Editor's introduction: Reflections on Japanese and Turkish modernization and global history

The trajectories of Japanese and Turkish modernization momentarily captivated the imagination of social scientists and historians during the 1960s as a testing ground for the analysis of the structural and institutional processes that went into the making of the modern in the world outside Europe and the US since the second half of the nineteenth century. The classic work on the subject is the volume edited by Robert Ward and Dankwart Rustow, *Political Modernization in Japan and Turkey* (1964), which was published as part of a Princeton University Press series on comparative modernization in Russia, Japan, India, Turkey and China.[1] A collection of articles by the foremost specialists in Japanese and Turkish Studies, the volume is representative of the kind of modernization theory prevalent in the American academy at the time. Despite its shortcomings, the volume remains a classic and a singular attempt that brought Japan and Turkey together within the field of modernization studies.

Ward and Rustow construct their framework by defining modernization as a process distinct from westernization in terms of political and cultural changes of identity; they claim to disregard the differences of such politically divergent regimes as democracies, communist totalitarianisms and constitutional monarchies. Accordingly, modernization is defined in structural terms of industrialization, secularization, social mobility, science and technology, education, the shift from ascribed to achieved status, and a rise in material standards of living. These are concepts which still dominate our everyday understanding of modernity, despite strong criticism and suspicions in current academic discourse. In the 1960s, modernization was described in terms of increasing control over nature.[2] However, our current assessment of that process is probably better represented by the jaundiced view that humans have destroyed nature. In *Political Modernization in Japan and Turkey*, Roderic H. Davison, Kemal H. Karpat, Peter F. Sugar, Arif T. Payaslıoğlu and Frederick Frey discussed Turkey in terms of traditional society,

---

1   Robert E. Ward and Dankwart A. Rustow, eds., *Political Modernization in Japan and Turkey* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964).
2   Ibid., 3.

environmental and foreign contributions, economic and political modernization, education, mass media, civil bureaucracy, military, political leadership and political parties. John W. Hall, Robert A. Scalapino, William W. Lockwood, R. P. Dore, Shuichi Kato, Masamichi Inoki, Roger F. Hackett and Nobutaka Ike contributed parallel essays on Japan on each of these topics.

Following a systematic comparison, Ward and Rustow concluded that Japan completed an earlier and more mature process of political modernization that involved the formation of a nation-state. Japan underwent the institutional and social processes of transformation outlined above, with a take-off period between 1868 and 1890, the Meiji Restoration period. Turkey, on the other hand, lagged behind by 40 years, with a take-off period between 1908 and 1928, a timeframe that conflates the Young Turk Revolution with that of the Kemalist Republican one. Environmental, foreign, and indigenous conditions were quite different in both cases: Japan had the advantage of not being the target of western imperialist expansion, of having a highly educated population and culturally homogeneous conditions suitable for the quick building of a modern nation-state. In the case of Turkey, the 40-year gap was fed by such disadvantages as being on the crossroads of western imperialist aggression, a low educational level of its culturally and ethnically diverse population, and the pains of salvaging a nation-state out of a dismantled empire. Still, the authors conclude that Japan and Turkey shared a common experience in terms of successful defensive modernization against the specter of colonization, able leadership of a practical and pragmatic political elite, and a prominent modernizing role of a strong military. They are neither alternatives, nor a case of success and failure. Rather, Japan is placed at one end of the modernization spectrum, whereas Turkey is in a position somewhere in the middle, but still in a position better than the rest of the Middle East.[3]

The political agenda of the volume by Ward and Rustow and other modernization studies in the series has been seriously criticized in the US academy. From the perspective of the critical leftist scholarship prominent in the United States during the anti-Vietnam war movement, the Princeton series represented the stronghold of area studies scholarship based on US Cold War policies in Asia, which had resulted in American intervention in Korea and Vietnam. The result of the modernization studies, including the volume on Japan and Turkey, did express a partiality to Japan's experience as a kind of ideal type which avoided a communist revolution, and yet

---

3   Ibid., 456-57.

managed to modernize its economy, society, and political structure without undue instability. In a critique of modernization studies scholars in the US academy, John Dover accused their approach as slanted towards emphasizing in Japanese modern history the factors that represented stability and harmonious development, but disregarding factors of crisis or conflict—such as pre-war ultra-nationalism, imperialist aggression in Asia, militarism, the misery of the disenfranchised peasantry, and the suppression of the strong labor movement.[4] Recently, Harry Harootunian has strongly attacked 1960s modernization studies scholars for pushing Japan as an anti-Communist Asian model of modernization for the use of US foreign policy, but lacking in significant theoretical and methodological explanation of the modern as it was globally experienced.[5]

