Nyantsan and the credit goes mainly to the Buddhist missionaries from *Liyul* (Khotan).<sup>1</sup> But the proper assimilation among the kingdom as well as common people started only after the 33<sup>rd</sup> Tibetan King Songtsen Gampo's marriage to the princess of Nepal and China in 640 AD and 641 AD respectively. Both the princesses re-introduced the doctrine of Buddhism in Tibet as they were staunch believers of this religion which is evidenced by the fact that brought along with them the statue of the Buddha. But in the case of Mongolia, it is difficult to accurately ascertain the exact date of the emergence of Buddhism there.

It has been generally assumed that Buddhism travelled along the trade route from India to China and then to Mongolia through Chinese Turkestan and Dunhang. The evidence of Buddhism in Mongolia appears to have been found in the 6<sup>th</sup> century AD, at the start of the Turkic period. According to the Mongolian Buddhist tradition, the Mongols came into contact with Buddhism within three different periods.<sup>2</sup> The first contact took place in the 1<sup>st</sup> century AD through the Turkish and Uighurs of Central Asia (Nyamdavaa, 2002:22). The second spread of Buddhism came into being during the times of the Great Mongolian State and Chinggis Khan's successors.<sup>3</sup> In 1247, another phase of Mongolian Buddhism began when Godan Khan invited Sakya Pandita of the Sakya order of Tibetan Buddhism to his court.<sup>4</sup> During the Yuan dynasty, the relations between Phagspa Lama and Khubilai Khan gave a further boost to the spread

---

<sup>1</sup> In the Tibetan history texts, *Liyul* is often used as Khotan; the ancient cultural centre in Central Asia, presently located in Xianjiang Uighurs Autonomous Region of the People's Republic of China. It is also called the East Turkestan.

<sup>2</sup> Historical evidence shows that, it was the Qocho Uighurs who had first invented a new script for writing Mongolian and provided administrative help for the growing empire. And also the Uighurs were the first who translated the Uighurs' Buddhist texts into Mongolian.

<sup>3</sup> Tangut Empire of Xixia had already been engaged with Tibetan Buddhists before Chinggis Khan annexed the Tangut Empire during 1206-1211. It is generally believed that since 11<sup>th</sup> century onwards the Tibetan Buddhists were engaged in translating Buddhist texts from Tibetan into Tangut and the *Tselpa* and *Barom* Kagyupa(s) monks held prominent official and state tutor positions also.

<sup>4</sup> The first appreciation of Buddhism by Godan Khan came when he ordered the reconstruction of Kadampa monasteries, Radreng and Gyal Lha khang in Central Tibet after these were plundered by troops under General Doorda Darkhan; which Wylie (1977:105) says, was the first Mongol contact with Central Tibet. Subsequently, Godan Khan summoned Sakya Pandita, after General Doorda Darkhan recommended him by describing the following: "the Kadampa are the best regarding the monastic institution; the Taklungpa are the most skilled in worldly human affairs; in splendor, the Drigungpa are the greatest; but as for Dharma, Sakya Pandita is the most learned of them all."

of Buddhism among the Mongols but not to the extent to include the broader Mongolian population.<sup>5</sup> The final phase of the spread of Buddhism among the Mongols started with the visit of the third Dalai Lama Sonam Gyatso in 1578. But, except the last phase, all other Tibetan Buddhist monks in the court of Mongolian Khans remained more as political representatives than as religious figures (Hyer, 1981:03). And here it may be pointed out that Peterson and Walhof (2002) while commenting on religion says that “creating, redefining, and standardizing religion has long been a political strategy linked to the making of national identities and the exercise of colonial power” (Peterson & Walhof, 2002:01).

As for the Mongols, it has been fallen into Western Oirat (Oriyat), Northern Khalkha, Southern Ordes-Tumed-Chahar and Eastern Manchurian (Jurchen) federations. The Western Mongols were known collectively as the Oirat and consisted of a confederacy of four tribes, several of which were to play an important role in future Tibetan history. These four tribes were the Oriyat (later known as the Kalmyk), the Choros (later known as the Dzungar), the Dorbot, and the Qoshot. The Eastern Manchurian victories over Chinese and other Mongols resulted in establishing the Qing Dynasty. But it was among the Southern Mongol tribes, (Ordes-Tumed-Chahar) that the Tumed Mongols played major roles in the events that subsequently unfolded in Tibet. The Tumed Mongols gradually extended their domain into Ningxia, Kansu and northeastern Amdo (Qinghai), where the local Tibetan overlords were involved in squabbles among themselves. This extended regions included people such as Tibetans, Chinese Muslims and Mongols. In this extended regions of Mongols particularly in Amdo, the great reformer of Tibetan Buddhism Tsongkhapa Lobsang Drakpa (1353-1419) was born, who later founded the Gelugpa School following the tradition of Atisha, Kadampa lineage. The scholars among the direct disciples of Tsongkhapa later on turned to be the foremost propagater of Gelugpa thought, the Dalai Lamas.

---

<sup>5</sup> It was not only Phagspa Lama who had reached the court of Khubilai Khan. In 1255, the Second Karmapa, Karma Pakshi (1206-1283) visited the court but despite Khubilai Khan's request he declined to stay and instead went to the court of Mongke Khan at Karakorum to participate in a debate in 1256. Although two leading Lamas of Tibetan Buddhism were in the Mongol court during the reign of Khubilai Khan, Buddhism still remained the state religion.

The landmark event in the Mongols' conversion to Tibetan Buddhism took place in the 16<sup>th</sup> century AD, when Altan Khan invited the third Dalai Lama Sonam Gyatso to Mongolia. This visit of the third Dalai Lama in 1578 led to the mass conversion of the Tumed and other Mongols.<sup>6</sup> The period marked the beginning of a golden era in Mongolian Buddhism. After then, Buddhism became a prevalent religion in Mongolia, penetrating almost every sphere of Mongolian life. By the end of 17<sup>th</sup> century, with the two-fold support from the Mongol nobles and the Tibetan Lamas, the Mongols were completely converted to Buddhism. According to Lattimore (1988), "like the Great Chinggis, Altan Khan wished to avoid the adoption of Chinese culture because it would not unify his marginal state but assimilate and subordinate it to China, Lamaism (Tibetan Buddhism) was just what he needed" (Lattimore, 1988:85). As Mongolian Buddhism is the same as Tibetan Buddhism, the Buddhist sects of this latter form are found today in Mongolia as well. It was throughout the Buddhist history of the Mongols that the foremost ceremonial language in almost all Mongolian monasteries has been Tibetan. All the religious terminology and texts are based on Tibetan language and the same language are recited during the ceremonies.

In both the Mongol and Tibetan societies, the monastery was the heart of ancient educational institutions. The monasticism was encouraged on large scale among both the Tibetans and Mongols and that too especially after the establishment of the institution of the Dalai Lama. Tibetan Buddhism remained the main religion and the most important cultural links between Tibetans and Mongols, though after the 1921 revolution relations between the two sides came to a halt for more than seven decades. Though Buddhism as the basis for Pan-Asianism was advocated by the Chinese Buddhists in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, the Chinese, even the Buddhists, "typically looked

---

<sup>6</sup> Even, the Ming Emperor Yongle Chengzu (the Prince of Yan) who was by birth a Mongol had received the fifth Karmapa Deshen Shekpa (1384-1415) at the Imperial court in 1407. He had expressed his wishes to re-introduce the *Chos Yon* (Priest-Patron) relationship of the Sakya-Yuan period but Karmapa turned down to do that and left the court in the very next year (Sperling, 1980:284). After then, the Emperor invited Tsongkhapa who sent his disciple Jamchen Choeje Shakya Yeshe twice in 1409 and 1414. But he too came back without the establishment of *Chos Yon* relationship which the Emperor wished to do.

down on Tibetan Buddhism as a corrupt religion, not even deserving of the name of Buddhism” (Tuttle, 2005:69).

### **Contribution of Tibetan Buddhists and Monasteries**

What has been revealed upto 1578 is that the Mongols had not been able to fully embrace to Buddhism despite the visits of Sakya Pandita in 1247-1251; Phagspa Lama in 1247-1280 and the second and third Karmapas during the Yuan Dynasty. These had been limited impact of Buddhism and the influence was confined only to the imperial court. Although the successive *Tishi* “Imperial Tutor” had been appointed from the Sakya School, there was no trace of the establishment of a monastic institution in the Mongol land by the master. However, the spiritual leaders of all the respective schools had been able to found their institutions in Tibet during the same time.

The visit of the third Dalai Lama Sonam Gyatso to the court of Altan Khan in 1578 changed the whole scenario of embracement of Mongols into Tibetan Buddhism. In 1586, on his second visit to Mongolia under by the pratonage of Abadai Khan of Khalkha Mongols, the third Dalai Lama established the first Buddhist monastery, Erdene Zuu and appointed one Tibetan monk Lama Yonten Gyatso as its representative (Verhaegen, 2002:53).<sup>7</sup> Withing ten years, the third Dalai Lama’s religious activities in and around Kokonor region had firmly rooted the seeds of Tibetan Buddhism among the Mongols. This gradual conversion of the warrior Mongols into peaceful ones was unfailingly attributed to the teaching of Tibetan Lamas (Lattimore, 1988:97). Stein has aslo mentioned Mongolians as having some kind of religious links with Karmapa (Stein, 1972:81). Since the Dalai Lama mediated on border dispute between Mongols and Chinese in 1585 due to his political capabilities, the Ming Emperor invited him to visit China in 1586. But he declined to do so because he assumed that he was purely to further the relations between Mongols and Tibetans through the message of his Gelugpa School’s doctrine of Buddhism.

---

<sup>7</sup> The mention of Lobsang Sangpo as representative of the third Dalai Lama is also found in other works.

The incarnation of the fourth Dalai Lama Yonten Gyatso as a Mongol prince (greatgrandson of Altan Khan) further helped strengthen the religious activities initiated by the third Dalai Lama. His rebirth as a Mongolian not only made the cultural bond more effective but also removed the doubts of Tibetanisation of Mongols besides dependence on the religious master. However, after he declined to accept the Ming emperor's invitation to visit Nanjing and bless a Buddhist in 1615, the Emperor imposed the condition that the Dalai Lama's representative in Urga should be reincarnated only in Tibet (Hoffmann, 1979:174).<sup>8</sup> The post of abbotship of Drepung monastery and an honorary abbotship of Tashi Lhundup monastery in 1607 was the first and the highest position held by any Mongolian (the fourth Dalai Lama) in the Tibetan Buddhist history. But the political and religious rivalry among the ruling elites of Tsangpa and Phakmodrupa led to the threat to the safety of the fourth Dalai Lama. And this very political condition may have caused his demise in 1617 at a tender age of twenty-eight, which proved to be a major setback to the very foundation of close religious links between the Tibetans and Mongolians. After him, the fifth Dalai Lama and the thirteenth Dalai Lama were the only major Tibetan Buddhist masters to be acknowledged in terms of contribution to the development of Tibeto-Mongol relations.

Qoshot ruler Gushri Khan's support to the Gelugpa in the internal war among the Buddhist schools further took the religious ties between the Tibetans and the Mongols to a new height. In 1638, Gushri Khan was coronated with the title of "Religious King, the Buddhist Faith Holder". Within a short period of time, almost whole of Mongols embraced the fifth Dalai Lama as their supreme spiritual leader and conferred on him the authority of united Tibet.<sup>9</sup> The reestablishment of the *Chos-Yon* (priest-patron) relations between the Tibetan Buddhist Lamas and Mongols was more dynamic this time in the sense that the faith in the doctrine of Buddha had been firmly

---

<sup>8</sup> The representative appointed by the third came to be known as Maidari Khutuktu. The reincarnation was born in 1592 as a Mongol prince and came to Lhasa along with the fourth Dalai Lama in 1600. But in 1604, he was sent back to Mongolia to represent the Dalai Lama's institution which he served till 1635. The successive reincarnation of this Khutuktu spread and entrenched Buddhism throughout Mongolia.

<sup>9</sup> The details of the Fifth Dalai Lama and Gushri Khan's unification of Tibet and their political relations have already been discussed in Chapter two.



rooted by the time. Though the Qosot ruler had been staying in Tibet since 1638, the Dalai Lama could visit the Mongol region only in 1651.

On his way to Beijing, the fifth Dalai Lama spent two years of his time in the Mongol region and Mount Wu tai. For the details of his travel to China, one has to read his autobiography, through which we come to know that the Dalai Lama had spent only two months in Beijing.<sup>10</sup> Hence, rest of the time of around one year; he had been involved in teachings at Mount Wu Tai and Mongolia. Though the Mongols had high reverence towards the fifth Dalai Lama, the Qoshot Lhasang Khan dethroned the sixth Dalai Lama. Yet it was the same Mongols, Dzungar and others who disapproved the deposition of the Dalai Lama by Lhasang Khan and brought the war against him in order to install the seventh Dalai Lama to his position. The attempts, though, were unsuccessful; there had been adverse affect on the relations between the Tibetans and the Mongols since then. Their relations were revived only in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. The fondness of the Dalai Lama was at such a level the legend has it, the sixth Dalai Lama was believed to be still alive in the Mongol regions where he was actively promoting the Buddhist doctrine and building monasteries (Norbu & Turnbull, 1969:291).

Yeshe Gyatso was another reputed Buddhist master who was an ethnic Mongol.<sup>11</sup> Although he was revered by the Kokonor region's Mongols as the sixth Dalai Lama, the Tibetans and other Mongols did not pay respect to him. Initially, the Manchu emperor delayed his approval but in 1710 after Lhasang Khan agreed to pay a regular tribute on behalf of Tibet, the Emperor accepted (Richarshon, 1962:48). Yeshe Gyatso himself was a *tultu* (reincarnated) monk and at that time he was studying in the Chakpori Medical *Dratsang* (college) but his enthronement to the post of the Dalai Lama was never recorded in the official list of Tibetan history. Within a short period of

---

<sup>10</sup> The autobiography of the fifth Dalai Lama as *Ngag dbang blo bzang rgya mtsho'i rnam thar* is available only in Tibetan. Originally it was published in 1681 but the latest issue came in 1989 after it was published from Bod ljong Mi dmangs dpe skrun khang, Lhasa.

<sup>11</sup> Yeshe Gyatso was replaced as the sixth Dalai Lama Tsangyan Gyatso by Lhasang Khan where the sources mentioned of, he was natural son of Lhasang Khan.

his being the religious head, he simply vanished in 1717 after being deposed by the Dzungars. Some records, however, reveal that he spent his time afterwards in the imperial court at Beijing. Infact, Yeshi Gyatso as the sixth Dalai Lama became the second Mongolian after the fourth Dalai Lama to hold the highest post in the Tibetan history, though he was not considered to be the same officially.

Although Central Tibet was going through reconciliation and Buddhist missions were in upgradation after the enthronement of Kalsang Gyatso, the revolts in eastern Kokonor by Mongols and Monguor (Tuzu) had halted the process of peaceful reconciliations.<sup>12</sup> Later on, Emperor Yongzheng rebuilt the monastery of Gonlung in eastern Kokonor after the seventh Dalai Lama's intervention, where the Mongols revolted to form a separate state soon after the death of emperor Kangxi in 1723. Gonlung monastery was one of the key centres of learning apart from Kumbum Jampaling in Kokonor where renowned Lamas like Changkya Khutuktu and Chuzang Nominhan were actively engaged in the promotion of Buddhism. Gonlung monastery was also the headquarters of the Changkya Khutuktu lineage and among the Changkya reincarnations Changkya Rolpe Dorje was the famous lineage (Kapsten, 2006:150). His appointment to the post of imperial preceptor during the Youngzheng period proved to be the most successful particularly in the pacification of warrior Mongols by converting them into peace loving ones. Actually, he was dependent on the seventh Dalai Lama's moral support to represent himself as a Buddhist master and had even actively toured the Mongol regions due to the absence of the Dalai Lama, who was politically inactive because of Pholanay hegemony in central Tibet.

After the third Dalai Lama, the most significant development in the Tibeto-Mongol relations was the visit of the thirteenth Dalai Lama to Mongolia in early twentieth century. His visit was not the intentional but circumstances led him to travel

---

<sup>12</sup> The Mongour were ethnically of Mongol descent but culturally remained Tibetan who were subjects of China. They were remnants of Yuan dynasty Mongols stationed in Qinghai and Kansu who had largely adopted Tibetan culture over the centuries (Tuttle, 2005:76). For details see, Louis Schram, "*The Monguors of the Kansu-Tibetan Frontier*, I, II, & III in vol. 44 (1954); vol. 47 (1957) & vol. 51 (1961), transactions of the American Philosophical Society.

to Mongolia following Colonel Younghusband's military expedition of Lhasa in 1904. However, his visit to Urga was severely opposed by both the Manchu emperor as well as the living Buddha of Mongols, Jebtsundamba Khutukhtu. So far as the Qing Dynasty was concerned, the officials anticipated that this may lead to the mass gathering of Mongols which could subsequently pave the way for the pan-Mongolian patriotism. Moreover, an encouragement from the Buryat Mongols to the pan-Buddhist concept generated a strong feeling of devotion common Mongols among the common Mongols who planned to give official reception to the Dalai Lama at Ulan Ude. Meanwhile, the visit of the thirteenth to Urga had flocked every Mongol for the Dalai Lama's blessings which dramatically reduced the Jebtsundamba Khutukhtu's treasure. As a result, Jebtsundamba opposed the Dalai Lama's longer stay in the Mongol capital. His strong displeasure to the Dalai Lama was solely based on his income, which got reduced due to the Mongols' reverence to the Dalai Lama and not to him. The Khutukhtu's displeasure provided ample excuse for the Manchus to oppose the Dalai Lama's stay at Urga. So, it was a major setback to the concept of pan-Mongolism which was especially favoured by the Buryat Mongol Agvan Dorjieff.

The Dalai Lama left Urga in 1906 and toured the regions of Kansu and eastern Qinghai in the Tibetans, Mongols and Mongour regions for more than two years. His stay at these regions reestablished the Tibeto-Mongol relations which had begun with the third Dalai Lama. The Dalai Lama visited the monasteries of Kumbum, Labrang Tashikyil and Gonlung also. It was in the eastern Amdo, near the lake Kokonor, at the monastery of Kumbum that the Dalai Lama was invited by the Manchu Emperor to visit Beijing. This was his second visit to foreign country but diplomatically he was not received as the fifth Dalai Lama was received by the second Manchu emperor. Though, he was able to meet and review ties with Mongols of Russian subjects more precisely.

Apart from the existence of the Gelukpa order in Mongol regions, of other Tibetan Buddhist schools too started coming up since the thirteenth century. In particular for the Sakyapa, it is widely written that the Sakyapa Lamas' intellect had captured the eyes of the Mongol rulers and leading scholars of the time such as Sakya

Pandita and his lineage's Phagspa Lama were assigned to serve as the 'Imperial Preceptor' during the Mongol Yuan Dynasty. However, it was not only the Sakyapa masters, who were quite active in the Mongol courts, but even the Kagyu Lamas were found to be active there, especially the Karma Kagyu sect master Karmapa who occupied leading position. During the reign of the Mongol ruler Mongke Khan, the second Karmapa Choskyi Lama (Karma Pakshi, 1204-1283) visited his court in 1251. Though the trace of any archaeological remains is not there, it is written that the Mongke Khan had constructed five-storied Stupa (Lkhadin-sum) at Karakorum. The sources mention Karmapa as being the state tutor who was conferred with the title of 'Karma Bagsh' (Karma Pakshi), Karma the master with a ceremonial 'black hat'.<sup>13</sup> The Great Khan of Mongols, Khubilai met Karma Pakshi and offered him the state tutor post but he declined which later on paved the way for Phagspa Lama (1235-1280) to become his preceptor.

The successive Karmapas had paid religious pilgrimages to the Mongol courts, which demonstrate that the pre-1578 Mongols were followers of the Karmapa though Sakyapa Lamas held the state preceptor position during the peak of the Mongol rule. After the second, the third Karmapa Rangjung Dorjee (1284-1339) stayed in the Mongol court in 1331. And his successor, the fourth Karmapa Rolpai Dorjee (1340-1383) became the personal tutor of the last Mongol ruler Tugon Temur Khan. After then, the prevalence of Kagyu sect was visible in Mongol regions. But the main cause for the decline of Kagyu can be traced to the Kagyu followers' support to the joint force of Khalkha Prince Tsogt Khun Taij (1580-1636) and Chahar prince Ligdan Khan against the expansionist policy of Manchus in the 17<sup>th</sup> century. However, the persecution of Kagyu sect by the Manchu officials in Mongolia led to the decline of Kagyupa, and emergence of Gelugpa since 1578 onwards.

Today the Mongols of Sukhbaatar aimag (Khuuchid khoshuu) keep the tradition of Mongolian Karma Kagyu lineage. It is believed that Ondor Gegeen Zanabazar

---

<sup>13</sup> The origin of the 'black hat' (Xa-nag) differs in some of the sources of the Tibetan texts. For details see Roerich (1976) and Lhalungpa (1985).

revived the Karmapa tradition by creating separate aimags but could not last long. In the late 17<sup>th</sup> century, the personal disciple of the fourth Jebtsundamba Khutukhtu, Karma Ngawang Sangchod himself came to central Tibet to study in Sera and Tsurphu monasteries and then revived the Kagyu sect in his regions. The revival of Karma Kagyu was supported by the successive Jebtsundamba lineage but this historical trend was not recorded and the available sources tell more of a legend. Yet, the Khuuchid Khoshuu who retained the lineage of the Karmapa is said to have kept shifting his centres in Inner and Outer Mongolia. During 1932-45, the Kagyu followers migrated to Shiliin gol in Inner Mongolia and established the Baruun khuuchid khoshuu monastery but in 1945 they moved back again to Outer Mongolia. Later on, the communist government in Mongolia merged the Yurt monastery of Baruun khuuchid khoshuu from Khambiin khiid to Gandantegchenlin. Though the monastery was integrated, only the descent of the direct lineage was made be holder of Mongolian Karma Kagyu tradition.

The Tibetan Buddhist monasteries in and around Beijing listed fifty-three with forty-two of them receiving regular imperial support (Naquin, 2000:585). Naquin (2000:69) further states that, “these Tibetan Buddhist temples enjoyed a condition of special dependency [and] they were usually both founded and funded by the throne” in order to keep intact the support received from the Mongols and Mongour to the dynasty. There can be two reasons, as to why and how Tibetan Buddhists were able to become imperial court’s special consideration: firstly, the Mongols themselves wanted to remain separate from the identity of Tibetan Buddhist culture so that they might not get lost in Chinese culture. Secondly, it was because of what English Buddhist Blofeld observed that “the Lamas understood the precise purposes and meanings of their ritual practices and could explain them. This was contrasted with the ignorance of most Chinese Buddhist monks. The attraction of its religious practices (Tibetan Buddhist) to the combination of practice grounded in a knowledge of the supporting theory”.<sup>14</sup> Yet, in the histories of the both countries Tibet and Mongolia, the monasteries have never been

---

<sup>14</sup> Cited in Kapstein, 2005:79 from John Blofeld (1939) “Lamaism and Its Influence on Chinese Buddhism” in Tien Hsia Monthly (September). This English Buddhist in the 20<sup>th</sup> century was in China, who and observed the state of Buddhism in China and noted down his experiences in the above mentioned article.

formally part of the system of state administration. Despite this, they wielded enormous power and governed in their own right a large part of the land. Many lamas regularly exercised public functions and enjoyed extensive privileges and rights of a political nature (Wangyal, 1975:82). This exercise of power on the part of the monasteries was neither beneficial to the Tibetan as well as Mongol state nor useful to the promotion and practice of their religious life.

