



BRILL

A Re-examination of the Establishment of the Mongolian People's Party, Centring on
Dogsom's Memoir

Author(s): HIROSHI FUTAKI

Source: *Inner Asia*, Vol. 2, No. 1, celebrating the 80th birthday of Urgunge Onon (2000),
pp. 37-60

Published by: Brill

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23615470>

Accessed: 19-01-2020 11:56 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Brill is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Inner Asia*

A Re-examination of the Establishment of the Mongolian People's Party, Centring on Dogsom's Memoir

HIROSHI FUTAKI

*Faculty of Foreign Studies
Tokyo University of Foreign Studies
4-51-21 Nishigara, Kita-ku, Tokyo, Japan 114-8580*

ABSTRACT

D. Dogsom's memoir which was published in *Source Materials Related to the History of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party* (Ulaanbaatar, 1928) should be considered the most comprehensive account of the establishment of the Mongolian People's Party. This memoir records extremely important facts which were later deliberately excluded from the description of modern Mongolian history, such as the Mongolian nationalists' approach to the White Russian regime and their religious and ritualistic observance. The comparison of three main source materials, that is, Dogsom's memoir, Sorokovikov's accounts and the 1934 edition of the history of the Mongolian revolution, reveals that the hitherto accepted theory of the establishment of the Mongolian People's Party contains fundamental errors, including the date of the establishment of the party. Additionally 'the myth of Sükhbaatar' strongly influenced the 1934 edition of the history of the Mongolian revolution. This edition has been treated as the most reliable source material for the study of the 1921 revolution. It is difficult to agree with the accepted theory that on 25 June 1920 two groups gathered at Danzan's, adopted the party's manifesto and united into the Mongolian People's Party. This paper is intended to show it is very improbable that the meeting and decision took place on 25 June. The meeting at Dogsom's which was held in the second month of spring using the lunar calendar in 1920 should be regarded as the real turning point for the Mongolian revolutionaries in the development of the Mongolian People's Party.

1. INTRODUCTION

The study of the history from the abolition of autonomy in the autumn of 1919 to the establishment of a new government in July 1921 has been one of the most important subjects in the modern history of the Mongols. If we examine the process of revolution and the members of the new government, it is incontestable that the Mongolian People's Party played an essential role in the independence

Inner Asia 2 (2000): 37–61
© 2000 The White Horse Press, Cambridge, UK.

movement. Amongst the leaders of the People's Party, two who played major roles were S. Danzan (1885-1924), who was elected chairman of the party at the first congress held in March 1921, and D. Bodo (1885-1922), who became the prime minister of the provisional government a little bit later. Originally the Mongolian People's Party was organised by uniting Danzan's group with Bodo's group. In 1919, 1920 Danzan's group was called 'the Civil Servants' Group (*tüsimed-iin nam*)' and Bodo's group 'the People's Group (*arad-un nam*)' respectively. There was a third group, called 'the Noblemen's Group (*noyad-un nam*)', led by Khatanbaatar Magsarjav, Jalkhanz Khutagt and others.¹ The relationship amongst the three groups became a key factor in the struggle for power after the 1921 revolution.

Since the second half of 1988 the Mongolian version of 'Perestroika' has entailed re-examination of the country's history; the cult of Sükhbaatar as given in the official description of the 1921 revolution has been criticised. However it is extremely difficult to disregard 'the myth of Sükhbaatar', which took root in Mongolian society a long time ago and even now the phenomenon of a return to the cult is seen.² The image of Sükhbaatar as the founder of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, the primary leader of the Mongolian revolution of 1921, the commander of the Mongolian People's Army and hence the founder of the new-born Mongolian People's Republic has been inculcated through propaganda, education, the media and politically motivated rituals.

Because the so-called 'western' researchers studied the history of the Mongols without reference to 'the official opinion of the Mongolian history', in some cases, it could be said that their investigations yielded better results than their counterparts in Mongolia. Two examples of such an investigation are *Revolutionaries of the Steppe* (1973), written in Japanese by the Japanese scholar Tanaka Katsuhiko and *Between the Hammer and the Anvil? Chinese and Russian Policies in Outer Mongolia 1911-1921* (1980), written by the American researcher Thomas E. Ewing. These books were relatively free from the myth of Sükhbaatar, as they managed to refer to the book, *A Short History of the Original Birth and Establishment of the Mongolian People's National Revolution* (1934) which was co-authored by Choibalsan, Losol and Demid, as a part of their source materials; henceforth I will refer to this as *Short History* (1934).³ Another book, *A Short History of the People's Revolution of the Mongolian Nation*, was published in 1938 in the name of Choibalsan alone.⁴ This book was a concise version of the original publication of 1934 and did not reflect the importance of the roles of Danzan and Bodo and attributed most of the achievements of the revolution to Sükhbaatar and Choibalsan.

However 'the myth of Sükhbaatar' had already begun in 1934. We can confirm the existence of 'the myth of Sükhbaatar' in *Short History* (1934) by comparing it to the book, *Source Materials Related to the History of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party* (1928), which I will use in this paper. This book, consisting of fourteen memoirs, should be acknowledged as the first study of the history

of modern Mongolia and the first investigation of the Mongolian revolution of 1921. The first part of the book recounts the preparation and victory of the revolution, the middle part depicts the Second Congress of the party as the last stage of the revolution, and the final part describes the social change after the establishment of the new regime in Outer Mongolia.

The purpose of this paper is to re-examine the accepted theory about the establishment of the Mongolian People's Party and present a new opinion about this process. I shall be comparing the contents of Dogsom's memoir about the establishment of the Mongolian People's Party, which was included in the above-mentioned book of 1928, with descriptions from books and personal memoirs relating the process of the revolution.⁵

Dansranbilegiin Dogsom was born in to a commoner's family at the Dalai Vang's Banner of the Setsen Khan Aimag district in 1884 and worked for the Ministry of Defence of the new Mongolian Government, which had been established in December 1911. After the 1921 revolution he served as mayor of Ulaanbaatar, Mongolian ambassador to Tuva and finally in March 1936 took the position of chairman of the Executive Committee of the National Small Council, which was considered to be the same rank as the chief of state. However he was arrested and sent to the USSR in a large-scale purge under Stalin's regime in July 1939 and was executed two years later in 1941.⁶

Due to political reasons Dogsom's memoir has been ignored and forgotten and almost pushed into the background of the *Short History* (1934). Yet this memoir is extremely important for two reasons. One is that it is the personal record by a leader of the revolutionary movement, who, notably, was a key member of the Civil Servants' Group, and uses his memory of the events, which took place 8 or 9 years previously. The other reason is that his memoir was written and published during the relatively liberal days when Mongolia had not been under the direct control of the Comintern and ultra-left policies such as full-scale attacks on pre-revolution powers.

2. THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CIVIL SERVANTS' GROUP

As I mentioned above, the Mongolian People's Party was organised by uniting the People's Group (Bodoo's group or the so-called Hill of Consulate Group) with the Civil Servants' Group (Danzan's group or the so-called Khüree Group).

It could be said that Dogsom's memoir gives the most comprehensive account of the birth of the Civil Servants' Group, whilst *Short History* (1934) recorded a concrete description about the process of the establishment of the People's Group.

As I will mention below, the first members of the Civil Servants' Group were five people, namely Danzan, Dendev, Dogsom, Dugarjav and Sühbaatar. Out of the five people, only Dogsom and Dugarjav recorded important ac-

counts about the establishment of the group. The other three did not leave any historical records, because Dendev and Danzan were executed in 1922 and 1924 respectively, and Sükhbaatar died from disease in 1923. The account by Dogsom is of course his memoir published in 1928; later I will refer to a short account by Dugarjav.⁷

According to Dogsom's memoir, the core of the group was formed by the process in which Danzan recruited Dendev first and enrolled Dogsom later. Danzan emphasised to Dogsom the necessity of protecting the autonomy of Outer Mongolia in September or October 1919 when a plan for the abolition of self-government was argued by the Chinese governor-general Chen Yi and the Mongolian prime minister Badamdorj and a rumour of the Chinese army's approach had spread.⁸ The plan for the abolition of autonomy was initiated by a number of aristocrats and high-ranking monks. This provoked strong antipathy amongst officials of the middle and lower ranks, intelligentsia and officers because it would nullify the fruits of the independent movements of 1911 and annul the autonomy of Outer Mongolia guaranteed by the Kyakhta treaty which was itself unsatisfactory for the Mongols. In those circumstances Danzan began to recruit fellow members and organised an opposition movement.

