COMPARATIVE MODERNISATION

Editors
Yavuz Çilliler - Emre Gündoğdu

nobel bilimsel

COMPARATIVE MODERNISATION
Editors: Yavuz Çilliler - Emre Gündoğdu

Publishing No.: 1042
ISBN: 978-625-7677-08-0
E-ISBN: 978-625-433-445-0
Edition: 1st Edition, July 2022

© Copyright 2022, NOBEL BİLİMSEL ESERLER SERTİFİKA NO.: 20779

All rights for this edition are reserved for Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık Eğitim Danışmanlık Tic. Ltd. Şti. No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying, electronically or mechanically recording or by any information storage or retrieval system, without permission of Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık Eğitim Danışmanlık Tic. Ltd. Şti.

Nobel Publishing Group has been operating nationwide since 1984 and worldwide since 2011. Nobel publications are included in the catalogs of higher education institutions at national and international levels.

'NOBEL BİLİMSEL ESERLER' is a Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık brand.

Executive Editor: Nevzat Argun -nargun@nobelyayin.com-
Publishing Coordinator: Gülfem Dursun -gulfem@nobelyayin.com-

Interior Designer: Samet Tekin -samet@nobelyayin.com-
Proofreader: Seval Sezer -seval@nobelyayin.com-
Cover Designer: Mehtap Yürümez -mehtap@nobelyayin.com-
Print Manager: Yavuz Şahin -yavuz@nobelyayin.com-



Library Information Card

Çilliler, Yavuz., Gündoğdu, Emre.
Comparative Modernisation
1st Edition. XVI + 222 p. 16,5x24 cm. Includes references and index.
ISBN: 978-625-7677-08-0
E-ISBN: 978-625-433-445-0
1. Comparative Politics 2. Modernisation 3. History

General Distribution

ATLAS AKADEMİK BASIM YAYIN DAĞITIM TİC. LTD. ŞTİ.
Adress: Bahçekapı Mh. 2465 Sk. Oto Sanayi Sitesi No:7 Bodrum Kat, Şaşmaz/ANKARA
Phone: +90 312 278 50 77
Fax: 0 312 278 21 65
Sales: siparis@nobelyayin.com
E-Sales: www.nobelkitap.com - esatis@nobelkitap.com
www.atlaskitap.com - info@atlaskitap.com

Points of Delivery and Sales: Alfa Basım Dağıtım, Arasta, Arkadaş Kitabevi, D&R Mağazaları, Dost Dağıtım, Kika, Kitapsan, Nezih Kitabevleri, Odak, Pandora, Prefix, Remzi Kitabevleri

Print and Binding

Meteksan Matbaacılık ve Teknik Sanayi Tic. Anonim Şirketi
Sertifika No.: 46519
Beytepe Köy Yolu No.: 3 06800 Bilkent-Çankaya/ANKARA

nobel bilimsel

Library Information Card

Çilliler, Yavuz., Gündoğdu, Emre.
Comparative Modernisation
222 p. 16,5x24 cm. Includes references and index.
ISBN: 978-625-7677-08-0
E-ISBN: 978-625-433-445-0
Politics 2. Modernisation 3. History

General Distribution
İK BASIM YAYIN DAĞITIM TİC. LTD. ŞTİ.
apı Mh. 2465 Sk. Oto Sanayi Sitesi No:7
Bodrum Kat, Şaşmaz/ANKARA
Phone: +90 312 278 50 77
Fax: 0 312 278 21 65
Sales: siparis@nobelyayin.com
obelkitap.com - esatis@nobelkitap.com
w.atlaskitap.com - info@atlaskitap.com

y and Sales: Alfa Basım Dağıtım, Arasta, Kitabevi, D&R Mağazaları, Dost Dağıtım, Kika, Kitapsan, Nezih Kitabevleri, Odak, Pandora, Prefix, Remzi Kitabevleri

Print and Binding
acılık ve Teknik Sanayi Tic. Anonim Şirketi
Sertifika No.: 46519
u No.: 3 06800 Bilkent-Çankaya/ANKARA

CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS ix

PREFACE xi

THE HISTORICAL AND CONCEPTUAL CONTENT OF MODERNISATION 1
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Yavuz ÇİLLİLER

Introduction 1
1. WESTERN PROGRESS OF MODERNISATION 2
1.1. Changes in the Feudal Era and the Emergence of the Modern State 3
1.2. The Changing Bases of Political Legitimacy and the Nation State 5
1.3. Modernism and Democratisation 8
2. MODERNISATION AND ITS CRITICS 10
2.1. Early Academic Studies and Critics 10
2.2. Critics of Modernisation as a Process 12
Conclusion 14
References 15

EMERGENCE OF WESTERN MODERNISATION: THE CASE OF FRANCE 17
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Emine AKÇADAĞ ALAGÖZ & R.A. Yunus TURAN

Introduction 17
1. FRANCE UNDER FEUDAL ORDER 18
2. REVIVAL OF COMMERCE AND EMERGENCE OF THE MODERN STATE 19
3. RENAISSANCE AND REFORMATION 22
4. MODERN SCIENCES AND THE ENLIGHTENMENT 24
5. THE FRENCH REVOLUTION AND THE RISE OF THE MODERN NATION-STATE 26
6. MODERNISATION OF FRANCE UNDER NAPOLEON 30
7. THE THIRD REPUBLIC: CONSOLIDATION OF PARLIAMENTARY DEMOCRACY 32
8. THE FOURTH REPUBLIC: INSTABILITY OF EXECUTIVE POWER 36
9. THE FIFTH REPUBLIC: IN THE PURSUIT OF A POWERFUL EXECUTIVE 40
Conclusion 44
References 45

HISTORY OF TURKISH MODERNISATION (1699-1938) **49**
Assist. Prof. Dr. Hakkı Göker ÖNEN 49