### **Mongol Monastic Institutions and Buddhist Masters**

Presently, the data shows that the Mongol population are scattered- in Mongolia (90%), Kalmykia (58%), Tuva (65%), Buryatia (25%), Inner Mongolia (20%) as well as in the Chinese provinces of Kansu and Sinkiang [or Xinjiang] (Barkmann, 1997:69). In 1990s, they all projected Buddhism as their common identity and initiated the process of strong urge to the revival of their traditional religion. It is in this context that an attempt has been made here to trace the traditional monastic institutions as well as the role played by the Mongol Buddhist Lamas in the past. Among several monastic institutions, the largest monastic institution in the Mongol history was Gandantegchenlin Khiid, founded by the fourth Jebtsundamba Khutuktu (khutagt) in of 1838. Jebtsundamba lineage can be traced back to Zanabazar, Ondor Gegeen (1636-1723), who became the first Jebtsundamba Khutuktu, the spiritual head of Tibetan Buddhism in Mongolia.<sup>15</sup> At the age of four, the Dalai Lama as well as the Panchen Lama recognised him as 'living Buddha' as he was widely considered as the reincarnation of Tibetan Buddhist master Taranatha, and became the head of Gelukpa in Mongolia.<sup>16</sup> The foundation of Erdene Zuu and Shankh monasteries in Mongolia were also attributed to the first Bogd Gegeen (Jebtsundamba Khutukhtu). The Mongolian

---

<sup>15</sup> The ninth Jebtsundamba Jampel Namdol Choskyi Gyaltzen (1933- ) visited Ulaanbaatar only once in 1999, but due to the Chinese political pressure he had to return back to Dharamshala. Initially, Reting Rinpoche recognised him in 1932 as the reincarnation of eighth Jebtsundamba after the communist government in Mongolia forbade his recognition in 1924. The abbot of Gandantegchenlin Khiid in Ulaanbaatar is currently referred to as the head of Mongolian monastic institutions. The Mongolian transliteration is '*Jevtsundamba khutagt*' whereas in the western writings it is *Jebtsundamba Khutuktu*. The Tibetan Wylie is '*rje btsun 'dam pa*' or commonly called Sogpo Lama.

<sup>16</sup> Jonang Tibetan master Taranatha (1575-1635) is still acclaimed for his historical work on '*rgya gar chos 'byung*' (History of Indian Buddhism).

script of Soyombo and Quadratic were invented by Zanabazar to study Buddhism through the Mongolian language itself. As the spiritual head of Mongolia and endowed with the supreme power of visualization Bogd Gegeen was considered as a highly learned and noble master of various fields of knowledge pertaining to Buddhism.

After the Jebtsundamba Khutuktu, the second most revered monk was Zayabandid (Zayapandita) in the Mongolian Buddhism. Zayapandita Luvsanperenlei (Lobsang Thinley, 1642-1715), who founded the monastic city of Zayaiin khuree in Tsetserleg, Arkhangai aimag was the first Mongolian reincarnation. It was the effort of first Zayapandita that the internal rivalry between Oirad Galdan Boshigt and Ondor Gegeen, Zanabazar (Khalkha) was peacefully settled. Except the Dzungar in the western Mongol region, the whole of Mongols came under the Manchu subjects since 1691. According to Bawden (1961), the first Jebtsundamba Khutuktu made a decision to surrender under the Qing Dynasty when his fellow Khalkha asked him to take a decision (Bawden, 1961:45). Miyawaki (1984) citing from Qing records of 'Zhang Mu & He Qiutao, Menggu Youmu Ji, 1859 of Chapter Seven' says the following:

In the twenty-seventh year of Kangxi (1688), the Qalqas [Khalkha] were discussing if they should go over to the Russians who were their neighbours. When they asked the rje btsun dam pa Qutuytu [Jebtsundamba Khutuktu] for a decision, the Qutuytu said: 'The Russians, in the first place, do not respect the Buddha and their custom is not like ours, being different in language and different in dress. To join them is not a policy for eternal peace. We had better bring our entire tribes to move inside and pledge our allegiance to the Great Emperor. Thus we will be able to enjoy happiness for ten thousand years.' They all rejoiced and made obeisance to him. Thus the matter was finally settled (Miyawaki, 1984:151).

Presently, the fifteenth Zayapandita Luwsandanzanpuljinjigmed (Lobsang Tenzin Phuljung Jigmed, 1972) is the abbot of the main monastery as well as the head of the centre in Ulaanbaatar. During 1999-2004, he studied in Sera Je Dratsang of Sera Monastic University in Mysore, South India. Among the Mongolian Lamas, Damtsigdorj (Damtshig Dorjee, 1781-1848) was much regarded for his treaty on Lamrim text (the Stages of Path). His scholastic goes back to Lhasa as Dashchoimbel datsan in Ikh Khuree (Mongolia) and later on founded his own monastery of Bragiriin khiid on the bank of river Ong.

As regards the spread of Buddhism in Trans-Baikal region, it was only in the eighteenth century that the strong influence of Buddhism started to be felt.<sup>17</sup> The first monastery established in Buryatia was dated back to 1707 and it was Burgaltaiski datsan. After then, Tsongoski (Khilgantuiski) was founded in 1730 by Damba Darzha Zayaev, the first Buryat Khambo Lama. Eastern Buryat has been Buddhist since early eighteenth century while the western Buryat accepted Buddhism only in the late nineteenth century. The credit goes to the famous Buryat leader and special envoy of the thirteenth Dalai Lama, Agvan Dorzhiev (1853-1938) and his first teacher Namnanai Gegen (Jangchub Pelzangpo), an incarnated lama from Aga Datsan in Buryatia. This Lama visited Lhasa along with Agvan in 1873-74 and was famously called the “Buryat Milarepa” for his retreat (Andreyev, 2001:176). Construction of Buddhist monasteries gradually took place in the nineteenth century and all these were built in the Tibeto-Mongol style. Among the monasteries, Gusinoozyorskii, Kizhinginskii, Aninskii, Egituiskii, Aga Datsan and Aginskii were some of the prominent ones in Buryatia. In that very Trans-Baikal region, the other Buddhist followers were the Tuvans, though they are of Turkic origin people (Soni, 2009:102). Besides Buddhism, they were keen in the practice of Shamanism. Due to their close linkage and relations with the Mongols, they followed the Mongolian form of Tibetan Buddhism. By 1914, there were almost twenty-two Buddhist monasteries with more than four thousand monks in Tuva (Terentyev, 1996:67).

So far as the spread of Buddhism in Kalmykia (Oyirat Aimag) is concerned the historian Kitinov (1996) says that the Kalmyks were followers of Buddhism since thirteenth century, though they migrated to the Volga region in the seventeenth century (Kitinov, 1996:36). Oyirats were known by the Russians as Kalmyks. In early 17<sup>th</sup> century (1609), their leader Torgut Ho-Orluk Khan signed an agreement with the Russian government and settled down near the Caspian Sea in the 1730s. After the visit of the third Dalai Lama, the Oyirat became the centre of Mongolian Gelugpa and the

---

<sup>17</sup> In 1741, the Russian Empress passed a religious decree on Buddhism and made compulsion on registration of Buddhist monks (lamas). It was kind of giving official recognition to the Buddhists of Buryatia, Kalmykia and Tuva by Russian empire, though there was a restriction on the number of monks and they were forbidden to have relations with the foreigners. For details see Pubaev & Sanzhiev (1991).



two monks from the Oyirat tribes of Torgut and Qosot came to be known as Neyiji Toyin (1557-1653) and Rabjampa Zayapandita (1599-1662) who became profound teachers. At the same period, the dominant Mongols of Khalkha and Chahar tribes followed the Karma Kagyu teachings. Meanwhile, the Qosot ruler Gushri Khan's military support to Gelugpa led to the dominance of Gelug order in whole of Mongol regions and that too after the firm establishment of the institution of the Dalai Lama. The emperors of the Qing Dynasty supported the spread of Tibetan Buddhism among the Mongols especially, because Qing Emperor Qianlong's 1792 inscription says, "by patronizing the Yellow Church we maintained peace among the Mongols. This being an important task we cannot but protect his [religion]."<sup>18</sup>

Even after the migration of Kalmyks to the Volga region, their mission to Lhasa continued in 1731 and 1737 until 1771 when most of the Torgut tribes of the Oyirat Mongols decided to return to the Ili area in present day Xianjiang province of China. Besides, due to the decree of the Russian Queen Catherine the Great, the independence of Kalmykia and its relations with Tibet since then prohibited but the Queen established the post of 'Chief of Kalmyk Buddhists'. Yet the Kalmyks in China and Mongolia kept visiting Lhasa and followed the Gelugpa teachings even after then. Eminent Oyirat (Kalmyk) Buddhist masters who turned-up in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, included Alasha Lharampa Ngawang Tendar, Padma Bovaew and Lobsang Sherab Teptin, the last 'Chief of Kalmyk Buddhists' (Kitinov, 1996:40). After the Bolshevik revolution, the prominent Kalmyk was Geshe Wangyal, who established the first Tibetan Buddhist monastery in America in 1956.

Thus, the spread of Buddhism in the Mongol region took place in three phases and it was the third phase in which the teachings of the Gelugpa order became dominant among the Mongolians. This teaching of the new doctrine had cultural influence on the masses due to religious and political reasons. This led to the Mongolian monks to take a strong decision to go for study in Tibet. Thus, till the pre-modern time as Kitinov

---

<sup>18</sup> Cited in Bartholomew (1992:353) on the 1792 inscription of the Qing emperor Qianlong at the Yonghegong, a Tibetan Buddhist temple in Beijing.

(1996) says, the “Mongolian monks have studied in Tibet and used the Tibetan language in ceremonies, rituals, etc., their land and population were attached to Tibet, therefore, there is no difference between the Tibetan and Mongolian Buddhism” (Kitinov, 1996:42). The Mongols had even incorporated the ancestral deities into Tibetan Buddhist pantheon as Buddhist guardian deities who were worshipped throughout the Mongol region. Since 17<sup>th</sup> century their famous ancestral king Chinggis Khan was incorporated into Buddhist pantheon as Vajrapani Boddhisattva incarnation, though he was historical by a conqueror with Mongol identity.

The following list shows the monastic institutions<sup>19</sup> in Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia with the Mongolian transliterations and most of them have been swere rebuilt after 1990s:

Gelugpa Monasteries (Yellow Sect):

1. Gandantegchenlin-Khiid.
2. Dashchoilin Khiid, Zuun Khuree.
3. Betuw Khiid.
4. Lamrim datsan (Dratsang).
5. Ikh khuree Manba datsan.
6. Ikh Khuree Zurkhai datsan.
7. Dambadarjaa Khiid.
8. Manba datsan.
9. Deed bod' Khiid.
10. Gandangejeelin.
11. Janchuwish dashlkhunduwlin Khiid.
12. Choidar odserlin datsan.
13. Dashgunpanlin Khiid.
14. Dashchaglin Khiid.
15. Gandan Sodnomdarjailin Khiid.
16. Dechinrawjaalin Khiid.

---

<sup>19</sup> [www.mongoliantemples.net/images/pdfs/DLDUBWEB2008.pdf](http://www.mongoliantemples.net/images/pdfs/DLDUBWEB2008.pdf) accessed on 11/02/2009

17. Agrim datsan.
18. Zurkhai datsan.
19. Mongol unshlagat Buyan arwijikhui Khiid.
20. Mongoliin Ikh Khuree Khiid.
21. Gandanshaddublin.
22. Gandandarjaalin datsan.
23. Dar' Ekh khiid/ Dulmalin khiid Getsogdarjaalin (nunnery).
24. Togs bayasgalant tow, emegteichuudiin khural (nunnery).
25. Baldankhajidlin khiid (nunnery).

Nyingmapa and Kagyupa Monasteries (Red Sect):

26. Namdoldechinlen Khiid, Jagarmolomiin neremjit ulaan yosnii tow.
27. Gowiin Noyon Khutagt Danzan Rawjaagiin neremjit Urjin Shadduwlin Khiid.
28. Ikh Amgalan nomiin khurd Khiid, Ulaan yosnii tow Dechinchoinkhorlon Khiid.
29. Urjin sanag rolwii choilin.
30. Puntsoglin Khiid.
31. Ekh ursiin buyanii tow, Dashchoinkhorlin Khiid.
32. Jurmeddechenlin Khiid.
33. Choi dechin dashsumprellin.
34. Dechin Choilin tawshi sunbrellin datsan.
35. Garma Garjid Urjin Perenlailin Khiid.
36. Narkhajid sum (nunnery).

The above listed monastic institutions are needed to be researched more thoroughly on the basis of the works done by Nicholas Roerich (1874-1947) and his son George (1902-1960) who provided detailed of the monasteries and monuments before their destruction by the Communist regime in 1930s (Rupen, 2003:461).<sup>20</sup> Nevertheless, "Buddhism served partly to provide separate and unique identity to Mongols and

---

<sup>20</sup> Nicholas and George Roerich(s) who contributed amount of literature in the studies of Tibetan Buddhism had been keen observers of the political and cultural development took place between the Mongols and Tibetans in the early twentieth century. See further details in Rupen (2003).

Tibetans, helping them to resist assimilation by Chinese and/or Russians. Pan-Buddhism was one element in a nascent native nationalism” (Rupen, 2003: 471). The origin of Pan-Buddhism and its development have been discussed in the following paragraphs.

### **Impact of Institution on Pan-Mongolism and Pan-Tibetanism**

Before the incorporation of Tibetan states in 1642 under a single administration of the institution of the Dalai Lama, the whole region of Tibet was scattered in small kingdoms ruled by powerful families, usually backed by one of the religious schools. Within a short period, the institution of the Dalai Lama was able to exert its influence on almost whole of ethnic Tibetan regions, though the kingdom of Ladakh and Bhutan remained out of the influence of the institution on religio-political ground. Yet, the persecution of monks belonged to different religious schools like Kagyupa and Nyingmapa-by-Gelugpa extremists continued, which thus led to the fleeing of those on the receiving side from central Tibet to eastern most or to Ladakh and Bhutan. Such religious intolerance led to the set back to the Pan-Tibetanism during the formative period of the institution. Even then, the institution’s early policy of integration of whole of ethnic Tibetans into a single administration remained intact. But, somehow the unsuccessful military campaign against Bhutan in 1640-50s as well as against Ladakh in 1660-70s completely cut the idea of Pan-Tibetanism (Dhondup, 2003a:28).

Whereas the creation of greater Mongolia was prevalent among various Mongol princes since the dissolution of the Mongol Yuan Dynasty in fourteenth century, the actual focus on the idea of Pan-Mongolism turned up only in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. The original idea of Pan-Mongolism owes much to the Mongol Dynasty of the thirteenth century, but the modern Pan-Mongolism ideology was primarily based on the same ethnic and cultural identity. In this regard, Soni (2002) is of the opinion that “Pan-Mongolian in nature [was] primarily focused on including territories comprising of not only Outer and Inner Mongolia as well as Buryat region of Siberia but also the territories of Tibetans, the Kyrgyzs and Kalmyks of Central Asia,

thereby stretching the whole area from the Caspian Sea to Lake Baikal” (Soni, 2002:60).

The greater nationalism of both the native ethnic states was not able to turn up due to the great powers’ geopolitical interest in inner Asia known as the ‘Great Game’. The countries like Russia, British India and China’s expansionist designs led to the fraction of inner Asia. Gradually, except Outer Mongolia whole of inner Asia was merged into the imperialist neighbours. Though the Russian Central Asian explorers like Prejevalsky, Pozdneev and Kozlov were not able to enter Lhasa it was they (also) who had advised to use the concept of Pan-Buddhism for the success of Russian diplomacy in Inner Asia. While pointing out that Prejevalsky especially had expressed ambitious political plans; Rayfield (1976) says the following:

Prejevalsky was the first Russian to voice the idea of fomenting a rebellion of Buddhist as well as Moslems and of uniting the Buddhist Tibetans and Khalkha Mongols with the Buddhist Buryats as well as the Moslem Uighurs with the Moslem Uzbeks and Kirgiz under Russian sovereignty. He began to look at Mongolia and China from the point of view of a military strategist. His dream of seeing Lhasa and the Dalai Lama was not just a personal, but a national dream. In 1878 he sent a memorandum to the Geographic Society and the War Ministry. He drew a picture of Lhasa as the Rome of Asia with the spiritual power stretching from Ceylon to Japan over 250 million people: the most important target for Russian diplomacy. The political goal, the spread of Russian influence of Tibet and the Himalayas, encircling China and threatening India (Rayfield, 1976:52-3).

Even, the 1907 Anglo-Russian Convention on Tibet and Afghanistan had not forbidden from having relations among the Tibetan Buddhist followers being subjects of Russia and British India. The second paragraph of the Article two says, “it is clearly understood that Buddhists, subjects of Great Britain or of Russia, may enter into direct relations on strictly religious matters with the Dalai Lama and the representatives of Buddhism in Thibet [Tibet]; the Governments of Great Britain and Russia engage, as far as they are concerned, not to allow those relations to infringe the stipulations of the present arrangement”.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> Refer the Anglo-Russian Convention, 1907 in Appendix IV

Yet, the Pan-Buddhism concept through the Pan-Mongolism and Pan-Tibetanism was highly advocated by a leading Buryat Lama Agvan Dorjieff (1853-1938). Due to his being the tutor to the thirteenth Dalai Lama and most learned in the Tibetan Buddhism among the Mongols, his advocacy for the Pan-Buddhism gained a good amount of momentum in the early twentieth century.<sup>22</sup> Till the late 19<sup>th</sup> century Lhasa was accessible to the Mongols from the north side of Tibet only and that too to the Khalkha Mongols, while “traditional links between the Buryat and Kalmyk Buddhists and Lhasa were cut short in the late 18<sup>th</sup> century owing to the seclusion policy of the Tibetan rulers” (Andreyev, 2001:168). Even then, the concept of Pan-Mongolism had developed the feelings of a strong nationalism among the Mongols who withstood both the Chinese as well as Russian control of their respective areas because both the Chinese and the Russians posed a threat to their identity. Therefore, the re-introduction of Buddhism in 1578 by the third Dalai Lama served the Mongols not only as a prime source of common identification but also as a tool utilized in various ways for political purposes (Rupen, 1958:169). Having strong faith among the Mongols in the Dalai Lamas and Bogdo Gegeen Jebtsundampa Khutuktu and among the Tibetans towards the Dalai Lamas, the notion of Pan-Mongolism was changed to Pan-Buddhism on the basis of religious similarities. Thus, the Pan-Buddhism urge was more pronounced among the Mongols of both the Outer and Inner Mongolia as well as Buryats, Kalmyks and Tibetans. But, the urge for Pan-Tibetanism among the Tibetan elite and lack of initiatives among the Mongols led to the futile idea of unifying whole of the Mongols. Cited in Soni (2002:61) Rupen gave three main factors behind the set-back to the idea of Pan-Mongolism:

- i. the inclusion of Tibet to the Mongol area which desired independence.
- ii. the use of the Tibetan language in the Lamaist Church instead of Mongolian; and
- iii. the rivalry of the 13<sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama of Lhasa and the 8<sup>th</sup> Jebtsundampa Khutuktu of Urga.

---

<sup>22</sup> Around the same time in China, Tuttle says, “the idea of Buddhism as a single pan-Asian religion with ethnic variants developed first among modernizing monks and laity but was eventually adopted by the government as well” (Tuttle, 2005: 68).

Because of the above factors, the main cause for the set-back of Pan-Buddhism or Pan-Mongolism seemed to have been primarily related to the Tibetan issue, which is not true at all if one observes thoroughly. The major cause was division of Mongols itself in early twentieth century. It was the secret 1912 Russo-Mongol agreement, which divided the Mongols into Outer and Inner Mongolia. At the same time, the 1914 Shimla agreement among the British India, China and Tibet too caused the division of Tibet into two regions as Outer and Inner Tibet. However, both to the Chinese as well as Russians the Pan-Buddhism in the context of Pan-Mongolism and Pan-Tibetanism would have been a major strategic problem as huge unification of ethnic warriors would mean the reduction of influence of both the nations in the two regions. Thus, an atmosphere of rivalry between the 8<sup>th</sup> Jebtsundampa Khutuktu and the 13<sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama during his stay in Urga and the conclusion of the secret 1912 Russo-Mongol agreement contributed much to the set-back of the idea of Pan-Buddhism.<sup>23</sup>

Nevertheless, a number of leaders tried to materialize the concept of Pan-Mongolism but it always underwent the set-back; especially because the leaders were under heavy surveillance and also they were used by the opponents for their political gain. On the political ground, although the movement of Pan-Mongolist leaders such as Cossack Grigorii Mikhailovich Semenov and Baron von Ungern-Sternberg was backed by the Japanese, it was primarily the fight against the Communist movement which was spreading from Russia to the Far East Asia. In Ungern's Pan-Mongolism, Tibet as well as Kyrgyz and Chinese Turkestan were included to compromise a great nation. In Ungern's letter to his agents in Peking on May 20, 1921 in the context of how the movement of Pan-Mongolism should be started, the political mobilization in Tibet seemed to have come last (Soni, 2002:65). Yet, the movement couldn't move forward on the ground of the Soviet success on keeping the Mongolian isolated so that Pan-Mongolist area may not become a military base of other nations, particularly Japan.

---

<sup>23</sup> Rupen says that "the Jebtsundamba Khutukhtu did not welcome the presence of the Dalai Lama, whom he looked on as a rival spiritually and politically, and he definitely did not encourage the Dalai Lama to remain" (Rupen, 2003: 458).

Even then, the Pan-Mongolist movement was much desired by the Mongols for their traditional identity, for sovereignty and to be able to get separated from the Chinese Yoke. In this particular context, the Russification of Mongols in Trans-Baikal and Volga regions and the Sinification of Inner Mongolia caused the decline of Pan-Mongolism ideology. By 1925, the question of Pan-Mongolism no longer remained a theoretical one (Soni, 2002:67). In the case studies of Pan-Mongolism, one comes to the conclusion that it was the Trans-Baikal Buryat Mongols who initially lanced the concept of Mongolian nationalism that too by the modern educated ones, who were highly influenced by the ideas of European nationalism and independence. These Buryat intellectual formed the “cultural *avant garde* among the Mongol tribes and introduced and directed the revolutionary ideas” along with the modern educationists of European style but without losing the traditional culture.<sup>24</sup> As early as in 1860s the Buryat intellectual had advocated Pan-Mongolism due to the Russian influence on their culture and conversion of their religious faith (Rupen, 1964:104). Though the Buryats in the Trans-Baikal region became part of Russia since the agreement of 1689 Treaty of Nerchinsk and later on again by the Treaty of Kiakhta in 1728, the leading Buryat leaders strongly expressed the “Pan-Mongolism Sentiment” in 1920s. According to Soni, “the key figures among the Buryats who nursed the Pan-Mongolism vision included Bazar Baraadin, E. Rinchino and Ts. Jamtsarano” (Soni, 2002:71). Bazar Baraadin brought out Roman alphabet to transcribe the Modern Mongolian language so that it could help bring the idea of Pan-Mongolism among the Mongols with the single communicable language. But the rivalry between the Mongol intellectuals: those who supported the communism and those who were against it led to the downfall of Pan-Mongolism in the late 1920s. The prominent leaders of Pan-Mongolism the movement were house-arrested, imprisoned and even executed. Besides the intellectuals and leaders like, Agvan Dorjjeff, Baraadin, Jamtsarano, Rinchino and Amagaev, thousands of common Mongols were implicated in the name of instigating Pan-Mongolism.