Danzan's level of education was limited to reading and writing in Mongolian and a little Russian, however his focus was directed towards how to abolish rule by feudal lords and free people from oppression, as he himself had been suppressed, unfairly punished and had his property confiscated by his lord.⁹

Three people, namely Danzan, Dendev and Dogsom gathered at Danzan's and discussed the possibility of sending a petition to the Russian Consul and in whose particular name it should be sent. They came to the conclusion that priority should be given to recruiting more members because they could not deny the probability of the white Russian Consul's connections with the Chinese authorities. At the meeting Dogsom proposed a strategy to enrol new members appealing to people's faith in Buddhism and respect for the king-reincarnation Jebtsundamba Khutagt.

After the meeting they tried to recruit more members but the result was far from perfect. Without revealing their real intention they approached Zaisan Jamiyan of the *Shabi* administration and some officials such as Lkhayajav, Nyamjav, Tsend, Togtokh, Dash and Galsan, and explained that if autonomy was abolished, the status of the king-incarnation and faith in Buddhism might decline.¹⁰

At the end of October 1919 Xu Shu-zheng, the governor of the North-western Province, 'the agent of Japan' arrived in Ikh Khüree.¹¹ He demanded that the Mongolian government abrogate autonomy using military pressure. On 15 November (on the 23rd day of the ninth month by the lunar calendar) the problem regarding the abolition of autonomy was discussed in the Upper and the Lower Houses of parliament.¹² After the resolution by the Lower House against the abolition of autonomy, the Upper House declared the nullification

DOGSOM'S MEMOIR

of the Lower House's right to the votes and adjourned parliament. That was the day when Outer Mongolia's autonomy was lost.

That evening Nyamjav, Dendev, Tsend, Dogsom, Danzan and Togtokh gathered at Zaisan Jamiyan's and decided to send a petition to the Russian Consul asking for help. After writing a draft of the petition five people (Jamiyan, Jigmeddorj, Dendev, Danzan and Nyamjav) went to the palace by the river (*Golyn süm*) to obtain authorisation from the king (Jebsundamba Khutagt). However the king ordered them, through an aide, to wait until the appropriate time arrived.¹³

Two things may be realised from this episode. One is that the idea of seeking help from Soviet Russia did not occur at this moment and the other is even a person who should be classified as member of the People's Group went to the palace with members of the Civil Servants' Group. The first point could be explained by the facts that the anti-revolutionary White armies still maintained their influence in Siberia and the authority of Soviet Russia had not yet been established and therefore Mongolian nationalists had not had an opportunity to make contact with Soviet Russia in those days. As for the second point it could be said that even the People's Party had a civil servant as a member and in some cases the activities of the two groups had overlapped.

After the visit to the palace Danzan, Dendev and Dogsom actively tried to recruit new members and succeeded in enrolling Dugarjav, Sükhbaatar, Jamiyan, Balsanov, Yumtarov, Galsan, Togtokh, Dash, Tsend and others.¹⁴ The order of entry in the list of the new members recorded in Dogsom's memoir has its own meaning. In other words it is not accidental that the name of Dugarjav was placed first, Sükhbaatar second and additionally Dugarjav's memoir published in 1925 confirms that the list clearly shows the order of entry for each member of the group.

We four people, Danzan, Dendev, Dogsom and Dugarjav, united by the same objective, discussed and agreed to recruit new members and I, Dugarjav, first enrolled comrade Sükhbaatar to the party. We five members burned incense for the 'Red Protective Deity' at the *Baruun Örgöö* [the West Tent] in the capital Khüree and swore to save the Mongolian people from their severe suffering and to return to a peaceful life and wrote auspicious phrases on the *khadags* [silk cloths for rituals] with milk and offered them to the deity.¹⁵

From Dogsom's and Dugarjav's accounts it is unquestionable that the fourth and fifth member of the Civil Servants' Group were Dugarjav and Sükhbaatar respectively. Sükhbaatar appeared on the 'stage of the revolution' at this moment. Therefore it could be said that *Short History* (1934), which states Sükhbaatar recruited Danzan, Dogsom, Dugarjav and Dendev and also organised the group, is completely wrong.¹⁶

Another important piece of information gleaned from Dugarjav's account is that these nationalists swore an oath before the 'Red Protective Deity' at the

Baruun Örgöö (the West Tent). Dogsom's account does not mention anything about the ritual attended by these five people, but he recorded that a similar ceremony took place when the Civil Servants' Group and the People's Group united.

'From now on we will never consider self-interest and devote ourselves to protect the Mongolian religion and the people and save the people from severe suffering. Please protect us.' Writing this vow with milk on the *khadag* and offering it to the Red Protective Deity with incense burning, we swore to struggle for this purpose to the last.¹⁷

The protective deity Jamsran, which had been known as the Red Protective Deity (*Ulaan sakhius*) because its entire body was red, was one of the most popular protective deities in Ikh Khüree.¹⁸ According to the legends, Jamsran had protected Jebtsundamba Khutagt I from horse robbers when his holiness was travelling in Eastern Tibet and also protected Jebtsundamba Khutagt II from a thunderbolt. At the *Baruun Örgöö* the service of thanksgiving to Jamsran had taken place every year.¹⁹ Ikh Khüree (present-day Ulaanbaatar, the capital of Mongolia) was a religious city which had originated from the monastery of the incarnation Jebtsundamba Khutagt, and Jamsran was the protector deity of the city.

The *Baruun Örgöö* was a shrine to Abudai Khan, who had introduced Buddhism into Khalkha (Outer Mongolia) in the sixteenth century. He founded the distinguished Tüsheet khaan family and when the hearth was put into the tent-style shrine, it was considered the symbol of Mongolia. After the declaration of independence, in the summer of 1912, ministers, aristocrats and high-ranking monks pledged allegiance to their country before Jamsran at the yurt-shaped shrine.²⁰

The nationalists' pledge before the Red Protective Deity at *Baruun Örgöö* was a reflection of their intention to take over the independence movement and it could be said that their activities were concentrated on this purpose.

If we regard the day of their pledge before Jamsran as the date of the establishment of the Civil Servants' Party, then the party was established not far from the time of the session in the consultative assembly, that is, in the second half of November 1919.²¹

It seems to me significant that Jamiyan's name was entered after those of Dugarjav and Sükhbaatar on the above-mentioned list. He was registered as a key member of the People's Group in *Short History* (1934) and even the 1985 version of the history of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party classified him as a member of the group.²² However it is natural to categorise him as a member of the Civil Servants' Group if we consider the facts that he had contact with Danzan and the decision to send a petition to the Russian Consul was made in the meeting at Jamiyan's.

It is also relevant that two Buryat Mongolian names (Balsanov and Yumtarov)

were added to the list of Danzan's group. In those days Balsanov worked as a translator in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and Yumtarov served as an interpreter in the army at Khujirbulan.²³ Although the role of Buryat Mongols in the 1921 Revolution, especially that of Elbegdorj Rinchino and Tseven Jamtsarano, who joined with revolutionaries from Outer Mongolia at Verkhneudinsk in the summer of 1920, has been considered to be essential to the success of the revolution, little attention has been paid so far to the Buryat Mongols who lived in Ikh Khüree and joined the revolutionary activities from the early stages.

3. THE UNIFICATION OF THE CIVIL SERVANTS' GROUP AND THE PEOPLE'S GROUP AND THE ACTIVITIES THAT ENSUED

According to Dogsom's memoir, the Civil Servants' Group knew of the existence of the People's Group a little later than the pledge given by the five people before Jamsran and earlier than the grant of the decree by the President of the Republic of China (1 Jan. 1920). The unification of the two groups was celebrated with the ritual which I have mentioned in the previous section.

Therefore I cannot agree with the opinions of Kungurov/Sorokovikov and Pürev/Dashnyam that they united in January 1920.²⁴

At the time of the two groups' uniting, Dogsom listed ten people: Bodoo, Choibalsan, Jigmed (=Jigmeddorj), Chagdarjav, Namsrai, Altangerel, Babuu, Losol, Bazarav and Bayar taij. They were members of the People's Group.²⁵

The situation in Outer Mongolia continued to degenerate after the unification of the two groups. In these circumstances, during a meeting at Dendev's they decided to ask the White Russian Consul for help and wrote a petition in the name of the Lower House and subsequently met the Russian Consul Orlov.

