



HOKKAIDO UNIVERSITY

Title	Ezo as relational territory : mapping and bordering Japan' s north [an abstract of entire text]
Author(s)	Boyle, Edward Kieran
Description	この博士論文全文の閲覧方法については、以下のサイトをご参照ください。 https://www.lib.hokudai.ac.jp/dissertations/copy-guides/
Degree Grantor	北海道大学
Degree Name	博士(法学)
Dissertation Number	甲第12972号
Issue Date	2018-03-22
Doc URL	https://hdl.handle.net/2115/69402
Type	doctoral thesis
File Information	Edward_Kieran_Boyle_summary.pdf



博士（法学） Boyle, Edward Kieran

学 位 論 文 題 名

Ezo as relational territory: mapping and bordering Japan's north

相対的な領土としての「蝦夷」：
日本北方領域の境界策定と地図作成に関する一考察

Summary

（日本語は以下）

This is a study into the political role of territory in a non-European context. The notion of territory has recently been the focus of a great deal of scholarship, encouraged by a concern with globalization that have worked to de-stabilize the linkage of territory with the modern, sovereign nation-state. However, much of this analysis has been historically myopic, accepting the claims made by the modern political map for a world of homogenous state spaces as indicative of actual political practice.

In order to understand how territory is constituted, this study examines how the amorphous Ezo region to Japan's north came to be recognized as Japanese territory by the latter half of the nineteenth century. It analyses the representation and incorporation of the lands associated with Ezo through the lenses provided by a pair of territorial practices, those of maps and borders. More broadly, the thesis will argue for the importance of examining territorial practices in order to understand territory relationally, both in the past and today.

This study is divided into three parts, each consisting of three chapters. Part 1 sets out the theoretical, conceptual and contextual background to the study, before offering a brief outline of the notion of relational territory that will be developed over its course. Chapter 1 reviews and analyses the recent attention paid to the notion of territory, and examines how such notions have come to be reduced to the modern European state. Recent attention to the concept of territory has overemphasized the importance of an

abstract notion of space as a precondition for the emergence of both the modern national state, and the bringing of the entire world within one European-derived political order. This is to misunderstand the relation between concepts of territory and their actual practice, which are never able to bring the material world into line with the concepts that legitimate them. This narrow temporal and spatial focus limits the utility of territory as a concept, which should rather be understood as a means of moulding social processes rather than being narrowly associated with a particular means of legitimation. The focus in this study will be on territorial practices themselves, and their ability to structure understandings about the world. These practices make possible the production of ascriptive statements about the world, which are able to be realized through a variety of political practices. It is through such practices that territory is able to be produced.

As the next two chapters will make clear, then actual operation of political practices was not determined by a specific concept of territory to which reference was made. Chapter 2 focuses on the notion of the map, moving away from recent studies that have tended to simplistically equate maps with power. Instead of an excessive concern with the finished object, here the focus is to examine the role of mapping as a process in the constitution of territory. It does this through a comparative examination of the mapping conducted by Tokugawa Japan and other early modern states undertaken in dialogue with recent theoretical contributions to the importance of mapping, in three particular registers. One is the concern of states with the mapping of land as a source of revenue, the second with the political mapping of their land, while the third concerns that of accurately mapping their place in the world. What will be stressed is that the actual practice of mapping was not dependent upon a particular understanding of territory, but rather the institutional context within which mapping by the state occurred. It was this which provide the background for the mapping of Ezo that occurred under the Tokugawa state, and enabled the representation of Ezo as Japan and its recognition as such.

