

German Institute for Japanese Studies (DIJ)
ドイツ-日本研究所

International Conference
国際会議

**PAN-ASIANISM IN MODERN JAPANESE HISTORY:
COLONIALISM, REGIONALISM AND BORDERS**

**近代日本史におけるアジア主義：
植民地主義、地域主義、境界**

**November 29 - 30, 2002
2002年11月29 - 30日**



Conference venue

Tokyo International Exchange Center, Plaza Heisei, Media Hall

会場
東京国際交流会館 プラザ平成 メディアホール

日英同時通訳付

Supported by:
The Japan Foundation
Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany

助成
国際交流基金
後援
在日ドイツ大使館

German Institute for Japanese Studies (DIJ)
3-3-6 Kudan Minami, Chiyoda-ku, Tôkyô 102-0074, Japan
ドイツ-日本研究所 〒102-0074 東京都千代田区九段南 3-3-6
Tel.: +81-(0)3-3222-5077 Fax: +81-(0)3-3222-5420
e-mail: dijtokyo@dijtokyo.org homepage: <http://www.dijtokyo.org>

Organization: Sven Saaler
Secretariat: Sugimoto Eiko

企画担当：スヴェン・サーラ
事務担当：杉本 栄子

DIJ International Conference

PAN-ASIANISM IN MODERN JAPANESE HISTORY: COLONIALISM, REGIONALISM AND BORDERS

In the decade since the end of the Cold War, regionalization has become of increasing global importance. In the search for a new world order, regionalism seems to offer a stepping-stone toward international cooperation in an era when national approaches remain unsatisfactory and universal ideas are still far from being realized. Europe is widely seen as the pioneer in regional integration and the quest to overcome the nation state, with North America following closely, at least in terms of economic integration. However, when it comes to the institutional manifestation of transnational ties, regional cooperation and integration in Asia seems to make less progress. New approaches such as the ASEAN+3 initiative, for example, still seem burdened by the legacies of the past. An important aspect of this past is the ideology of Pan-Asianism, which served not only as the basis for early efforts at regional integration in East Asia, but also a tool for legitimising Japanese colonial rule. With this past experience in mind, this conference proposes to explore the ideology of Pan-Asianism (or Asianism) as a predecessor of contemporary Asian regionalism, thereby bringing historical perspective to bear on approaches to regional cooperation and integration, as well as to analyse various utilizations and manifestations of Pan-Asian ideology. Moreover, the conference aims at analysing the relationship of historical Pan-Asian ideology to the much-noted phenomenon of “Asian values,” and at demonstrating that Pan-Asianism remains a persistent force in Japanese thought and foreign policy.

The concept of a Pan-movement actually originated within the framework of European history and thus may seem inappropriate for analysing an aspect of Asian history. However, as early as the late 19th century the term “Pan-Asianism” or “Asianism,” was in wide use in Japanese media coverage, intellectual discourse, and foreign policy planning. Pan-Asianism subsequently manifested itself in a wide variety of forms. While it certainly functioned as a tool for legitimizing Japanese colonial rule

in East Asia and as an ideological foundation for Japanese regional hegemony, there is more to Pan-Asianism than this very common yet one-dimensional interpretation of self-interested political utilization. Pan-Asian ideology also served as a means to mobilize Asian peoples in their struggle for independence from colonial rule and as an instrument to construct a regional identity in opposition to “the West.” Furthermore, Pan-Asian rhetoric is still widely employed today, perhaps most notably in the quest to define so-called “Asian values” in response to a supposed universality of Western thought. Considered from this perspective, the phenomenon of Pan-Asianism seems to possess a stronger “transnational” character than European Pan-movements and, when employed in efforts to establish a collective regional identity, to cut across nation-state boundaries and appeal to certain cohesive cultural factors, e.g. language/script, religion, shared historical experience, geography, and race. By addressing these aspects of Pan-Asianism in Japan from the late 19th century until the post-World War II period, this conference aims at making both an empirical and a theoretical contribution to the study of Pan-Asianism and the historical background of regionalism in general, and to stimulating future research in the field. Participants will include researchers from the fields of history, political science, social science and Japanese studies.

PROGRAM

29 NOVEMBER 2002 (9:00-18:00)

9:00-9:30: Opening

Irmela Hijjya-Kirschner (DIJ): Opening Remarks

Sven Saaler (DIJ): Introduction

9:30-11:30 Panel 1: Pan-Asianism in Comparative Perspective

Chair: Isa Duce (DIJ)

John Namjun Kim (Cornell University)

German Cosmopolitan Ideals in the Political Philosophy of Japanese Imperialism

Romano Vulpitta (Kyôto Sangyô University)

The European Integration and East Asia

Li Narangoa (Australian National University)

Pan-Asianism and Co-Prosperity in the Japanese Imperial Imagination

Discussant: Rolf-Harald Wippich (Sophia University)

11:30-13:00: Lunch Break

13:00-15:00 Panel 2: Creating a Regional Identity: Ideal and Reality

Chair: Andrea Germer (DIJ)

Kuroki Morifumi (Fukuoka International University)

The Pan-Asianism of the Kôa-kai and of Ueki Emori

Nojima (Katô) Yôko (Tôkyô University)

The Imperial Army's View of Asian Regionalism

Christopher Szpilman (Takushoku University)

Between Pan-Asianism and Japanese Nationalism: Mitsukawa Kametarô and

His Campaign to Reform Japan and Liberate Asia

Discussant: Sakai Tetsuya (Tôkyô University)

15:00-15:30: Coffee Break

15:30-17:30 Panel 3: Regionalism, Nationalism and Ethnocentrism

Chair: Rolf-Harald Wippich (Sophia University)

Dick Stegewerns (Ôsaka Sangyo University)

"The Inferiority of Asia": The Taishô 'Civilization Critics' and Regional Integration

Michael A. Schneider (Knox College)

"Women Pan-Asianists are the Worst": Internationalism and Pan-Asianism in

the Careers of Inoue Hideko and Inoue Masaji

Harald Kleinschmidt (Tsukuba University)

Pan-Europeanism in Comparative Perspective

Discussant: Sven Saaler (DIJ)

