

**The Ainu and Indigenous Trading in Maritime  
Northeast Asia: A Comparative Review of the  
Histories of Hokkaido, Amur-Sakhalin and Chukotka**

東北アジア海域におけるアイヌと先住民交易  
—北海道、アムール・樺太、チュコトカの地域史比較にかかわる研究動向展望

**Hiroki TAKAKURA**

# The Ainu and Indigenous Trading in Maritime Northeast Asia: A Comparative Review of the Histories of Hokkaido, Amur-Sakhalin and Chukotka

東北アジア海域におけるアイヌと先住民交易  
—北海道、アムール・樺太、チュコトカの地域史比較にかかわる研究動向展望

Hiroki TAKAKURA (高倉 浩樹)\*

Keywords : indigenous trade, Ainu, Siberian peoples, Japan-Russia relations,  
Maritime Northeast Asia

キーワード : 先住民交易、アイヌ、シベリア諸民族、日露関係、東北アジア海域

## Abstract

This paper is a comparative review on the recent historical studies on the indigenous trading of the North. The purpose is to reconsider the significance of 18th and 19th century economic activities of the indigenous peoples of Hokkaido and Sakhalin within a regional framework of Maritime Northeast Asia, which refers to the Sea of Japan, the Sea of Okhotsk, and the Bering Sea. I translate the historical descriptions of three indigenous trading systems, each of which have been constructed within the contexts of disciplines of history and anthropology. The development and the decline of the trading systems are focused by taking into account the international relations of the time. In the nineteenth century, modern states in the North Pacific Rim were finally attempting to territorialize unclaimed land and to establish national borders. Relations between Japan and Russia during that period should be considered in the above context. The framework of Maritime Northeast Asia is indispensable and effective for finding comparable contexts of the social-economic changes of indigenous peoples in the "frontier territories" of both Japanese and Russian states, and for analyzing the motivations of their economic and strategic resources in that area.

## 要 旨

北方先住民交易史に関わる近年の文献史学及び人類学研究動向について展望する。特に18-19世紀における北海道及び樺太先住諸民族の経済活動の意義を、日本海・オホーツク海・ベーリング海にひろがる形で構成される東北アジア海域という参照枠組みにおいて再考することが目的である。従来、蝦夷地近世史における場所請負制の問題は日本史、アムール・樺太先住民交易史およびベーリング海峡交易は人類学、といった専門領域毎に扱われてきた。これらの歴史叙述を、先住民と国家との関係性という観点において翻訳＝再記述・比較検討し、さらに当時の国際関係をも視野に入れることで、先住民交易の発展と衰退の特徴を浮き彫りにする。19世紀の北太平洋世界においては、近代国家による「領土化」過程が最後の段階を迎えるが、当

---

\* Center for Northeast Asian Studies, Tohoku University

時の日露関係はそうした文脈にある。この二国家間の「境界」領域に暮らす先住民の社会変化の文脈を再定位すると同時に、領土化の背後にある両国家の経済・戦略資源を分析する上で、東北アジア海域という地域概念の設定が有効であることが明らかにされる。

### **Introduction: Historiography of Ainu and the North**

Recently, historians and anthropologists have arduously developed the historical studies on indigenous trade in the Northern Frontier of Japan that includes present-day Hokkaido, Sakhalin, Chishima, and Kamchatka(1). The purpose of this paper is to reconsider the significance of 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century economic activities of the indigenous peoples of Hokkaido and Sakhalin and to place this history within a framework of a broader Maritime Northeast Asia, which refers to the human societal spaces neighboring the Sea of Japan, the Sea of Okhotsk, and the Bering Sea.

Whenever historians discuss the island north of Hokkaido known either as Karafuto or Sakhalin(2), attention has been concentrated primarily on Japan-Russia political processes such as bilateral exchanges and national border negotiations. Beginning in the late 1980s, however, the concept of "indigenous peoples" opened up new research perspectives for historians and anthropologists and allowed researchers to relativize a state-centric history. While this new indigenous viewpoint emerged in the context of research developments, it would not necessarily be incorrect to say that it was influenced by the end of the Cold War between East and West.

The history of Sakhalin, or the Russian Far East (southern areas) used to be interpreted under a shroud of extreme Soviet-Russian state ideology. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, Russian historians and anthropologists have tried to describe the factual history of Sakhalin in terms of local points of view and indigenous issues [Vishnevski 1994, Vysokov 2000, Larin 2002, Roon 2005]. Across the Bering Strait, American anthropologists have extended the Southern part of the Russian Far East, Sakhalin, and even Hokkaido into the research framework of Northeastern Siberian studies. Although the founder of American anthropology, Franz Boas, had introduced comparative studies of the indigenous peoples of the North Pacific Rim at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, this kind of research was almost disappeared during the Cold War. As it again became possible to conduct Siberian anthropological field studies, the significance of these comparative indigenous studies was met with renewed interest in the U.S. [Fitzhugh, et al., 1988, Fitzhugh, et al., 1999].

Japanese researchers in the fields of history and anthropology sought to recognize the historical space occupied by the indigenous people of Hokkaido, Sakhalin, and the Chishima (Kuril) Islands prior to the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century, and concentrated their efforts on constructing a historical description centered on trading activities. They firmly negated the established, timeless image of the Ainu and Nivkh as hunter-gather or fishing societies based on their findings that, rather than closed systems, indigenous people formed socio-economic networks among themselves that were wholly unrelated to present-day national borders. Specifically, these trade networks connected Ezo (historical term for Hokkaido and some Northern frontier of Japan) to Karafuto and the continent, and Chishima to Kamchatka [T Kikuti 1994, Kikuti 1994]. Coupled with archeological evidence confirming the existence of these networks for millennia, it was clear that the indigenous peoples had occupied a space quite different from existing historical representations, and the history of the northern Japanese islands was reopened for examination.

The demise of these trade networks, that is, the division of these indigenous historical spaces

by national borders, has been explained mainly only through the lens of political confrontation and industrialization. The first independent trading activities of the Ainu grew weaker as the degree of Japanese control and subordination increased; the final blow came with Japan's direct rule of the Ezo region as Hokkaido in the face of Russia's southward movement.

In 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century studies, most historians have focused on the economic exploitation of Ainu society rather than Ainu trading activities. At the same time, however, an ethnohistorical approach to the *Santan* trade (indigenous trading between the Amur basin and Sakhalin) has indicated that indigenous trading activity actually peaked between the 18<sup>th</sup> and early 19<sup>th</sup> centuries, when Ezo Ainu trade had been presumably discontinued. It has been suggested that this indigenous trade network, based between Sakhalin and the Amur River basin, grew by taking advantage of the tributary system with the Qing dynasty and the Tokugawa shogunate, and was grounded with the emergence of the contemporary states of Meiji Japan and the Russian Empire [Sasaki 1996].

After the 18<sup>th</sup> century then, trade was no longer a key concept to indigenous history in the Ezo region, but it was still extremely important in Sakhalin. This idea corresponds with frontier theory in the history of Northern Frontier of Japan, that is, the view that northern borders were not drawn by political lines, but by the northward economic development and immigration of each era [Kikuti 2001]. Ainu trading in the Ezo region was shut down with the development of fisheries under the shogunate system, which in turn drew the further northern areas of Sakhalin and Chishima into range for trading. The demise of indigenous trading in these areas was not so much due to the development of fisheries, but to political relations with Russia after the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

Since the latter half of the 1990s, research trends both in the history and anthropology of Northern Frontier of Japan and the Ainu have been fueled by a reconsideration of the previous historical descriptions of the demise of these indigenous networks. These most recent historical studies have suggested that trading activities played an important role in Ainu livelihoods from the 18<sup>th</sup> to mid-19<sup>th</sup> centuries. This is a criticism for the argument that the Ezo Ainu were controlled under the shogunate system as fishing laborers. In the field of anthropology, a growing number of comparative historical analyses have been concerned with 18<sup>th</sup> to early 20<sup>th</sup> century indigenous trading in the areas further north of Sakhalin and Chishima, such as northeast Siberia and the arctic region of North America, which included not only indigenous trading, but also fur trades with China and the Euro-America merchants.

This paper aims to incorporate new knowledge mainly in Japanese academia into a reconsideration of the historical description of the Ezo-Karafuto indigenous trade, and examine the significance of the demise of indigenous trade networks while illuminating the historical conditions that existed behind Russian and Japanese territorial disputes in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. In particular, this paper is concerned with the relationship between the *Santan* trade and Ainu trade in Ezo, and the economic networks of indigenous peoples. By comparing the experience of the Ezo Ainu with their indigenous neighbors in Sakhalin and even further north into the Arctic Circle in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century, I would like to rethink the significance of the dissolution of indigenous trade in this region, a subject that is inevitably linked to an alternative vision of Maritime Northeast Asia as an integrated region in terms of indigenous peoples.

