



# THE POLITICS OF ANTI-WESTERNISM IN ASIA

VISIONS OF WORLD ORDER IN PAN-ISLAMIC AND PAN-ASIAN THOUGHT

CEMIL AYDIN





# THE POLITICS OF ANTI-WESTERNISM IN ASIA

VISIONS OF WORLD ORDER IN PAN-ISLAMIC AND PAN-ASIAN THOUGHT

CEMIL AYDIN



# THE POLITICS OF ANTI-WESTERNISM IN ASIA

COLUMBIA STUDIES IN INTERNATIONAL AND GLOBAL HISTORY  

---

MATTHEW CONNELLY AND ADAM MCKEOWN, SERIES EDITORS

Columbia Studies in International and Global History Matthew Connelly and Adam McKeown, Series Editors

The idea of “globalization” has become a commonplace, but we lack good histories that can explain the transnational and global processes that have shaped the contemporary world. Columbia Studies in International and Global History will encourage serious scholarship on international and global history with an eye to explaining the origins of the contemporary era. Grounded in empirical research, the titles in the series will also transcend the usual area boundaries and will address questions of how history can help us understand contemporary problems, including poverty, inequality, power, political violence, and accountability beyond the nation-state.

Cemil Aydin, *The Politics of Anti-Westernism in Asia: Visions of World Order in Pan-Islamic and Pan-Asian Thought*

Adam M. McKeown, *Melancholy Order: Asian Migration and the Globalization of Borders*

Patrick Manning, *The African Diaspora: A History Through Culture*

James Rodger Fleming, *Fixing the Sky: The Checkered History of Weather and Climate Control*

Steven Bryan, *The Gold Standard at the Turn of the Twentieth Century: Rising Powers, Global Money, and the Age of Empire*

Heonik Kwon, *The Other Cold War*

CEMIL AYDIN

THE POLITICS OF ANTI-  
WESTERNISM IN ASIA

---

---

Visions of World Order in Pan-Islamic and Pan-  
Asian Thought

---

---



Columbia University press  
New York

Columbia University Press  
Publishers Since 1893  
New York Chichester, West Sussex  
[cup.columbia.edu](http://cup.columbia.edu)

Copyright © 2007 Columbia University Press  
All rights reserved  
E-ISBN 978-0-231-51068-4

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data  
Aydin, Cemil.

The politics of anti-Westernism in Asia : visions of world order in pan-Islamic and pan-Asian thought / Cemil Aydin.

p. cm. —(Columbia studies in international and global history)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-231-13778-2 (cloth : alk. paper)

1. Panislamism. 2. Asia—Politics and government. 3. International cooperation.

I. Title. II. Series.

DS35.7.A95 2007

303.48'2176701821—dc22

2007001759

A Columbia University Press E-book.

CUP would be pleased to hear about your reading experience with this e-book at [cup-ebook@columbia.edu](mailto:cup-ebook@columbia.edu).

# CONTENTS

## *Acknowledgments*

### 1. INTRODUCTION

### 2. THE UNIVERSAL WEST: EUROPE BEYOND ITS CHRISTIAN AND WHITE RACE IDENTITY (1840–1882)

The Great Rupture: Ottoman Imagination of a European Model

Ottoman Westernism and the European International Society

A Non-Christian Europe?

The West in Early Japanese Reformist Thought

The Modern Genesis of Pan-Islamic and Pan-Asian Ideas

Conclusion

### 3. THE TWO FACES OF THE WEST: IMPERIALISM VERSUS ENLIGHTENMENT (1882–1905)

The Muslim World as an Inferior Semitic Race: Ernest Renan and His Muslim Critics

Yellow Versus White Peril? Pan-Asian Critiques and Conceptions of World Order

Crescent Versus Cross? Pan-Islamic Reflections on the “Clash of Civilizations” Thesis

Conclusion

### 4. THE GLOBAL MOMENT OF THE RUSSO-JAPANESE WAR: THE AWAKENING OF THE EAST/EQUALITY WITH THE WEST 1905–1912)

An Alternative to the West? Asian Observations on the Japanese Model

Defining an Anti-Western Internationalism: Pan-Islamic and Pan-Asian Visions of Solidarity