17:30-18:00: Discussion

30 NOVEMBER 2002 (9:30-17:30)

9:30-12:00: Panel 4

Creating a Regional Hegemony: Japan's Quest for a 'New Order'

Chair: Monika Schimpf (DIJ)

Roger Brown (University of Southern California)

Visions of a Virtuous New Order: Yasuoka Masahiro and the Kingly Way

Kevin Doak (Georgetown University)

The Concept of Ethnic Nationality and its Role in Pan-Asianism in Imperial Japan

Gerhard Krebs (Free University Berlin)

Pan-Germanism Meets Pan-Asianism: Nazi Germany and Japan's
Greater East Asia Policy

Discussant: Hatano Sumio (Tsukuba University)

12:00-13:30: Lunch Break

13:30-14:30: Panel 5

Pan-Asianism Adjusted: Wartime to Postwar

Chair: Sven Saaler (DIJ)

Victor Koschmann (Cornell University)

'Constructing Destiny': Rôyama Masamichi and Asian Community in Wartime Japan

Hatsuse Ryûhei (Kyôto Women's University)

Pan-Asianism in International Relations: Prewar, Postwar, Present

14:30-15:00: Coffee Break

15:00-16:30

Oguma Eiji (Keiô University)

The Postwar Intellectuals' View of "Asia"

Kristine Dennehy (California State University, Fullerton)

Overcoming Colonialism in Bandung, 1955

Discussant: Fujiwara Kiichi (Tôkyô University)

16:30-17:30:

Final Discussion

Closing Remarks (Miwa Kimitada, Prof. Emer., Sophia University)

Panel 1: Pan-Asianism in Comparative Perspective

What were the historical roots and background of Pan-movements in general? How was the concept of a Pan-movement and of regional identity and integration transferred to an Asian framework, and how was it adjusted to suit completely different cultural and political backgrounds? What elements from European politics and philosophy were most influential in shaping the ideology of Pan-Asianism? What made Asian regionalism different from regionalism in other parts of the world?

Chair: Isa Duche (DIJ)

John Namjun Kim: German Cosmopolitan Ideals in the Political Philosophy of Japanese Imperialism

This paper seeks to determine the sense in which the Hegelian concept of “mediation” is central to the philosophical-political projects of the Kyôto School philosophers Miki Kiyoshi and Tanabe Hajime and how this concept introduces an important ambiguity in the notion of cosmopolitanism. Specifically, it focuses on how both Miki and Tanabe—as divergent as their views are—rely implicitly on the abstract notion of cosmopolitanism laid out by Immanuel Kant’s essay *Toward Perpetual Peace* for their arguments in support of the project of Japanese imperialism.

It argues that both Miki and Tanabe accept Kant’s notion in order to criticize it in favor of a more “concrete” conception of cosmopolitanism. However, this more “concrete” conception, as it turns out, is *almost* indistinguishable from nationalism insofar as “Japan” becomes the primary unit by which individual self-hood is measured. While G.W.F. Hegel’s philosophy of mediation is not in itself “nationalist,” this paper argues that the introduction of the concept of mediation produces a political ambiguity when considered in terms of Kantian cosmopolitanism. On the one hand, mediation in the political sphere suggests the thoroughgoing mutual determination of all subjects in the world and thus suggests an ultimate form of cosmopolitanism. On the other hand, the concept of mediation might also be applied, first, within a determined geopolitical boundary such as the Japanese Empire and then, in turn, on a larger scale such as the world *in toto*, such that the Japanese Empire is mediated by other nation-states.

The latter case, as this paper argues, cannot be adequately described by the conceptual language of either nationalism or cosmopolitanism. Rather, mediation in the latter case describes the logic of imperialism. Mediation in the latter case designates the internal subsumption of cultural differences—e.g. Japanese, Okinawan, Korean, Taiwanese, etc—such that they all are subsumed under representational sphere called “Japan.” It is important to investigate this form of “multiculturalism” in view of contemporary concerns, for it serves as an early model of the kind of hegemony exerted by other imperial forms, such as that represented today by American.

John Namjun Kim was born in San Francisco in 1972 and studied philosophy, German literature and Asian studies at the University of California at Santa Cruz, the University of Vienna, and Cornell University. He received his B.A. at UC Santa Cruz in 1996 and the M.A. at Cornell in 2000. He is currently seeking his Ph.D. in the Department of German Studies at Cornell, writing his dissertation on the literary and philosophical representation of violence in modern subject formation. From 2000 to 2001, he was a Fulbright scholar at the Tôkyô University of Foreign Studies, conducting research on the influence of Hegelian political philosophy on Kyôto School philosophers. Part of this research was recently published as “Cultural Heterogeneity and Philosophical Nationalism: the Idea of ‘Japan in the World’ in Miki Kiyoshi” (*Quadrante* 4, 2002).

Romano Vulpitta: The European Integration and East Asia

The globalization game is no longer between countries, but between regions . In spite of the two World Wars fought in the first half of the twentieth century, in its second half the countries of Western Europe engaged in a successful process of integration. This has gradually extended to almost all of Europe. The reasons for such success lay in an unexpected underlying strong feeling of unity between the diverse countries, no doubt resulting from long experience of competition and cooperation, which provided the know-how for intra-regional relations.

In East Asia the countries of the southern part of the region went through an earlier process of integration, but relations between the countries of the northern part are still at the bilateral stage. Until now, the strong ties of economic interdependence that the latter are building between themselves, and with the southern part of the region, have not developed into an organic form of integration. However, if the countries of East Asia fail in finding some degree of integration, the region will not be able to consolidate its position as the third pole of the world economy.

Can the European experience become a model for integration in East Asia? Culturally, economically and politically, the conditions are, of course, very different; but the problem of how to accommodate two big powers like China and Japan in any proposed integration poses the biggest challenge to the region.

Romano Vulpitta was born at Rome in 1939 and graduated in Law at the University of Rome. Following service in the Italian diplomatic service, he has been teaching comparative culture and European management at Kyôto Sangyô University since 1978. His recent publications are *Fuhai no jôken: Yasuda Yojûrô to sekai shichô* (Chûô Kôronsha, 1995) and *Mussolini – Itaria-jin no monogatari* (Chûô Kôronsha, 2000).