Political Modernization in Japan and Turkey forms the background to this special issue bringing together essays on Japan and Turkey by Selçuk Esenbel, Binnaz Toprak, Hiroshi Mitani and Selim Deringil as well as a commentary by Zafer Toprak. These papers constitute individual reflections on aspects of Japanese and Turkish modern history and questions of modernity that were not dealt with in the volume by Ward and Rustow. In this sense, the essays constitute a re-reading of that book 40 years after its publication in the light of the debates about the overall shift in the modernization paradigm. They also reflect each author's preferred perception of what constitutes the modern experience today.

The product of a series of workshops helt at Boğaziçi University and Tokyo University between 2000 and 2002, and organized by Suzuki Tadashi of Tokyo University, the following essays each in their own way posit questions that help construct a more global perspective and open up the conceptual framework of the original study.

As a contribution to the intellectual history behind the political and cultural framework of Japanese and Chinese nationalism, Hiroshi Mitani's paper traces the long journey of the concept of Asia as a geo-cultural entity from Europe to China and Japan (for that matter to the rest of that continent as well) in the early modern period. The journey of the idea of Asia as an intellectual and geographic concept makes us aware of the process by which the peoples in the far east of the continent started thinking of themselves as Asians, a category that previously did not exist in their vocabulary of self-identification. Here, Mitani demonstrates how the division of modern history as that of Europe/West and that of Asia as separate categories is

NEW PERSPECTIVES ON TURKEY

---

4   John W. Dower, *Origins of the Modern Japanese State: Selected Writings of E. H. Norman* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1975), 3-102.
5   Harry Harootunian, *History's Disquiet: Modernity, Cultural Practice and the Question of Everyday Life* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000).

questionable from the outset. He discusses how geographical concepts which form the foundation of civilizational and cultural identities—such as European or Asian—have been historically formed in the context of global history. Mitani's essay is in line with recent criticisms of cartographic positivism. For instance, Jeremy Black and Brian Harley have re-constructed the history of map-making in the west, by drawing attention to its cultural and ideological character as part of the scientific endeavor of drawing the global map according to Euro/American historical and cultural values that reinforce the western-centered vision of world supremacy.[6] Recent works by Karen Pinto, Giancarlo Casale and Çiğdem Kafesçioğlu, who have picked up the topic of re-interpreting Ottoman maps as socially constructed bodies of knowledge to serve the Ottoman imperial idea, are interesting comparable studies in the same vein.[7] Mitani takes the story beyond the boundaries of the cultural vision of the west and looks at its global implications from the geo-historical position of East Asia. He expands the analysis by showing how the European vision of the world map first overpowered existing territorial views of the globe in China and Japan and then was reinterpreted by Chinese and Japanese nationalism–and subsequently by Japanese imperialism–to serve their own ends.

Selçuk Esenbel picks up the same global journey in the intellectual and political interaction between early-twentieth-century nationalist and emancipatory movements in the Islamic world (including Turkey and Japan) that provides a peculiar justification for the Japanese Asianist militarist vision of modernity. By then Asia had become an indigenous term of self-definition for Japanese political actors and intellectuals. For them, Asia constituted the modern future under Japanese leadership, a future that would challenge the declining modernity of the colonial west. Japan's modern experience is better known as an inspiration for the nationalist and political actors in the Islamic world, and in the Turkish context as an alternative and desirable model of modernity more suitable than that of the west. Yet, we should also consider Colonel Hashimoto's

---

6   For a discussion of the role of nationalism and Euro-centrism that went into the making of maps and world atlases during nineteenth-century imperialism, see Jeremy Black, *Maps and History: Constructing Images of the Past* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000). For the argument that maps were texts of meaning and socially constructed forms of knowledge that served as a form of power, see John Brian Harley, *The New Nature of Maps: Essays in the History of Cartography* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001).