The delegation consisted of six people, that is, Dendev, Danzan, Bodoo, Dugarjav, Dogsom and Galsan.²⁶ It should be noted that all of them except Bodoo belonged to the Civil Servants' Group.

Consul Orlov's response was, 'It is impossible to recognise the Lower House as a parliament which represents the state, because the members of it were not officially elected in each district and all of them are government officials. If the document bears the seal of the Bogd Khaan [=Jebstundamba Khutagt], I may forward it to my government.'²⁷

Encouraged by the Russian Consul's answer, the group prepared another letter of petition to the Russian government. Selecting an auspicious day, that night five members of the group, Sükhbaatar, Danzan, Dendev, Dugarjav and Dogsom visited the Khaistai palace near the Tuul river in secret. Two members of the delegation, Danzan and Dogsom met the king directly and requested that he sign the letter. The king conferred with his aide Da Lama Puntsagdorj for a long time and finally, just like the previous meeting of November 1919, returned the letter and ordered them to wait until the appropriate moment.

Members of the second delegation to the king's palace consisted of leaders of the Civil Servants' Group and this suggests that even after the unification of the two groups each group continued its activities separately.

Perhaps the decision by the king, Jebtsundamba Khutagt, to defer asking the White Russian government for help was correct, because at the end of 1919 the Red Army took the offensive and the anti-revolutionary government of general Kolchak in Siberia was almost in a state of collapse.

At about this time Mongolian revolutionaries began to consider Soviet Russia as a possible ally. Yet their approach took a quite religious form at first. Dugarjav, Dogsom and others first asked a high-ranking monk of the Gandan Monastery, and then two fortune-tellers of the Züün Khüree whether making a request for help to Soviet Russia would be appropriate. They were given positive answers and they then visited a Buddhist oracle (*gütembe lam-a*) of the Vanggai *aimag* and asked advice about their future plans.²⁸ In a trance the oracle ordered them to achieve the *sor* ritual, a kind of exorcist ceremony. Dendev, Galsan, Danzan, Dugarjav, Dash, Jigmeddorj and Jamiyan collected money and asked Buddhist monks to perform the *sor* rite.²⁹ According to the Buddhist oracle's prediction, some omens should appear within three days after the ritual, but nothing happened and a large sum of money was lost in vain.³⁰

It should be mentioned that on this occasion all of the participants of the ritual were members of the Civil Servants' Group, except for Jigmeddorj.

After these events the nationalists tried to recruit new members and made plans to purloin armaments from the government's arsenal.

Dogsom's memoir suggests that the above-mentioned predictions and rituals occurred at the end of 1919, because the accounts of them are followed by the description of a ceremony (1 Jan. 1920), in which Jebtsundamba Khutagt was obliged to kowtow to a picture of the President of the Republic of China in order to demonstrate his acceptance of China's suzerainty.³¹

The nationalists who had become interested in the revolution in Russia sent Danzan and Sükhbaatar to reconnoitre the Russian situation. Their journey began in the first month of the lunar calendar, New Year's day which was 20 Feb. 1920. Although they managed to reach Kyakhta, the border town between Mongolia and Russia, they could not cross the border and had to return to the Mongolian capital. According to Dogsom's memoir, after the above-mentioned incident he became acquainted with two Russians, Kucherenko and Gembarzhevskii, who explained the Russian revolution to him, and Dogsom became convinced that only Soviet Russia could save Mongolia.³²

This episode seems to indicate that members of the Civil Servants' Group had begun to contact pro-revolutionary Russians in Ikh Khüree, because in other pages of Dogsom's memoir, he wrote that prior to the unification of the two groups, the People's Group had already made contact with Russian revolutionaries such as Kucherenko and Maslakov. In short, Dogsom's conviction arose from his meeting with the two Russians and therefore seems to suggest that the two

groups had started to co-operate with each other from the spring of 1920.

In Dogsom's memoir, these events were followed by descriptions of the rule of the Chinese tyrant Xu Shu-zheng and Dogsom quotes the letter of protest which had been placarded on the wall of Xu Shu-zheng's residence.³³

4. A RE-EXAMINATION OF THE DATE OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE MONGOLIAN PEOPLE'S PARTY

The accepted opinion is that the Mongolian People's Party was officially established on 25 June 1920. This has been supported not only by Mongolian scholars, but also most foreign researchers.³⁴ No doubts have arisen about this date in recent reconsiderations of Mongolian history by Mongolian scholars.

The accepted theory states that on 25 June 1920 Bodoo's group (the People's Group) and Danzan's group (the Civil Servants' Group) met and officially became one party, by creating the party's manifesto entitled 'Pledges of party members'. This theory is based on the view that the party was established in June after a period of co-operative activities by the two political groups.

It is important to re-examine when and how this seemingly unquestionable theory was established. In Mongolian publications of the 1920s and 1930s I could not find any descriptions which give an exact date for the establishment of the party. Neither Dogsom's memoir of 1928 or *Short History* (1934) gives us the date of the party's establishment. Similarly the 1938 edition of the Mongolian revolution's history published in the name of Choibalsan omits concrete evidence. A text of the manifesto 'Pledges of party members' was contained in *Sükhbaatar, Letters and documents*, published in 1952, but it lacks the date of the pledges.³⁵ *History of the Mongolian People's Republic*, the first comprehensive history of Mongolia written by Mongolian and Soviet scholars, published in 1955 in Mongolian, just states that the Mongolian People's Party was established in June 1920 and does not mention a specific date.³⁶

As far as I am aware the date of 25 June 1920 was first mentioned in a book, *Aratskaia revoliutsiia*, which was co-authored by two Russians, Kungurov and Sorokovikov and published in Irkutsk in 1946. It should be noted, however, that in the Russian book the date (25 June 1920) is not recorded in the description of the June conference of revolutionaries, but only appears in the attached chronological table at the end of the book.³⁷

The Russian revolutionary Sorokovikov, who liaised between Soviet Russia and Mongolian revolutionaries, left a short memoir about the incidents of 1920 which was published in a Soviet journal in 1965. In this memoir Sorokovikov also indicated 25 June 1920 as the date of the establishment of the Mongolian People's Party.³⁸

From this it would appear that Sorokovikov's accounts should be considered the most evidential for the theory that the party was established on 25 June 1920.

I would like to now reconsider the accepted theory regarding the date of the establishment of the Mongolian People's Party, by comparing three sources, that is, Dogsom's memoir of 1928, *Short History* (1934) and Sorokovikov's accounts.

a. The date of the first meeting of the Mongolian revolutionaries with Sorokovikov

Dogsom's memoir states that the Mongolian revolutionaries met Sorokovikov on a day in the second month of spring using the lunar calendar.³⁹ This meeting, which was arranged by Kucherenko and Gembarzhevskii, can be dated to between 21 March and 18 April 1920. As for the date of the first meeting, the description in *Short History* (1934) is similar to that of Dogsom's memoir, simply stating that it took place in the second month of spring.⁴⁰ Sorokovikov's memoir is specific. He wrote he had met the Mongolian revolutionaries at Kucherenko's in the evening of 11 March 1920.⁴¹ This corresponds exactly with the 22nd day of the first month referring to the lunar calendar.

It should be noted here that Sorokovikov's memoir differs slightly from Dogsom's memoir and *Short History* (1934).

b. The personal history of Sorokovikov

According to Dogsom's memoir, Sorokovikov was sent by Yanson, a high-ranking official of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Soviet Russia.⁴² *Short History* (1934) states that he was sent by the 'Eastern Department' of the Comintern in order to explain the Russian revolution and investigate the Mongolian situation.⁴³

However the description in Sorokovikov's memoir is quite different from those of the above-mentioned two accounts. Sorokovikov states that he was sent by the Revolutionary Committee of Russian residents in Ikh Khüree, because the committee had been sought for help and advice by the Mongolian revolutionaries.⁴⁴ The account in *Aratskaia revoliutsiia* is more comprehensive: 'Choivan, chairman of the Revolutionary Committee told the Mongolian revolutionaries that Sorokovikov, a member of the committee, was just about to go to Soviet Russia and could report on the situation of Russian residents in Khüree to the Soviet Russian authorities.'⁴⁵

In short, Dogsom's memoir and *Short History* (1934) coincide in that Sorokovikov was sent to Mongolia on a mission and Sorokovikov's memoir states that he had lived in Khüree, the Mongolian capital. It is probable that he lived in Khüree at that time, because another source states that Sorokovikov had come to Khüree in the spring of 1919 and worked for a co-operative as an accountant.⁴⁶ According to Sorokovikov's memoir he went to Irkutsk and informed Yanson of the wishes of the Mongolian revolutionaries after meeting them in Khüree. The main difference between the Mongolian sources and the Russian source is

that in the former Sorokovikov was sent by Yanson from Russia, while in the latter he went to Russia to meet Yanson. Therefore the three sources correspond in showing a relationship between Yanson and Sorokovikov.