Li Narangoa: Buddhism and Pan-Asianism

The basic idea of Pan-Asianism from the late 19th century to the mid-20th century was Asian unity against Western imperialism. Many of the advocates of Pan-Asianism emphasized the similarity of Asian culture, especially the common root of religion or philosophy. In both Europe and Asia there was a strong tendency to characterise the civilizations of the two continents in such a way that they were seen as fundamentally at odds in philosophical terms. Thus, many Asians, especially Chinese and Japanese, acknowledged the power of Western technology, but rejected Western philosophy and sought to identify common cultural features which linked Asian countries. They wanted to adopt Western technology only on the basis of what they saw as their own oriental spirit. Buddhism was one of the most significant common cultural bases along with Confucian philosophy. In order to prevent, for example, Christian influence from the West, Japanese Buddhists began to seek alliances with their fellow Buddhist in other Asian countries. They did not have any coherent strategy to implement using these alliances, but solidarity gave them a sense of strength.

This paper shall examine the elastic nature of regionalism by looking at the motives of Japanese religious groups, especially Buddhist groups, in expanding their mission to other parts of Asia. It will examine the problems they faced in trying to pursue their 'Buddhist brothers' – under the name of 'Asian unity' – in the Japanese Buddhist form, which was a more 'civilized' and 'up to date' religious form.

Li Narangoa was born in Inner Mongolia 1963 and studied and worked in China, Japan and Germany. She received her Ph.D. from Bonn University, Germany in 1998. After having worked for three years as a researcher at the Nordic Institute of Asian Studies (NIAS), Copenhagen, she is now employed at the Australian National University, Canberra. Her major recent publications are *Japanische Religionspolitik in der Mongolei 1932-1945. Reformbestrebungen und Dialog zwischen japanischem und mongolischem Buddhismus* [Japanese Policy toward Religion in Mongolia 1932–1945: Reform Initiatives and Dialogue between Japanese and Mongolian Buddhism] (Harrassowitz, 1998) and *Imperial Japan and National Identities in Asia* (edited with Robert Cribb, RoutledgeCurzon, 2002, forthcoming).

Discussant: Rolf-Harald Wippich

Rolf-Harald Wippich was born in Leverkusen in 1950 and studied history, philosophy, political science and anthropology at the University of Cologne, where he received his Ph.D. in 1985. He then taught history at the University of Cologne from 1985 to 1989. Since 1989 he has lived and worked in Japan and, from 1991, has been teaching western history and international relations at Sophia University in Tôkyô. His major publications include *Japan und die deutsche Fernostpolitik 1894-1898* (Steiner 1987); *Vermiedene Kriege* (co-editor, Oldenbourg, 1997); *Japan als Kolonie?* (Abera, 1997); *War, Diplomacy and Public Opinion: German-Japanese Relations 1895-1945* (co-editor, RoutledgeCurzon, forthcoming).

Panel 2: Creating a Regional Identity: Ideal and Reality

What general elements are necessary for constructing a regional identity? What role do language, script, race and religion play? What were the main contents of Pan-Asian ideology in Japanese intellectual discourse? How was a regional identity created and how was it articulated in political discourse and policy-making? How did Meiji Asianism differ from later, more politicized versions of Asianism?

Chair: Andrea Germer (DIJ)

Kuroki Morifumi: The Pan-Asianism of the Kôa-kai and of Ueki Emori

This paper begins with an examination of the Kôa-kai, Japan's first organization dedicated to Pan-Asianism to appear in modern times, founded in 1880. The presenter will trace and clarify the historical background related to the development of the Kôa-kai's organization, its aims, the composition of its members, its organizational structure, the ideas held by members as well as the association's activities.

Next, the presenter explores the Pan-Asianism propounded and developed by Ueki Emori, a leader of the Jiyûtô (Liberal Party) and a political theorist connected with the popular rights movement. Ueki harshly criticized the Kôa-kai's stand on Pan-Asianism. The author then traces the changes in the Jiyûtô's views on Pan-Asianism that took place from the time when Ueki passed away in 1885 through the period of the Sino-Japanese War (1894/95).

Kuroki Morifumi graduated from Kyûshû University and from Tôkyô University. After teaching for several years at the Faculty of Law of Kyûshû University, he now teaches at Fukuoka International University. His research has focused on the modern history of Japanese foreign relations, nationalism in modern Japan and the early Asianism in Meiji Japan. His publications include several articles on early Asianism in Meiji Japan, he is co-author of *Ikoku to Kyûshû* (Yûsankaku, 1992) and co-editor as well as author of the introductory essay commentary to the collection of documents relating to the Kôa-kai and the *Ajia kyôkai Kôa-kai hôkoku, Ajia kyôkai hôkoku (fukkokuban)* (Fuji Shuppan, 1994).

Nojima (Katô) Yôko: The Imperial Army's View of Asian Regionalism

In the period before World War II, the Japanese Imperial Army maintained its own unique stance concerning issues related to national security and exerted its influence on national defense policy and foreign policy. This process has become well understood through the work carried out by James B. Crowley and Michael A. Barnhart. Their studies are focused on an analysis of the period from the 1930's onward following the influence of great changes caused by the world depression and the rise of Chinese nationalism related to the activities of China's National People's Party (Kuomintang).

However, consistently throughout the years that followed the end of World War I, in the Japanese Imperial Army's own views, the most likely probable cause for a breakout of war were seen to be a US-Japan confrontation stemming from economic and political chaos in China. Given this view, then, in the minds of Japanese Imperial Army personnel, what kind of a relationship between China and Japan did they regard as ideal? Using Honjô Shigeru, Ugaki Kazushige (Issei), Ishihara Kanji and Itagaki Seishirô as examples, I will trace the various aspects of army thinking concerning this relationship during the period from the 1920's into the 1940's.

Nojima (Katô) Yôko was born in 1960 and received her Ph.D. in 1989 in Japanese History from the Graduate School of Humanities, University of Tôkyô. After teaching at Yamanashi University as an assistant professor, she is now an associate professor of modern Japanese history at the Department of Japanese History, Graduate School of Humanities and Sociology, Faculty of Letters of the University of Tôkyô. Her major publications include: *Mosaku suru 1930nendai. Nichibei kankei to rikugun chûkensô* (Yamakawa Shuppansha, 1993); *Chôheisei to kindai Nihon, 1868-1945* (Yoshikawa Kôbunkan, 1996); *Sensô no Nihon kingendaishi* (Kôdansha, 2002). She also has translated Louise Young's *Japan's Total Empire* into Japanese (Iwanami Shoten, 2001).

