

The Ottoman Travellers' Perceptions of the Far East in the Early Twentieth Century

Mustafa Serdar Palabiyik*

Abstract

The Ottoman interest towards the Far East has recently begun to be examined in the literature of the disciplines of history and international relations. This article focuses on the relatively under-researched sources, namely the Ottoman travelogues on the Far East in order to analyze the Ottoman perception of this particular region. The Ottoman travellers to the Far East classified local people with regard to their level of development, and they perceived the Japanese, the Chinese and the Koreans differently in terms of their physiognomy and characteristics. Moreover, they vividly described the intense colonial rivalry over the Far East and especially criticized the missionary activities in the region. Finally, the projects for establishing a “unity of the East” were mentioned in these travelogues. These projects resulted in the emergence of “Eastern-ness” as a component of Ottoman identity besides its Ottoman, Turkish and Islamic dimensions. Therefore, racial taxonomy, anti-colonial mode of thinking and the emphasis on the Eastern dimension of Ottoman identity make these travelogues extremely important sources for understanding the Ottoman perceptions of the external world.

Keywords

Ottoman Empire, travelogue, Far East, the unity of the East, anti-colonialism, Japan, China, Korea

* Dr., TOBB University of Economics and Technology, Department of International Relations Instructor – Ankara / Turkey
spalabiyik@etu.edu.tr

Introduction

In the first two decades of the twentieth century, when the Ottoman Empire was approaching the end of its political existence, Ottoman travellers began to appear in the Far East. A Japanese beggar from Yokohama, for instance, might encounter an old man with a long white beard and a large turban on his head, wandering in the streets of the city in a rickshaw. A Chinese dock worker in the port of Hong Kong might be surprised when he spotted a brunet man aboard a British vessel coming from Singapore wearing a weird crimson hat with a black tassel. The governor of Gochar in Xinjiang might listen to the complaints of the local Muslim élites about a teacher coming from a large empire in the West and confusing the minds of Muslim children through so-called modern education. A soldier in Shanghai might wonder why his commanding officer ordered him to follow five individuals, whose appearance neither resembled the Chinese nor the Europeans. In other words, the beggar, dock worker, governor and soldier might have come across such Ottoman travellers as Abdürreşid İbrahim, Süleyman Şükrü, Ahmed Kemal or Adil Hikmet and his fellow companions, respectively. These Ottoman travellers had been to the Far East for various purposes and their accounts, which were as travelogues, became a significant source for understanding the Ottoman perceptions of the Far Eastern lands and communities.

Indeed, Ottoman relations with and perceptions of the Far East have not attracted much scholarly attention. The reasons for this neglect are manifold. First of all, the Ottomans contacted the Far Eastern peoples rather late, only towards the end of the nineteenth century. The Ottoman preoccupation with the West in the form of military confrontation, diplomatic and economic relations diverted the Ottoman attention from the East to a great extent, except for the intense Ottoman-Persian rivalry. What is more, due to the geographical distance and mutual disinterestedness towards each other, Ottoman relations with the Far East remained limited to some symbolic visits, most of which were made by the Japanese, and some Ottoman attempts to establish contact with the Chinese Muslims within the framework of Pan-Islamism. Moreover, until the mid-nineteenth century, Japan was a self-isolated country, while Chinese relations with the Western world were minimal because of the Chinese disinterest in the West except for limited trade relations with the European states such as Portugal, the Low Countries and England. In sum, the Ottoman focus on the West instead of the East and the Japanese and Chinese lack of interest in the Western as well as the Islamic world resulted in reciprocal aloofness.

However, from the 1990s onwards, some Japanese and Turkish historians have undertaken a comparative study of Ottoman relations with the Far East, particularly with Japan. The concomitant modernization processes of the two states, namely the *Tanzimat* reforms in the Ottoman Empire from the 1840s onward and the Meiji restoration in Japan from the late 1860s onward make this comparison possible. In other words, the similarities and differences between the Ottoman and Japanese policies and practices of modernization aroused scholarly attention in the Ottoman-Far Eastern relations. This emerging literature focuses on themes such as the Japanese perceptions of the Ottomans, the Ottoman perceptions of the Japanese, and particularly, the Ottoman reception of the Japanese victory in the 1905 Russo-Japanese War (Arık 1991, Esenbel vd. 2003, Akmeşe 2007). These authors argue that the Japanese victory over Russia had been considered by the Ottomans as the victory of an Eastern power over a Western one. The Ottomans perceived Japanese modernization as a model for the Eastern states in general and the Ottoman Empire in particular. Besides comparative modernization discourse, the tragic story of the *Ertuğrul* frigate, which sunk in 1890 off the coast of Kushimoto, a Japanese town located in the southeast Japan on its return voyage after completing an Ottoman courtesy mission to Japan, has produced an interesting literature focusing not only on the mission and the accident, but also on this accident's impact on the development of the Ottoman-Japanese relations (Öndeş 1988, Komatsu 1992, Apatay 2008). In addition to these works, the Muslim communities living in the Far East and the Ottoman policies toward them have constituted another field of research. Some scholars focus on the dissemination of the Pan-Islamist discourses of Sultan Abdülhamid II (1842-1909) in Japan and China to examine the Ottoman-Chinese relations within the framework of the implications of the Pan-Islamist strategies over the Chinese Muslims (Lee et al. 1989, Lee 1999, Ocaklı 1999, Adıbelli 2007, Aydın 2007).

These studies on the Ottoman-Far Eastern relations has thoroughly examined the archival material to study the mutual interaction that had emerged by the end of nineteenth and consolidated by the early twentieth century. This article, on the other hand, analyzes a neglected literature, namely the travelogues on the Far East written by the Ottoman travellers. Indeed, the number of Ottoman travelogues focusing on this region is extremely limited. In all likelihood, it is this dearth of material that has directed the attention of the scholars to the archival documents and other primary sources instead of the travelogues. However, since these travellers actually visited the Far East and examined the Far Eastern lands and peo-

ples, their writings are of great significance for understanding the Ottoman perceptions of the political, economic and social structures of this distant region. The analysis of Ottoman travelogues on the Far East demonstrates how the Ottoman travellers evaluated this region, which was quite different from their own in many respects, including religion, ethnicity, and culture. Although these travellers had different backgrounds, personal characteristics and political stances, their perceptions of the Far Eastern lands and peoples had significant similarities. In making this argument, after introducing the Ottoman travellers and their travelogues on the Far East, the article first focuses on the stereotypical Ottoman perceptions of the Japanese and the Chinese as a way to demonstrate certain hierarchical categorizations established by the Ottoman travellers for the Far Eastern communities. Secondly, the accounts of the travellers on the implications of the European colonial penetration into the Far East are elaborated upon in order to discuss the travellers' anti-colonial stance, which was a significant feature of the transnational discourses developed by the Ottomans in the form of Pan-Islamism and by the Japanese in the form of Pan-Asianism. Finally, the Ottoman travellers' embracement of the idea of "the unity of the East" in addition to other pan-movements, such as Pan-Islamism and Pan-Turkism, which had been perceived by the Ottoman travellers as relatively insufficient in coping with European imperialism, is examined. By focusing on the idea of the unity of the East, these travellers added an "Eastern" dimension to their self-identification which had been mainly composed of the Ottoman, Islamic and Turkish identity markers. In making this addition, they tended to disregard the religious-cultural differences between the Ottoman Empire and the Far East in favour of emphasizing the need for struggling against a common threat, namely European imperialism.

