

Does Reuters find the Dalai Lama admirable?

- No, they quote negative things about him. Continually stating that he is denying authority.
- No not really, the way to me that they portray him seems to be in a negative way.
- The writers for Reuters have lost sight of the traditional core values of Buddhism. It does not say anything about him as a person; it just says a lot about their need to be critical.
- They say how the Dalai Lama is in the wrong, "regularly defies Chinese authority".
- Yes. In good stories there is the "hero" and the "villain". The Dalai Lama and Tibet are painted as the oppressed with only "occasional unrest". They give Tibetans the last word. They cite, without the use of adjectives, what could be deemed "heroic" uprisings against oppression and suicides in the name of freedom. Dalai Lama is the underdog.
- No because the whole article complains about the Dalai Lama and what it's trying to do.
- I don't think so. They use words like "crimes", "claimed", "regularly defies", and "attempted uprising" when explaining, describing or talking about the Dalai Lama. All these words have negative connotations and decrease the Dalai Lama's credibility. The paper also suggests that he is responsible for "occasional unrest".
- Because the Dalai Lama sticks up for what he believes in.

Does Reuters think China justified?

- Yes it seems like they do, stating that China has had authority for a very long time.
- I'm going to say Yes!
- This is another form of political control. Recognizing the ancient old customs.
- They give commentary on Chinese officials stating how the Dalai Lama is to obey.
- No. They cite very little that favors the Chinese and it is well surrounded by things promoting the Dalai Lama of Tibet.
- No because they don't see the big picture or know exactly what the Dalai Lama does. Although opinions about reincarnation are different they should try to compromise.
- I think the writers are more supportive than unsupportive of China. They use more positive words like "has held authority" and that China has to "take tough measure to ensure stability". They decrease the validity of the people who set fire to themselves saying "allegedly in protest".
- I think maybe in a sense the writers see where the Chinese government is coming from but would have liked to see them listen and take into consideration more of the Dalai Lama.

Does Reuters find the Dalai Lama admirable?

- I believe Reuters writers do believe the Dalai Lama as admirable for if they did not, they wouldn't be writing about him nor would they take time to look into the event at hand.
- The writers for Reuters do not think that the Dalai Lama is admirable.
- Yes. "exiled Buddhist monk was trying" "mouthpiece of the ruling Communist party" "has to sign off on the selection ... " This is especially good - the sacred selection process is reduced to a bureaucratic signature on a form; "regular target of Chinese denunciations." "Superior reincarnation". The quoted passages (or translation I suppose) sound ridiculous.
- I do not think they think it is admirable because through the article they complain about the Dalai Lama and what it is doing.
- No. They seem to focus on the negative light surrounding him. Although they use the quotes to do so, so it's not so deliberate.
- I think that the writers for Reuters are trying to talk about the situation in China without bias.
- Yes, they speak of how he is standing up to the government about what he believes in.
- I don't think the writers for Reuters thought him admirable, but maybe seen the whole scenario is blown out of proportion. It seems that they favour the Dalai Lama's side because it appears unfair solely to him.

Does Reuters think China justified?

- Reporters are supposed to be bias and not take the side of one or the other. The writers have an equal amount of information on both sides however I believe there was a little bit of opinion in "not" opposing his views. Then again it is the way one reads something that determines how the writer is portraying their view.
- The writers say that Dalai Lama's "goal is to preserve his clique's grasp on the symbol of the next reincarnation to serve his political separatist aims". I do not think they like his views.
- No. Working backwards from the last pro-Tibet statement (which is the last one holds the reader) one can see all kinds of indications of this, some noted above. Another is "to help it make its point ..." which references the identification of Koresh and , which most readers would think is patently false.
- I think the article also sheds negative light on Tibet so no. Calling Tibetans actions desperate. Yes by saying that China has the final word or say in the topic of reincarnation in Buddhism.
- No, they don't say anything good about China. They say that the Tibetan leaders blame China for forcing Tibetans to change.
- It's clear that they had thought China was over the top, but I don't think it was justified. China is firm in their beliefs, but what they don't take into account is what they would do in that situation.

Why make the comparison?

- They put a reference in the article like Waco for it helps the reader understand more to what's going on and makes them relate to something a bit more known. Also xxxx has a big contribution.
- The Chinese were hoping that outsiders would see Koresh as very much like the Dalai Lama, a person who usurped moderate mainline religion to keep control. They are establishing themselves as the holders of stability and rationality, just like the US government was in the case of Waco. They are, as well, threatening the Dalai Lama and his followers that they will take violent action like the US government did if they have to.
- I think their point was to show the importance to the Dalai Lama and what it's doing. It's there to show how many people are concerned, and how much is involved.
- I think that putting that example as a comparison was done intentionally. Comparing the Dalai Lama to Koresh – a man accused of child abuse etc. seems to be a random, harsh comparison.
- They are trying to emphasize their situation by using the Waco siege example where what the Chinese people believe in (the followers of the Dalai Lama) does not go according to what the government thinks.
- They used it as a warning, saying that this is how it might end.
- I think the point was to smother out the possible up-rising, or to stop bringing different beliefs in the people, because China was benefitting previously.

Why make the comparison?

- To share a shocking example.
- People who pretend to be higher up (some religious figure) are ultimately horrible people.
- That the Dalai Lama is David Koresh.
- To compare the Dalai Lama, negatively, to Koresh. To give a "prediction" of what the Dalai Lama "wishes" to do. To tell of the potential results of freeing Tibet to the Dalai Lama.
- To show how strongly people think of what the Dalai Lama is trying to do. And how concerned some people are.
- The Dalai Lama could be the next David Koresh.
- That they are so quick to make assumptions and not take the time to look into what was actually going on. Also not really listening to anyone's point of view but their own.