7   Giancarlo Casalle, "The Ottoman Age of Exploration: Spices, Maps and Conquest in the Sixteenth-century Indian Ocean" (Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University, 2004), Çiğdem Kafesçioğlu, "The Ottoman Capital in the Making: The Reconstruction of Constantinople in the Fifteenth Century" (Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University, 1996), Karen Pinto, "Ways of Seeing: Scenarios of the World in the Islamic Cartographic Imagination!" (Ph.D. Dissertation, Columbia University, 2001).

idealization of the Kemalist revolution as an ideal Asian military-led revolution suitable for Japan and Okawa Shumei's vision of a pan-Islamic movement as the Asian International which would help Japan ride the crest of Asian emancipation and empire. These examples strikingly show how the modern history of Turkey and the Islamic world was perceived by Japanese right-wing intellectuals and political actors who took the lead in pushing for an innovative right-wing, or *kakushin uyoku*, Asian revolution during the 1930s as the dynamics of Asian modernity. In a sense, the historic journey of the concept of Asia, as traced in Mitani's article, was the basis for twentieth-century political action in Japan. It is also clear that the west was not the only category that defined the modern for Asians. They also looked outside the west at their contemporaries as desirable revolutionary models with strong military leadership.

Selim Deringil examines the Japanese as well as the Ottoman gaze toward the western world as parallel historical occurrences, with interesting similarities and differences that connected the Japanese' and the Ottoman Turks' perspectives of western hegemony to their policy-making style in their mutual efforts at reform and catching up with the west. While Ward and Rustow's book discusses the attitudes of western powers towards Japan and Turkey as one of the given factors of modernization, the authors ignore Japanese and Turkish attitudes toward the west and westerners in the nineteenth century, attitudes that shaped decision-making by political elites in both countries. According to Deringil, the Ottomans shared with the Japanese a defensive attitude against the west; yet, they differed in their approach to the need to import western civilization. Deringil's article makes use of the memoirs and journals of travelers from both of these non-western polities, who were pioneers in transferring images of the western world to their own environment. His conclusion suggests that the Ottoman statesmen of the late nineteenth century were pragmatically, and perhaps cynically, aware of the inevitable reality that they would stick out within a larger community of western (read Christian) nations.[8] The Japanese appear much more aggressive in their challenge to the west and desire to carve out an Asian empire for themselves, an empire that would vie for joining the western club of world powers on an equal footing. Compared to the Japanese, who were suddenly forced to open their country to the west in 1853 by Commodore Perry of the US fleet, the Ottomans did not feel alien in Europe, since it had been

---

8 Selim Deringil, *The Well-Protected Domains: Ideology and the Legitimation of Power in the Ottoman Empire 1876-1909* (London: I. B. Tauris, 1998). See title page for the comment of Said Paşa in a memorandum prepared for the Sultan.

part of their historical world. The Ottomans did not make a shopping list for studying in depth European civilization as an alien entity; the Japanese did so in the 1872 Iwakura mission which traveled around the world immediately after the 1868 Meiji Restoration, after the traditional Tokugawa feudal polity had been abolished and replaced by a modern state. The Japanese systematically studied *in situ* all aspects of the Euro/American "enlightened civilization" (the Japanese term of the day)— that is, industry, parliamentary politics, state structure, women's education and the technology considered necessary to bring Japan the same status as western powers. In comparison to the systematic aggressive effort of the Japanese to destroy "backward customs" and adopt western institutions wholesale, thereby revamping the face of Japan, the Ottoman view toward western civilization appears more phlegmatic. Forced to operate within a system of international relations that threatened the empire, Ottoman statesmen were probably still confident that their adoption of western institutions to complement their own was a viable alternative to enable the empire's survival. This is an imperial attitude in some respects more reminiscent of the attitude of late-nineteenth-century Chinese mandarins who hoped to strengthen the Sino-Confucian civilization of the Qing dynasty by adopting some western institutions.

In her article on the gender issue in Japanese and Turkish modernization -an issue completely ignored by the male-dominated modernization discourse in Ward and Rustow's book- Binnaz Toprak tackles the framework of that volume on two fronts. First, by providing a study of the actual conditions of women in modern Japan and Turkey, she deciphers the myths about traditionalism and modernity in the images of Turkish and Japanese women. Second, the choice of topic challenges the male-oriented cultural bias of the social science discourse of the pervious generation, a discourse that did not factor in the experience of half of the population as an integral part of the modernizing process. In view of the symbolic significance of women's emancipation and modernity for the ideology of the Turkish Republican revolution, her article demystifies the subject especially in view of the fact that, while an important image for the justification of Japanese reform efforts ever since the 1868 Meiji Restoration, the "modern woman" has not held a comparable symbolic role in political debates in Japan, as she has continued to do so in Turkey.