The Turkic Central Asian Buddhist region of Tannu Tuva could not be excluded from the Pan-Mongolist sentiment. Rupen states that “Tuvans are very Mongols, while

---

<sup>24</sup> Cited in Soni, 2002:69 from Heissig, 1966:183.



others are very Turkic, so, they could be described as constituting an ethnic and cultural bridge between Central Asian Turkic and Central Asian Mongol group” (Rupen, 1975:154). Since 1757, this Tannu Tuva came under the jurisdiction of Manchu dynasty till 1911. But it never fell under the direct control of Manchu officials, as its administration was attached to the officials of Outer Mongolia. After the proclamation of Mongolian independence in 1911, the Tuvan leader *amby-noyon* (feudal lord) Gombodorji declared Tuva as part of Mongolian regime of Jebtsundamba Khutuktu. But due to its own territorial aim on Tannu Tuva, in 1914 Russia gave an instruction to Gombodorji to “maintain no relations of any kind with foreign states, including Mongolia” (Soni, 2002:77). Thus, this instruction turned the Pan-Mongolist activities to a halt, and later on recognized the declaration of Tuva’s independence in 1921. However, the Tuvan tendency to join the Pan-Mongolism was not vanished. Donduk, the Tuvan Prime Minister stated that, “the Tuvian people are small, poor and backward in the cultural aspect. That is why it must be united with Mongolia” (Rupen, 1958:175). But the Tuvan desire to come under the greater Mongolia was suppressed by the Soviet troops in 1924-26 and in 1926 the treaty of friendship between Tuvan and Mongolians proved to be the success of the Soviet policy to chase away Pan-Mongolist activities.

At this juncture, Soni (2002) analyses Moscow’s policy in the Far East on the following ground: “firstly, China was used to keep foreign powers out of Outer Mongolia as a whole. Secondly, Outer Mongolian ‘independence’ was used to oust China and lastly, Tuvan ‘independence’ was used to prevent Pan-Mongolist moves for unity” (Soni, 2002:79). After several attempts to annex Tannu Tuva into Soviet Russia, in 1944 Tuva was “incorporated” into Soviet Union with the special decree by the Soviet Government. But it came to be known to the outside world only in 1946 and that time Russians successfully used Tannu Tuva to work both as anti-China as well as anti-Mongol. The incorporation of Tuva and Buryat’s downfall in the nationalist sentiment was the biggest set-back to the concept of Pan-Mongolism, which never came into being after then (Soni, 2002:80).

But, the Tibetanised Mongour and Mongols from the frontier between China and Tibet were more likely than the Tibetans to view the Chinese and Tibetan “Buddhism” as a link in the development of Pan-Buddhism. The Mongol, Chinese and Tibetan Buddhist masters like Lama Bai Puren (1876-1927), Master Dayong (1893-1929), Nenghai Lama (1886-1967), Master Fazun (1902-1980), the 9<sup>th</sup> Panchen Lama, Dorjee Chopa Geshi (1874-1930) and Norlha Qutughtu (1865-1836) were found to be very actively promoting Tibetan Buddhism in China in the early twentieth century with the sole purpose of the development of Pan-Buddhism.<sup>25</sup> Even then, the Tibetan Buddhist leaders especially the Dalai Lama and the Panchen Lama pursued the Chinese emperors or officials to use religion as a means to exert their influence or to rule over the Mongolians, who had always been an element of uncertainty on China’s northern border in the past centuries.

Nonetheless, the visits of the fourteenth Dalai Lama (in 1979, 1982, 1991, 1994, 1995, 2003 and 2006) provided a fresh impetus to nationalism through cultural bonding between the Mongols and the Tibetans. The Mongolian daily *Barkmann* (1997:77) quoted the Dalai Lama’s statement to media as follows:

Mongolian culture is a culture with a close relationship to Tibetan religion. The Mongols have, over centuries, believed in Buddhism. It does not matter if religion is cherished or not: what matters is to defend these customs, traditions, culture and art.

The author mentions that the Dalai Lama is well aware of the impact of this traditional religion of all Mongols and that too closely connected with the activities of traditionalist groups, in the revival of Pan-Mongolism ideas. Though early twentieth century treaties have bounded the aspects of Pan-Mongolism (in near future), the Mongolian official proclamations say, it is obligated to care for the well-being of the Mongol diasporas. Mongolian Ambassador in Russia, N. Mishigdorj said in 1993 that:

On the basis of respect for the (Russian) federation treaty we direct our attention as appropriate towards the development of multilateral relations with the republics belonging to the Russian Federation. Due to the close kinship in cultural heritage and tradition, the language, customs, way of life and the territorial vicinity (for

---

<sup>25</sup> For further reading of Chinese and Tibetan masters in promoting Tibetan Buddhism in early twentieth century, see Tuttle’s (2005) third chapter Buddhism as a Pan-Asian Religion (1890’s 1928).

instance Buryatia, Kalmykia, Tuva, the Altai and Yakutia) these relations are very intensive (Barkmann, 1997:77-8).

The Lamaism (Tibetan Buddhism) has, therefore, always been the key aspect of linking all the Mongolian nationalities together even the Mongolian ethnic groups living in the diasporas.

In the forgoing paragraphs, Buddhist factor in the relations between the Mongols and the Tibetans have been observed. It has been found that Buddhism was introduced in the first millennium through Central Asia but the bondness of same religion started with the visit of Sakya Pandita in the 13<sup>th</sup> century. Yet, the Tibetan Buddhism was not a common subject to the Mongols until the visit of the third Dalai Lama in the 16<sup>th</sup> century. His visit had built the common bondage between the Mongols and the Tibetans on the cultural ground through the spread religion, which ultimately gave the idea of Pan-Buddhism as the core of Pan-Mongolism or Pan-Tibetanism in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. In the societies of both the Mongols and Tibetans, the monastery was the heart of ancient educational institutions. The monasticism was encouraged on a large scale among both the Tibetans and Mongols and that too especially after the establishment of the institution of the Dalai Lama. Tibetan Buddhism remained the main religion and the most important cultural force between the Tibetans and Mongols. Not only that, the Trans-Baikal Mongols in Russia and Mongols in Mongolia used Lamaist Buddhism as a tool for resistance to Russification, while Tibetans used their religion similarly to resist the Chinese.

With the foundation of monasteries and missionaries by the Gelugpa School as well as Kagyupa, the Buddhism in Mongolia reached at the height of flourishing. But the Bolshevik Revolution in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century diminished the monastic institutions as well as the concept of Pan-Mongolism. Yet, Inner Mongolian support to the idea of Pan-Mongolism based on Pan-Buddhism was not eliminated. However, the 13<sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama's declaration of self-determination and proclamation of Tibet as an independent nation was a set-back to the concept of Pan-Buddhism because even the Pan-Tibetanism had not been able to muster support for cooperation among the fellow Tibetans.

Besides, the Pan-Mongolism along with the Pan-Tibetanism couldn't be realised due to ineffectiveness of the institution of the Dalai Lama and the lack of coordination among the Mongols. Thus, as Rupen says that "both religious leaders- the Dalai Lama in Tibet and the Jebtsundamba Khutukhtu in Mongolia became political symbols of independence, and their fate became the political fate of their countries" (Rupen, 2003:471).

## **Chapter Fourth**

# **The Dalai Lama's Proclamation and Mongolia-Tibet Treaty**

In the previous chapter, the shortfall of the Pan-Buddhist nation development was primarily focused on the declaration of Tibetan independence and subsequently disunity among the Mongol princes. Though the concepts of Pan-Mongolism and Pan-Tibetanism were prevalent among the Mongols as well as the Tibetans even after the 1911 Chinese Revolution, yet both the nations' principal concern was how to keep their sovereignty intact after the downfall of the Qing Dynasty. Not only that, the initial first one decade after 1911 was focused more on how to build the two newly declared independent nations. It is true that in order to remain outside the Han cultural influence, both Mongolia and Tibet started to mutually assist each other besides promoting and preserving the culture of Tibetan Buddhism. The following paragraphs discusses the genesis of the 13th Dalai Lama's Proclamation of Tibetan Independence (1913) following the fall of the Qing dynasty and various events that led to the signing of a treaty between Mongolia and Tibet (1913), and the significance of the treaty in international relations as well as China's response to it.

### **The Downfall of Qing Dynasty and Proclamation of Tibetan Independence**

On October 10, 1911, the beginning of Wuchang Uprising in proper China gradually turned into a mass revolution led by the Chinese students and intellectuals who returned from Japan and Europe and who believed in the republican ideology. The Revolution was named as *Xinhai* or Chinese Revolution after the Chinese lunar calendar of Xinhai fall on the year of 1911.<sup>1</sup> The Revolution ended with the abdication of Qing throne by Emperor Puyi, the last Manchu ruler on February 12, 1912. Though the revolution was primarily against the government corruption, and its inability to deal with the intervention of foreign powers, scholars argue that the main cause was the Han Chinese resentment towards the Qing government, which was dominated by an ethnic minority Manchus.

---

<sup>1</sup> The revolutionary organizations like the *Revive China Society* and *Tongmenghui*, which were largely operated in the Han dominated provinces advocated for the anti-Manchu struggle on the basis of Han chauvinism to 'expel the Manchus and restore the Han Nationalism' in China. Although the anti-Manchu sentiment was highly used during the revolution, 'harmony among five races' and 'political and economic reforms' were stressed more in order to strengthen the Republic of China's Central Government.

On January 1, 1912, with the establishment of the Nanjing Provisional Government of the Republic of China, Sun Yat-sen announced the beginning of a formal era of the Republic of China and himself declared as the first Provisional President. After a month, on February 12, 1912 the Imperial abdication of Emperor Xuantong Puyi was announced through a formal edict with the mediation of Yuan Shikai. From then onwards Yuan Shikai became the second Provisional President of the Republic of China in Peking after the resignation of Sun Yat-sen from the presidential status. After the formal recognition by the world community, President Yuan Shikai relocated the capital of the Republic of China from Nanjing to Beijing and within a short period Sun Yat-sen lost his power. Yuan Shikai's assumption of power continued with the Qing policy of vassal dependencies and reasserted the "imperialist sovereignty" over Tibet and Mongol regions. Goldstein says, "Yuan Shikai's Government not only proclaimed Tibet to be a part of China but began to take steps to implement their views" (Goldstein, 1989:65). Thus, Yuan Shikai further prevented other provinces as well to be seceded from the Chinese centralized government after the downfall of the Qing Dynasty. Initially, Han Chinese (Sun Yat-sen) policy of 'republic' was referred only to the eighteen provinces where as non-Han Chinese regions such as, Northeast China (Manchu), Outer and Inner Mongolia and Xinjiang (Chinese Turkestan) and Tibet were excluded from the 'republic'.<sup>2</sup> Though Yuan Shikai reasserted the "imperialist sovereignty" over these regions, Mongolia and Tibet were the first two nations to have declared their independence. Later on, in the first half of the twentieth century frontier regions like Tannu Uriankhai as Tannu Tuva, Northeast China (Manchu) as Manchukho and Xinjiang (Chinese Turkestan) as East Turkestan too declared their independence for the time being. Except Tannu Tuva which was annexed into the Soviet Union in 1944, all the other regions were again reasserted back by the People's Republic of China (Communist).

---

<sup>2</sup> The Han Chinese exclusion of non-Han from the 'republic' was first founded during the Wuchang Uprising in Hubei province with the uses of 18-star banner 'Flag of the Iron Blood and Eighteen Stars'. The 18-star represented the 18 provinces settled by the Han Chinese. But in 1911, during Shanghai revolutionary's assembly, the flag was proposed for the national flag was rejected and instead it was made the flag of army. The flag of 'Five Races under One Union' became the national flag after then.

Earlier, before the Chinese Revolution, in 1909 the thirteenth Dalai Lama again went into exile to India after General Zhao Er-feng military campaign reached upto Lhasa. The Manchu Emperor once again annulled the title of Dalai Lama following the latter's exile to Urga in 1904. After spending more than two years in British India particularly in Sikkim during 1909-1912, the Dalai Lama returned to Tibet at the end of 1912 and reached Lhasa in early January 1913.<sup>3</sup> The Chinese Revolution in 1911 and the overthrow of the Qing Dynasty provided the Tibetans an opportunity to expel the remaining Qing troops from Tibet, who mutinied against the General and later on defeated by the Tibetan armed forces after a month of fighting. Primary causes for the Chinese soldiers in Tibet to stage *en mass* revolts was due to the non-receipt of salaries, rations etc. These internal problems led to the emergence of a faction between the *Ambans* Lien Yu and the military commander's soldiers. The mutiny amongst the Chinese troops in Tibet, particularly in Lhasa, Chumbi and Yatung took large scale looting and killing, even to Tibetans. Tibetan soldiers under the commandship of Tsarong Dzasas insisted Chinese troops to surrender or get defeated. Thus, with the expulsion of the Qing troops (about three thousand Chinese troops and officers) as well as even the Manchu Ambans, the thirteenth Dalai Lama went on to exercise a political authority not seen since the reign of the fifth Dalai Lama (Goldstein, 1989:59).<sup>4</sup> Besides attempting to modernize Tibet, the Dalai Lama also tried to eliminate some of the more oppressive features of the Tibetan monastic system. While in exile in British India and Sikkim, the Dalai Lama was fascinated with the modern world and his first priority after reaching Lhasa was the introduction of currencies and coins; post-office and department of foreign affairs. He also sent four young Tibetans to England to study on electrical engineering and initiated several steps towards the modernization of armed forces. Among all of these, his most outstanding achievement was his proclamation made on

---

<sup>3</sup> The ninth Panchen Lama's relations or responses to the Dalai Lama were not good at that time. When the Dalai Lama was in exile in Mongolia and China during the British expedition, the Panchen Lama visited India. While the Dalai Lama was exiled in India during the Zhou Er-feng military campaign, the Panchen Lama was seen occupying the Dalai Lama's quarters in Lhasa. Besides, the Panchen Lama's authorities did not help Lhasa's authorities to expel Chinese troops from Shigatse after 1911 revolution. For details see Goldstein, 1989:62-63.

<sup>4</sup> Shakabpa (1984:249) says Chinese Buddhist soldiers were on the Tibetan side during the mutiny, and small traders and peasants were apparently not expelled from Tibet.



February 15, 1913, as a public statement of the five points of declaration of Tibetan Independence.<sup>5</sup>

In his declaration of independence, the thirteenth Dalai Lama clearly mentioned that “the Chinese authorities in Szechwan and Yunnan endeavoured to colonize our territory. They brought large numbers of troops into central Tibet on the pretext of policing the trade marts”.<sup>6</sup> Thus, the proclamation ran into five points, and the statement asserted the re-establishment of the Tibetan Government and its future programs to be carried out. In the first two points, the focus was on the peace and happiness apart from the mention about and the religious institutions of the nation which ‘ultimately can be’ maintained through the Buddhist doctrine. Hence, in order to preserve and promote the doctrine he had forbidden the monasteries and its administrators ‘except for special persons’ to be indulged in “trade, loan money, deal in any kind of livestock, and/ or subjugate another’s subjects”. In the next two points, the focus was on the government rules and regulations as well as on the officials, who should be dedicated to their duty in order to come out from the backwardness of the nation, where as in the past due to the “invasions of foreigners, our [Tibetan] people may have to face certain difficulties”. So, he further declared by reasserting the sovereignty of the nation that in order to “safeguard and maintain the independence of our country, one and all should voluntarily work hard”, where, “we are a small, religious, and independent nation” with “rich in natural resources; but it is not scientifically advanced like other lands”.

On the occasion of declaration of independence, the last point gave special concession to the common Tibetan people in the sense that the “land taxes will not be collected until three years have passed.” It further stated that after then one has to pay taxes but “the land will belong to the cultivator”. That too on the basis that “Tibet, although thinly populated, is an extensive country”. With these points, the Dalai Lama ordered that “this letter must be posted and proclaimed every district of Tibet, and a

---

<sup>5</sup> See the Appendix VII for the ‘The Dalai Lama Proclamation of Tibetan Independence, 1913’ for further details.

<sup>6</sup> Quoted from Appendix VII.

copy kept in the records of the offices in every district". And finally, ending the relationship between the Chinese and Tibetans the proclamation says, "I am now in the course of driving out the remnants of Chinese troops from Do Kham in eastern Tibet. Now, the Chinese intention of colonizing Tibet under the patron-priest relationship has faded like a rainbow in the sky". But, instead of accusing the colonization by the Han Chinese to the Central Government's policy of the Qing Dynasty in Peking, the Dalai Lama said in his declaration "the Chinese authorities in Szechuan and Yunnan endeavoured to colonize our territory". That means "whether a diplomatic fiction or recognition of the effects of Chinese provincial autonomy is a matter for future research", argues McKay (1997:12). Thus, after the fall of the Qing Dynasty Tibet formally declared its independence with the head of the state becoming the Dalai Lama himself on February 15, 1913, and this is commonly described by the Tibetan authorities as a Declaration of Independence (McKay, 2003c:11).<sup>7</sup>

Prior to the declaration, the Provisional President Yuan Shikai offered the Dalai Lama of reinstating his (Chinese) official titles, upon which the Dalai Lama responded that "he was not asking the Chinese for any ranks, as he intended to exercise both temporal and spiritual rule in Tibet".<sup>8</sup> Bell says, "the holy sovereign made clear his declaration of Tibetan independence" (Bell, 1998:155). In the case of the Mongols also, they had already declared their independence on December 1, 1911 and Jebtsundamba Khutukhtu was formally enthroned as "the ruler of Mongolia and the Great Khan of the Empire" at the Great Khural called on December 28, 1911 at Urga (Mehra, 1969:02).<sup>9</sup> Mehra (1969) citing from the Russian text on the declaration goes on saying:

---

<sup>7</sup> Goldstein (1989:60) argues that, "the Dalai Lama issued a proclamation to all his officials and subjects that unilaterally reaffirmed his total rule in Tibet" after twenty-two days to his return to Lhasa. So, when did the Dalai Lama reach Lhasa?

<sup>8</sup> This information is mentioned only in Bell (1998:155) and is apparently the only one (I mean, the Dalai Lama's response). Smith (1996:182) mentions that Sir Charles Bell was present in Lhasa during the time. Regarding the President Yuan Shikai's telegraph, apologizing for the excesses of the Chinese troops and "restoring" his title or rank, see Goldstein (1989:59) cited from Tiechman's (1922:17-8).

<sup>9</sup> Online wikipedia (2009) says, "A declaration of independence is an assertion of the independence of an aspiring state or states. Such places are usually declared from part or all of the territory of another nation or failed nation, or are breakaway territories from within the larger state. Not all declarations of independence were successful and resulted in independence for these regions. (And) in many cases,

Our Mongolia in its original founding was an individual state. Mongolia proclaims itself an independent state under a new Government endowed with authority to manage its affairs, independently of others. Mongols shall obey neither Manchu nor Chinese officials, whose administrative authority is completely abolished.<sup>10</sup>

However, both the nations could not get success in gaining formal recognition from any third country. But the fact remains that the end of the Qing Dynasty and assumption of complete charge of the temporal and political affairs marked the exercising of full sovereignty rights over the whole of Tibet with the end of vassal relations between religious leader and the Manchu Emperor. When Yuan Shikai became the Provisional President of the Republic of China, he reasserted Chinese suzerainty/ sovereignty over Tibet as well as over Mongolia. Yuan Shikai's presidential decree said that the subjects of Mongols and Tibetans, etc. from now on will be on equal footing with the provinces of China proper, i.e., within the sphere of internal administration (Lamb, 1966:391).

### **1913 Tibetan-Mongol Treaty**

On June 24, 1912, five months after the establishment of the Republic of China, the Dalai Lama left Kalimpong and headed towards Chumbi valley. In early July at Phari, the diplomat Agvan Dorjiev received and greeted the Dalai Lama with the greetings from the other Mongol princess.<sup>11</sup> But, Smith (1996) views that "Dorjiev's presence in Tibet now (was) uncomfortable for the Dalai Lama, who wished to rely upon British patronage and eliminated any suspicion of Tibetan intrigues with the Russians. Dorjiev was, therefore, entrusted by the Dalai Lama with powers to establish Tibetan relations with newly independent (Outer) Mongolia" (Smith, 1996:181). Mehra (1969) while quoting from the official note exchanged between Sir Charles Bell and

---

independence is achieved without a declaration of independence but instead occurs by bilateral agreement". Also, "on the other hand, regions often achieve *de facto* independence, but do not declare independence" due to the pressure from the neighbouring states. This line on *de facto* independence is much resample on the Tibetan history between 1912 to 1951 period.

<sup>10</sup> Cited in Mehra, 1969: 1 from Peter SH Tang (1959:301), *Russian and Soviet Policy in Manchuria and Outer Mongolia: 1911-31*, Durham: North Carolina from the Russian text, *Soizlev*, in *Novyj Vostok*, No.13 (1926).

<sup>11</sup> Agvan Dorjiev, the diplomat monk and ambassador of the thirteenth Dalai Lama was a Russian subject of Buryatia and passed the highest degree of Geshe Lharampa in Tibetan Buddhist studies in Drepung Monastic University by the age of 35. Around 1898, he became the personal tutor to the Dalai Lama and

*Kalon* Lonchen Shatra during 1913-14 Simla Conference on the meeting between the Dalai Lama and the diplomat Agvan Dorjjeff, constructed the following:

Mr. [later Sir] Charles Bell “to ask you whether” the Mongol-Tibetan treaty had been “authorized” by the Dalai Lama.<sup>12</sup> In the reply to Bell, Lonchen stated that, “the Lama is said to have underlined, “the friendly relations between Tibet and Mongolia which existed like that of the teacher and his disciple”. He [Dalai Lama] was keen too that these “should continue and that they [Tibet and Mongolia] should help each other for the benefit of the Buddhist religion.<sup>13</sup>

Scholars argue on this very statement of “should continue” and “should help each other for the benefit of the Buddhist religion” which has given a broader authorization and power to make a more formal and binding alliance with the Mongols to Agvan (Mehra, 1969:03). Thus, in the early January 1913 while the Dalai Lama was entering Lhasa, the diplomat Agvan Dorjjeff formally concluded an agreement with the Mongols at Urga on January 11, 1913. Here, one can firmly say that the diplomat was intentionally went to Urga to make a more binding treaty after meeting with the Dalai Lama in July 1912 at Phari, that too with the full authorization as the Tibetan plenipotentiary according to the letter exchanged between Bell and Shatra shown in the (inbox) paragraph. Tibetan leader had been observed of taking same steps whatever the Mongol leaders did for the self-determination. It is however, yet to establish whether those initiatives were taken after the diplomat Agvan Dorjjeff’s guidance. Before the declaration of Mongol independence, a delegation of Mongol princes was in St. Petersburg in August 1911 which had asked for Russian protectorate over Mongolia’s independence, whereas in the same manner while the Dalai Lama was in India, in March 1912 Lonchen Shatra (the Tibetan Minister, who was along with the Dalai Lama in exile) made a similar request to the British (Bawden, 1989:189).