The Ottoman Travellers to the Far East

The Ottomans travelled to the Far East not for the sake of travel itself, but mainly for various missions to be accomplished. They were state agents either formally or clandestinely sent there; therefore, the relationship between the political authority and the traveller contributed to the content as well as the style of the travelogues. This intimate relationship diverted the focus of the travelogues on the mission that the travellers performed instead of the narration of the travel itself. This is also the case in the Ottoman travellers' writings about the Far East. Among the Ottoman travellers to this region, Abdürreşid İbrahim (1857-1944) arguably attracted the most scholarly attention because of his efforts in disseminating Islam among the Japanese and the subsequent emergence of an influential Mus-

lim community in Japan (Türkoğlu 1997, Mardin 1999, Hisao 2006). Indeed, Abdürreşid İbrahim was not an Ottoman citizen at the time of his travel to the Far East between September 1908 and 1909 at the end of which he wrote his travelogue entitled *Âlem-i İslam ve Japonya'da İntişâr-ı İslamiyet* [*The Islamic World and the Spread of Islam in Japan*]. He was born to a Bukharan Uzbek family in the small town of Tara in the Tobolsk Province of Siberia. After having basic religious education in his home town, he went to Medina where he stayed five years and attended prominent Muslim schools of the city. During his return voyage to Russia, he came to Istanbul where he attracted the attention of Münif Paşa (1830-1910), the then Minister of Education of the Ottoman government, whose mansion had been renowned to be a guesthouse for theologians, philosophers and artists both from the East and the West. His encounter with Münif Paşa resulted in his presentation to the Ottoman bureaucratic and intellectual circles as well as Sultan Abdülhamid II. Although Abdürreşid İbrahim returned to his hometown, he continued to visit Istanbul, and these frequent visits resulted in Ottoman citizenship, which was granted to him in 1912. This was also the date when he published his travelogue (for the brief biography of Abdürreşid İbrahim, see 1328 [1912], 21-32). Hence, although Abdürreşid İbrahim was not an Ottoman citizen during his travel to the Far East, he can still be considered as an Ottoman traveller.

Indeed, Abdürreşid İbrahim (1912, Vol. 1: 7) declared that the reason for his travels in these distant lands was personal; he claimed that he just obeyed the religious prescriptions advising all Muslims to travel and undertook this long and exhausting expedition. However, his intimate connection with Sultan Abdülhamid II prompts some scholars to argue that Abdürreşid İbrahim was a special agent supported by the Sultan for missionary purposes as well as for maintaining the continuation of local Muslim communities' allegiance to the Caliph (Lee 1999: 367, Deringil 2003: 42-47). Whether an agent of Abdülhamid or not, his two-volume travelogue is perhaps the most-detailed account of the Far East ever written by an Ottoman about these lands. What is more, among the Ottoman travellers, he was the only one who actually visited Japan. The other Ottoman travellers encountered the Japanese in other parts of the Far East, particularly in China.

The travelogue of Karçinzade Süleyman Şükrü (1865-1922?), entitled *Seyahat-i Kübrâ* (*The Great Travel*), was published in 1907 in St. Petersburg. The publisher was another notable traveller, Abdürreşid İbrahim, who

might have found Süleyman Şükrü's travelogue narrating his grand tour between 1901 and 1907 over Iran, Central Asia, Europe, North Africa, South Asia and China worth of publishing. Unlike Abdürreşid İbrahim, except for his own writings about his personal background, almost nothing has known of Süleyman Şükrü. Born to an *ulama* family in the town of Eğirdir in south-western Anatolia, Süleyman Şükrü was appointed a postal official in various parts of the Ottoman Empire after his education in his home town. He wrote (1907: 130-131) that the reason for his travel was his escape from the city of Deir ez-Zor in contemporary Syria, where he was exiled in 1901 as a result of being defamed by his rivals. However, he did not clearly explain how and why he had been defamed and undertook such a long and expensive journey. This ambiguity has led some scholars to argue that he was a clandestine agent supported by Abdülhamid for carrying out his Pan-Islamist policies (Lee et.al. 1989: 367, Ocaklı 1999: 593). Indeed, Süleyman Şükrü's pro-Hamidian stance and his staunch critique of Abdülhamid's opponents strengthen this claim. Whatever the reason for his travels, for the purpose of this study, the sections of his travelogue that pertain to China are extremely important for understanding the author's fierce critique of European colonialism and missionary activities as well as his accounts of the Far Eastern communities.

Unlike Abdürreşid İbrahim and Süleyman Şükrü who had a Pan-Islamist stance, the two post-Hamidian travellers to the Far East, Ahmed Kemal and Adil Hikmet were fervent Pan-Turkists who were extremely eager to prevent Great Power interventions into the Ottoman Empire by establishing a strong alliance among the Turks. Their Pan-Turkist ideals led them to undertake some missions for establishing contacts with the Central Asian Turks. It was these missions that indirectly resulted in their travels to the Far East. The mission undertaken by Habibzade Ahmed Kemal (1889-1966) was the first one at the end of which the memoirs of the traveller had been published. Born to a merchant family in Rhodes, Ahmed Kemal served as a teacher on various Aegean islands. In 1911, he fled from the island of Kastelorizo (Meis) after the island was invaded by the Italians during the Tripolitanian War between the Ottoman Empire and Italy. He made his way to Istanbul and became involved with the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP), serving as one of the closest aides to Talat Paşa (1874-1921), a leading member of the CUP. In 1913, a notable from Kasghar, Ebulhasan Hacı Musabay arrived in Istanbul on his way to Mecca for the *haji* (the Islamic pilgrimage). After being informed by Musabay about the illiteracy of the Turkish youth of Turkistan (the Xinjiang Province of China), Talat Paşa decided in 1913 to send Ahmed Ke-

mal to Kasghar as a teacher in order to educate the Turkish youth in Turkistan, who lived under oppressive Chinese rule (for a brief biography of Ahmed Kemal, see İlkul 1997: 9-23). In some cities of Turkistan, such as Kasghar, Artux, Kucha and Urumchi, he attempted to introduce modern education to the Turkish young people; however, he encountered the opposition of the local Muslim elites who opposed the youngsters being inculcated with ideas such as liberty, equality, or abandonment of religious dogmatism, which would shatter the local elites' authority in the region. As a result of the tacit collaboration between these elites and the Chinese, Ahmed Kemal was imprisoned by the Chinese authorities who later brought him to Shanghai and took him into custody (İlkul 1997: 17). He was released in 1919 due to the intervention of the Consul of the Netherlands and was able to return to Istanbul a year later (İlkul 1997: 22-23). His adventurous memoirs were compiled in two travelogues, the first one, entitled *Çin Türkistan Hatıraları (Memories of China-Turkistan)*, was published in 1925 and the second one, entitled *Şangay Hatıraları (Memories of Shanghai)*, was published in 1939. In these travelogues, he not only criticized the Muslims of Turkistan for their ignorance and bigotry but also narrated the Far Eastern cities he visited and peoples he encountered along his exile route from Kasghar to Shanghai.