Interestingly, the statistics on Japan's level of socio-economic development in 1960, as outlined in *Political Modernization in Japan and Turkey*, provides a convenient benchmark to put the Turkish women's prospects into perspective. Japan's development indicators in 1960 were 98 percent literacy, 37 percent of the population in agriculture and a *per*

capita income of around USD 1,500 to 2,000.[9] The corresponding figures for Turkey were 39 percent literacy, 77 percent agricultural population, and half of the amount of *per capita* income. By emphasizing the effective role of post-war industrialization as the impetus to the development of Japanese women's conditions, Binnaz Toprak unveils the ideological framework of women in Turkey as symbols of modernity. But at the same time, she points to the difficulties that lie ahead for Turkish women in view of prospects for Turkey's economic and industrial growth.

Finally, Zafer Toprak proposes that we adopt a global perspective to study the Ottoman economy in his commentary. He emphasizes the global processes that went into the making of a modern economic transformation in the late Ottoman Empire. His commentary challenges the classic thesis of decay in national historiography, which claims that the political and military decline of the Ottoman Empire also brought about its economic decline. Furthermore, in contrast to Ward and Rustow, Zafer Toprak hints at the connections between European and Ottoman economic processes within the framework of global economic dynamics. This is in contrast to the essays in *Political Modernization in Japan and Turkey* which dismissed the productive character of economic changes in the late Ottoman period simply as cases of dependency distortions. It is revealing to observe the difference between the terminology used in Ward and Rustow's book (especially in Peter Sugar's article) and Zafer Toprak's perspective. What Ward and Rustow described as "semi-colonization" and "hyper colony,"[10] Toprak prefers to describe as "proto-globalization" during the long-term integration of the Ottoman economy. His approach leaves the hyper colony thesis aside and instead links Ottoman economic dynamics, especially at the turn of the century, to the post-imperial and early republican history of Turkey, with a subtext that is suggestive of the historical roots of Turkey's economic integration with the European Union today.

Each essay in this special issue, therefore, addresses issues of modernity and global interaction in its own way and asks new questions. Inevitably, strict boundaries of what is modern and what is traditional are blurred as a result. Binnaz Toprak observes that Japanese people mark western holidays, but sometimes also wear traditional attire. For Deringil, Ottoman statesmen end up as quite the accomplished contemporaries in comparison to their Japanese counterparts, although politically weaker. According to Esenbel, Japanese militarists looked towards Ankara rather than Berlin or Rome as the inspiration for their Asian revolution, an image quite shocking

---

9   Ward and Rustow, eds., *Political Modernization in Japan and Turkey*, 6.
10 Ibid., 440.

to our standard vision of Turkey's revolutionary legacy as a safely westernizing venture. In a similar vein, in Mitani's article, the boundaries between the so-called east and west, or Asia and Europe, as historical categories are blurred. Even the idea of Asia is not originally Asian, but has undergone a process of becoming so. However, for Zafer Toprak the Ottoman economy was not being destroyed, but rather integrated into Europe in the second half of the nineteenth century. Interaction, links, connectedness, contemporary-ness are key words that stand out. Each author from his or her own vantage point enables us to view the history of modernity–in this case through the examples of Japan and Turkey–as a shared global process of change, rather than in terms of national and indigenous dynamics only. All in all, the papers constitute a reflection on *Political Modernization in Japan and Turkey* by introducing themes and conceptual questions that were not touched upon in that volume. The essays also raise new questions that need to be addressed in future studies about Japan's and Turkey's experiences with modernity.

Modernization studies of the 1960s, including Ward and Rustow's book, exhibit conceptual constraints that invite discussion. An effort at defining the national factors in the modernizing process of the nation-state, the modernization perspective was a product of post-1945 American social science scholarship that aimed to replace what previously would have been termed the westernization or the civilizing of Asian and African peoples. By reducing the role of the west and redefining westernization as a non-regional structural process, the modernization perspective tended to leave out the significant transnational and cosmopolitan framework of the imperial polities of the nineteenth century and at the same time disregarded the connections among these countries sharing a global history with western powers. In this analysis, empires and their varying polities were lost. They only provided a contrasting background to the emergence of the twentieth-century modern nation-state constructed on the ashes of empires that were inevitably destroyed in the early twentieth century. The role of western influences was a given factor, not organically linked to the future nation-state. Therefore, while replacing the politically incorrect term of westernization, modernization simultaneously disregarded the history of the west beyond the geography of the western world, not only as a colonizing power, but also as being a part of the transformation of countries outside its cultural borders.