Moreover, the treaty was signed with full authorization by Agvan Dorjjeff because while the Dalai Lama was on his way to Lhasa, he “must certainly have known of these developments in Urga and, one would suspect, from Dorjjeff himself”

---

a close advisor as well as diplomat but was in a secret service for Russian in the eyes of British and Chinese. For details, see Kleshov (1992) and Snelling (1993).

<sup>12</sup> Cited in Mehra, 1969:20 (in footnotes) from the Foreign, June 1914, Proceedings 151-157 Official Note: Page 2.

<sup>13</sup> These second and third lines are also cited in Mehra, 1969:3 from the above Official Note.

regarding the Russian and Mongolian four-clause agreement with a detail protocol of seventeen articles on November 3, 1912 (Mehra, 1969:03). This agreement firmly stated that “the Imperial Russian Government shall assist Mongolia to maintain the autonomous regime” which the Mongolian “has established” and besides “the right to have her national army, and to admit neither the presence of Chinese troops on her territory nor the colonization of her land by the Chinese” (refer appendix V). Upon that, the third clause had firmly lined that even “if the Mongolian Government finds it necessary to conclude a separate treaty with China or another foreign power, the new treaty shall in no case either infringe the clauses of the present agreement and of the protocol” (refer appendix V). Thus, in the very same month following the Mongolian agreement with the Russians, the “*Tsongdue* or the National Assembly wrote to the Indian Governor-General that the country had broken off relations with Peking and would like all Chinese troops to be withdrawn from the land”.<sup>14</sup> But there wasn’t any reply to the *Tsongdue*’s communication to the Governor-General, which might (it can be presumed) ultimately let Agvan Dorjieff to run to Urga and sign the 1913 Treaty with Mongols that too was given consideration to the third clause of the Russo-Mongolian agreement.<sup>15</sup> On the other hand, before the Russian and Mongolian convention was signed on November 1912, British memorandum presented to the Chinese Foreign Office on August 1912 stated that British will not accept Tibet as “an equal footing with the provinces of China proper” of the presidential order of April 21, 1912. The memorandum says that:

His Majesty’s Government, while they have formally recognized the suzerain rights’ of China in Thibet [Tibet], have never recognized, and are not prepared to recognize, the right of China to intervene actively in the internal administration of Thibet [Tibet], which should remain, as contemplated by the treaties, in the hands of the Thibetan [Tibetan] authorities.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> This quoted line is taken from Mehra (1969:03) but he has not mentioned any sources of this particular line, though in the following lines he has noted that the communication “lacked some of the essential desiderate of a formal proclamation of independence and would be hard to accept as such” by the Governor-General of India.

<sup>15</sup> Refer the Appendix V for the details of the 1912 Russo-Mongolian Agreement and Protocol. Also see the 1913 Russo-Chinese Agreement, which more firmly established the autonomous status of Outer Mongolia.

<sup>16</sup> Cited in Woodman, 1969:382 as Memorandum to Wai-chiao Pu, 17 August 1912.

British thought that if the convention between Russians and Mongolian came into effect and would support for the independence movement of the Mongols, Tibetans might also asked Russia for the same, which British would not allow as they were anxious to secure India's northern border.

Soon after resuming his office, President Yuan Shikai asked the Jebtsundamba Khutukhtu to retrace his declaration of independence and join the new initiative among 'the five races: Chinese, Manchus, Mongols, Muhammadans and Tibetans' for the complete integrity of the territories to make a great state of the Republic of China. The concept of the five races unity for the integrity of the nation was that the, "doctrine (of) premised upon the belief that frontier peoples wanted only equality of treatment under Chinese administration, not freedom from Chinese control altogether" (Smith, 1996:183). But being "dependencies" of the Qing Empire both the territories of the Mongols and Tibetans were not "on a footing of equality with China proper", replied the Great Khan, Jebtsundamba Khutukhtu to the Provisional-President Yuan Shikai. He said the following:

The declaration of independence and autonomy was effected before the abdication of the Manchu Empire. Such proclamation has been made to the world, and I am not at liberty to make any alteration. If you insist on doing so, please consult with the neighbouring country to prevent any objections that might arise.<sup>17</sup>

President Yuan Shikai made it clear that "dependencies" was the term used by the imperial court and, will not be used anymore. And while asking five races to be "on a footing of equality with China proper" he did so on the ground that the involvement from the neighbouring countries in the frontier of China posed strategic threat to the mainland China. He declared, the following:

Now that the five races are joined in a democratic union, the term "dependences" as used under the monarchy, must therefore cease to be used. For the future all administrative matters in connection with these territories (Tibet, Mongolia and Turkistan) will come within the sphere of internal administration. Until the local

---

<sup>17</sup> Cited in Mehra, 1969: 05 from Aitchen K. Wu (1950: 42) "China and the Soviet Union" Methuen: London.

politics have all been brought into harmony, all matters in Mongolia, Tibet and Turkistan should be dealt with in accordance with existing procedures.<sup>18</sup>

But this presidential 'order' from Yuan Shikai had not discouraged the Mongols and the Tibetans towards the independence movement. As discussed in the previous pages, both the countries mutually agreed to the treaty of friendship and alliance to each other on early January 1913, and subsequently the thirteenth Dalai Lama declared the independence of Tibet on February 15, 1913. By the end of 1913, the British India's Governor-General Lord Hardinge in his letter to the Secretary of State pointed out that "it would appear safer to count upon the existence of the agreement and bring it into the open".<sup>19</sup> It was brought "into the open" at the tripartite meeting of British India, China and Tibet during 1913-14 in Simla on equal terms, though Tibet was mentioned as a 'special status' in the agreement concluded in Delhi in July 1914. Thus, Mehra says, "even a cursory glance at its terms will bring out the fact that the treaty was an affirmation by the two states of their newly-won independence from a common yoke, with a clear pledge to support each other against such dangers as they may encounter" (Mehra, 1969:07).

So, the Tibetan-Mongol treaty was signed on January 11, 1913 at Urga, where the Mongolian Government was represented by Lama Rabdan, the acting Foreign Minister along with Damdinsurun, while Tibetan Government was represented by the diplomat Agvan Dorjjeff along with Agvan Choinzin and Gendun Galsan. Out of the nine articles, the first two were mutual acknowledgement by the heads of the states of the two countries as independent and sovereignty in position to rule. The articles started with the Dalai Lama's "approves and recognises" the independent Mongol state ruled by the Jebtsundamba Khutukhtu and in the same way the Jebtsundamba Khutukhtu's "approves and recognises" the independent Tibetan state ruled by the Dalai Lama. The third point on the Buddhism as the state religion was decided on the basis that it "will

---

<sup>18</sup> Cited in Mehra, 1969:06 from Foreign, Proceeding 36, sub-enclosure 2 on Presidential order: dated April 21, 1912. During the Republic of China, whole of China's frontier were under the influence of Japan in Manchuria and Inner Mongolia; Russia in Outer Mongolia and Sinkiang; France in Yunnan and Britain in Tibet.

<sup>19</sup> Cited in Mehra, 1969:09 from (Proceedings 154, Viceroy to Secretary of State, December 9, 1913), in Foreign, June 1914, Proceedings, 151-157, Office Note

work by joint consideration for the well being of the Buddhist faith". In order to "work" together for the "well being of the Buddhist faith" of both the countries, the next clause focused on the "afford" to assist each other "against external dangers" whether insider or outsider. The next three articles (V, VI & VII) discussed on the "official" or "religious" travelling and "mutual trade", and guaranteed that the transactions of credit were to be "allowed along with the knowledge and permission of official institutions". And the remaining last two articles VIII and IX say that the two Governments can "come to an agreement according to the circumstances then existing" by a supplement to the treaty by appointing a "special plenipotentiaries", while the treaty came into force without any procedure for the ratification from the "date of the signature itself".<sup>20</sup>

However, the existence of the treaty was occasionally considered questionable by some scholars and often put on doubts about the authority of the Tibetan signatories (Smith, 1996:186).<sup>21</sup> Even the foremost Tibetologist at the time Charles Bell had cast doubt on the validity of the treaty (Bell, 2000:151). But, the existence of the text since signed and authorized to be under the Dalai Lama is noted in McKay saying that "the British were supplied with their first official copy of the treaty by the Russian Government" and that too in the initial time (McKay, 1997:55). Besides, the work on the biography of Agvan Dorjiev by Snelling believes that "the Dalai Lama invested Dorjiev with plenipotentiary powers to negotiate and finalize a rapprochement between Mongolia and Tibet as sovereign states" (Snelling, 1993:150). The re-published form of the text of the Tibetan-Mongol treaty in Mongolian language by the Mongolian Academy of Sciences in 1982 and the discovery of the original text in Tibetan language from Mongolian archives (in 2007) are considered to be an important document in the field of Tibetan studies. Thus, commenting on the re-surfaced of the

---

<sup>20</sup> The quoted given in these two paragraph were from the Treaty of 1913 and for detail of the Treaty, do refer the Appendix VI etc. Both the treaties contains are same but some variations on the sentence formation are observable. The original Tibetan version translation is yet to be available, which was discovered in Mongolia, 2007.

<sup>21</sup> Here, Smith (1996:186) says, "the validity is often questioned, mainly on grounds of the authority of Dorjiev to negotiate on behalf of Tibet. The fact that Dorjiev was a Russian citizen while ethnically Tibetan somewhat compromises his role; the treaty had some advantages to Russia in that it could be interpreted as extending Russia's protectorate over Mongolia to encompass Tibet".



original Tibetan text of the treaty and various version of the treaty, Sperling (2008) says the following:

The treaty was found in Mongolia. It was likely in the state archives (it bears the seal of the old foreign ministry); with copies beginning to circulate only last year (2007). No doubt the delicate political situation of Mongolia, for most of the 20th century (positioned as it was between the USSR and China) played a role in keeping the original version of the treaty inaccessible. Nevertheless, other versions of the treaty were available in English, Chinese and Mongol. There was even a Tibetan version, translated (like the Chinese version) from English (!), by Tsepon W.D. Shakabpa—and until the original Tibetan text appeared this was the only version available to Tibetan readers. The English version itself was a translation from Russian, and the Russian version in turn is assumed to have been based on an unofficial Mongol rendering of the original. None of these other versions really match the full meaning of all parts of the original Tibetan text exactly, but the degree to which they come close to the sense of the original is surprising. To sum up, the chain of translation went from the Tibetan original to Mongol, then to Russian, then to English, and then from English separately to Chinese and (via Shakabpa) back into Tibetan (but as a different text than the original).<sup>22</sup>

Even then, the independence of neither Tibet nor Mongolia was recognised by both the British and Russia at that time. Scholars have argued that recognising the independence of Mongolia and Tibet by others (excluding Russia and British), which nominally was under the control of a weak China after the fall of the Qing Dynasty, might give chances to be controlled by Western powers particularly Russia and British. For example, (Outer) Mongolia which even after the independence in 1924 came under indirect control of Soviet Russia for more than seven decades. Thus, for Tibet and Mongolia, declaration of independence even after the mutual alliance and recognising each other was ignored by almost all the other countries. The Russians and British particularly during that period wished to improve their relations with each other and so did not want to arouse suspicions with regard to Tibet and Mongolia issue which may have affected their interest in the regions (Smith, 1996:186).

Even then, before the conclusion of Tibeto-Mongol treaty in 1913, Agvan Dorjjeff informed I Y Korostovets (the Russian diplomat who had negotiated the Russo-Mongolian Treaty) at Urga and Russian Foreign Ministry in St. Petersburg about his

---

<sup>22</sup> Thinley (2008) "Tibet-Mongolia Treaty of 1913, A proof of Tibet's Independence: Interview with Prof. Elliot Sperling" online news <http://phayul.com/news/article.aspx?23205&0=1&c=5> [Accessed on 2008/12/22]

proposal of a tripartite agreement on Tibet, which was received without any favour. As quoted in Snelling (1993) Korostovets's co-related his meeting with Dorjjeff in the following words:

The Dalai Lama wanted to break with China. He had already been proclaimed secular ruler, had appointed new ministers and wanted to enter into a new pact with Russia similar to the Russo-Mongolian one. The basis could be a mutual Russo-English protectorate over Tibet and the elimination of Chinese sovereignty. The conditions of the treaty would be as follows: Russia and England to get freedom of entry to Tibet; the Tibetan Government to consult Russian and English advisers and instructors on the organization of its financial and military systems. Russia to get the right of duty-free trade and a concession for exploiting the natural resources of the land. In exchange Russia to grant Tibet a financial loan, with its gold deposits as surety. Russia and England to provide arms for Tibet.<sup>23</sup>

The Russians were much satisfied with the protectorate over Mongolia and replied that both the Russians and British were bound by the 1907 convention. The same reply was given to Lonchen Shatra by the British, when Lonchen requested for British protectorate over Tibet in March 1912. Besides, "the Russians were undoubtedly aware that a joint protectorate over Tibet would be dominated by the British from their stronghold in India, while Russia had no common border with Tibet" (Smith, 1996:187).

### **The Significance of the 1913 Treaty and China's Response**

Speaking on the importance of the 1913 Tibetan-Mongol Treaty especially after the discovery of the original Tibetan text Sperling (2008) says, "since the very existence of the treaty [it] was sometimes called into question, its rediscovery has historical significance. The fact that it constitutes an official document wherein both Tibet and Mongolia recognize each other as independent in the wake of the collapse of the Qing Dynasty is central to its significance".<sup>24</sup> Until recently the treaty has been under the term of "alleged", "legal validity of", "have come to be signed or sealed" and "the competence of the plenipotentiaries who signed it". Here, Mehra says that the Russians

---

<sup>23</sup> Quoted in Snelling, 1993:150.

<sup>24</sup> Thinley (2008) "Tibet-Mongolia Treaty of 1913, A proof of Tibet's Independence: Interview with Prof. Elliot Sperling" online news <http://phayul.com/news/article.aspx?23205&0=1&c=5> [Accessed on 2008/12/22]

were not ignorant of the treaty as barely a week later “the Russian reportedly concluded with the Mongols, in St. Petersburg, a convention which clearly brought out the fact that they (Russian) were not ignorant of Urga’s earlier deal with Lhasa” (Mehra, 1969:08). This was the first treaty between Mongolian and Tibetans, where earlier it does not arise to have such a treaty to cement the relationship.

An invisible recognition to the treaty, as mentioned earlier in the Governor-General’s letter to the Secretary of State, London, was that Tibet was to “bring into the open”, which was done at the tripartite meeting of British India, China and Tibet at Simla. In his proposed draft for the agreement, the British plenipotentiary Sir Henry McMahon stated:

Three Governments (British India, China and Tibet) recognise the special status of Tibet and the special mutual interest of Great Britain and China in the maintenance of peace and tranquility in that country, agree that Tibet shall be regarded as a part from all party and provincial politics of China.<sup>25</sup>

In that very same memorandum, McMahon continued that the region—“was clearly prejudicial to the interests of Great Britain, in spite of the fact that our geographical position and our extended frontier line forced upon us a closer relation with Tibet than could be claimed by any foreign power”. This “any foreign power” was certainly pointed to Russia because after the Russo-Mongolia treaty in November 1912, Tibet had concluded treaty with Mongolia in January 1913, which posed a doubt on the British to think that Russian initiatives were behind the treaty of 1913. Thus, in order to reverse the 1907 Anglo-Russian Treaty on Tibet with new clause on Tibet to keep away from Russian influence, the British India had called the Simla Conference on the British term with the comparison to Russian treaty with Mongolia. However, the Russians were not ready to accept Tibet as in the case of Mongolia during the 1907 convention on Tibet along with Afghanistan and Persia.<sup>26</sup> In order to allow British to conclude treaty with Tibet, Russians asked concession on Afghanistan and Persia which the British were not ready to accept. Hence, the Simla convention was called by taking in to

---

<sup>25</sup> Mehra, 1969:09 cited from McMahon “Final Memorandum by the British Plenipotentiary, Tibet Conference”, Foreign, May 1915, Proceeding, 36-50.

<sup>26</sup> Refer the Appendix IV for ‘agreement concerning on Tibet’ of Anglo-Russian Convention, 1907.

consideration the Tibetan treaty with the Mongolian in mind and understanding that Tibetan has treaty making power. Yet, the British thought it would be necessary to include China so that it would not violate the 1907 agreement in which Britain had agreed to “not directly negotiate with Tibet” (Refer Appendix IV). At this point, Smith (1996) says the following:

The British moved the Chinese to negotiate by the threat to without British recognition of the Chinese Republic and by the implied threat to negotiate directly with Tibet, as Russia had negotiated with Mongolia. The renewed British interest in Tibet may have convinced the Chinese that they stood to lose Tibet to British influence, much as Mongolia rights as suzerain to negotiate over Tibet. China finally agreed to attend the negotiations, even though they protested Tibetan representation as an equal party.<sup>27</sup>

Though Chinese plenipotentiary was represented, he could not oppose to the British term and had initialed the treaty. But, later on, the Chinese Government refused to ratify the Agreement and had even disregarded the treaty on the reason that Tibet is a part of China (Goldstein, 1989:75). Yet, it did not stop British to take Tibet under their control, which resulted into the blockage of the implementation of the spirit of the friendship alliance between Tibet and Mongolia as well as re-introduction of diplomatic relationship between Tibet and Russia. This exploitation of British India on the Tibetan self-determination can be judged from McMahan’s introduction draft in the 1913-14 Simla Convention as following:

The Government of Great Britain and China recognise the right of the Government of Tibet to grant (and the Governments of Great Britain and China and their respective subjects hereby enjoy the right to undertake) concessions for railways, roads, telegraphs, mining and other industrial enterprises in Tibet, but the Government of Tibet agrees that no such concessions shall be granted to any power except with the consent of the Governments which are parties to this Treaty.<sup>28</sup>

As presented in the first proposed draft by McMahan, in the second proposed draft also (see inbox) forbidding relations with “any power” was exclusively added on Tibet. While the Simla Convention was on its way among Tibet, China and British India, the Russo-Chinese Declaration on (Outer) Mongolia as an autonomous region of China was

---

<sup>27</sup> See Smith, 1996:189-90.

<sup>28</sup> Mehra, 1969:09 cited from McMahan “Final Memorandum by the British Plenipotentiary, Tibet Conference”, Foreign, May 1915, Proceeding, 36-50.

signed on November 5, 1913.<sup>29</sup> The division of Mongolia into Outer and Inner had given an ample clue and provision for British India to exclude Russian and Chinese influence on Tibet with the same declaration of Outer and Inner Tibet. This creation of Outer and Inner Tibet was basically meant to take away the region from Peking's control. But the division of the two culturally bounded areas into outer and inner regions had completely blocked the clauses of the January 1913 agreement specially the third article's aims and objectives between the two nations.<sup>30</sup> This also means the Chinese strategic win over the traditional 'barbaric' people's plan of forming Pan-Mongolism or Pan-Tibetanism to 'Great' Pan-Buddhist State by the revolutionary Mongols and Tibetans. Thus, Mehra (1969) says that the division of Tibet into Outer and Inner was a set-back to the Pan-Buddhist state conception in general and Tibeto-Mongol relations in particular:

The creation of Inner Tibet was important in its own right. Essentially it was designed to bring into being a Chinese buffer zone between autonomous Tibet and (outer) Mongolia that would make more difficult the conduct of Tibeto-Mongol relations as defined by the new compact between the two countries.<sup>31</sup>

Though the Chinese officials declined to accept the treaty from the beginning itself, they did acknowledge that it was internal arrangement between regions within one country. Sperling (2008) analyses the Chinese authors' views on the 1913 Treaty in the following manner:

Chinese writers have generally disparaged the treaty, though not all do so using the same terms. One Chinese language work takes pains to refer to the treaty as an "agreement," implying that it had no international validity. (The same lexicographical attitude is evident in the 17-Point Agreement of 1951, where the term "agreement" was used to show that the document in question represented an internal arrangement between parties within one sole country and was not to be construed as an international instrument.) Other Chinese writers, in disparaging the Tibet-Mongol Treaty, rely on the account of Charles Bell, who stated that the 13th Dalai Lama had explicitly neither sought the conclusion of such a document nor, afterwards, ratified it.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup> For details of the Russo-Chinese Agreement, 1913, see Appendix VIII.

<sup>30</sup> See the Mongol-Tibetan Treaty of 1913 in Appendices VI, VI (a) and (b).

<sup>31</sup> See Mehra, 1969:11.

<sup>32</sup> Thinley (2008) "Tibet-Mongolia Treaty of 1913, A proof of Tibet's Independence: Interview with Prof. Elliot Sperling" online news <http://phayul.com/news/article.aspx?=-23205&0=1&c=5> [Accessed on 2008/12/22]

Nevertheless, the Chinese plenipotentiary did participate in Simla Convention at which one of the focal points was the contents of the 1913 Tibeto-Mongol Treaty. China, however, refused outrightly to accept the 1913 Tibeto-Mongol Treaty hoping to unilaterally reimpose Chinese control over Tibet and Mongolia in near future. The bilateral treaties of both the countries- Mongolia and Tibet with the Russian in 1912 and Britain in 1913-14 had divided the regions of Mongols and Tibetans into Outer and Inner, which was in direct interest of the British and Russian for their ambitious gain on trading and mining exploration. Besides, as discussed earlier, those treaties were a discouragement as well as a set-back to the desire of Pan-Mongolism or Pan-Tibetanism for having a Pan-Buddhist state which could be ethnically, culturally and geographically different from the “Han-Chauvinism” state of China.

To sum up, following the fall of the Qing Dynasty in 1911, it was a tough struggle for the spiritual and temporal leaders of the Tibetans as well as Mongols to retain their newly gained independence from the Chinese. In their struggle for independence, the common people of both the regions had participated in driving out the Chinese troops, especially in Tibet by Jensey Namgang Dzasa (later on Tsarong). But, again the saddest part of the history was the leading aristocrats and prominent monks who gave back up to the Chinese troops and not helped during their expulsion, especially the ninth Panchen Lama and his authorities in Shigatse. With the declaration of independence by both the thirteenth Dalai Lama and the ninth Jebtsundamba Khutukhtu, only Lhasa and Urga regimes’ recognised each other’s independence by the treaty of 1913. The treaty was exactly what its appellation stated it to be, which was signed and sealed by representatives of Tibet and Mongolia. It is also to be noted that the discovery of the original Tibetan text has now removed the term like “alleged”, “not exist”, “classic case of disinformation” and “legal validity”. Also this treaty was the first of its kind concluded between Mongolian and Tibetan, where as earlier there was no such treaty to bind their relationship. Though the Republic of China did not accept the treaty as well as the declaration of independence, yet the words like “autonomous” or “dependencies” were removed by the Presidential order in 1912, which declared China as being the nation of five races along with same equality with the China proper.