Chapter 3 reconsiders the place of borders in the early modern state, by emphasizing the importance of a border as performance, rather than a material object. Drawing on the interdisciplinary insights of border studies, it argues for the role of borders as authoritative claims to spatial extent, ones which facilitate knowledge while tying together spaces represented on the state's map. It provides a comparative look at borders in Tokugawa Japan with those of other Asian states, examining how it was that administrative borders within these polities worked to define political space. Rather than an absolute division within space, it works as a means to manage and filter the movement of people and objects across the boundary, and thus to make sense of the movement occurring space. As is emphasized, the claims made for these boundaries

were not qualitatively different than those at the edge of the state, which were similarly able on occasion to find representation in natural or artificial features that were not *necessarily* indicative of absolute barriers to movement. Rather, the geographical limits of the state were partially constituted by the authorities established to manage them, who served as a membrane filtering the movement of goods and people, a filtering as often dependent upon the priorities of local administration as national. While it was possible to map these frontier spaces as part of the state, they were effectively constituted through the relation between local administrations and those from beyond the state's border, thus arguing for the importance of scale in considering the constitution of borders. Such scalar notions are crucial to a relational understanding of territory, which will be briefly set out at the end of this chapter.

Part 2 builds upon the theoretical and empirical background provided by the first part in order to dig into the constitution of Ezo as a political space in relation to Japan. In Chapter 4, it does this through first examining how Ezo came to be understood as a space bound off from the rest of Japan. This was partially constituted through a historical understanding of an unknown region populated by a barbarian peoples, which began to acquire definition at the outset of the Tokugawa era. However, the actual operation of a barrier between two areas, known as Matsumae and Ezo, was the outcome of local administrative requirements. These partially stemmed from the wider political structure within which the Matsumae were incorporated, but also reflected the specifics of their frontier situation. This border aided Matsumae claims to both authority and knowledge of its lands. As has long been argued, this border came to function as a strictly demarcated indication of status in the domain. However, while the ascription of status was not really based upon geography, the structure of rule necessitated the assertion of a geographic division. Although the border did not function as an effective means of separating or controlling the movement of population, this was nevertheless how it came to be represented on the map. In doing so, it served the same functional role as the borders that were examined in the previous chapter.

Chapter 5 highlights how the structuring effect of the border's authority also operated at the national scale, representing the Matsumae's administrative boundary as a national border filtering the movement of people and goods across it. Through the expansion of Japanese trade in the region, the space of Ezo came to be reconstituted as a series of places on the coast accessible from Matsumae, granting its geography official representation upon the maps of the state. This was in accordance with a number of other means through which the Matsumae sought to assert their place within the Tokugawa order. This meant that although the Matsumae stood outside the normative framework used for mapping the rest of Tokugawa Japan, as detailed in Chapter 2, its representation of the Ezo came to be assimilated onto the map of the state. However,

their land was only made commensurable with that of elsewhere in Japan following the return of Matsumae and Ezo to the family after 1821, when the extent of their lands had been reauthorized by its return to them from the state. This sanction allowed for the incorporation of this commensurably different space within the map of Japan.

Chapter 6 examines how the invocation of this border was incorporated into understandings about Japan's place in the world. Seen from Edo, and although ruled by the Matsumae, Ezo represented an exotic and distant land, about which little was understood. As such, however, over the course of the eighteenth century, the lands of the Ezo would come to be familiarized as demarcating the edges of Japan, providing the uncivilized other against which Japan was able to map itself. This was able to be achieved through emphasizing not only the Ezo's distance from Japan, but links with them, through a reinterpretation of China's tributary system to explain trade being conducted at Japan's frontiers. While this allowed for the incorporation of Ezo land on the map, however, it maintained a civilizational distance from the rest of Japan. This would only be overcome through the introduction of agriculture in Ezo, which was a project that only came to fruition after the Meiji Restoration. The understanding of Ezo that came to circulate within Japan came to be reflected back in Ezo itself, and ultimately how it was that the space of Ezo came to be delineated and incorporated into Japan in the nineteenth century as Hokkaido. The Part as a whole indicates how this Ezo territory was created in relation to that of the rest of Japan, which served to create the coordinates within which the Japanese idea of Ezo was understood.