However there is a fundamental difference between Dogsom's memoir which reports Yanson as a representative of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and *Short History* (1934), which reports Yanson as a representative of the Comintern. As a matter of fact, it is anomalous to regard the events of the spring of 1920 as those related to the activities of the Comintern, if we consider the organisation of the Comintern in those days and the aims of the Mongolian revolutionaries.

Y. D. Yanson (1886-1939), a leader of the Siberian Bolsheviks worked as chairman of the revolutionary committee of the Irkutsk Prefecture from March to June 1920 and also served as head of the Siberian and Far- Eastern branch office of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Soviet Russia in 1920 and 1921.⁴⁷

According to E. Rinchino's memoir, he proposed to Yanson the establishment of an organisation which would be responsible for Mongolian affairs and Yanson then sent a proposal to the Siberian Bureau of the Russian Communist Party. After studying the proposal, the Siberian Bureau decided to establish the Asian Bureau (*Aziatskoe biuro*) in Irkutsk, which would be attached to the Siberian Branch Office of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The head of the Asian Bureau was F. N. Gapon, but the majority of the practical activities were undertaken by Rinchino.⁴⁸ Accordingly the Asian Bureau was established in the spring of 1920.⁴⁹

In July of the same year the Bureau was re-organised into the Section of the Eastern Nations, attached to the Siberian Bureau of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party. N. Burtmann was appointed head of the Section.⁵⁰ The Mongolian and Tibetan Department was set up in this Section and S. S. Borisov was in charge of the Department. Source material suggests Rinchino was working as a secretary in the Department.⁵¹

The Far-Eastern Secretariat of the Comintern was established in Irkutsk and evolved from the Section of the Eastern Nations. The resolution of the Russian Communist Party about the establishment of the Far-Eastern Secretariat was adopted on 5 Jan. 1921 and the resolution of the Executive Committee of the Comintern was passed on 15 Jan. of the same year.⁵² The head of the Secretariat was B. Z. Shumyatskii and Rinchino worked as the secretary of the Mongolian and Tibetan Department.

Thus the organisation for Mongolian Affairs was first established in Irkutsk and was attached to the Ministry of Foreign affairs of Soviet Russia. It was then re-organised and became attached to the Russian Communist Party and finally formed a department of the Comintern. Practical activities of these organisations were carried out by Borisov and Rinchino. As these three organisations had similar objectives and staff in common, they have very often been confused by researchers.⁵³

Now I shall return to the problem of the questions raised by Sorokovik-

ov's personal history. He wrote that Yanson doubled as a representative of the Comintern and as a representative of the Foreign Ministry to Siberia and the Far East.⁵⁴ It might have been possible for Yanson to serve for the Comintern, but even if Yanson was a Comintern representative, it is difficult to affirm that Sorokovikov worked for the Comintern in the spring of 1920. The Comintern had just been organised in 1919 and its large-scale activities towards Mongolia began after the Second Conference of the Comintern in July and August in 1920, especially after the establishment of the Far-Eastern Secretariat. Therefore it seems improbable that Sorokovikov was sent by the Comintern, as *Short History* (1934) claims. I believe that Dogsom's memoir reflects the truth concerning Sorokovikov's activities.

c. Participants of the meeting—the myth of Sükhbaatar

According to Dogsom's memoir, Choibalsan, Dugarjav, Jigmeddorj, Bodoo and Yumtarov attended the meeting with Sorokovikov.⁵⁵ However *Short History* (1934) mentions Sükhbaatar, Choibalsan, Dugarjav, Jigmeddorj and Bodoo as participants in the meeting.⁵⁶ Sorokovikov's account is quite different and he states he met Choibalsan, Sükhbaatar, Bodoo, Danzan and Chagdarjav.⁵⁷

The comparison of Dogsom's memoir to *Short History* (1934) shows us that in the latter the name of Yumtarov was deleted and instead the name of Sükhbaatar was inserted and entered at the top of the list. Dogsom states that at the meeting, the opening gambit was made by the Mongolian side, that is Choibalsan, Dugarjav, Jigmeddorj, Bodoo and Yumtarov. Conversely, *Short History* (1934) claims that the first question was put by Sükhbaatar alone. In *Short History* (1934) it is possible to identify several falsifications which were intended to exaggerate the role of Sükhbaatar in the revolution and this is a typical example of it. Out of the five people who are listed in Dogsom's memoir, three people (Choibalsan, Jigmeddorj and Bodoo) belonged to the People's Group and two (Danzan and Yumtarov) were members of the Civil Servants' Group. It should be noted that both groups sent a member who understood Russian: Choibalsan from Bodoo's group and Yumtarov from Danzan's group. If the Civil Servants' Group had sent Sükhbaatar instead of Yumtarov, no one in the group would have understood Russian. Also there would be no reason for Dogsom to deliberately delete the name of Sükhbaatar, who belonged to the same group as himself. Therefore I think Dogsom's memoir is correct and *Short History* (1934) is wrong. Out of the five people whom Sorokovikov claims to have attended the meeting, only two people (Choibalsan and Bodoo) were present and the rest (Sükhbaatar, Danzan and Chagdarjav) were absent.

d. Details of the meeting

Dogsom's memoir and *Short History* (1934) give detailed accounts of Sorokovikov's questions and the Mongolian nationalists' answers. The comparison of

DOGSOM'S MEMOIR

the two accounts makes it clear that *Short History* (1934) duplicates Dogsom's memoir with slight amendments. There is even a phrase which does not exist in the original (Dogsom's memoir) but was deliberately falsified to misrepresent the truth. When Sorokovikov asked, 'What are those who exercised their powers in the ex-government doing now?' the answer was: 'All of those who exercised their powers before are now only thinking of getting posts and privileges, crawling to shrewd Chinese officials' (in Dogsom's memoir). On the other hand, in *Short History* (1934), the expression 'those who exercised their powers' is replaced by 'princes and living incarnations'.⁵⁸

When the abolition of autonomy in Outer Mongolia was argued in 1919, secular princes supported the abolition in negotiations with the Chinese representative Chen Yi, while the majority of high-ranking monks were against it.⁵⁹ Therefore it is inconsistent that the expression 'living incarnations' is recorded in the answer from the revolutionaries. Yet if we take into account the time when *Short History* (1934) was published, we can understand why the expression 'living incarnations' was deliberately inserted. This expression should be understood in a historical context as the powers of living incarnations were removed in the waves of ultra-left policies during the era between the late 1920s and the beginning of 1930s.

According to Dogsom's memoir, at the end of the meeting Sorokovikov advised the revolutionaries to send delegates to Soviet Russia immediately.⁶⁰ However *Short History* (1934) states that Sorokovikov advised them to send delegates to the 'Eastern department' of the Comintern.⁶¹ As I mentioned above, Dogsom's memoir should be considered correct and the title 'the Comintern' in *Short History* (1934) is therefore improbable.

According to Sorokovikov's account, at the end of the meeting, he said, 'I will inform the Soviet Russian government and the Bolshevik Party of the wishes of the Mongolian revolutionaries and return with an answer.'⁶²

The gap between the descriptions of Mongolian revolutionaries' accounts and those of the Russian revolutionary henceforth becomes wider.

e. Decisions after the meeting and their implementation

According to Dogsom's memoir, in the evening of the day when the revolutionaries had met Sorokovikov, they gathered at Dogsom's and made three decisions. First, to send Choibalsan and Danzan to Soviet Russia, second, to divide the remaining members into three groups and assign them tasks and third, to create the seal for the Mongolian People's Party. Then Dogsom's memoir describes a secret pledge by some members of the group and the departure of Choibalsan and Danzan on 29 June.⁶³

According to *Short History* (1934) four events occurred after the meeting with Sorokovikov. First, the revolutionaries met at Danzan's, approved 'Pledges of party members', decided to create the party's seal and chose Choibalsan and Danzan as delegates to Russia. Second, they met at Bodoo's, approved the party's

seal and decided to devise a secret code for communication purposes and to move Bodo's tent. Third, Choibalsan and Danzan prepared for the journey to Russia and departed on 30 June 1920. Fourth, the revolutionaries were divided into three groups and each group attempted to collect information on the whereabouts of Choibalsan and Danzan who had not reported back to the group.⁶⁴

On the other hand, Sorokovikov's account is completely different from the previous two sources and can be summarised as follows.

