

Global Times

<http://world.huanqiu.com/roll/2008-11/296036.html>

美媒借批英国"出卖西藏"为"藏独"造势

The American media uses criticism of Britain for "selling out Tibet" to [create] influence for "Tibetan independence"

来源：环球时报

2008-11-27 16:36

环球时报特约记者宸宇报道

在流亡藏人召集的所谓"全球流亡藏人特别大会"草草收场，并被国际舆论嘲笑为"打造空中楼阁"会议之时，美国《纽约时报》发表了一篇美国哥伦比亚大学研究西藏问题的专家罗伯特·巴雷特（Robert Barnett）的文章，为"藏独"势力在国际上失势疾呼，称西方不应该因为在金融危机问题上有求于中国就在西藏问题上对中国"让步"。

As the exile Tibetans' so-called 'global special meeting for exiled Tibetans' hastily ended, and while their meeting has been mocked by international public opinion as 'building castles in the air', America's New York Times issues an article written by Columbia university researcher/expert on the Tibet question, Robert Barnett, which laments the loss of influence of 'Tibetan independence' internationally, and says the West should not 'give in' to China on the Tibet question because they want China's help in the financial crisis.

英国外交大臣米利班德10月29日在英国外交部网站发表声明称，英国政府明确承认西藏是中华人民共和国一部分，中国对西藏拥有主权。米利班德还称"宗主权"这个概念"已经过时"。巴雷特的这篇题为《英国出卖西藏了吗》的文章正是将矛头对准英国的，称英国在金融危机上有求于中国，所以就"转变"了在西藏问题上的立场，向中国做出"让步"。巴雷特写道，在西方国家苦苦寻求措施以复兴经济时，他们越来越倾向于向中国求助。上个月英国首相布朗就请求中国向国际货币基金组织注资。巴雷特称，如今有猜测说这种"交易"意味着英国在西藏问题立场上的"大转变"。

Miliband....made a statement on the web...saying that the UK government clearly recognized Tibet is part of China, and China has sovereignty over Tibet. Miliband also said the concept of "suzerainty" is "anachronistic". Barnett's article, titled "Did Britain sell out Tibet?" has its spearhead pointed at Britain, saying that Britain in the financial crisis has asked China for help and therefore "shifted" its stance on the Tibet question, 'giving in' to China. Barnett writes that as Western countries painstakingly seek ways to revive their economies, they are more and more inclined to seek China's help. Last month, Britain's PM Brown asked China to put money into the IMF. Barnett says there is now speculation that this sort of 'trade/transaction' indicates Britain's 'big shift' in its stance on the Tibet question.

中国人民大学国际关系学院副院长金灿荣并不认同巴雷特所说的这种"转变"之间的因果关系。金灿荣说，即使英国有这种态度的转变，也不是因为金融危机，"金融危机充其量只能算是转变的'契机'，而不是原因"。

他说："人们总是先是有思想的转变，才会有行为的变化。"今年以来，围绕西藏问题发生了很多事情，这些事情在很大程度上促使西方人开始反思西藏问题的实质，开始真正认识西藏的历史和现实。拉萨事件后，中国民众以及海外华人的强烈反应大大震撼了西方，网络上掀起的中国民间反"藏独"浪潮，海外华人对"藏独"的愤怒，都出乎西方意料。在这位学者看来，研究西藏问题的巴雷特很显然是在故意模糊因果关系，回避问题的实质。

Jin Canrong, deputy head of the International Relations Institute at China's Remin University, did not agree with Barnett's stated argument about the cause and effect of this "shift". Jin Canrong said even if the UK had this kind of change in attitude, it's not because of the financial crisis. "The financial crisis can only be said to have been an opportunity, not the cause." He said: "People always have a change in thinking first and then a change in conduct."