In a recent study by Kimura (2004: 213) on the fur trade that spanned the North American

continent and northern Eurasia in the 17<sup>th</sup> through the 19<sup>th</sup> centuries, fur is called the "forgotten global commodity." Unlike the historically significant spices, silver, sugar and other tropical and subtropical goods that formed the basis for a Modern World System, fur was specialized and limited; it was not a product that could be mass-produced simply through an increase in capital or labor. Still, one reason that Kimura focuses on the fur trade as a topic of study is because the demand for furs highlighted the need for topographies and ethnographies of the previously unknown far north and sub-far north regions of the northern hemisphere. Based on this topographic and ethnographic information, the Western powers moved to arbitrarily territorialize these spaces and succeeded in a final divvying up of the northern hemisphere. Thus, we should recognize that the territorial disputes over Sakhalin, Chishima, and even Hokkaido must be understood not simply as a problem between the two countries of Japan and Russia, but as an issue that stretches across much wider contexts. This paper attempts to concretely describe such a frame of reference while reevaluating the historical placement of Ezo-Karafuto indigenous trading.

### **Ainu subsistence economy in the 17<sup>th</sup>-19<sup>th</sup> centuries and its historical understanding**

#### ***Historical description and methodology***

Japanese history of the North takes the position that, in the development of the fishing industry in the Ezo region, the Ainu were caught up in "unjust" contract labor. This view has been the cornerstone of positive analysis in studies thus far (3). Specifically, as stated earlier, *Zyouka koueki* 城下交易, in which the Ainu had participated, comparatively freely, in autonomous trading at castle posts, was transformed into *Akinaiba tigyousei* 商場知行制, or a mastery system of trading posts, and then later into *Basyo ukeoisei* 場所請負制, with control and management in the hands of the Japanese merchants. However, supporting evidence for this claim and its accompanying view of history have become the subject of controversy in recent years. This is an issue of how to interpret and depict the reality of Ainu subsistence economy in the early modern era. Iwasaki [2003] asserts that existing Ainu historical studies immobilize the Ainu as "exploited victims" and have an inadequate understanding of the meaning of the contemporary past:

The historical reality of the Ainu has undergone a shifting from subjects preserving their way of life in modern Ezo, to backward natives in contemporary Hokkaido, to an ethnic minority in Japan. In historical descriptions, the Ainu have been objectified as absolute subjects supporting Japan from behind, or they are equated to a negative print, unilaterally absorbing the continuing development and expansion of Japan. Parallel to incorporating the Ainu into the Japanese state, contemporary Japan has robbed the Ainu of their history— in both reality and historical description [p. 230, trans. by the author].

In her definition of "reality," Iwasaki is referring to institutions such as *Basyo ukeoisei* or the contract fisheries system (early 19<sup>th</sup>-1869), and *Hokkaido Kyuu dozin hogo hou* 北海道旧土人保護法, or the act of preservation of Ainu (1899-1997). Despite the different meanings these regulations had for Ainu society, they are perceived as continuing exploitation - according to Iwasaki, these understandings are also "exploitation" in terms of the historical description of the Ainu. To borrow her words, even though there was a "disconnect dividing early-modern and modern [p. 195]," positivism in history was unable to shed light on the gap. Furthermore, Iwasaki asserts that

historical description is not a transparent, scientific activity, but a way to reconstruct the past based on a particular historical view [p.194]. Rather than investigating the validity of positive proof in existing studies, she is critical of how this historical supporting evidence is selected. She poses the question: should we reconsider *how* evidence is amassed under a particular historical viewpoint, that is, under the premise of gradual and systematic exploitation of the Ainu? This opinion is based on an epistemology that has come to be shared between the humanities and social sciences since the development of postcolonial critique; it seeks to understand historical texts from an external standpoint while identifying the politics implied in the conduct of research. This is an important contention especially for Japanese history, which has a strong tendency not to make a distinction between positivism and empiricism, because it demands a framework hitherto foreign to research and invites analytical reassessment.

Yet, while Iwasaki proposes a reconsideration of the historical reality of the Ainu in the early-modern and modern eras, the brunt of her criticism falls on Japanese history itself. This seems somewhat questionable for me, however, if we consider that Ainu history (early-modern to modern) cannot be reduced from Japanese history methodologies alone. It is true that the vast majority of the Ainu individuals today are holders of Japanese citizenship, and their historical outlook is centered on history post-Meiji restoration (late 19<sup>th</sup> century). However, the same cannot be said for the "early-modern" era that is Iwasaki's area of concentration. This is because a great many historical documents from Russia and Euro-America exist from before (and after) the Northern Frontier of Japan was demarcated by national borders. The quality of these historical materials, including their multi-lingual nature, should be carefully considered in methodology [Sasaki 2004, Tanimoto 2004], but most Japanese historians fail to take this kind cautious approach in their studies of Ainu history.

The leading historian on this topic, Kikuti Isao, has commented on the definition of the history of Northern Frontier of Japan:

The history of Northern Frontier of Japan is just a convenient term for the history of the inhabitants of the islands and territories to the north of Japan. So long as we call it the Northern Frontier of Japan, we of course have an issue that cannot escape Japan's interest. I would like to refer to the history of Northern Frontier of Japan with this understanding, but it seems that there is a large overlapping between the history of Northern Frontier of Japan and Japanese history itself, if not a complete swallowing of the former into Japanese history. If we go back in time, however, the overlap between the two decreases, and we see how the history of the Northern Frontier of Japan is in fact, very distinct [Kikuti 2003:10, trans. by the author]

What Kikuti means by a "distinct" history of Northern Frontier of Japan, is a description based on archeological evidence and an analysis of Chinese historical documents in a context that differs from that of Japanese history. Since the late 1980s, a large amount of reference material has been accumulated across various fields on the history of the Northern Frontier of Japan from ancient to medieval times [Emori 2001, 2003]. However, probably because they represent Japan's "frontier," northern regions are increasingly woven into Japanese history as the history becomes more modern. Why doesn't early-modern-to-modern history of Northern Frontier of Japan employ the

same multidisciplinary, hybrid methods used in prehistoric or medieval history?

For example, completely new research tasks and viewpoints can be gained through a review of multi-lingual historical documents and an examination of their quality, taking account into Japan-Russia relations after the 19<sup>th</sup> century and its background of international relations in the North Pacific Rim. In fact, Morris-Suzuki [2000] has done exactly this in her theory on Ainu modernization. The widespread response to Morris-Suzuki's theory was due to her success in re-depicting, from an indigenous perspective, the development and end of the historical spaces of northern indigenous peoples that had existed until the 19<sup>th</sup> century [See also Takakura 2002]. Morris-Suzuki used Japan studies and postcolonial critique as methodological cornerstones, and referenced both Japanese and Russian historical materials for a comparative analysis of Soviet minority policies and Ainu assimilation policies.

While still conforming to current Japanese history methodologies, one study expanded traditional boundaries with the use of Ainu oral traditions. It is very interesting that the introduction and examination of this new type of reference material brought about a criticism of existing historical perspectives. Sakata [2004] used Ainu oral tradition, previously categorized as part of the arts, to undertake the task of relativizing the terminology of Japanese history. Specifically, the meaning of "*kaihou* 介抱 or care," which tends to be used synonymously with early-modern Ainu assimilation policy, was compared with the Ainu translation of "*ureshipa*" found in oral tradition and other historical references of the same period. Differences between the two connotations — the former implies looking after or protecting, while the latter suggests nurturing and mutually assisting, led Sakata to reevaluate how the Ainu were described historically. Sakata concluded that "care," which from the Japanese standpoint denoted aid and the provision of various resources, was not understood in the same way by the Ainu or by the Japanese doing trade with the Ainu, at least before 1807 (the beginning of the first Tokugawa shogunate's direct control policy on Ezo during 1807-1821). In fact, the Ainu saw their relationship with the Japanese as mutually beneficial, believing that trade with the Japanese was important to strengthening relations with their god, *kamui*. Sakata suggests that this understanding began to change only in the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

The overall relations of the Ezo Ainu to the Tokugawa shogunate in the 18<sup>th</sup> century consisted of the *uimamu* or greeting ritual in tribute, which required presenting gifts and holding audiences with the Matsumae Lord (*daimyo*), and *omusya*, or greeting rituals, which occurred at each trading post (later, basyo or fisheries spots). However, interpretation of these rituals differed between the Ainu and the Japanese; the Ainu did not view themselves as dependents of the Japanese [see also Howell 1999:98]. The political implications of the greeting rituals grew heavier in the 19<sup>th</sup> century even though the trade relationship continued unchanged.