Arriving at Irkutsk, Sorokovikov reported to Yanson the wishes of the Mongolian revolutionaries. Two months later at the beginning of June Yanson gave him instructions that he should go back to Khüree and invite them to Soviet Russia. On 20 June he met the revolutionaries for the second time and informed them of his journey to Irkutsk and invitation from Yanson. On 21 June the Mongolian revolutionaries decided to send delegates to Soviet Russia. In order to negotiate with Soviet Russia in the name of the party it was considered imperative to officially establish the party. On 25 June the 'Pledges of party members' were approved. These were thought equivalent to the party's manifesto and regulations. At a meeting of the executive committee Choibalsan and Danzan were chosen as delegates to Russia and they departed on 28 June.⁶⁵

As I have shown above, the three sources are quite different in their contents. First of all both Dogsom's memoir and *Short History* (1934) do not report the second meeting with Sorokovikov.⁶⁶ It is doubtful that Sorokovikov returned in June from Irkutsk and met the Mongolian revolutionaries again. But even if he did so, these meetings must have been very ordinary and were not considered worthy of recording from the Mongolian revolutionaries' point of view. According to Dogsom's memoir, after the departure of Danzan and Choibalsan, Borisov and Tseden-Ish arrived in Khüree from Irkutsk. Rinchino states he recruited Borisov and Tseden-Ish to the Asian Bureau and they visited Mongolia on the pretext of membership of the Central Association of Co-operatives.⁶⁷ After the arrival of the two revolutionaries, all members of the People's Party gathered by the river Tuul and argued about the establishment of their relationship with Soviet Russia and decided to send another five members to Russia; the five members were Bodo, Chagdarjav, Dogsom, Sükhbaatar and Losol.⁶⁸ If Sorokovikov's account is correct, he should have been involved in this meeting, but he does not mention the name of Borisov and Tseden-Ish, or the meeting by the river Tuul. All of Sorokovikov's descriptions of the meetings on 20 June, 21 June and 25 June are very dubious and it is difficult to believe important decisions were made at these meetings.

The question is then what is the exact date of the resolution of the 'Pledges of party members', which have been believed to be adopted on 25 June 1920? In a note in the new version of *Short History* (1934), D. Dash, one of Mongolia's distinguished historians, states that the 'Pledges of party members' were approved at the meeting at Danzan's on 25 June.⁶⁹ However such an interpretation

DOGSOM'S MEMOIR

is only acceptable if it is recognised that the accounts in *Short History* (1934) are a combination of the two meetings with Sorokovikov. If we read the book straightforwardly, the meeting at Danzan's should be considered to have been immediately after the meeting with Sorokovikov, that is, in the spring of 1920. In that case did the Mongolian revolutionaries really approve the 'Pledges of party members' at this meeting? Why does Dogsom's memoir lack a description of the pledges? To answer these questions we should compare the contents of the two meetings in detail: the meeting at Dogsom's as described by Dogsom and the meeting at Danzan's recorded in *Short History* (1934).

First it is necessary to consider what is common to the accounts of the meetings. Both accounts record the decisions to create the party's seal and to send Danzan and Choibalsan as delegates to Russia. Thus if this coincidence is true, then the two meetings described should in fact have been recorded as one.

Next, the differences between the two accounts of the meetings should be considered. On close examination of *Short History* (1934) in which the assignment of roles to collect information about Danzan and Choibalsan after their departure, it is possible to draw an equivalence to the description of the assignment of roles as given in Dogsom's memoir. The relationship between Dogsom's memoir and *Short History* (1934) in regard to the various groupings may be shown as follows.

Group A. Sükhbaatar, Bodoo, Yumtarov and Balsanov: To collect information on Russia through Kucherenko and Gembarzhevskii (Dogsom's memoir)

Sükhbaatar and Bodoo: To meet Kucherenko and Gembarzhevskii in order to collect information on Choibalsan and Danzan (*Short History*)

Group B. Losol, Jamiyan, Galsan, Altangerel and Dash: To examine the activities of aristocrats, monks and the Chinese authorities (Dogsom's memoir)

Jamiyan and Losol: To approach high-ranking monks in order to collect information on Choibalsan and Danzan (*Short History*)

Group C. Dogsom, Jigmeddorj, Dugarjav and Dendev: To approach Khatanbaatar Magsarjav, Jalkhanz Khutagt, Diluv Khutagt and Daa Lama Puntsagdorj in order to recruit them into the party and gain the king's seal of approval on documents (Dogsom's memoir)

Dogsom and Dugarjav: To meet aristocrats to collect information on Choibalsan and Danzan (*Short History*)

In analysing the constituent members of each group and their assignments it becomes clear that the two accounts were originally one only. In my opinion the assignment of roles recorded by Dogsom is accurate and that described in *Short History* (1934) is fictitious. Because the list of members and their tasks in Dog-

som's memoir are more comprehensive than those in *Short History* (1934).

If the assignment of the roles described in *Short History* (1934) is false and Dogsom's memoir is true, then suspicion regarding their accuracy must fall on the 'Pledges of party members' as recorded in the history book. In Dogsom's memoir a secret pledge made by some party members after the meeting held at Dogsom's may be equated with the 'Pledges of party members' as given in *Short History* (1934); Danzan, Choibalsan, Bodoo, Dogsom and Chagdarjav made a secret pledge that they would not betray secrets of their activities for the party and if any one of them deliberately damaged the party, he should kill himself or should be executed by another member.⁷⁰ This pledge is very similar to Article Four of the 'Pledges of party members' but it is basically different from the 'Pledges' in that it was secretly made by some members, while the 'Pledges' were unanimously adopted as the party's manifesto. Dogsom does not describe the pledges as being adopted by all members of the party.

Some other sources confirm that the 'Pledges' were not faked but really existed. According to the Mongolian historian Dash, apart from the original pledge which consisted of nine articles, there exists a thirteen-article version which was made later.⁷¹

The exact date of the adoption of the 'Pledges of party members' which are cited in *Short History* (1934) should be considered unknown at the present stage of the study. I have already explained why the classical theory about the date (25 June 1920) is not acceptable and would now reconsider the reliability of the accepted theory that the two groups were united into the Mongolian People's Party by adopting the 'Pledges of party members'. For example it is true that Article One of the 'Pledges', states the concrete aims of the party: 'The aim of the People's Party of Outer Mongolia is to justly strengthen, develop and protect the state and the religion by removing the enemies of the religion and the nation and recovering lost rights, to clean up domestic policies, taking into account the interests of poor lower-class people, and to permanently maintain internal administration and realise life without oppression and suffering.'⁷²

However these aims had already been basically expressed in the pledge made before 'the Red Protective Deity' and therefore were not new. On the other hand, the anti-feudal opinion that hereditary rule by feudal lords should be ended and governors ought to be chosen by election, which was mentioned in the letter of protest placarded on the wall of Xu Shu-zheng's residence, was not reflected in the 'Pledges of party members'.

In the history of the Mongolian party, the argument concerning the importance of the adoption of the 'Pledges of party members' should be taken into account with regard to the establishment of the party's organisations and especially the selection of the chairman and the executive committee. Even if the concept of the party was confirmed by the 'Pledges', the activities of the party could not be fully guaranteed without the advice of the executive organisations. As it is well known, it was at the meeting in March 1921 that members of the Central

Committee were chosen and Danzan was elected chairman of the party.⁷³ I consider it is inappropriate to surmise that the adoption of the 'Pledges' was the only grounds for the establishment of the party without taking into account the election of the executive members.

I have re-examined the theory that the Mongolian People's Party was established on 25 June 1920, by comparing three sources, namely Dogsom's memoir, *Short History* (1934) and Sorokovikov's accounts.

It is clear that the theory is not acceptable and *Short History* (1934) and Sorokovikov's accounts are mendacious.

It may be assumed that there were four stages in the process of the establishment of the Mongolian People's Party: unification of the Civil Servants' Group and the People's Group (the end of 1919); adoption of the name of the Mongolian People's Party; approval of the 'Pledges of party members'; and election of executive members of the party (March 1921).