Christopher W. A. Szpilman: Between Pan-Asianism and Japanese Nationalism: Mitsukawa Kametarô and His Campaign to Reform Japan and Liberate Asia

This paper focuses on the thought and behavior of Mitsukawa Kametarô (1888–1936), a journalist, writer, and university professor. Though almost completely neglected by postwar Japanese historians, Waseda-educated Mitsukawa, an ardent promoter of pan-Asianist ideas, was a pivotal figure in Japan's prewar right-wing movement. He founded the Rôsôkai and the Yûzonsha, perhaps the best-known pan-Asianist and renovationist organizations of the 1920s, and was subsequently active in several other radical organizations. But in addition to radicals, Mitsukawa's contacts also included members of the traditional right wing, as indicated, for example, by his association with Hiranuma Kiichirô's National Foundation Society and Uchida Ryôhei's Kokuryûkai.

In the first part of the presentation, I trace the development of Mitsukawa's views on Asia, Japan's mission in Asia, Japanese nationalism, Japanese colonial policy, party politics, and the race problem. I place these views in their historical context and discuss the influences, both native and foreign, that helped to shape them. Noting inherent tensions between Pan-Asianism and nationalism that existed in Mitsukawa's thought, I also describe the ways in which Mitsukawa attempted to reconcile such contradictions. In the second part I attempt to gauge the influence of Mitsukawa's pan-Asian ideas on the Japanese right wing movement in the interwar period. To this end, I examine both how his radical ideas were propagated and the reactions they inspired in an extensive network of Mitsukawa's associates in the army, navy, bureaucracy, and journalism.

Christopher W. A. Szpilman has been a visiting professor at the Institute of Japanese Culture at Takushoku University since 1997. Born in 1951, he received a B.A. in Japanese Studies from the School of Oriental and African Studies (University of London, 1980) and a Ph.D. in Japanese history from Yale University (1993). He did research at the Faculty of Law, Tôkyô University from 1986 to 1989. His research interests cover modern Japanese political and intellectual history. His recent publications include an introductory essay commentary to *Mitsukawa Kametarô: Chiiki chikyû jijô no keimôsha* (Takushoku University, 2001) and "Kita Ikki and the Politics of Coercion" (*Modern Asian Studies*, 36:2, May 2002).

Discussant: Sakai Tetsuya

Sakai Tetsuya is a professor in the Department of International Relations at the University of Tôkyô. His major field of research is modern Japanese history. He is author of *Taishô demokurashii taisei no hôkai* (Tôkyô Daigaku Shuppankai, 1992); “‘Tôa kyôdôtai-ron’ kara ‘kindaika-ron’ e” (*Nenpô seijigaku 1998: Nihon gaikô ni okeru Ajia-shugi*, Iwanami Shoten, 1999); “Sengo gaikô-ron no keisei” (Kitaoka Shin’ichi and Mikuriya Takashi eds.: *Sensô, fukkô, hatten*, Tôkyô Daigaku Shuppankai, 2000); and “Anakizumu-teki sôzôryoku to kokusai chitsujo” (*Raiburarii Sôkan Shakai Kagaku* 7, 2001).

Panel 3: Regionalism, Nationalism and Ethnocentrism

How was the ideology of Pan-Asianism related to the discourse on nationalism and ethnic identity? Was Pan-Asianism only instrumentalised to advance Japanese nationalism and colonial rule, as well as to sustain belief in Japan's superiority in Asia, or did it favor the construction of a transnational identity and regional integration? How was Pan-Asianism perceived outside of Asia and how did it influence international politics?

Chair: Rolf-Harald Wippich (Sophia University)

Dick Stegewerns: "The Inferiority of Asia": The Taishô 'Civilization Critics' and Regional Integration

In Meiji Japan's race to catch up with Western civilisation the existence of ideas on an alliance of Asian nations had seemed snowed under by Fukuzawa Yukichi's famous adage of 'stepping out of Asia'. However, by the Shôwa period such ideas had become so much a part of rightist rhetoric and government propaganda that in hindsight they were looked upon as part and parcel to the notorious 'Greater East Asian Co-Prosperity Sphere' and thus considered suspicious and dangerous. This led to the situation that when such ideas were discovered to have existed amongst 'respectable' actors on the prewar modern Japanese scene, they tended to be ignored or downplayed. The extreme cases, which could not be ignored, were swept together under the name 'Asianism', a tag that, because of its prewar, often dubious content, has strong negative connotations.

Still, it is hard to deny that ideas on Asian integration were a constant element in the intellectual make-up of the Japanese intelligentsia, and there were hardly any Japanese who did not share the long-term policy of kicking the Western nations out of Asia. This policy was usually subdued, however, for short-term political, economic and strategic reasons. In any case, the most common expression of such ideas was still a far cry from 'Asianism', because the majority of the Japanese found it hard, in spite of the shared Asian political objective, to find a common Asian identity or, if they did, to give it a respectable content. This paper will deal with the ideas on regional integration of several opinion leaders of the 1910s and 1920s, the so-called 'civilisation critics'.

Dick Stegewerns was born in 1966, and is an assistant professor at the Faculty of Economics of Ôsaka Sangyô University. He has studied at Leiden University, Kyôto University and Tôkyô University. His major publications include *Adjusting to the New World - The Taishô Generation of Opinion Leaders and the Outside World, 1918-1932* (forthcoming, 2003); “The End of World War One as a Turning Point in Modern Japanese History” (Bert Edstrom ed.: *Turning Points in Japanese History*, Japan Library, 2002) and several articles on intellectual history of Taishô Japan. He has also edited the volume *Nationalism and Internationalism in Imperial Japan. Autonomy, Asian Brotherhood, or World Citizenship?* (RoutledgeCurzon, 2002, forthcoming).