#### *The place of trade in Ainu livelihoods*

The main argument in Sakata's study is that the Ainu remained economically and culturally autonomous even while they came to be politically dominated by the Japanese following the development of *Akinaiba tigyousei* or the mastery system of trading posts after the 17<sup>th</sup> century. Along with Iwasaki and other historians [Tanimoto 1998, 2003; Tazima 1995], Sakata expresses a view that has come to be shared in the studies of Ainu social history and the contract fisheries system.

Using the historical term of *zibun kasegi* 自分稼, or self earning as a cue, Tanimoto [2003] has

proposed that *aitai koueki* 相对交易, or mutual trade, was very much alive in Ainu society in 18<sup>th</sup> to mid-19<sup>th</sup> century Ezo, despite the fact that exchange was limited to merchants at designated fisheries spots. Ainu production activities during this period can be classified as employed labor under the contract fisheries system, preparation of products for trade (specialty fishing for salmon and sea cucumbers, hunting for furs, handicrafts such as *Attusi* robe), self-sustaining fishing, hunting, and other labor activities called *hanryou kasegi* 飯料稼, or food-earning. The degree of combination of these activities varied across different regions, and Tanimoto states that while it is important to note the addition of employed labor to self-sustaining household production and consumption activities, the preparation of goods for trade is also extremely significant. Furthermore, Tanimoto points out that Ainu migrant fishing or *dekasegi ryou* 出稼漁, which has traditionally been viewed as a form of forced-labor at the hands of the contract fisheries system, included a kind of *zibun tori dekasegi* 自分取出稼 or self-earning in migrant fishing.

Fish taken from river basins, noted as "*basyo* [place]" in Japanese historical documents, was the business of both production activities for trade and employed-labor fishing. What happened when different kinds of operations shared the same production space? Iwasaki [2003:195-217] offers an explanation where Japanese merchants relied on Ainu fishing rights to manage and maintain fishing grounds for themselves. Iwasaki focuses on how Ainu salmon fishing rights in the early-modern era were composed of two parts: *hanryu tori* 飯料取, mainly for the purpose of household consumption, and *sanbutu tori* 産物取, for the supplementary purpose of trade with the Japanese. Through an analysis of an actual conflict over fishing rights to the Nishibetsu and Yoichi rivers that occurred in the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century, Iwasaki demonstrates how Japanese merchants even in this period were effectively "parasites" of Ainu fishing rights. River fishing rights unmistakably belonged to the Ainu, and the fishing grounds of Japanese traders were determined within the *sanbutu tori* 産物取 category of Ainu fishing rights. If disputes arose between Japanese traders and Ainu fishermen, Iwasaki reveals how an Ainu method of conflict resolution called *tyaranke* was used. In fact, throughout the early-modern era, the shogunate central government did not intervene in affairs concerning Ainu fishing rights.

It was not until the introduction of colonization policies by the Meiji government that the subsistence activities of the Ainu saw any dramatic change. Beginning with a ban on poisoned hunting arrows, Ainu land tenure and property rights were denied. With the development of Japanese fishing industries, Ainu fishing rights were likewise taken away. Iwasaki states that there was a deep gap between the Ezo that restricted the Japanese in an effort to preserve an Ainu order centered on subsistence fishing, and the Hokkaido that began with settling what had been calculated as the consequent loss [2003:216]. Her conclusion is one shared by Humoto [2002], a scholar of modern Hokkaido history, as well as by Tezuka [2005], an anthropologist specializing in the historical subsistence culture of the Ainu.

#### *Small game hunting and the indigenous peoples of Northeast Asia*

According to the analysis of the *Souya basyo* (fishery) by Tanimoto, small game hunting came under the category of *zibun kasegi* 自分稼 in autonomous Ainu activities. On the other hand, after a thorough analysis of historical materials on *Nemoro basyo* (fishery), Nagasawa [2002] concludes that while some aspects of this hunting could be called *zibun kasegi* or self-earning, it was not completely unrestricted. Nagasawa calls attention to the fact that hunting activities were



orchestrated by the Japanese merchant, and cautions that a distinction must be made between "the original meaning of hunting in Ainu society versus its meaning under *basyo ukeoisei*, or the contract fisheries system."

According to the Nagasawa's work, there were two types of hunting, one for household consumption, and one for the fur trade. As was the case for fishing, hunting in the form of *zibun kasegi*, or self-earning, was restricted in terms of trading partners. Taking this into consideration, one might say that there can be no free and "original" hunting, as assumed by Nagasawa, so long as it encompasses the action of trade. What is significant in these studies is the demand from the Matsumae *daimyo* and the shogunate for small game hunting, and the sale of these goods at the price it was bought from the Ainu.

Tezuka [2005, 1998], an anthropologist, has incorporated recent revisionist theories on the *basyo ukeoisei*, or the contract fisheries system, and described Ainu lifestyles in the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century with the key concept of "diversity." Departing from the stereotypical image of the Ainu as hunter-gathers, Tezuka examines Ainu political and economic systems, working patterns, livelihoods and food culture, and annual festivals and rituals to present overall Ainu culture in its various modes across different regions and time periods. He stipulates that a specialized hunting and fishing culture began to develop among the Ainu for the purpose of trade with the Japanese under the contract fisheries system. Although big game hunting was mainly for household consumption, there was also some hunting of marine animals and bears for the purpose of trade. In small game hunting, Tezuka suggests that in addition to demand from the Matsumae *daimyo* and the shogunate in Japan, it was possible that the Ainu were influenced by "external demand for fur" from the Qing and Russia, citing how fur taxes were imposed on the indigenous inhabitants of northeast Asia by Imperial Russia. A similar view and opinion can be found in Deriha's [2002] study of 19<sup>th</sup> century Ainu fur hunting activities. Through an empirical examination of material culture and everyday folk goods, Deriha decisively describes the Ainu fur trade as "compulsory hunting." Concentrating on how traps were made and used, he proposes that similarities throughout northeast Asia imply shared historical conditions.

Reflecting on the discussion thus far, we can say that a more accurate historical description of the Ainu, which is more than a question of subjugation under the *basyo ukeoisei* or the contract fisheries system, may be possible based on a concrete review of both fishing and hunting activities. We should remember that trade was fed not only by fishing, which was in high demand in the marketplace of early modern Japan, but also by hunting. For convenience, we can summarize the various trading activities centered on the Ezo Ainu as the "Ezo trade." While fishing was divided into three purposes, Ainu self-earning or *zibun kasegi*, Ainu food-earning or *hanryou kasegi*, and Japanese commercial fishing, the fur and animal trade was divided into two purposes: Ainu self-earning or *zibun kasegi* and Ainu food earning or *hanryou kasegi*. Based on research on small game hunting, we can surmise that the trade relationship between the Japanese and Ainu should be considered not solely within Japanese history, but within the context of northeast Siberia. Keeping this in mind, let us further consider trade among the indigenous inhabitants, including the Ainu, of Sakhalin, north of Ezo.

### **The Santan trade and other trade networks of the indigenous peoples of Amur-Sakhalin**

*Peripheral policies of East Asian states and indigenous trades*

Post World War II research on the history of Sakhalin indigenous peoples was conducted within the domain of Soviet Ethnography as a historical science, not as a part of Japanese history or Japanese anthropology. In a unique methodology, Soviet ethnographers deduced and analyzed the traditional elements of culture through field surveys and literature reviews and placed them within a fixed timeline. In many cases they were able to succeed in reconstructing traditional cultures from the latter half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century to the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Rediscovered indigenous peoples, such as the Nivkh, Uilta, and Sakhalin Ainu, were believed to have led self-sufficient lifestyles as hunter-gathers or reindeer herders. The same was also believed to be true for the indigenous peoples inhabiting the lower basins of the Amur River, opposite Sakhalin. While the influx of material culture from China and Japan was recognized, it was not doubted that these were folk culture-centered, closed socioeconomic systems.

Towards the end of the 1980s, studies on the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century indigenous peoples of Sakhalin and the Amur River region began to appear in Japan as part of Siberian ethnographic research and the history of the Qing dynasty's peripheral governance institutions. This was because the related documents were finally published, making it possible to study Qing political control in Sakhalin and the Amur River areas [Matuura 2006:ix]. In the field of anthropology, Sasaki [1990] showed how the Qing presence in these areas had a strong influence on the ethnicity of the indigenous peoples, contrary to Soviet ethnographic theory. In later studies, 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century trade activities among the indigenous peoples of Sakhalin and the Amur River basin were reconstructed based on Qing and Japanese historical documents and ethnographic resources. (4) In Japanese history, one part of these trade activities is known at the Santan trade network, stretching from the Amur River basin to Sakhalin and Ezo, sandwiched between the Qing and the Tokugawa shogunate. Trade was effectively divided into two types: trade between indigenous peoples, and trade between indigenous people and traditional states, including greeting rituals in tribute. We will next look more specifically at these two kinds of trade while referring to the studies of Sasaki [1998, 2003].

