

平成 30 年 6 月 6 日現在

機関番号：11501

研究種目：基盤研究(C) (一般)

研究期間：2015～2017

課題番号：15K03317

研究課題名(和文) From Frontiers to Boundaries: How was the borderline drawn between British Burma and China (1886-1941)?

研究課題名(英文) From Frontiers to Boundaries: How was the borderline drawn between British Burma and China (1886-1941)?

研究代表者

今村 真央 (Imamura, Masao)

山形大学・人文社会科学部・准教授

研究者番号：60748135

交付決定額(研究期間全体)：(直接経費) 3,400,000円

研究成果の概要(和文)：2014年の米国の博士論文(スタンフォード大学)が中国・ミャンマー国境に関して画期的な研究を提示したことを受けて、一つの事例を掘り下げるといふ当初の研究を見直し、3つの軌道修正を行った。1つは、インド国境も視野に入れ、空間的な視野を広げること。もう1つは、国境地帯内部の動態に注目し、言語と宗教の変化を分析すること。そしてまた、事例の比較を可能とする理論的枠組みを提出すること。この結果、「ゾミア、マンダラ、帝国、国民国家」という四つの範疇を組み合わせたパラダイムを提示した。アジア(特に東南アジア)での領域形成の歴史動態を分析する際に有効なパラダイムとなることが期待される。

研究成果の概要(英文)：The project primarily used archival and secondary resources, while carrying out field work in multiple countries including China, Myanmar, and India. I conducted an extensive inventory of the secondary literature including the most recent dissertations. In response to the advancements made by the recent studies, I have sought to (a) broadened the scope of inquiry, (b) analyze changes within the borderlands, especially in language and religion, and (c) present a conceptual model under which cases from Asia can be meaningfully compared. I arrived at a four-fold model of geopolitical order: zomia, mandala, empire, and nation-state. This four-fold model, I contend, can capture better the historical trajectories of borderlands in Asia.

研究分野：Human geography

キーワード：Borderland Frontier Zomia

1 . 研究開始当初の背景

When this project was conceived (back in 2014), there was no substantive study of the China-Myanmar boundary except one old monograph published in the early 1960s (*The Making of Burma* by Dorothy Woodman 1962). There was, as I wrote in the proposal, shortage of studies on China's borderlands. Whereas borderlands studies were actively pursued in Southeast Asia and South Asia, the same could not be said about East Asia.

2 . 研究の目的

The purpose of this research project was to investigate how the idea of bounded territory was introduced and negotiated between Britain and China by examining the Sino-Myanmar boundary in particular. It was to understand the process of encounters and negotiations between the two powers—the British and the Qing/China—during the dramatic decades in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, while taking into account interactions with the locals .

3 . 研究の方法

The project primarily used archival and secondary resources, while carrying out filed work in multiple countries including China, Myanmar, and India. I conducted an extensive inventory of the secondary literature including the most recent dissertations. The amount of frontier and borderland studies turned out to be vast. The recent surge in world/global history has resulted in a large amount of new, historically oriented scholarship on borderlands. The new approaches are useful and insightful, drawing attention to hitherto neglected areas such as technological and environmental transformations and suggest better organizing frames. Covering these recent studies turned out to be a substantive and consuming scholarly project.

Understanding the importance of learning from other scholars, this research project played a role in organizing a series of seminars at Kyoto University for its entire duration. Under the banner of Zomia Studies Group, the series convened more than 30 public seminars. Most of these seminars had to do with the China-Myanmar borderland, and some of

them directly examined the area (most notably Magnus Fiskesjo, David Bello, and Eric Vanden Bussche). This seminar series, involving hundreds of researchers, has been a unique achievement.

4 . 研究成果

Archival research

First of all, I am pleased to report that I was able to digitize an enormous amount of British archival documents (nearly 36,000 pages). This is a significant achievement in itself. These documents are extremely valuable and show the British side of the story.

The Chinese side of the story, as it has turned out, has been investigated quite comprehensively by the pioneering scholarship of Eric Vanden Bussche, who wrote his doctoral dissertation on the history of the Sino-Myanmar boundary at Stanford University (2014). Bussche's dissertation is not publicly available, but he is going to publish his study as a monograph in a few years.

The Chinese and British diplomatic correspondence regarding the Sino-Myanmar boundary are scattered around the world; most important ones can be found at First Historical Archive, and the Archives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Beijing; the Second Historical Archives in Nanjing. The Archives of the Institute of modern History at Academia Sinica; Academia Historica and the Archives of the Ministry of Defence in London; the National Archives and the India Office Record at the British Library; the Archives Nationales d'Outre-Mer in Aix-en-Provence and the Archives du Ministère des Affaires Etrangères in Paris. The National Archive in Yangon, Myanmar. Learning that Bussche has visited all these archives, I realized that it was not my priority to follow him and visit the same archives.

