```
氏
         名
                   Glisic Jelena
学 位 の 種 類
                   博士(国際日本研究)
学位記番号
                   博甲
                        第 8005
学位授与年月日
                   平成 29年 3月
                               24 日
学位授与の要件
                   学位規則第4条第1項該当
審査研究科
                   人文社会科学研究科
 学位論文題目
                  Japanese-Yugoslav Diplomatic Relations in the
                  Cold War, 1952-1980
                  (冷戦期における日本・ユーゴスラビアの外交関係、
                    1952-1980)
主
     杳
        筑波大学
              教
                 授
                    博士 (国際政治経済学)
                                    潘
                                       亮
副
                 授
                                    杳
        筑波大学
              教
                    博士(法学)
副
     査
        筑波大学
              准教授
                    博士(国際政治経済学)
                                    タック川崎レスリー
副
        筑波大学
                    博士(国際政治経済学)
     杳
              准教授
                                    明石
                                        純一
副
     査
        筑波大学
              准教授
                    博士 (国際政治経済学)
                                    大友
                                        貴史
```

論文の要旨

This dissertation is a study of the diplomatic relations between Japan and Yugoslavia within the context of the Cold War. It argues that despite the differences in their socio-political-economic system, they have shown the will to work on the development of their relations so as to achieve their respective national goals. The center of Japanese political and trade relations has always been the United States and the Western world. However, throughout the Cold War Japan was attempting to diversify its diplomatic relations.

Some of those communist countries were Eastern European communist countries. From the Japanese side, all Eastern European communist countries were treated as part of one single bloc since they shared similar socio-political-economic systems. In this regard, Yugoslavia was also considered as one of the Eastern European communist countries. However, despite geographical proximity and common ideology, there were in fact major differences between Eastern European communist countries and Yugoslavia. Although it was a communist country belonging geographically to the Eastern Europe, Yugoslavia, different from the satellites, distanced itself from the Soviet Union. Moreover, Yugoslavia developed relatively good relations with the United States and other major nations in the Western bloc. It cooperated with both superpowers, although sometimes it had also strained relations with them.

Due to its close relations and connections with both the Eastern and Western blocs, Yugoslavia was a valuable source of information about interactions between the two blocs for Japanese officials. Therefore, although it was a communist country, Yugoslavia was a useful communist country to Japan under the Cold War.

Yugoslavia became the first Communist country to establish diplomatic relations with Japan after World War II in 1952 – four years before the Soviet Union and Eastern European countries did so. Over years Belgrade and Tokyo exchanged numerous high-level visits, among which President Josip Broz Tito's visit to Japan in April 1968 was the most important diplomatic event in their bilateral relations. President Tito was the very first Communist leader from Eastern Europe ever visited Japan. By the time of Tito's arrival in Tokyo in April 1968, the Yugoslav president was already well-known to the world owing to his frequent international tours and numerous meetings with world leaders. As one of the founding fathers of Non-Allied Movement (NAM) and influential figure in East-West relations, Tito has visited many countries across the iron curtain, including the United States and the Soviet Union. He was eager to boost his political power within the NAM as well as on global level. On the other hand, Japan has achieved envious economic growth and has become not only an influential actor in the East Asian region but also a "rising sun" in world politics.

Based upon the case studies conducted at each chapter, the author has brought us to the following conclusion. During the Cold War, Yugoslavia and Japan had to fight for their independence in foreign policymaking and hence worked very hard to balance their position in the bipolar system. As both Japan and Yugoslavia were very much influenced by the superpowers, their relations with the superpowers represented the biggest part in their diplomacies. The case of Japanese-Yugoslav relations also shows that the blocs were not monolithic and unified in their fight against each other, and moreover, that the Cold War was not the war of ideologies, but in fact, a war where ideological differences were often eclipsed by national interests. Economically, Yugoslavia needed Japan's technology and capital in its efforts to modernize domestic economy while Japan needed to diversify her export markets. In addition, raw materials produced by the Yugoslav market was also important to Japan's economic development. Politically, Yugoslavia needed Japan, an industrial nation and a member of the Western bloc, to support its endeavor to strengthen position in NAM. It also attempted to use its relations with Japan to diversify her allies and thereby obtain more bargaining chips visà-vis the two superpowers. By the same token, Japan needed Yugoslavia, a major regional power in the Third Word, to endorse its bid for a more important role in global and regional politics. Japan and Yugoslavia chose to develop their bilateral relations not because of common ideology or greater trade benefit. It was their broader foreign policy goals that had given rise to the motivation for cooperation.

All in all, throughout the dissertation the author argued that the pursuit of national goals was a prime motivation for Japan and Yugoslavia to ignore ideological differences between them. In other words, this study demonstrated that even during the Cold War days, ideological differences were not a decisive factor in determining the outcome of bilateral relations between countries from the Eastern and Western blocs respectively.

1 批評

This dissertation is a very pioneering study focusing on Japan's relations with former Yugoslavia – a "black horse" in the East bloc – during the Cold War days. Most previous studies about Japanese foreign relations under the Cold War placed strong emphasis on relationship with "big powers" and "neighboring states." East Europe, on the other side, was generally considered as a "minor" region with less impact on Japan's national interests. In such context, it seems very unlikely that the Japanese government at the time would have the motivation to take the risk by reaching out to those Soviet "satellites" on the other side of the iron curtain. The author of this dissertation, however, has demonstrated, in a rather persuasive manner, that Japan, despite the fact that her national interests were guaranteed by the alliance with the U.S., did have sophisticated motivations to build up a semi-friendship with Yugoslavia. And such attempt was very much welcomed by Yugoslavia which also had enough reason to cooperate with a major ally of the West in Asia. As an effort to support those arguments, the author has made the best use of her language skill by conducting several rounds of thorough investigations in both Japanese and Serbian Archives. Volumes of U.S. diplomatic documents were also carefully examined. Many of those sources were never used so far in academic works.

On the other side, the focal point of the entire dissertation is somehow too narrowly-defined. More argument could have been made if the author brought Japanese relationship with other smaller Communist nations into the picture. Likewise, while concentrating on the analysis of detailed cases like Tito's visit to Japan, the author seemed to miss some "bigger" research questions such as the theoretical implications of the way the two nations used their bilateral relations as a method to balance their relations with bigger powers in the two blocs respectively. Also, while examining the substance of policies adopted by Prime Minister Sato and President Tito, the author did not pay enough attention to the role of personal characters in the formation of those policies. Hopefully, the author could take those points into consideration when updating the draft for future publication.

2 最終試験

In January 19, 2017, the Degree Dissertation Screening Committee of the Graduate School of Humanities and Social Sciences, with the participation of all Committee Members, asked the author to explain the content of this dissertation while responding to questions and comments made by the Members. As a result of further deliberation, the Screening Committee Members unanimously agreed that the dissertation has passed the exam.

3 結論

Given the result of the above deliberation and final exam, it is agreed that the author is entitled to receive the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in International and Advanced Japanese Studies.