The second Pan-Turkist mission was undertaken by Adil Hikmet and his four companions during World War I. Adil Hikmet (1887-1933) was the son of an Ottoman official serving in Darnah in the Tripolitania Province. After graduating from the Military Academy in Istanbul, in 1914, on the eve of World War I, Adil Hikmet and four other Ottoman officers were ordered by the CUP administration to organize the Central Asian Turks and, if possible, to start a Turkish rebellion against Russia. During their mission, they were captured by the Russians in 1915, tried and sentenced to death; however, with the intervention of the German Embassy in Beijing, they were imprisoned in Kapal, China (Adil Hikmet 1998: 130-175). In 1916, they were able to escape and returned to Turkistan. Then they took the leadership of the local Kirghiz rebels and launched one of the most significant rebellions against the Russians during World War I (Adil Hikmet 1998: 184-226). After this rebellion was suppressed by the Russians, Adil Hikmet and his fellow officers fled to Khotan by passing through the Taklamakan Desert. Finally, in June 1918 they reached Shanghai, where Adil Hikmet stayed for three years (Adil Hikmet 1998: 227-310). His memoirs were published in the *Cumhuriyet* newspaper in 1928 and later compiled as a book (for a brief biography of see Adil Hikmet 1998 551-554). These memoirs were particularly important for un-

derstanding the Ottoman perception of the Chinese and the presence of European colonial powers in China.

All in all, none of these Ottoman travellers undertook travel solely for the sake of travel; rather they either visited the Far Eastern lands to establish contact with the Far Eastern Muslims or to disseminate Islam in the region, as in the case of Süleyman Şükrü and Abdürreşid İbrahim, or they were forced to travel from inner Asia to Shanghai, as in the case of Ahmed Kemal and Adil Hikmet. Whatever the motive was, these travelogues provide the reader with a significant insight of the Ottoman perception of the Far Eastern lands and inhabitants.

The Ottoman Travellers' Perceptions of the Far Eastern People

In each of the Ottoman travelogues on the Far East, a significant portion is devoted to the description of the physical appearance and cultural characteristics of the Far Eastern people. The Ottoman travellers preferred to classify the Far Eastern communities in a way to create several hierarchical categorizations among these people. To start with, the Ottoman travellers appreciated and admired the Japanese for the perceived cultural similarities between the Japanese and the Muslims, the Japanese modernization project that retained the Japanese national characteristics, and emergence of Japan, an Eastern state, as a political, military and economic power competing with the European states.

The Ottoman travellers' appreciation of the Japanese was so strong that even their physiognomic qualities were highlighted in the Ottoman travelogues in a way to highlight their progress. For instance, Süleyman Şükrü (1907: 544) defined the Japanese, whom he had encountered aboard the vessel on which he had been travelling to Shanghai, as such: "They are short, their bodies are solid, their bones are big, their arms are strong, their feet are swift, their steps are agile, their hearts are vivid, and their eyes are small but quite open." The adjectives he utilized to describe the Japanese imply that the Japanese physiognomic characteristics reflected the reasons for their progress. Their physical strength was combined with agile and swift movements reflecting their infinite energy; it was this combination, for Süleyman Şükrü, that resulted in the Japanese achievements. Ahmed Kemal additionally likened them to the Turkish race. This similarity made him feel comfortable and that he was in a familiar environment during his stay in a Japanese hospital in Hangzhou for the treatment of his sore throat. He (1925: 223) wrote that his sense of comfort and familiarity was reciprocal; the Japanese did not perceive him as a foreigner and treated him as if "one of their brothers from the West had come to their hospital."

Besides physiognomy, the Ottoman travellers' cognizance of the achievements of Japanese modernization was the main reason for the positive perception of the Japanese. First and foremost, the Ottoman travellers extensively emphasized the Japanese diligence. They described the Japanese as a people who did not speak and laugh pointlessly while thinking and working vehemently (Ahmed Kemal 1925: 16, Abdürreşid İbrahim 1912, Vol. 1: 281). For the Ottoman travellers, the reason for Japanese sobriety and diligence was the consideration of Japanese national interests. Instead of serving foreign aims, the Japanese were aware that they should solely work for the benefit of their own country (Ahmed Kemal 1939: 17-20, Abdürreşid İbrahim 1912, Vol.1: 189).

The Japanese lifestyle was another matter of appreciation. Especially the cleanliness, orderliness and plain lives of the Japanese attracted the attention of the Ottoman travellers. For instance, on his way to Yokohama, Abdürreşid İbrahim visited a Japanese village and admired the cleanliness of the streets as well as the tidiness of the houses; he wrote (1912, Vol. 1: 180) that "the cleanliness of the streets was extraordinary." He was also quite surprised when he saw a telephone cabin in the midst of the village together with a modern post and telegraph office. In other words, his encounter with such technical elements of modern civilization in a village amazed him. Besides cleanliness and orderliness, Abdürreşid İbrahim (1912, Vol.1: 214) maintained that all the Japanese were polite, hospitable and good-mannered. Similarly, Ahmed Kemal (1939: 16-17) wrote that it was difficult to establish friendship with the Japanese; however, once it was established, they were extremely generous and sincere toward their friends.

The Japanese were also admired by the Ottoman travellers for the attachment of extreme importance placed upon education. The travellers were amazed when they saw education facilities in the smallest villages. For Abdürreşid İbrahim (1912, Vol.1: 189), in the cities, except for government buildings, "...only the schools were constructed on a colossal scale", which was an indication of the significance given to education. What is more, the Japanese were extremely inclined to reading; Ahmed Kemal (1939: 16) declared his astonishment after seeing libraries even in the houses of Japanese villagers. Similarly, Abdürreşid İbrahim (1912, Vol.1: 208) mentioned that the Japanese were reading newspapers regularly; "the newspapers were published not only in big cities but also in villages and small towns."

The Ottoman travellers also appreciated the Japanese family life and respectfulness displayed in the Japanese culture. This admiration also in-

cluded a kind of self-criticism because most of the Ottoman intellectuals of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century criticized the superficial westernization of the Ottoman Empire and subsequent deviations of some members of the Ottoman ruling elite from the Ottoman/Islamic culture (Kara 2001: 20-21, Gündüz 2007: 246-247). In other words, in appreciating the Japanese allegiance to traditions, the Ottoman travellers attempted to demonstrate that modernization without westernization was possible. The emphasis of Ahmed Kemal's travelogue (1939: 17-20) on the education of the Japanese children by their mothers in accordance with Japanese traditions, the respect of the Japanese women to their husbands, and the helpfulness of the Japanese men to their wives reflected his desire to see similar patterns adopted in his own country. Similarly, Abdürreşid İbrahim focused upon the Japanese ruling elite's adherence of their traditions. In narrating his reception by the Japanese Minister of the Imperial Palace, Abdürreşid İbrahim wrote that the minister received him first in a room decorated in European style. After a few minutes spent in this room for official dialogue, the minister invited him to his personal room decorated in Japanese style. The minister says Abdürreşid İbrahim (1912, Vol. 1: 279-280) that "The official formality between them is over ... We are Easterners, we should communicate in Eastern style".