Japanese Pan-Asianism After the Russo-Japanese War

Conclusion

5. THE IMPACT OF WWI ON PAN-ISLAMIC AND PAN-ASIANIST VISIONS OF WORLD ORDER

Pan-Islamism and the Ottoman State

The Realist Pan-Islamism of Celal Nuri and İsmail Naci Pelister

Pan-Islamic Mobilization during WWI

The Transformation of Pan-Asianism During WWI: Ôkawa Shûmei, Indian Nationalists, and Asiaphile European Romantics

Asia as a Site of National Liberation

Asia as the Hope of Humanity

Conclusion

6. THE TRIUMPH OF NATIONALISM? THE EBBING OF PAN-ISLAMIC AND PAN-ASIAN VISIONS OF WORLD ORDER DURING THE 1920S

The Wilsonian Moment and Pan-Islamism

The Wilsonian Moment and Pan-Asianism

Pan-Islamic and Pan-Asianist Perceptions of Socialist Internationalism

“Clash of Civilizations” in the Age of Nationalism

The Weakness of Pan-Islamic and Pan-Asianist Political Projects During the 1920s

Conclusion

7. THE REVIVAL OF A PAN-ASIANIST VISION OF WORLD ORDER IN JAPAN (1931–1945)

Explaining Japan’s Official “Return to Asia”

Withdrawal from the League of Nations as a Turning Point

Asianist Journals and Organizations

Asianist Ideology of the 1930s

Wartime Asian Internationalism and Its Postwar Legacy

Conclusion



### 3. CONCLUSION

*Notes*

*Bibliography*

*Index*

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

THIS BOOK GREW out of my Ph.D. dissertation on Japanese pan-Asianism at the history department of Harvard University and my master's thesis on nineteenth-century Ottoman intellectual history at Istanbul University. A generous postdoctoral fellowship from the Harvard Academy for International and Area Studies allowed me to complete the research for this book by conducting further studies on pan-Islamism.

I owe a deep debt of gratitude to three outstanding dissertation advisers, professors Cemal Kafadar, Andrew Gordon, and Akira Iriye, who not only guided my research but also became role models as public intellectuals. Their intellectual vision in the fields of comparative and global history made working with them as a student, teaching assistant, and later colleague a formative experience. I should especially note the unfailing support and friendship of Cemal Kafadar, who encouraged me as his graduate student to get a break from the libraries by watching a soccer game with him once a week.

I would like to thank the adviser of my master's thesis, Professor Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu, especially for inspiring my comparative research on Ottoman and Japanese histories. Even with his very busy schedule as the secretary general of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, Professor İhsanoğlu took the time to read and comment on portions of my research while sharing his insights about the contemporary relevance of the historical theme of my book.

During my undergraduate education at Boğaziçi University, I was fortunate to learn from a group of dedicated and interesting teachers. I am especially indebted to Faruk Birtek's inspiring seminars on questions of modernity and social theory. Throughout my undergraduate education, I also benefited from the academic program and lectures at the Bilim ve Sanat Vakfı of Istanbul.

During my studies at Harvard, I was blessed by the ideas and encouragement of many scholars, as well as by their insightful conversation. Mikhael Adolphson, Herbert Bix, Harold Bolitho, Sugata Bose, Daniel Botsman, Albert Craig, John Dower, Roger Owen, and Genzo Yamamoto contributed to this work at various stages. Selçuk Esenbel of Boğaziçi University not only wrote the first scholarly articles on the interactions between pan-Islamic and pan-Asian movements but also advised me during my graduate research. Many friends made life in Cambridge, Massachusetts, intellectually stimulating and interesting and contributed to the content of the book. I would like to mention by name here Danielle Widmann Abraham, Rahim Acar, Mustafa Aksakal, Sahar Bazzaz, Kim Beng Phar, Evan Dawley, Mark Farha, Rusty Gates, Akbar Hyder, Davesh Kapur, Ilham Makdisi, Erez Manela, Eiko Maruko, Tosh Minohara, Ghada Osman, Mike Reynolds, Dominic Sachsenmaier, Chiho Sawada,

Nilufer Shaikh, Cengiz Şişman, Himmet Taşkömür, Jun Uchida, Hikmet Yaman, and Hüseyin Yılmaz. I also want to thank James Clem and Beth Baiter at the Harvard Academy, Ruiko Connor at the Reischauer Institute, and Clare Putnam at the Weatherhead Center for their administrative support.

