

琉球大学学術リポジトリ

SOUTH MANCHURIA RAILWAY COMPANY「CONTEMPORARY MANCHURIA A BI-MONTHLY MAGAZINE」

メタデータ	言語: 出版者: 公開日: 2018-04-16 キーワード (Ja): 矢内原忠雄 / Yanaihara Tadao キーワード (En): 作成者: - メールアドレス: 所属:
URL	http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12000/37906

Sovietization of the Outer Mongolia. Should Manchuria be neglected and deserted as in the case of Outer Mongolia, it would certainly become a source of colossal calamity in the Eastern Asia.

In the midst of such conditions was born the Manchoukuo, which proved a barrier or more properly a break-water against the onrush of the surging Red waves. It is an event worthy of felicitations, not only to the Eastern Asia, but also the whole humanity.

Manchuria was fated to be subject to spoliation of the Western Powers as well—not to say Soviet Union. It is needless to dilate on how bitter were the struggles, how sinister the chicanery of the Western Powers, who even though pampered by their extensive territories and their vast colonial possessions, remained yet unsatiated and ventured forth their tentacles of greed to Manchuria. Withal, the Chang Regime susceptible to the lure of personal gains, readily succumbed to the ominous temptations and went to the length of extending the hand of welcome to those tendentious gestures of the West.

Manchuria was for decades placed under the ægis of the Open Door Doctrine. The true meaning of the Open Door Doctrine lies in this, that it is dedicated to the promotion of happiness and interest of the people residing under its influence. It attaches a cultural significance, only when it is construed as in above connotation. But the attitude of the White races to other races, especially to the Asiatic races, was essentially that of exploitation and plunder. The aggression of the Czarist Russia is typical one. Should several "Czarist Russia" ever make their debut in Manchuria and contend for the mastery or the lion's share, Asia would be turned into a scene of tumult, anarchy and holocaust.

Attacked by the Communists on the one hand, and subjected to the barrage of the Western Capitalism on the other, the constituted authorities in Manchuria remained powerless to resist and even lacked the will to resist.

Dismal, sombre clouds about to threaten whole Asia were rising up in Manchuria. However, the timely advent of Manchoukuo speedily cleared away such ominous clouds and dispelled the overwhelming unrest of Asia.

The advent of Manchoukuo accelerated thus the rejuvenation of Asia. Asia, long regarded as a happy hunting ground, an object of exploitation,—Asia tremulous at the impending sight of depredation in the hands of Western Powers—was enabled to enjoy a volt face or an opportunity of creating its own civilization and developing its resources by its own strength. And this is due veritably to the birth of New State.

Little wonder then, Japan had staked her national existence and bent all her energies for the growth of Manchoukuo. Little wonder again, the precious blood of her sons were spilled all over the vast plains of Manchoukuo.

The growth of Manchoukuo has contributed primarily to the reawakening of Asia; it has also conferred not inconsiderable quota of the increase of foreign trade upon the Western countries.

As mentioned elsewhere, Manchoukuo welcomes investments from the West. The newly established State has made all investments and undertakings safe and secure. That the total volume of her trade was augmented is beyond dispute, in the light of statistical figures. At least the demand for raw materials has been met to such an extent that it cannot, in point of quality

as well as quantity, be compared to that of the period under the old Regime.

Viewed from this angle, there is every reason to believe that Western Powers should be appreciative of the independence of Manchoukuo. Their assumption of blindness to the reality of facts under the spell of past circumstances would mean only a self-deception as well as a stultification of others. Should such be the case, no commendable outcome, be it noted, can ever be expected.

III

As regards the independence of Manchoukuo, a number of arguments and counter-arguments were advanced from the standpoint of international law or the interpretation of international treaty. For these controversies, Japan has provided from the beginning very lucid expositions, which it is needless to reiterate, in as much as the existence of Manchoukuo is *fait accompli* lasting nearly five years.

Nevertheless, Nanking Government is still attempting, whenever an opportunity offers, to denounce Manchoukuo, probably on the plea that she be regarded in the same category as that of the local Government of Hopei-Chahar or of the East Hopei. Often it pretends purposely to overlook the reality of the case. Despite its oft-repeated pronouncements to the effect that it is for the best interest of China and Japan to set aside the Manchoukuo issue, the Nanking Government is reported to be attempting, simultaneous with the resuscitation of anti-Japanese sentiments, not only to repudiate Manchoukuo negatively, but also undermine her foundations in positive manner.