Introduction 49
1. THE DECLINE OF THE EMPIRE AND THE FIRST REFORM ATTEMPTS (1699–1789) 51
2. REFORM ATTEMPTS OF SELIM III (1789–1807) 55
3. REFORMS OF MAHMUD II (1808–1839) 58
4. THE TANZIMAT REFORMS (1839–1876) 61
4.1. The Imperial Act of Gülhane (1839) 61
4.2. The Islahat Decree (1856) 63
4.3. Institutional Reforms 64
4.4. Legal Reforms 66
4.5. Military Reforms 66
4.6. Educational Reforms 67
4.7. The Young Ottomans Movement (1865–1876) 68
4.7.1. Dethroning sultan Abdulaziz 68
4.7.2. The Foundation of the Young Ottomans 70
4.7.3. Mustafa Fazil Pasha and organising in Europe 72
4.7.4. The dissolving 73
4.7.5. The ideas of Islamism 74
5. THE *KANUNİ ESASİ* AND THE FIRST CONSTITUTIONAL REGIME (1876–1878) 74
6. RETURN TO ABSOLUTE MONARCHY (1878–1908) 77
7. THE RISE OF THE YOUNG TURKS (1889–1908) 80
8. THE SECOND CONSTITUTIONAL MONARCHY (1908–1918) 82
8.1. The 1908 Revolution and the Liberalisation 82
8.2. Counter-Revolutionary Attempt: The 31 March 1909 Rebellion 85
8.3. The Military Alarmed: Arrival of The Movement Army 87
8.4. Conflict for Power and Military Politicisation (1909–1913) 88
8.5 The One-Party Rule of the Unionists and the First World War (1913–1918) 90
9. THE TURKISH LIBERATION WAR AND ATATÜRK'S REFORMS 91
Conclusion 95
References 97

MODERNISATION IN RUSSIA **101**
Assist. Prof. Dr. Viktoriia DEMYDOVA

Introduction 101
1. ORIGINS OF RUSSIA'S MODERNISATION: IVAN III AND IVAN IV THE TERRIBLE 102

1.1. Ivan III (1462 - 1505) 102
1.2. Ivan IV The Terrible (1533-1584) 103
2. MODERNISATION OF RUSSIA UNDER PETER THE GREAT (1672-1725) 105
2.1. Administrative Reforms 106
2.2. Economic Development 106
2.3. Financial and Social Measures 108
2.4. Education, Science and Culture 109
3. MODERNISATION OF RUSSIA IN THE SECOND HALF OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY AND EARLY TWENTIETH CENTURY 111
3.1. Economic Modernisation in the Russian Empire 111
3.2. Political Reforms of Alexander II (1855-1881) 112
3.3. Political Reforms of Nicholas II (1894-1917) 113
3.4. Stolypin Agrarian Reform of 1906 115
4. MODERNISATION OF THE USSR IN THE 1920s AND 1930s 116
4.1. Political and Social Modernisation 116
4.2. Economic Development and Industrialisation 117
4.3. Cultural Revolution 119
4.4. Central Asia 119
4.5. "Women's Issue" 120
5. MODERNISATION IN RUSSIA AFTER THE BREAKUP OF THE SOVIET UNION (1991-2000) 120
5.1. Political Modernisation 121
5.2. Economic Modernisation 122
Conclusion 123
References 126

CHINESE MODERNISATION DURING THE LATE QING AND EARLY REPUBLICAN ERA FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF ELITES 129
Assist Prof. Dr. Hayriye Asena DEMİRER

Introduction: Is there only one Western road to modernity? 129
1. CHINESE MODERNISATON: IS CHINA A LATECOMER OR AN EARLY BIRD? 131
2. HOW TO DEAL WITH CHINESE MODERNISATION? 137
3. REFORM MOVEMENTS IN CHINA AS THE MILESTONES OF CHINESE MODERNITY ... 140
4. LARGE-SCALE REFORMS LAUNCHED DURING THE LATE QING DYNASTY 142
4.1. The Self-Strengthening Movement (1861-1895) 142
4.1.1. The First Phase of Self-Strenghtening Movement (1861-1872) 143
4.1.2. The Second Phase of Self-Strenghtening Movement (1872-1885) 145

4.1.3. The Third Phase of Self-Strenghtening Movement (1885-1895) 146
4.2. Reforms after the Sino-Japanese War (1894–1895) until the end of the Qing Dynasty (1912) 148
4.2.1. The Hundred Days' Reform (1898) 150
4.2.2. New Policies of the Late Qing Dynasty or "Late Qing Reform" (1901-1911) 151
4.2.2.1. Empress Dowager Cixi's institutional reforms (1901-1905) 151
4.2.2.2. The Constitutional Movement, 1905-11 154
4.2.2.3. Zaifeng or Prince Chun Reforms (1909-1911) 155
4.2.2.4. Establishment of the Republic and the Beiyang government (1912–1928) 157
5. THE REFORMIST THOUGHT OF REPUBLICAN PERIOD: FROM THE FOUNDING OF THE REPUBLIC TO THE NEW CULTURE MOVEMENT (1915-21) 158
5.1. The New Culture Movement 159
5.2. The May Fourth Movement (4 May 1919) 162
6. CLASSIFYING LATE QING AND EARLY REPUBLICAN ERA CHINESE INTELLECTUALS REGARDING TO THEIR MODERNISATION MODELS 164
7. EARLY REPUBLICAN INTELLECTUALS' DISCUSSIONS ON THE WEST AND EAST DICHOTOMY 167
Conclusion 170
References 173

THE MODERNISATION OF IRAN 175
Assist. Prof. Dr. Emre GÜNDOĞDU

Introduction 175
1. MODERNISATION IN THE QAJAR DYNASTY ERA UNTIL CONSTITUTIONAL REVOLUTION (1794-1905) 176
2. MODERNISATION IN THE QAJAR DYNASTY DURING THE CONSTITUTIONAL ERA (1905-1925) 178
3. MODERNISATION DURING THE PAHLAVI DYNASTY ERA (1925-1979) 180
4. MODERNISATION OF IRAN AFTER THE 1979 REVOLUTION 185
Conclusion 187
References 188