While Part 2 relates the constitution of Ezo territory primarily with Japan, Part 3 seeks to account for how Ezo came to acquire territorial definition on the world's map. Chapter 7 traces out how the region of Ezo came to be represented and demarcated on European maps and within geographical texts of the period, and how these materials were subsequently reincorporated within Japan's own map of Ezo space. European accounts of the sixteenth and seventeenth century relied on a limited body of information about the region. Nevertheless, while Japanese were able to abstract Ezo space in order to position it solely in relation to its own national body, in Europe the extent location of Ezo was an issue bound up with other places, relations between which had to be adjusted and represented on the map. European speculation about Ezo's place in the world would find its way back to Japan, where it would come to unsettle the formerly fixed place of Ezo on the map. This destabilization occurred in the context of fears of the threat from Russia, whose presence came to be known around the same time. As a result, Ezo came to be reinterpreted within a wider geopolitical context within Japan, a context that unsettled the actual shape of the land represented upon the map.

Chapter 8 looks at the way this reincorporation encouraged a new attention to Ezo's extent, one which resulted in the representation of this space of Ezo, and a reinterpretation of the meaning ascribed to the borders in the region. This was done through a close attention to the geography of the region itself, which came to be the object of repeated investigation by both Japanese and foreign parties. Both groups were engaged in the same process of trying to make the space of Ezo commensurable with that of elsewhere on the world map, through an extensive process of geographical and cartographic exchange that served to bring the world to Ezo itself. This served to appear to make the segmented frontier strategy of the Tokugawa redundant and emphasize the connections between Nagasaki and Ezo, which came to be shown in the movement of people between them. The increasing concern of both the administration and wider intellectual circles with what was happening beyond Japan's borders is shown by the career of Kondō Jūzō, who joins together the central shogunal administration with the oversight of Nagasaki and new necessity of direct administering the frontiers of Ezo. In the work he wrote on the occasion of a Russian trade mission's appearance at Nagasaki, Kondo examined the existent literature on Ezo in order to seek to answer the question of where to position Ezo in the world.

Chapter 9 follows the process by which this re-produced Ezo space came to be reinserted back into the world map. This occurred through the state's ability to bring together both global and local information and make it commensurable upon the same representation. Takahashi Kageyasu's mapping project hinged upon his interpretation of Northern Ezo, about which he published a text justifying his choice of representation. Through bringing together the latest western and Qing maps with empirical investigation on the ground and a new understanding of events in China a century earlier, Takahashi was able to provide a new, more accurate representation of the island that had been known in Japan as Karafuto, and thus came to fix Ezo's extent upon a map of the world. Through his exchange with, above all, Siebold, it was this vision of Japan's extent that would shape the world's understandings of Ezo as it incorporated Japan a half-century later, and thus authorize Japan in its subsequent determination to decisively incorporate as much of this land as possible within its own empire in the latter half of the nineteenth century. That incorporation continued to rely, however, upon an understanding of Ezo as having been part of Japan, a land whose extent was only finally determined in the course of this investigation.

While it remains common within Japan to understand the work of Takahashi and Ino Tadataka as indicating a modern concern with the location of Japan in a global, abstract space, in fact their surveys served to provide Japan with a series of institutional claims to territory. However, this was only possible through bringing together a whole series of practices of bordering and mapping that together served to newly reconstitute this Ezo

space to Japan's north. This emphasizes the importance of maps and borders as territorial processes open to re-enactment in the constitution of territory at a variety of scales, stretching from the local to the global, and that the constitution of relational territory is not restricted in time, but the product of a territory's inevitable creation in its wider context.

In conclusion, this thesis confirms the value of bringing history back into the study of territory, specifically through asserting the value of a relational approach to understanding the concept. Much of the current literature on the topic asserts the importance of the emergence of 'abstract space', associated with a scaled vision able to incorporate the entire globe, as crucial for this process of transforming the world into a space of territorialized states. Here, the emphasis is on the notion of 'relational' rather than absolute territory, arguing for the territory to be understood as emerging in relation to other places, rather than constituted as a property of space itself. As such, offers a crucial contribution to understanding the notion of territory in the present, and provides context for the contemporary focus on the manner in which notions of territory are transforming.