Outer Mongolia and Hsin-kiang are the regions of far

wider territorial extent; yet they are with impunity and utter complacency left in the hands of Soviet Union; while Tibet is also given up to the domination of England. Nevertheless, China would single out Manchoukuo alone as her implacable foe and embark upon its destruction. Such motive is believed to be ascribable to her inordinate desire to hamper Japan.

Japan is assisting Manchoukuo in every way; but she is not dependent on the latter. Suppose for a moment Japan might by any possibility have to withdraw herself from Manchoukuo, and the latter be subjected to the fatal dissolution at the mercy of China! What will ensue then?

In all probability, Manchoukuo will become a powder-magazine of Asia. It is too plain to foretell that the New State will become a powder-magazine of the whole world, liable by a single spark of turning the whole of Asia into the scene of fratricidal carnage and also of dragging the whole world again into the darkness of despair.

Historically, Manchuria was the hereditary property of the Manchurian people. At the incursion of Manchurian kings into Peking, from which city they ruled the whole of China, Manchuria was made a forbidden territory, or an exclusive "Crown Colony." Manchuria and China became a sort of confederation under one Sovereign. In another word, Manchuria conquered China, but never did China subjugate her as Chinese dominion or possession. Manchuria and China were affiliated for nearly three hundred years by virtue of the Manchu Dynasty. With the downfall of Manchu Dynasty, China set herself free from the bondage.

Hence, the independence of Manchoukuo does not

signify her isolation or secession from China; it simply means the remodelling of her historical existence in the garb of "modern state."

Since the establishment of Manchoukuo does not connote the disruption of China, nor the loss of that which she had possessed, it is not to be regarded as equivalent to the "loss of face" on the part of China.

As a matter of fact, Chinese inhabitants numbering more than 20,000,000 or the kinsmen of Chinese in China Proper, are now daily enjoying peaceful, happy livelihood, which was not dreamed of in the pre-independence days.

Is it too much to expect that China would rather felicitate heartily the people of Manchoukuo and promote her friendship with them, while consolidating their mutual relations, especially when the regime of Manchoukuo, constituted as it is to-day, has been fully supported by the general will of the entire population, even though there were some dissentient, recalcitrant elements at the beginning of the new Administration?

The people of Manchoukuo are engaged of their own accord in the formulation of their administrative measures for their own interests and also in going their own ways. Is there any ground on which to justify the obstruction of such a spontaneous development of the people?

Furthermore, their fundamental ideas of government are based on Wang-tao, "the Kingly Ways." The Government derives its authority from Heaven, as mirrored in the Popular Will. Heavenly Will is, in short, the Supreme Reality, or the Divine Will. The classical adage reads "Heaven does not speak. It causes Man to speak." General Will of the people is tantamount also to the Divine Will. The essence of the Wang-tao

Government exists in the realization of ideal government based on theocracy (the Unity of Gods and Man). China may be able to exalt fully her qualities and possibilities of a great nation, in proportion as she will aid the Wang-tao Government in Manchoukuo at work.

Some people hold that Manchoukuo is a territory of China, since the bulk of her population are composed of Chinese (the Han race). However, such a contention is wholly untenable, in view of what has already been referred to. If it can be maintained that Manchoukuo is a Chinese territory, because Chinese people have penetrated beyond the Great Wall into the forbidden territory of Manchuria, we might as well be warranted in counter-arguing to the effect that the United States shall be made an British territory; the Latin American countries a Spanish territory; or the Island of Hawaii a Japanese territory. Likewise, the Mongolian region now presumed to be Chinese territory may have to be returned to the Mongolians; and the large portion of frontier regions to the Miao tribe, the Mohammedans and Tibetans respectively.

Obviously, the growth and progress of Manchoukuo has brought about considerable benefits to China, a neighbour most directly interested therein. The conclusion of treaties regarding the through traffic and through postal services is self-explanatory of the close relationship of these two countries. They are kin and kith in their racial relationship; furthermore, they are cemented by the inseparable bonds of economic and industrial nature. There are no reasons whatever that they should be opposed to each other. By and large, China is ordained by destiny to advance, correspondingly with the progress of Manchoukuo.

