

氏名（本籍）	しげさわ あつこ 繁沢 敦子（広島県）
学位の種類	博士（学術）
学位記番号	乙第 13 号
学位授与年月日	2019 年 9 月 25 日
学位授与の要件	広島市立大学大学院学則第 36 条第 3 項及び広島市立大学学位規程第 3 条第 3 項の規定による
学位論文題目	Demystifying the Atomic Bomb: The U.S. Strategic Bombing Survey Goes to Hiroshima and Nagasaki
論文審査委員	主査 教授 ジェイコブズ, ロバート 委員 教授 湯浅 正恵 委員 准教授 倉科 一希 委員 名誉教授 ハーケン, グレグ (カリフォルニア大学)

論文内容の要旨

The defense of Atsuko Shigesawa's dissertation was held on August 20, 2019 at the Satellite Campus of HCU. Professor Emeritus Gregg Herken of the University of California joined the defense via computer from California.

Ms. Shigesawa presented her thesis to the committee. Her topic is the work of the United States Strategic Bombing Survey (USSBS) in Japan, and specifically its work in Hiroshima and Nagasaki and its detailed assessment of the impact of the two nuclear attacks conducted on those cities at the end of World War Two. The official *Summary Report* of the USSBS concluded that Japan would have surrendered to the United States by November 1945 even if no nuclear attacks had been conducted, and no invasion planned or conducted. This conclusion, that the two nuclear attacks on Hiroshima and Nagasaki did not compel the Japanese surrender has been called the “early surrender” thesis, or the “counterfactual” conclusion by historians and other scholars.

There has been extensive scholarly debate about why the *Summary Report* arrived at the counterfactual thesis. At the time it was presented as having been based on postwar interviews by the USSBS with Japanese wartime leaders. In 1995, several scholars published works asserting that Paul Nitze, the Director and Vice Chair of the USSBS, came to Japan with the conclusion already formulated in his mind, and that he compelled the Survey personnel to insert this conclusion into the *Summary Report*. Ms. Shigesawa's thesis is that rather than being inserted directly and *counterfactually*

into the summary, the counterfactual conclusion can be seen emerging in the detailed work of the various divisions of the USSBS over the period of their operation in Japan. Her work was based on extensive archival research conducted in the National Archives of the United States and the Library of Congress.

The dissertation explores the organization, operation and publications of the five divisions that comprised the inquiry in Hiroshima and Nagasaki: the Physical Damage Division (PDD), the Urban Areas Division (UAD), the Civilian Defense Division (CDD), the Medical Division, and the Moral Division. It immerses itself in the production of the eight reports produced by these five divisions. She explores the source material of each report, the early drafts, and tracks the revisions of the eight reports. Specifically, in the work of the PDD, the CDD and the Morale divisions, she tracks the emergence and development of the counterfactual conclusion over the period of operation of the USSBS in Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

She also analyzes the conflict between the “contested terrain” of two narratives about the nuclear attacks: the counterfactual narrative of the USSBS, and the narrative of the nuclear weapons as revolutionary and decisive weapons being championed most directly by the leadership of the Manhattan Engineering District (MED) or Manhattan Project. Ms. Shigesawa describes how the counterfactual narrative emerged as the official narrative in the immediate postwar world, but that the narrative of nuclear weapons as revolutionary weapons that were decisive in compelling a Japanese surrender soon overwhelmed and supplanted the reports of the USSBS.

論文審査の結果の要旨

Date of Defense: August 20, 2019

The committee was very impressed by the work of Ms. Shigesawa. The HCU members were specifically impressed at the depth and breadth of her revisions based on discussion and suggestions by the committee during the preliminary defense held in 2018. Prof. Herken remarked that he was deeply impressed at the scale of archival research in the dissertation. He commented that Ms. Shigesawa’s work was the first work that he had seen that had examined the source material that the USSBS divisions were working with, and not just the conclusions reached in the various finalized and published reports, especially the *Summary Report*.

The committee voted unanimously to accept the dissertation without the need for any revisions to the final version.