Bussche, in his pathbreaking dissertation, stresses that the British and the Chinese were not as antagonistic as they are often considered. Precisely because their knowledge was so limited, they had to cooperate. He also points out that they indeed shared the common objective of subduing the locals in the borderland. Bussche thus challenges the view, rather commonly held today, that the negotiations between the two powers were full of intense hostility

Connecting case studies

Realizing that Bussche has already completed a thorough study, I decided to add two dimensions to this study.

First, I broadened the scope of inquiry to include another case study, because the tendency in the current scholarship was to produce a series of case studies without showing how they are connected with each other. I decided to consider not only the Sino-Myanmar boundary but also the Sino-India boundary. This was in fact a natural extension because in fact the two processes of boundary demarcation between Britain and China influenced each other. In fact, it was because Beijing knew that the latter (that is, negotiating with Delhi) would be more difficult, they sought to end the long-standing disputes with Rangoon (Yangon) swiftly.

In 2016, I began conducting field work in Northeast India and studying the secondary literature. Here again, I quickly learned that a landmark study had been completed recently by Bérénice Guyot-Réchar (2018). Guyot-Réchar study, however, does not cover well the 19th-century in depth, focusing on the 20th century. During my archival work, I was able to uncover some of the cross-border interactions in the borderland from the early 19th century. The findings reveal that because there was no state boundary as such back then, people (laborers, merchants, etc.) travelled quite extensively from Bengal to Yunnan, criss-crossing the Kachin region. I began presenting these findings during the second year of this project.

Second, I sought to shed light on the dynamics within the borderland in more localized contexts. The studies by Bussche and Guyot-Réchar are both very much focused on international diplomacy. I thought that I would pay more attention to how the locals in the borderland reacted to the border formation, taking advantage of my fieldwork. This approach would investigate less overtly political aspects of the story such as cultural and religious changes. The spread of Christianity, for example, in these borderlands is extremely widespread and intense. And the Christian missions have been extremely active across borders. The Christian missionaries profoundly influenced the ways that natives reacted to dramatic changes in modernity. These influences were extensive

and far-reaching. The missionaries, for instance, created orthography for a series of tribal peoples in the borderlands. I studied these changes and made a series of presentations.

Making presentations, especially abroad, helped me realize that it was necessary to have a larger framework, under which various case studies can be meaningfully compared. Without a comparative framework, case studies from non-West tend to be automatically subsumed either as exceptions or as variants of the cases already studied in the West. There is a strong tendency to overlook non-Western cases, which tend to be subsumed under the story of how the Western model spread to the rest of the world. In the final year of this project, I was convinced it was necessary not only to interrogate the Westphalia historiography but also to present an alternative model.

Towards comparative borderland histories

In search of an alternative mode, I read the recent literature in "Border Studies" (or BS) and made the following assessment.

- BS suffers from persistent Eurocentrism.
- BS is too preoccupied with the present-day cases of boundary neglecting history.
- BS lacks comparison and synthesis—unable to connect a variety of case studies.

To put it bluntly, geography has remained a strongly Eurocentric discipline because it has not found a new mission and *raison d'être* in the post-colonial world. The persistence of the Westphalia myth needs to be understood as an aspect of this failure. While this historiography has been subject to penetrating criticism lately (see, for example, Kayaoglu 2010), it has survived well in the discipline of geography (see, for example, Elden 2009).

How do we overcome Eurocentric historiography and understand borderland formations in more global contexts? Here it is helpful to gain insights from recent studies in world/global history, especially those of empires. Comparative studies of empires such as the recent monography by Jane Burbank and Frederick Cooper show convincingly that nation-states and what we today call sovereign territories actually have a very short history in the world because in fact empires remained as the dominant model at least until the mid 20th century. These insights call for

fundamental rethinking of border studies. Scholars like Burbank and Cooper illuminate how empires operated with difference logic of inclusion and exclusion. Especially instructive to us today is how empire maintains ambiguous territories. While such ambiguous spaces have been given different names: “middle ground” (Richard White) “contact zone” (Mary Louise Pratt), I consider “frontier” to be the most useful in the final analysis. The term “frontier” of course carries heavy burden from controversies in the American history (that is, the history of the United States). It is, in the eyes of many historians, too tainted a word, irreversibly associated with the popular yet unjustly one-dimensional narrative, initially presented by Fredrick Turner. It is worth reminding ourselves, however, there were other scholars who presented their own frontier studies. For our present purpose of pursuing comparison, it is especially useful to recall Owen Lattimore and Edmund Leach, two scholars who worked in Asia and presented original studies of frontier.