Re-reading Ward and Rustow's book today shows how much our perception of the twentieth century (in Eric Hobsbawm's words, the shortest century) is conditioned to primarily focus on history as a series of events that occurred *within* a given society as an inner transformation of

the national. This perspective places relatively little emphasis on the concurrent links of the national to global historical dynamics at the time.

Needless to say, a problem of studying the transformation of polities and societies such as Japan and Turkey is that the conceptual tools have been derived from the European experience of modernity—for example, from the emergence of nation-states, the French Revolution, the rise of Euro/American capitalism, western imperialism, the scientific and industrial revolutions, and so on. Therefore, Euro/American history is frequently seen as the basis of the forces of modern history, as the very essence of the definition of modernity, whereas countries outside of the perceived geographic and cultural boundaries of the western world have been lumped together in the residual category of non-western. The latter were expected to experience a replay of an earlier European historical experience, if they were up to it or lucky, or sometimes under proper colonial tutelage. To give credit where it is due, Ward and Rustow were aware of this problem. In their concluding remarks they suggested that the study of Japan and Turkey shows the existence of various models of modernity (not alternatives, as is argued by some social scientists today) and recommended that the earlier experience of European countries should be studied in similar systematic fashion to expose the diversity in the European transformation to modernity.[11]

Another point concerns Turkish social science scholarship on the topic of Japanese and Turkish modernization at the time of the publication of the Ward and Rustow volume. Never translated into Turkish, the book itself was generally ignored in the Turkish debate on the question of Turkish modernization/westernization, with the exception of a few works that made brief references. During the 1960s, the only work that undertook a serious comparative analysis of the Japanese and Turkish revolutions in Turkish was that of Doğan Avcıoğlu who described both experiences from a Marxist perspective as national bourgeois revolutions.[12] Avcıoğlu viewed Japanese modernization as a coalition of feudal and bourgeois elements in an absolutist regime which engendered capitalism under an authoritarian regime without its accompanying liberal and democratic processes.[13] Reflecting the mainstream Japanese Marxist scholarship of Takahashi Kohachiro on the subject through Paul Baran's *The Political Economy of Growth* and other important works such as those of E. H. Norman, and T. C. Smith, Avcıoğlu's brief analysis still stands as an accomplished evaluation

---

11   Ibid., 464.
12   Doğan Avcıoğlu, *Türkiye'nin Düzeni: Dün-Bugün-Yarın* (Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1969), 37-47 (for the Japanese development).
13   Ibid., 37-47.

from a Marxist perspective.[14] It is interesting to note that Avcıoğlu disregards Ward and Rustow's work in his book, although his book appeared five years after the former, an omission that alludes to the political and ideological gap between the American orientation of the modernization debate and the contemporaneous Turkish intellectual milieu.

Unlike Marxist-oriented Turkish scholars for whom Japan has not been a major topic of interest (perhaps because it was assumed that such an interest would reinforce a right-wing perspective of developmentalist political economy, authoritarian methods and traditionalist culturalism), Japan's and Turkey's encounters with modernity have constituted a popular topic of comparison for Turkish intellectuals and political figures of a mainstream and right-wing tendency (the Turkish version of *kakushin uyoku*, as it were). Yet, often the overall treatment of the topic did not go beyond a lamentation about how unsuccessful Turkish efforts have been in contrast to the striking success of Japan, the rising star of the east.

A thoughtful example of the conservative perspective on Japan's developmental experience is Mehmed Turgut's detailed study of Japanese industrial policy as an instructive model for Turkey.[15] A former minister of industry and energy who served in many of the Justice Party cabinets of the 1960s and 1970s, Turgut saw Japan's industrialization as a viable example that Turkey should follow. He criticized Turkey's policies accordingly.