In Japan, while based at the University of Tokyo as a visiting student, I benefited from the support and advice of Merthan Dündar, Hiraishi Naoaki, Karita Toru, Mitani Hiroshi, Naoki Sakai, Ôtsuka Takehiro, Sakai Tetsuya, Suzuki Norio, Suzuki Tadashi, Christopher Szpilman, Tamamoto Masaru, and Yamauchi Masayuki. During my two years stay in Tokyo, Hosaka Shuji, Misawa Nobuo, Morimoto Kazuo, Nakajima Takeshi, and Yamada Chioi became friends who not only advised me on my research but also served as host families. In Istanbul, Tufan Buzpinar, Gökhan Çetinsaya, İsmail Kara, and Azmi Özcan shared their notes, comments, and insights about the history of pan-Islamism.

Over the years, I have exchanged papers and corresponded with scholars in various parts of the world regarding the topic of this book. Engin Akarli, Houchang Chehabi, Sebastian Conrad, John De Boer, Kevin Doak, Prasenjit Duara, Vasant Kaiwar, İbrahim Kalin, Hasan Kösebalaban, Sucheta Mazumdar, Michael Penn, David Steigerwald, Stefan Tanaka, Gesa Westerman, Renee Worringer, and Hayreddin Yücesoy were very generous in sharing their research results and critically reading my own writings. At UNCC, history department chair John Smail arranged my teaching schedule to allow maximum time for writing, while John David Smith served as an experienced faculty mentor.

In the last couple of years, I have received great inspiration from two transnational communities of scholars, with whom I met regularly for joint research projects. I would like to thank the members of the Global History Network, supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, and the study group “Japan’s Challenge to the International Order during the 1930s,” sponsored by the Shibusawa Foundation, for exciting discussions and conversations that generally influenced my thinking on the subject of this book as well.

I would like to add my thanks to the following institutions for their financial support. The Center for Islamic Studies (ISAM) in Istanbul gave the initial grant for my doctoral study. At Harvard, the Center for Middle Eastern Studies, the Reischauer Institute of Japanese Studies, and the Weatherhead Center for International Affairs not only served as academic hosts but also provided financial assistance in different research and writing stages. The Japanese Ministry of Education and the Toyota Foundation sponsored my research in Japan. My friend Vural Ak supported my research activities during several trips to Istanbul.

I also owe thanks to Columbia University Press editor Anne Routon for her coordination of the publication of this book and the reviewers of the manuscript for their critique and suggestions. Two editors of the International History series of Columbia University Press, Matthew Connelly and Adam McKeown, critically read the manuscript and proposed valuable suggestions for its final format. I am very grateful to Sarah St. Onge for her meticulous and patient copy editing, and Carolyn G. Weaver for indexing.

My deepest gratitude is for my parents for a lifetime of love, support, and pride in

my achievements. My brother Ertan Aydin, as the other Ph.D. student and then professor in the family, always provided the necessary moral and intellectual support. Finally, I owe the greatest thanks to my wife, Juliane, for our conversations, woven into the beauty of everyday life, that inspired and encouraged me in this project. She not only helped me organize the book sections and manage the writing schedule but also edited all the chapters, even during the last days of her pregnancy. Our daughter, Leyla, brought a new sense of joy to our life in the last year of this project. It is to the love and companionship of Juliane and Leyla that I dedicate this book.

# 1

## INTRODUCTION

I WAS IN the middle of a research project on Japanese pan-Asianism when the events of September 11 sparked an unprecedented scholarly and nonscholarly discussion about Muslim rage against the West. What surprised me, as a student of modern Japanese intellectual history, was that the issues covered in historical materials about Japanese-Western relations from 1905 to 1945 seemed very similar to what journalists and news program editors were discussing with regard to the contemporary relationship between the Muslim world and the West. Both before and after the Pearl Harbor attack of 1941, almost half a century before September 11, there were similar questions about anti-Westernism in Japan, with equally similar arguments among both Japanese and Western intellectuals. As a historian with specializations in both Middle Eastern and Japanese studies, I could not help thinking about anti-Westernism in the Muslim and non-Muslim parts of Asia in a comparative context and about the implications of such a comparison for understanding and responding to the questions of today. Thus the idea for this book was born as a quest to understand the significance of anti-Western ideologies in modern international history.