This year, many things have happened surrounding the Tibet question, and these things have to a large extent pushed western people to start to reflect on the true nature of the Tibet question, start to really recognize Tibet's history and reality. After the Lhasa incident, the Chinese public and overseas Chinese's strong reaction convulsed the West, on the internet, a wave of opposition to 'Tibet independence' started among Chinese people, overseas Chinese's anger against 'Tibet independence' surprised the West. In the view of this scholar, Barnett who researches the Tibet question, is clearly deliberately blurring causality and effect, avoiding the true nature of the question.

巴雷特还在文中对英国在没有与其他大国"协调"的情况下就做出这种"转变"提出了指责，他说："英国的'变心'有着撕碎历史的危险，而这种历史构成了国际秩序，提供了解决中国与西藏之间争端的基础。"在巴雷特看来，这种所谓的"历史"就是西方大国在西藏问题上联手向中国施压。他在文中写道，"在1951年中国接管西藏之前，英国都与其他主要大国一道，与西藏政府达成正式共识。所以，不可能出现例外，除非是想破坏这些共识。"巴雷特认为，英国政府可能认为这个问题对英国的国家利益来说无足轻重，也没有必要公开辩论，但这个决定却会产生广泛的影响。

Barnett also in his article criticizes Britain for not 'coordinating' with other big countries before making this 'shift'. He said: " Britain's change of heart risks tearing up a historical record that frames the international order and could provide the basis for resolving China's dispute with Tibet." In Barnett's view, this sort of so-called 'history' is a means for the West to jointly apply pressure on China on the Tibet question. In his article, he writes: "in 1951 ... consensus." Barnett thinks that the British government could have thought this question counts for little in Britain's national interest, and so there was no need for a public debate, but that this decision does have widespread implications.

显然，巴雷特所称的这种所谓的"协调"、"共识"，正好反应了长期以来西方国家在西藏问题上有着战略利益，他们也向来以战略思维来看待西藏问题。金灿荣说，其实西藏在历史上是没有"藏独"思潮的，西藏独立的理念是从西方输入的。冷战时期，西方国家出于自己的战略需要，制造或者强化西藏独立。"藏独"从本质上讲是西方对华战略思维的产物"。金灿荣认为，西方国家之所以支持达赖，也是出于它们的战略需要，"在某些国际问题上，西方需要达赖这个宗教的、非基督教的、宣扬所谓和平的角色来为自己的某些行动'正名'，而达赖也很善于将自己打造成这种迎合西方口味的角色"。他还举例说，"也许很多人还不知道，宣扬'和平'、'非暴力'的达赖是坚决支持美国攻打伊拉克的，在这一点上，作为宗教人士的达赖表态支持，对美国绝对是有利的"。

Clearly, the sort of 'coordination', 'consensus' that Barnett refers to reflects Western countries' long-held advantage on the Tibet question - they have also always used strategic thinking to view the Tibet question. Jin Canrong said actually Tibet historically did not have the trend of 'Tibet independence' thinking, and the

concept of Tibetan independence was imported from the West. During the cold war, Western countries because of their own strategic needs created or strengthened "Tibet independence". "Tibet independence' basically is an outcome of the West's strategic thinking vis-à-vis china." Jin Canrong thinks western countries support the Dalai also out of their own strategic needs, "on some international questions, the West needs the Dalai who is religious, non-Christian, to boast about their so-called peaceful role to provide 'proof' for some of their own actions, and the Dalai is also good at giving himself that kind of role which caters to the West's appetite."

He also gave an example, saying "maybe many people still don't know, he may proclaim 'peace' and 'non-violence' but the Dalai is resolutely supportive of the US invasion of Iraq. On this point, as a religious person expressing support he is definitely beneficial to the US."