It goes without saying that remittances sent from inhabitants in Manchoukuo to North China, as well as cash carried back home by the Chinese immigrants were the source of boom to Chinese in the North China, ever cursed by the overpopulation and famines. This is only one instance out of many. It simply illustrates that the bulk of Manchurian inhabitants are Chinese, closely bound by the ties of various inter-relationships. The upshot of all is that such a contingency makes China happily a beneficiary of advantages accruing from the growth and progress of Manchoukuo, and never a recipient of disadvantages and inconvenience arising therefrom. Hence, any move or design calculated to plunge the New State headlong into vortex of disorder cannot but be branded as a conspiracy of suicidal nature.

In particular, the security of Manchoukuo is a question, on which Japan cannot look with something of equanimity or indifference, as she is vitally concerned in all phases of the situation in the capacity of a neighbour. The same may be said of China. Herein lies the *raison d'être* of Japan's titanic struggle in the past even at the risk of her national existence.

Is it conceivable that Japan, who struggled for Manchoukuo at enormous sacrifices entailing the loss of three hundred thousand precious lives and the expenditure of huge sum of more than ten billion yen, inclusive of military expenses, investments and the cost of other enterprises, would allow the New State thus steadily built up to collapse into non-entity, or be blown up to four winds for nothing?

In relation to Manchoukuo, Japan has already made firm determination after forty odd years of vicissitudes.

Little wonder is it that her will in connection therewith is growing daily firmer.

It bears repetition that the question under review involves not only the destiny of Japan, but also the very fate of Asia. It is the hinge upon which hangs the life of Asia. Therefore, should any country harbouring malicious designs ever tamper with it, some tragic disaster will surely ensue therefrom.

All sensible, forward looking peoples in Asia—except those Communists or those susceptible to the Communist agitation—are fully conscious of the necessity of bringing up the young State known as Manchoukuo. They are keenly alive to the fact that the only way of insuring the future peace of Asia is to tender the young State every timely assistance. On the contrary, any secret act conducive to the subversion of Manchoukuo shall be duly construed as a misdeed sowing seeds of suspicion and dissension among Asiatics.

Asia is now awakening with undreamt of rapidity. It is no longer the colonial appendages of Western Powers nor their possessions. Should there be an activity aimed at suppressing the renaissance movement, or alienating those people engaged in the promotion of such a movement—a movement, the sole purpose of which is to contribute, under the inspiration of culture of three thousand years, its own share to the sum total of human civilization—then such an activity shall be condemned as heinous crime against the cause of humanity. A person who may approve of such a perfidy shall be ostracized as a traitor to humanity.

AN OUTLINE OF THE MANCHOUKUO-SOVIET BORDER CONTROVERSY

I. THE RISE AND FALL OF RUSSIAN AND CHINESE INFLUENCES IN THE FAR EAST AND CHANGES IN THE BOUNDARY

"The history of Russia is the history of a country that is being colonized. Falling at times and rising at times, this everlasting movement has continued up till the present day." So writes Kliuchevsky in his *History of Russia*.

Originating in Bessarabia, the Russian race had by the end of the 17th century expanded throughout the vast territory extending eastward as far as Kamchatka. During the period between 1581 and 1585, the Volga Cossack, Ermak, with a small number of followers and with reckless courage and perseverance, had subjugated the inhabitants along the banks of the Tobo and Taara Rivers, tributaries of the Obi. After his death, many expeditions followed in his footsteps, each one advancing farther eastward than the one preceding. Entertaining the unreasonable belief that the various races in Siberia should pay tribute to the Emperor in Moscow, these expeditions conquered one race after another; and during the thirty-five-year reign of Emperor Mihail Feodorovitch (1613-48) of the Romanoff Dynasty, they succeeded in conquering the vast territory stretching from the Obi River to the Pacific Ocean and in subjugating the Samoeds, Tungus, Yakuts, Buriats, Daurians, and the Koriaks. As reasons for these successful conquests may be given: possession of firearms, patriotism and a sense of Christian superiority. It is, however, an undeniable fact that the "yassak" (tribute in furs)

MANCHOUKUO-SOVIET BORDER CONTROVERSY 19

collected from the conquered races, proved a no small factor in increasing their lust for conquest. Concerning the conditions existing at that time, *The S.M.R. Survey Report* states:

The chaotic sight of magistrates, village officials, Cossacks, sharpshooters (regulars of that time), merchants, hunters, Government farmers, exiles and free immigrants overrunning the whole of Siberia and fossicking for profit by inhuman exploitation of the native tribes as beasts depicts the actual situation in Siberia of that period.¹

In order to lure their fellow-countrymen of Tsari to migrate to Siberia, these "pioneer immigrants" made raids upon the natives, took as hostages those who were wealthy or held high positions, and obtained as ransom for their release furs, valuables, live-stock, cereals and almost anything they could possibly lay their hands on. A part of this ransom they sent to Tsari or to their superior officials as presents; the rest they kept for themselves to satisfy their greed. In case the native tribes refused to accede to their demands, the invaders massacred the male population, enslaved the women, and inflicted brutal punishment upon the traitors. So notorious were the Russians for their brutality that the Sanskrit word "locha," meaning a demoniac god of the barbarous cannibals, was a popular name by which they were known at that time.

The invasion and the subsequent occupation of the Amur River basin by the Russian hordes inevitably brought them into conflict with China, ruled at the time by the Ching Dynasty which had been receiving tribute from the inhabitants of that region. With a magnanimity befitting a great nation, China then was pursuing an extremely humanitarian racial policy while content-

¹ Volume 17: "A Study of Recent Russo-Chinese Relations."

ing herself with a traditionally defensive attitude towards other nations. True to her benevolent policy towards the people owing fealty to her, she came to the rescue of the inhabitants of the Amur basin to free them from the Russian invaders. After first issuing an order for their evacuation to safer regions within the kingdom, China opened hostilities against the invaders. Thus Russia, the conqueror of all the races in Siberia, for the first time found herself confronted with a mighty enemy in China. At the end of a long struggle with China, which continued for over three decades (1652-86), Russia awakened to the realization that all factors considered, including her 17th century weapons and the racial and national consciousness of her people, her eastward advance had reached its limit. The result was a reorientation of her policy towards one of peace.

The capitulation of the Arbazin Fortress—a noted historical event in the Russo-Chinese struggle of the 17th century—afforded the Russians an excellent opportunity to discuss peace terms with China. The thirty-year struggle was brought to an end by the signing of the Nerchinsk Treaty which settled their respective spheres of influence. Although it is said that China made the first peace overture, it is a fact that Russia had by that time already inclined towards conciliation.

At the peace conference, held in Nerchinsk, the Russian delegation was headed by Golovin, who left Moscow towards the end of January 1686, accompanied by his suite and a bodyguard of 500 soldiers. The head of the Chinese delegation was So E-tu, who left China in May, 1686, with an escort of 800 soldiers. It took a long time for the two parties to get in touch with each other owing to defective means of communication, and

it was not until August 1689, when they finally arrived in Nerchinsk.

The conference first dealt with the war itself, following which it took up the question of clarifying the frontier between the two countries. With both delegations maintaining an adamant attitude, the parley encountered considerable difficulty in reaching an agreement. Assembling at the venue of the conference some 10,000 troops, composed of its bodyguard and local garrison troops, the Chinese delegation took a firm attitude throughout the parley, even going to the extent of threatening to attack Arbazin if Russia did not agree to making the Zabaikal region the new frontier. That the Chinese were able to take such a firm stand may be explained by the fact that anti-Russian feeling was running high among the native inhabitants of the frontier districts at that time. The Russians, on the other hand, vehemently contended that the Amur River should form the boundary and refused to make any concessions. After much heated discussion, however, the two delegations finally reached a compromise and agreed upon the following points:

- (1) The Gorbitza River flowing into the Shilka River from the left side near the Tchernaya River shall form the frontier between Russia and China. All rivers, both large and small, which flow into the Amur from the southern side of the Hsingan Range (which extends from the source of the Gorbitza River to the sea)² shall belong to China, while all rivers having their source on the other side of the Hsingan Range shall belong to Russia.
- (2) The ownership of the rivers located between the Uji River, in Russian territory, and the border mountains

² Geographic conception at that time being very vague, it is believed that what is meant by the above-mentioned "Hsingan Range" are the present Yablonoi and Stanovoi mountain-ranges.

near the Amur River, and flowing into the sea, and of all land between the Uji River and the border mountains shall be decided upon at a proper time in the future.