These positive qualities attributed to the Japanese prompted Abdürreşid İbrahim (1912, Vol.1: 265) to conclude that the Japanese had already been practising the Islamic principles, such as cleanliness, honesty, or the mutual respect between man and woman. He (1912, Vol.1: 273) wrote that "thenceforward, there is no doubt that Islam will spread in Japan because the Japanese nation were naturally inclined to Islam." He (1912, Vol.1: 311) also devoted a chapter in his travelogue to the characteristics of the Japanese, which he found similar to Muslims, in order to state that "if [the Ottoman] *ulama* are able to show the way to the Japanese, there is no doubt that the Japanese have the perfect competence with regard to Islam". Abdürreşid İbrahim might have been concerned that the common Ottoman citizen might not embrace the Japanese way of modernization, which he saw as extremely plausible for the Ottoman Empire, because the Japanese were considered as infidels in Islamic terminology since they did not belong to the Islamic category of "people of the book" (*ehl-i kitab*, meaning Muslims, Christians and Jews). By emphasizing the potential inclination of the Japanese to Islam and the similarities between the Japanese and Muslim lifestyles, it could have been Abdürreşid İbrahim's intention to prevent possible Muslim prejudices toward the Japanese.

International respect and power that the Japanese attained in a short period of time also highly impressed Abdürreşid İbrahim. In one of his conversations with the former Japanese Foreign Minister, Okuma Shigenobu (1838-1922), he (1912, Vol.1: 202) declared his views regarding the Japanese achievements in the international arena as such: “[T]he Japanese suddenly arose like the sun and in their first attempt they proved to the world that the Eastern nations had the capacity to become civilized. This contradicts the European diplomats’ vicious ideas and vile interests regarding the East; therefore, there is no doubt that they will change the political ideas that they have pursued so far.”

In other words, Abdürreşid İbrahim underlined that the emergence of Japan as a significant power in the international system forced the Europeans to revise their policies toward the East. He (1912, Vol.1: 500-501) added that this development was miraculous: “The emergence of a small nation, having no name and trace in the world, by making all the nations existing in the earth tremble, is an unforgettable wonder”. In addition to such statements, Abdürreşid İbrahim (1912, Vol.1: 215, 339) also perceived Japan as a guide for all Eastern peoples:

Today, I convinced myself through my own observations on the Japanese advance. It is the natural competence I observed in the Japanese that gives me a great confidence... The Japanese nation will act as a guide for all Eastern nations, as the natural channel of the East is to rise. (...)

I see the Japanese as a new-born sun; I demand from God that the entire Eastern world shall benefit from the lights of this sun. The Japanese are a newly-flowered fruit tree, all Eastern and particularly we, the Muslims, are waiting to eat from its fruits... If the elites of this nation cannot preserve this fruit, they will become responsible to the entire Eastern world because the life of the Japanese is the life of the entire Eastern world.

These excerpts demonstrate that Abdürreşid İbrahim perceived Japan as a model for all Eastern peoples. The manner in which the Japanese carried out the modernization process without giving up their national characteristics prompted him with regard to ascribing the Japanese the responsibility of guiding the other Eastern nations to a similar pattern of development. For him, it would be this guidance that ended the Eastern backwardness *vis-à-vis* the West effectively because the only choice for the Easterners was the adoption of modern scientific and technological achievements of the West while preserving the Eastern (Islamic) morality.

In writing about the Chinese, the Ottoman travellers were not as positive as in their description of the Japanese. They praised the virtues of the Chinese while criticizing their perceived negative characteristics at the same time. To start with the positive qualities, the Ottoman travellers appreciated the Chinese awareness of their national culture and pride. Abdürreşid İbrahim compared the Chinese with the Koreans in this respect. He wrote that in Manchuria, although both the Chinese and the Koreans were living under Japanese influence, the Chinese did not totally surrender to Japanese cultural imperialism, unlike the Koreans. The Chinese remained more prosperous compared to the Koreans; the reason he (1912, Vol.1: 487-489) noted for their prosperity and resistance to foreign domination was their devotion to Chinese traditions and national customs. For instance, Abdürreşid İbrahim (1912, Vol.1: 154) admired the respect of the Chinese men gave to their national dress and their long hair. He (1912, Vol.1: 554) compared this attitude with some Ottomans' embarrassment of wearing their national headdress, the fez, when they travelled in Europe and argued that the Chinese were superior to these Ottomans for preserving their cultural appearance.

The Chinese of Shanghai attracted the attention of Adil Hikmet, who perhaps produced one of the most positive accounts of the Chinese in his travelogue in addition to the most negative ones. According to him (1998: 412), "the Chinese of Shanghai is the most vigilant and patriotic community of the entire Chinese territory." He praised their respect for the Chinese culture and the importance given to the use of national products instead of European imports. Adil Hikmet (1998: 412) concluded that "if all the Chinese people loved their country as the Chinese of Shanghai and if they became as diligent as them, then there would be no doubt that the yellow peril, from which the Europe has feared, is to be materialized."

In sum, the Ottoman travellers considered the honouring of Chinese traditions instead of adopting European morality as the basic virtue of this community. However, they also underlined what the travellers perceived the negative characteristics of the Chinese. The most severe criticism of the Chinese came from Ahmed Kemal and Adil Hikmet, who had been subjected to unfair and relentless treatment by Chinese officials, including imprisonment and exile. In other words, their personal experiences with the Chinese influenced their perceptions tremendously. To start with the negative qualities attributed to the Chinese, Ahmed Kemal emphasized the dirtiness of the Chinese, their personal residences and their neighbourhoods. For instance, regarding the city of Urumchi, he wrote about three

neighbourhoods of the city inhabited by the Europeans, the Turks and the Chinese. He (1925: 156) particularly emphasized the dirtiness of the Chinese neighbourhood by declaring that he wondered how the Chinese did not suffer extinction from diseases such as cholera and plague although they had been living under miserable conditions.

In addition to dirtiness, the most significant criticism regarding the Chinese society was the absence of rule of law. Being imprisoned multiple times in Kasghar led Ahmed Kemal (1925: 79) to conclude that “[i]n Kasghar governmental affairs are quite disordered. Order and regularity are forgotten [...] Governance in the Chinese country means the sheltering of bandits in [the Chinese] cities.” What is more, he narrated the prison conditions, torture and mistreatment he had encountered during his imprisonment; he (1925: 139) commented “in this era of progress of the society of mankind, the cruel laws of China applied these provisions [for torturing the prisoners] to the sons of Adam.” In addition to criticizing Chinese domestic law, Ahmed Kemal (1925: 51) argued that the Chinese were not aware of international law either: “Since the Chinese governors have not yet been familiarized with the rules and provisions of international law, they did not perceive such occurrences as important, they ignored even the most serious and significant problems humiliating the honour of the government and the dignity of the country.”¹

Similarly, Adil Hikmet (1998: 236, 241) wrote that except for the Chinese of Shanghai and the Chinese officials who had declared themselves to be of Turkish origin, all the Chinese were vicious and hateful people. According to him, the reason for the Chinese xenophobia was arrogance, for the Chinese perceived themselves as superior to all other nations; in their view, the rest of the world’s peoples were savage and Confucian ethics represented the most civilized and proper law. However, Adil Hikmet (1998: 369) argued that Confucian ethics had been distorted for centuries, failing to keep up with the current conditions.