There are also important, if only few, exceptions to the conservative approach in comparing Turkey's and Japan's developmental trajectories. For instance, Esenbel and Demircioğlu have brought together for the first time articles by mostly Turkish scholars on Japan in an edited volume that aims to look at Japanese history and contemporaneous development from the perspective of the Turkish experience.[16] The book includes a wide range of topics—such as labor law, banking, economic models, secular constitutions, and international relations. Another notable work is that by Huri İslamoğlu-İnan who has emphasized Japan's ability to industrialize, even though it lacked a European institutional background.[17]

---

14 See, Paul Baran, *The Political Economy of Growth* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1957), E. Herbert Norman, *Japan's Emergence as a Modern State* (New York: Institute of Pacific Relations, 1946), Thomas Carlyle Smith, *Political Change and Industrial Development in Japan: Government Eterprise, 1868-1880* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1955), Kohachiro Takahashi, "La Place de la Revolution de Meiji dans l'histoire agraire du Japon," *Revue Historique* (October-November 1953).

15 Mehmet Turgut, *Japon Mucizesi ve Türkiye* (İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 1985).

16 Selçuk Esenbel and Murat Demircioğlu, eds., *Çağdaş Japonya'ya Türkiye'den Bakışlar* (İstanbul: Simurg, 1999).

17 Huri İslamoğlu-İnan, "Introduction: Why European History," *O.D.T.Ü. Gelişme Dergisi* 22, no. 3 (1995). Also see, İlkay Sunar, *State and Society in the Politics of Turkey's Development* (Ankara: Ankara Universitesi S. B. F. Yayınları, 1974).

Since the late Ottoman period there is also a tradition of Islamist intellectual debate since the late Ottoman period on Japanese modernity as a suitable alternative for Muslims, an alternative that would avoid the cultural westernization that was dominant in the Turkish experiment. Late Ottoman intellectuals' fascination with the activities of Pan Islamist figures such as Mehmed Akif and Abdürreşid İbrahim, who had political and intellectual involvement with Japan, is an interesting undercurrent of late Ottoman Turkish history. They perceived Japan as a successful model for having incorporated traditionalist attitudes and religious traditions and, hence, as an example against which to critique the strongly secular dynamics of the Turkish republican model which, according to them, failed in nation-building and Japanese-style rapid industrialization. Needless to say, this idealization of Japan as a suitable model for a Muslim society because of its traditionalist policies has dismissed the significance of westernization, secularization and the social crises that went into the Japanese transformation.[18] Along the same lines, it is worth mentioning that Ward and Rustow made a passing reference to the Japanese advantage of accomplishing an innovative symbiosis of traditionalist attitudes and institutions with modernity, a symbiosis that reinforced dualism in the process of constructing a modern society, such as the clever use of the notion of the divine emperor and the samurai ethic for strengthening political unity. In contrast, the authors assess Turkey less likely to succeed, because of the abolishing of the Caliphate and the hard-line secularism of early Kemalist reforms against the Islamic tradition.[19] It is interesting to note that the current Turkish Islamist approach to the Japanese experience ironically takes off from this point of criticizing Turkish modernization as lacking the cultural and spiritual instruments of the Japanese use of tradition. A notable exception to the perspective favoring the culturalist mode of the Japanese experience is an essay by Abdülkadir Buluş that avoids the simplistic positing of this country's experience as an alternative to the west.[20] Following a fine discussion of the roots of Japanese

---

18 For an exposé of the Pan Islamist vision of Japan, see Selçuk Esenbel, "Japan's Global Claim to Asia: Transnationalism and World Power Japanese Pan Asianism and the World of Islam: 1900-1945," *American Historical Review* 109, no. 4 (October 2004). For a discussion of the economic resources of industrialization, traditionalism, westernizing elements and social crises in modern Japanese history, see Selçuk Esenbel, "Japon Aydınları ve Batı Bilimi," *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 40 (1988), Selçuk Esenbel, "Japonya'da Islahat Düşüncesi ve Ulusal Kimlik," *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 54-55 (1991), Selçuk Esenbel, "Türk ve Japon Modernleşmesi: 'Uygarlık Süreci' Kavramı Açısından Bir Mukayese," *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 84 (2000), Selçuk Tözeren, "Japon 'Eğitim Modeli' ve Doğu Batı Sorunsalı," *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 25-26 (1984), Selçuk Tözeren, "Japonya'da Toprak Düzeni ve Kapitülasyonlar," *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 25-26 (1984).

