様　式　Ｃ－１９、Ｆ－１９、Ｚ－１９　（共通）

科学研究費助成事業　　研究成果報告書

平成　２７　年　　６　月　　４　日現在

機関番号：　１７１０２
研究種目：　若手研究(B)
研究期間：　2013～2014
課題番号：　２５８７０４９５

研究課題名（和文）北東アジアにおけるアメリカン・ヘゲモニーの発展：占領と同盟の国際史

研究課題名（英文）The Rise of American Hegemony in Northeast Asia: An International History of Military Occupations and Alliances

研究代表者

オーガスティン　マシュー（Augustine, Matthew）

九州大学・比較社会文化研究科（研究院）・准教授

研究者番号：４０５９８７１０

交付決定額（研究期間全体）：（直接経費）　　1,000,000円

研究成果の概要（和文）：本研究では第二次世界大戦後、北東アジアにおける米国の占領と同盟の国際史、とりわけアメリカン・ヘゲモニー(覇権主義)と称する軍事的勢力を背景とした国際秩序の台頭と発展を探求した。戦後日本や南朝鮮に米占領軍が配置された1945年からアメリカ主導の軍事同盟ネットワークが成立した1954年頃までの期間中、日本の帝国がどのような過程を経てアメリカによるヘゲモニー体制へと転換したのかという問題を解明することができた。

研究成果の概要（英文）：The purpose of this research project was to examine the rise of American hegemony in Northeast Asia during the early phase of the Cold War, focusing on the regional history of US military occupations and alliances. Beginning with the deployment of postwar occupation forces in 1945 to the consolidation of the US-led security alliance network in 1954, I clarified the process by which American hegemony replaced the Japanese empire in the region.

研究分野：　人文学

キーワード：　近現代史　東アジア史　アメリカン・パワー　占領　軍事同盟

１．研究開始当初の背景

Historians have examined separately the US military occupations of postwar Japan, South Korea, and Okinawa, but have not attempted an integrated, regional history of the American interlude in Northeast Asia. For example, in his Pulitzer Prize-winning study of the postwar occupation of Japan, John Dower writes that after 1945 the once aggressively imperial Japan withdrew from the world into “an almost sensual embrace with its American conquerors.” As insightful as this binational metaphor may be, it cannot be applied to either occupied Korea or Okinawa, where direct US military rule led to resistance, not an embrace. Diplomatic historians and political scientists have been more adept at placing occupied Japan in the context of America’s overall East Asian policy. In what he calls Japan’s “empire in eclipse,” John Welfield demonstrates how the Allied occupation was replaced by an American-led regional security alliance system. However, his study focuses on the interaction between Japan’s foreign policy and domestic politics, and pays scarce attention to other American alliances in the region. I began my research project to fill these historiographical gaps.

２．研究の目的

(1) Seven decades after the end of the Pacific War, the presence of approximately 78,000 American troops in Japan and South Korea continues to symbolize and project US power in Northeast Asia today. These troops are stationed in thirty-eight US military bases, where they are granted legal immunity from local jurisdiction, based on status of forces agreement (SOFA)s with the host nations. This enduring American military presence in the region is perhaps the most visible, combined legacy of the postwar occupations and the bilateral military alliances formed with these two countries. American diplomats negotiated virtually unlimited freedom for the US military to move its servicemen and women, munitions, and other materials across the borders of nations that hosted American bases, even after the occupations formally ended. By setting up permanent military bases in Japan, South Korea, and Okinawa, the US military continues to occupy foreign territory, projecting its power throughout the region and beyond. Beginning with the deployment of occupation forces in 1945 to the consolidation of the US-led regional security alliance network in 1954, my research examined the rise of American hegemony in Northeast Asia during this early phase of the Cold War.

(2) An international history of how the emergence of an American-led network of security alliances replaced the Japanese empire in the aftermath of World War II is a story that requires equal attention to the US occupations of post-imperial Japan and post-colonial Korea. However, the conspicuous absence of any scholarship explicitly incorporating the interlinked histories of occupied Japan and Korea testifies to the continuing dominance of nation-centered historiographies. Transcending this historiographical divide and integrating the two counties into a regional and international history of Northeast Asia can make an important contribution to this field.