The first indigenous trading operation of note was the Sakhalin Ainu - Santan trade. After the end of the 16<sup>th</sup> century, independent trading of furs and *Ezo nisiki* textiles 蝦夷錦 (5) took place between the Sakhalin Ainu and the Santan people (ethnic name taken from Japanese historical references to the ancestors of present-day Ul'ichi people) living downstream of the Amur River. While some groups of Sakhalin Ainu brought furs as tribute when a Qing outpost was first established in the downstream area of the Amur in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, the tributary relationship died out by the end of the century, and the Ainu ceased to cross over to the continent. Instead, the Santan began to travel to Sakhalin to trade, and the Sakhalin Ainu began to accumulate debt with the Santan traders. The growing problem was relieved at the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century through the intervention of Japanese official explorer and inspector, Matsuda Denzyurou 松田伝十郎, effectively terminating the trade relationship between the Santan and Ainu.

A second indigenous operation was the Sumerenkuru trade. Like Santan, Sumerekuru is an ethnic name taken from Japanese historical documents, with origins in the Ainu language. The Sumerenkuru include the ancestors of the present Nivkh people in the downstream Amur area and the northern west coast of Sakhalin; they maintained trade relationships with various indigenous groups in Sakhalin (east coast Sakhalin Nivkh and Ainu, Uilta). In 19<sup>th</sup> century Russian ethnographic documents, the Amur Nivkh (could be categorized as Smerenkuru), and identified as

private middleman traders. They exchanged products bought from China, Japan, and Russia with furs from other indigenous groups and went door-to-door to trade. On the other hand, in the site of Nayoro, on the west coast, it is believed that special trading posts were constructed for indigenous trade that continued until the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

In indigenous trade with states, the Qing played a prominent role. First, they set up a fur tribute coordinating office at Ninguda 寧古塔 in the middle stream basin of the Mudan river 牡丹江, and then followed Sanshin 三姓 at the junction of the Mudan river and Sungari 松花江 river after 1780. Further, they established outposts near Lake Kiji downstream of the Amur to receive those coming from afar to pay tribute. Although the Sumerenkuru, Santan, and also the Sakhalin Ainu during the 18<sup>th</sup> century visited these places, they are thought to have recognized their dealings with the Qing not as normal transactions, but as "tributes." After the 1750s, inspection tours of Sakhalin by Qing officials ceased, and the influence of Qing rule on Sakhalin was lost before the start of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Still, tributes at the Sanshin 三姓 continued into the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century until the Amur River basin was turned over to Russia in the Treaty of Peking in 1860.

What was the indigenous relationship with the Tokugawa shogunate? At first, just as in trading between the Sakhalin Ainu and the Santan, the Sakhalin Ainu acquired *Ezo nisiki* textiles from the Santan, and then brought these goods to the *Souya basyo* (fishery) to trade. After the *Siramusi kaisyō* 自主会所 trading post was established in southern Sakhalin in 1790, exchanges, including greeting rituals, were held every summer. After the first Ezo direct control policy (in which the policymakers of the shogunate intended Ezo to mean not only Ezo island but also Sakhalin) was put into effect in 1807, the shogunate began to trade directly with the Santan and Sumarenkuru rather than through the Ainu. Again, trading commenced was after greeting ritual. In 1868, however, the *Siramusi kaisyō* trading post was closed down by the Hakodate magistrate's office.

To review, we now know that in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries, trading was actively conducted between indigenous peoples and non-indigenous external merchants and representatives of the traditional state governments of the Qing and Tokugawa shogunate in the areas covered by present-day northeastern China, the far east coastal areas of Russia, Sakhalin, and Hokkaido. We can summarize it as the Mamiya Strait trade (6) because most exchanges were centered in Sakhalin and Lower Amur Region. What is especially interesting about this trade is that indigenous traders worked independently between the Qing at one end and the shogunate at the other. Local products were collected not only for direct trade, but also for exchange with third parties. These kinds of trading relationships were the basis of small-scale regional trading and countless trade networks. Broadly, we can divide the trade networks into Sakhalin Ainu-Santan trading and Sumerenkuru trading. While the Sakhalin Ainu were involved in exchange of commodities between Ezo and Japan in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, they were gradually replaced by the Santan. The Sumerenkuru people also began trading to Tokugawa shogunate in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, but their main partners were other indigenous groups rather than state representatives or merchants. For this reason, indigenous relations with both the Qing and Tokugawa shogunate began to decline, however, Sumerenkuru's trading activities continued strong into the middle of the 1800s and did not die out until the beginning of the next century.

#### *Contrast in trading activities between Sakhalin Ainu and Nivkh*

The question of just how active Sakhalin Ainu trading activities were in the 18<sup>th</sup> century is also

a question of reassessing the previously mentioned *basyo ukeoisei* or the contract fisheries system in the early modern history of Northern Frontier of Japan. Before the establishment of the *Siranusi kaisyō* trading post in southern Sakhalin in 1790, we can confirm from Japanese historical documents that Souya Ainu, who lived in the northernmost areas of Hokkaido lying only fifty kilometers from the southernmost coasts of Sakhalin, were acting as intermediaries in trade with Sakhalin Ainu [Tanimoto 1998]. Souya Ainu maintained long-distance trading relations and independently set up indigenous networks for trade with the Sakhalin Ainu. They were quite unique compared to other places in Ezo in the same period, where trading was in the form of *zibun kasegi* or self-earning under the contract fisheries system, thus limiting partners to the contract merchants at each trading place. However, by the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the Sakhalin Ainu entered into the same situation as the Ezo indigenous peoples, and, as we have already discussed, the Santan took over the role of exporting goods from the continent. After the *Siranusi kaisyō* trading post was established in Sakhalin, the Souya Ainu were entered into organized labor arrangements under the contract fisheries system. Likewise, the Sakhalin Ainu, especially those in the western coastal areas, were driven into the Japanese fishing industries.

In contrast to the Ainu, we know that the Nivkh enjoyed very active trading in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries, as indicated in the ethnographic accounts taken by a mid-19<sup>th</sup> century Russian ethnologist, L. von Shrenk [1899:276-284]. In particular, the Amur Nivkh in the mid 19<sup>th</sup> century were engaged in tribute to Qing dynasty along with the neighboring Nanai people. There are reports of Chinese traders going north to the Sungari river basins, but the Amur Nivkh had control of the downstream Amur River area. They also continuously traded with the indigenous Nivkh, Ainu, and Uilta in eastern coastal Sakhalin. They traded liquor and iron products such as pots and armor that were obtained not only from China and Japan, but also from the Nikoraevsk trading post after it was established by Russia in the mid-1800s along the Amur river.

## Russia and the Northern fur trade

### *Trade in the Bering Strait*

As discussed at the beginning of this paper, American anthropologists began studying the Northern Pacific Rim, including Siberia, beginning in the late 1980s. This research included the topic of indigenous trades in the region. The ethnohistorical studies on the American Arctic and sub-arctic indigenous peoples traditionally looked at trade relationships among various indigenous groups and considered how indigenous people were influenced by Westerners in the fur trade. Of course, this framework extended across the Bering Strait to the indigenous people of Siberia. Trading in the Bering Strait was mainly between the peoples of northwestern Alaska and the Chukotka peninsula, just across the sea. Eventually it was subsumed under imperial Russian colonization and the European fur trade.

Let us paint a picture based on the studies of Birch [1988], Kuroda [1992], and Kisigami [2001, 2002]. Trading in the Bering Strait was firmly established by around the 15<sup>th</sup> century; the Chukchi people brought reindeer hides from Siberia, and the Yupik people traded lumber and badger hides from Alaska. Things changed, however, when Russian colonialism crossed through Siberia and into the Chukotka peninsula in the latter half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century. The Chukchi aggressively protested this infiltration, and managed to remain outside of Russian control until the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. A peace treaty between the Chukchi and Russia was signed in 1789, and

the Anui trading post was established at a branch of the Kolyma river, which flows from north-eastern Siberia into the Arctic ocean. The agreement to trade represented a move from antagonistic to peaceful relations, and a special trading fair was held each year at Anui. Russian government officials representing the tsar gave tea, tobacco, pots, and medals to Chukchi leaders and received red fox furs in return. Following this ceremonial exchange, regular trading activities commenced among the people.