19 Ward and Rustow, eds., *Political Modernization in Japan and Turkey*, 434.

20 Abdülkadir Buluş, "Japon Kapitalizminin Kökenleri ve Osmanli Devleti ile Bir Karşılaştırma," *Divan*,

capitalism and a comparison with the Ottoman state, Buluş ends his essay with the open-ended remark that such a comparison exhibits methodological difficulties due to differences in social, cultural, economic and religious social formations. He argues that each society has to give birth to its own developmental process out of its own structural character and that it is not realistic to expect the possibility of an identical adaptation of either the western or the Japanese model of development. While informative and offering a pragmatic answer to a profoundly difficult question, this comment begs elaboration.[21] It also raises the danger of creating a vicious circle that prevents us from pursuing comparative study to understand the complex phenomenon of modernity.

Prospects for fruitful comparative studies in the future lie in focusing on a clearly defined singular topic that provides a focused instrument for discussing modernity by bringing in research from regional studies beyond the reductionism of the west and the rest. A recent book edited by Huri İslamoğlu, on the institution of private property in China, India and the Ottoman Empire, brings together specialists from each field and represents a good example of a multi-regional analysis of modernity from the perspective of economic history, even though the book's title has retained the east versus the west terminology.[22] Another notable comparative work, although focusing on a different region, is Faruk Birtek and Thalia Dragonas's edited volume on the dilemmas of citizenship and the nation-state in Greece and Turkey, two countries which emerged from the heterogeneous historical legacy of the Ottoman world. The book highlights the political problems of nation-building, or rather nation-engineering, an issue which *Political Modernization in Japan and Turkey* was unable to fully explore, other than suggesting that it was easier for Japan than for Turkey.[23]

For the historically minded, however, a number of new strategies of investigation which possibly imply a new curriculum of training, are in order, aiming to cross the borders of nation-state analysis into a new terrain of research. Herein lies the benefit of global history as a new perspective on international history. By focusing on the international and intra-national connections within a historic spatial and temporal setting, this method will engender a new set of questions that will provide the means to plunge into uncharted territories and bring to the surface material left unstudied in the

---

no. 2 (2002).

21   Ibid.

22   Huri İslamoğlu, ed., *Constituting Modernity: Private Property in the East and West* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2004).

23   Faruk Birtek and Thalia Dragonas, eds., *Citizenship and the Nation-State in Greece and Turkey* (London: Routledge, 2005).

past for ideological or methodological reasons. The student of modernity can connect the historical experience of a generation across national, geo-political and cultural boundaries, as a shared one that dismantles the nation-state trajectory of analysis and expands modernity to a global platform.

Historians recently have begun to realize the importance of the global, not so much as an ideal or a model, nor as a value-laden framework for positive or negative comparison (that is, in terms of east versus west), but as historical processes that took the shape of political, economic and intellectual interaction–connectedness of the so-called external social phenomena with the domestic stage of events. The global approach is especially relevant for the historical study of the modern era, an era in which western military and techno-industrial developments and western colonial and imperial expansion quickened the connections between peoples and regions.

The perspective of global history encourages the study of the organic links between the national and the international at any given moment in historical time. However, it presents problems in the training of historians, for it requires mastery of the languages of archival material in several countries. Based on the use of multi-linguistic materials contemporaneous with each other and a firm understanding of the debate on the historiography in each respective region, such an analysis obviously expands the nation-state frame and connects historical processes beyond the divide between European and/or American, Asian and African histories.

Such an approach would place emphasis on the historical role of transnational political/religious/ethnic networks, the global interaction of ideas via the press, and attitudes and intellectual discourses that cut across national boundaries. The fields of Chinese and Indian historiography have been particularly fertile in the engendering of a global and transnational perspective for understanding modern history beyond the nation-state. Studies that adopt such a broad perspective set the stage for contention against linear histories of China and India by drawing attention to supra-national historical factors.[24] For instance, Rebecca Karl's recent study of Chinese nationalism and revolutionaries around the turn of the twentieth century reveals how Chinese revolutionaries debated their agenda of nationalist awakening in the light of the Young Turk revolution of 1908. Her study shows how the global interaction of ideas and experiences were

---

24 See, Prasenjit Duara, *Rescuing History from the Nation: Questioning Narratives of Modern China* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1996).

connected to this revolutionary moment.[25] Thus, historians increasingly turn their attention to topics that extend the historical stage across the political borders of the state and the nation by drawing attention to the history of diaspora or émigré populations within the home country and overseas, or to informal connections of diplomacy that cut across national institutions. The familiar topic of the global economic interests of firms and the unfamiliar topic of world powers' intelligence operations as well as international revolutionary movements constitute subjects that invite attention to the study of the global.[26] In sum, a global perspective can help us embark upon the study of alien shores as a shared experience that brings light to the shadows that govern (again in the words of Hobsbawm) our interesting times.[27]

Selçuk Esenbel

Department of History,
Boğaziçi University

References

Avcıoğlu, Doğan. *Türkiye'nin Düzeni: Dün-Bugün-Yarın*. Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1969.

