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I. Introduction

Three days after the attack on Pearl Harbor, on 10 December 1941 the Japanese navy started invading the Philippine main island Luzon. This day marked the beginning of the Japanese occupation of the Philippine Islands which was to last for about almost three years. In spite of the lesser role the Philippines might have played in the Japanese government’s plans before the war against America became an eminent issue, the Philippine archipelago was home to the largest Japanese community in Southeast Asia in the early 20th century. In the late 1930s about 25000 Japanese resided in the Philippines, most of them in the Davao community in the Southern island of Mindanao, engaging in the cultivation of abaca (Manila hemp)\(^1\). In the wake of the planning for the Pacific War the Imperial government showed greater interest in the Philippine islands. The American military bases in the archipelago imposed a direct threat to the Japanese main islands and therefore the Philippines was strategically of great importance\(^2\).

The official justification given by the Japanese government for the Southward expansion including the invasion of the Philippines was to liberate the peoples of Southeast Asia from Western oppression and unite them in a self-sustaining economic bloc, namely the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere (GEACPS, Daitōa kyōeiken). The underlying idea of the GEACPS was pan-Asianism (Han Ajia-shugi), an ideology that propagated the liberation and unity of all Asian peoples. In the eyes of Japanese pan-Asianists the creation of the GEACPS functioned as a final step in the Asian emancipation process from Western hegemony. The term was introduced to the public by Japanese Foreign Minister Matsuoka Yōsuke (1880-1946) on 1 August 1941 when he proclaimed the necessity of a self-sustaining stability sphere for East Asia. This Sphere should include amongst others the Philippine Islands\(^3\). What makes the Philippines a special case in connection with pan-Asianism are the historical and cultural specifics of the archipelago in comparison to its Southeast Asian neighbours.

The Philippines differed in many ways from
the other countries of Southeast Asia by the time of the Japanese invasion. The archipelago’s history as a Spanish colony for three centuries and as an American dominion for almost four decades had produced a society subject to Ibero-American influences instead of the British, Dutch and French colonial experiences of other Southeast Asian regions. As part of the Spanish legacy the great majority of the populace was Catholic and most Filipinos respected the Americans as teachers instead of considering them occupiers. Furthermore, the United States had scheduled Philippine independence for 4 July 1946 and in the Philippine Commonwealth that had been established in 1935, Filipinos already were able to decide their domestic affairs and choose their own government. Japan that sought to act as a liberator of the Asian continent found itself confronted with an environment where those who were to be freed did not feel suppressed. On the contrary, different to for example in Indonesia and Burma where the Japanese were in the beginning welcomed as liberators from Dutch oppression, in the Philippines the idea of “Asia for the Asians” seemed strange to many Filipinos since they saw themselves less as Asians but rather as belonging to the Western hemisphere. Most Filipinos did not feel oppressed by the Americans and they had no desire to be “liberated” by the Japanese. Overall, the pan-Asianist ideology had to be implemented in the arguably most Western-orientated country of the region. The Japanese propaganda therefore mostly fell on deaf ears and the Japanese were confronted with more hostility against themselves than in any other country of the region.

The strong and positive relationship between the Philippine population and the Americans made it difficult for the Japanese invaders to win over the Filipinos for their slogan of “Asia for the Asians”. Disseminating the idea of a GEACPS, Japan sought to unify Asia and free the continent from Western suppression. According to Japanese pan-Asianist ideologues Japan as the most developed country of the region had to take the leadership in this struggle for Asian independence. This New Order (shin chitsujo) for East Asia was one of the official Japanese objectives in the war against America. The geographer Noguchi Hôichirô who co-wrote Volume 2 of the “Ethnic Nation Series” in 1943, titled “The Nations of the GEACPS” (Daitôa kyôeiken no minzoku) pointed out that pan-Asianism was the obligation of Japan as the leader of the GEACPS and a method of self defence. This must not be the method of capitalist imperialist exploitation and extortion of the various ethnic groups of Asia that Europe and America have employed in the past; rather it is a league devoted to the co-existence and co-prosperity of all the ethnic nations of Greater East Asia.

However, ideas to unify Asia under Japanese leadership emerged in Japan as early as in the beginning of the Meiji period (1868-1912). Pan-Asianist movements called for the unification of the Asian race (“One Asia”) under Japanese leadership. Due to the obvious differences in terms of culture, language and politics, most advocates of pan-Asianism by then however only referred to the unification of the Eastern part of Asia.