Michael A. Schneider: “Women Pan-Asianists are the Worst”: Internationalism and Pan-Asianism in the Careers of Inoue Hideko and Inoue Masaji

This paper considers the lives of Inoue Hideko (1875–1963) and her husband Inoue Masaji (1876–1947), internationalists who became Pan-Asianists. Their careers highlight key features of 1930’s Pan-Asianism, notably the allure of Pan-Asianism for 1920s internationalists. Their careers, moreover, allow us to consider the importance of gender in the appeal of Pan-Asianism.

The new participation of Japanese women in international relations of the 1920s forces us to consider their subsequent support for Pan-Asianism. Even among the many startling examples of intellectual apostasy in 1930s Japan, Inoue Hideko’s turn to fascism is remarkable. Inoue was Japan’s leading female internationalist of the 1920s. What does conversion of Inoue Hideko and other women internationalists to Pan-Asianism tell us about their relationship to pan-national/pan-ethnic ideologies? Is it the case, as is occasionally argued, that Pan-Asianist ideology was aided more critically and even advanced more feverishly by women rather than men?

This paper will address such questions by considering the ideas of Hideko with her husband, Inoue Masaji. Masaji had an internationalist agenda in his own right. His turn to Pan-Asianism is somehow less controversial. His Pan-Asianism is viewed as more typical than tragic. I will argue that the different approaches of Hideko and Masaji to Pan-Asianism (and the different reactions to their 1930s support for Pan-Asianism) suggest general truths about relationship between gender and Pan-Asianism. Women promoted internationalism during the 1920s to justify their participation in international affairs. Thus they risked much more than men who did the same. Their turn to Pan-Asianism reflected a continuing need to defend women’s competence in international affairs.

Michael Schneider received a Ph.D. in Modern Japanese/International History from the University of Chicago in June 1996 and presently holds the Chair, Department of History as well as being the Co-Director of the Center for Global Studies at Knox College. His recent publications include: “Globalization and Historical Writing: Home Economics as Internationalism in Japan 1920–1940” (*Waseda Journal of Asian Studies*, December 2001); “The Limits of Cultural Rule: Internationalism and Identity in Japanese Responses to Korean Rice” (Gi-Wook Shin and Michael Robinson eds.: *Colonial Modernity in Korea*) and “The Intellectual Origins of Colonial Trusteeship in East Asia: Nitobe Inazô, Paul Reinsch and the End of Empire” (*The Asian American Review* XVII, 1999).

Harald Kleinschmidt: Pan-Europeanism in Comparative Perspective

Saying that Pan-Europeanism no longer exists would be wrong but saying that it was important as an ideology would be an exaggeration. Pan-Europeanism had a difficult position among the ideologies of the first half of the twentieth century and bequeathed a problematic legacy to the latter part of the same century. As an ideology, Pan-Europeanism was an answer to the growing sense of cultural despair in the 1920s. Its essential protagonist in the German speaking area, Count Richard Nicolaus Coudenhove-Kalergi (1894–1972) requested respect for idealism as a means to fend off what he identified as the evils of materialism and technology.

He demanded the strengthening of religious faith against the perceived dangers of secularisation and socialism and proposed that the elite culture of the aristocracy should be accepted as a bulwark against what he described as the ravages of populism and militarism. With materialism, secularisation and populism targeted as primary foes, Pan-Europeanism presented itself as a conservative ideology drawn on the traditional aristocratic conceit that only the nobility were of consequence and could represent the unity of Europe through its own cosmopolitan values and Europe-wide kin networks.

With technology, socialism and militarism positioned as the core evils of the modern world, Pan-Europeanists became missionaries against progress and equality but for peace. Coudenhove-Kalergi, whose mother was Japanese and whose father was an established critic of racism, seemed to be able to articulate these attitudes, values and goals better than anyone else. However, the attitudes were snobbish, the values unattractive for most of the population and the goals conflicting. Aristocratic elitism, an ill-conceived preference for idealist values and religious sectarianism marginalised Pan-Europeanism and prevented it from contributing significantly (or substantially) to the unity of Europe.

Harald Kleinschmidt was born in Göttingen in 1949 and studied history, English, anthropology and philosophy at the University of Göttingen and Amherst College. He received his Ph.D. in history from Göttingen University in 1978. In 1985, he received his habilitation from the University of Stuttgart. He taught history at Stuttgart University from 1980 to 1989 and has been teaching the history of international relations at the University of Tsukuba since 1989. His major recent publications are *The Nemesis of Power. A History of International Relations Theories* (Reaktion Books, 2000); *Understanding the Middle Ages* (Boydell & Brewer, 2000); *Doitsu no nashonarizumu* (Sairyûsha, 2001) and *Menschen in Bewegung* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002).

Discussant: Sven Saaler

Sven Saaler studied history, political science and Japanese Studies at the Universities of Mainz, Cologne and Bonn. After conducting research in Japan from 1996 to 1999, he received a Ph.D. from Bonn University for his doctoral dissertation *Between Democracy and Militarism. The Role of the Imperial Japanese Army in Taishô politics, 1912-1926*. After teaching Japanese history at the Universities of Kanazawa and Marburg, he has been a research fellow at the DIJ since November 2000. Recent publications include *Pan-Asianism in Meiji and Taishô Japan - A Preliminary Framework* (DIJ Working Paper 02/4, 2002); “Japan in der internationalen Militarismusforschung“ [Japan in the International Debate on Militarism] (*Japanstudien* 14, 2002); “Zur Popularisierung und Visualisierung von Geschichte in Japan. Ein Beitrag zur aktuellen Diskussion um Erinnerungskultur” [The Popularisation and Visualisation of History in Current Japan. The Discussion About Historical Memory and Memorials] (*Festgabe für Peter Pantzer zu seinem sechzigsten Geburtstag*, 2002) and “Kiro ni tatsu Nihon gaikô. Daiichi sekai taisen makki ni okeru ‘Jinshu tôsô-ron’ to ‘Doitsu tôzen-ron’” [Japanese Foreign Policy at a Crossroads: Discourse on “Racial Conflict” and “The German Advance to the East”, 1917–1921] (*Kan-Nihonkai Kenkyû* 8, 2002; forthcoming).