Out of the four stages it is currently impossible to identify the exact dates of the second and third stages. It is theoretically possible that the first and second stages were simultaneous – the name of the Mongolian People's Party was adopted when the two groups were united; however, there is no evidence to support this theory. The existence of the name of the Mongolian People's Party can be confirmed for the first time from the account of the meeting at Dogsom's where the revolutionaries decided to create the seal of the party.⁷⁴

The officially accepted theory on the date of the establishment of the party is based on the view that the third stage should be considered decisive and crucial. It is also possible to assume that hidden in the background of the theory is the intention to eradicate the religious factors and the evidence of the approach to anti-revolutionary Russian diplomats at the first stage. I believe *Short History* (1934) intentionally combined the adoption of the 'Pledges of party members' with the creation of the party's seal and interpolated them into the account of the fictitious meeting at Danzan's in order to emphasise the third stage.

If it is necessary to decide the date of the establishment of the Mongolian People's Party, the most appropriate date would be a day in the middle month of spring of 1920 using the lunar calendar; the day when the revolutionaries met Sorokovikov and a relationship with Soviet Russia became realistic, and when important decisions were made at the meeting at Dogsom's such as the selection of delegates to Russia, the assignment of roles of each member and the creation of the party's seal.

5. CONCLUSION

If we define the Mongolian revolution of 1911 as the first revolution of independence, we can call that of 1921 the second revolution of independence.

The original goal of the Mongolian People's Party which had played the

leading part in this revolution was to recover the autonomy of Outer Mongolia which had been forcibly abolished by the Chinese military commander Xu Shu-zheng. Members of the party first asked the White Russian regime for help and then approached Soviet Russia, subject to the political changes in Russia, especially those in Siberia. From the end of the 1920s, when the USSR and the Comintern took control of Mongolia, the Mongolian party began to define the 1921 revolution as 'the People's revolution which was supported by the Comintern and Soviet Russia'. Additionally the party removed from history those details which did not fit their definition; it was therefore quite natural that Dogsom's memoir was disregarded in this process.

The historical drama which was played out by several forces on the stage of the Mongolian plateau from 1919 to 1921 is very complicated. Although the 1921 revolution is basically different from the 1911 revolution in that some revolutionaries of the former had opinions about social reform, the expression 'the People's revolution' which has been used to describe the 1921 revolution for several decades is too clichéd and an inappropriate characterisation of the events.

A really objective and unbiased study of the 1921 revolution of Mongolia has just begun. As I have shown above, *Short History* (1934), which has been considered the most fundamental source for study of the 1921 revolution, is in fact the first monumental work of falsification in modern Mongolian history and gives the credence to the myth of Sükhbaatar. I want to emphasise that researchers should be very careful in using this book.

Jadamba, vice-chairman of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, states in his introduction to *Source Materials Related to the History of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party* (1928) as follows.

It is useful not only for ordinary people and party members, but for the historians of the future to publish a book, which was written in plain Mongolian by the persons concerned, and which explains how the party was first established, how the People's government and the Red army were organised, and how the party defeated its enemies, stabilised politics and extended the people's freedom.⁷⁵

We, 'the historians of the future', are in charge of the work of deciphering and analysing source materials published in the 1920s, including other memoirs contained in *Source Materials Related to the History of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party*.

NOTES

My thanks to Ms Louise Harvey-Freeman for reading this paper's draft, correcting and refining my English.

¹ Names of the three groups are confirmed by the list of secret codes which was devised

in 1920. Dash, 1979, p.281.

² O. Pürev, one of the well-known Mongolian scholars of Sükhbaatar studies, attempted to mythologise Sükhbaatar as an idol in society again in a series of articles published in newspapers in 1992 and 1993, in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Sükhbaatar. Conversely, D. Dashjamts, another distinguished researcher in the same field, wrote an article (Dashjamts, 1993) which was intended to study Sükhbaatar more objectively. Onuki Masao's *Modern history of Mongolia* (1993) reproduced 'the myth of Sükhbaatar' and over-estimated the role of Sükhbaatar, even though the author had managed to incorporate some recent studies of the 1921 revolution.

³ Authors of the 1934 edition of the history of the Mongolian Revolution were not Choibalsan, Losol, Demid, but G. Navaannamjil (an interview with academician Sh. Natsagdorj, November 1989). According to Prof. Natsagdorj, most books published in the name of Choibalsan were actually written by Navaannamjil.

⁴ Choibalsan, 1938. The third version of this book was translated into many languages and false information was spread about the Mongolian revolution all over the world.

⁵ Some parts of Dogsom's memoir were republished in *Memoirs of Sükhbaatar* (1965, pp. 35-38) and *Recollections of the Partisan Army* (1969, pp. 294-308). However, as some phrases were intentionally deleted or falsified, these can not be recommended as source materials to cite.

⁶ For Dogsom, see Ichinnorov's article (1992).

⁷ Prof. Tanaka states as follows: 'As for the Eastern Khüree Group [= the Civil Servants' Group, H. F.], members of the group did not leave any records, we don't have any other option but to rely on the description in the 1934 edition of the history of the Mongolian revolution written by Choibalsan and others.' (Tanaka, 1990, p. 88) This is incorrect because we have Dogsom's memoir which is a comprehensive account given by a member of the group.

⁸ Dogsom, 1928, pp. 10-24.

⁹ Ibid., p. 9.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 33.

¹¹ Dogsom's memoir states Xu Shu-zhen arrived in Khüree on the fourth day in the first month of autumn using the lunar calendar (29 August 1919). However Xu actually arrived in the Mongolian capital on 29 October 1919 (Li Yu-shu, 1961, p.247). Hence 'the fourth day in the first month' in Dogsom's account should be corrected; it should be 'the fourth day in the last month of autumn' (28 October 1919).

¹² Dogsom, 1928, p. 34. Dogsom states members of the Upper and the Lower houses of parliament had their discussions on the 25th day in the ninth month (17 November 1919), but this date is incorrect; it should be the 23rd day in the ninth month (15 November 1919). On 17 November the petition for the abolition of autonomy of Outer Mongolia was submitted to the Chinese representative and on the 22nd of the same month the President of the Republic of China issued the decree regarding the abrogation of autonomy.

¹³ *Short History* (1934) does not mention this visit to the king's palace. On the other hand, citing Kallinikov's article (1928), Ewing gives almost the same description as that of Dogsom's memoir (Ewing, 1980, p. 167). It is possible that Kallinikov used Dogsom's memoir.

¹⁴ Dogsom, 1928, p. 40.

¹⁵ Dugarjav, 1991. Dugarjav's memoir was first published in the journal *Arad-un nam*, No. 7 (1925). Pürev and Dashnyam indicated the importance of this memoir and opened the way for other researchers to challenge the myth of Sükhbaatar (Pürev/Dashnyam, 1989).

¹⁶ *Short History*, 1934, p. 53.

¹⁷ Dogsom, 1928, p. 41.

¹⁸ Jamsran is of Tibetan origin: *lcam sring*. However some scholars state Jamsran was a pre-Buddhistic local deity of Mongolia and was changed into a protective deity of Buddhism when the Dalai Lama Bsod nams rgyam tsho visited Mongolia (Nebesky-Wojkowitz, 1956, p.88). For the belief in Jamsran in Ikh Khüree, see Pozdneyev, 1978, p. 47.

¹⁹ Bawden, 1961, 11 v., 35 r.

²⁰ Dashnyam, 1990; Pürev/Dashnyam, 1989. For the location of the *Baruun Örgöö* see the following: (1) Tsultem, 1986, Plate, No.155, the painting entitled 'a bird's-eye view of Urga [Ikh Khüree] in the middle of the 19th century', a yurt(tent) with 'wor gwuo in Tibetan characters, (2) 'the plan of the Gandan Monastery of Ikh Khüree' (Hashimoto, 1942, p.197), a yurt with *baragon uruhe* in Japanese characters. However Hashimoto's explanation of the plan, 'the Gandan Monastery of Ikh Khüree' is incorrect and it should be read as 'the Züün Khüree'.

²¹ Pürev and Dashnyam assumed the pledge was made on 20 November, an auspicious day by the contemporaneous calendar (Pürev/Dashnyam, 1989).

²² *Short History*, 1934, p. 170; *History of the MPRP*, 1985, p. 25. However *History of the Mongolian People's Republic* describes Jamiyan as a member of the Khüree Group (*History of the MPR*, 1976, p. 68).