On the other hand, the Russo-Mongolia convention of 1912 and the Simla convention on 1913-14 had given the kind of a protectorate state to Mongolia and Tibet under Russia and Britain respectively. Yet, both the countries remained under the legal status of *de facto* Independence - Mongolia up to 1924 and Tibet up to 1951. But, the signatory of the 1913 Tibeto-Mongol treaty, the diplomat Agvan Dorjjeff let Tibet to become a victim of geo-politics in the "Great Game". Russians never considered him as a representative of Dalai Lama but merely a spokesman for spiritual affairs, while the British and Chinese treated him as a secret service to the Russian. All the previous correspondence by the Dalai Lama through Agvan Dorjjeff came under private correspondence to the Russian and was not considered as official documents. Thus, as mentioned earlier, both the countries' declaration of independence was turned into *de facto* independence due to the pressure from the neighbouring states like Britain, China and Russia. Besides, except the "1951 Agreement between China and Tibet on Seventeenth Point", no treaty has ever been found in which Tibetans had accepted or recognised the Chinese as the leader of their country, even the Mongols had not signed any such treaty. Thus, the discovery of the original Tibetan text of the 1913 Tibeto-Mongol treaty shows the importance of Tibet and Mongolia as being the two "independent" nations, but its prospects in present geo-political scenario cannot be predicted. Yet, it can be argued that the treaty cannot be dismissed as out of time or irrelevant in the international relations perspective, as Tibet has always been in search for the diplomatic recognition from the outside world as being separate from China.

## Chapter Fifth

## **Conclusion**



As discussed in the foregoing chapters the relations between the Tibetans and Mongols have been very significant during the entire period of this study, particularly after the establishment of the Institution of the Dalai Lama which gave a new dimension to the existing relations. The historical background of the relationship between the two people reveals that it was in the mid thirteenth century that they came in to proper contact when the Mongol Prince Godan Khan summoned the Tibetan ecclesiastical leader Sakya Pandita to his court. However, scholars argue that Chinggis Khan was the first to come in to contact with the Tibetan religious leaders or monks in the early thirteenth century after he annexed the Tangut Xixia Kingdom, presently located in the Kansu and Ningxia Hui provinces of China. It is thus believed that since then Buddhism began to flourish in the Mongol region with Tibetan spiritual leaders paying regular visits to the Mongol court. The study shows that the two sides also came closer due to the Buddhist tradition prevalent in both the regions of Tibetans and Mongols since a long time. In the case of Tibet, Buddhism is generally believed to have been introduced in the fourth century AD but it was only after the visit of Padma Sambhava (Guru Rinpoche) that the general populace was properly absorbed in to Buddhism in the seventh-eight century AD. On the other side, Buddhism seems to have first ventured into the Mongol region since the beginning of the first millennium through the Turkish and Uighur Buddhist missionaries of Central Asia, particularly those operating in today's Xinjiang-Uighur Autonomous Region of China.

The Tibetan sources mention that the Great Mongol Khans were converted to Buddhism by the Tibetan monks just after their early interactions with the latter, such as Prince Godan Khan by Sakya Pandita and Emperor Khubilai Khan by Phagspa Lama. Yet, Buddhism is said to have remained merely a court religion during those periods. With the visit of Sonam Gyatso, the third Dalai Lama to the Mongol court in 1578 there began a gradual transformation of the warrior Mongols in to the peace loving ones, which proved to be of immense back-up to the Ming Dynasty's policy of pacifying the Mongols in order to keep its kingdom safe and sound. In addition to the third, the fourth Dalai Lama Yonten Gyatso due to his being a prince tried to upgrade the relations between the Tibetans and Mongols. What is significant to note here is that it was during

his time that formal patronage to the monks of Tibetan religious schools by the Mongols started to change from Kagyupa to Gelugpa Lamas. The Dalai Lama, the spiritual and temporal leader of the Tibetan Buddhism, was coined into *tulku* (incarnation) tradition, while other schools followed the hereditary or nominative system to choose their own spiritual leaders. Further in 1642, the fifth Dalai Lama Lobsang Gyatso is credited with founding the Government of Tibet or the Institution of the Dalai Lama named as *Ganden Phodrang Chokle Namgyal* with the support of the Mongol chieftain Gushri Khan.

With the establishment of the Institution of the Dalai Lama, Tibet witnessed the beginning of a new reign in its history. Since then the Dalai Lama has been both the spiritual and temporal head of the Tibetans. But the administration of the Institution and its policies were fully based on religious and political considerations and so, it was intermingled with both the ongoing politics as well as the role played by the monasteries. In short, the politico-religious character of the Institution had been rooted in a feudal theocracy. The ruling elite, mostly belonged to the patrician families permanently based in Lhasa and nearby, was found to be running the administration with the monastic officials who were thought to be secular and peace loving but in reality they were just opposite. Though the structure of the Institution was more or less within the aristocracy and monastery, underneath the temporal and spiritual head was always the Dalai Lama. The day to day administration and political affairs were run by the *Desi* with the help of the council of ministers *Kashag*, while the assembly *Tsongdue* that included members from aristocrat families, trading communities as well as high lamas was merely a functional one. Later on, it also appears that despite the Institution being an intact entity the Dalai Lama became just a religious figure. What is more striking is that the Institution remained handicapped for almost two centuries due to intervention by the *Ambans* and *Mongols* during the periods between the seventh to the thirteenth Dalai Lamas.

Nevertheless, religion always played a major role both within and outside the Institution, particularly in forging relations with the Mongols. At the end of the

nineteenth century, the structure of the Institution and its policies were in such a scenario that the century's old tradition had to be changed in order to arrive at the modern stage. It became more or less possible after the assumption of authority of the Institution in 1895 by the thirteenth Dalai Lama or the Great Thirteenth, as he came to be known. In the early twentieth century, he changed the whole prevailing scenario of the Institution's activities, though later on at the political level he was not able to save Tibet from the future uncertainty. Due to the initiatives taken by the Great Thirteenth the governance and policies of the Institution seem to have implemented new methods to bring Tibet to the modern period. He issued a political testament to set right the Institution's backwardness and to keep observing the impending danger to Tibetan political scenario in order to safeguard the religion and the "nation" (Tibet) as a whole. That is why his reform policy changed the structure of the government by introducing new departments, such as foreign affairs. His proclamation of 1913 declaring Tibet as an independent nation was considered to be a "legally proven de facto independence in international law". It is more so because a treaty concluded between Mongolia and Tibet in the same year further confirms the independent existence of the two "sovereign" nations. Though for a short period of early twentieth century, the Institution of the Dalai Lama was found to have gained sovereignty to rule Tibet, the danger surrounding the very existence of the Institution in particular and Tibetan region in general proved to be a set back for the Tibeto-Mongol relations.

So far as Buddhist factor in the development of relations between the Tibetans and the Mongols is concerned, it has been found that Buddhism provided the essential bedrock for cementing the ties between the two sides especially since the visit of the Tibetan monk Sakya Pandita to the Mongol court in the thirteenth century. Yet, the popularity of Buddhism among the Mongol masses took a significant amount of time which owes much to the third Dalai Lama who visited the Mongol court in the sixteenth century. His visit brought in to limelight the common cultural bondage existing between the Tibetans and the Mongols due to the spread of religion, i.e., Tibetan Buddhism or Lamaism which ultimately gave the idea of Pan-Buddhism as the core of Pan-Mongolism or Pan-Tibetanism in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

In both the Mongol and Tibetan societies, the Buddhist monastery was the heart of ancient educational institutions. The monasticism was encouraged on a large scale among both the Tibetans and Mongols and that too especially after the establishment of the Institution of the Dalai Lama. Tibetan Buddhism remained the main religion and the most important cultural force in evolving the ties between the Tibetans and Mongols. Not only that, the Trans-Baikal Mongols in Russia and Khalkha Mongols in Mongolia used Buddhism as a tool for resistance to Russification, while Tibetans used this religion in the same way to resist the Chinese.

Although with the establishment of monasteries and missionaries by the Gelugpa as well as Kagyupa schools, Buddhism in Mongolia flourished like anything else to reach its height, the Bolshevik Revolution in the early twentieth century contributed much to diminish the monastic institutions as well as any hope for the realization of the idea of Pan-Mongolism based on the concept of Pan-Buddhism. Added to this was the thirteenth Dalai Lama's declaration of self-determination and proclamation of Tibet as an independent nation which again was a set back to the concept of Pan-Buddhism because even the Pan-Tibetanism had not been able to muster support for cooperation among the fellow Tibetans. Besides, the Pan-Mongolism along with the Pan-Tibetanism could not be realized due to ineffectiveness of the Institution of the Dalai Lama and the lack of coordination among the Mongols. The rivalry between the thirteenth Dalai Lama and the eighth Jebtsundamba Khutukhtu for having supremacy in the Pan-Mongolian aspirations further made the situation worse. Thus, as quoted in chapter third, "both religious leaders- the Dalai Lama in Tibet and the Jebtsundamba Khutukhtu in Mongolia became political symbols of independence, and their fate became the political fate of their countries."

A few years after the overthrow of the Qing Dynasty by the Republicans in China in 1911, a tough struggle began for the spiritual and temporal leaders of the Tibetans as well as Mongols to retain their newly gained independence from the Chinese. In their struggle for independence, the common people of both the regions had participated in driving out the Chinese troops, especially in Tibet by Jensey Namgang

Dzasa (later on Tsarong). But, again the saddest part of the history was the leading aristocrats and prominent monks who instead of helping to expel the Chinese troops gave their back up to them, especially the ninth Panchen Lama and his authorities in Shigatse. In the meantime, as mentioned elsewhere, with the declaration of independence by both the thirteenth Dalai Lama and the ninth Jebtsundamba Khutukhtu, only Lhasa (Tibetan Capital) and Urga (Mongolian capital now known as Ulaanbaatar) regimes recognized each other's independence by the treaty the two sides concluded in 1913. The treaty was exactly what its appellation stated it to be, which was signed and sealed by representatives of Tibet and Mongolia. What is significant to note here is that with the discovery of the original Tibetan text of the Tibetan-Mongol treaty of 1913 the terms like "alleged", "not exist", "classic case of disinformation" and "legal validity" have now been removed. Besides, this treaty also signifies the fact of being the first of its kind concluded between Mongolian and Tibetans, whereas no such treaty to bind their relationship has earlier been found. Though the Republic of China did not accept the treaty as well as the declaration of independence, the words like "autonomous" or "dependencies" were removed by the Presidential order of 1912, which declared China as being the nation of five races along with same equality with the China proper.

Meanwhile, the Russo-Mongolia convention of 1912 and the Simla convention of 1913-14 provided the kind of a "protectorate" over Mongolia and Tibet under Russia and Britain respectively. Yet, both the countries remained under the legal status of *de facto* Independence - Mongolia up to 1924 and Tibet up to 1951. What has been noticed is that the signatory of the 1913 Tibetan-Mongol treaty, the diplomat Agvan Dorjjeff was made responsible for Tibet falling victim to geo-politics in the "Great Game". Russians never considered him as a representative of the Dalai Lama but merely a spokesman for spiritual affairs, while the British and Chinese treated him as a secret service to the Russian. All the previous correspondence by the Dalai Lama done through Agvan Dorjjeff came under the category of private correspondence with the Russian and was not considered as official documents. Thus, as mentioned earlier, both the countries' declaration of independence was turned into *de facto* independence due to

the pressure from the neighbouring states like Britain, China and Russia. Besides, except the “1951 Agreement between China and Tibet on Seventeenth Point”, no treaty has ever been found in which Tibetans had accepted or recognised the Chinese as the leader of their country, even the Mongols had not signed any such treaty. In such a scenario, the 1913 Tibetan-Mongol treaty signifies the importance of Tibet and Mongolia as being the two “independent” nations, but its prospects in present geo-political scenario cannot be predicted. Yet, it can be argued that the treaty cannot be dismissed as out of time or irrelevant in the international relations perspective, as Tibet has always been in search for the diplomatic recognition from the outside world as being separate from China.

In the post-1913 period, there have been hardly any sources which could give a clear picture of the state of relations between Tibetans and Mongols. However, it has been revealed that after the formation of the United Soviet Socialist Republic (USSR) following the 1917 Bolshevik Revolution in Russia, the Tibetan-Mongol relations witnessed a definite set back. While Mongolia gradually came under the Soviet grip, Tibetan territory saw its delineation into inner and outer regions with China exercising its influence on both the regions. Besides, the establishment of the Communist rule in Mongolia had an adverse impact on maintaining relations between not only the Mongols of Mongolia and Tibetans but also between Russian Mongols (Buryatia, Tuva and Kalmykia) and Tibetans. This was more so because Urga, the capital of (Outer) Mongolia, which was the connecting link between Tibetans and Mongols of Mongolia as well as Russia, witnessed the implementation of Communist ideology that did not allow Tibetan Buddhism to flourish. Such relations remained unrealized for a period of more than 50 years. It was only after the visit of the fourteenth Dalai Lama to the former USSR and Mongolia in 1970s that the revival of relations between the Tibetans and Mongols began to take place. More recently, in 2007, with the visit of more than 400 Russian Mongols and the Mongols of Mongolia to Dharamshala a new chapter has been opened in the relations between the Tibetan and Mongols. One can safely conclude that such visits would reinforce the importance of the Institution of the Dalai Lama in evolving Tibetan-Mongol relations in the years to come.

# Appendices

**APPENDIX I**

**The Successive Dalai Lamas**

<b>S/no.</b>	<b>Name of the Dalai Lamas</b>	<b>Period</b>	<b>Regions</b>	<b>Families Background</b>
1	Gedun Drupa	1391-1475		Nomadic Families
2	Gedun Gyatso	1475-1542	Tsang	Yogis Families
3	Sonam Gyatso	1543-1588	Tolung Valley, Tsang	Nobles Families
4	Yonten Gyatso	1589-1617	Mongolia	Royal
5	Lobsang Gyatso	1617-1682	Chongyas, Tsang	Nobles Families
6	Tsangyang Gyatso	1683-1706	Monyul, Tawang	Yogis-Nobles Families
7	Kalsang Gyatso	1708-1757	Lithang, Kham	Farmer
8	Jampel Gyatso	1758-1804	Thopgyal, Tsang	
9	Lungtok Gyatso	1806-1815	DanChokhor, Tsang	
10	Tsultrim Gyatso	1816-1837	Lithang, Kham	
11	Khedrup Gyatso	1838-1856	Garthar, U	Farmer
12	Thinley Gyatso	1856-1875	Olga, U	
13	Thubten Gyatso	1876-1933	Thakpo Langdun,	Farmer
14	Tenzin Gyatso	1935-	Taktser, Amdo	Farmer



## APPENDIX II

The Reign of the *Desi* / *Si-kyong* (Regent)

S/no.	Name of the Regent	Reign Period	Ruler	Remarks
1	<i>Desi</i> Sonam Choephel	1642-1658	5 <sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama	Died
2	<i>Desi</i> Thinley Gyatso	1660-1668	-do-	Died
3	<i>Desi</i> Lobsang Thutob	1669-1675	-do-	Removed
4	<i>Desi</i> Lobsang Jinpa	1675-1679	-do-	Retired
5	<i>Desi</i> Sangye Gyatso	1679-1703	5 <sup>th</sup> / 6 <sup>th</sup> Dalai Lamas	Removed/ Executed
6	<i>Desi</i> Ngawang Rinchen	1703-1706	6 <sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama	Removed
	King Lhasang Khan	1701-1717	6 <sup>th</sup> / 7 <sup>th</sup> Dalai Lamas	Killed
	Dzungar General Tsewang Rabten	1717-1720	7 <sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama	Runaway
	<i>Kalon</i> Kanchenay Sonam Gyalpo	1721-1727	-do-	Murdered
	King Pholanay Sonam Topgyal	1727-1747	-do-	Died
	King Pholanay Gyurmed Namgyal	1747-1750	-do-	Murdered
	<i>Kalon</i> Doring Pandita	1750-1757	-do-	Retired
7	<i>Si-kyong</i> Demo Jampel Delek Gyatso	1757-1777	8 <sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama	Died
8	<i>Si-kyong</i> Tsemoling Ngawang Tsultrim	1777-1786	-do-	Retired
9	<i>Si-kyong</i> Kundeling Tenpai Gonpo	1789-1790	-do-	Removed
10	<i>Si-kyong</i> Tsemoling Ngawang Tsultrim	1791-1791	-do-	Reappointed /Died
11	<i>Si-kyong</i> Kundeling Tenpai Gonpo	1791-1810	8 <sup>th</sup> / 9 <sup>th</sup> Dalai Lamas	Reappointed/ Died
12	<i>Si-kyong</i> Jigmed Gyatso	1810-1819	9 <sup>th</sup> / 10 <sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama	Died
13	<i>Si-kyong</i> Tsemoling Jampel Tsultrim	1819-1844	10 <sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama	Removed
14	<i>Si-kyong</i> Reting Tsultrim Gyaltsen	1845-1855	11 <sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama	Retired
15	-do-	1856-1862	12 <sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama	Reappointed / Removed
16	<i>Si-kyong</i> Sadra Wangchuk Gyalpo	1862-1864	-do-	Died
17	<i>Si-kyong</i> Lobsang Khenrab Wangchuk	1864-1872	-do-	Died
18	<i>Si-kyong</i> Kundeling Choskyi Gyaltsen	1875-1886	12 <sup>th</sup> / 13 <sup>th</sup> Dalai Lamas	Died
19	<i>Si-kyong</i> Demo Thinley Rabgyas	1886-1895	13 <sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama	Removed
20	<i>Si-kyong</i> Reting Yeshe Gyaltsen	1934-1941	14 <sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama	Retired
21	<i>Si-kyong</i> Taktra Tenpai Gyaltsen	1941-1950	-do-	Retired

## APPENDIX III

Tenure of (Manchu) *Ambans*

S/ no.	Name of the Ambans	Ethnic Origin	Reign Period	Dalai Lamas	Qing Emperors	Remarks
01	Sengge ( <i>zongli</i> )*	Manchu	1727-1733	7 <sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama	Shizong	
02	Mala ( <i>zongli</i> )	"	1727-1728	"	"	No.05 <i>Zongli</i> (1729-1731) No.10 <i>Xieban</i> (1733-1736)
03	Mailu ( <i>xieli</i> )	"	1727-1733	"	"	
04	Zhouying ( <i>xieli</i> )	?	1727-1729	"	"	
05	Mala ( <i>zongli</i> )	Manchu	1729-1731	"	"	No.02 <i>Zongli</i> (1727-1728) No.10 <i>Xieban</i> (1733-1736)
06	Baojinzhong ( <i>xieli</i> )	?	1729-1732	"	"	
07	Qingbao ( <i>xieban</i> )	?	1731-1734	"	"	
08	Miaoshou ( <i>xieban</i> )	Manchu	1731-1734	"	"	
09	Lizhu ( <i>xieli</i> )	?	1732-1733	"	"	Died prior to assuming office.
10	Mala ( <i>xieban</i> )	Manchu	1733-1736	"	"	No.02 <i>Zongli</i> (1727-1728) No.05 <i>Zongli</i> (1729-1731)
11	Aerxun	"	1734	"	"	
12	Nasutai	"	1734-1737	"	"	
13	Hangyilu	"	1737-1738	"	Gaozong	
14	Jishan	"	1738-1741	"	"	No.19 <i>Fu dutong</i> (1749-1750)
15	Suobai(Subai) ( <i>fu dutong</i> )	"	1741-1744	"	"	No.17 <i>Xieban</i> (1747-1748)
16	Fuqing Manchu	"	1744-1748	"	"	No.20 <i>Dutong</i> (1749-1750)
17	Suobai(Subai) ( <i>xieban</i> )	"	1747-1748	"	"	No.15 <i>Fu dutong</i> (1741-1744)
18	Labudun ( <i>fu dutong</i> )	"	1748-1749	"	"	No.21 <i>Zuo duyushi</i> (1750)
19	Jishan ( <i>fu dutong</i> )	"	1749-1750	"	"	No.14
20	Fuqing ( <i>dutong</i> )	"	1749-1750	"	"	Killed in 1750 anti-Manchu riots in Lhasa.
21	Labudun ( <i>zuo duyushi</i> )	"	1750	"	"	-do-
22	Tongning ( <i>zongshi</i> )	"	1750	"	"	Did not assume office.
23	Bandi Mongol <i>fu dutong</i> , <i>banshi dachen</i> (Amban)**	Mongol	1750-1752	7 <sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama	"	
24	Namuzhaer Assistant Amban (AA)	"	1750-1752	"	"	

S/ no.	Name of the Ambans	Ethnic Origin	Reign Period	Dalai Lamas	Qing Emperors	Remarks
25	Duoerji ? Amban	?	1752-1754	"	"	
26	Shutai(Shuchun) (AA)	Manchu	1752-1756	"	"	
27	Zhaohui (AA)	"	1753-1754	"	"	
28	Salashan (Amban)	"	1754-1757	"	"	
29	Wumitai (AA)	Mongol	1756-1759	"	"	No.42 Amban (1773-1775)
30	Guanbao (Amban)	Manchu	1757-1761	7 <sup>th</sup> & 8 <sup>th</sup> Dalai Lamas	"	No.36 Amban (1766-1767)
31	Jifu (AA)	Mongol	1759-1761	8 <sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama	"	
32	Funai (Amban)	Manchu	1761-1764	"	"	
33	Fujing (AA)	?	1761-1764	"	"	
34	Aminertu (Amban)	Manchu	1764-1766	"	"	Relieved of his post.
35	Machang (AA)	"	1764-1767	"	"	
36	Guanbao (Amban)	"	1766-1767	"	"	No.30 Asst. Amban (1757-1761)
37	Tuoyun (AA)	"	1767-1769	"	"	
38	Manggulai (Amban)	"	1767-1773	"	"	
39	Changzai (AA)	"	1769-1771	"	"	
40	Suolin (AA)	"	1771-1773	"	"	No.45 Amban (1776-1780)
41	Hengxiu (AA)	"	1773-1776	"	"	
42	Wumitai (Amban)	Mongol	1773-1775	"	"	No.29 Asst. Amban (1756-1759)
43	Liubaozhu (Amban)	"	1775-1779	"	"	No.49 Amban (1785-1786)
44	Hengrui (AA)	Manchu	1776-1780	"	"	
45	Suolin (Amban)	"	1776-1780	"	"	No.40 Asst. Amban (1771-1773) Died in 1780.
46	Baotai (Fuxihun) (AA)	Mongol	1780-1783	"	"	No.57 Amban (1790-1791)
47	Boqing'e (Amban)	Manchu	1780-1785	"	"	
48	Qinglin (AA)	Mongol	1783-1788	"	"	Relieved of his post.
49	Liubaozhu (Amban)	"	1785-1786	8 <sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama	"	No.43 Asst. Amban (1775-1779)
50	Yamantai Mongol (AA)	"	1786-1788	"	"	No.56 Asst. Amban (1790-1791)
51	Fozhi (Amban)	Manchu	1788-1789	"	"	
52	Shulian (Amban)	Manchu	1788-1790	"	"	No.59 Asst. Amban (1791-1792)
53	Bazhong (Amban)	Mongol	1788-1789	"	"	
54	Pufu (AA)	"	1789-1790	"	"	No.55 Amban (1790)