Panel 4: Creating a Regional Hegemony: Japan's Quest for a New Order

What role did Pan-Asianism play in legitimizing Japan's expansion on the Asian continent and efforts to establish a "New Order" in East Asia? What different schools of thought existed in intellectual discourse on Asia during the 1930s? How did Pan-Asianism influence Japanese foreign policy, especially in Japan's relations with Germany, its closest ally since the 1930s?

Chair: Monika Schimpf (DIJ)

Roger Brown: Visions of a Virtuous New Order: Yasuoka Masahiro and the Kingly Way

This paper examines the idealistic vision of a new order in East Asia as articulated by the nationalist intellectual Yasuoka Masahiro (1898–1983). A student of Confucian thought and a principal activist in post-World War I right-wing organizations, Yasuoka emerged as a leading conservative reformist and confidant to prominent individuals within the bureaucracy, in the business world, and at court. Dating from the period of the Versailles Peace Conference, Yasuoka's Pan-Asianism envisioned a renaissance of East Asian civilization to be animated by "Oriental" self-cultivation and realized through the oversight of a virtuous officialdom. This was in essence the same perspective that informed his Japanist discourse on the need for a domestic "restoration" in line with the principles of the Kingly Way (*ôdô*), highlighting the fact that for Yasuoka these values supplied the best means not only for ruling Manchuria, but for governing Japan, as well. As further expansion led to war, Yasuoka offered his reading of China's dynastic history as a guide for eliciting Chinese cooperation in the creation of a Greater East Asia, all the while stressing the need for Japanese of superior character to step forward and help realize the Kingly Way at home and abroad.

Roger Brown is a Ph.D. Candidate in the Department of History at the University of Southern California and a part-time lecturer in East Asian history at Temple University Japan. His dissertation research focuses on the nationalist thought and political activities of Yasuoka Masahiro, a Confucian scholar and nationalist ideologue whose place close to those at the center of political and economic power in Japan spanned a period from the 1920s through the 1970s. Roger Brown is author of "Yasuoka Masahiro and Takushoku University" (*Takushoku Daigaku Hyakunen-shi Kenkyû* 10, 2002) and "Yasuoka Masahiro no Taishô-Shôwa shoki ni okeru jinkakuron" [Yasuoka Masahiro's Taishô-Early Shôwa Era Discourse on Moral Character] (*Kyôgaku*, January 2003 [part 1] and April 2003 [part 2], forthcoming).

Kevin Doak: The Concept of Ethnic Nationality and its Role in Pan-Asianism in Imperial Japan

In my paper, I present the outlines of a broadly shared vision for a new form of regionalism that was promoted by intellectuals, bureaucrats and others at the height of wartime Japan. This new regionalism was eventually expressed as a “New Order in East Asia.” While the general features of Japanese imperialism and the impact of Japan’s diplomatic withdrawal from the international community in the mid-1930s are now well understood, work on the cultural ideology of Japanese regionalism is less advanced.

My paper argues that the vision behind Japanese efforts to establish Asian regionalism was informed by the re-discovery of ethnicity (*minzoku*) as a key social identity, beginning around the outbreak of World War I. By the 1930s, a new approach to national or “Volk” identity had emerged that emphasized the plasticity of this ethnic identity or nationality. Takata Yasuma called for a new expansive sense of nationality that would encompass all the people in East Asia, even while an independent political state remained the goal of most people in the region. Takata’s theories were most useful in shaping a new regionalism when they were incorporated into the concept of hierarchical social order presented by the ethnologist Oka Masao. Oka’s concept of *minzoku chitsujo* envisioned East Asia as a vertical ordering of the various ethnic groups in the region. Finally, wartime bureaucrats in the Ministry of Welfare wrote a policy for East Asia which tried to synthesize these different approaches. In conclusion, I argue that a close look at these arguments for regionalism in wartime East Asia, and especially the role and scope of this concept of *minzoku*, will reveal some surprising conceptual legacies in contemporary efforts to revive East Asian regionalism.

Kevin Doak has the Nippon Foundation Endowed Chair in the Department of East Asian Languages and Cultures at Georgetown University and has taught Modern Japanese History for several years at University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. He is author of *Dreams of Difference: the Japan Romantic School and the Crisis of Modernity* (University of California Press, 1994; Japanese translation Kashiwa Shobô, 1994); co-editor of *Constructing Nationhood in Modern East Asia* (with Kai-Wing Chow and Poshek Fu; University of Michigan Press, 2001) and *Overcoming Postmodernism: Overcoming Modernity and Japan* (with Takada Yasunari, Eikoh Institute of Culture and Education, 2002) as well as author of numerous articles on ethnicity and national identity in modern Japanese history.

Gerhard Krebs: Pan-Germanism Meets Pan-Asianism: Nazi Germany and Japan's Greater East Asia Policy

Hitler as a racist disliked all non-European peoples and made only a gradual exception in the case of the Japanese. His basic plan was to strengthen the supremacy of the Europeans all over the world, and this stood in sharp contrast to Japan's aim to expel the "white man" from East Asia. It is even said, bizarrely, that during World War II Hitler thought of offering military assistance to Britain for the defence of its Empire in Asia –against Japan. However, his dream of a German empire on the European continent, mainly at the expense of the Soviet Union, resulted in him seeking closer links with Japan, a longtime enemy of Russia. Since Britain refused his offer for a free hand overseas in return for a similar free hand for Germany on the European continent, a military alliance with Japan, even with Britain as a possible enemy, became increasingly attractive.

Japan disassociated itself from Germany after the conclusion of the Hitler-Stalin treaty, but showed renewed interest in closer relations when Germany won a surprising victory over the Netherlands, Belgium and France in spring 1940 and even Britain seemed to be on the brink of defeat. In siding with Germany, Japan saw the chance to take over the colonies of the European nations in Southeast Asia, in particular the oil-rich Dutch East Indies. In September 1940 the Tripartite Pact was signed as a "defence alliance" against the USA and an agreement to divide the world into blocs, whereby Germany and Italy were granted Europe (and Africa) as their zone of influence and Japan would dominate Asia. When Japan opened war against the USA and England, Germany and Italy declared war against the United States, too. Nevertheless, distrust between Japan and its European allies remained. Hitler often showed signs of regretting his decision to side with the "yellow" Japanese against the British because of the "racial affinity" between Britain and Germany. In addition, German public opinion of the early military successes of Japan expressed an inferiority feeling and a revival of the fear of the "yellow peril". Japan, knowing quite well Hitler's preferences, feared throughout the war that a German-British separate peace would be concluded at the expense of Asian peoples.