THE MODERNISATION IN JAPAN: FROM FEUDAL SYSTEM TO MODERN NATION-STATE 191
Assist. Prof. Dr. Keisuke WAKIZAKA & Assist. Prof. Dr. Idlir LIKA

Introduction 191
1. THE END OF JAPAN'S SELF IMPOSED ISOLATION 192

ent (1885-1895) 146
ntil the end of the
..... 148
..... 150
Qing Reform"
..... 151
eforms (1901-1905)..... 151
1..... 154
-1911)..... 155
Beiyang government
..... 157
M THE FOUNDING
915-21)..... 158
..... 159
..... 162
IINESE INTELLECTUALS
..... 164
IE WEST AND
..... 167
..... 170
..... 173
..... 175
..... 175
NSTITUTIONAL
..... 176
ONSTITUTIONAL ERA
..... 178
.925-1979) 180
I..... 185
..... 187
..... 188
..... 191
..... 191
..... 192

2. LAYING THE FOUNDATIONS OF JAPANESE MODERNISATION: THE EDO PERIOD (1603-1868) 194
3. THE IMPORTANCE OF MEIJI RESTORATION FOR JAPANESE MODERNISATION (POST-1868) 196
4. THE FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY MOVEMENT AND THE DEBATES ON LAW 199
5. COMPARING AND CONTRASTING JAPANESE AND TURKISH MODERNISATION PROCESSESS 203
Conclusion 205
References 206

THE MODERNISATION OF HUNGARY 207
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Annamaria CSISZER

Introduction 207
1. THE FIRST HUNGARIAN REPUBLIC 209
2. NATIONALISATION OF THE ECONOMY 210
3. THE THIRD REPUBLIC 212
4. COLLECTIVISATION IN HUNGARY AS AN ATTEMPT AT MODERNISATION 214
5. INTERMITTENT MODERNISATION 215
6. THE MODERNISATION OF HUNGARY IN THE CENTRAL-EASTERN EUROPEAN CONTEXT 215
7. RELIGION VS. SECULARISATION AS AN ASPECT OF MODERNISATİON 217
8. THE FORMATION OF NATIONAL IDENTITY 218
Conclusion 220
References 220

THE MODERNISATION IN JAPAN: FROM FEUDAL SYSTEM TO MODERN NATION-STATE

Assist. Prof. Dr. Keisuke WAKIZAKA & Assist. Prof. Dr. Idlir LIKA

Introduction

Since the seventeenth century, Japan had cut relations with foreign states except for China and Netherlands and was isolated for more than 200 years in order to protect itself from the threats of foreign states and Christianity. As a result of this policy, Japan had lived in peace for a long time without being influenced by the development of world politics and had kept its unique political, social and cultural structure.

However, after Commodore Matthew Perry's visit to Japan in 1853, Japan was forced to open itself to foreign states and was forcefully incorporated into the modern international system. Japan's modernisation process began with the break of its self-imposed isolation and the process reached its peak with the socio-political transition from the Edo to the Meiji regime in 1868.

During the Meiji period, the important part of the traditional socio-political system was abolished and a new system was adopted from the Western world. Although some difficulties existed in the modernisation process in that period, the European system was adopted in the fields of law, politics, education and industry, transforming the Japanese socio-political system to an important degree. However, it was with the proclamation of the Constitution of the Great Empire of Japan in 1889 that Japan finally considered itself a modern state of law like European countries.

This chapter first examines the ways in which Perry's 1853 visit affected Japan by opening it to the outside world. Secondly, we explain how the

foundation for modernisation was established at the end of the Edo period. The third section analyses the reforms in Japan after the establishment of the Meiji government, particularly the reforms in the state system. Changes in culture and industry are also examined here. The fourth section examines the effect of the Freedom and Democracy Movement that took place in the 1870s and 1980s on the Japanese state system and the debates in the process of re-structuring the legal system. The fifth section compares and contrasts the Japanese and Turkish modernisation processes. The concluding section summarizes the argument and identifies future avenues for research.

1. THE END OF JAPAN'S SELF IMPOSED ISOLATION

During the Edo period, which started at the beginning of the seventeenth century, Japan was ruled by a feudal system with each region organised as a khanate The Japanese people at that time self-identified first and foremost with the khanate they belonged to. Moreover, people were divided into classes such as the Samurai Class, Farmer Class, Craftsman Class and Merchant Class. But the Japanese class system was less rigid than those of Europe and other countries (Fujioka, 1996: p.13-14) since one could change class from Farmer to Craftsman or Merchant to Samurai, and vice versa. Of course, the Empire still existed at that time, but since political power was completely in the hands of the feudal lord, the Emperor was mostly symbolic.

Examining Japan's relationship with other countries at the time shows that it isolated itself by breaking off relations with all countries except the Netherlands and China (Atarashii Shakai-Rekishi, 1999: p.159-161) in order to protect itself from imperial Western powers. While this situation kept the Japanese people in ignorance about international politics, it did maintain domestic peace for 250 years.

Due to this self-imposed isolation, educational opportunities were limited. However, the Samurai taught children mathematics and how to read and write in schools named Terakoya. Thus, the education level of Japanese people was quite high during the Edo period. The technology level significantly improved due to the inter-khanate rivalry in various fields such as education and technology (Cihan, 2006: p.15-16).

In 1853, Commodore Matthew Perry, a U.S. naval officer, visited Japan in a convoy of five military ships in an attempt to open Japan to the outside

world. Perry delivered a letter from the U.S. president to the feudal lord, but it was rejected due to the demand that they only trade through the Port of Nagasaki. But Perry planned to break Japan's isolation by military means (Matsumoto, 1998: p.13). Realising that the U.S. was militarily stronger, Japan was compelled to accept the U.S. offer.