Four-fold model of geopolitical order

Frontier and boundary present two contrasting models of geopolitical ordering. This binary framework itself, however, is not altogether novel. A dualist model of this sort, juxtaposing zonal frontier and linear boundary, has been proposed in the past (for example, by Embree); indeed it had been already acknowledged by this research project from the beginning. A more novel framework, at which I arrived towards the end of this project, includes two more concepts: *mandala* and *zomia*. Once these concepts, both coming from Southeast Asian studies, are incorporated, the model, I contend, will be better able to capture the historical trajectories of territorial ordering in Asia. Here I present a schematic explanation of these four geopolitical concepts:

- Zomia:

A space with countless small, autonomous, territories with relatively clear boundaries; these territories continuously self-divide in order to keep the units small.

- Mandala:

A cluster of urban centers and their ambiguous realms of influence. Multiple centers create overlapping spheres of influence.

- Empire:

Hierarchically organized space with wide, ambiguous borderlands. The territories shift both in terms of shape and size. Empires create hierarchical political order yet at the same time maintain multinational, multi-religious, multi-lingual and multi-legal, hybrid systems, in which belonging is fluidly realigned.

- Nation-state:

Exclusively organized territory with sharp boundaries. The members are categorically divided into insiders (citizens) and outsiders (non-citizens). The insiders come to regard themselves as a fate-sharing community.

Each of these four concepts is familiar to many scholars, but these have rarely been discussed together as comparable categories. My hope is that this four-fold model of geopolitical ordering will be found useful.

Lastly, it should be mentioned here that in the final year I wrote a proposal for a research project, which would extend and broaden this project. The proposal has been approved, and as a result the new project has already started with a group of other scholars. The findings from this project, now over, will be tested and refined in the new 5-year project.

References:

- Bussche, Eric Vanden. “Contested Realms: Colonial Rivalry, Border Demarcation, and State-Building in Southwest China, 1885-1960.” PhD Thesis, Stanford University, 2014.
- Elden, Stuart. “Why Is the World Divided Territorially?” In *Global Politics: A New Introduction*, edited by Jenny Edkins and Maja Zehfuss. London; New York: Routledge, 2009.
- Embree, Ainslie T. “Frontiers into Boundaries: The Evolution of the Modern State.” In *Imagining India: Essays on Indian History*, 67–84. New Delhi and New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Guyot-Réchar, Bérénice. *Shadow States: India, China and the Himalayas, 1910–1962*. Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- Kayaoglu, Turan. “Westphalian Eurocentrism in International Relations Theory.” *International Studies Review* 12, no. 2 (2010): 193–217.

(研究代表者、研究分担者及び連携研究者には下線)

[雑誌論文](計9件)

1. Masao Imamura. 2018 "On the Mobility of Religious Communities: Migration and Translation of Protestant Christianity—seen from Southeast Asia" 『山形大学人文社会科学部研究年報』第15号, 201-214

2. Masao Imamura. 2018. "Evangelical Vernacularism: How Protestant Missions Have Delineated the Ethno-linguistic Boundaries in Upland Southeast Asia" Compilation of Papers presented at the Consortium for Southeast Asian Studies in Asia Conference 2017 (March 2018)

3. Masao Imamura. 2015 "Rethinking Frontier and Frontier Studies" Political Geography 45: 96-97.

4. Masao Imamura. 2016 "Slow Anthropology: Negotiating Difference with the Iu Mien by Hjørleifur Jonsson." Journal of Asian Studies. 75 (4): 1164 - 1165

5. Keita Kurabe and Masao Imamura. 2016. "Orthography and Vernacular Media: the Case of Jinghpaw-Kachin." IIAS The Newsletter (75), 36-37

6. 今村真央 2016 「少数民族と天然資源-ミャンマーでの連邦制をめぐる議論」、『連邦制の逆説?—効果的な統治制度か』松尾英哉(編)ナカニシヤ出版 267-272

7. 今村真央. 2016. 「東南アジア山地研究は地域研究として成り立つのか? [東南アジア大陸部山地民の歴史と文化. クリスチャン・ダニエルス編]」 『東南アジア研究』53(2) : 279-285

8. Masao Imamura. 2015. Review Article. "Being and Becoming Kachin: Histories Beyond the State in the Borderlands of Burma by Mandy Sadan." Southeast Asian Studies 4 (1). 199-206

9. Masao Imamura. 2015. "Imagining a remote homeland: Japanese quasi-academic ethnography of upland Southeast Asia." The Center for Southeast Asian Studies Newsletter 71: 14-16

[学会発表](計20件)