Gerhard Krebs was born 1943 in Warsaw and studied history, German linguistics and Japanese language in Hamburg, Freiburg, Bonn and Tôkyô. He has held teaching positions at Waseda University and Freiburg University, and was a research fellow at the DIJ and the Institute for Military History in Potsdam. Since 2000 he has been professor at Berlin Free University. Among his publications are his doctoral thesis *Japans Deutschlandpolitik 1935-41*, 2 vols. (OAG, 1984), which was awarded the Japan-prize of the German East Asia Society (OAG) in Tôkyô. He has co-edited *Formierung und Fall der Achse Berlin-Tôkyô* (1994) and *1945 in Europe and Asia* (Iudicium, 1997) and edited *Japan und Preussen* (Iudicium, 2002).

Discussant: Hatano Sumio

Hatano Sumio received a doctorate in law and political science from Keiô University. Before joining Tsukuba University in his present position in 1988, he worked at the War History Department of the National Institute for Defense Studies as a professor of Military History (1979–1988) and served at the Diplomatic Record Office of the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs as a part-time research assistant (1974–1979). He was also a visiting fellow at the Harvard Reischauer Institute of Japanese Studies (1995–1996) and Columbia East Asia Institute (1983–1984). His main publications include *Taiheiyo sensô to Ajia gaikô* [The Japanese policy towards Asia during the Pacific War] (University of Tôkyô Press, 1996); he is co-author of *International Commercial Rivalry in Southeast Asia in the Interwar Period* (Yale University Press, 1994), co-author/co-editor of *Taiheiyô sensô* [The Pacific War] (University of Tôkyô Press, 1993) and co-author of *The Opening of the Second World War* (Peter Lang, 1991).

Panel 5: Pan-Asianism Adjusted: Wartime to Postwar

In what forms did Asianism survive the end of the war and the demise of the Japanese Empire? What were the main schools of thought sustaining Pan-Asian ideology in the postwar period? What role did Pan-Asianism play in Japan's foreign policy and in the process of decolonization? What influence does Asianism have in contemporary Japan and what are the legacies of Pan-Asianism for Japan and its place in Asia?

Chair: Sven Saaler (DIJ)

Victor Koschmann: 'Constructing Destiny': Rôyama Masamichi and Asian Community in Wartime Japan

Historical forms of Japanese Pan-Asianism (*Ajiashugi*) often tend to rely on an idealized, highly conceptual notion of "Asia." In fact, such concepts of "Asia" are sometimes unconsciously substituted for the complexity and diversity of "real" phenomena on the ground in the region. In such cases, "Asia" becomes a collective fantasy, and when policies – especially those that involve military and political interventions – are based on such fantasies, the results can be disastrous.

Of course, even during periods like the mid-1930s to the end of the Asia-Pacific War, when Pan-Asianist fantasies were ascendant, they were never embraced universally by those concerned with Japan's Asia policy. Some commentators, like the political scientist, Rôyama Masamichi, tried to bring realism, empiricism and rational analysis to the debates on Asia policy, despite his own fantasies regarding Japan's Asian "destiny." He called attention to the unpleasant facts that "Asia" was by no means a naturally cohesive "region," and pointed out that Japan had almost no history of interaction with substantial areas that it now proposed to unify into a "Co-Prosperty Sphere." Noteworthy aspects of his approach to Asia in this period include a highly subjective (*shutaiteki*), instrumentalist stance toward what he saw as the political project of constructing Asian community and the conviction that narrow nationalism had to be transcended and subsumed in an Asian regional identity.

J. Victor Koschmann is a professor of history at Cornell University. After several years at the International Christian University and Sophia University and working as translator of the journal “The Japan Interpreter”, he received his Ph.D. in history from the University of Chicago in 1980. His research has focused on Japanese history of thought from the late Edo period until the postwar period; his current research includes theories of technology, civil society and Japanese responses to American modernization theory in the 1960s. He is author of *Revolution and Subjectivity in Postwar Japan* (University of Chicago Press, 1996); *The Mito Ideology: Discourse, Reform and Insurrection in Late Tokugawa Japan, 1790-1864* (University of California Press, 1987; Japanese translation Perikansha, 1998); “Asianism’s Ambivalent Legacy” (Peter J. Katzenstein and Takashi Shiraishi ed.: *Network Power. Japan and Asia*, Cornell University Press, 1997) and co-editor of *Conflict in Modern Japanese History: The Neglected Tradition* (with Tetsuo Najita, Princeton University Press, 1982).

Hatsuse Ryûhei: Pan-Asianism in International Relations: Prewar, Postwar, Present

Pan-Asianism in Japan has three dimensions: national, international and transnational. It comprises Japanese nationalism as well as expansionism, reactions to the Western dominance, and identification with Asian people(s) and “values”. Actually Pan-Asianism is expressed in political, economic, and cultural terms, with the balance, in essence, being determined by changes in international relations.

Before World War II, Pan-Asianism was mainly political and related to the liberation of Asia from Western colonialism. After the War, however, economic factors became more important in Pan-Asianism as more Asian nations regained independence and sought economic development as a national goal. At that time, the Cold War divided Asia into two blocs, thereby preventing economic and political cooperation in the region. Thus, Pan-Asianism disappeared from the surface. But in the late 1970s, Japanese NGOs started activities to assist regional or local autonomy in Asia. This resulted in more transnational human interactions in the region. A new type of cooperation among Asian people seems to have come into being, irrespective of whether we call this transnationalist Pan-Asianism or not. The presentation will start with a general framework, then moving on to the changes in Pan-Asianism in the different historical stages, and ends with a few examples of recent NGO activists.

Hatsuse Ryûhei is a professor at Kyôto Women’s University and professor emeritus of Kôbe University. He graduated from Tôkyô University and taught at Kita-Kyûshû University, the University of Sheffield and the Faculty of Law of Kôbe University. He is author of *Dentôteki uyoku Uchida Ryôhei no kenkyû* (Kyûshû Daigaku Shuppankai, 1980) and *Kokusai seijigaku – riron no shatei* (Dôbunkan, 1993), co-author of *Kokusai kankei kiiwaado* (Sanrei Shobô, 1988) and author of numerous articles concerning regionalism in East Asia and the Pacific region.