The way into the concept of territory adopted by this thesis is through the territorial practices of maps and borders. That is, they are crucial practices to territories emergence that function at both the epistemological and ontological level. They are also both practices that seek to facilitate an understanding of, not space, but of actions occurring within such spaces. Such actions come to be reinterpreted through the grids provided by these twin practices of borders and maps. These are central to the emergence of territory, for they serve as a series of ascriptive claims made about the world. With the recognition of such claims, both maps and borders serve as a framework within which knowledge is understood, and as a series of assertions about the world. It is the mutual intelligibility of such practices that enables the possibility of territories coming to be related to one another. The repetition and representation of such practices is what writes this territory back into the space of the world. The institution of this territory relationally is what comes to define the 'territorialization' of the globe.

This thesis also makes a valuable contribution to the existing literature on maps and borders by reinterpreting them through a processual lens. Rather than interpreting either institution as a fixed outcome, the emphasis is on them as being in a constant state of becoming. This allows for the contextualization of their reception, rather than merely their production, and thus offers a significant advance on histories of both the exploration and administration of the region.

学位論文内容の要約

本研究は、非西欧的文脈において領土というものがもつ政治的役割を考察するものである。グローバリゼーションが、近代主権国家と領土の関係性を不安定化させているという事態を受け、近年領土という概念に対し学問的関心が高まっている。しかしながら、現実の政治的実践に示されるように、同質な国家空間から成る世界に対する近代の政治的地図によってなされる主張を認めるならば、これらの分析の多くは歴史的に近視眼的であるといえる。領土というものがどのように形作られるかということを理解するために、この研究は、日本の北限として、形をなさない蝦夷地がどのようにして19世紀の後半までに日本の領土と見なされるようになったのかを考察する。そして、地図と境界という二つの領土的な実践によって、もたらされた視点を通して、蝦夷という名と結びついた土地の表象とその併合を考察する。さらに、本論文では、過去と現在の両方において領土というものを理解するためには、領土的な実践を調べることが重要であることを示したい。

本論文は、各々3章で構成される3つの部に分かれている。第1部では、この研究の理論的、概念的、文脈的背景を提示し、同時に、その概念上の貢献も概略を示す。第1章では、近年注目されている領土の概念を再評価し、分析する。そして、その概念がいかにして、近代西欧国家と結びつけられてきた領土という概念へと還元されたのか調べる。このように時間的にも、空間的にも狭く焦点を絞ってしまうことは、社会の組織化・成形化の手段として理解されるべき一つの概念としての領土という概念の有用性を狭めてしまう。その効能は、現実における領土の概念と一致する必要はない。領土という概念を展開することは、世界における様々な産物の帰属性をどのように理解するかとも深く関わっている。ゆえに、本論文で検討されている地図や境界に象徴されるように、国家というのは

政治的実践によって領土というのを正当化し実現化するのである。第2章では、これらの領土的な実践の一つである地図を取り上げる。本論では、地図とパワーを過度に同一視する傾向から距離をおき、地図の概念について考察する。ここでは、個々の地図がより大きな趨勢を象徴するものという考え方ではなく、地図策定というプロセスに焦点を当てている。このプロセスの妥当性と有用性は、近年における地図策定の重要性を示す理論的貢献を取り入れながら、徳川時代の日本やその他近世国家が行った地図策定の比較研究を通じて説明をしている。この理論的枠組みと比較研究により、徳川時代における蝦夷地の地図策定の背景を説明し、このプロセスが蝦夷地を日本の領土として取り入れるために決定的であった点を示す。第3章では、物理的な対象としてではなく、境界という実践の重要性に焦点を当て、近代における境界の意味を問う。学際的学問領域である境界研究に依拠して、境界とは空間的広がりに対する権力的主張であるという点を強調したい。加えて、徳川自体における境界の比較研究を提供している。さらに、理論的・概念的考察によって、過去と現在において政治における領土の重要性を理解する手段として、相関的な領土の概念を浮き彫りにする。