A historical comparison between Japanese and Muslim critiques of the West is significant beyond the peculiarities of my academic training because it reveals the paradoxes of contemporary controversies about anti-Westernism. While a politically influential paradigm argues that the Muslim revolt against the West derives either from Muslims' inability to harmonize their religion with Western modernity or from their primordial conservative reaction to a Christian-dominated globalization process, a counternarrative emphasizes that this rage was and still is a natural response to Western imperialism and hegemony.<sup>1</sup> Yet this polarized literature on the roots of the clash of civilizations between Islam and the West raises more questions than it answers. If anti-Western critiques in the Muslim world had something to do with the eternal conflict between the religious traditions of Islam and Christianity, why do we see equally strong traditions of anti-Western critiques in the non-Muslim societies of Asia, such as China and Japan?<sup>2</sup> Similarly, if modern anti-Western critiques were a natural response to Western colonialism, why did they not fade away in the postcolonial period?<sup>3</sup> Why did noncolonized parts of Asia, such as Ottoman Turkey and Japan, also develop strong traditions of anti-Western critique? If anti-Western ideologies were correlated to religious revivalism, why did so many secular and humanist thinkers formulate some of the most articulate critiques of the West?<sup>4</sup> More important, how can we explain the fact that many of the themes of anti-Western

critiques were simultaneously formulated and expressed by European and American intellectuals as well?<sup>5</sup>

Existing scholarly literature on anti-Western critiques in Middle Eastern, Indian, Chinese, and Japanese histories demonstrate that anti-Western ideologies can neither be seen simply as derivative of the anticolonial struggles nor explained solely as conservative and religious reactions to global modernity.<sup>6</sup> Yet both religious traditions and the legacy of Western colonialism were nonetheless highly relevant for the formation of anti-Western images, discourses, and ideologies. It is thus necessary to examine historically how various religious traditions and the experience of European colonialism interacted with peculiar Muslim or non-Muslim discontent with globalization, the international order, and modernization to produce shared anti-Western discourses in the twentieth century.

With a comparative focus on Ottoman and Japanese histories, this book offers a global history perspective on modern anti-Western critiques in order to understand their genesis, content, and political significance in international history. It challenges the exceptionalist writings on the critiques of the West in the Muslim world, which have underlined the historical memory of the conflicts between Muslim and Christian political entities. This focus has led to an overemphasis of the role of confrontations between essentialized geographies of the Muslim world and the Christian West in the interpretation of anti-Western emotions and ideas at the expense of the modern global context of Muslim discourses on the West.<sup>7</sup> It has also led to a neglect of the largely secular critiques of the West in Middle Eastern history, because of the depiction of a misleading dichotomy between pro-Western secularists versus anti-Western religious revivalists in the Middle East when in fact in the long history of decolonization many humanist and modernist thinkers in Asia, some of them followers of Enlightenment thought, such as Namik Kemal, Mahatma Gandhi, Rabindranath Tagore, Okukara Tenshin, Celal Nuri, Ahmed Riza, and Sun Yat-sen, formulated sharp critiques of what they considered to be the West.

It is largely due to the lack of attention to the international politics behind positive or critical images of the West that we still lack any sophisticated comparison of anti-Western thought in the Muslim world and non-Muslim Asia. The existence of a rich and diverse tradition of anti-Western critiques in the non-Muslim societies of Asia, especially in highly modern and capitalist Japan, indicates that anti-Western ideas in the Muslim world cannot and should not be reduced to the dynamics of a relationship between the followers of two interrelated faith traditions, Islam and Christianity.<sup>8</sup> There is a growing awareness of the need for an interdisciplinary and comparative approach to both critiques of the West and anti-Western ideologies that will take the global circulation of Western-originated anti-Western ideas into account as well.<sup>9</sup>

The histories of pan-Islamic and pan-Asian visions of world order provide excellent case studies for understanding the appeal and impact of anti-Western ideas in global history. Both pan-Islamic and pan-Asian ideas emerged around the same time, during the last quarter of the nineteenth century, and contained a strong element of anti-Westernism in their assessment of modernity, cultural Westernization, and the international order. Pan-Islamic and pan-Asian thought not only became very influential in the formative periods of Asian nationalisms, they were also part of the wartime ideologies of the Ottoman Empire and imperial Japan during both WWI and

WWII. The literature on Western, Islamic, and Asian civilizations, as well as various political projects involving their solidarity and encounter, has always been intimately related to the debates on the normative values and power relations of a globalizing international order. Case studies of pan-Islamic and pan-Asian thought can help us explore the interrelationship of cultural debates on civilizational and racial identities, on the one hand, with diplomatic and international developments, on the other. How can we explain the rise of anti-Western ideas, emotions, and trends in Asia parallel to the globalization and Westernization of world cultures from the 1880s to the 1940s? Are anti-Western critiques a reflection of discontent with the international order or a nativist rejection of Western-originated universal modernity? What has been the impact of anti-Western ideas in modern international history?