S/ no.	Name of the Ambans	Ethnic Origin	Reign Period	Dalai Lamas	Qing Emperors	Remarks
55	Pufu (Amban)	Mongol	1790	"	"	Relieved of his post prematurely. No.54 Asst. Amban (1789-1790)
56	Yamantai (AA)	"	1790-1791	"	"	Relieved of his post prematurely. No.50 Asst. Amban (1786-1788)
57	Baotai(Fuxihun) (Amban)	"	1790-1791	"	"	Relieved of his post prematurely. No.46 Asst. Amban (1780-1783)
58	Kuilin (Amban)	Manchu	1791	"	"	Died in 1791.
59	Shulian (AA)	"	1791-1792	"	"	No.52 Amban (1788-1790)
60	Ehui (Amban)	"	1791-1792	"	"	Relieved of his post prematurely.
61	Eledengbao (AA)	"	1792	"	"	
62	Chengde (Amban)	"	1792-1793	"	"	
63	Helin (Amban)	"	1792-1794	"	"	
64	Hening(Heying) (AA)	Mongol	1793-1800	"	"	No.67 Amban (1800)
65	Songyun (Amban)	"	1794-1799	"	"	
66	Yingshan (Amban)	Manchu	1799-1803	"	Renzong	
67	Hening(Heying) (Amban)	Mongol	1800	"	"	No.64 Asst. Amban (1793-1800)
68	Funing (AA)	Manchu	1801-1803	"	"	No.69 Amban (1803-1804)
69	Funing (Amban)	"	1803-1804	"	"	No.68 Asst. Amban (1801-1803)
70	Chenglin (AA)	"	1803-1805	"	"	
71	Cebake (Amban)	Mongol	1804-1805	"	"	Relieved of his post prematurely.
72	Wenbi (AA)	Manchu	1805-1808	9 <sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama	"	No.74 Amban (1808-1811)
73	Yuning (Amban)	"	1805-1808	"	"	
74	Wenbi (Amban)	"	1808-1811	"	"	No.72 Asst. Amban (1805-1808)
75	Longfu (AA)	"	1808-1809	"	"	
76	Yangchun (AA)	"	1809-1811	9 <sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama	"	No.77 Amban (1811-1812)
77	Yangchun (Amban)	"	1811-1812	"	"	No.76 Asst. Amban (1809-1811)
78	Qinghui (AA)	Mongol	1811-1812	"	"	
79	Hutuli (Amban)	Manchu	1811-1813	"	"	
80	Fengshen (AA)	"	1812	"	"	Relieved of his post prematurely.
81	Xiangbao (AA)	"	1812-1814	"	"	
82	Ximing (AA)	"	1814	"	"	No.83 Amban (1814-1817)
83	Ximing (Amban)	"	1814-1817	9 <sup>th</sup> & 10 <sup>th</sup> Dalai Lamas	"	No.82 Asst. Amban (1814)

S/ no.	Name of the Ambans	Ethnic Origin	Reign Period	Dalai Lamas	Qing Emperors	Remarks
84	Keshike (AA)	?	1814-1817	"	"	Died in 1817.
85	Yulin (Amban)	Manchu	1817-1820	10 <sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama	"	
86	Linghai (AA)	?	1891-1821	"	"	
87	Wen'gan (Amban)	Manchu	1820-1823	"	"	
88	Nadanzhu(Nadang'a) (AA)	"	1821	"	Xuanzong	Appointment cancelled.
89	Baochang (AA)	"	1821-1825	"	"	
90	Songting (Amban)	"	1823-1827	"	"	
91	Dunliang (AA)	"	1825-1826	"	"	Injured on the way to Tibet; returned to Beijing.
92	Guangqing (AA)	"	1826-1828	"	"	
93	Huixian (Amban)	"	1827-1830	"	"	
94	Shengtai (AA)	Mongol	1828-1830	"	"	Relieved of his post prematurely.
95	Xingke (AA)	Manchu	1830	"	"	No.96 Amban (1830-1833)
96	Xingke (Amban)	"	1830-1833	"	"	No.95 Asst. Amban (1830)
97	Longwen (AA)	"	1830-1833	"	"	No.98 Amban (1833-1834)
98	Longwen (Amban)	"	1833-1834	"	"	No.97 Asst. Amban (1830-1833)
99	Xu Kun (AA)	<i>Hanjun</i>	1833-1834	"	"	
100	Wenwei (Amban)	Manchu	1834-1835	"	"	No.127 Amban (1853)
101	Songlian (AA)	"	1834	"	"	Did not assume office.
102	Nadanzhu(Nadang'a) (AA)	"	1834	"	"	Did not assume office.
103	Qinglu (AA)	Mongol	1834-1836	"	"	No.104 Amban (1836)
104	Qinglu (Amban)	"	1836	10 <sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama	"	No.103 Asst. Amban (1834-1836)
105	Eshun'an (AA)	Manchu	1836-1837	"	"	No.122 Asst. Amban (1849-1851)
106	Guanshengbao (Amban)	"	1836-1839	10 <sup>th</sup> & 11 <sup>th</sup> Dalai Lamas	"	
107	Naerjing'e (AA)	Manchu	1837-1838	"	"	Did not assume office.
108	Meng Bao (AA)	<i>Hanjun</i>	1838-1839	11 <sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama	"	No.109 Amban (1839-1842)
109	Meng Bao (Amban)	"	1839-1842	"	"	No.108 Asst. Amban (1837-1838)
110	Haipu (AA)	Manchu	1839-1842	"	"	No.110 Amban (1842-1843)
111	Haipu (Amban)	"	1842-1843	"	"	No.111 Asst. Amban (1839-1842)
112	Naleheng'e (AA)	"	1842	"	"	Did not assume office.
113	Zhong Fang (AA)	<i>Hanjun</i>	1842-1844	"	"	

S/ no.	Name of the Ambans	Ethnic Origin	Reign Period	Dalai Lamas	Qing Emperors	Remarks
114	Meng Bao (Amban)	<i>Hanjun</i>	1843	"	"	No.108, No.109
115	Qishan (Amban)	Manchu	1843-1847	"	"	
116	Ruiyuan (AA)	"	1844-1846	"	"	
117	Wenkang (AA)	"	1846	"	"	Appointment cancelled due to health reasons.
118	Mutenge (AA)	"	1846-1848	"	"	No.120 Amban (1848-1852)
119	Binliang (Amban)	"	1847-1848	"	"	
120	Mutenge (Amban)	"	1848-1852	"	"	Relieved of his post. No.118 Asst. Amban (1846-1848)
121	Chongen (AA)	"	1848-1849	"	"	
122	Eshun'an (AA)	"	1849-1851	"	"	Relieved of his post. No.105 Asst. Amban (1836-1837)
123	Enteheng'e (AA)	Mongol	1851-1852	"	Wenzong	Relieved of his post.
124	Baoqing (AA)	Manchu	1852-1853	"	"	
125	Haimei (Amban)	"	1852	"	"	Fell ill on the way to Tibet; therefore never took office.
126	Zhunling (AA)	?	1852-1854	"	"	Relieved of his post.
127	Wenwei (Amban)	Manchu	1853	"	"	Did not assume office.
128	Hetehe (Amban)	Mongol	1853-1857	"	"	Relieved of his post.
129	Yujian (AA)	Manchu	1854	11 <sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama	"	Died in 1854.
130	Manqing (AA)	Mongol	1855-1857	"	"	No.131 Amban (1857-1862)
131	Manqing (Amban)	"	1857-1862	12 <sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama	"	No.130 Asst. Amban (1855-1857)
132	Ancheng (AA)	Manchu	1857	"	"	Did not assume office. No.164 Asst. Amban (1900-1902)
133	Enqing (AA)	Mongol	1857-1862	"	"	Died in 1862.
134	Chongshi (Amban)	Manchu	1859-1861	"	"	Did not assume office.
135	Jing Wen (Amban)	<i>Hanjun</i>	1861-1869	"	"	
136	Ruichang (AA)	Manchu	1866-1867	"	Muzong	Did not assume office.
137	Enlin (AA)	Mongol	1867-1868	"	"	No.138 Amban (1868-1872)
138	Enlin (Amban)	"	1868-1872	"	"	No.137 Asst. Amban (1867-1868)
139	Detai (AA)	?	1868-1873	"	"	
140	Chengii (Amban)	Manchu	1872-1874	"	"	
141	Xikai (AA)	Mongol	1873-1876	12 <sup>th</sup> & 13 <sup>th</sup> DL	"	Relieved of his post.

S/ no.	Name of the Ambans	Ethnic Origin	Reign Period	Dalai Lamas	Qing Emperors	Remarks
142	Songgui (Amban)	Manchu	1874-1879	"	"	
143	Guifeng (AA)	"	1876-1878	13 <sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama	Dezong	
144	Xizhen (Xichun) (AA)	"	1878-1879	"	"	Did not assume office.
145	Selenge (AA)	"	1879			No.146 Amban (1879-1885)
146	Selenge (Amban)	"	1879-1885	"	"	No.145 Asst. Amban (1879)
147	Weiqing (AA)	"	1879-1882	"	"	
148	Eli Manchu (AA)	"	1882	"	"	Did not assume office.
149	Chonggang (AA)	Mongol	1882-1886	"	"	Relieved of his post.
150	Wenshi (Amban)	Manchu	1885-1888	"	"	
151	Shangxian (AA)	Mongol	1886	"	"	Did not assume office.
152	Shengtai (AA)	"	1886-1890	"	"	No.154 Amban (1890-1892)
153	Changgeng (Amban)	Manchu	1888-1890	"	"	
154	Shangxian (Amban)	Mongol	1890-1892	"	"	No.152 Asst. Amban (1886-1890)
155	Shaojian (Shaoxian) (AA)	Manchu	1890-1891	"	"	Died prior to assuming office.
156	Kuihuan (AA)	Mongol	1891-1892	"	"	No.157 Amban (1892-1896)
157	Kuihuan (Amban)	"	1892-1896	13 <sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama	"	No.156 Asst. Amban (1891-1892)
158	Yan Mao (AA)	<i>Hanjun</i>	1892-1894	"	"	
159	Naqin (AA)	Manchu	1894-1898	"	"	No.166 Asst. Amban (1902-1903)
160	Wenhai (Amban)	"	1896-1900	"	"	
161	Yugang (AA)	Mongol	1898-1900	"	"	No.163 Amban (1900-1902)
162	Qing Shan (Amban)	<i>Hanjun</i>	1900	"	"	Died prior to assuming office.
163	Yugang (Amban)	Mongol	1900-1902	"	"	No.161 Asst. Amban (1898-1900)
164	Ancheng (Amban)	Manchu	1900-1902	"	"	Relieved of his post.
165	Youtai (Amban)	Mongol	1902-1906	"	"	
166	Naqin (AA)	Manchu	1902-1903	"	"	Relieved of his post.
167	Guilin (AA)	"	1903-1904	"	"	Relieved of his post.
168	Fengquan (AA)	"	1904-1905	"	"	Killed in 1905 anti-Manchu riots in Bathang, Eastern Tibet.
169	Lianyu (AA)	Manchu	1905-1906	"	"	No.170 Amban (1906-1912)
170	Lianyu (Amban)	"	1906-1912	"	Dezong, Puyi, Republic of China	No.169 Asst. Amban (1905-1906)
171	Zhang Yintang (AA)	Chinese	1906-1908	"	Dezong	Later held ambassadorial posts in USA, Peru, Cuba and Mexico.

S/ no.	Name of the Ambans	Ethnic Origin	Reign Period	Dalai Lamas	Qing Emperors	Remarks
172	Zhao Erfeng (Amban)	<i>Hanjun</i>	1908-1911	"	Puyi	
173	Wen Zongyao (AA)	Chinese	1908-1910	"	Puyi	Relieved of his post.

Sources: Wu Fengpei and Zeng Guoping (1988), *Qingdai zhu Zang dachen zhuanlue* (Biographies of Ambans of Tibet in the Qing Period); Tibet People's Press: Lhasa  
Josef Kolmas (2003), "The Ambans and Assistant Ambans of Tibet (1727-1912) Some Statistical Observations", in Alex McKay (ed.) *The History of Tibet, Vol. II, The Medieval Period*; RoutledgeCurzon: London

---

\* Till the year 1750 (S/no. 01-22) the Manchus representatives in Lhasa were given different official ranks such as Zongli (superintendent); Zieli (assistant manager); xieban (assistant agent); Fu dutong (vice commander-in-chief); Dutong (commander-in-chief); Zuo duyushi (president of censorate); Shilang (vice minister)

\*\* From 1750 onwards, a system of 2 imperial residents was introduced. The chief or senior was called Zhu Zang banshi dachen (Amban) "Grand Master Resident of Tibet. And the assistant or junior was titled Zhu Zang bangban dachen (Asst. Amban) "Grand Minister Assistant Administrator of Tibet".



## APPENDIX IV

### CONVENTION BETWEEN GREAT BRITAIN AND RUSSIA, 1907

[Signed at St. Petersburg on the 18<sup>th</sup> (31<sup>st</sup>) August 1907]

His Majesty the King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and of the British Dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India, and His Majesty the Emperor of All the Russias, animated by the sincere desire to settle by mutual agreement different questions concerning the interests of their States on the Continent of Asia, have determined to conclude Agreements destined to prevent all cause of misunderstanding between Great Britain and Russia in regard to the questions referred to, and have nominated for the purpose their respective Plenipotentiaries, to wit:

His Majesty the King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and of the British Dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India, the Right Honourable Sir Arthur Nicolson, His Majesty's the Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to His Majesty the Emperor of All the Russians:

His Majesty the Emperor of All the Russias, the Master of his Court Alexander Iswolsky, Minister for Foreign Affairs; who, having communicated to each other their full powers, found in good and due form have agreed on the following: -

#### **Agreement Concerning Tibet\***

The Government of Great Britain and Russia recognizing the suzerain rights of China in Tibet, and considering the fact that Great Britain, by reason of her geographical position, has a special interest in the maintenance of the status quo in the external relations of Thibet (Tibet), have made the following agreement: -

**Article I** The two High Contracting Parties engage to respect the territorial integrity of Thibet (Tibet) and to abstain from all interference in the internal administration.

**Article II** In conformity with the admitted principle of suzerainty of China over Thibet (Tibet), Great Britain and Russia engage not to enter into negotiations with Thibet (Tibet) except through the intermediary of the Chinese Government. This engagement does not exclude the direct relations between British Commercial Agents and the Thibetan (Tibetan) authorities provided for in Article V of the Convention between Great Britain and Thibet (Tibet) of the 7<sup>th</sup> September 1904, and confirmed by the Convention between Great Britain and China of the 27<sup>th</sup> April 1906; nor does it modify the engagements entered into by Great Britain and China in Article I of the said Convention of 1906.

It is clearly understood that Buddhists, subjects of Great Britain or of Russia, may enter into direct relations on strictly religious matters with the Dalai Lama and the representatives of Buddhism in Thibet (Tibet); the Governments of Great Britain and Russia engage, as far as they are concerned, not to allow those relations to infringe the stipulations of the present arrangement.

---

\* There was an 'agreement concerning on Afghanistan and Persia' also in this very agreement but excluded here.

**Article III** The British and Russian Government respectively engage not to send Representatives to Lhasa.

**Article IV** The two High Contracting Parties engage neither to seek nor to obtain, whether for themselves or their subjects, any Concessions for railways, roads, telegraphs, and mines, or other rights in Thibet (Tibet).

**Article V** The two Governments agree that no part of the revenues of Thibet (Tibet), whether in kind or in cash, shall be pledged or assigned to Great Britain or Russia or to any of their subjects.

**Annex to the arrangement between Great Britain and Russia concerning Thibet (Tibet).**

Great Britain reaffirms the declaration, signed by His Excellency the Viceroy and Governor-General of India and appended to the ratification of the Convention of the 7<sup>th</sup> September 1904, to the effect that the occupation of the Chumbi Valley by British forces shall cease after the payment of three annual installments of the indemnity of 25,00,000 rupees, provided that the trade marts mentioned in Article II of that Convention have been effectively opened for three years, and that in the meantime in the Thibetan (Tibetan) authorities have faithfully complied in all respects with the terms of the said Convention of 1904. It is clearly understood that if the occupation of the Chumbi Valley by the British forces has, or any reason, not been terminated at the time anticipated in the above Declaration, the British and Russian Governments will enter upon a friendly exchange of views on this subject.

The present Convention shall be ratified, and the ratifications exchanged at St. Petersburg as soon as possible.

In witness whereof the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Convention and affixed thereto their seals.

Done in duplicate at St. Petersburg, the 18<sup>th</sup> (31<sup>st</sup>) August 1907.

## APPENDIX V

### RUSSO-MONGOLIAN AGREEMENT AND PROTOCOL

[Signed at Urga on the 21<sup>st</sup> October (3<sup>rd</sup> November) 1912]

#### Agreement

In accordance with the desire unanimously expressed by the Mongolians to maintain the national and historic constitution of their country, the Chinese troops and authorities were obliged to evacuate Mongolian territory, and Djebzoun Damba-Khutukhtu was proclaimed Ruler of the Mongolian people. The old relations between Mongolia and China thus came to an end.

At the present moment, taking into consideration the facts stated above, as well as the mutual friendship which has always existed between the Russian and Mongolian nations, and in view of the necessity of defining exactly the system regulating trade between Russia and Mongolia;

The actual State Councillor Ivan Korostovetz, duly authorized for the purpose by the Imperial Russian Government; and

The protector of the ten thousand doctrines Sain-noin Khan Namnan-Souroun, President of the Council of Ministers of Mongolia;

The plenipotentiary Touchetou Tzun-van Tchakdorjab, Minister of Finance; and

The plenipotentiary Erdeni Tzun-van Namsarai, Minister of Justice;

Duly authorized by the ruler of the Mongolian nation, by the Mongolian Government and by the ruling Princes, have agreed a follows:-

**Article I** The Imperial Russian Government shall assist Mongolia to maintain the autonomous regime which she has established, as also the right to have her national army, and to admit neither the presence of Chinese troops on her territory nor the colonization of her land by the Chinese.

**Article II** The Ruler of Mongolia and the Mongolian Government shall grant, as in the past, to Russian subjects and trade the enjoyment in their possessions of the rights and privileges enumerated in the protocol annexed hereto.

**Article III** If the Mongolian Government finds it necessary to conclude a separate treaty with China or another foreign power, the new treaty shall in no case either infringe the clauses of the present agreement and of the protocol annexed thereto, or modify them without the consent of the Imperial Russian Government.

**Article IV** The present amicable agreement shall come into force from the date of its signature.

In witness whereof the respective plenipotentiaries, having compared the two texts, Russian and Mongolian, of the present agreement, made in duplicate, and having found the two texts to correspond, have signed them, have affixed thereto their seals, and have exchanged texts.

Done at Urga on the 21<sup>st</sup> October, 1912 corresponding to the 24<sup>th</sup> day of the last autumn month of the 2<sup>nd</sup> year of the reign of the Unanimously Proclaimed, according to the Mongolian calendar.

## **Protocol annexed to Russo-Mongolian Agreement of the 21<sup>st</sup> October (3<sup>rd</sup> November) 1912**

By virtue of the enactment of the second article of the agreement, signed on this date between Actual State Councillor, Ivan Korostovetz, Plenipotentiary of the Imperial Russian Government, and the President of the Council of Ministers of Mongolia, Sain-noin Khan Namnan-Souroun, the Protector of ten thousand doctrines; the Plenipotentiary and Minister of the Interior, Tchinsouzouktou Tzin-van Lama Tzerin-Tchimet; the Plenipotentiary and Minister for Foreign Affairs, Daitzin-van Handa-dorji of the rank of Khan-erdeni; the Plenipotentiary and Minister of War, Erdeni Dalai Tzun-van Gombo-Souroun; the Plenipotentiary and Minister of Finance, Touchetou Tzun-van Tchakdorjab; and the Plenipotentiary and Ministry of Justice, Erdeni Tzun-van Namsarai, on the authority of the Ruler of Mongolia, the Mongolian Government, the Ruling Princes; the above-named Plenipotentiaries have come to an agreement respecting the following articles, in which are set forth the rights and privileges of Russian subjects in Mongolia, some of which they already enjoy, and the rights and privileges of Mongolian subjects in Russia:

**Article I** Russian subjects, as formerly shall enjoy the right to reside and move freely from one place to another throughout Mongolia; to engage there in every kind of commercial, industrial, and other business; and to enter into agreements of various kinds, whether with individuals, or firms, or institutions, official or private, Russian, Mongolian, Chinese, or foreign.

**Article II** Russian subjects, as formerly shall enjoy the right at all times to import and export dues, every kind of product of the soil and industry of Russia, Mongolia and China and other countries, and to trade freely in it without payment of any duties, taxes, or other dues.

**Article III** Russian credit institutions shall have the right to open branches in Mongolia, and to transact all kinds of financial and other business, whether with individuals, institutions or companies.

**Article IV** Russian subjects may conclude purchases and sales in cash or by an exchange of wares (barter), and they may conclude agreements on credit. Neither 'khoshuns' nor the Mongolian Treasury shall be held responsible for the debts of private individuals.

**Article V** The Mongolian authorities shall not preclude Mongolians or Chinese from completing any kind of commercial agreement with Russian subjects, from entering into their personal service, or into commercial and industrial undertaking formed by them. No rights of monopoly as regards commerce or industry shall be granted to any official or private companies, institutions, or individuals who have already received such monopolies from the Mongolian Government previous to the conclusion of this agreement shall retain their rights and privileges until the expiry of the period fixed.

**Article VI** Russian subjects shall be everywhere granted the right, whether in towns or 'khoshuns', to hold allotments on lease, or to acquire them as their own property for the purpose of organizing commercial industrial establishments, and also for the purpose of constructing houses, shops, and stores. In addition, Russian subjects shall have the right to lease vacant lands for cultivation. It is, of course, understood that these allotments shall be obtained and leased for the above-specified purposes, and not for speculative aims. These allotments shall be assigned by agreement with the Mongolian Government in accordance with existing laws of Mongolia, everywhere excepting in sacred places and pasture lands.

**Article VII** Russian subjects shall be empowered to enter into agreements with the Mongolian Government respecting the working of minerals and timber, fisheries, &c.

**Article VIII** The Russian Government shall have the right, in agreement with the Government of Mongolia, to appoint consuls in those parts of Mongolia it shall deem necessary. Similarly, the Mongolian Government shall be empowered to have Government agents at those frontier parts of the Empire where, by mutual agreement, it shall be found necessary.

**Article IX** At points where there are Russian consulates, as also in other localities of importance for Russian trade, there shall be allotted, by mutual agreement between Russian consuls and the Mongolian Government, special 'factories' for various branches of industry and the residence of Russian subjects. These 'factories' shall be under the exclusive control of the above-mentioned consuls, or of the heads of Russian commercial companies if there be no Russian consul.