From February 1941, the Supreme Command of the Japanese Imperial Army conducted specific research on how to administer occupied territories. In these plans it considered the independence of Burma and the Philippines within a GEACPS. This independence meant that the Philippine government was to be run by Filipinos; however, the Philippines would become part of an economic bloc where it was no longer dependent on trade with America but subject to Japanese domination. This domination the pan-Asianists justified with Japan taking the burden of liberating the
suppressed East Asian countries. However, the Japanese administrators failed in winning over the Filipinos for the cause of the establishment of the GEACPS. The vast majority of the Philippine population considered the Japanese army from the very beginning of the occupation on rather an oppressor than a liberating force. The overall positive attitude towards the Americans among the Philippine population along with the perspective of guaranteed independence for 1946 made it almost a mission impossible for the Japanese Military Administration to convince the Filipinos that their country would be better off as a part of the GEACPS. It also cannot be doubted that the Japanese army repeatedly mistreated Filipinos and ignored Philippine culture. The purpose of this paper is to analyze the ideological background of the Japanese invasion of the Philippines by examining the perception of the archipelago in Japanese pan-Asianist thought from the early Meiji era until the wake of the Pacific War. First the development of Japanese pan-Asianism in the respective time period will be examined followed by a section on the differing views on Southeast Asia and the Philippines within the pan-Asianist community by the wake of the Pacific War.

II. Diverging Views Melting into One—the Perception of the Philippines in Japanese Pan-Asianist and Nationalist Thought, 1886-1931

The purpose of this section is to describe the development of Japanese pan-Asianism from the idea of a Sino-centric bloc to the GEACPS along with the perception of the Philippines in both pan-Asianist and nationalist thought from the Meiji era (1868-1912) to the Manchurian Incident. It was during this time span that Japan emerged from a developing country to the strongest economical and military power in the Far East.

Japanese nationalists took interest in the South Seas (Nan’yō) and thus also the Philippines as early as by the beginning of the Meiji Restoration when they considered Southward expansion as the only possible answer to the threat the Western powers imposed on Japan. A prominent example for a Japanese nationalist advocating expansim to the South and colonisation of the Philippines was the journalist, political scientist and politician Fukumoto Nichinan (1857-1921). To Fukumoto colonisation of the Philippines was a measure to secure Japan’s independence by avoiding contact with the Great Powers. Fukumoto along with the nationalist Kuga Katsunan (1857-1907) co-founded the nationalist newspaper “Nihon” (Japan) in 1889 that was critical towards the policy of the Meiji administration and warned of an ongoing Westernization of Japan. “Nihon” found wide proliferation in Japan and made Fukumoto become an influential political commentator in the country. In 1908 he was even elected a member of the Lower House. Fukumoto represented the typical nationalist stance towards Southward expansion and was determined to accomplish the work of his old friend Sugenuma Teifû who was one of the pioneer advocates of a Japanese colonisation of the Philippine archipelago. In the face of the decline of the Spanish Empire, Fukumoto considered it likely to happen that another Western power would take the Spaniards’ place which would ultimately threaten Japan. Fukumoto did not advocate a military invasion of the archipelago but argued for taking over the islands by Japanese settlements and
trade. In 1889 he published his book Firipin guntô ni okeru nihonjin (The Philippine Archipelago with Regards to the Japanese) providing an account of the Philippines as a Spanish colony and describing perspectives for a Japanese colonisation of the islands. Even though Fukumoto showed great respect for former Bakufu-leaders as Harada Nobutane (1560-1598), Date Masamune (1567-1636) and Matsukara Shigemasa (1574-1630) who pursued an expansionist policy by the sword and in the case of Matsukara even planned a military invasion of Luzon, he advocated rapprochement by peaceful means.

Two years after Fukumoto, in 1891, Hattori Tôru (?-1908) published his book Nan’yô saku (South Seas Policy). Hattori undertook excursions into the South Seas where he collected plants and studied the vegetation. In 1908, as a journalist of the Osaka Mainichi Shinbun, he once more went on a trip to the Nan’yô in 1908 and died during the passage from Hong Kong to Java on the boat. Hattori was along with Shiga Shigetaka (1862-1927) one of the first “embedded” nationalist writers taking part in the naval training cruises of the Japanese navy throughout the Meiji era. As a journalist he functioned as a kind of messenger for the navy in its effort to bring the importance of the South Seas to the consciousness of the Japanese public. Just as Fukumoto, Hattori argued for close trade relations between the South Seas and Japan. He conceded a strong relationship between the Asian continent and the islands of the South due to the Pacific Ocean that he called the reason why the whole region was named Oceania.