Because of this annual Anui fair, the Chukchi dependence on European goods increased steadily. Unable to keep up with their consequent need for more furs, Chukchi traders set a supply system by reviving old indigenous trading networks not only in northeastern Siberia, but also in Alaska (under Russian domain at the time). In trading that peaked in the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, Alaskans provided beaver hides and the Chukchi supplied tobacco, beads, and metal goods, acting as middleman between Alaskan natives and the Russians.

After the 1830s, this intersection between indigenous trading networks and the fur market became less and less frequent. This was because the Russian-American company and the Hudson's Bay Company, figured out how to get furs without depending on the indigenous population. However, this did not mean the end of indigenous trading. After 1848, U.S. whaling ships sailed north from the Hawaiian Islands to trade in both Alaska and Chukotka. In addition to tobacco and metal goods, with which the indigenous traders were already familiar, the Americans introduced guns and whisky. In a shift from the previous pattern, Western products poured in through Alaska while furs were supplied from the Chukotka peninsula after the 1900s. We should note that, unlike the fur traders, American whaling ship traders were not interested in exporting indigenous goods to other markets. They were involved in indigenous trading only to meet the indigenous demand for Western goods. Indigenous trading across the Bering Strait began to dwindle when the commercial whaling industry declined in the 1910s, but it continued on a small scale until the waters were completely closed in the 1940s with the start of the Cold War (7).

According to Ikeya [2002], a trading fair was held every spring at the Anui trading post, and it was attended by Chukchi, Even people, as well as Russians. Chukchi people could be divided in the marine hunting and fishing-dependent coastal dwellers and the "reindeer Chukchi," who lived off of reindeer husbandry. While both groups were involved in trading, the coastal Chukchi produced more trading middlemen. Increased earnings from fur trading are thought to have led to an expansion in the living area of reindeer Chukchi.

The appearance of American whaling ships is very interesting. It suggests that the hegemony over the early 19<sup>th</sup> century North Pacific Rim changed from the Russian-American Company to these whalers who crisscrossed sea and land as if they belonged to no one. As we will discuss further later, fur resources had dried up and markets had shrunk by the latter half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. When the whaling ships appeared, whales came to be recognized as a source of wealth, and the strategic value of northern "Russian Far East" suddenly came to light when the British and French militaries attacked Kamchatka during the Crimean War in the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century [Kaminaga 2001].

#### *Development of the Siberian frontier and Russia's move southward*

What was behind the Russian fur trade that so stimulated the flowering of trade in the Bering Strait? Let us now consider the historical and geographical background of the Bering Strait trade,

as it may be related to the question of why Russia approached Sakhalin and south Chishima after the 19<sup>th</sup> century, leading to military tensions with Japan.

It is well known that "soft gold" in the form of furs was the motivating force behind Russia's development of the eastern and northeast frontiers and the colonization of Siberia. As Russia moved eastward, furs, especially sables, contributed significantly to national income. In 1589, revenue from fur made up 3.8% of Russia's national income; in 1644, it had risen to 10% [Wolf 1982:159]. In the latter half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, the Russians searched for routes to the Pacific Ocean from the Amur River, but the Qing checked this effort after the Treaty of Nerchinsk (1689) was completed. It was at this point that the Russians next turned their eyes towards Kamchatka and Chukotka. At the frontline of development was the town of Yakutsk, near the middle area of the Lena river.

The 18<sup>th</sup> century was a turning point in the Russian fur trade. This was because the market focus shifted from sables, hunted in the interior, to sea otters, which inhabited the coastal areas. At the same time, the markets themselves shifted from Europe to China. The Qing imperial family wore sea otter skins while the general population used squirrel or fox. Russia began to export furs in full force to the Qing in the latter half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century. At its zenith in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, furs took up anywhere from 58 to 100 percent of all exports. This led to gross over-hunting; by 1750 in Kamchatka and by the 1780s in the Aleutian Islands as well as Chishima, sea otters had been annihilated [Gibson 1969:26-33, Wolf 1982:184, Kawakami 2003:262]. At the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century then, furs began to be sought from Alaska, prompting establishment of the Russian-American Company.

It is well known that the tsarist colonization in Siberia required the local population to pay the fur tax (yasak) under its reign. Most indigenous Siberians, as suppliers of the fur, were thus placed at the tail end of the state system, although the indigenous Sakha people of the Lena river basin were also part of the distribution network. The distribution routes for sea otter skins acquired in Kamchatka and northeastern Siberia went from Okhotsk to Yakutsk to Irkutsk, to Kyakhta, to Peking. The Sakha were the main handlers between Okhotsk and Yakutsk, and they used horses and carriages, as well as dog sleds in the winter, to transport the furs. At the end of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, Sakha people used horses they had bred to go along the notoriously rough highway that ran between Okhotsk and Yakutsk. The Sakha are the only Turkic ethnic group in northern Siberia; in the 10<sup>th</sup> through 13<sup>th</sup> centuries, they had migrated north from the southern steppes to the banks of the Lena river. Depending mainly on cattle and horse farming for their livelihood, they gradually took on the role of transporting furs to Yakutsk from the stocks (trading areas) dotting Okhotsk and Kolymsk. That is, Sakha traders appeared as a sort of byproduct of development in northeastern Siberia and Russian America. After that, Irkutsk traders moved the furs along the Lena by boat to Irkutsk and then to Kyakhta, where they were taken by camel caravan to Beijing. Furs were not the only valuable goods being transported along the Okhotsk to Yakutsk route; grains, an essential food source in the poor farming lands of eastern Siberia, were brought back on the return trip. Especially after the establishment of the Russian-American Company and the development of Russian America at the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, it was apparent that it would be important to secure emergency food provisions [Wolf 1942:184, Gibson 1969:73-101, Vasil'ev 2004:49].

After the 19<sup>th</sup> century, Russia began to have contact with Japan, mainly because they sought to

establish diplomatic relations to stabilize the supply of food provisions in the northern far east and Russian America [Kirichenko 2001:77]. The Siberian historian, Gerhard Friedrich Müller, pointed out in 1741 how it would be ideal to open the Amur to free navigation in the interest of trade with China, Japan, and India, as well as to secure provisions for Kamchatka. Because of the difficult road conditions between Yakutsk and Okhotsk, the transport of food and raw materials was always a pressing problem. It was for this reason that a new route tying the Amur river to the Pacific Ocean was sought after the 19<sup>th</sup> century by A. J. Krusenstern and G. I. Nevel'skoi [Akizuki 1994:62-69]. At the same time, by the latter half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the market for furs started to shrink as the supply of furs was exhausted. The Bering Sea, the Okhotsk Sea, and the Kamchatka peninsula were no longer profitable to Russia. Instead, they came to have value for strategic reasons, as mentioned above. The Okhotsk Sea and Kamchatka became even more important militarily when Russia eyed Sakhalin as a base for exploration and development after coal was discovered in the mid-1800s and it was confirmed that it was an island [Gibson 1969:224, Kimura 2004:101-115].

### **Comparative analysis of trading activities in Ezo, the Mamiya Strait, and the Bering Strait**

In this paper, we have discussed the particular characteristics of trading in Ezo, the Mamiya Strait, and the Bering Strait. A comparative viewpoint on indigenous trading in the Maritime Northeast Asia region was first suggested by Shrenk [1899:298]. The Nivkh and Chukchi, whose languages are both categorized as part of the Paleo-Asiatic language group, shared a common history of acting as middlemen in trade activities among indigenous people as well as in trading with states in the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century. In all of the three trades discussed in this paper, we can confirm from historical written documents that local goods were used in bartering and trading among indigenous peoples starting as far back as the 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> centuries.

This was also a time when surrounding states thought of the northern regions as their own frontiers and contemplated political control and economic development. The three Maritime Northeast Asia trades we have discussed consisted of trading between indigenous peoples and trading between indigenous people and non-indigenous traders (indigenous-state trading) involved in fur and the contract fisheries, both of which were related to state military power. In fact, trading was done across ethno-networks involving various ethnic groups in the stages of hunting, basic processing, and transportation of local animals for trade [Akimiti 1995:179]. The relationship between these two kinds of trading, indigenous and indigenous-state, differed depending on time and place. While they were able to coexist for a certain period, the situation began to deteriorate with the territorializing trend that took over the northern hemisphere in the 17<sup>th</sup> to 19<sup>th</sup> centuries. Ethno-networks were absorbed by state-controlled commercial trading networks, and by the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, they had been completely severed by national borders.