**Article X** Russian subjects, in agreement with the Mongolian Government, shall retain the right to institute, at their own cost, a postal service for the dispatch of letters and the transit of wares between various localities in Mongolia and also between specified localities and points on the Russian frontier. In the event of the construction of 'stages' and other necessary buildings, the regulations set forth in article 6 of this protocol must be duly observed.

**Article XI** Russian consuls in Mongolia, in case of need, shall avail themselves of Mongolian Government postal establishment and messengers for the dispatch of official correspondence, and for other official requirements, provided that the gratuitous requisition for this purpose shall not exceed one hundred horses and thirty camels per month. On every occasion, a courier's passport must be obtained from the Government of Mongolia. When traveling, Russian consuls, and Russian officials in general, shall avail themselves of the same establishments upon payment. The right to avail themselves of Mongolian Government 'stages' shall be extended to private individuals, who are Russian subjects, upon payment for the use of such 'stages' of amounts which shall be determined in agreement with the Mongolian Government.

**Article XII** Russian subjects shall be granted the right to sail their own merchant-vessels on, and to trade with the inhabitants along the banks of, those rivers and their tributaries which, running first through Mongolia, subsequently enter Russian territory. The Russian Government shall afford the Government of Mongolia assistance in the improvement of navigation on these rivers, the establishment of the necessary beacons, &c. The Mongolian Government authorities shall assign on these rivers places for the berthing of vessels, for the construction of wharves and warehouses, for the preparation of fuel, &c., being guided on these occasions by the enactments of article 6 of the present protocol.

**Article XIII** Russian subjects shall have the right to avail themselves of all land and water routes for the carriage of wares and the droving of cattle, and, upon agreement with the Mongolian authorities, they may construct, at their own cost, bridges, ferries, &c., with the right to exact a special due from persons crossing over.

**Article XIV** Travelling cattle, the property of Russian subjects, may stop for the purpose of resting and feeding. In the event of prolonged halts being necessary, the local authorities shall assign proper pasturage areas along travelling cattle routes, and at cattle markets. Fees shall be exacted for the use of these pasturing areas for periods exceeding three months.

**Article XV** The established usage of the Russian frontier population harvesting (hay), as also hunting and fishing, across the Mongolian border shall remain in force in the future without any alteration.

**Article XVI** Agreements between Russian subjects and institutions on the one side and Mongolians and Chinese on the other may be concluded verbally or in writing, and the contracting parties may present the agreement concluded to the local Government authorities for certification. Should the latter see any objection to certifying the contract, they must immediately notify the fact to a Russian consul, and the misunderstanding which has arisen shall be settled in agreement with him.

It is hereby laid down that contracts respecting real estate must be in written form, and presented for certification and confirmation to the proper Mongolian Government authorities and a Russian consul. Documents bestowing rights to exploit natural resources require the confirmation of the Government of Mongolia.

In the event of disputes arising over agreements concluded verbally or in writing, the parties may settle the matter amicably with the assistance of arbitrators selected by each party. Should no settlement be reached by this method, the matter shall be decided by a mixed legal commission.

There shall be both permanent and temporary mixed legal commissions. Permanent commissions shall be instituted at the places of residence of Russian consuls, and shall consist of the consul, or his representative, and a delegate of the Mongolian authorities of corresponding rank. Temporary commissions shall be instituted at places other than those already specified, as cases arise, and shall consist of representatives of a Russian consul and the prince of that 'khoshun' to which the defendant belongs or in which he resides. Mixed-commissioners shall be empowered to call in as experts' persons with knowledge of the case from among Russian subjects, Mongolians and the Chinese. The decisions of mixed legal commissions shall be put into execution without delay, in the case of Russian subjects through the prince of the 'khoshun' to which the defendant belongs or in which he is resident.

**Article XVII** The present protocol shall come into force from the date of its signature.

It witness whereof, the respective plenipotentiaries, finding, upon comparison of the two parallel texts of the present protocol- Russian and Mongol- drawn up in duplicate, that the texts correspond, have signed each of them, affixed their seals, and exchanged texts.

Executed at Urga, the 21<sup>st</sup> October 1912 (o.s.), and by the Mongolian calendar, on the twenty-fourth day of the last autumn moon, in the second year of the administration of the 'Unanimously Proclaimed'.

In the original follow the signature of M. Korostovetz, Minister Plenipotentiary; and in the Mongol language the signatures of the President of the Mongolian Council of Ministers, and the Plenipotentiaries, the Ministers of the Interior, Foreign Affairs, War, Finance, and of Justice.

## APPENDIX VI

### THE TIBETAN TEXT OF THE TIBETO-MONGOL TREATY OF 1913<sup>†</sup>

[Translation]

Both Tibet and Mongolia have each emerged from under the domination of the Manchu state. Having separated from China, Tibet and Mongolia have constituted themselves as independent nations. From early times up to the present both Tibet and Mongolia have had very close relations based on their identical esteem for the [Buddhist] Doctrine. Thus, for the sake of concluding a treaty in furtherance of yet greater firmness [in their relations], the foreign ministry [Tib. *ya-mon* < Ch. *yamen*; “government office”] officer and plenipotentiary invested, by order of the Great Emperor of the Mongolian Nation, with treaty-making powers, *Da blam-a Niyta Biligtü* [Tib. *Tā bla-ma Nyig-tha sbi-legs-thu*] Rabdan; and the secondary high minister, *Jhangj^un Manglai Ba^atur Beyile* [Tib. *Cang-cun* (<Ch. *jiangjun*; “general”) *Lmang-las Dpa^thur Dpal-li*] Damdingsürün; along with the plenipotentiary invested, by order of the precious Dalai Lama, Great Emperor of Tibet, with treaty-making powers, the Personal Attendant and Monk [of the Dalai Lama], Blo-bzang ngag-dbang; the Liason Officer [of the Dalai Lama], Ngag-dbang chos^dzin; the Cleric Official [attached to the Potala; i.e., under the Dalai Lama] and Manager of the [Dalai Lama^s] Urga Bank Holdings, Ye-shes rgya-mtsho; and the Assistant Secretary Dge^dun skal-bzang have concluded a treaty as follows:

**Article One** The Mongols have established an independent state and on the 9<sup>th</sup> day of the 11<sup>th</sup> month honored the lord of the Yellow Hat doctrine, the Precious Rje-btsun dam-pa Qutuytu [Tib. *Hu-thog-thu*] as Great Lord and Emperor. The praise from Tibet^s Great Lord and Emperor, the precious Dalai Lama is firm and unchanging.

**Article Two** The Tibetans have established an independent state and honored the victorious and powerful precious Dalai Lama as Great Lord and Emperor. The praise from Mongolia^s Great Lord and Emperor, the precious Rje-btsun dam-pa Qutuytu is firm and unchanging.

**Article Three** In order that the precious doctrine of the Buddha spread undiminished, both two states must make every effort through consultations and discussions.

**Article Four** Henceforth both Tibet and Mongolia shall afford each other aid and assistance against internal and external threats.

**Article Five** Each side shall provide aid within their own territories to those travelling between them on religious or civil affairs or for religious or civil studies

---

<sup>†</sup> This translated text is included in the appendix, with the permission by the translator and author Prof. Elliot Sperling through email (07/03/2009), which is translated from the Original Tibetan Text of the Treaty by the author. The original Tibetan Text is being circulated since 2007 among Tibetologist. The translated text which I have included here is being extracted from the paper which Prof. Sperling presented in the Institute of Asian Research, British Columbia University, Canada title as “*The Tibet-Mongol Treaty of 1913 and Its Significance*” on 14, March 2008 in the seminar of “Tibet-Mongolia Links in Religion and Medicine”. I am grateful to Prof. Elliot Sperling for providing me the research paper as well as the translation of the copy, which is yet to be published through personal email contacted on 06/03/2009.

**Article Six** For the realization of the full potential of commerce between both Tibet and Mongolia in such things as the goods, livestock and skins that they produce, as well as in monetary exchanges, there shall be, as before, no obstructions.

**Article Seven** From now on, when loans are made, at the time they are handed over an office [Tib. *ya-mon*] seal should be requested. If it is sealed but not kept fixed there can be no grounds for petitioning the office in pursuit of the loan. Either party holding debts predating the conclusion of this treaty, for which there has been actual \_\_\_\_ [ ? *unclear* ] are permitted to pursue those debts and get repayment. However, this is not the responsibility of one's own *Šabi* or *Qosiyun* [Tib. *Sha-spi Ho-shon-rnams*; i.e., the monastic estate authorities or the banner authorities].

**Article Eight** Following the conclusion of this treaty, if there is an issue that requires an amendment the two states, Tibet and Mongolia, may convene joint discussions between their appointed plenipotentiaries.

**Article Nine** This treaty has been concluded, and from the time the seals are applied, firm and unchanging, it is, accordingly, set and fixed, sealed by the foreign ministry officer and plenipotentiary invested, on the part of the Great Lord and Emperor of the Mongolian Nation, with treaty-making powers, *Da blam-a Niyta Biligtü* Rabdan; and the secondary high minister, *Jhangjun Manglai Ba'atur Beyile* Damdingsürün; along with the seal [ **The seal is affixed here** ] of the minister-plenipotentiary appointed and invested by the precious and victoriously powerful Dalai Lama, Great Lord and Emperor of Tibet, with treaty-making powers, the Personal Attendant and Monk [of the Dalai-Lama], *Blo-bzang ngag-dbang*; the seal [ **The seal is affixed here** ] of the Liaison Officer [of the Dalai Lama], *Ngag-dbang chos-'dzin*; the Cleric Official [attached to the Potala; i.e., under the Dalai Lama] and Manager of the [Dalai Lama's] Uрга Bank Holdings, *Ye-shes rgya-mtsho*; and the Assistant Secretary *Dge'-dun skal-bzang*

The second throne year of the *Mong-bkur* king of the Mongols, the 4<sup>th</sup> day of the 12<sup>th</sup> month of the Water-Mouse Year [January 11, 1913].



## APPENDIX VI (A)

### ALLEGED MONGOL-TIBETAN TREATY, 1913<sup>‡</sup>

[Said to have been signed at Urga in January 1913]

Whereas Mongolia and Tibet, having freed themselves from the Manchu dynasty and separated themselves from China, have become independent States, and whereas the two States have always professed one and the same religion, and to the end that their ancient mutual friendships may be strengthened: on the part of the Government of the Sovereign of the Mongolian people-Nikta Biliktu da Lama Rabdan, acting Minister of Foreign Affairs and Assistant Minister-General and Manlai Caatyr Bei-Tzu Damdinsurun; on the part of the Dalai Lama, ruler of Tibet-Gujir tsanshib Kanchen Lubsan- Agwan, donir Agwan Choinzin, Tshichamtso, manager of the bank, and Gendun-Galsan, secretary, have agreed on the following:

**Article 1** The Dalai Lama, Sovereign of Tibet, approves of and acknowledges the formation of an independent Mongolian State, and the proclamation on the 9<sup>th</sup> day of the 11<sup>th</sup> month of the year of the Swine, of the master of the Yellow Faith Jebtsundampa Lama as the Sovereign of the land.

**Article 2** The Sovereign of the Mongolian people Jebtsundampa Lama approves and acknowledges the formation of an independent State and the proclamation of the Dalai Lama as Sovereign of Tibet.

**Article 3** Both States shall take measures, after mutual consideration, for the prosperity of the Buddhist faith.

**Article 4** Both States, the Mongolian and the Tibetan, shall henceforth, for all time, afford each other aid against dangers from without and from within.

**Article 5** Both States, each on its own territory, shall afford mutual aid to their subjects, traveling officially and privately on religious or on State business.

**Article 6** Both States, the Mongolian and the Tibetan, shall, as formerly, carry on mutual trade in the produce of their lands-in goods, cattle, &c., and likewise open industrial institutions.

**Article 7** Henceforth transactions on credit shall be allowed only with the knowledge and permission of official institutions; without such permission no claims shall be examined by Government Institutions.

Should such agreements have been entered into before the conclusion of the present treaty, and should the parties thereto be unable to settle matters amicably, while the loss suffered is great, the payment of such debts may be enforced by the said institutions, but in no case shall the debts concern the Shabinars and Hoshuns.

---

<sup>‡</sup> This text of 1913 Treaty is reproduced from "Tibet Past and Present" authored by Charles Bell (2000) first published in 1924. In the notes for the treaty the author mentioned that, he reproduced it from "pp. 10-13 of *With the Russians in Mongolia*, by Perry Ayscough and Otter Barry (John Lane)" but mentioned of the year in which the book was not published. The author, Bell clearly mentioned of the "alleged" treaty and "said to have been" signed at Urga, in his reproduced of the text of treaty (Bell, 2000:304)

(Shabinars-people who depend from the Court of Hu-tuk-tu (Khutukhtu) and pay taxes to the Court Department) (Hoshuns-principality)

**Article 8** Should it be necessary to supplement the articles of this treaty, the Mongolian and Tibetan Governments shall appoint special Plenipotentiaries, who shall come to an Agreement according to the circumstances then existing.

**Article 9** The present treaty shall come into force on the date of the signature thereof.

Plenipotentiaries of the Mongolian Government: Acting Ministers of Foreign Affairs Biliktu da-Lama Rabdan and Assistant Minister-General and Manlai Caatyr Bei-Tzu Damdinsurun.

Plenipotentiaries of the Dalai Lama, Sovereign of Tibet: Gujir tsanshib Kanchen Lubsan-Agwan Choinzin, Tshichamtso, manager of the Bank of Tibet, and Gendun-Galsan, secretary.

According to the Mongolian chronology, on the 4<sup>th</sup> day of the 12<sup>th</sup> month of the second year of 'Him who is exalted by all'.

According to the chronology of Tibet, in the year of the Watermouse, on the same month and day.

## APPENDIX V (B)

(Translation of the Tibetan text)<sup>§</sup>

### TREATY OF FRIENDSHIP AND ALLIANCE BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENTS OF MONGOLIA AND TIBET

Concluded Between the Government of Mongolia and Tibet at Urga  
29 December 1912 (11 January 1913)

Mongolia and Thibet, having freed themselves from the dynasty of the Manchus and separated from China, have formed their own independent States, and, having in view that both States from time immemorial have professed one and the same religion, with a view to strengthening their historic and mutual friendship the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Nikta Biliktu Da-Lama Rabdan, and the Assistant Minister, General and Manlai baatyr beiseh Damdinsurun, as plenipotentiaries of the Government of the ruler of the Mongol people, and gudjir tsanshib kanchen-Lubsan-Agvan, donir Agvan Choinzin, director of the Bank Ishichjamtso, and the clerk Gendun Galsan, as plenipotentiaries of the Dalai Lama, the ruler of Thibet, have made the following agreement.

**Article 1** The ruler of Thibet, Dalai Lama, approves and recognizes the formation of an independent Mongol State, and the proclamation, in the year of the pig and the ninth day of the eleventh month, of Chjebzun Damba Lama of the yellow faith as ruler of the country.

**Article 2** The ruler of the Mongol people, Chjebzun Damba Lama, approves and recognizes the formation of an independent (Thibetan) State and the proclamation of the Dalai Lama as ruler of Thibet.

**Article 3** Both States will work by joint consideration for the well-being of the Buddhist faith.

**Article 4** Both States, Mongolia and Thibet, from now and for all time will afford each other assistance against external and internal dangers.

**Article 5** Each State within its own territory will afford assistance to the subjects of the other travelling officially or privately on affairs of religion or State.

**Article 6** Both States, Mongolia and Thibet, as formerly, will carry on a reciprocal trade in the products of their respective countries in wares, cattle, &c., and will also open industrial establishments.

---

<sup>§</sup> This text of 1913 Treaty is reproduced from M C van Walt van Praag's (1987) "The Status of Tibet: History, Rights and Prospects in International Law". The translation from the Tibetan version did not mentioned of "alleged" or "said to have been" as available previous appendix. This translated version is not of the original Tibetan document, which was re-surfaced since 2007 but the 'Tibetan version' which is mentioned here is of Shakabpa (1976:633-35) "Bod kyi srid don rgyal rabs" (Political History of Tibet, Vol. II).

**Article 7** From now the granting of credit to anyone will be permitted only with the knowledge and sanction of official institutions. Without such sanction Government institutions will not consider claims.

As regards contracts made previous to the conclusion of the present treaty, where serious loss is being incurred through the inability of the two parties to come to terms, such debts may be recovered by (Government) institutions, but in no case shall the debt concern "shabinars" or "khoshuns."

**Article 8** Should it prove necessary to supplement the articles of the present treaty, the Mongolian and Thibetan Governments must appoint special delegates, who will conclude such agreements as the conditions of the time shall demand.

**Article 9** The present treaty shall come into force from the date of its signature.

Plenipotentiaries from the Mongolian Government for the conclusion of the treaty: Nikta Biliktu Da-Lama Rabdan, Minister for Foreign Affairs; and General and Manlai baatyr beiseh Damdinsurun, Assistant Minister.

Plenipotentiaries from the Dalai Lama, the ruler of Thibet, for the conclusion of the treaty: Gudjir tsanshib kanchen Lubsan-Agvan, Choinzin, the Director of the Bank of Thibet Ishichjamtsa, and the clerk, Gendun-Galsan.

Signed (by Mongol reckoning) in the fourth day of the twelfth month of the second year of the "Raised by the Many," and by Thibetan reckoning on the same day and month of the year of the "water-mouse."

## APPENDIX VII

### TIBET DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE 1913

I, The Dalai Lama, most omniscient possessor of the Buddhist faith, whose title was conferred by the Lord Buddha's command from the glorious land of India, speak to you as follows:

I am speaking to all classes of Tibetan people. Lord Buddha, from the glorious country of India, prophesied that the reincarnations of Avalokitesvara, through successive rulers from the early religious kings to the present day, would look after the welfare of Tibet.

During the time of Genghis Khan and Altan Khan of the Mongols, the Ming dynasty of the Chinese, and the Ch'ing (Qing) dynasty of the Manchus, Tibet and China co-operated on the basis of benefactor and priest relationship. A few years ago, the Chinese authorities in Szechuan and Yunnan endeavoured to colonize our territory. They bought large numbers of troops into central Tibet on the pretext of policing the trade marts. I therefore, left Lhasa with my ministers for the Indo-Tibetan border, hoping to clarify to the Manchu Emperor by wire that the existing relationship between Tibet and China had been that of patron and priest and had not been based on the subordination of one to the other. There was no other choice for me but to cross the border, because Chinese troops were following with the intention of taking me alive or dead.

On my arrival in India, I dispatched several telegrams to the Emperor; but his reply to my demands was delayed by corrupt officials at Peking. Meanwhile, the Manchu Empire collapsed. The Tibetans were encouraged to expel the Chinese from central Tibet. I, too, returned safely to my rightful and sacred country, and I am now in the course of driving out the remnants of Chinese troops from Do Kham in eastern Tibet. Now, the Chinese intention of colonizing Tibet under the patron-priest relationship has faded like a rainbow in the sky. Having once again achieved for ourselves a period of happiness and peace, I have now allotted to all of you the following duties to be carried out without negligence;

1. Peace and happiness in this world can only be maintained by preserving the faith of Buddhism. It is, therefore, essential to preserve all Buddhist institutions in Tibet, such as the Jokhang temple and Ramoche in Lhasa, Samye, and Traduk in southern Tibet, and the three great monasteries, etc.
2. The various Buddhist sects in Tibet should be kept in a distinct and pure form. Buddhism should be taught, learned, and meditated upon properly. Except for special persons, the administrators of monasteries are forbidden to trade, loan money, deal in any kind of livestock, and/or subjugate another's subjects.
3. The Tibetan Government's civil and military officials, when collecting taxes or dealing with their subject citizens, should carry out their duties with fair and honest judgment so as to benefit the government without hurting the interests of the subject citizens. Some of the central government officials posted at Ngari Korsum in western Tibet, and Do Kham in eastern Tibet, are coercing their subject citizens to purchase commercial goods at high prices and have imposed transportation rights exceeding the limit permitted by the government. Houses, properties, and lands belonging to subject citizens have been confiscated on the pretext of minor breaches of the law.

Furthermore, the amputation of citizens' limbs has been carried out as a form of punishment. Henceforth, such severe punishments are forbidden.

4. Tibet is a country with rich natural resource; but it is not scientifically advanced like other lands. We are a small, religious, and independent nation. To keep up with the rest of the world, we must defend our country. In view of past invasions by foreigners, our people may have to face certain difficulties, which they must disregard. To safeguard and maintain the independence of our country, one and all should voluntarily work hard. Our subject citizens residing near the borders should be alert and keep the government informed by special messenger of any suspicious development. Our subjects must not create major clashes between two nations because of minor incidents.
5. Tibet, although thinly populated is an extensive country. Some local officials and landholders are jealously obstructing other people from developing vacant lands even though they are not doing so themselves. People with such intentions are enemies of the state and our progress. From now on, no one is allowed to obstruct anyone else from cultivating whatever vacant lands are available. Land taxes will not be collected until three years have passed; after that the land cultivator will have to pay taxes to the government and to the landlord every year, proportionate to the rent. The land will belong to the cultivator.

Your duties to the government and to the people will have been achieved when you have executed all that I have said here. This letter must be posted and proclaimed in every district of Tibet, and a copy kept in the records of the offices in every district.—

From the Potala Palace (Seal of the Dalai Lama)  
(8<sup>th</sup> day of the month of the Water Ox year (1913))

(February 15, 1913)

## APPENDIX VIII

### Russo-Chinese Agreement, 1913

[Signed at Peking on the 5<sup>th</sup> (18<sup>th</sup>) November 1913]

The Russian Government having formulated the principles constituting the basis of its relations with China regarding Outer Mongolia, and the Chinese Government having signified its approval thereof, the two Powers agree as follows:

1. Russia recognizes Outer Mongolia as being under the suzerainty of China.
2. China recognizes the autonomy of Outer Mongolia.
3. Recognizing the exclusive right of the Mongols of Outer Mongolia to administer their internal affairs and to settle all commercial and industrial questions concerning autonomous Mongolia. China will not maintain there either civil or military officials, and will abstain from all colonization,- it being understood, however, that a dignitary sent by the Chinese Government can reside in Urga, accompanied by the requisite subordinate staff and an escort. Also China may station in certain localities of Outer Mongolia, to be arranged subsequently, agents for the protection of the interests of her subjects. Russia, in turn, undertakes not to maintain troops in Outer Mongolia, with the exception of Consular guards, nor to interfere with the administration, and to refrain from colonization.
4. China will accept the good offices of Russia to establish her relations with Outer Mongolia conformably with the above principles and the stipulations of the Convention of Urga concluded between Russia and Mongolia on November 3<sup>rd</sup>, 1912.
5. Questions regarding the interests of China and Russia in Outer Mongolia arising from the new conditions will form the subject of subsequent negotiations.

The notes exchanged are to the following effect:

1. Russia recognizes that the territory of Outer Mongolia forms part of Chinese territory.
2. In any negotiations regarding political and territorial questions between the Chinese and Russian Governments, the authorities of Outer Mongolia will participate.
3. All three parties will participate in the negotiations referred to in Article 5 of the Declaration and designate the place of meeting.