Regarding the Philippines, Hattori was almost euphoric about the resources available in the islands and also praised the infrastructure as the harbours of Manila and Iloilo. Hattori saw great potential in various Philippine industries like the hemp and sugar production or the textile industry and stressed the ancient ties between Japan and the Philippines as well as the efforts of the Meiji government to enhance the relationship:

By the way, in ancient times 3000 Japanese established a Japanese city in the centre of Luzon, a mountain away from the capital Manila and in the year before last year our government built a consulate in Manila and sent a consul for the first time.

Fukumoto and Hattori were typical Japanese nationalists who took a strong stance towards the expansion of Japanese influence into Southeast Asia. Throughout the early Meiji-period various organizations emerged that focused on the exploration of the Southeast. One of them, the Tôhô kyôkai (Eastern Society), saw Japan’s obligation in leading the less developed countries of the region by extending its own influence. One of this organization’s most prominent members was Tanaka Suiichirô (1873-1923). He studied in England and Germany from 1905 to 1907 and established the Department of History at Keio University in 1910 where he not only taught Western history but also gave lectures in Japanese and Oriental history as well as in political science. During his studies under German exchange professors at the Department of Literature of Keio Gijuku University, Tanaka published one of his most renowned books, Tôhô kinseishi (Modern History of the Far East) in 1902. In his account of the American invasion of the Philippine archipelago he emphasized the strategic importance of the Philippines for the American advance into the Far East that would turn the United States into the dominant power of the region.

Tanaka wrote of proximity of the Philippines to the Asian continent which means that he did not consider the archipelago a part of Asia itself. He widely referred to independence movements in the Philippines but did not come up with a Japanese mission to help the Filipinos in their struggle.
for liberation. Fukumoto, Hattori and Tanaka were all concerned about Japan’s own security in connection with the Philippines. Fukumoto and Hattori feared that after the end of the Spanish colonial period in the archipelago another Western power could take control of the islands and thus threaten Japan. When Tanaka wrote his book the Philippines was eventually under American rule and he considered the archipelago a stepping stone for an American advance into the Far East. This fear of the Philippines being used as a basis for American domination of Southeast Asia became also an important point in later pan-Asianist writings in the Taishô era (1912-1926) and the Shôwa era (1926-1989). Furthermore, Fukumoto, Hattori and Tanaka emphasized the ancient, friendly relationship between Japan and the Philippines but they did not come up with a particular vision for liberation of the islands from Western domination.

Early Meiji Foreign Minister Inoue Kaoru’s (1836-1915) vision of establishing a “European style empire on the edge of Asia” showed the willingness of the Meiji oligarchy to learn from the West first to be able to challenge it later. Inoue’s vision represented the nationalist thought in Japan by the end of the 19th Century. Japan’s own national integrity had to be preserved by adaption of Western style imperialism; hence, the “Asian identity” of Japan was either ignored or even neglected by the Meiji oligarchy. In 1886, the Nanyô kyôkai (South Seas Society) was established that worked out detailed plans for Japanese settlers to colonise the Philippines. These plans involved Japanese settlers winning over the native chiefs on three islands of the archipelago, then start cultivating land and engaging in local industries. Branch offices of the Nanyô kyôkai were to observe these activities. The first objective of the organization was to find a solution for the problem of surplus population in Japan. Other organizations like the Tôkyô chigaku kyôkai (Tokyo Geographic Society), the Tôkyô keizaigaku kyôkai (Tokyo Society for Economic Science) or the Shokumin kyôkai (Colonial Society) were also mainly concerned with Japanese economic interests, the aspect of a cultural and racial kinship with the Filipinos did not play any role in their agendas. The establishment of these various nationalist organizations coincided with a clash between the Japanese army and navy. Whilst both factions agreed on the necessity of expansionism to secure Japan’s survival as a sovereign state, the army advocated for an advance into the North (Hokushin-ron, “Northward Doctrine”) and the navy for Southward expansion (Nanshin-ron, “Southward Doctrine”). As Lydia N. Yu-Jose puts it; pan-Asianism later became the “ideological counterpart” of this latter doctrine. Advocates of Nanshin-ron considered the South Seas the future sphere of Japanese interest and were eager to establish cultural, ethnological and historical links with this region. Ikehata Setsuho drew as a conclusion from her studies of popular magazines advocating Nanshin-ron such as Nihonjin (Japanese), Tôhô kyôkai hôkoku (Report of the Eastern Association) or Shokumin kyôkai hôkoku (Report of the Colonial Association) that there had been the “assumption that Japan would come to possess the Philippines one day.”