²³ Dash, 1979, p. 294. The full-name of Balsanov is Badamtseren Balsanov and that of Yumtarov is Dorjdamba Yumtarov (Battogtokh, 1991, p.16).

²⁴ Pürev and Dashnyam support the January 1920 theory, insisting that Kungurov and Sorokovikov submitted the theory on the basis of Choibalsan's confirmation (Pürev/Dashnyam, 1989); but I am not convinced by the Mongolian scholars' opinions.

²⁵ Dogsom, 1928, p.40.

²⁶ Ibid., p.42.

²⁷ Ibid., pp. 43-44.

²⁸ Ibid., pp. 48-49.

²⁹ *Sor* is of Tibetan origin: *zor*.

³⁰ Dogsom, 1928, p. 56.

³¹ Dogsom states the ceremony of the official appointment was made on the seventh day in the eleventh month using the lunar calendar (29 December 1919); but it actually took place on 1 January 1920. Many books incorrectly state the ceremony took place on 19 February 1920 (Shirendev, 1969, p.151; Tanaka, 1990, p.71; Onuki, 1993, attachments, p. 15). They probably misunderstood 30 December as the thirtieth day in the twelfth month of the lunar calendar and calculated the date using the Gregorian calendar.

³² Dogsom, 1928, pp. 60-61.

³³ Ibid., pp.61-65.

³⁴ *Historical Path of the MPRP*, 1995, p. 10; *Mongolia in the 20th Century*, 1995, p. 36 Baabar 1999, p. 201. A. J. K. Sanders explains in his *Historical Dictionary of Mongolia* that the Mongolian People's Party was founded on June 25, 1920, under the entries of 'Mongolian People's Party' (Sanders, 1996, p. 136) and 'Sühbaatar' (p. 189), while curiously he states that the same party was founded in April 1920, under the entry of 'Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party' (p. 137) and in 'Chronology' (p. XXXI).

³⁵ Sühbaatar, 1952, pp. 27-30.

³⁶ *History of the MPR*, 1955, p. 295.

³⁷ Kungurov/Sorokovikov, 1946, p.135.

³⁸ Sorokovikov, 1965, p. 31. A Mongolian translation of the memoir was published in the

DOGSOM'S MEMOIR

journal *Namyn amidral* in 1961 (Sorokovikov, 1961); that is, the original Russian edition was published later than the Mongolian translation. The dates of the birth and death of Sorokovikov are unknown. But as his name is framed by black in the Mongolian journal, it confirms that he died a little before the publication of the journal.

³⁹ Dogsom, 1928, pp. 66-67.

⁴⁰ *Short History*, 1934, p. 87.

⁴¹ Sorokovikov, 1965, p. 30.

⁴² Dogsom, 1928, pp. 67, 71.

⁴³ *Short History*, 1934, pp. 88, 92-93.

⁴⁴ Sorokovikov, 1965, pp. 29-30.

⁴⁵ Kungurov/Sorokovikov, 1957, p. 83.

⁴⁶ *Encyclopedia for Children*, p. 20; Dash, 1967, p. 36. According to Onchukov's memoir, Sorokovikov had fled in the direction of Kyakhta with Choivanov and others just before the White army of Baron Ungern occupied Khüree in February 1921 (Onchukov, 1986, p. 102). Therefore it is clear that he had lived in Khüree at the beginning of 1921. Later in June 1922, after evaluating his intelligence activities in the Red Army, the Soviet Fifth Army sent Sorokovikov to Mongolia and appointed him as head of the Intelligence Department of the Mongolian Army, Chief of staffs' headquarters (Sorokovikov, 1980, pp. 127, 131).

⁴⁷ Dash, 1979, p. 277.

⁴⁸ Rinchino, 1998, p. 247. For Rinchino's proposal, see Genkin's article which was included in Eudin/North (Eudin/North, 1957, p. 202).

⁴⁹ Dash writes the Bureau was established in March 1920 (Dash, 1967, p.89).

⁵⁰ Dash, 1979, p. 295.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 293.

⁵² Second Conference of the MPRP, 1974, p. 159. See also Dalin's memoir (Dalin, 1975, p. 27).

⁵³ In the description of May 1920, M. Onuki refers to Borisov as the head of the Mongolian and Tibetan Department of the Far-Eastern Secretariat of the Comintern and also states that Shumyatskii was the leader of the Far-Eastern Secretariat in the account of August 1920 (Onuki, 1993, pp. 173, 176); however, the Far-Eastern Secretariat did not exist in 1920.

⁵⁴ Sorokovikov states that on hearing his report 'Yanson established the Mongolian and Tibetan Department of the Secretariat of the Comintern (*Mongolo-Tibetskii otdel Sekretariata Kominterna*) and Gapon was in charge of the department.' (Sorokovikov, 1965, p. 30) However this departmental name is in itself strange and it is quite possible that Sorokovikov confused the Comintern's organisation with the Asian Bureau which had been attached to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

⁵⁵ Dogsom, 1928, pp. 67-68.

⁵⁶ *Short History*, 1934, p. 90.

⁵⁷ Sorokovikov, 1965, p. 30.

⁵⁸ Dogsom, 1928, pp. 72-73; *Short History*, 1934, pp. 94, 96.

⁵⁹ Li Yu-shu, 1961, p. 181; Ewing, 1980, pp. 136-138.

⁶⁰ Dogsom, 1928, p. 74.

⁶¹ *Short History*, 1934, p. 98.

⁶² Sorokovikov, 1965, p. 30.

⁶³ Dogsom, 1928, pp. 78-80.

⁶⁴ *Short History*, 1934, pp. 98-109.

⁶⁵ Sorokovikov, 1965, pp. 30-31. The date of Danzan's and Choibalsan's departure is 28 June in Sorokovikov's account, 29 June in Dogsom's memoir and 30 June in *Short History* (1934), respectively.

⁶⁶ In *Short History* (1934) the name of Sorokovikov appears for the second time in the account of August 1920: 'Sükhbaatar, Dogsom and Losol met Sorokovikov in Troitskosavsk again, and went to Ust'-kyakhta together.' (*Short History*, 1934, p. 167) This episode is not described in Dogsom's memoir.

⁶⁷ Rinchino, 1994, p. 131; Rinchino, 1998, p. 247.

⁶⁸ Dogsom, 1928, pp. 80-82.

⁶⁹ Dash, 1979, p. 277.

⁷⁰ Dogsom, 1928, p. 80.

⁷¹ Dash, 1979, pp. 277-280.

⁷² *Short History*, 1934, p. 100.

⁷³ Sorokovikov states 'To ensure secrecy the Executive committee was not formed in June 1920; two months later the committee was organised with Danzan as chairman and Sükhbaatar as secretary.' (Sorokovikov, 1965, p. 31) However this account is inconsistent with his other account: '[in June] the Executive committee chose Choibalsan and Danzan as delegates to Russia.' Also his explanation that the Executive committee was not formed to ensure secrecy is a little illogical.

⁷⁴ The account of *Short History* (1934) states the meeting was held at Danzan's; this should be considered incorrect. I think Dogsom's memoir is correct and the meeting was held at Dogsom's.

⁷⁵ Jadamba, 1928, p. 4.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Baabar (Bat-Erdene Batbayar) 1999. *Twentieth Century Mongolia*, translated from the Mongolian by D. Sühjargalmaa, S. Burenbayar, H. Hulan and N. Tuya. Cambridge.
- Battogtokh, S. 1991. *Nuuts khuivaldaanaas nugalaа zavkhrald* [From Secret Plots to Deviations]. Ulaanbaatar.
- Bawden, Charles R. 1961. *The Jebtsundamba Khutukhtus of Urga*, edited and translated by Charles R. Bawden. Wiesbaden.
- Choibalsan, 1938. Coyibalsang, *Mongol arad-un ündüsün-ü qubisqal-un tobči teüke* [A Short History of the People's Revolution of the Mongolian Nation]. Ulaanbaatar.
- Dalin, S.A. 1975. *Kitaiskie memuary 1921-1927* [Chinese Memoirs 1921-1927]. Moscow.
- Dash, D. 1967. *Mongol түмний төлөө зүтгэсэн and нөххөд* [Comrades who fought for the Mongolian people]. Ulaanbaatar.
- Dash, D. 1979. 'Tailbar', (Kh. Choibalsan, D. Losol, G. Demid, *Mongol ardyn үндэсний khuvisgalyn ankh үүсэж багуулагдсан товч түүх*) [D. Dash, Notes to the second edition of *Short History of the Original Birth and Establishment of the Mongolian People's National Revolution*, co-authored by Kh. Choibalsan, D. Losol, G. Demid]. Ulaanbaatar.
- Dashjams, D. 1993. 'D. Sükhbaatarын тухай түүх судалгааны зарим асуудал' [Some Problems of Historical Studies of D. Sükhbaatar], *Shinjelekх Ukhaany Akademiin Medee*, No. 3.

