

In the conclusion and epilogue Frazier examines the cultural roots of the institution of *danwei* and he compares cultural aspects of Chinese labor management with those in former Soviet Union, in some other former socialist countries, in Japan and in the USA. At the end he briefly discusses the present and future of labor management in China.

Mark Frazier is interested in an important problem of Chinese history as well as of the Chinese present and future. His study is an actual contribution to the discussion about the future of state owned enterprises in China, which according to author in the 1990s employed 100 million workers with this number declining by about 5 – 6 million every year. Frazier describes the painful and slow process of change in the labor management of Chinese enterprises in the past 70 years, which has been hampered by the constant fight of workers and managers in order to fill new structures imposed by the state with old content. The author underlines steady pressure of workers in order to achieve higher wages and welfare contributions and the opposing pressure of labor management whoever it represented. He stimulates readers' considerations of to what degree the present state owned enterprises in China struggle with the same problems.

Frazier brings a new understanding to the problem and disproves previously accepted views of some scientists. His study is based on perfect argumentation: on logically clear arguments as well as precise numbers and facts. No deviation from the problem and central question can be found in his book. The chapters continue without interruption and the very dense text requires a concentrated reader. Finally, the book is based not only on quantitative arguments, but also brings witnesses of concrete people and this way it attracts the reader directly to people's fates: to observe their hopes, fears, losses and victories and their striving for a better life.

Gabriela Gregušová

DAWA NORBU: *China's Tibet Policy*. Durham East Asia Series. Richmond, Curzon Press 2001. 470 pp. ISBN 0-7007-0474-4. Price £ 75.

The publication under review represents a rich source of information on the Sino-Tibetan relationship, which is presented by a well-qualified Tibetan academic, Prof. Dawa Norbu, affiliated with the Jawaharlal Nehru University in New Delhi. The author has so far written a number of important papers on this issue, which were published in either scholarly journals or proceedings of Tibetological conferences. His present publication is an outcome of his lasting interest and it also comprises some of these previously published papers, which were partly enlarged and updated for the present volume (chapters 10, 11, 13, 16, 17 and 18 which deal with the non-coercive character of the Tibetan regime, the concepts of Tibetan "autonomy" and "suzerainty", the developments which resulted in the 1959 revolt, the place of Tibet in Sino-Indian and Sino-Taiwanese relations, and finally the analysis of the post-1979 Sino-Tibetan dialogue). It does not offer a diachronic overview of Sino-Tibetan relations (like the recently published book by W. W. Smith, Jr., *Tibetan Nation: A History of Tibetan Nationalism and Sino-Tibetan Relations*, Boulder 1996), but it touches upon numerous problems related to this issue. The book is divided into five parts in which the reader finds a number of chapters, which reflect upon the general topic of the individual chapters (i.e. "Patterns of the Sino-Tibetan Past and Cultural Political Realities", pp. 13-122; "China and Tibet in War and Peace", pp. 123-176; "Tibet in Communist China", pp. 177-260; "Tibet in International Poli-

tics”, pp. 261-312; “Tibet’s Future”, pp. 313-391). As obvious from these headings, the content of individual parts of the reviewed publication often overlap and as a consequence of this, the reader will unavoidably repeatedly encounter formulations, conclusions and facts, which were presented to him/her a few pages earlier. I guess it is difficult to avoid it completely, but I believe that some more editorial work would have made the volume more readable and eliminate these repetitions.

As stated by the author in his Introduction, his aim was to adopt “a social science approach” with its “value-neutral orientations and scientific generalities” (p. 2) in order to escape the partisan scholarship of the most Chinese and exiled Tibetan academics, who often see the intricate Sino-Tibetan relationship in simplistic manner and understand their scholarly mission as the provision of historical facts – often very questionable facts – for the respective political cause. Prof. Dawa Norbu has successfully escaped from this – sometimes self-imposed trap – and has provided the informed reader with reliable facts and balanced conclusions. He correctly criticizes the Chinese intellectuals for their historicization of the Tibetan question, but also he finds it necessary to start with an overview of Sino-Tibetan relations from the Tang Dynasty onwards to the 20th century. Prof. Dawa Norbu argues that there existed a special form of tributary relations between Chinese dynasties (Yuan, Ming, Qing) and Tibet for which he has coined the term “neo-Buddhist diplomacy” (p. 4, see also pp. 30-31). In my opinion it is not very fruitful to attempt to see Sino-Tibetan relations as a special form of contacts between Imperial China and the “barbarians”, and it would be better to understand it within the context of tributary relations with foreign empires and countries, especially from the Inner Asian region. I strongly doubt also the assertion that the Tibetan lamas lent moral support to the Mongolian Yuan and Manchu Qing dynasties and, thus, helped to legitimate their rule in China (p. 6). I do not think that the interest in Tibetan Buddhism of Mongolian and Manchu rulers would boost their prestige in the eyes of the Confucian literati.