本月22日在印度达兰萨拉结束的"全球流亡藏人特别大会"在国际舆论中没激起多大涟漪，巴雷特的文章显然有着给"藏独"势力加油鼓劲，给他们在西方国家中"拉赞助"的意味。不过金灿荣认为，巴雷特的观点只代表了西方社会极少部分人对西藏问题的看法，与西方国家政府官方立场是不一致的，到目前还没有哪个国家承认西藏独立。

On the 22nd of this month, the Dharamsala 'Global Special Meeting of Tibetan Exiles' did not cause much of a ripple in international opinion. Barnett's article clearly was meant to drum up influence for 'Tibet independence', and help them "win support" among western countries. But Jin Canrong thinks Barnett's view represents how only a very small portion of Western society sees the Tibet question. It is not aligned with the stances of Western government. Up till now, there hasn't been a country that recognizes Tibet independence.

在分析西方社会为何会有同情"藏独"声音时，金灿荣说，西方人对民族—国家（nation-state）体制有着强烈的认同感，他们对多民族国家有着天然的成见，认为一个民族就有权利建立国家，所以在国际上出现某个民族要独立时，西方就会出现支持的声音。此外，金灿荣还提到，西方存在着一些把西藏理想化的倾向，认为西藏是"精神家园"。他们不会从西藏历史上农奴制这个角度去看待西藏，也不会从西藏的现代化这个视角去看待西藏的发展和进步，他们对西藏的看法完全出于"浪漫的理想"。他们将对自己现代化的不满投射到自己心中构建的某种"理想"中。西方人某些人对西藏的同情不是什么事实问题，而是心理结构问题。

In analyzing why Western society has voices of sympathy for 'Tibet independence', Jin Canrong said Western people have a strong sense of identity with the nation-state system. They are naturally prejudiced against multi-ethnic countries, and think that an ethnic group should have the right to establish a country. Therefore when any ethnic group in the world wants to have independence, there will be voices of support in the west.

Besides, Jin Canrong also pointed out, the West has some tendency to idealise Tibet, and to think that Tibet is a 'spiritual home'. They won't look at Tibet from the point of view of Tibet's history of serfdom, and won't look at Tibet's development and progress from the view of modernization. Their views on Tibet completely come out of 'romantic ideals'. They put their own unhappiness with modernisation into this sort of 'ideal' they construct in their own hearts. The sympathy some people in the West have for Tibet is not a matter of reality but a matter of psychological make-up.

Announcement in Global Times of Miliband statement
<http://world.huanqiu.com/roll/2008-11/276392.html>

环球时报特约记者宸宇报道
英国《每日电讯报》5日报道称，英国外交大臣戴维·米利班德10月底曾发表一个声明，澄清立场强调西藏是中国的一部分。

推荐阅读

1500硕士争卖猪肉职位

广州一家猪肉连锁店年薪8万招卖猪肉工，吸引1500多名应届硕士研究生。

川灾区建材疯狂涨价 商家发国难财

* [资讯] 世界对印度信心遭重挫

* [资讯] 铁岭市府设20副秘书长

* [财经] 图集：007中出现的豪华酷车

* [财经] 推荐：爱的就是降价实惠车推荐

* [健康] 男人每天应吃的11种食物

* [健康] 她说：完美丈夫15个标准

Vitas版“青藏高原”雷翻网友

* [旅游] 另类！日本男女靠共浴相亲

* [旅游] 全球已荒废的十座著名城市

* [读书] 让毛泽东记在心的井冈山死敌

* [读书] 林彪麾下“吃人猛虎”的王牌师

* [读书] 曾国藩与“刺马案”的瓜葛

《每日电讯报》在报道中说，米利班德10月底在一份几乎没有引起人们注意的议会声明中，宣布了英国承认中国主权的立场发生历史性变化。米利班德在声明中说：“像其他每一个欧盟成员国以及美国一样，我们视西藏为中华人民共和国的一部分。”

对于所谓的英国承认中国的“宗主权”而不承认中国对西藏的“主权”的说法，米利班德表示，整个“宗主权”的概念已经过时。他说：“有人据此质疑我们正在谋求的目标，声称我们否认中国对其一大片领土拥有主权。”