Perry gave a lesson on international law by presenting the feudal lord with a white flag. At that time in Japan, a white flag was considered to represent the Minamoto tribe and Eastern soldiers. However, in international law, the white flag represented surrender (Matsumoto, 1998: p.17). Perry gave the white flag because he was sure that if war broke out, the U.S. would definitely win, and because he sought to enlighten the "backward and rude country Japan" with the model of the "developed U.S.". The feudal lord (Atarashii Rekishi-Kyoukasho, 2001: p.86-87) eventually accepted the white flag since he knew that after the 1840-1842 Opium Wars, Asian countries had begun to be occupied by European powers. Thus, after more than two centuries of self-imposed isolation, Japan was forced to open up to the outside world and enter the field of fierce international competition.

Most of the khans in every region argued against the idea of opening the doors. Since the khans owed their privileges to the feudal system, they did not want to see it ended. However, the feudal lords also did not want to start a war with foreign countries because they recognised their dire situation and accepted opening the door to the outside world by, for example, allowing limited trade. While there was much debate within Japan, people such as Kaishu Katsu argued that they should actively open their doors to the outside world in order to strengthen their own military by adopting the military system and technologies of foreign countries (Matsumoto, 1998: p.51-52). Upon the insistence of the feudal lords, in 1853 the ban on the construction of large ships was lifted and the following year an American-Japanese friendship pact was signed. This pact mandated the opening of the ports of Shimoda and Hakodate to foreign countries, the obligation to rescue people at sea, the extension of most-favoured-nation status, the provision of water, food and wood to U.S. ships while in Japanese waters, and permission for foreign diplomats to stay in Shimoda.

Following this treaty, Japan signed similar agreements with France, Britain and Russia.

2. LAYING THE FOUNDATIONS OF JAPANESE MODERNISATION: THE EDO PERIOD (1603-1868)

Following Perry's visit, Japan turned toward increasing its military power to protect itself from external dangers and thus took the first step toward modernisation.

Shoin Yoshida planned to go abroad with the intention of learning the practices of foreign countries in order to strengthen Japan's military. During Perry's second visit to Japan, Shoin offered to take Perry around the country, but Perry refused on the ground that mutual distrust was still prevalent in American-Japanese relations (Oubeikara Mita Nihonno Kaikoku, 1998). After Shoin was captured and released by the feudal lordship, he opened a school called Shokason-Juku, where he attempted to train soldiers.

In 1853, Puchatin, from Tsarist Russia, also visited Japan. From this visit, Japan learned the importance of the "Territory Game" between imperialist powers and began to seriously consider the idea of "strengthening the soldiers and enriching the state". A major example of this is the construction of the ship Diana. Puchatin was caught in a storm on his way back to Russia and the Russian navy ship Diana was lost. Japan offered to re-construct the ship with a view to developing its shipbuilding skills (Matsumoto, 1998: p.75-77).

In addition, following the signing of the American-Japanese treaty, Japan ordered a naval ship from Netherlands and established a Naval War College in the city of Nagasaki. The college was structured according to the European war academies and its teaching staff largely consisted of Dutch. This school also educated those who were to play an important role at the end of the Edo period, such as Kaishu Katsu (Atarashii Rekishi-Kyoukasho, 2001: p.89-91).

At that time, inter-khanate rivalries on various issues also existed and this competition led to an increase in the level of education and development of technology (Nishio, 1999: p.382-384). While visiting Kagoshima, Kattendieke, a naval academy instructor, talked about this, emphasising the potential power of Japan.

In 1857, Townsend Harris, a U.S. diplomat, visited Japan to discuss international politics, international law and the superiority of international law in the liaison between him and the feudal lordship. The 1858 American-Japanese trade agreement reflected the gap between "civilized" European countries and "non-civilized" Asian countries, and included the idea of Japan opening up to achieve standards of European civilization.

However, as foreign influence increased, so did Japanese nationalism. Nationalists argued that in order to protect their own state from foreign countries, it was necessary to create an imperial identity, emphasising the importance of specifying their own identity and distinguishing their state system from that of foreign countries. In 1854, with the proposal of Nariakira Shimadzu, khan of Satsuma khanate (now Kagoshima province), the design of the Japanese flag was agreed upon (Atarashii Rekishi-Kyoukasho, 2001: p.92).

At that time, tension between the empire and the feudal lordship grew because Naosuke Ii, head minister of the feudal lords, decided unilaterally to sign the Treaty of Amity and Commerce between the United States and the Empire of Japan. This further increased nationalism in Japan. Thus, the authority of the feudal lordship significantly decreased. Despite this, Naosuke Ii pressured the nationalists to protect his power, and those who defended the idea of opening to the outside world, such as Shoin Yoshida and Sanai Hashimoto, bowed to those pressures. This strategy of applying pressure further decreased the legitimacy of Li's own leadership and led to the rise of nationalism. Eventually, in 1860, Naosuke Ii was assassinated in the Sakuradamon-gai incident.

At the end of the Edo period, in response to Japan being forced by foreign countries to break its isolation, nationalism rose. From this time on, acts of terrorism against foreign representatives and those who defended Japan's opening up became common.

While nationalist movements were intensifying, the feudal lordship sent the ship Kanrin-maru to the U.S. to protect those representatives sent to change the treaty acceptance letter. On board were people who played an important role in the Meiji period such as Kaishu Katsu, Manjirou Nakayama and Yukichi Fukuzawa, and who planned to learn from the U.S. They admired not only the advanced technology and education, but also the social and political environment and level of development (Bunmei-Kaikano Shishi, 2005). In particular, Fukuzawa emphasised that the primary factors that made European countries advanced were civilisation, liberalism and democracy. This experience significantly affected Fukuzawa's political ideas, which is clearly seen in his article "Recommendation of Learning".