The Ottoman travelogues distinguished between the Chinese and the Chinese Muslims. For instance, Abdürreşid İbrahim made a comparison between the Chinese Muslims and Confucians, finding the former to be superior to the latter in terms of cleanliness. He (1912, Vol. 1: 138) considered the Chinese Muslims’ adherence to the Islamic principle of ablution before prayers as a significant reason for their cleanliness. Another positive characteristic was the Chinese Muslims’ efforts for establishing new educational facilities to eliminate ignorance, which was one of the most significant problems of the Muslim community in China, Ahmed

Kemal (1939: 26) praised the wealthier Chinese Muslims, who were able to establish a new school, “the Islamic School” (*Medrese-i İslâmiye*), in Beijing for the Muslim youngsters.

Besides these positive accounts, Süleyman Şükrü and Abdürreşid İbrahim criticized the Chinese Muslims for preserving their long hair while cutting their moustaches and beards, which was contrary to the practice of Prophet Muhammed. They argued that the Muslims should separate themselves from the non-Muslim Chinese through adopting Islamic dress and life style (Süleyman Şükrü 1907: 563, Abdürreşid İbrahim 1912, Vol.1: 512). In other words, these travellers wanted to identify Chinese Muslims distinctively. Reflecting this concern was Abdürreşid İbrahim's (1912, Vol. 1: 138) complaint that the Muslim Chinese houses, shops and places of worship (mosques) could not be differentiated from the ones of the non-Muslim Chinese, if it were not for the Arabic scripts and Islamic signs carved on these buildings. In sum, the Ottoman travellers appreciated the non-Muslim Chinese for preserving their national culture through their distinct physical appearance and clothing; however, they criticized the Chinese Muslims for not adopting the markers of Islamic faith to distinguish themselves from the non-Muslims.

The ignorance and bigotry of the Chinese Muslims was also a significant matter of criticism. For instance, Abdürreşid İbrahim (1912, Vol. 1: 141) found the Chinese *imams* extremely ignorant and wrote that they were even deprived of the knowledge of simple Arabic. What is more, he blamed them for inserting the Confucian traditions into Islamic jurisprudence, which deteriorated the “true path” of this religion. The Chinese Muslim elites were deemed to be quite ignorant as well; Abdürreşid İbrahim complained about their disinterest in concepts like nation, progress or education. He (1912, Vol.1: 143) noted that when he began to talk with the Chinese Muslims on these themes, they did not listen to his words and even began to sleep.

What is important in the writings of Abdürreşid İbrahim (1912, Vol.1: 155) was that the perceived ignorance of the Chinese Muslims was thought to be able to be eliminated only by proper religious education, which would be provided by the Ottoman Empire:

In northern China, especially in the north-eastern parts and in Manchuria, ignorance is widespread, even to the degree that they are not aware of their ignorance; [...] sending people to awaken them is the duty of the enlightened Muslims. Particularly the Muslims living un-

der the Islamic Caliphate and especially the post of *seikh-ul-islam* should help and save them from the darkness of ignorance; otherwise, their future would be extremely desperate.

As such, the Pan-Islamist stance of Abdürreşid İbrahim led him to recommend a significant responsibility to the Ottoman *ulama*, namely the education of Chinese Muslims. This suggestion was made because of the dual role of the Ottoman Sultan, both as the ruler of the most powerful Muslim political entity and as the Caliph of the entire Muslim community.

All in all, for the Ottoman travellers, the Japanese were appreciated the most for their achievements and were placed at the top of the hierarchical categorization established for the Far Eastern communities. The Chinese were categorized as either being Chinese Muslim or non-Muslim Chinese; the former was perceived as superior to the latter. However, whether Muslim or not, the Chinese were deemed inferior to the Japanese. This inferiority is reemphasized in the Ottoman travelogues, particularly with respect to the reactions of the Far Eastern nations to the European colonial encroachments in the region.

The Ottoman Travellers' Critique of European Colonial Policy and Missionary Activities in the Far East

Another significant theme that Ottoman travellers focused on in their travelogues was the implications of European colonial policies in the Far East so as to underline the similarity between the Ottoman Empire and the Far Eastern states. To start with, they examined the reasons for European encroachments and concluded that not only economic but also security considerations resulted in the penetration of the colonial powers into the Far East. For instance, according to Süleyman Şükrü, European states only exploited local resources; each of them also attempted to expand their sphere of influence in order to secure its possessions against the rival colonial states. For instance, he (1907: 542) concluded that in occupying Hong Kong, the British only sought to control a lucrative trade centre, but also tried to prevent further French colonial expansion in the region. Abdürreşid İbrahim's account of Russian-Japanese rivalry over Harbin, a Chinese city in Manchuria, was another example, demonstrating an intra-Asian colonial rivalry in the Far East. He (1912, Vol.1: 145-146) argued that after the Russo-Japanese War, Harbin and its environs were totally lost to the Japanese and the Russian trade in the region collapsed dramatically.

Besides the rivalry between the colonial powers, one of the most significant criticisms directed by the Ottoman travellers towards European colonialism was the colonial segregation between the Europeans and the local people, which became extremely visible particularly in the Chinese metropolitan cities such as Shanghai and Beijing. For instance, Ahmed Kemal (1939: 8) complained that in Shanghai it was impossible for a Chinese person to enter the parks, stores and theatres that the Europeans frequented because of the regulations of the colonial powers dominating these cities. Similarly, Süleyman Şükrü criticized the European presence in Beijing. He wrote that a significant part of the city was controlled by different European colonial powers; even the old city centre, which also included the imperial palace, was under German control and not a single Chinese person could freely enter into this region. He (1907: 556) found this situation extremely humiliating.

In addition to the colonial segregation, the intimate relationship between the colonial administrations in the region and the missionary activities was another matter of criticism in the Ottoman travelogues. Almost all the Ottoman travellers to the Far East, either being Pan-Islamist, such as Abdürreşid İbrahim and Süleyman Şükrü, or being Pan-Turkist, such as Ahmed Kemal and Adil Hikmet, complained about the work of the Christian missionary groups. In other words, even those travellers whose priority was not religion but national identity perceived missionary activities to be extremely negative because they considered these activities as a part of the colonial policy. Hence, anti-colonialism fostered a reactive stance against missionary activities as well.