(3) The Argun River, which empties into the Amur, shall also form the boundary between the two countries.

(4) The Arbazin Fortress shall be destroyed.

(In addition an agreement was also reached regarding communications between the two countries. The above data are obtained from the publication of the Russian Foreign Office on Russo-Chinese treaties.)

By the conclusion of the Nerchinsk Treaty, China realized her long-cherished desire of having the Argun River established as her northwestern frontier and of gaining possession of the Amur River basin, thus nullifying Russia's thirty-year efforts to acquire the extensive and fertile farming land along the Amur River. However, what Russia desired most at that time was the opening of trade with China, and simultaneously with the conclusion of the above treaty, overland trade which later developed into a thriving condition was started between the two countries.

The ownership of the vast tract of land near the mouth of the Amur River was left undecided. Although it constitutes a question of great importance when viewed in the light of conditions today, both Russia and China at the time of the conclusion of the Nerchinsk Treaty had no special interest in that region, the importance of which was regarded as being not equal to that of the Arbazin Fortress.

The next important event in Sino-Russian relations was the conclusion of the Pula Treaty in August 1727—38 years after the signing of the Nerchinsk Treaty—under which the Argun River was definitely adopted as the western boundary between the two countries.



Heihsiatzu Island, triangular delta at the confluence of the Amur and Ussuri Rivers, over the ownership of which no satisfactory agreement has been reached between Manchoukuo and Soviet Russia



The Amur River, which forms the northern boundary between Manchoukuo and Soviet Russia, and Blagoveschensk, as seen from the Manchoukuo bank of the Amur

October of the same year saw the conclusion of the Chiakotu Treaty which settled the Outer Mongolian frontier west of the Argun. These treaties may be regarded as having clarified, in written form, the Russian and Chinese spheres of influence. An explanation of the Chiakotu Treaty will not be made here as it deals chiefly with Russo-Chinese trade relations.

Generally speaking, for about 150 years after the conclusion of the Nerchinsk Treaty, a balance was maintained between Russia and Chinese influences in the Far East, Russia giving up all ambitions of occupying the Amur region. However, with the advance into the Far East of Great Britain, France and other powers about the middle of the 19th century, Russia, for political reasons, found herself faced with the necessity of gaining possession of the above district in order to strengthen her defences in the Far East. China at that time was too preoccupied otherwise to establish strong government in the Amur region, and the only establishments she had there were those for frontier defence. Russia, on the other hand, utilizing her powerful army to advantage, launched steadfastly upon her program of territorial aggrandizement. Finally in May, 1858, the Aihun Conference was called.

At this parley, Russia was represented by Nikolai Mouravieff, Governor of East Siberia, and others, and China by General I Shan, Commander of the Heilungkiang Garrison, and Chilaminga, Vice-Governor of Aihun. China had not yet recovered from the disastrous effects of the Taiping Rebellion (1833-48), and in Kirin and Heilungkiang Provinces there was a serious shortage of troops and provisions. Taking advantage of her weakness, the Russian delegation, with a powerful army at

its command, cowed the Chinese delegation into accepting its demand for the cession to Russia of the entire territory on the left bank of the Amur River, extending from the Argun River to the mouth of the Amur.

As she had no special interest in the Amur region since the conclusion of the Nerchinsk Treaty, China was at first unaware of the grave significance of the Aihun Treaty but it was not long before she became conscious of it. General I Shan and Chilaminga were held responsible for China's failure at the conference and were punished. China even issued a statement announcing her non-recognition of the transfer of the Amur district to Russia. Mouravieff and the other Russian delegates, on the other hand, were accorded the highest honors by their Government.

On June 13, 1858, only a month after the signing of the Aihun Treaty, the Russian representative, Poutiatin, who had diligently been conducting negotiations with the Chinese authorities for the conclusion of a most-favored-nation treatment agreement, surprised Britain, France and the United States by signing the so-called Tientsin Treaty, an epochal event marking the establishment of formal diplomatic relations between Russia and China. The urgent necessity of concluding an agreement for definition of that portion of the boundary between the two countries which still remained unmarked, was mentioned in Article 9 of the Treaty. However, as Poutiatin was at that time still unaware of the conclusion of the Aihun Treaty, the Aihun Treaty is today regarded as a supplementary agreement to the Tientsin Treaty.