Study of pan-Asianism and pan-Islamism necessarily involves a methodology that gives serious consideration to the role of transnational imagination and identity in international history. Since Benedict Anderson's groundbreaking work, the powerful influence of nationalist imagination has been given due attention in the study of international history.<sup>10</sup> Imaginations of race, religion, and civilization, however, also represent a significant force in modern world history, even though they have often been overshadowed by the emphasis on nationalism. For example, from the early Meiji period on, changing conceptions of Asia became a powerful cultural-geographical representation in relation to which the character and mission of the Japanese nation were defined and redefined.<sup>11</sup> Similarly, the Muslim world as a geographical civilizational entity, not simply denoting a shared religious identity, emerged during the 1860s in relation to the evolution of the notion of the West. It is necessary to understand why the civilizational identities of Asia and the Islamic world, together with the omnipresent concept of the West, came to exist as essential components of the invention of national identity.

As a matter of fact, the predisposition to identify with an entity larger than the nation, be it a civilization, religion, or race, seems paradoxical for a historical period retrospectively characterized as the age of rising nationalism.<sup>12</sup> The ideals of pan-Asianism and pan-Islamism were only two of the numerous similar political and intellectual trends, including pan-Slavism, pan-Europeanism, and pan-Africanism. The transnational identity of being Asian, Muslim, African, or European was also significant in defining the nature of nationalism and international politics even when these were not formulated into a systematic ideology of regional, religious, or racial solidarity.<sup>13</sup> Moreover, these transnational identity constructions influenced international relations, as can be observed in the complex relationship between pan-Islamic and pan-Asianist ideology, on the one hand, and the foreign policies of two non-Western empires of the twentieth century, the Ottoman and Japanese empires, on the other.

Although there exists a rich literature on pan-Islamism and pan-Asianism, especially in the historical writings on the late Ottoman and the Japanese empires, scholarship on these questions contains several conflicting and competing interpretations with regard to two major questions. The first question relates to the ideological significance of the anti-Westernism associated with these two non-Western visions of world order. Given that Japan was the most Westernized and industrialized nation in Asia, with close diplomatic and cultural ties to Europe and America, how can

we account for the strong current of anti-Western thought that historically characterized Japanese intellectual life in the first half of the twentieth century? Some postwar scholars have offered a sympathetic view of the Asianist critiques of the West, perceiving in Japan's prewar Asianist thinkers a desire to overcome the problems of Western modernity that resembled the attempts of such esteemed humanist figures as Tagore, Gandhi, and Lu Xun.<sup>14</sup> Another group of scholars, however, has pointed out that anti-Westernism in Japan not only undermined democratic values and party politics domestically but also encouraged the rejection of liberal international norms associated with the West, especially Wilsonian internationalism.

A similar division in historiography exists in the literature on pan-Islamism. Initially, pan-Islamism was seen as a reactionary "Islamic" response to the challenge of global modernity and Western civilization as it was usually identified with international visions of Islamist individuals, whether Sultan Abdulhamid II or the Young Turkera Islamists. It was also associated with the propaganda discourse of the Ottoman government during WWI. The existence of a larger group of secular and nationalist figures who advocated a pan-Islamic policy for the Ottoman state illustrates, however, that pan-Islamism cannot be reduced to the utopian and expansionist world order vision of some Islamist thinkers. The relationship between Turkish nationalism and pan-Islamism is much more complex, given the fact that many Ottoman intellectuals who were categorized as secular nationalists expressed pan-Islamic sympathies, ideas, and world order visions around the years of WWI. In fact, the consensus on pan-Islamic notions of solidarity among various segments of the Ottoman intellectual elite before WWI is a reminder that at one point pan-Islamism was seen not as a reactionary idea but as a realist policy option available for Muslim societies. After all, it was the Ottoman government elite, which had avoided military confrontations with the leading Western powers since the 1840s through its famous realist balance-of-power diplomacy, that ended up declaring a pan-Islamic jihad against the British, French, and Russian empires during WWI. Interpreting the official Ottoman endorsement of the anti-Western discourse of pan-Islamism during WWI as a natural response to Western imperialism is also an insufficient explanation, as the expansion of Western powers in the Muslim world had been ongoing since the 1830s. Why was there no pan-Islamism at the time of the French invasion of Algeria in 1830 or during the mutiny of Muslim soldiers against British rule in India in 1857? Why did the rise of pan-Islamism occur after the 1880s?