Meanwhile in Japan, khanates began to refuse the orders of the feudal lords. Satsuma Khanate and Choshu Khanate (now Yamaguchi province), in particular, defended nationalism and there was great tension between them and the feudal lordship. After defeat in war with Britain (which broke out after the 1863 Namamugi Incident, in which British citizens were killed because

they were rude to Hisamitsu Shimadzu, the khan of the Satsuma Khanate), the Satsuma Khanate accepted Britain's political and military terms and began to turn away from extreme nationalism (Matsumoto, 1998: p.190), maintaining distance from the Choshu Khanate. Thus, tensions were created between the Satsuma and Choshu Khanates, sometimes evolving into war.

However, in 1863, a new military organisation called Kihei-tai was formed in the Choshu Khanate under the leadership of Shinsaku Takasugi. This organisation included not only samurai but also citizen volunteers. It shared several important features with the military of modern states and is seen as the first step in the modernisation of Japan's military system (Nishio, 1999: p.413). This organisation was highly significant as it was victorious against the feudal lordship in the Second Choshu War in 1865, and led to the construction of a modern Japanese military system. Following this war, the failures and weaknesses of the feudal lordship and the old military system became clear, and Kaishu Katsu, formerly a supporter of feudalism, began to argue in favour of shifting from feudalism to a modern nation-state. In addition, as suggested by Ryoma Sakamoto, an alliance was formed between the Satsuma and Choshu Khanates. Thus, the downfall of feudalism was finalised and in 1867, Yoshinobu Tokugawa, who was the fifteenth feudal lord, returned all power to the emperor, thus, peacefully ending the Edo period.

At that time, while France supported the feudal lordship, Britain supported the Satsuma and Choshu Khanates and Japan was in danger of being invaded by European countries (Hunter, 2002: p.23-24). The 1867 peaceful transfer of power to the Emperor and the end of the feudal lordship were of great importance since these factors helped Japan to avoid invasion.

In addition, in the 1868 Boshin War among khanates and the Meiji government, modern weapons were used and international laws were applied from its beginning to its end, shifting the war system from the old to one based on the European system (Matsumoto, 1998: p.300). For instance, when Aidzu Khanate (now Fukushima province) surrendered to the Meiji government, they waived the white flag.

3. THE IMPORTANCE OF MEIJI RESTORATION FOR JAPANESE MODERNISATION (POST-1868)

The Meiji era began in 1868, and the most important goal of the Meiji government was Japan's transformation from a feudal polity to a modern nation-state on a par with advanced European countries

The Meiji government contended that in order to raise Japan to the same level as European countries, it was necessary to consolidate the nation-state structure and to strengthen the Imperial system. As a first step toward this, in 1869, the Emperor took possession of the registers of all Japanese people. At that time, the Japanese self-identified primarily with the khanate in which they resided, while the central state was an entity that was distant from the people. The aim of the Emperor possessing the registry records was to bring the Japanese people closer to him, the son of the sun, and teach them about the Emperor (Nishio, 1999: p.440-443), and connect their identity with the centre in order to establish a centralized state.

The most important step in Japan's nation-state building was the abolition of the khanates in 1871 and the implementation of the provincial system. This reform was made by Takamori Saigou, Toshimichi Okubo, Takayoshi Kido, and Aritomo Yamagata, with the intention of removing the privileges of the two formerly leading classes, the samurai and the khans. There are two critical factors that pushed the Meiji government to implement this policy despite the strong opposition of the samurai and the khans.

The first was the need to abolish the khanate soldier system and introduce the modern state military system. In order to establish a military as strong as those in European countries, it was necessary to establish a regular military system under the control of a unified state, not a scattered military system under the control of each khanate. The Kihei-tai, organised by Shinsaku Takasugi at the end of the Edo period, consisted of people from all classes and won a great victory against the khanate soldiers, which significantly affected this policy.

Secondly, Yasutake Yokoyama criticised the government on the ground that it still consisted only of those born in Satsuma, Choshu, Tosa and Hizen (now Oita province) Khanates (Matsumoto, 1998: p.337-340), implying that the lack of change in the composition of government might lead to inefficiency in running the country. Due to these two factors, then, in 1872 the Meiji government decided to remove the khanate soldiers and establish the compulsory military system. But because of this policy, many samurai became unemployed, and until 1877, there were many uprisings in various parts of the country, the Seinan War of 1877 being the biggest of these rebellions. Okubo, one of those who brought this policy into effect, was assassinated by these samurai.

In 1871, the Meiji government, under the leadership of Tomomi Iwakura, sent people such as Toshimichi Okubo, Takayoshi Kido and Hirobumi Ito to the U.S. and several European countries (Atarashii Rekishi Kyoukasho, 2001: p.110). However, in 1868, the government announced the "5-item declaration" to the people, which consisted of the following:

1. Prohibition of disservice
2. Prohibition of organising rebellions and illegally fleeing
3. Prohibition of Christianity
4. Prohibition of violation of the rights of foreign people
5. Necessity of settled life

The first three items were transferred from the feudal laws to dispel the turmoil of the early Meiji period. The fifth was included in order to harness the energy of the people (Sakamoto, 1998: p.120). The reason for prohibiting Christianity was the perceived threat from Christianity among the people. But since it was impossible to completely forbid Christianity, it was necessary to enlighten and control people with a religion peculiar to Japan. This brought Shintoism under control of the state from 1871 until 1945 (Sakamoto, 1998: p.123-124). Thus, nation-state construction covered a variety of domains, from the military system to religion.

Although the Meiji government aimed to build a new nation-state, European countries were still defining Japan as an uncivilized and not fully sovereign country. Therefore, the goal of the Meiji government was also to increase Japan's power in the international legal system and to raise its status to a fully sovereign state (Atarashii Rekishi Kyoukasho, 2001: p.113-115). The prerequisite for this was to re-arrange the inequality pacts between Japan and European countries, and for this, it had to establish a new European-style legal system, as well as develop its industry.