Among the Ottoman travellers, Abdürreşid İbrahim produced the fiercest critique of missionaries; he labelled them as “incorrigible parasites” (1912, Vol.1: 305). According to him (1912, Vol.1: 553), “[t]he missionaries did not attempt to spread their own religion; they were not the servants of Christianity. They just sow the seeds of sedition.” Therefore, he did not criticize the missionaries for disseminating their religion in the Far East, but because they did this in a way to create socio-cultural disturbance in the region. Abdürreşid İbrahim underlined that another indication of the missionaries’ “malice” was their benefitting from the weaknesses of the local population. For instance, regarding the missionary activities in Korea, he wrote that the Koreans’ addiction to alcohol facilitated missionary activities since the missionaries could easily convert the Koreans to Christianity by offering them a glass of drink (1912, Vol.1: 473). Similarly, Süleyman Şükrü (1907: 512-513) complained that through providing the

Chinese with simple daily sustenance, the missionaries were able to convert many people to Christianity. Ahmed Kemal emphasized that the missionaries not only benefitted from the poverty of the local inhabitants of the Far East but also approached these people as if they were one of them. Exemplifying the methods of the missionaries serving in China, he (1939: 10) wrote that the missionaries were dressed like the Chinese and adopted the Chinese life style in order to better facilitate their contact with the local population, and they organized their working programme after a thorough study of Chinese traditions. In sum, the Ottoman travellers argued that instead of being satisfied with simply declaring the principles of Christianity, the missionaries were “deceiving” the Far Eastern communities by manipulating the weaknesses of the people or by cloaking their real intentions through demonstrating their so-called respect to the local traditions.

Despite this “deceptive” characteristic of the missionary activities, the Ottoman travellers admitted that the missionaries were quite successful in converting local people to Christianity. The most important reason for the achievements of the missionary activities was considered as the local people’s abandonment of their traditional culture and morality. For instance, Abdürreşid İbrahim (1912, Vol.1: 469) perceived Korea as the country where the missionaries had performed conversions very easily because of the incapacity and indifference of the Koreans for the preservation of their national culture and identity. Similarly, in one of his speeches delivered in Japan, he (1912, Vol.1: 383-384) warned the Japanese not to abandon their national characteristics in order to be strong enough to prevent any surrender to the “Frankish customs” and sedition of the missionaries.

The critique of European colonial policies and missionary activities is a significant theme in the Ottoman travelogues on the Far East; however, it is quite ironic that the Ottoman travellers considered Japanese imperialism in the region favourably. The reason for this positive treatment was their distinction between European and Japanese versions of imperialism. They maintained that Japanese imperialism was preferred over the European variety in the Far Eastern context. For example, Abdürreşid İbrahim (1912, Vol.1: 466) remarked that the Koreans welcomed a Japanese invasion instead of Russian one because, unlike the Russians, the Japanese were eager to ameliorate the infrastructure, which would advance the life standards of the Koreans. In other words, he appreciated the Japanese colonial policy in the Far East because, unlike the European colonial policy, which focused on the destruction of existing structures and exploita-

tion of the local resources, the Japanese expansion in the region was based on reconstruction and thereby brought wealth and prosperity to those living under Japanese control. For instance, he (1912, Vol.1: 472) wrote that whatever he found as an indication of civilization in the Korean cities had been constructed by the Japanese. Similar to Abdürreşid İbrahim, Ahmed Kemal (1939: 12) also considered the Japanese penetration into China as a positive development for the Chinese. In writing his observations regarding the Japanese-controlled regions of China, he appreciated that “the Japanese found jobs for the Chinese, they educate them and they attempted any kind of propagandistic sacrifice [...] in order to awaken a hatred and enmity against the Europeans in Asia.”

Adil Hikmet's account went beyond approving of Japanese imperialism, for he not only excused Japanese colonial initiatives in China and Korea, he also encouraged the Japanese to expand more toward the interior parts of Asia. In his travelogue, Adil Hikmet (1998: 442) wrote that the Japanese should extend their sphere of influence in the region and establish industrial facilities in these newly acquired territories in order to be able to maintain their power *vis-à-vis* the other colonial powers.

All in all, the Ottoman travellers' anti-colonial discourse is multidimensional. In the first instance, they criticized European colonialism in a classical fashion by focusing on the destructive, exploitative and discriminatory characteristics of the colonial policy. They also considered missionary activities as a part of colonial strategies, attempting to distort the socio-cultural structure of the Far East. However, the Ottoman travellers transcended these usual criticisms and distinguished between the European and Japanese versions of imperialism. They perceived the Japanese version as more preferable compared to the European form since the Japanese priority was to provide better conditions for the Chinese and Koreans and to protect them against the European political, economic and cultural penetration into the region through diplomats, merchants and missionaries. The Ottoman travellers' admiration of the Japanese and their presentation of the Japanese as a model for the other Asian communities resulted in a highly positive account of Japanese imperialism.

The Idea of the “Unity of the East”

The Ottoman travellers to the Far East not only reflected the implications of European colonialism in this region, they also proposed a significant solution for the Far Eastern nations to cope with this threat. This solution was the idea of “the unity of the East” (*İttihâd-ı Şark*). After observing the conditions in the Far East and combining these observations with their

perceptions of Europe as well as the non-European world, the Ottoman travellers concluded that the policy of “the unity of the Muslims” (*İttihâd-ı İslam*), which the Hamidian administration had tried to implement, did not suffice to thwart European colonialism. Rather, a larger unity should be considered among the Eastern nations, regardless of their religion. In other words, the only solution to be able to overcome the underdevelopment of the Eastern world and to counter the negative effects of European colonialism was to establish the unity of the East.

According to the Ottoman travellers, it was the “Eastern” indifference to the European imperialist expansion that resulted in the underdevelopment of the East. For instance, Süleyman Şükrü (1907: 557) emphasized the absence of collective Eastern resistance against European penetration into the non-European world: “Isn’t it the deep sleep that all Easterners are sleeping that indulges some Western nations as such? When we went to sleep, they woke up. They began to attack and spread everywhere in the absence of vigilant administrators. In order to survive the evil of these plunderers, let’s wake up.”

This excerpt is quite interesting because it not only addressed the Muslim community, but also all Eastern nations. Süleyman Şükrü was a Pan-Islamist traveller; however, after his travels he concluded that the unity of the Muslims should be inclusive of the non-Muslim communities of Asia because European expansion not only threatened the Islamic world, but all Eastern communities. Secondly, he continuously used the personal pronoun “we.” This means that he considered himself as an Easterner, not solely a Muslim. In other words, besides the Islamic element, he added another dimension into his identity structure, namely Eastern-ness. Therefore, despite his Pan-Islamist background, he did not hesitate to address all Easterners and call for a collective awakening.

In his travelogue, Süleyman Şükrü (1907: 557) also recalled the glorious past of the East *vis-à-vis* the West and, in doing that, he once more addressed all Eastern communities: “When Eastern nations were enlightened with the lights of science and were presented as an example to the world, the Western nations were swimming in stupidity and ignorance and they were totally unenlightened.” Thus, according to Süleyman Şükrü, underdevelopment had not always been a fact of the Eastern world; rather, the East had once been superior to the West. The reason of this superiority was the Eastern interest in science, the absence of which resulted in the decline of the East. Therefore, what the Easterners should do was to revive

the scientific and technological interest inherent in their own cultural establishment and to strive for parity with the West.

Abdürreşid İbrahim's emphasis on the idea of the unity of the East was quite visible in his memoirs on Japan. In one of his meetings with a high-ranking Japanese bureaucrat, Abdürreşid İbrahim told him that the Europeans could not bear to witness the rise of a rival power in the East and that they did their best to prevent Japanese progress and modernization. He further argued that the only way to face the European threat was to establish an alliance between China and Japan. However, considering the difficulty of this alliance because of the hostilities between these two states, Abdürreşid İbrahim (1912, Vol.1: 290) advised the Japanese bureaucrat to contact Chinese Muslims, who might be more eager for such cooperation. In addition to these indirect references to establish an alliance among the Eastern states, Abdürreşid İbrahim (1912, Vol.1: 351) also openly declared that the only way to cope with the European threat was "to serve the unity of the East." Similarly, in Beijing, in a newspaper published by Muslims, he published an article entitled "The East is for the Easterners" (*Şark Şarklılar İçindir*). In this article, he (1912, Vol.1: 542-545) warned the Chinese Muslims about European imperialist intentions and repeated his proposal for establishing an alliance among the Eastern states.