Why were these three trades not taken up in the comparative framework in previous studies? The reason is believed to be because of the difficulty of translation in historical analysis. As historical terms tend to be interpreted in particular local contexts, it can be difficult to discern similar structures across various historical settings. Many historians never imagine the possibility of comparing the fur tribute coordinating offices mentioned in Qing documents or the trading posts and fairs listed in Russian documents to the contract fisheries described in Japanese historical

documents, even though all three of these external states commonly established trading places to annex new borderlands.

Furthermore, historical terms have been interpreted as a difference in quality in the relationship between indigenous people and the state. While the tribute system and greeting rituals were cornerstones of the Qing and the Tokugawa shogunate, imperial Russia imposed a fur tax. Thus, China and Japan have been considered traditional states while Russia may have been posed as a modern state. But these are nothing more than relative differences. Wolf [1982:123] has pointed out differences between the fur trading practices of the Russian-American Company and the leading trader in North America, the Hudson's Bay Company. He suggested that a distinction should be made between the former, which engaged in commercial exchange, and the latter, which bore a political stamp. Certainly, the Russian fur tax was different from the Chinese tribute and it brought no direct rewards, but regarded formally, the fur tax was a declaration of protection under the Russian Empire. While there was no material gain, it might be said that the reward was the promulgation of Christianity and the transmission of civilization.

In this sense, the ceremonial trading that took place in the Bering Strait is quite interesting. The Chukchi, who had continued to resist Imperial Russia, were officially exempted from paying the fur tax in the 18<sup>th</sup> century under the reign of Ekaterina II. They continued to hold this status even after the Siberian Administrative Reform at the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. What the Chukchi viewed as gift-giving formalities to maintain good trade relations, Russian officials recorded as tribute, assuming that the Chukchi were voluntary fur tax payers [Znamenski 1999:26-27].

This Bering Strait trade demonstrates how states used trading as the means to control the space and people of the boundary regions that were considered to be final frontiers. The fact that both greeting rituals and actual trading occurred in tandem is very suggestive because it indicates that, as in the other two trades, states related to political and cultural others - neither citizens nor subjects of one state or another - as if though they were one of their own. It also reminds us that even when some kind of rituals were conducted, named, and recorded as such by a state party, this logic was not always accepted by the supposed subject just like the case of the Ainu in the 18<sup>th</sup> century.

The most significant difference between the three trades is the way they ended. Trading in Ezo began with the indigenous trading amongst themselves, and then later with states. Eventually, the indigenous people were surpassed by the state, and trading died out in the latter half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. In the Bering Straits, indigenous and indigenous-state trading managed to coexist for some time until the latter was stopped at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century while the former continued on through the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. What we should note here is that while Ezo trading may have been mutual trade, it was a limited ethno-network in which trading partners were Japanese traders. Eventually, it was taken over by Japanese commercial trading networks.

In contrast, there were numerous ethno-networks including indigenous and non-indigenous traders in the Bering Strait. The crucial difference is that while at one time the Chukchi were subsumed under Euro-American commercial fur-trading networks, they led and maintained their own ethno-network centered around indigenous trade. Trading in the Mamiya Strait fell somewhere in the middle. As we saw in the demise of the Santan trade, indigenous-state trading ended by the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century while Sumerankru (indigenous) trading continued throughout the 19<sup>th</sup> century in



the same way as it did in the Bering Strait. At the same time, the fishing activities of the Nivkh in the 1860s were overtaken by the introduction of paid labor and Japanese and Russian commercial fishing [Smolyak 1975:161-162]. In Sakhalin, the Ainu gradually stepped down from their leadership role in multi-ethnic indigenous trading during the 18<sup>th</sup> century. Like the Ezo Ainu, they began to trade only with the Japanese state. In this sense, the indigenous traders of Sakhalin operated in a way that was somewhere between northeast Siberia and Ezo patterns.

## Conclusions

Let us consider what these differences meant in the context of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. As we can see from its frontier development and trading in the Bering Strait, Russia was one of the most earnest countries engaged in exporting furs to China. The Russians were not interested in the furs of the Santan trade because their interest had already moved elsewhere. In the southward movement of the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, Russia's objectives were indeed to secure an alternate export route through Russian America and to alleviate food shortages in the far-north colonies. However, in the latter half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the fur trade declined and the development of the north Pacific shifted to whaling. Unable to adjust to these market changes, Russia sold its territory to the United States. Russia's exports to China changed from furs to cotton textiles and other industrial goods [Siotani 1998, Morinaga 2005]. This new venture differed greatly from 18<sup>th</sup> century acquisition and export of animal skins, and it explains why Russia lost interest in the Lower Amur regions and north part of Sakhalin.

Finally, I would like to reconsider the significance of trading in Ezo as well as the trading of the Sakhalin Ainu. We should first confirm that Ezo trading and the Sakhalin Ainu can be placed in a frame of reference that is shared with other indigenous people in the greater historical context of Maritime Northeast Asia, rather than in the context of history of Northern Frontier of Japan or Japan-Russia territorial issues. Indigenous people traded local goods not only amongst themselves, but also to meet the demands of foreign markets and states. At the same time, their world was subdued as states drew their borders. But an important factor in this process of change was the type of good used for trade. The decline of trading in Ezo and parts of the Amur-Sakhalin seaboard was markedly different from the other two cases. Here, fur was forgotten as markets shrunk in the latter 1800s, and although there was a continuously expanding demand for marine products, in particular, in Japan, adequate procurement was difficult. This became an important factor in changes to the subsistence and socioeconomic activities of the Ainu after the Meiji era in the later 19<sup>th</sup> century. As early modern Japanese historians assert, the refusal of the Meiji government to recognize fishing rights for the Ainu had a decisive effect on their livelihoods. On the other hand, in northern Amur-Sakhalin region, and Chukotka where the same kind of indigenous trading had taken place, the indigenous people began to depend on hunting and gathering activities (also reindeer herding) after the collapse of the fur market. In the context of Russian history, it was not until the collectivization of agriculture after the 1930-1940s that the livelihoods of indigenous Siberians experienced any critical change. This setting contributed the Russian anthropologists successfully to describe the cultures of the indigenous peoples in the closed system of subsistence economy.

Before explaining these changes simply as a matter of policy, we should recognize the factors that come into play when indigenous societies are subsumed by external states: what are the

products of trade, how do states attempt to reconstruct commercial trading networks, and how does the market respond? In other words, the relationship between indigenous trade networks and capitalistic commercial trade networks is not one where the latter one-sidedly subsumes or subjugates the former. Rather, we must ask how the use of commodities is placed in the context of the market economy. This idea posits an explicit constellation of three different indigenous trades in the history of the Maritime Northeast Asia region.

In this paper, I have translated the historical descriptions of three indigenous trading systems, each of which have been constructed within the context of the disciplines of history and anthropology with their specific historical terms. The development and the decline of the trading systems were examined by taking into account the international relations of the time. In the nineteenth century, modern states in the North Pacific Rim were finally attempting to territorialize unclaimed land and to establish national borders. Relations between Japan and Russia during that period should be considered in the above context. The regional framework of Maritime Northeast Asia is indispensable and highly effective for finding comparable contexts of the social-economic changes of indigenous peoples in the "frontier territories" of both Japanese and Russian states, and for analyzing the motivations of their economic and strategic resources in that area.

### Acknowledgements

The gist of this paper was first published in Japanese under the title, "18-19 seiki no kita taiheiyō sekai ni okeru Karafuto senzūmin koueki to ainu." as a section of a monograph called *Kinsei tiiki fouramu 1, Rettōsui no minami to kita*, edited by Kikuti Isao and Maehara Fusaaki and published by Tokyo *Yoshikawa Koubunkan* in November 2006. In making this English version, I have expanded the research framework and added corresponding discussions of reference literature. For the transliteration of Japanese historical terms and literature into Latin alphabet, as a general rule, I have adopted the method of the society for the Romanization of the Japanese alphabet (<http://www.roomazi.org/>). This system is similar to the Kunrei system of Romanizing Japanese. The method I adopted here is oriented for transliteration rather than phonetic transcription. Exceptions to this system are found in some place names and proper nouns that are already known in the Romanized alphabet of the Hepburn system of Romanization; these include proper nouns such as Tokyo, Hokkaido, Karafuto, Meiji and so on.