At the beginning of the Meiji era, the administrative system was rebuilt under the leadership of the Ministry of Finance, and in 1871 the tax system was completely changed. In the past, taxes had been levied on the amount of agricultural products produced, but after the Meiji period, tax was imposed on each person's land and money became legal tender rather than goods. In addition, exchange of land became completely free.

In 1873, compulsory military service came into effect. The purpose of this system was to abolish the formerly existing classes and consolidate equality

between people by making everyone serve the state. In addition, this system aimed to prevent "harm to the state" and it was eventually expected that the unified Japanese identity would be consolidated (Nishio, 1999: p.454). However, initially, the first son in every family was exempted from military service and many avoided military service by paying the jizya, so few people actually went to the military.

Reforms of the legal system advanced after Shinpei Etou became minister of justice in 1872. Etou wanted to build a systematic and unified legal system, and as an important step toward this, he suggested that the Supreme Court be independent from the Court of Accounts (Sakamoto, 1998: p.154-155). In other words, while the Supreme Court at that time was under the control of the Ministry of Finance, Etou wanted it to belong to the courts subordinate to the Ministry of Justice. As the Ministry of Finance opposed this on the ground of the dire financial situation, tensions arose between Etou and the ministry.

After 1872, major reforms were also introduced in education. The Meiji government closed the former Tera-Koyas and opened 2,000 new primary schools, as well as secondary schools, high schools and universities (Cihan, 2006: p.17-18). The basis of this education system was individuality and equality, which Yukichi Fukuzawa explains in his article "Recommendation of Learning" as "God did not create man above man, he did not create man under man".

In addition to reforms in education and law, the Meiji government also made efforts to develop the industry. European agricultural styles were applied in places such as Komaba Agricultural School and Mita Farm, engineers and machines from Europe were brought to the Tomioka Textile Factory and Senju Carpet Factory. Merchants were trained and kept under protection in order to protect trade routes (Sakamoto, 1998: p.161-162). Under the umbrella of the Meiji government, big corporate groups such as Mitsubishi, Mitsui, Sumitomo and Yasuda were established. The fact that Japan successfully adopted Western technology and values but at the same time avoided coming under the influence and domination of Western powers is in itself a remarkable achievement (Fujioka, 1996: p.200-201).

4. THE FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY MOVEMENT AND THE DEBATES ON LAW

Toward the end of the 1870s, the Freedom and Democracy Movement had taken hold in Japan with the aim of improving the legal system, and a

serious debate on parliamentary democracy began. Taisuke Itagaki founded the Risshisha Party for this political movement and demanded the expansion of the right to participate in politics in order to strengthen patriotism and state sovereignty. This party grew until the founding of the Aikokusha (Patriot Party) in 1878. Itagaki put his request to open a parliament as follows (Atarashii Shakai-Rekishi, 1999: p.134):

> The state should be shared by the people, and the opening of a Parliament leads to patriotism and independence. The state cannot be independent if the people do not have the right to live as a nation.

In 1879, Itagaki demanded from the Empire the opening of parliament. The government first resisted these demands, yet as the movement intensified, the government was compelled to make serious inquiries about parliament and the constitution.

Discussions within scientific circles on the Japanese state system identify three people who played an important role in this debate. Choumin Nakae studied in France in 1871 and translated Jean Jaques Rousseau's "Social Contract Theory" into Japanese. According to him, every person has moral powers and one should complete this power under the state, and in this way, the Rulers and the Ruled will be equal. Emori Ueki argued that the Meiji Revolution and the state were all constituted by people's sovereignty, and that people-led politics should be implemented to complete this revolution. Azusa Ono, on the other hand, argued that the Meiji Revolution was very important because it created the concept of "Japanese people equal to each other under the Emperor", and criticised regionalism as it created discrimination between the Japanese people (Sakamoto, 1998: p.246-252). Ono contended that parliamentary democracy is necessary to ensure equality among people.

Kowashi Inoue, however, criticised the British political system, arguing that it was dangerous since its parliament can become stronger than the government, which may lead to a return to feudalism. He also criticised the parliamentary system based on people's sovereignty, saying that the Emperor's authority would be in danger of being shaken because of the power of political parties (Nishio, 1999: p.466-469). Inoue defended the constitutional political system in Germany, noting that the German constitution was made by the Emperor.

In 1881, when Prime Minister Kiyotaka Kuroda unfairly sold state-owned assets to a colleague at cheap prices, the media criticised this, arguing that a

parliament was needed to prevent such secret dealings (Atarashii Shakai-Rekishi, 1999: p.139). Thus, people's demand for opening a parliament increased. As a result, Aritomo Yamagata conveyed his request to open a parliament and it was decided that the national assembly would open in 1882.

In addition, after Hirobumi Ito went to Europe to research the constitution, the Ministry system was established in 1885. Although the prime minister's power was meant to be strengthened, it was actually reduced due to the strong reactions of those who defended Imperial policy.

While the state system was changed to raise Japan to the level of European countries, negotiations were also made with foreign countries to re-arrange the terms of the unequal treaties. First, Munenori Terashima negotiated for Japan to gain the right to set its own trade tax, and in 1873 a postal convention was signed between Japan and the U.S. and in 1878 a treaty of Commerce was signed. However, in the 10th article of this treaty, it was written that in order for this treaty to come into effect, it was necessary for other countries to sign similar treaties (Atarashii Rekishi-Kyoukasho, 2001: p.120-123). Since countries such as Britain opposed the amendment of the treaty, this treaty was not implemented and the negotiations failed.

Second, Kaoru Inoue turned toward partial change of jurisdiction and tax rights. The content of the amendments was to recognise the right of foreign consuls to trial, to have foreign legal experts do so, and to apply Japanese law. The tax rate was also changed from 5% of the price of goods and 25% of the valuables to 15% each (Sakamoto, 1998: p.315). Also, Inoue constructed the Rokumeikan building in Yokohama province in order to show that Japan is a civilised country just like its European counterparts.