Adil Hikmet's account of the unity of the East was as strong as the account of Abdürreşid İbrahim. He even transcended Süleyman Şükrü's and Abdürreşid İbrahim's self-identification as Easterners and defined himself as an Asian. In other words, besides his Turkish and Muslim elements of his identity, he added a third dimension, namely Asian-ness. He (1998: 425) wrote in his travelogue that like the Japanese, he was an Asian; he defined Anatolia as being at the Western edge of Asia and argued that the Turks had migrated to Anatolia from Central Asia. All these references to the Asian character of the Turks created the supra-identity of Asian-ness. What is more, similar to Süleyman Şükrü and Abdürreşid İbrahim, Adil Hikmet (1998: 441) perceived the unity of the East as the only way to overcome European imperialism; however, different from these two travelers, he also demanded that the Japanese lead this movement:

Yes, we, the Turks, who had struggled to protect Asia from the threat of the West for centuries and the Japanese, who [established] the strongest and the only independent state of the Far East, had forgotten each other. The Turks had shed their pure blood continuously in order to protect Asia from their migration to the west of Asia until this time. Millions of sons of Asia had been buried because of the attacks of Eu-

rope and the Turkish population decreased for that reason. There are two independent states in Asia. You [The Japanese] are a rearguard in the East and we are a forerunner in the West. You should understand that the forerunner is now very tired. You should assume this responsibility [of the unity of the East] as the noble sons of Asia.

This excerpt is quite significant because Adil Hikmet assigned the responsibility of protecting Asia against external threats, especially European imperialism, to the Japanese, by relieving the Ottomans from this difficult task. This means that Adil Hikmet recognized the superiority of the Japanese *vis-à-vis* the Ottomans and acknowledged a prospective Japanese leadership to constitute the unity of the East. This acknowledgement was quite interesting considering the traditional Ottoman sense of superiority over the rest of the world and demonstrated the transformation of the Ottoman self-perception toward the end of the empire.

Conclusion

The weakening of the Ottoman Empire and the growing distrust of the European powers, which displayed the signs of abandoning their policy of protecting the territorial integrity of the empire, directed the Ottomans' attention to the East. The emergence of Japan as a significant rival to the European states both in terms of patterns of development and actual political/military power as well as the awareness of the potential of Chinese Muslims in relation to Pan-Islamist policies contributed to the Ottoman interest in the Far East. Although political and diplomatic relations between the Ottoman Empire and the Far Eastern states remained limited, some Ottoman travellers were able to visit the region and encounter a different culture. Their writings are of significant value for understanding the Ottoman travellers' perceptions of the Far East because the travellers were the actual observers of the peoples and cultures of this region.

The Ottoman travelogues focusing on the Far East reveal that the travellers established several hierarchies among the Far Eastern peoples, placing the Japanese at the top because of successful Japanese modernization and particularly the Japanese victory over the Russians. Not only physiognomic qualities but also the lifestyles of the Japanese were appraised in the Ottoman travelogues as a way to demonstrate that modernization and the efficient struggle with foreign encroachments might be possible without abandoning one's own culture. In other words, in making this appraisal, the travellers perceived the Japanese as a viable model for the Ottomans, who were seeking a pattern of modernization without westernization. The

Chinese, on the other hand, were considered inferior to the Japanese because they failed to follow the Japanese path of modernization, and therefore, they suffered from external intervention. The Chinese Muslims seemed to be placed above the non-Muslim Chinese because of their adherence to Islamic principles; however, their ignorance and bigotry resulted in their “backwardness” *vis-à-vis* the Japanese. In sum, the criteria for hierarchical representation of the Far Eastern peoples were the level of development and the efficiency of coping with external encroachments.

This emphasis on the capacity to resist colonial interventions is an outcome of the Ottoman travellers' anti-colonial rhetoric. Whether Pan-Islamist or Pan-Turkist, these travellers had staunch anti-Western critiques. They perceived the European colonial powers as the usurpers of the local resources and considered the rivalry among themselves as a major factor for colonial expansion in the region. Moreover, they associated Christian missionary activities with the general colonial policies and considered the missionaries as agents of colonialism, who were “deceiving” the Far Eastern people and serving to encourage the internal dissidence in the region in order to facilitate colonial expansion. The ironic point is that the Ottoman travellers distinguished between European and Japanese versions of imperialism; they indulged Japanese imperialism because they argued that the Japanese version did not exploit local resources but contributed positively to the life standards of the peoples living under Japanese rule through infrastructure building or employment. Indeed, the Ottoman travellers seemed to prefer Japanese domination in the Far East instead of the European dominance in this particular region.

The Ottoman travellers' observations in the Far East directed them to conclude that Pan-Islamism or Pan-Turkism might be insufficient to cope with the European colonial interests. They offered the widening of the anti-Western alliance; the idea of “the unity of the East” was a product of such thinking. The Ottoman travellers believed that if the Eastern states were able to come together and set up an alliance, then they might resist more effectively against European imperialism. Such unity would not only serve to enhance the modernization of the East but also deter the Europeans from expanding their sphere of influence. Some of these travellers even perceived Japan as the natural leader of this Eastern unity project; this was a tacit acceptance of the insufficiency of the Ottoman Empire to lead this project. In sum, the Ottoman travellers to the Far East raised their hopes for a joint Eastern revival; they recalled the glorious past of the East *vis-à-*

vis the West and it was their confidence in this potential of the East that led them to believe in the rise of the East once again.

The Ottoman travellers' confidence in the potential of the East also contributed to the incorporation of an Eastern element to their identity. The travellers' identity was multi-dimensional, including an Ottoman element deriving from their state, a Muslim element deriving from their religion, and a Turkish element deriving from their ethnic background. Depending on their personal or political background, some of these elements were prioritized. While Abdürreşid İbrahim and Süleyman Şükrü emphasized the Muslim element, Ahmed Kemal and Adil Hikmet prioritized the Turkish-ness. Meanwhile, their travel to the Far East added another dimension to their identity, namely the Eastern element. In other words, the Eastern-ness (or, in some cases, Asian-ness) became a wider and looser component of the Ottoman travellers' self-identification. As such, they began to consider themselves as Easterners transcending their ethnic and religious identity. This search for commonness among the diverse communities of Asia was perceived by these travellers as the only way to establish the unity of the East in order to cope with European colonialism threatening the entire East.

Instructions

¹ These lines were written after the incident in which Adil Hikmet and his fellow companions were captured by the Russian Cossacks operating within the Chinese territory. He applied to the local governors and mentioned that Russia had acted contrary to international law and the Chinese had the right to reclaim these captured Turks. However, the Chinese governor attempted to ignore the incident in order not to disturb the fragile relations between China and Russia.