The third and fourth parts of the publication under review deal with the modern history of Tibet, especially after its incorporation in the People’s Republic of China in 1951. Chapters 12 to 14 deal with internal political, economical and social developments in Tibet. Prof. Dawa Norbu offers a detailed analysis of the Seventeen Point Agreement signed in May 1951 and with minor changes presents his findings on the 1959 revolt published earlier in 1979. Finally he concentrates on the strategic implications of the Tibetan region for the Beijing government. Chapters 15 to 17 provide an interesting account on the instrumentalization of the Tibet question in Sino-American and Sino-Indian relations in the second half of the 20th century. The author’s analysis shows that a non-sovereign territory – as is the case of Tibet – can be merely an instrument for the regulation of relations between two countries with equal status (which may be valid also for a sovereign state, of course), but on the side of either India or the United States there has never been a serious intention to support Tibetan independence politically, economically or militarily. I believe it would also be very interesting to focus on the Russian and Soviet policy towards Tibet in the context of Sino-Russian relations (the publications by N. S. Kuleshov *Russia’s Tibet File*, Dharamsala 1996, and T. Shaumian *Tibet, The Great Game and Tsarist Russia*, New Delhi 2000 has started this undertaking, but the Soviet period with its twists and turns in Moscow-Beijing relations also offers an interesting research topic; see p. 250). The final chapter of this part deals with the validity of the Tibetan experience of incorporation into communist China for the Republic of China on Taiwan. Though the internal characteristics (economy, political system, social and ethnic composition) and international environment of both territories (i.e. Tibet and Taiwan) is different, the comparison of the official Chinese attitude towards Tibet and

Taiwan is certainly worth consideration, as is evident also from the contribution of Prof. Dawa Norbu.

The final part deals with the future of Tibet's status. As it is basically a matter of discussion between Beijing and Dharamsala (while Prof. Dawa Norbu also pleads for a stronger say of Tibetan intellectuals inside Tibet, p. 357), this part starts with an updated overview of the contacts between the Dalai Lama and China. The original version – published in 1991 – was accompanied by the subtitle “Prenegotiation Stage or Dead End?”. In my opinion, ten years later one can answer it with the second option: I believe there is no willingness on the Chinese side to discuss the Tibetan issue with the current 14th Dalai Lama and if there are no dramatic developments inside either Tibet or China the political elite in Beijing will lay back and wait for the next reincarnation who will not have the credentials of personal contacts with the most influential world politicians. The next chapter deals with the often mentioned vision of a federal China as proposed by a group of exiled Chinese intellectuals (most prominent among them is Yan Jiaqi). Prof. Dawa Norbu points out some open questions: the most crucial – as is the case also in the dialogue between the Dalai Lama and Beijing – is the issue of the so-called Outer, that is Ü-Tsang, and Inner Tibet, that is Kham and Amdo, where there is very little space for compromise for either. According to me the concept of the Chinese federation seems to be quite overestimated by Tibetans and Uighurs, as it does not constitute a consensus even of the exiled Chinese intellectuals, not mentioning the political and intellectual elites in China. The last, more theoretical, chapter is devoted to the vague concept of the self-determination as enshrined by the UN Charter. Prof. Dawa Norbu argues for the right of self-determination of Tibetan people as they are obviously a distinct ethnic group. As is well known, the concept of self-determination is not part of the Chinese constitution and the understanding of it by the Chinese statesmen is not inclined to the arguments of the author and others.