While Britain and Germany accepted the changes on tax rights, when it came to the trials, they requested that Japan inform every country about the new legal system within two years after the acceptance of the new agreement and they demanded that cases involving foreigners be tried by foreign judges in Japanese courts.

However, people like the French lawyers Boissonard and Nakae, who were invited to Japan to regulate the legal system, reacted negatively to these changes, contending that foreign judges would be harmful to Japan, that informing each country would lead to a loss of sovereignty and that reactions that may arise against this that could turn into conflict (Sakamoto, 1998: p.317).

Then, in 1886 an event occurred that sealed the fate of Inoue's negotiations. The British ship Normanton sank in the Wakayama province, resulting in the loss of all Japanese passengers, while the British were saved. The court's decision to give a very light sentence to the British led to an intense popular reaction, marking the end of negotiations. It was not until the adoption of the constitution in 1889 that the treaty was amended.

The 1880s saw the most intense debates regarding the legal system and an increase in the number of political parties. The Freedom Party was founded in 1881. The party extolled the virtues of equality and, on this basis, aimed to expand the right to participate in politics. But this party did not have a strong centre because of the power of regional branches.

The Constitution Progressive Party, founded in 1883 under the leadership of Shigenobu Okuma, attached importance to the freedom of movement of individuals and argued that politics should protect this. The state perceived this party as a threat since it had a strong central organisational power (Atarashii Shakai-Rekishi, 1999: p.144).

But after Itagaki went to Europe in 1882, the people began to look at Itagaki with suspicion and the Freedom Party's reputation was severely damaged. In addition, Itagaki himself began to lose his attachment toward the movement because he could not connect his perspective to politics and efforts in Japan after seeing the level of development in Europe. And since most of the people that supported the Freedom Party were from rural areas, once the rural areas became poorer, support decreased and the party's finances deteriorated (Sakamoto, 1998: p.330-333). After uprisings of the farmers such as the Chichibu Rebellion and the Fukushima Revolt, the government began to examine the relations between these rebellions and the Freedom Party and the party was dissolved in 1885 as a result.

However, after these uprisings, Yamagata together with Mosse, a German lawyer, argued that regional autonomy was necessary. They said that in order to keep the rural areas in order, it was necessary to give autonomy to the provinces and municipalities between the people and the government and to involve people in the decision-making process (Sakamoto, 1998: p.338). With the efforts of Yamagata, in 1889 the municipality-village system was established.

In that year, the imperial dynastic law was also established. The purpose of this was to insulate the dynasty from developments in the political arena. The aim was also to contribute to the consolidation of the Empire by codifying how the dynasty was transferred.

As for discussions on the constitution, various constitutional drafts were delivered by deputies and scientists, but most of them put Japanese history and traditions into the background and proposed to directly emulate European systems (Atarashii Rekishi-Kyoukasho, 2001: p.130). Hirobumi Ito criticised these drafts, pointing to the failure of the Mithat Constitution in the Ottoman Empire, and emphasised that Japanese history and traditions should be reflected in the constitution in order to make Japan a truly developed country.

After Ito returned from Germany, he began to prepare a constitution with Kowashi Inoue and Lösrer. In this process, he defined the Emperor as an institution who aimed to establish peace and develop the state (Dainihon Teikoku Kenpou, 2002). All this culminated in 1889 with the promulgation of the Constitution of the Great Empire of Japan. This constitution was hailed in Europe as the constitution that most perfectly combines Japan's history and traditions with European theory of constitution and democracy.

5. COMPARING AND CONTRASTING JAPANESE AND TURKISH MODERNISATION PROCESSESS

Japanese and Turkish modernisation processes present an interesting empirical observation of the different ways in which the Western/European modernisation model was emulated and the ways in which it was not. To start with, the beginning of the modernisation process for both countries can be traced back to the mid-nineteenth century and the primary focus of efforts to modernise was the military. Both countries in this respect consciously emulated the Hohenzollern Prussian model with its outstanding military reforms of the early nineteenth century. The dissolution of local feudal military units was especially important in terms of giving the state centralised monopoly of the means of violence. A parallel can be drawn in this respect between the elimination of the janissary corps in the Ottoman Empire in 1826 by Sultan Mahmud II and the liquidation of the samurai as a privileged class in Japan by the Meiji government in 1873. Likewise, both the 1876 Ottoman Constitution and the 1889 Japanese Constitution were modelled on that of Prussia, although the Ottoman constitution also had included significant French elements. The Ottoman Empire under the reign of Sultan Abdulhamid II went much further in its association with Hohenzollern Prussia since the Sultan forged a close military alliance with Kaiser Wilhelm II and entrusted the re-organisation of the entire Ottoman defence system (primarily the

defence of the Straits) to Prussian army generals. What was rather remarkable for Japan, on the other hand, was the speed with which it implemented Prussian military reforms. For instance, the Meiji government introduced mass conscription in 1873, well before the United Kingdom (Craig, 1967).

Another aspect in which Japanese and Turkish modernisation processes was similar was in their adoption of the "official nationalist" model from the nineteenth century European dynasties. As Benedict Anderson explains in his magisterial *Imagined Communities,* official nationalism is the "willed merger of nation and dynastic empire", denoting the identification of the ruling authorities of a nominally multinational dynasty with the dominant nation therein (Anderson, 1991: p.83-86). Just as the Romanovs of the Russian Empire became Russian nationalists and the Hohenzollerns in Prussia became German nationalists, both to shore up legitimacy of their dynasties, the imperial house in Japan during the Meiji governments much more closely identified with the Japanese nation whereas the Young Turks in the Ottoman Empire switched to Turkish nationalism in an effort to save the Empire from collapsing. Definitely, the exploitation of nationalism for state purposes was much easier in Japan given the high degree of Japanese ethno-cultural homogeneity, its centuries of self-imposed isolation, and the "unique antiquity of the imperial house" in Japan. Indeed, "Japan is the only country whose monarchy has been monopolized by a single dynasty throughout recorded history" (Anderson, 1991: p.96).