Oguma Eiji: The Postwar Intellectuals' View of "Asia"

Shimizu Ikutarô, one of Japan's most popular intellectuals at the time, made the following famous statement in 1950: "At the present time, the Japanese are once more Asians". Stunned by Japan's defeat in the war, Japanese intellectuals who had also fallen into economic poverty in this period, no longer perceived Japan to be a member of the club of powerful Western nations, but rather to be a weak, poor "Asian" country. This type of thinking was the cause of many confrontations concerning whether efforts should be focused on learning more about the modern era from Western countries or whether the focus should be on a reevaluation of "Asia" and of tradition.

In this paper, the author verifies the various meanings that "Asia" had for the more advanced intellectuals in Japan's postwar era and then reviews in outline how the image of "Asia" changed through from the postwar period immediately following Japanese defeat through the period of high economic growth and, in parallel with this, will thereby clarify the fluctuating aspects of Japan's national identity based on differing images of "Asia" vis-à-vis "the West".

Oguma Eiji was born in 1962 and is an associate professor at Keiô University. He received his M.A. and his Ph.D. from Tôkyô University and worked for several years with the publisher Iwanami Shoten. His major publications are *Tan'itsu minzoku shinwa no kigen – 'Nihonjin' no jigazô no keifu* (Shin'yôsha, 1995; English translation: *A Genealogy of "Japanese" Self-Images*, Trans Pacific Press, Melbourne, 2002); *'Nihonjin' no kyôkai – Okinawa, Ainu, Taiwan, Chôsen. Shokuminchi shihai kara fukki undô made* [The Boundaries of the 'Japanese'. Okinawa, Ainu, Taiwan and Korea from Colonial Rule to the Return Movement] (Shin'yôsha, 1998) and *'Minshu' to 'aikoku'. Sengo Nihon no nashonarizumu to kôkyôsei* (Shin'yôsha, 2002).

Kristine Dennehy: Overcoming Colonialism in Bandung, 1955

In April of 1955, Japan participated in the Asian-African Conference in Bandung, Indonesia. Even though Japan had been an imperial power up until 1945, by 1955 progressive Japanese historians pointed to Japanese participation at Bandung as a potent marker of Pan-Asian/African solidarity against Western (particularly U.S.) imperialism. Coming just three years after the end of the American-led Occupation of Japan (a process often criticized as subjecting Japan to semi-colonial status), the Bandung conference provided an opportunity for these intellectuals to express their solidarity with other countries that were also subject to the postwar political reality of the Cold War international order. The Bandung conference, along with the Asian Conference that was convened in Delhi India in 1955, were important milestones in the post-1945 period, in the sense that they symbolized moments of Japanese resistance to the developing postwar order.

In this paper, I will argue that postwar progressive intellectuals used notions of Pan-Asianism as a form of political resistance, in combination with an historiographical agenda that strongly critiqued Japan's own imperialist past. The motivating force behind this new rhetoric of Pan-Asianism was a combination of anti-nuclear, anti-imperial sentiment. An essential element of such sentiment was the argument that not only had the Japanese people been victimized by the Japanese elite before 1945, but also that they continued to be victimized by the hegemonic power of the U.S. during the Occupation and the Cold War force of the American nuclear umbrella in Asia.

Kristine Dennehy is an assistant professor at the Department of History at California State University Fullerton. She received her M.A. in Asian Studies from Sophia University, Tōkyō and her Ph.D. in History from the University of California, Los Angeles. Recent publications include “Shokuminchi shihai o uketagawa no shiten kara” [From the Perspective of the Colonized] (Hikakushi, hikaku rekishi kyōiku kenkyūkai ed.: *Teikokushugi no jidai to genzai: higashi Ajia no taiwa* [The age of imperialism and today: an East Asian dialogue]. (Miraisha, 2002). She has also translated “The History Textbook Controversy and Nationalism” by Nakamura Masanori (*Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars* 30:2, 1998).

Discussant: Fujiwara Kiichi

Fujiwara Kiichi was born in 1956 and is Professor of International Politics at the Graduate School of Law and Political Science at The University of Tôkyô. His major field of research is international relations and Southeast Asian studies. He received his Ph.D. from the University of Tôkyô and was a Woodrow Wilson International Center Fellow as well as a Fulbright scholar at Yale University. He is author of *Demokurashii no Teikoku* [A Democratic Empire] (Iwanami Shoten, 2002); *Sensô o kioku suru* [Remembering the War] (Kodansha, 2001) and editor of *Tero-go* [After the Terror] (Iwanami Shoten, 2002). He has also published numerous articles on international relations in East Asia, the phenomenon of nationalism and the role of historical memory in recent international relations.

Closing Remarks: Miwa Kimitada

Miwa Kimitada, Professor Emeritus, Sophia University, was born in 1929 in Matsumoto, Japan. He received a Ph.D. in history from Princeton University. His English publications relating to Asianism include “Fukuzawa Yukichi’s ‘Departure from Asia’: A Prelude to the Sino-Japanese War” (Edmund Skrzypczak ed.: *Japan’s Modern Century*, Charles E. Tuttle, 1968); “The Ejection of Localism: An Origin of Ultrationalism in Japan (*The Japan Interpreter*, vol. 11, no. 1, spring, 1974); “Japanese Images of War with the United States” (Akira Iriye ed.: *Mutual Images: Essays in American-Japanese Relations*, Harvard University Press, 1975); “Japan in Asia, Past and Present: How the Southeast Asians View the Japanese and How the Japanese Ought to Implement their Newly Emergent Pacific Basin Cooperation Concept” (*Sophia University Institute of International Relations Research Papers Series*, A-42, 1981); “Japanese Policies and Concepts for a Regional Order in Asia, 1930–1940” (J.W.O. White et al. eds.: *Ambivalence of Nationalism*, University Press of America, 1990); “Colonial Theories and Practices in Prewar Japan” (John Howes ed.: *Nitobe Inazo: Japan’s Bridge Across the Pacific*, Westview Press, 1995).