China's announcement of her non-recognition of the Russian occupation of the Amur district, however, gave

rise to a fresh controversy, and after one year of fruitless negotiations (June 1859 to May 1860), diplomatic relations between the two countries were finally severed. Just at this time matters between Britain and France, on the one hand, and China, on the other, came to a head over the question of ratification of treaties, the two European Powers opening hostilities against the Celestial Empire. The Russian Minister to China, Ignatieff, intervened in the conflict and, taking advantage of the favorable turn of the feelings of the Chinese Government and people toward Russia, succeeded in concluding the Peking Treaty with China. The Treaty stipulated that the Ussuri River, Lake Khanka (Hsingkai), and the Paileng, Huputu, Hunchun and Tumen Rivers shall form the boundary between the two countries and that the territory lying to the east of these rivers shall belong to Russia and that to the west, to China. Under this pact approximately 1,000,000 square kilometres of territory were definitely brought under Russian sovereignty. The present boundary is on the whole based on the Peking Treaty and although various supplementary treaties have been concluded since, no basic changes in the boundary have been made. In short, the two incidents, namely, the Taiping Rebellion and the Anglo-French armed expedition to China, proved very costly to China in that by a single treaty, she had lost to Russia an extensive colonial territory.

Beginning from the latter part of the 19th century, Russian immigration to the Far East increased by leaps and bounds. To quote from Kliuchevsky's *History of Russia* (p. 25):

Russian immigration to Siberia, which did not exceed 2,000 annually before 1880, reached 50,000 in 1890, and increased

still further to 200,000 in 1896—the year of the completion of the Siberian railway.

Although Russo-Chinese relations entered into a state of comparative lull after the conclusion of the Peking Treaty, occasional disputes concerning navigation rights and immigration broke out owing to disagreement over the names of certain rivers mentioned in the treaties concluded between the two countries.

II. THE PRESENT BOUNDARY BASED ON TREATIES

The present boundary between Manchoukuo and the Soviet Union is based on treaties concluded between China and Russia to which the Manchoukuo Government succeeded, as stated in the communique issued, simultaneously with the foundation of the new State in March 1932, to the Foreign Ministers of various powers to the effect that "Manchoukuo shall succeed to those liable obligations due to the Republic of China by virtue of treaty stipulations with foreign countries, in the light of international laws and conventions and that these obligations shall be faithfully discharged."

As previously mentioned, the Peking Treaty, of November 14, 1860, supplementary to the Tientsin Treaty, was the final basic agreement defining the Russo-Chinese boundary. It stipulated that the three large rivers—the Argun, the Amur and the Ussuri—shall form the boundary between the two countries. Parts of the treaty containing direct reference to the demarcation of the frontier are:

.... the western frontier between the two Empires, beginning from the confluence of the Shilka and the Argun Rivers, shall follow the course of the Amur River up to its confluence with the Ussuri. The territory on the left (northern) bank of the Amur shall belong to the Russian Empire, while that

on the right (southern) bank, up to the mouth of the Ussuri, shall belong to the Chinese Empire. Further, from the mouth of the Ussuri River to Lake Khanka, the frontier shall follow the course of the Ussuri and Sungacha Rivers. The territories on the eastern (right) banks of these rivers shall belong to the Russian Empire, and those on the western (left) banks, to the Chinese Empire. Furthermore, the frontier between the two Empires shall cut Lake Khanka and run to the Paileng River, then, from the mouth of the latter, over mountains to the mouth of the Huputu River, and from there over the mountain range situated between the Hunchun River and the sea, to the Tumen River. Here also, the regions to the east of the frontier shall belong to the Russian Empire, and those to the west, to the Chinese Empire. The frontier shall end at the Tumen River, 20 Chinese "li" above its mouth.³

The western frontier, hitherto undefined, shall henceforth follow mountains, big rivers and the line of the still existing Chinese pickets, beginning from the last frontier-mark, called Shahintapaha (erected in 1728 in accordance with the Kiakhta Treaty), towards the southwest to Lake Tsaisang; from there the frontier shall run to the Tengrishan, also called the Tien-shannanlu (meridional branches of the Celestial Mountains), south of Lake Issykkoul to the Kokand possessions.⁴

.... due to the establishment of the new frontier line, the regulations in the Nerchinsk and Kiakhta Treaties and in their supplementary treaties shall henceforth become inapplicable.⁵

The boundary as stipulated in the Peking Treaty differed considerably from that prescribed in former Sino-Russian treaties. Under the Nerchinsk Treaty, signed in 1689, a mountain range considerably north of the Amur River marked the frontier. The Aihun Treaty of 1858 brought the border line south to the Amur, but contained special provisions under which Russia recognized China's special interests in the Chinese colony northwest of Heiho on the other side of the Amur.