The weakest point of the publication under review is the editorial work of the author and the publishing house. The reader will find a lot of misprints in the Chinese, Tibetan and even English words. The transcription system for Chinese and the transcription/transliteration system for Tibetan is very inconsistent. The author does not state which systems he is using and as illustrated on the bibliography of Tibetan texts and books (pp. 460-461), it is sometimes difficult to understand to what Tibetan text he is referring. As the author does not speak Chinese, there are numerous mistakes in Chinese terms quoted by him (e.g. Jiang instead of Qiang, p. 33; Le instead of Li, p. 296), which could have been easily corrected by a Sinologist. Unfortunately, there are also quite a number of mistakes and misprints in the Tibetan terminology (e.g. *brtan dgra* instead of *bstan dgra*, p. 226). It is a pity and it negatively affects the high academic standard of this otherwise valuable publication.

Prof. Dawa Norbu has offered to the interested reader an important contribution to the research in Sino-Tibetan relations. It is not an overall and definite overview of the history and current state of the relationship between China and Tibet, but as the author approaches this topic from a wide angle, the publication under review covers a lot of various political, economic, legal, cultural and strategic aspects of it. As a matter of fact, there are still points which need some more clarification and inquiry. For instance it would be certainly interesting to closely focus on the particular measures of Chinese Imperial and Republican policy towards Tibet in order to concentrate on the issue of continuity/discontinuity of China's Tibet policy: for example the instrumentalization of prominent lamas for the goals of Chinese policy by granting various Imperial titles in the past and the installation of lamas to different puppet posts in the Chinese bureaucracy (pro-

vincial People's Congresses, provincial branches of the China's Buddhist Association, etc.) in today's China. However, anybody dealing with these and other issues of the evolving Sino-Tibetan relationship is well advised to consult also the publication under review.

*Martin Slobodník*

BĚLKA, L.: *Tibetský buddhismus v Burjatsku* [Tibetan Buddhism in Buryatiya]. Brno, Masarykova univerzita 2001. 348 pp. ISBN 80-210-2727-4.

The publication under review is devoted to the history and contemporary situation of Tibetan Buddhism in Buryatiya, a subject basically neglected by researchers outside the former Soviet Union and Russia. The author, L. Bělka (Institute for the Study of Religions, Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic) presented his monograph to the interested reader after a long and laborious research conducted both *in situ* (several research trips in the 1990's) and with the use of primary and secondary sources from Russian archives and publications. He grasped the opportunity when the religious revival started in Buryatiya after the fall of communism in the Soviet Union and thanks to repeated stays in the region was able to follow this process which was unfolding literally in front of his eyes. The focus of his research is the historical context of the diffusion of Tibetan Buddhism in Buryatiya and a religious topography (a kind of modern metamorphosis of the traditional Tibetan genre *neyig /gnas yig/*) which gives a detailed structure of the monastic institutions in Buryatiya in the past and in the present. As stated in the foreword (p. 15) his approach is more descriptive and to a lesser degree analytical and interpretative. The monastic aspect of Buddhism in Buryatiya (for which he has coined the term ecclesiastical structure, p. 18) stands in the centre of his interest and issues related to the non-institutionalized aspects of the religion of the laity are mentioned only briefly.

His monograph is preceded by a chapter (pp. 19-28) devoted to the available sources and research so far done on this issue. This introductory part is very useful as it makes the reader acquainted with the situation in the field to which mostly Russian-language scholarship has contributed. Although the works published during the Soviet period were influenced by the ideological viewpoint (so-called "scientific atheism"), these secondary sources provided the author with much valuable information and without them this field of research would be a *tabula rasa*. The author was able to consult most of the works published in Russian and the extensive bibliography (pp. 303-323) gives evidence of the fine heuristic work accomplished by him. The works so far published in other languages than Russian are scarce and usually deal merely with partial problems of this issue and do not provide a broader picture. A typical example is the book of J. Snelling *Buddhism in Russia: The Story of Agvan Dorzhiev, Lhasa's Emissary to the Tsar* (1993) which discusses only a limited chapter of the history of Tibetan Buddhism in Buryatiya. Bělka's *Tibetský buddhismus v Burjatsku* [Tibetan Buddhism in Buryatiya] is the first non-Russian monograph devoted to this issue. It might be stated already at this point that it would be useful to publish it also in English and make it available to a broader readership.

The first part of the monograph (pp. 29-113) examines the historical developments of Tibetan Buddhism in Buryatiya. The author also briefly mentions issues related to the ethnogenesis of the Buryats, their language and the administrative divisions of the region. The diffusion of Tibetan Buddhism from Mongolia to Buryatiya in the 17th-18th