The second significant historical aspect of pan-Islamism and pan-Asianism is the role they played in the history of decolonization while at the same time offering justifications for the Japanese and Ottoman leaderships and their domination over East Asia and the Middle Eastern Islamic world, respectively.<sup>15</sup> The anti-imperialist credentials of pan-Islamism have been emphasized in the literature. After all, even Hindu nationalists such as Gandhi joined the pan-Islamic Khilafat movement of India to show solidarity with the Muslim struggles against Western imperialism. The Ottoman government also used pan-Islamism, both to call for the unity of all Muslim subjects of the empire against the nationalist demands of its Christian subjects and to assert Ottoman leadership in the Muslim world as leverage in its relationship with the European powers. During WWI, pan-Islamism was not only part of the propaganda rhetoric of the Ottoman state but also a tool used by the German Empire in its great-



power competition with the British, French, and Russian empires.

Similarly, an emphasis on the anti-imperialist aspects of pan-Asianism has been part of the scholarly literature since Marius Jansen's study on the collaboration between Chinese nationalist leader Sun Yat-sen and Japanese Asianists, which demonstrated that many Japanese supporters of Sun Yatsen acted under an idealistic anticolonial vision of solidarity between Japan and China. There is an especially rich literature on the anticolonial motivations of the Japanese who worked with Subhas Chandra Bose in the Indian National Army campaign against the British Empire during WWII. As Prasenjit Duara has suggested, during the late 1930s, pan-Asianism continued to inspire idealist individuals, groups, and religious movements with liberationist, anticolonial, and redemptive agendas even at a time when these same ideas were being utilized in the grand scheme of Japanese imperialism.<sup>16</sup> Yet the fact that pan-Asianism also came to be an ideological tool used in the Japanese occupation to suppress Chinese nationalism has been accepted by virtually all scholars. How do these two conflicting aspects of pan-Asianism relate to each other?<sup>17</sup> This question continues to be the subject of scholarly and public controversy, particularly in the context of the discussions provoked by the textbook revision movement of some Japanese groups who insist on the decolonizing legacy of Japan's wartime expansion in East and Southeast Asia, a claim that naturally attracted harsh protests from East Asian nations.<sup>18</sup>

These questions point up the fact that it is necessary to examine the changes in the legitimacy and inclusiveness of the Eurocentric international order, as well as transformations in the relationship between the Western center and the non-Western peripheries, to grasp better the genesis and appeal of the alternative visions of world order embodied in the anti-Western discourses of pan-Islamic and pan-Asian thought. This book argues that it was the legitimacy crisis of a single, globalized, international system that produced pan-Islamic and pan-Asian visions of world order. The content of both these alternative visions of world order was shaped by the peculiar challenge to the intellectual justifications of late-nineteenth-century imperialism, especially through discourses of Orientalism and racism. In terms of their political projects, trajectories of pan-Asianism and pan-Islamism were intertwined with the major turning points in international history that altered both the power configuration and legitimacy claims of the world order, such as the Russo-Japanese War of 1905, WWI, and Japan's occupation of Manchuria. As pan-Asianism and pan-Islamism contributed to the decolonization process and influenced the foreign policies of both the Ottoman and the Japanese governments, they also left a long-lasting legacy that influenced nationalist thought and the international relations of the post-WWII period.

This book approaches the histories of pan-Islamism and pan-Asianism in their chronological stages within the global narrative of one single Eurocentric international order in order to resolve the historiographic debates outlined above, and thus the following chapters are organized around historical turning points.