### Endnotes

- (1) This term, "Northern Frontier of Japan" is translated from Japanese historical term "Hoppou 北方". I would like to express historically ambiguous space of the Northern territories bordering Japan through this term, or just northern space from the Japanese view point with a non-political meaning.
- (2) Some English and Russian researchers define Karafuto as the southern part of the island, signifying the name of the former Japanese administrative territory until 1945. However, this Japanese term refers to the island as a whole.
- (3) For example, Emori [1997:189] argues that an autonomous Ainu trade did not exist. After *akinaiba tigyousei*, or the mastery system of trading posts, was established in the first half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, trading posts existed only nominally and in reality were used to run fishing

operations.

- (4) Ohnuki-Tierny [1984] gives an introduction to the aggressive trading activities of the Karafuto Ainu in the 18<sup>th</sup> century.
- (5) *Ezo nisiki* is the term used in Japanese historical documents to signify the brocaded officer costumes of the Qing dynasty. The textile was imported to Japan from the Northern Frontier of Japan or Ezo Area, hence its naming.
- (6) Mamiya (Tatar) Strait is named for the Japanese official explorer and inspector, Mamiya Rinzou 間宮林蔵. Mamiya went through Sakhalin and across to the Continent in 1808 and in 1809. His reports on the Sakhalin and Lower Amur basins includes not only geographical information, but also good quality ethnographical descriptions. Some parts of their reports were translated into German by P.F. Siebold in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. German natural historian, L. Shrenk embarked to the Lower Amur and Sakhalin in the middle of 19<sup>th</sup> century and then critically examined the information of Mamiya's report in his monograph. I suppose that Shrenk could not correctly estimate the differences in the historical settings of the region during the period between Mamiya's trip and his own trip that had a time range of up to half a century between them (See also Grant 1997).
- (7) Informal trading with foreigners (including Alaskan natives) was not limited to Chukotka Peninsula in the early Soviet era. There was much cultural contact, including trade between locals and Japanese fishermen in Kamchatka [Watanabe 2001].

## References

Akimiti, Tomoya 秋道智彌 1995

*Kaiyou minzokugaku* 海洋民族学 [Maritime Ethnology], Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

Akizuki, Tosiuyuki 秋月俊幸 1994.

*Nitiro kankei to saharintou* 日露関係とサハリン島 [Russo-Japanese relations and Sakhalin], Tokyo: Tikuma syobou.

Birch, E.J. 1998

War and trade, Fitzhugh, W. & A. Crowell eds., *Crossroads of Continents: Cultures of Siberia and Alaska*, pp.227-240, Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Deriha, Kouzi 出利葉浩司 2002

Kinsei makki ni okeru ainu no kegawa zyuu syuryou katsudou ni tuite: kegawa koueki no siten kara [Late early-modern Ainu fur hunting: from the perspective of the fur trade], *Kokuritu minzokugaku hakubutukan tyousa houkoku* 国立民族学博物館調査報告, 34: 97-164.

Emori, Susumu 榎森進 2003

Hokutou azia kara mita ainu [The Ainu as seen from Northeast Asia], Kikuti Isao ed., *Ezogasima to hoppou sekai* 蝦夷島と北方世界, pp.126-166, Tokyo: Yosikawa koubunkan.

Emori, Susumu 榎森進 2001

Ainu minzoku no kyosyuu, hokuou kara Karafuto made: Syuuhun minzoku to no "koueki" no siten kara [The historical migration of the Ainu from the Hokuou to Sakhalin: From the perspective of "trade" with neighboring indigenous peoples], Amino & Isii eds., *Kita kara minaosu nihonsi* 北から見直す日本史, pp.27-124, Tokyo: Daiwa syobou.

Emori, Susumu 榎森進 1997

*Hokkaido kinseisi no kenkyuu: zouho kaitei* 北海道近世史の研究：増補改訂 [A early modern

- history of Hokkaido], Sapporo: Hokkaido syuppan kikaku sentaa.
- Fitzhugh, W. & A. Crowell eds. 1998  
*Crossroads of Continents: Cultures of Siberia and Alaska*, Washington, D.C: Smithsonian Institution Press
- Fitzhugh, W. & C. Dubreuil eds. 1999  
*Ainu: Sprit of a Northern People*, University of Washington Press
- Grant, Bruce 1997  
Empire and savagery: the politics of primitivism in late imperial Russia, in D. Brower and E. Lazzarine eds., *Russia's Orient: Imperial Borderlands and Peoples, 1700-1917*, pp.292-310, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Gibson, J. 1969  
*Feeding the Russian Fur Trade: Provisionment of the Okhotsk Seaboard and the Kamchatka Peninsula 1639-1856*, Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Howell, D. 1999.  
The Ainu and the Early Modern Japanese State: 1600-1868, in Fitzhugh, W. & C. Dubreuil eds., *Ainu: Sprit of a Northern People*, pp.96-101, University of Washington Press.
- Humoto, Siniti 麓慎一 2002  
*Kindai nihon to ainu syakai* 近代日本とアイヌ社会 [Modern Japan and Ainu society], Tokyo: Yamakawa syuppansya.
- Ikeya, Kazunobu 池谷和信 2002  
20 seiki zenhan ni okeru "tonakai tyukuti" to amerikazin no kegawa koueki [The fur trade between the "Reindeer Chukchi" and the Americans in the early 20<sup>th</sup> Century], *Kokuritu minzokugaku hakubutukan tyousa houkoku* 国立民族学博物館調査報告, 34: 51-70.
- Iwasaki, Naoko 岩崎奈緒子 2003  
"Rekisi" to Ainu ["History" and the Ainu], C. Gluck et. al. *Nihon no rekisi 25, Nihon ha dokohe ikunoka* 日本の歴史25 日本はどこへいくのか, pp.193-232, Tokyo: Koudansya.
- Kaminaga, E. 神長英輔 2001  
Robei kaisya to hogeigyou [The Russian American Company and the whaling industry], *Rosiasi kenkyuu* ロシア史研究, 69: 2-15.
- Kawakami, Zyun. 川上淳 2003  
Nitiro kankei no naka no ainu [The Ainu in Japan-Russia relations], Kikuti Isao ed., *Ezogasima to hoppou sekai* 蝦夷島と北方世界, pp. 260-294, Tokyo: Yosikawa koubunkan.
- Kikuti, Isao 菊地勇夫 2003  
Ezogasima to hoppou sekai [The Island of Ezo and the Northern World], Kikuti Isao ed., *Ezogasima to hoppou sekai* 蝦夷島と北方世界, pp.7-89, Tokyo: Yosikawa koubunkan.
- Kikuti, Isao 菊地勇夫2001  
Kyoukai, henkyou kara "nihon" wo tou ["Japan": a view from boundary and periphery], *Touhoku gaku* 東北学, 4: 400-403.
- Kikuti, Isao 菊地勇夫1994  
*Ainu minzoku to nihonzin: higasi azia no naka no ezoti* アイヌ民族と日本人—東アジアのなかの蝦夷地 [The Ainu and the Japanese: Ezo as Part of East Asia], Tokyo: Asahi sinbunsya.
- Kikuti, Tosihiko 菊池俊彦 1994