Where Japanese and Turkish modernisation processes greatly differ is in the fact that official nationalism in Japan took on an aggressive imperialist character whereas official nationalism in the Ottoman Empire and later Republican Turkey was defensive and status-quo oriented. What this means more specifically is that Japan "copied" both the official nationalist model of European dynasties and its imperialist character. To quote Anderson again, "As the parcellization of Africa at the Congress of Berlin (1885) showed, great nations were global conquerors ... for Japan to be accepted as 'great', she too should turn Tenno into Emperor and launch overseas adventures, even if she was late to the game and had a lot of catching up to do." (Anderson, 1991: p.98) The annexations of Taiwan (1895), Korea (1910), Manchuria (1931), and later of Burma, Indonesia and Philippines during the Second World War are concrete examples of the imperialist character of Japanese official nationalism.

The Prussian-modelled military and economic modernisation reforms paid off handsomely in the Japanese case as Japan was transformed into an

independent military power by the end of the nineteenth century. In the Turkish case, modernisation was also relatively successful in the military aspect as the country's respectable performance in the First World War showed. On the other hand, the Young Turks' emulation of the official nationalist model in an empire as diverse as the Ottoman was bound to raise nationalism among the ethnic, religious and sectarian minorities and consequently impede progress. The Ottoman Empire eventually collapsed after being defeated in the First World War while Japan became an aggressive imperialist power. Again, like the European model it emulated, Japanese imperialism took on a distinctly nationalist character. As Anderson aptly put it (Anderson, 1991: pp.98-99):

> In the interwar years Koreans, Taiwanese, and Manchurians, and, after the outbreak of the Pacific War, Burmese, Indonesians and Filipinos, were subjected to policies for which the European model was an established working practice. And just as in the British Empire, Japanified Koreans, Taiwanese or Burmese had their passages to the metropole absolutely barred. They might speak and read Japanese perfectly, but they would never preside over prefectures in Honshu, or even be posted outside their zones of origin.

The European-modelled modernisation process in Turkey was nowhere near as successful as that of Japan. However, crucially, Turkey did not adopt the imperialist and nationalist working practices of the European model.

Conclusion

Modernisation in Japan advanced rapidly after the 1868 Meiji Restoration, but it is possible to say that Japan's modernisation began actually after Perry's visit in 1853 when its self-imposed isolation was finally broken. During the Edo period, the level of technology was quite high as there was competition among each khanate on various issues, and the education level of the people was likewise high due to Tera-Koya schools where the samurai educated children for free. Hence, the Edo period contributed significantly to the Japanese modernisation process.

In addition, the Meiji Restoration did not occur in the form of destroying the samurai class. This revolution differs greatly from the revolutions in other places because the samurai class itself saw the necessity for revolution and abolished itself. During the Edo period, the samurai first gave importance to serving the state and the people, and this mission of the samurai gained a new

dimension after the Meiji Revolution and played an important role in the development of Japan. It bears emphasis that in Japan, while each khanate trained samurai, the samurai ultimately served the Empire (Bushi-ga Tsukutta Kokumin-Kokka, 2009). Therefore, after the Edo period, the transfer of power to the Empire in the Meiji period was carried out easily and nation-state building was completed rather smoothly. Lastly, keeping in mind the differences in the modernisation processes between Japan and Turkey, it would be interesting for future research to probe further into the question of whether Japan could have somehow avoided the imperialist and nationalist features of the European model. In other words, Japan was an outstanding emulator of the economic and military modernisation reforms, yet why was the European modernisation model also taken up imperially?

References

Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism.* London: Verso.

Atarashii Rekishi-Kyoukasho [New History Textbook]. (2001). Tokyo, Fusou-Sha.

Atarashii Shakai-Rekishi [New Social Sciences-History]. (1999). Tokyo; Tokyo-Shoseki.

Cihan, A. (2006). *Japonya'da Egitim Kultur ve Modernlesme* [Education, Culture and Modernization in Japan], İstanbul; Ark Kitapları.

Craig, A. M. (1967). *Choshu in the Meiji Restoration.* Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Fujioka, N. (1996). *Kyoukasho-ga Oshienai Rekishi* [History that Textbooks Don't Teach]. vol.1. Tokyo; Fusou-sha.

Hunter. J. E. (2002). *Modern Japonya'nın Doğuşu* [The Birth of Modern Japan]. Trans. by Mufit Gunay. Ankara; İmge Kitabevi.

Japan On the Globe (13. 12. 1998). Oubeikara Mita Nihonno Kaikoku: Yoshida Shouin. Retrieved from http://www2s.biglobe.ne.jp/nippon/jogbd_h10_1/jog038.html.

Japan On the Globe (08. 12. 2002). Dainihon Teikoku Kenpou: Ajia Saishono Rikken-Seijiheno Chousen. Retrieved from http://www2s.biglobe.ne.jp/nippon/jogbd_h14/jog242.html.

Japan On the Globe (26. 12. 2005). Bunmei-Kaikano Shishi Hukuzawa Yukichi. Retrieved from http://www2s.biglobe.ne.jp/nippon/jogbd_h17/jog379.html.

Japan On the Globe (01. 11. 2009). Bushiga Tsukutta Kokuminkokka. Retrieved from http://www2s.biglobe.ne.jp/nippon/jogdb_h21/jog603.html.

Matsumoto K. (1998). *Nihon-no Kindai 1: Kaikoku, Ishin* [Japan in Contemporary Age. Vol 1 – Opening up to Outside and Revolutions]. Tokyo; Chuo-Kouron.

Nishio. K. (1999). *Kokumin-no Rekishi* [History of Nationality]. Tokyo, Fusou-sha

Sakamoto, T. (1998). *Nihon-no Kindai 2: Meiji Kokka-no Kensetsu* [Japan in Contemporary Age Vol 2 – Construction of Meiji State-]. Tokyo: Chuo-Kouron.