1. Masao Imamura. 2018. " Rethinking

Zomia as a frontier space" 京都大学(3月23日、京都大学東南アジア研究所)

2. 今村真央. 2018. 「雲南・カチン・アッサム回廊」(2月16日、京都大学東南アジア研究所)

3. Masao Imamura. 2018. " Spaces of Ethnicity " (1月20日、. 「ビルマ(ミャンマー)の「民族団結神話」を超えて」. Beyond the Myth of 'Solidarity of the National Races' in Burma (Myanmar).上智大学)

4. Masao Imamura. 2017. "After the Magic? Protestant Vernacularism among the Kachin " (12月16日、バンコク、チュラロンコーン大学、SEASIA2018学会)

5. Masao Imamura. 2017. " Kachin Evangelical Travel Agency "(オックスフォード大学、EuroSea2017学会)

6. Masao Imamura. 2017. "Traveling of Kachin Christians" in the panel titled "Travel in Zomia: Making Contrasts, Comparisons and Complementary Reflections" at the 9th EuroSEA Conference by the European Association for Southeast Asian Studies (Oxford University, Oxford, UK, 17 August)

7. 今村真央. 2017. 「宗教の近代化と翻訳:揺れ動くカチン・キリスト教」(7月15日、東南アジア大陸部宗教研究の新パラダイムの構築、山形大学)

8. 今村真央. 2017. 「シンポー族:仏教徒カチンという例外」(6月17日、共同研究会「雲南・カチン・アッサム」津田塾大学)

9. 今村真央. 2017. 「戦争と戦争の記憶:レジリエンスとトラウマ」(5月13日、東南アジア大陸部の被戦争社会の変容とレジリエンス京都大学)

10. Masao Imamura. 2017. "Religious Networking among Migrants: The Case of the Kachin People from Highland Myanmar," Joint Research Forum on Migration (University of San Carlos, Cebu: March 16)

11. 今村真央. 2017 「東南アジアのサンスクリット文化遺跡をめぐる政治」(山形大学小白川図書館、山形:2月17日)

12. 今村真央. 2016 「移動・越境・翻訳:宗教研究から見る東南アジア研究の過去10年」東南アジア学会第96回研究大会 550周年

記念シンポジウム(慶應義塾大学、東京：12月4日)

13. Masao Imamura. 2016. "The Rise of the Jinghpaw Vernacular" (with Dr. Keita Kurabe) 『少数民族の『多様なやりとり』にみる現在の『ゾミア』地域 異なる政治経済体制下での比較研究』共同研究会発表(山形：10月23日)

14. 今村真央. 2016. 「『スケール』という概念について：世界史、帝国、非国家主体」「地域概念の再検討」セッション 北東アジア学会大会(慶應大学、東京：2016年10月9日)

15. Masao Imamura. 2016. "Coping with Linguistic Diversity: Cosmopolitanism and Vernacularism in Southeast Asia" Public talk at Humanity Institute (Myitkyina, Myanmar: August 26)

16. Masao Imamura. 2016. "Politics of Kachin Orthography: Large versus Small Group Identification in Highland Myanmar" Language, Power and Identity in Asia: Creating and Crossing Language Boundaries (Leiden, The Netherlands: March 15)

17. 今村真央. 2016. 「戦時下の草の根ナショナリズム：ミャンマーのジンポー・カチン」東南アジア大陸部の被戦争社会の変容とレジリエンス研究会(京都大学3月8日)

18. Masao Imamura. 2016. "Rethinking the Hill-Plain Divide in Southeast Asia: Putting Geophysical and Cultural Landscapes to Good Use." Zomia Study Group(Kyoto University, 5 February 2016). Presented with Noboru Ishikawa.

19. Masao Imamura. 2016. "Protestant vernacularism among the Kachin of northern Myanmar," SEASIA (Kyoto, 13 December 2016)

20. Masao Imamura. 2015. "Vernacularism and Protestantism among the Kachin of northern Myanmar," Indigenous Christianity in the Asia-Pacific Region (Academia Sinica, 11 November 2015)

〔図書〕(計0件)

〔産業財産権〕

出願状況(計0件)

名称：

発明者：
権利者：
種類：
番号：
出願年月日：
国内外の別：

取得状況(計0件)

名称：
発明者：
権利者：
種類：
番号：
取得年月日：
国内外の別：

〔その他〕
ホームページ等

6. 研究組織
(1)研究代表者

今村 真央 (Imamura, Masao)
山形大学 人文社会学部・准教授
研究者番号 60748135

研究者番号：

(2)研究分担者 ()

研究者番号：

(3)連携研究者 ()

研究者番号：

(4)研究協力者 ()