The next chapter discusses why there was no systematic anti-Westernism in Asia until the 1870s, despite the reactions to European expansion, and explains this absence by the reformist non-Western elite's ambivalent acceptance of a civilizationist worldview as legitimizing the new Eurocentric international order. The chapter discusses the emergence of the notion of a universal West, beyond the Christian and

white race identity of Europeans, in the minds of Asian intellectuals and reformers. Ottoman and Japanese intellectuals during the nineteenth century attributed a quality of universality to Western civilization and constructed an abstract image of the West that became a central pillar in their visions of world order and their assessments of intensifying global interactions. Their acceptance of the normativity of the Eurocentric civilization of the nineteenth century derived from the decoupling of the narratives of European and American progress from any association with religion, race, and geography. Non-Western elite's gradually became familiar not only with Enlightenment thought but also with various exceptionalist European explanations of their superiority over the rest of the world, such as those found in the writings of Montesquieu, Guizot, and Buckle. In this process, the reformist intellectuals and leaders of Japan and the Ottoman state formulated a more inclusive notion of global civilization and international order, believing that they should encounter no religious, cultural, or racial obstacle to being as civilized as the Europeans. They insisted that upon achieving a certain set of "civilized" reforms, their societies could attain not only prosperity and might but also security and equality in the emerging world order.

The appeal of membership in a secure and prosperous international society, centered in Europe and transforming the world through globalization, had been a major component of the idea of the West among non-Western elite's during the nineteenth century. The reformist elite's in Asia faced unequal treaties, colonial tutelage, and even some forms of discrimination by Western political entities, yet they believed that these would be temporary, disappearing once non-Western societies successfully completed the necessary civilized reforms. In other words, they imagined a potentially more inclusive international society than the one existing in the mid-nineteenth century.

The third chapter discusses the emergence of pan-Islamic and pan-Asianist ideas during the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Pan-Islamic and pan-Asian visions of world order emerged during the late 1870s in response to the perceived rejection by the European center of its own claims to the universality of modern civilization and inclusiveness of the world order. The main critique of pan-Islamic and pan-Asianist thought was directed against the "uncivilized" acts of European imperialism, which created obstacles in the process of self-civilizing reforms of non-Western societies. Thus it was a corrective critique of the world order, asking for the fulfillment of the promises of the global civilization process and the universalization of modernity.

Following the turn to formal imperialism in Europe's relationship with Asia and Africa, well observed in the scramble for Africa in the aftermath of the invasion of Egypt in 1882, Asian intellectuals became more concerned with the transnational power of the new European discourses on the Orient, race, and empire. Just when the reform projects of the Ottoman and Japanese elite's were being tied to the idea of a universal West, highly rigid interpretations of civilizational and racial hierarchies that identified progress with the white race or the culture of Christianity became the dominant explanations for Western hegemony and superiority in Europe and America. This led to a crucial contradiction in the legitimacy of the Eurocentric world order: the universalist tones of the Enlightenment image of the West, well established in Asian thought until the 1880s and in many ways continuing afterward, contradicted the exclusion of the Muslim world and Asia from the liberal promises of the Enlightenment in the ideologies of the permanent racial and civilizational superiority

of the West over Muslims and “yellow race” Asians.

The seeming failures of the economic and political reforms in the Ottoman state, Egypt, and China formed only part of the reasons for inspiring the thesis “the East will never be the West” and for strengthening Western discourses that coupled progress and civilization with Christianity or the white race. Although there were anti-imperialist and inclusive intellectual projects in Europe, the popularization of the cultures of imperialism in Europe strengthened the exclusion of “yellow race” and Muslim claims to equality and dignity in the world community. More important, the imperialist competition among the European powers, which initiated a period of colonization for the sake of colonization beyond the arguments of “civilizing mission,” increased the sense of insecurity in the rest of the world. Yet Orientalist and race discourses were not a simple derivation of uneven power relations, as they survived beyond the power hierarchy in global relations between various societies. It is in this global context that Asian intellectuals first developed an alternative discourse of civilization and race, which continued to uphold the idea of a universal modernity while aiming to delegitimize the imperial power structures in the world order. Both Ottoman and Japanese intellectuals engaged in intense debates about notions of empire, race, civilization, progress, and humanity. Parallel to these intellectual efforts, some of them developed visions of world order springing from notions of pan-Islamic and pan-Asian solidarities in opposition to imperialist international order. Yet neither of these two anti-Western internationalisms envisioned a return to the previous isolated regional systems or deglobalization. On the contrary, pan-Islamic and pan-Asian alternatives aimed at a reunified global order divided into complementary and equal regional blocks, in which the West would be forced to abide by its own proclaimed standards in cooperation with a free and modern Islamic world and Asia. The notion of a clash between the Islamic and Christian worlds, as well as the idea of a conflict between the white and yellow races, emerged in this period. Pan-Islamic and pan-Asian intellectuals emphasized clash-of-civilization or race theories as a diagnosis and critique of European policies, not as a prescription for their vision of world order. This era also gave birth to the main argument of anti-Western discourse, namely, that the West was applying a double standard in its international relations by violating the very principles of civilized behavior that Western public opinion proclaimed.