³ Article 1 of Peking Treaty. Translated from Russian.

⁴ Article 2 of Peking Treaty. This article, with the exception of a part referring to the Russo-Manchurian frontier, concerns with the Outer Mongolian border.

⁵ Article 9 of Peking Treaty.

Furthermore, it did not specify the ownership of the immense territory lying between the Ussuri River and the sea. The Peking Treaty and other agreements concluded after it will be next explained in their relation to the Russo-Chinese frontier.

1. The Eastern Boundary.

In accordance with the provisions of the Peking Treaty, a mixed Sino-Russian committee, after conducting a survey of the eastern border in 1861, the year following the signing of the above treaty, erected wooden posts (marked in Russian alphabetical order) along the eastern frontier and recorded their location on a map. Copies of the map, together with a protocol, known as the Lake Khanka Treaty, were exchanged between the two countries. The protocol was so named because it was signed at Pailengho, on the shore of Lake Khanka.

As many of the wooden posts decayed in the years that followed, making the frontier indistinguishable, a Sino-Russian conference, attended by Baranoff and Wu Ta, was called in May 1886, 25 years after their erection, for the purpose of replacing them. As the result of an agreement reached at the conference—the final agreement to be concluded in regard to the eastern border—stone boundary-marks were newly erected at spots where the border had become indefinite. The boundary-marks replaced at that time, it is said, were the T mark on the bank of the Tumen River, the R and S marks located between the T and P marks, the M mark standing between the L and N marks, and the O mark which was removed to the mouth of the Huputu River from Hsia-kushan. In addition, 26 new frontier posts, numbered from 1 to 26, were said to have been erected between the boundary-marks T and K, between Lake Khanka and

the Tumen River, but no data showing their exact position are available. According to data compiled by the Chinese authorities in 1914, the positions of the boundary-marks, many of which have disappeared, were as follows:

Boundary-Marks	Existing or Disappeared	Location
T (also T in English)	Existing	At the northwestern foot of Mount Wofeng, on the eastern bank of the Tumen River
No. 1	Existing	At Yangkuanping, north of Shakangzu
No. 2	Existing	At Ikangtsui
No. 3	Disappeared	On Mount Paershshih
No. 4	Existing	On a mountain located east of Chitao-paotzu
No. 5	Disappeared	On a mountain located east of Liutao-paotzu, at the foot of Mount Machiuning
No. 6	Disappeared	On a mountain located east of Wuchiatzu
No. 7	Disappeared	On a mountain located south of Hochang-trukou
No. 8	Disappeared	On a mountain located south of Santao-hotzu
No. 9	Disappeared	At Fotoshihling
No. 10	Disappeared	At Yentungchetrusikouling
No. 11	Disappeared	At Hulupiehankouling, at the source of the Yenchu River
No. 12	Disappeared	At Nanpiehlikouling
No. 13	Disappeared	At Sipeikouling
No. 14	Disappeared	At Chihtzuyinkouling
No. 15	Disappeared	At Peikouling
C (S in English)	Existing	At Achimiling
No. 16	Disappeared	At Lishukouling
P (R in English)	Existing	On the summit of a mountain located at the source of the Mengkuchieh River
II (P in English)	Existing	At Laosungling, a ridge at the source of the Huputu River
O (also O in English)	Existing	On a precipice on the northern bank of the Suifen River, northwest of Wuchekou
No. 17	Disappeared	At Pataohotzukaoling
No. 18	Existing	On the east side of Kungssuling
No. 19	Existing	At Pingkangshang
No. 20	Existing	At Pingshanling
H (N in English)	Existing	At Hengshanhuichu, near the Nancha River
No. 21	Existing	At the watershed of the Muleng and Siyang Rivers