Autonomous Outer Mongolia will comprise the regions formerly under the jurisdiction of the Chinese Amban at Urga, the Tartar General at Uliassutai, and the Chinese Amban at Kobdo; but since no detailed maps exist and the boundaries are uncertain, it is agreed that the frontier of Outer Mongolia, together with the boundaries between Kobdo and the Altai Mountains, shall be the subject of negotiations as provided in Article 5 of the Declaration.

## APPENDIX IX

### SHIMLA CONVENTION BETWEEN GREAT BRITAIN, CHINA AND TIBET (1914)

(N.B. not ratified by China)

His Majesty the King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and of the British Dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India, His Excellency the President of the Republic of China, and His Holiness the Dalai Lama of Tibet, being sincerely desirous to settle by mutual agreement various questions concerning the interests of their several states on the Continent of Asia, and further to regulate the relations of their several governments, have resolved to conclude a Convention on this subject and have nominated for this purpose their respective Plenipotentiaries, that is to say:

His Majesty the King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and of the British Dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India, Sir Arthur Henry McMahon, Knight Grand Cross of the Royal Victorian Order, Knight Commander of the Most eminent Order of the Indian Empire, Companion of the Most Exalted Order of the Star of India, Secretary to the government of India, Foreign and Political Department;

His Excellency the President of the Republic of China, Monsieur Ivan Chen, Officer of the Order of the China HO;

His Holiness the Dalai Lama of Tibet, Lonchen Gaden Shatra Paljor Dorjee; who having communicated to each other their respective full powers and finding them to be in good and due form have agreed upon and concluded the following Convention in eleven Articles:

**Article 1** The Conventions specified in the Schedule to the present Conventions shall, except in so far as they may have been modified by, or may be inconsistent with or repugnant to, any of the provisions of the present Convention, continue to be binding upon the High Contracting Parties.

**Article 2** The government of Great Britain and China recognizing that Tibet is under the suzerainty of China, and recognizing also the autonomy of Outer Tibet, engage to respect the territorial integrity of the country, and to abstain from interference in the administration of Outer Tibet (including the selection and installation of the Dalai Lama), which shall remain in the hands of the Tibetan Government at Lhasa.

The government of China engages not to convert Tibet into a Chinese province. The government of Great Britain engages not to annex Tibet or any portion of it.

**Article 3** Recognizing the special interest of Great Britain, in virtue of the geographical position of Tibet, in the existence of an effective Tibetan Government, and in the maintenance of peace and order in the neighbourhood of the frontiers of India and adjoining states, the government of China engages, except as provided in Article 4 of this Convention, not to send troops into Outer Tibet, nor to station civil or military officers, nor to establish Chinese colonies in the country. Should any such troops or officials remain in Outer Tibet at the date of the signature of this Convention, they shall be withdrawn within a period not exceeding three months.



The government of Great Britain engages not to station military or civil officers in Tibet (except as provided in the Convention of September 7, 1904, between Great Britain and Tibet) nor troops (except the Agents' escorts), nor to establish colonies in that country.

**Article 4** The foregoing Article shall not be held to preclude the continuance of the arrangement by which, in the past, a Chinese high official with suitable escort has been maintained at Lhasa, but it is hereby provided that the said escort shall in no circumstances exceed 300 men.

**Article 5** The government of China and Tibet engage that they will not enter into any negotiations or agreements regarding Tibet with one another, or with any other Power, excepting such negotiations and agreements between Great Britain and Tibet as are provided for by the Convention of September 7, 1904, between Great Britain and Tibet and the Convention of April 27, 1906, between Great Britain and China.

**Article 6** Article III of the Convention of April 27, 1906, between Great Britain and China is hereby cancelled, and it is understood that in Article IX(d) of the Convention of September 7, 1904, between Great Britain and Tibet the term "Foreign Power" does not include China. Not less favourable treatment shall be accorded to British commerce than to the commerce of China or the most favoured nation.

**Article 7**

- (a) The Tibet Trade Regulations of 1893 and 1908 are hereby cancelled.
- (b) The Tibetan Government engages to negotiate with the British Government new Trade Regulations for Outer Tibet to give effect to Articles II, IV and V of the Convention of September 7, 1904, between Great Britain and Tibet without delay; provided always that such Regulations shall in no way modify the present Convention except with the consent of the Chinese Government.

**Article 8** The British Agent who resides at Gyantse may visit Lhasa with his escort whenever it is necessary to consult with the Tibetan Government regarding matters arising out of the Convention of September 7, 1904, between Great Britain and Tibet, which it has been found impossible to settle at Gyantse by correspondence or otherwise.

**Article 9** For the purpose of the present Convention the borders of Tibet, and the boundary between Outer and Inner Tibet, shall be as shown in red and blue respectively on the map attached hereto.

Nothing in the present Convention shall be held to prejudice the existing rights of the Tibetan Government in Inner Tibet, which include the power to select and appoint the high priests of monasteries and to retain full control in all matters affecting religious institutions.

**Article 10** The English, Chinese and Tibetan texts of the present Convention have been carefully examined and found to correspond, but in the event of there being any difference of meaning between them the English text shall be authoritative.

**Article 11** The present Convention will take effect from the date of signature.

In token whereof the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed and sealed this Convention, three copies in English, three in Chinese and three in Tibetan.

Done at Shimla this third day of July A.D., one thousand nine hundred and fourteen, corresponding with the Chinese date, the third day of the seventh month of the third year of the Republic, and the Tibetan date, the tenth day of the fifth month of the Wood Tiger year.

Initial of the Lonchen Shatra  
Seal of the  
Lonchen Shatra

(Initialled) A.H. McMahon  
Seal of the  
British Plenipotentiary.

#### Schedule

1. Convention between Great Britain and China relating to Sikkim and Tibet, signed at Calcutta the 17<sup>th</sup> March 1890.
2. Convention between Great Britain and Tibet, signed at Lhasa the 7<sup>th</sup> September 1904.
3. Convention between Great Britain and China respecting Tibet, signed at Peking the 27<sup>th</sup> April 1906.

The notes exchanged are to the following effect –

1. It is understood by the High Contracting Parties that Tibet forms part of Chinese territory.
2. After the selection and installation of the Dalai Lama by the Tibetan Government, the latter will notify the installation to the Chinese Government whose representative at Lhasa will then formally communicate to His Holiness the titles consistent with his dignity, which have been conferred by the Chinese Government.
3. It is also understood that the selection and appointment of all offices in Outer Tibet will rest with the Tibetan Government.
4. Outer Tibet shall not be represented in the Chinese Parliament or in any other similar body.
5. It is understood that the escort attached to the British Trade Agencies in Tibet shall not exceed seventy-five per centum of the escort of the Chinese Representative at Lhasa.
6. The government of China is hereby released from its engagement under Article III of the Convention of March 17, 1890, between Great Britain and China to prevent acts of aggression from the Tibetan side of the Tibet-Sikkim frontier.
7. The Chinese high official referred to in Article 4 will be free to enter Tibet as soon as the term of Article 3 have been fulfilled to the satisfaction of representatives of the three signatories to this Convention, who will investigate and report without delay.

Initial + of Lonchen Shatra  
Seal of the  
Lonchen

(Initialled) A.H.M.  
Seal of the  
Shatra British Plenipotentiary

## Reference

(\* Refer to Primary Sources)

Ahmad, Zehrudin (1970), *Sino-Tibetan Relations in the Seventeenth Century*, Serie Orientale Roma 40, Istituto Italiano per il Medio Estremo Oriente: Rome

Andreyev, Alexandre (2001), "Indian Pundits & the Russian Exploration of Tibet: an unknown story of the Great Game Era", *Central Asiatic Journal*, 45 (2): 163-180

..... (2003), *Soviet Russia and Tibet: The Debacle of Secret Diplomacy, 1918-1930s*, Brill: Leiden

Barkmann, Udo B. (1997), "The Revival of Lamaism in Mongolia", *Central Asian Survey*, 16(1): 69-79

Bawden, C. R. (1961), *The Jebtsundamba Khutukhtus of Urga*, Asiatische Forschungen: Wiesbaden

..... (1989), *The Modern History of Mongolia*, Weidenfeld & Nicolson: London [1968]

Bell, Sir Charles (1998), *Portrait of the Dalai Lama: The life and time of the Great Thirteenth*, Book Faith India: Delhi [1946]

..... (2000), *Tibet, Past and Present*, Motilal Banarsidass: Delhi [1924]

\* *Bod-kyi Lo-rGyus Yig-Tsags gCes bTues Zhes-pa'i dPe-deb La dPyed-pa-'i gTam* [An Analysis on the Text called the Collection of Documents on Tibetan History] (2000), Bod gNes Nyam Zheb-kyi Deb-Phreng 7 (Research & Analysis Centre), Deptt. of Security, CTA- Tibetan Govt. in Exile: Dharamshala

\* *Bod dang Manchu'i 'Brel-bar dPyed-pa'i gTam, Des-sKabs lNga-chen* [An Analysis on the Relationship between Manchu and Tibetan on Five Opportunities] (1999), Bod gNes Nyam Zheb-kyi Deb-Phreng 6 (Research & Analysis Centre), Deptt. of Security, CTA- Tibetan Govt. in Exile: Dharamshala

Blofeld, John (1939), "Lamaism and Its Influence on Chinese Buddhism" in *Tien Hsia Monthly* (September) :51-160

Brauen, Martin, ed. (2005), *The Dalai Lamas: A Visual History*, Serindia: Chicago

Dalai Lama, Tenzin Gyatso (1977), *My Land and My People*, Potala Corporation: New York [1962]

..... (1990), *Freedom in Exile: The Autobiography of the Dalai Lama*, HarperCollins: New York

Dhondup, K. (2003a), *The Water Horse and Other Years: A History of 17th & 18th Century Tibet*, Library of Tibetan Works & Archives: Dharamshala [1984]

..... (2003b), *Songs of the Sixth Dalai Lama*, LTWA: Dharamshala [1981]

\* DIIR (1996) *The Mongols and Tibet*, DIIR: Dharamshala

Doboom Tulku (1996), "The Lineage of the Panchen Lamas: A Brief History and Biographical Notes", Trans. Thupten T Rikey, *Lungta*, I (10): 5-9

\* Fengpei, Wu and Zeng Guoping (1988), *Qingdai zhu Zang dachen zhuanlue* (Biographies of Ambans of Tibet in the Qing Period); Tibet People's Press: Lhasa

Furen, W. & Suo W. (1984), *Highlights of Tibetan History*, New World Press: Beijing

Goldstein, Melvyn C. (1989), *A History of Modern Tibet 1913-1951: the Demise of the Lamaist State*, University of California Press: Berkeley

Heissig, Walther (1966), *A Lost Civilization: The Mongols Rediscovered*, Thames and Hudson: London

Hoffmann, Helmut (1979), *The Religions of Tibet*, Greenwood Press: Connecticut [1969]

\* *Hor-ram Youn-gyi rGyal-rabs Dang Hor Bod 'Brel-bar dPyed-pa'i gTam, bDen Don Rab-gSel* [An Analysis on the Relationship between Mongol Yuan Dynasty & Mongol-Tibetan, called Outclear-Fact] (1995), (Research & Analysis Centre), Deptt. of Security, CTA- Tibetan Govt. in Exile: Dharamshala

Hopkirk, Peter (1995), *Trespassers on the Roof of the World*, Kodansha: New York

Howarth, Henry Hoyle (1927), *History of the Mongols from the 9th to the 19th Century*, Longmans: London

<http://mongoliantemples.net/images/pdfs/DLDUBWEB2008.pdf> [accessed on 11/02/2009]

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Declaration\\_of\\_independence](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Declaration_of_independence) [accessed on 12/02/2009]

Hyer, Paul (1981), "The Dalai Lamas and the Mongols", *The Tibet Journal*, 6(4):3-12

\* International Commission of Jurists (1959), "*The Question of Tibet and the Rule of Law*", Geneva

Jiawei, Wang & Nyima Gyalcian (1997), *The Historical Status of China's Tibet*, China

Continental Press: Beijing

- Kapstein, Matthew T. (2006), *The Tibetans*, Blackwell Publishing: Malden, MA, USA
- Kitinov, Baatr (1996), "Kalmyks in Tibetan History", *The Tibet Journal*, 21(3):35-46
- Kolmas, Josef (2003), 'The Ambans & Assistant Amban of Tibet 1727-1912: Some Statistical Observations' in Alex McKay (ed.), *The History of Tibet Vol. II, The Medieval Period*, RoutledgeCurzon: London
- Koros, Csoma De (1834), *A Grammar of the Tibetan Language*, Calcutta
- Kuleshov, Nikolai (1992), "Agvan Dorjiev, the Dalai Lama's Ambassador", *Asian Affairs*, 23(1):20-33
- Lamb, Alastair (1966), *The McMahon Line: A Study in the Relations between India, China and Tibet, 1904-1914*, 2 Vols. Routledge & Kegan Paul: London
- Lattimore, Owen (1988), *Inner Asian Frontiers of China*, Oxford University Press: Hong Kong [1940]
- Lhalungpa, Lobsang, trans. (1985), *Mahamudra: The Quintessence of Mind and Meditation*, Shambhala: Boston
- Malik, Inder (1984), "Dalai Lamas of Tibet", Uppal: New Delhi
- Markham, Clements R (ed.) (1971), *The Mission of George Bogle to Tibet and the Journey of Thomas Manning to Lhasa*, Bibli. Himalayica, Manjusri: Delhi [1876]
- McKay, Alex (ed.) (2003a), *The History of Tibet, Vol 1, The Early Period: to c. AD*

- 850, *The Yarlung Dynasty*, RoutledgeCurzon: London
- ..... (2003b), *The History of Tibet, Vol 2, The Medieval Period: c. 850-1895, The Development of Buddhist Paramountcy*, RoutledgeCurzon: London
- ..... (2003c), *The History of Tibet, Vol 3, The Modern Period: 1895-1959, The Encounter with Modernity*, RoutledgeCurzon: London
- ..... (1997), *Tibet and the British Raj: The Frontier Cadre 1904-1947*, CurzonPress: Richmond
- Mehra, Parshotam (1969), "The Mongol-Tibetan Treaty of January 11, 1913" in *The Journal of Asian History*, 3(1):1-22
- Miyawaki, Junko (1984), "The Qalqa Mongols and the Oyirad in the seventeenth century", *Journal of Asian History*, 18(2): 146-160
- Mullin, Glenn (1985), *Essence of Refined Gold*, SnowLion: Ithaca
- Nanda N. (1982), *Tawang, the Land of Mon*, Vikas Publishing House, New Delhi
- Naquin, Susan (2000), *Peking: Temple and City Life, 1400-1900*, University of California Press: Berkeley
- \* Ngag dBang bLo bZang rGya mTsho (1989); *Ngag dBang bLo bZang rGya mTsho'I rNam Thar* (The Biography of the Fifth Dalai Lama Ngawang Lobsang Gyatso): Bod lJong Mi dMangs dPe sKrun Khang: Lhasa [1681]
- Norbu, Dawa (1985), "Analysis of Sino-Tibetan Relationships: Imperial Power, Non-coercive Regime and Military Dependency", in Barbara Aziz and Mathew Kapstein

- (eds.), *Soundings in Tibetan Civilization*, Manohar: New Delhi
- ..... (2001), *China's Tibet Policy*, Curzon Press: London
- Norbu, T. Jigme & Colin Turnbull (1969), *Tibet: Its History, Religion & People*, Penguin Books: Harmondsworth
- Nyamdavaa, Oidov (2002) "*Mongolia-India Relations, 1947-1999*" Unpublished Ph. D Thesis, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi
- Pema Thinley (2007), "All Reincarnations Not Blessed by China Outlawed", *Tibetan Review*, XLII (9): 4-6
- ..... (2007), "Bush Becomes First US President to Publicly Honour Dalai Lama", *Tibetan Review*, XLII (11): 21-23
- ..... (2007), "Dalai Lama May Nominate Own Successor", *Tibetan Review*, XLII (12): 25
- Petech, Luciano (2003), "The Dalai Lamas and Regents of Tibet, A Chronological Study", in Alex McKay (ed.) *The History of Tibet, Vol. II, The Medieval Period; c.850-1895, the Development of Buddhist Paramountcy*, RoutledgeCurzon: London
- ..... (1990), *Central Tibet and the Mongols: the Yuan-Sa-skye Period of Tibetan History*, Serie Orientale Roma 65, Istituto Italiano per il M. E. Oriente: Rome
- ..... (1972), *China and Tibet in the Early XVIIIth Century*, Brill: Leiden
- Peterson, Derek R. and Daren R. Walhof (2002), *The Invention Religion: Rethinking Belief in Politics and History*, Rutgers University Press: New Jersey



- Pubaev, R. E & Sanzhiev, G. L (1991), *250-letie buddizma v Buryatii I Rossii// 250-letie ofitsialnogo prizaniya buddizma v Rossii* [250<sup>th</sup> anniversary of official acknowledgement of Buddhism in Russia], Ulan-Ude: Institute of Social Sciences
- Rahul, Ram (1969a), "The Institution of the Dalai Lama", *International Studies*, 10 (4): 480-510
- ..... (1969b), *The Government and Politics of Tibet*, Vikas Publications: Delhi
- Rayfield, Donald (1976), *The Dream of Lhasa: The Life of Nikolay Przhevalsky (1839-1888), Explorer of Central Asia*, Ohio University Press: Ohio
- Richardson, H.E. (1962), *Tibet and its History*, Oxford University Press: London
- ..... (2003), "The Dalai Lamas" in Alex McKay (ed.), *The History of Tibet, V. II, The Medieval Period: 850-1895, The Development of Buddhist Paramountcy*, RoutledgeCurzon: London [1998]
- Rockhill, W. Woodville (1998), *The Dalai Lamas of Lhasa and their relations with the Manchus Emperors of China: 1644-1908*, Library of Tibetan Works & Archives: Dharamshala [1910]
- Roerich, G. N. trans. (1976), *The Blue Annals*, Motilal Banarsidas: Delhi
- Rupen, Robert A. (1964), *Mongols of the Twentieth Century*, 2 Vols., Indiana University Press: Bloomington
- ..... (1958), "Mongolian Nationalism: Part I", *Journal of Royal Central Asian Society*, 45(2):157-78

- ..... (1975), "The Absorption of Tuva" in T.T. Hammond (ed.) *The Anatomy of Communist Takeovers*, New Heaven
- ..... (2003), "Mongolia, Tibet, and Buddhism or, a Tale of two Roerichs", in Alex McKay (ed.) *The History of Tibet, Vol. III, The Modern Period: 1895-1959: The Encounter with Modernity*, RoutledgeCurzon: London [1979]
- Schwieger, Peter (1999), "Towards a Biography of Don-yod rdo-rje, King of Beri" Helmut Eimer et al. (eds.) in *Studia Tibetica et Mongolica (Festschrift Manfred Taube)*, Swisttal-Odendorf
- Shakabpa, W. D. (1984), *Tibet: A Political History of Tibet*, Potala Publications: New York [1967]
- Shaumian, Tatiana (2000), *Tibet: The Great Game and Tsarist Russia*, Oxford University Press : New Delhi
- Sheel, R. N. Rahul (1989), "The Institution of the Dalai Lamas", *The Tibet Journal*, 14(3): 19-32
- Sho Zhisheng (2008), *Tibet: Past and Present*, SDX Joint Publishing Company: Beijing
- Smith, Warren W Jr. (1996), *Tibetan Nation: A history of Tibetan Nationalism and Sino-Tibetan Relations*, Westview Press: Oxford, London
- Snellgrove, David, & Hugh Richardson (1968), *A Cultural History of Tibet*, Frederick A Praeger: New York & Washington DC
- Snelling, John (1993), *Buddhism in Russia: the Story of Agvan Dorzhiev, Lhasa's Emissary to the Tsar*, Element: Rockport, Massachusetts

- Soni, Sharad K. (2002), *Mongolia-Russia Relations: Kiakhta Times to Viladivostok*, Shipra Publications: New Delhi
- ..... (2006), *Mongolia-China Relations: Modern and Contemporary Times*, Pentagon Press: New Delhi
- ..... (2009), "The Siberian Republic of Tuva: Linkages with Mongolia" in Suchandana Chatterjee and others (eds.), *Asiatic Russia: Partnerships and Communities in Eurasia*, Shirpa Publications: Delhi:101-115
- Sperling, Elliot (1980), "The 5<sup>th</sup> Karmapa and Some Aspects of the Relationship Between Tibet and the Early Ming" in M. Aris & Aung San Suu Kyi (eds.) *Tibetan Studies in Honour of Hugh Richardson*, Aris & Phillips: Warminster: 280-89
- ..... (1987), "Lama to the King of Hsia" in *The Journal of Tibet Society*, 7:31-50
- ..... (2000), "Karma Rol-pa'I rdo-rje and The Re-Establishment of Karma-pa Political Influence in the 14<sup>th</sup> Century" in *The Relationship Between Religion and State (chos srid zung 'brel) in Traditional Tibet*, paper presented in Seminar held in Lumbini, Nepal
- ..... (2003), "The 5<sup>th</sup> Karmapa and Some Aspects of the Relationship between Tibet and the Early Ming", in Alex McKay (ed.) *The History of Tibet, Vol II, The Medieval Period; c.850-1895, the Development of Buddhist Paramountcy*, RoutledgeCurzon: London
- ..... (2008), "The Tibet-Mongol Treaty of 1913 and Its Significance" a paper presented on 14 March, 2008 in the seminar of *Tibet-Mongolia Links in Religion and Medicine* at Institute of Asian Research, British Columbia University [through personal email contacted on 06/03/2009]

- Stein, R. A (1972), *Tibetan Civilization*, Stanford University Press: Stanford
- Teichman, E (1922), *Travels of a Consular Officer in Eastern Tibet*, Cambridge: England
- Terentyev, Andrey (1996), "Tibetan Buddhism in Russia", *The Tibet Journal*, 21(3): 60-69
- Thinley (2008) "Tibet-Mongolia Treaty of 1913, A proof of Tibet's Independence: Interview with Prof. Elliot Sperling" online news <http://phayul.com/news/article.aspx?&id=23205> . Accessed on 2008/12/22
- Tucci, Giuseppe (1988), *The Religion of Tibet*, University of California Press: Berkely
- Tuttle, Gray (2005), *Faith and Nation: Tibetan Buddhists in the Making of Modern China*, Columbia University Press: New York
- van Praag, Michael C. (1987), *The Status of Tibet: History, Rights and Prospects in International Law*, Westview Press: Colorado
- Wangyal, Phuntsog (1975), "The Influence of Religion on Tibetan Politics", *The Tibet Journal*, 1(1): 78-86
- Wylie, Turnell V. (1977) "The First Mongol Conquest of Tibet Reinterpreted", *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, 37.1: 103-133
- ..... (2003), "Lama Tribute in the Ming Dynasty", in Alex Mckay (ed.) *The History of Tibet, Vol II, The Medieval Period; c.850-1895, the Development of Buddhist Paramountcy*, RoutledgeCurzon: London