Baran, Paul. *The Political Economy of Growth*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1957.

Birtek, Faruk, and Thalia Dragonas, eds. *Citizenship and the Nation-State in Greece and Turkey*. London: Routledge, 2005.

Black, Jeremy. *Maps and History: Constructing Images of the Past*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000.

Buluş, Abdülkadir. "Japon Kapitalizminin Kökenleri ve Osmanli Devleti ile Bir Karşılaştırma." *Divan*, no. 2 (2002): 135-95.

Casalle, Giancarlo. "The Ottoman Age of Exploration: Spices, Maps and Conquest in the Sixteenth-century Indian Ocean." Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University, 2004.

Deringil, Selim. *The Well-Protected Domains: Ideology and the Legitimation of Power in the Ottoman Empire 1876-1909*. London: I. B. Tauris, 1998.

Dower, John W. *Origins of the Modern Japanese State: Selected Writings of E. H. Norman*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1975.

Duara, Prasenjit. *Rescuing History from the Nation: Questioning Narratives of Modern China*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1996.

Esenbel, Selçuk. "Japan's Global Claim to Asia: Transnationalism and World Power Japanese Pan Asianism and the World of Islam: 1900-1945." *American Historical Review* 109, no. 4 (October 2004): 1140-70.

---

25 Rebecca Karl, *Staging the World: Chinese Nationalism at the Turn of the Twentieth Century* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2002).
26 See, Esenbel, "Japan's Global Claim to Asia."
27 Spelling of Japanese words have disregarded lines to indicate long o and u sounds.

——, "Japon Aydınları ve Batı Bilimi." *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 40 (1988): 35-42.

——, "Japonya'da Islahat Düşüncesi ve Ulusal Kimlik." *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 54-55 (1991): 65-75.

——, "Türk ve Japon Modernleşmesi: 'Uygarlık Süreci' Kavramı Açısından Bir Mukayese." *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 84 (2000): 18-36.

Esenbel, Selçuk, and Murat Demircioğlu, eds. *Çağdaş Japonya'ya Türkiye'den Bakışlar*. İstanbul: Simurg, 1999.

Harley, John Brian. *The New Nature of Maps: Essays in the History of Cartography*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001.

Harootunian, Harry. *History's Disquiet: Modernity, Cultural Practice and the Question of Everyday Life*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2000.

İslamoğlu-İnan, Huri. "Introduction: Why European History." *O.D.T.Ü. Gelişme Dergisi* 22, no. 3 (1995): 221-25.

İslamoğlu, Huri, ed. *Constituting Modernity: Private Property in the East and West* London: I. B. Tauris, 2004.

Kafesçioğlu, Çiğdem. "The Ottoman Capital in the Making: The Reconstruction of Constantinople in the Fifteenth Century." Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University, 1996.

Karl, Rebecca. *Staging the World: Chinese Nationalism at the Turn of the Twentieth Century*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2002.

Norman, E. Herbert. *Japan's Emergence as a Modern State*. New York: Institute of Pacific Relations, 1946.

Pinto, Karen. "Ways of Seeing: Scenarios of the World in the Islamic Cartographic Imagination!" Ph.D. Dissertation, Columbia University, 2001.

Smith, Thomas Carlyle. *Political Change and Industrial Development in Japan: Government Eterprise, 1868-1880*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1955.

Sunar, İlkay. *State and Society in the Politics of Turkey's Development*. Ankara: Ankara Universitesi S. B. F. Yayınları, 1974.

Takahashi, Kohachiro. "La Place de la Revolution de Meiji dans l'histoire agraire du Japon." *Revue Historique* (October-November 1953).

Tözeren, Selçuk. "Japon 'Eğitim Modeli' ve Doğu Batı Sorunsalı." *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 25-26 (1984): 23-38.

——, "Japonya'da Toprak Düzeni ve Kapitülasyonlar." *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 25-26 (1984): 39-58.

Turgut, Mehmet. *Japon Mucizesi ve Türkiye*. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 1985.

Ward, Robert E., and Dankwart A. Rustow, eds. *Political Modernization in Japan and Turkey*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964.