３．研究の方法

(1) Recent methodological approaches to international history frame this article’s study on the rise of American hegemony in postwar Northeast Asia. Historian Michael Cullen Green’s work on race in the making of what he calls an “American military empire” after World War II is one model of this kind of work. Green weaves conventional narratives of political and social history with an examination of African American engagement with military service in occupied Japan, war-torn South Korea, and an emerging empire of bases anchored throughout the Asia-Pacific region. In addition, Turan Kayaoglu’s comparative study of extraterritoriality in Japan, China and the Ottoman Empire serves as another model for this article. Kayaoglu’s comparative study employs not only a spatial but also a temporal framework, comparing nineteenth-century British extraterritoriality with American adaptations of extra-territoriality after World War II. Combining the comparative and international approaches of these studies, this article will examine the process by which American hegemony was

established in Northeast Asia, focusing on the regional history of US military occupations and alliances.

(2) The execution of this regional history project required multi-archival research and the use of diverse sources, including occupation-era records, parliamentary debates, diplomatic papers, popular press accounts, and official correspondences. During the first year, I conducted archival research on occupation policies of the United States towards Japan, Korea, and Okinawa, making a two-month research trip to the US in the summer of 2013. Specifically, I immersed myself in the most pertinent records deposited with the National Archives and Records Service (NARA) in College Park, Maryland, the Library of Congress in Washington, DC, Stanford University's Hoover Institution, Princeton University's Mudd Manuscript Library, and Columbia University's Oral History Archives. In the second year, I conducted archival research on Japanese and Korean security relations with the US, focusing on official records of diplomatic negotiations that led to the signing of military treaties and related agreements. During a ten-day research trip to Tokyo in September 2014, I gathered relevant documents at the Japanese Foreign Ministry's Diplomatic Archives and the National Diet Library. The sources I consulted in Seoul during a one-week research trip later that month came from the ROK Foreign Ministry's Diplomatic Archives and the National Assembly Library. I also made use of the Okinawa Prefectural Archives, where US military records pertaining to the military bases during and after the occupation period are located.

４．研究成果

(1) Based on my archival sources, I analyzed the process by which American hegemony was established in Northeast Asia, beginning with outbreak of the Pacific War to the entrenchment of US military presence in the wake of the Korean War. Over the course of this tumultuous decade, US armed forces arrived in the region as enemy combatants, occupation personnel, military advisors, and security forces, while the conflict shifted from defeating imperial Japan to containing communism. Despite intermittent opposition at home and abroad, US military leadership consistently sought autonomous and permanent bases of operation in the region, which were finally guaranteed through the establishment of security treaties in the early 1950s. The combination of US military strength and authority, the tradition of American exceptionalism, and the Cold War containment policy provided a powerful justification for this presence in the region and beyond. The military bases and personnel deployed in Northeast Asia became linked to a vast, global network of US military presence that remains intact today.

(2) Historians and social scientists have begun to focus on this regional and global US military presence, some labeling it an empire of bases; a new type of informal empire that has replaced colonial possessions with military bases. My work contributes to this ongoing debate by comparing colonial empires with military occupations, examining the history of American occupations, and by measuring the extent of US military authority in allied nations that host American bases. I contend that the US government traded territorial annexation with the retention of military bases in formerly occupied territory, following historical precedents set in Cuba and the Philippines, thus enabling the US military to extend its coercive authority. The expansion of military bases in Northeast Asia and elsewhere was accompanied by a legal expansion in the form of status of forces agreement (SOFA)s, which provided extraterritorial immunity for American military personnel. This practice of extending the legal reach of the US military into allied territory was not only maintained throughout the Cold War period, but has also been adapted to the ongoing "war on terror." In other words, from World War II to the present, US governments have pursued a policy of expanding military bases and extraterritorial jurisdiction, a powerful package that has helped maintain American hegemony.

５．主な発表論文等
（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１件）

Matthew R. Augustine, “The Rise of American Hegemony in Northeast Asia: An International History of Military Occupations and Alliances, 1945-1954” 地球社会統合科学研究、査読有、２２巻１号、2015、印刷中

６．研究組織
(1)研究代表者
オーガスティン　マシュー（AUGUSTINE, Matthew）
九州大学・比較社会文化研究院・准教授
研究者番号：４０５９８７１０