- Ainu minzoku to hoppou koueki [The Ainu and northern trading], Tihousi kenkyuu kyougikai ed., *Hoppousi no sin siza: taigai seisaku to bunka* 北方史の新視座—対外政策と文化, pp. 97-113, Tokyo: Yuuzankaku.
- Kimura, Kazuo 木村和男 2004  
*Kegawa ga tukuru sekai: Hadoson wan kara yuurasia he* 毛皮交易が創る世界—ハドソン湾からユーラシアへ [The world created by the fur trade: from the Hudson Bay to Eurasia], Tokyo: Iwanami syoten.
- Kirichenko, A. キリチェンコ アレクセイ 2001  
Kaizokusen Yunona gou to Awosi gou: Rosia gawa touzisyua no koudou kara miru Karafuto, Etorohu tou syuugeki ziken [The pirates ships "Jnona" and "Avosi": The Russian attacks on Japanese in the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century], *Tohoku azia kenkyuu* 東北アジア研究, 6: 77-102.
- Kisigami, N. 岸上伸啓 2002  
18-20 seiki ni okeru beiringu kaikyuu tiiki no senzyuumin koueki to syakai kouzou [Social structure and indigenous trade in the Bering Strait Area in the 18<sup>th</sup> -20<sup>th</sup> Centuries], *Kokuritu minzokugaku hakubutukan tyousa houkoku* 国立民族学博物館調査報告, 34: 39-50.
- Kisigami, N. 岸上伸啓 2001  
Hokubei hoppou tiiki ni okeru senzyuumin ni yoru syo sigen no koueki ni tuite: kegawa koueki to sono syo eikyuu wo tyuusin ni [Indigenous trading of commodities in American Arctic and Subarctic: a focus on the fur trade and its influences], *Kokuritu minzokugaku hakubutukan kenkyuu houkoku* 国立民族学博物館研究報告, 25-3: 293-354.
- Kuroda, Sinitirou 黒田信一郎 1992  
Tyukuti no teikou [The Chukchi resistance], Okada et. al. eds., *Kita no zinruigaku* 北の人類学, pp. 161-184, Tokyo: Akademia syuppankai.
- Larin, V. ラーリン ヴィクトル 2002  
Nozomi naki syuuhenu ka, soretomo mirai no erudorado ka? Kyokutou no rekisika tati no tatiba kara mita ittaiteki na tiikisi no naka no hokutou azia [Hopeless frontier or the future El Dorado? Russian Far East historian's view of Northeast Asia in an integrated regional history], Asakura Y. et.al. eds., *Rekisi hyousyuu to site no higasi azia* 歴史表象としての東アジア, pp.95-104, Tokyo: Seibundou.
- Matuura, S. 松浦茂 2006  
*Sintyou no amuuru seisaku to syousuu minzoku* 清朝のアムール政策と少数民族 [Qing Policy towards the Amur District and Minorities], Kyoto: Kyoto University Press
- Morinaga, T. 森永貴子 2005  
Ekateriina nisei ki ni okeru kyahuta boueki tyudan to rosia kegawa koueki [The Russian fur trade and the ending of Kyafuta trading under Ekatarina II era], *Syakai keizasigaku* 社会経済史学, 71-1: 25-47 .
- Morris-Suzuki, Tessa 2000  
*Henkyou kara nagameru: ainu ga keiken suru kindai* 辺境から眺める—アイヌが経験する近代 [A view from periphery: an experience of modernity for Ainu], Tokyo: Misuzu syobou.
- Nagasawa, Masayuki 長澤政之 2002  
Basyo ukeoisei ka no ainu no syuryou [Ainu hunting under the basyo ukeoi system], *Azia bunkasi kenkyuu* アジア文化史研究, 2: 1-30.

Ohnuki-Tierny, Emiko 1984

*The Ainu of the Northwest Coast of Southern Sakhalin*, Prospect Heights, Illinois: Waveland.

Roon, T. ローン タチヤーナ 2005

*Saharin no uiruta* サハリンのウィルタ [The Uilta people in Sakhalin], trans. by Nagayama et.al., Sapporo: Faculty of Letters, Hokkaido University.

Sakata, M. 坂田美奈子 2004

Ainu moshiri ni okeru ureshipa no gensoku: hokusuu no siten kara miru zen kindai ezoti syakaisi ni mukete [The principle of ureshipa in Ainumosiri: towards a multi-faceted early modern Ezo social history], *Hokkaido Tohoku si kenkyuu* 北海道東北史研究, 1: 2-17.

Sasaki, S. 佐々木史郎 2004

Yori hiroi siya kara mita ainu bunka kenkyuu [An expanded view of Ainu cultural studies], Kotani Yosinobu ed., *Kaigai no ainu bunka zai: genzyou to rekisi* 海外のアイヌ文化財—現状と歴史, pp. 171-185, Nagoya: Nanzan zinruigaku kenkyuuzyo.

Sasaki, S. 佐々木史郎 2003

Karafuto ainu no tairiku boueki [Continental trade of the Karafuto Ainu], Ootsuka Kazuyosi ed., *Kita taiheiyou no senzyuumin koueki to kougei* 北太平洋の先住民交易と工芸, pp.84-89, Kyoto: Sibunkaku syuppan.

Sasaki, S. 佐々木史郎 1998

18-19 seiki ni okeru amuru gawa karyuuiiki no zyuumin no koueki katsudou [Trade activities of the peoples of the Lower Amur River in the 18th and 19th Centuries], *Kokuritu minzokugaku hakubutukan kenkyuu houkoku* 国立民族学博物館研究報告』22-4: 683-763.

Sasaki, S. 佐々木史郎 1996

Hoppou kara kita kouekimin: kinu to kegawa to santanzin 北方から来た交易民—絹と毛皮とサンタン人 [Traders from the North: silk, fur, and the Santan], Tokyo: Nippon Housou Shuppan Kyoukai.

Sasaki, S. 佐々木史郎 1990

Amuru kawa karyuu iki syo minzoku no syakai bunka ni okeru sintyou sihai no eikyuu ni tuite [Qing peripheral policies and Lower Amur peoples], *Kokuritu minzokugaku hakubutukan kenkyuu houkoku* 国立民族学博物館研究報告14-3: 671-771.

Shrenk, L. Шренк, Л 1899

*Ob inorodtakh' Amurskago kraia, t. 2.* Об инородцахъ Амурскаго края, т. 2 [On the natives in Amur region, t.2], St-Peterburg.

Siotani, M. 塩谷昌史 1998

19 seiki zenhan ni okeru rosia men kougyou no hatten to azia muke menorimono yusyutu [The development of Russian cotton industries and exports to Asia in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century], *Keizaigaku zassi* 経済学雑誌, 99-3/4: 38-59.

Smolyak, A. Смоляк, А. 1975

*Etnicheskie protsessy u narodov Nizhnego Amura i Sakhalina* Этнические процессы у народов Нижнего Амура и Сахалина: середина XIX- начало XX в. [Ethnic process among the peoples in Lower Amur and Sakhalin], Moscow: Nauka.

Takakura, H. 高倉浩樹 2002

Senzyuumin no kuukan to site no tohoku azia sekai: siberia minzokusi to nihon hoppousi no kousa [The world of Northeastern Asia as an indigenous space: the intersection between

- Siberian ethnography and history of Japan North], Oka and Takakura eds., *Tohoku azia tiikiron no kanousei* 東北アジア地域論の可能性, pp.68-83, Sendai: CNEAS, Tohoku University.
- Tanimoto, T. 谷本晃久 2004  
Ainu si no kanousei [The potential of Ainu history], Kotani Y. ed., *Kaigai no ainu bunka zai: genzyou to rekisi* 海外のアイヌ文化財—現状と歴史, pp. 162-170, Nagoya: Nanzan zinruigaku kenkyuuzyo.
- Tanimoto, T. 谷本晃久 2003  
Ainu no "zibun kasegi" [Ainu's "self-earning"], Kikuti I. ed., *Ezogasima to hoppou sekai* 蝦夷島と北方世界, pp.199-231, Tokyo: Yosikawa koubunkan.
- Tanimoto, T. 谷本晃久 1998  
Kinsei ainu no dekasegi saikuru to sono seiritu katei [Establishment of early modern Ainu migrant working cycle], *Gakusyuuin daigaku bungakubu kenkyuu nenpou* 学習院大学文学部研究年報, 45: 39-108.
- Tazima, Y. 田島佳也 1995  
Basyo ukeoisei kouki no ainu no gyogyo to sono tokusitu: Nisi ezoti yoiti basyo no baai [The feature of Ainu fishing activities under the latter term of the contract fisheries system: a case of Yoiti], Tanaka T., ed., *Zen kindai no nihon to higasi azia* 前近代の日本と東アジア, 271-295, Tokyo: Yosikawa koubunkan.
- Tezuka, K. 手塚薫 2005  
Kinsei ni okeru ainu no seikatu yousiki no tayousei [The diversity of early modern Ainu lifestyles], Ikeya K. et. al. eds., *Nihon no syuryou saisyuu bunka* 日本の狩猟採集文化, pp. 100-149, Kyoto: Sekai sisousya.
- Tezuka, K. 1998  
Long-distance trade networks and shipping in the Ezo vegin, *Arctic Anthropology*, 35-1: 350-360.
- Vashil'ev, N. Васильев, Н.И. 2004  
*Istoriia Yakutii* История Якутии [History of Yakutia], Yakutsk: Bichik.
- Vysokov, M.S.et.al ヴィソコフ・M他 2000  
Saharin no rekisiサハリンの歴史 [A history of Sakhalin], trans. by Itabasi Masaki, Sapporo: Hokkaido Satsueisya.
- Watanabe, Y. 渡部裕 2001  
Kamutyakka senzyuumin no bunka sessyoku: hokuyou gyogyo to senzyuumin no kankei [Cultural contacts in Kamchatka: Japanese North Sea Fishing industry and the Indigenous Peoples], *Hokkaido ritu hoppou minzoku hakubutukan kenkyuu kiyou* 北海道立北方民族博物館研究紀要, 10: 17-46.
- Wolf, E. 1982  
*Europe and the People without History*, Berkley: University of California Press.
- Znamenski, A. A. 1999  
"Vague sense of belonging to the Russian Empire": The Reindeer Chukchi's Status in Nineteenth century Northeastern Siberia, *Arctic Anthropology*, 36-1/2: 19-36.