In the fourth chapter, the emphasis is on the impact of the Russo-Japanese War of 1905 on the content and politics of pan-Islamic and pan-Asianist thought. Contemporary commentators characterized the period from 1905 to 1914 as the era of the “awakening” of the East against the Western hegemony, a slogan that became the symbol of an intellectual decolonization that preceded the political one. Worldwide responses to the Japanese victory over Russia in 1905 show how a globally interconnected public sphere interpreted the historical significance of the Japanese victory through shared notions of East-West civilizational relations and the balance of power between the white and colored races. This chapter emphasizes that the Russo-Japanese War became the key historical reference in resolving the tensions between the universalization of Eurocentric modernity, through the agency of non-Western elite’s, and late-nineteenth-century Orientalist and racist discourses that justified the Eurocentric imperial world order.

The Russo-Japanese War of 1905 empowered the claims of non-Western

intellectuals in the debates about race, the Orient, and progress. It became the strongest evidence against the discourse of the white race's permanent and eternal superiority over the colored races. After 1905 no scholarly or nonscholarly discussion of racism and innate civilizational hierarchies in world politics could ignore the example of Japan. Anticolonial intellectuals could and did use the Japanese success to invalidate the discourse of the white man's superiority and his burden to civilize Asia. The Japanese example was similarly used in the critiques of European Orientalism, as it proved that Orientals were not inferior and the Orientalist discourse of Western superiority over other civilizations was not necessarily true. If the Japanese could achieve progress and development without colonialism, other colonized Oriental nations could do the same. The slogans about the awakening of Buddhism, Hinduism, and Islam, against the charges of the decline of these faith traditions, became part of the self-consciousness of this era. Beyond proving the equality of the colored races and Oriental People's, the Japanese success helped Asian intellectuals to assert that the existing backwardness of Asian societies was not a result of deterministic factors, conditioned by race, culture, geography, climate, and religion. They emphasized that this underdevelopment was just a temporary delay in progress that could be altered by a set of reforms, such as the ones Meiji Japan had implemented in just three decades. Parallel to the widespread critics of the discourse of race and Orientalism as a challenge to the intellectual and moral justifications of the then-existing world order, in the aftermath of the Russo-Japanese War both pan-Asian and pan-Islamic ideas entered journalistic and scholarly writings on international affairs, signifying the revolt of rising Asia against the imperialist West and further strengthening their appeal among Asian nationalists.

The fifth chapter discusses the experience and transformation of pan-Islamic and pan-Asianist visions during WWI. Both pan-Asianist and pan-Islamist critiques of the West included an effort to define Japan's or the Ottoman state's national interest and international mission in a way that would appeal to the realist policy makers in those non-Western empires. These efforts gained special policy relevance during the crucial deliberations leading to the Ottoman Empire's decision to enter WWI. The chapter describes the triumph of pan-Islamic ideas among the Ottoman elite both as a repository of anti-Western emotions and as a new realist thinking about the Ottoman response to the geopolitics of world affairs. It argues that the pan-Islamic diagnosis of international relations as an encirclement of the Muslim world by Christian imperial powers and the fear of further isolation of the Ottoman state as a Muslim political entity created the conditions for the Ottoman decision to ally with Germany in WWI, paradoxically to express the desire to belong to European international society while fighting against the three big Western empires.

From the early 1880s to 1912, pan-Islamism was an important topic in Muslim intellectual networks and European writings on the rising nationalism and modernization movements in the Muslim world. But during this period it did not become an officially endorsed Ottoman policy, despite the fact that the Ottoman state and the caliphate institution remained a central focus of pan-Islamic imagination. The Ottoman state elite's approach to pan-Islamism gradually changed during the crisis of Ottoman international isolation initiated by the Italian invasion of Tripoli in 1911 and the Balkan wars of 1912–1913, when the Western great powers all supported Christian