- Dashnyam, G. 1990. 'Tangarag örgökh yoslolyn tukhaid' [On the Ritual of Giving Pledges], *Ünen*, 25 November.
- Dogsom, 1928. Doyson, 'Mongyol Arad-un Nam-un angq-a egüsüsen tuqai yabudal,' (Mongyol Arad-un Qubisqaltu Nam-un Töb Qoriy-a, *Mongyol Arad-un Qubisqaltu Nam-un teüke-dür qolboydal бүхий жүл-үд*) [Dogsom, 'How the Mongolian People's Party was first established,' in *Source Materials Related to the History of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party*, published by the Central Committee of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party]. Ulaanbaatar.
- Dugarjav, 1991. 'Gishüün Dugarjav' [Dugarjav, a member], *Ünen*, 15 August.
- Encyclopedia for Children*, 1986. S. Jambaldorj (ed.), *Khüühked- zaluuchudyn neverterkhii toli* [An *Encyclopedia for Children and Young People*], Vol. 2. Ulaanbaatar and Moscow.
- Eudin, Xenia A. and North, Robert C. 1957. *Soviet Russia and the East 1920-1927*. Stanford.
- Ewing, Thomas E. 1980. *Between the Hammer and the Anvil? Chinese and Russian Policies in Outer Mongolia 1911-1921*. Bloomington.
- Hashimoto, Kouhou 1942. *Mouko-no Ramakyou* [Lamaism of Mongolia]. Tokyo.
- Historical Path of the MPRP*, 1995. MAKhN-yn erdem shinjilgee, surgalt, medeelliin töv, *Mongol Ardyn Khuvisgalt Namyn түүхэн замнал* [Center for Research, Education and Information of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, *Historical Path of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party*]. Ulaanbaatar.
- History of the MPR*, 1955. *Bүгд Найрамдах Монгол Ард Улсын түүх* [History of the Mongolian People's Republic]. Ulaanbaatar.
- History of the MPR*, 1976. *History of the Mongolian People's Republic*, translated from the Mongolian and annotated by William A. Brown and Urgunge Onon. Cambridge and London.
- History of the MPRP*, 1985. B. Lkhamsüren et al., *Mongol Ardyn Khuvisgalt Namyn товч түүх* [Short History of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party]. Ulaanbaatar.
- Ichinnorov, S. 1992. 'Dansranbilegiin Dogsomyg shineer үнелех ni' [A New Evaluation of Dansranbilegiin Dogsom], *Zasgiin gazryn medee*, No. 10 (April).
- Jadamba, 1928. 'Orosil', (Mongyol Arad-un Qubisqaltu Nam-un Töb Qoriy-a, *Mongyol Arad-un Qubisqaltu Nam-un teüke-dür qolboydal бүхий жүл-үд*) ['Introduction,' in *Source Materials Related to the History of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party*, published by the Central Committee of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party]. Ulaanbaatar.
- Kungurov, G. and Sorokovikov, I. 1946. *Aratskaia revoliutsiia, istoricheskii ocherk* [The ard Revolution, a Historical Sketch]. Irkutsk.
- Kungurov, G. and Sorokovikov, I. 1957. *Aratskaia revoliutsiia, istoricheskii ocherk* [The ard Revolution, a Historical Sketch], Second Revised Edition. Irkutsk.
- Li Yu-shu, 1961. *Weimenggu chezhi wenti* [The Question of Abrogation of Outer Mongolia's autonomy]. Taipei.
- Memoirs of Sükhbaatar*, 1965. D. Sükhbaatarын tukhai durdatgaluud [Memoirs of D. Sükhbaatar], compiled by D. Gongor and Ts. Dolgorsüren. Ulaanbaatar.
- Mongolia in the 20th century*, 1995. Mongol Ulsyn Shinjilekh Ukaany Akademi Tүүкhiin khüreelen, *Khoridugaar zuuny Mongol, түүхийн toim* [Institute of History of the Mongolian Academy of Sciences, *Mongolia in the Twentieth Century, a Historical Review*]. Ulaanbaatar.

- Nebesky-Wojtkowitz, René de 1956. *Oracles and Demons of Tibet*. London.
- Onchukov, A.P. 1980. 'D. Sükhbaatar manai üiledvert zochlon irsen,' *Zövlöltiin and nökhöd D. Sükhbaataryn tukhai* ['D. Sükhbaatar Inspected Our Factory,' *D. Sükhbaatar from the Accounts of Soviet Comrades*, Compiled by D. Dash]. Ulaanbaatar.
- Onuki, Masao 1993. *Mongol Gendaishi* [A Modern History of Mongolia]. Tokyo.
- Pozdneyev, Aleksei M. 1978. *Religion and Ritual in Society: Lamaist Buddhism in Late 19th-Century Mongolia*, translated from the Russian by Alo Raun and Linda Raun. Bloomington.
- Pürev, O. and Dashnyam, G. 1989. 'Khuvisgalt nuuts khoyor bülgemiin tүүkhiin zarim asuudald' [Questions on the History of Two Revolutionary Secret Groups], *Ünen*, 1 March.
- Recollections of the Partisan Army*, 1969. *Ardyn juramt tsergiin durdatgaluud* [Recollections of the People's Partisan Army], compiled by L. Dүgersүren and G. Tserendorj. Ulaanbaatar.
- Rinchino, Elbek-Dorzhi 1994. *Dokumenty, stat'i, pis'ma* [Documents, Articles and Letters], compiled by R. D. Nimaev, B. B. Batuev, S. B. Ochirov and D.-N. T. Radnaev. Ulan-Ude.
- Rinchino, Elbek-Dorzhi 1998. *Elbek-Dorzhi Rinchino o Mongolii, Izbrannye trudy* [Elbek-Dorzhi Rinchino's Accounts of Mongolia, Collected Works], compiled by B. U. Bazarov, B. D. Tsibikov and S. B. Ochirov. Ulan-Ude.
- Sanders, Alan J.K. 1996. *Historical Dictionary of Mongolia*. Lanham, MD and London.
- Second Conference of the MPRP*, 1974. *Mongol Ardyn Khuvisgalt Namyn Khoyordugaar Ikh Khural* [The Second Conference of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party], compiled by B. Tsenden. Ulaanbaatar.
- Shirendev, B. 1969. *Mongol ardyn khuvisgalyn түүх* [A History of the Mongolian People's Revolution]. Ulaanbaatar.
- Short History*, 1934. Coyibalsang, Losol, Demid, *Mongyol arad-un ündүsүн-ii qubisqal-un angq-a egүсүü bayiyuluydaysan tobči teүke* [Choibalsan, Losol, Demid, A Short History of the Original Birth and Establishment of the Mongolian People's National Revolution], Volume One. Ulaanbaatar.
- Sorokovikov, I.I. 1961. 'Mongol-Zövlöltiin nairamdlyn torgon ekh' [The Glorious Start of the Friendship between the Soviet Union and Mongolia], *Namyn amidral*, November.
- Sorokovikov, I.I. 1965. 'Na zare sovetsko-mongol'skoi družhby', *Materialy po istorii i filologii Tsentral'noi Azii*, No. 2 ['Dawn of the Friendship between the Soviet Union and Mongolia', *Materials on the History and Philology of Inner Asia*, No. 2]. Ulan-Ude.
- Sorokovikov, I.A. 1980. 'Janjin Sükhbaatar', *Zövlöltiin and nökhöd D. Sükhbaataryn tukhai* ['General Sükhbaatar', *D. Sükhbaatar from the Accounts of Soviet Comrades*]. Ulaanbaatar.
- Sүkhbaatar, D. 1952. *Zakhidal, bichgүүd* [Letters and Documents], edited and compiled by Kh. Perlee and B. Dashzeveg. Ulaanbaatar.
- Tanaka, Katsuhiko 1990. *Sougen-no Kakumeikatachi* [Revolutionaries of the Steppe], revised and enlarged edition. Tokyo.
- Tsultem, N. 1986. *Development of the Mongolian National Style Painting 'Mongol zurag' in Brief*. Ulaanbaatar.