第2部は、日本との関連における政治空間としての蝦夷地の成り立ちを探るために、第1部で展開した理論的・実証的背景をさらに発展させている。第4章では、蝦夷地が日本と分離された状態で理解されていたことを検討する。この章では、松前と蝦夷地の境界が、当時の行政区分の結果であった重要性に注目している。この境界は、蝦夷地に関する権利と知識を松前藩に帰属させる点では重要であった。第5章では、国家レベルにおける境界を統治する権力の実効性に焦点を当て、松前藩の行政区分の境界を、蝦夷地を行き来する人々や物品の動きを規制する辺境として捉えている。こういった動きにより、蝦夷地は江戸時代において日本の領土として公式な地図にも描かれるようになる。第6章では、この境界が世界における日本の地位の理解にどのように貢献したかと、そしてそれが蝦夷地に対し、どのように反映されたかという点を検討している。この過程は究極的には、蝦夷地がどのようにして19世紀に北海道として日本に組み入れられることになったかを描き出している。

第2部においては蝦夷地がどのように日本の領土として組み入れられたかという点に焦点を当てたが、第3部では、蝦夷地がどのように世界地図にて表現されたかということを検討している。第7章では、欧州の地図において蝦夷地がどのように表現され作成されたというのを当時の地理的文脈に沿って説明し、またそれがどのように日本の蝦夷地理解に影響を及ぼしたかを分析している。第8章では、蝦夷地の理解の関連性に焦点を当て、ヨーロッパでの蝦夷地に関する知識がどのように蝦夷地に跳ね返ってきたかを分析している。近藤重蔵が示したように、蝦夷地を取り巻くネットワークや日本における政治的実践においてこのネットワークがどのような影響を及ぼしたかという点を検討している。第9章では、高橋影保の地図作成に焦点を当て、蝦夷地という空間がどのように世界地図に再導入されているかという過程を分析している。この第3部においては、地図作成や境界が領土を策定する過程において極めて重要であることを浮き彫りにし、様々なスケールにおいて領土というのがどのように組み入れられまた再導入されるかという点を検討した。これは、領土が政治的重要性を帯びる過程においては、領土の相対的な理解が必要であるということを示している。

結論では、領土という概念を考察するためには歴史的視点を持つことを思い出す必要があると主張したい。特に、概念を理解することへの相関的アプローチの価値を強く主張する。このテーマに関しては現在の文献の多くが、「抽象空間」の出現の重要性を説いている。抽象空間は、全地球を包含することのできるビジョンと結びついたものであり、世界を領域国家の空間へと変えるという過程によって決定的に重要なものである。ここにおいて、領土というのは絶対的なものではなく、むしろ「相関的」な概念であると強調したい。同様に、現在において領土という概念を理解する際に多大な貢献をするものである。領土の概念が移り変わるその有様に焦点を当てる際に、その文脈を与えるものである。

本論は、領土という概念を理解するにあたって、地図作成や境界という領土をめぐる実践という文脈からアプローチしている。なぜならば、領土の出現を促す決定的な実践であり、これは認識論的・

存在論的レベルでも機能している。このような実践は、空間自体を理解するのではなく、特定の空間における行動を理解するために極めて重要である。このような行動は、境界と地図作成という実践において再解釈される。また、このような実践は領土の出現にも重要な要素である。このような主張を認識することにより、地図や境界が世界を理解する知識としても役立つ枠組みである。このような実践の繰り返しと象徴が、まさに領土を世界の空間として再導入させるのである。世界における「領土化」というのは領土の相関性によって定義される。

本論文では、地図作成や境界に関する文献に依拠しながらも、蝦夷地という事例を考える上で再解釈している。地図作成や境界は、決して固定されたものではなく常に変化するものであるという点を強調している。この点を強調することによって、地図作成や境界が生み出す産物ではなく、このような実践がどのように受け入れられたかということに焦点を当てることができ、この地域の策定や統治に関する歴史の理解が進むことを期待する。