References

- Abdürreşid İbrahim (1328). *Alem-i İslam ve Japonya'da İntişar-ı İslamiyet*. 2 Volumes. İstanbul: Ahmed Saki Bey Matbaası.
- Adıbelli, Barış (2008). *Osmanlıdan Günümüze Türk-Çin İlişkileri*. İstanbul: IQ Kültür Sanat Yay.
- Adil Hikmet Bey (1998). *Asya'da Beş Türk*. Haz. Yusuf Gedikli. İstanbul: Ötügen Neşriyat.
- Akmeşe, Handan Nezir (2007). "The Japanese Nation in Arms: A Role for Militarist Nationalism in the Ottoman Army". *The Islamic Middle East and Japan: Perceptions, Aspirations and the Birth of Intra-Asian Modernity*. Ed. Renée Worringer. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 63-89.
- Apatay, Çetinkaya (2008). *Türk-Japon İlişkileri ve Ertuğrul Fırkateyni'nin Öyküsü*. İstanbul: Milliyet Yay.

- Arık, Umut (1991). *A Century of Turkish-Japanese Relations: A Special Partnership*. Tokyo: Gyosei Tsushin Co.
- Aydın, Cemil (2007). *Politics of Anti-Westernism: Visions of World Order in Pan-Islamic and Pan-Asian Thought*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Deringil, Selim (2003). "Ottoman-Japanese Relations in the Late Nineteenth Century". *The Rising Sun and the Turkish Crescent: New Perspectives on the History of Japanese Turkish Relations*. Eds. Selçuk Esenbel and Chiharu Inaba. İstanbul: Boğaziçi University Press.
- Esenbel, Selçuk and Chiharu Inaba (eds.) (2003). *The Rising Sun and the Turkish Crescent: New Perspectives on the History of Japanese Turkish Relations*. İstanbul: Boğaziçi University Press.
- Gündüz, Mustafa (2007). *II. Meşrutiyetin Klasik Paradigmaları: İctihad, Sebülü'r Reşad ve Türk Yurdu'nda Toplumsal Tezler*. İstanbul: Lotus Yay.
- Habibzade Ahmed Kemal (1341 [1925]). *Çin Türkistan Hatıraları*. İzmir: Marifet Matbaası.
- Habibzade Ahmed Kemal (1939). *Şanghay Hatıraları*. İstanbul: Kader Basımevi.
- Hisao, Komatsu (2006). "Muslim Intellectuals and Japan". *Intellectuals in the Modern Islamic World*. Ed. Stephane A. Dudoignon et.al. London: Routledge. 273-288.
- İlkul, Ahmet Kemal (1997). *Çin-Türkistan Hatıraları, Şanghay Hatıraları*. Translated and edited by Yusuf Gedikli. İstanbul: Ötüken Yayınları.
- Kara, İsmail (2001). *İslamcılarının Siyasi Görüşleri 1: Hilafet ve Meşrutiyet*. İstanbul: Dergah Yay.
- Karçınzade Süleyman Şükrü (1907). *Seyahat-i Kübra*. Petersburg: [The Printing House of Abdürreşid İbrahim].
- Komatsu, Kaori (1992). *Ertuğrul Faciası: Bir Dostluğun Doğuşu*. Ankara: Turhan Kitabevi.
- Öndeş, Osman (1988). *Ertuğrul Fırkatayını Faciası*. İstanbul: Aksoy Yay.
- Lee, Hee Soo and İbrahim İlhan (1989). *Osmanlı-Japon Münasebetleri ve Japonya'da İslamiyet*. Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yay.
- Lee, Hee Soo (1999). "II. Abdülhamid ve Doğu Asya'daki Pan-İslamist Siyaseti". *Osmanlı*. Vol. 2. Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yay. 363-371.
- Mardin, Şerif (1999). "Abdurreşid İbrahim and Zeki Velidi Togan in the Muslims of Russia". *Rethinking Central Asia: Non-Eurocentric Studies in History, Social Structure and Identity*. Ed. Korkut Ertürk. London: Ithaca Press.
- Ocaklı, Arzu (1999). "XIX. Yüzyıl Sonu ve XX. Yüzyılın Başında Çin Müslümanları ve Osmanlı İlişkileri". *Osmanlı*. Vol. 1. Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yay. 588-593.
- Türkoğlu, İsmail (1997). *Sibiryalı Meşhur Seyyah Abdürreşid İbrahim*. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yay.

Yirminci Yüzyıl Başlarında Osmanlı Seyyahlarının Uzakdoğu'ya İlişkin Algılamaları

Mustafa Serdar Palabıyık*

Öz

Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Uzak Doğu'ya yönelik ilgisi son dönemde tarih ve uluslararası ilişkiler disiplinlerinin literatüründe incelenmeye başlanmıştır. Bu makale ise bu literatürün henüz yeterince incelenmediği kaynaklara, yani Osmanlı seyahatlerinin yazdığı seyahatnamelere odaklanarak yirminci yüzyıl başlarında Osmanlıların Uzak Doğu algısını incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Uzak Doğu'yu gören Osmanlı seyahatleri bu bölgenin halkları arasında gelişmişlik düzeyleri çerçevesinde bir sınıflandırmaya gitmiş, Japonlar, Koreliler ve Çinlileri karakter ve fizyonomilerine göre farklı değerlendirmişlerdir. Ayrıca Uzak Doğu'daki sömürgeci rekabetin şiddetini canlı bir biçimde tasvir etmişler ve özellikle misyonerlik faaliyetlerini şiddetle eleştirmişlerdir. Son olarak, Uzak Doğu halkları ile bir *İttihād-ı Şark* (Doğu Birliği) kurma projeleri bu seyahatnamelerde yer almıştır. Bu sayede Osmanlı kimliğinin Osmanlılık, Müslümanlık ve Türklük boyutlarına bir de "Doğululuk" boyutu eklenmiştir. Böylece bir taraftan ırksal taksonomi, diğer taraftan da sömürgecilik karşıtı düşünce tarzı ve Osmanlı kimliğinin Doğulu boyutunun vurgulanması bu seyahatnameleri Osmanlıların dış dünyayı algılamaları açısından önemli kaynaklar haline getirmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler

Osmanlı İmparatorluğu, seyahatname, Uzak Doğu, *İttihād-ı Şark*, sömürgecilik karşıtlığı, Japonya, Çin, Kore

* Dr., TOBB Ekonomi ve Teknoloji Üniversitesi, Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü – Ankara / Türkiye
spalabiyik@etu.edu.tr

Аннотация

В статье рассматриваются вопросы, связанные с применением методов математического анализа в теории вероятностей и статистике. В частности, приводятся формулы для вычисления вероятностей различных событий, а также описываются методы оценки параметров случайных процессов. В работе используются различные математические инструменты, включая дифференциальное и интегральное исчисление, а также методы теории вероятностей. Приводятся конкретные примеры расчетов и объясняется их физический смысл. В заключение делается вывод о важности применения математических методов в анализе данных и вероятностных процессах.

Ключевые слова

теория вероятностей, математический анализ, статистика, случайные процессы, дифференциальное исчисление, интегральное исчисление.

*
spalabiyik@etu.edu.tr