Despite the huge interest of the nationalists in the South Seas and the Philippines, early pan-Asianists in Meiji-Japan were rather indifferent towards this region. They focused on the commonalities of “script and culture” (dôbun dôshu) within the Sino-centric world system Japan had been a part of for centuries. Parallel to the afore mentioned nationalist organizations also various Asianists joined together to form the first pan-Asianist groups. Early organizations like the Kôa-kai (Society for Raising Asia) and the Ajia kyôkai (Asia Association) put an emphasis on
solidarity between Asian countries and refused to interfere in China’s affairs whereas follow-up organizations as the Tōa dōbun-kai (East Asia Common Culture Association), Kokuryū-kai (Armur Society) and the Kokumin dōmei-kai (National Alliance Association) advocated for the establishment of a cooperative body consisting of Japan, China and Korea under Japan’s leadership.

Early pan-Asianism in Japan stood in opposition to the Realpolitik conducted by the ruling Meiji government. Even though members of the Meiji oligarchy sympathized with pan-Asianist ideals it was common sense that Japan first had to modernize before it could challenge the Western Great Powers. The early pan-Asianists on the other hand were convinced that instead of “Leaving Asia” (Datsu-A) Japan needed to “Return to Asia” (Ajia kaiki) and become aware of its Oriental roots again if it wanted to withstand the Western encroachment. One of the pioneers of Japanese pan-Asianism, Okakura Kakuzo (1862–1913), bemoaned the departure from Asia and claimed the continent for Japan to be “the true source of our inspirations” despite everything Japan had learned from the West. However, Okakura’s vision of Asia was confined to only Japan, China, Korea and India. Thus, the slogan “Asia is one” used by Okakura at the very beginning of his 1904 first published standard work Ideals of the East and later a trademark of pan-Asianism clearly aimed at the unity of the Chinese Confucian hemisphere and the Buddhist Indian subcontinent.

The above mentioned pan-Asianist groups also focused on the unification of the Sino-centric core of Asia. Whereas Okakura’s pan-Asianism was a rather romantic idea based on solidarity and equality, groups as the Kokuryū-kai clearly emphasized the necessity of Japanese leadership in the process of creating a Sino-Japanese bloc. However, one early pan-Asianist took interest in the Philippine islands and tried to support the independence movement there. Miyazaki Tōten (1870-1922) was born in Kumamoto Prefecture and studied at Tokyō Senmon Gakkō (the institution preceding today’s Waseda University). In 1897, he became friends with the Chinese revolutionary leader Sun Yat-sen (1866-1925) and supported Sun’s struggle to topple the Qing government. Sun was a friend and supporter of the Philippine revolutionary Mariano Ponce (1863-1918) who came to Japan in 1898 officially representing the First Philippine Republic that had been inaugurated after the end of the Spanish rule in the same year. During this time Ponce met Miyazaki who was described by literary scientist Yamaguchi Kōsaku (1926-1993) as a “so called Rônin in the continent” and a “patriot who actively supported Sun Yat-sen’s Chinese Revolution.” Miyazaki strongly sympathized with the Philippine independence movement and was eager to support Ponce’s cause. In 1899, Miyazaki tried to send arms and ammunition on a ship to Filipino independence forces but the old yacht sank shortly after its departure from the harbour. In his autobiography My Thirty-Three Years’ Dream first published in 1902, Miyazaki recalled his first meeting with Ponce and how he became sympathetic with the Philippine case. Just as his contemporary Asianists, Miyazaki was first of all concerned with Chinese affairs but soon developed a sense of solidarity for Philippine resistance against the United States when Ponce told him how his country had been betrayed by America. Ponce appealed to Miyazaki as a fellow Asian (“Oh, my friend from a chivalrous Asian country”) and thus succeeded in winning his support:

Although my aspirations centred on China, I also made friends with men from the Philippines while I was in Hong Kong. When I think about it, it seems fickle to me, but I
couldn’t help it. [...] I was full of sympathy. How could I listen to much of this without trying to help?36

Miyazaki mentioned how enthusiastic Sun Yat-sen was about giving aid to the Filipinos and that he shared Sun’s enthusiasm right away37. Miyazaki Tôten seemed to have taken interest in the Philippine struggle for independence rather spontaneously. Just as his contemporary pan-Asianists, his main concern was the creation of a Sino-centric bloc driven by a strong sense of solidarity for the Chinese revolution. Therein, he was a representative of the “first generation” of Japanese pan-Asianists that was lacking the aspiration for Japanese domination of the continent. Miyazaki was not aiming either at Japanese domination of China nor the Philippines but saw the overthrow of the Manchu dynasty in China and support for Philippine resistance against American colonisation as a first step towards global freedom and justice. Therein, he differed from many of his fellow pan-Asianists who also defined China as the starting point for Asian and worldwide liberation but clearly under Japanese leadership. Even though Miyazaki felt very close to Kokuryû-kai-leader Uchida Ryôhei (1873-1937) whom he called a “real comrade”38 he did not share the latter’s expansionist views. His support for the Philippine independence movement was very unusual for Japanese pan-Asianism around the turn of the century and the Philippines was not part of Miyazaki’s Asianism from early on. He was rather convinced by the representatives of the First Philippine republic like Ponce and Aguinaldo that the Philippines was a cause worth fighting for. Different to Uchida and other so called tairiku rônins, for Miyazaki Asian interests ranked higher than Japanese nationalistic interests what clearly separated his Asianism from the agendas of the Kokuryû-kai or the Tôa dôbun-kai 39. Nevertheless, it was the latter organizations’ pan-Asianism that gained more and more prominence throughout the last years of the Meiji era.

Uchida Ryôhei who founded the Kokuryû-kai in 1901 was one of the most prominent and most radical activists propagating a Japanese expansionist national policy and Japanese leadership in Asia under the banner of pan-Asianism. In his younger years Uchida already joined the radical nationalists of the Genyôsha (Black Ocean Society) that pressed for an aggressive Japanese foreign policy in Central Asia, especially Korea. Uchida, just like the Genyôsha became a strong advocate of pan-Asianism in the course of the Japanese annexation of the Korean peninsula in 1910. Therein, he perfectly exemplified the ongoing fusion of nationalist and pan-Asianist ideas during the Taishô period. In his 1912 published volume Nihon no sandai kyûmu (Japan’s Three Urgent Issues), Uchida outlined a national policy emphasizing the necessity for Japan to prepare for an “international war” militarily and economically40. To Uchida, Germany was the most powerful country to emerge by the wake of World War I and he praised its rapid development and vitality41. Overall, according to Uchida, Japan would need to prepare for a confrontation with the Great Western Powers in a decisive conflict:

It is the five Great Powers England, Russia, Germany, France and America that dominate world policy and engage in the Asian continent and the Pacific. How is our empire to fight each of these powers? We have to simultaneously prepare militarily and economically, participate in world policy and finally will prevail. What is world policy? It is the lessons learned from our imperial ancestors, namely, a foreseeing, universal plan for the whole world. That is the fundamental national policy of the Empire42.

The “foreseeing, universal plan for the whole
“world” is a reference to the core principle of pan-Asianism, hakkô ichiu (The whole World under one Roof). This principle also became the leitmotiv for overcoming the old world order and establishing a new one (shin chitsujô) that finally lead to the concept of the GEACPS\(^{43}\).

In 1914, in his “Personal View on Government Abuse” (Seihei shigi) Uchida once more made clear Japan’s obligation to unify the whole world according to this principle:

> The Great Empire indeed is awarded with the great task of protecting the cosmos (rikugô) containing the whole world (hakkô) […]\(^{44}\)

In this volume, he criticized the ruling government and proposed Japanese intervention into foreign states’ affairs. Uchida concluded that a passive stance would lead to Japan’s decline as an influential power in the Far East:

> If we look at ourselves, today there are not more than only the two methods of passivism and activism that we can choose from. In the case of passivism the Empire gives up Manchuria and Mongolia, gives up Korea and returns Karafuto to Russia and Taiwan to China […] If the advocates of passivism are apt to leave Chinese affairs to the Chinese, will this make it possible to preserve a long term peace in the Pacific? Again I must absolutely say that I do not believe so.\(^{45}\)

Whilst pure nationalists like Tanaka and Hattori considered expansion into Southeast Asia and especially the Philippines a matter of national interest for Japan, pan-Asianist Uchida favoured a Japanese domination of the Sino-centric core of Asia to secure the empire’s hegemony in the continent. Uchida could be labeled an advocate of Hokushin-ron (Northward Doctrine) as he clearly saw the key to Japan’s future in the expansion towards China and Central Asia. Uchida’s comrade Miyazaki actually showed sympathy for the Philippine independence movement and tried to support it. However, his Asianism was anchored in the principle of Asian solidarity and not based on the idea of liberating the continent by means of Japanese domination.

Overall, there was a clear distinction between the aims of pan-Asianists and nationalists in Meiji Japan: the former proposed the creation of a Sino-centric bloc under Japanese leadership to withstand the Western encroachment and a re-orientation towards Oriental values whereas the latter called for expansion to the South pursuing a Western-style, imperialist policy. However, the fact that more and more pan-Asianist organizations put an emphasis on Japanese superiority instead of solidarity among all Asian peoples made the ideology increasingly attractive to nationalists, too. Especially the idea of creating a “Greater Asia” that came up during the Taishô era (1912-1926) made an increasing number of nationalists join pan-Asianist societies.

In 1916, Lower House member Kodera Kenkichi (1877–1949) published his Dai-Ajiashugi-ron (Treatise on Greater Asianism), the first major work with the word “Asianism” in the title\(^{46}\). Kodera went beyond the idea of a Japanese-Chinese-Korean entity even though he considered close cooperation between Japan and China the precondition for a new Asia under Japanese leadership. The creation of a Sino-centric bloc was only the first stage on the way to unify the entire yellow race:

> By the interdependence between the same script and race along with trust and cooperation we withstand the world’s current thought and establish a great new Asian civilization, aggrandize it little by little, revive the entire Yellow Race under this doctrine and gain politically complete freedom and independence. After all, it must be the ultimate
goal to unify all yellow people in the world and thus the key conclusion of our so called Greater Asianism is that Asia is the Asia for the Asians [...] 47

Even though Uchida Ryôhei and other early pan-Asianists, too, shared the vision of a world unity starting from a Sino-Japanese bloc, Kodera introduced the outline for the establishment of Greater Asia. Kodera’s vision of “one Asia” went beyond a Sino-centric bloc and confined the whole of Asia (including the South Seas) as the final stage of Greater Asianism. Thus, his magnum opus can be considered a blueprint for future pan-Asianist writings of the Shôwa era (1926-1989) when finally pan-Asianism became the official doctrine of Japanese Foreign Policy and many Asianists considered the South Seas a natural part of Greater East Asia 48. Regarding the Philippines, Kodera described the islands as at the mercy of the Great Western Powers. Similar to Uchida Ryôhei’s concerns about German expansionism in Southeast Asia, Kodera in his account of Germany’s reaction towards the outcome of the first Sino-Japanese War claimed that Germany took an interest in leasing, not occupying the Philippines to gain influence in the Far East. However, the high price of 1680000 Reichsmark made the German Empire abandon the plan. America that was not pleased by the idea of the Philippines “falling into the hands of Germany” then came to buy the Philippines itself whereas Germany leased the Jiaozhon Bay and Palao giving the “political struggle in the Far East a new development” 49. Kodera just like the nationalists of the early Meiji era and later Asianists of the 1930s and 1940s emphasized the strategic importance of the Philippines by claiming that the possession of Hawaii and the Philippines enabled America to “send big warships into the Far East” and thus inhibited Chinese trade making Japan suffer a “high degree of damage” 50. Kodera was convinced that the fate of the Far East would be at the hands of Japan, Britain, America and Russia with Japan being the future hegemonic power in the region. In the event of a war Kodera considered the Philippines a stepping stone for the American advance in the Pacific 51.

Kodera wrote his Treatise during the transition period between the end of the Meiji period (1868-1912) and the beginning of the Second Sino-Japanese War (1931-1945). Throughout the era of the so called “Taishô Democracy” (1912-1931) Japan actively engaged in internationalism but at the same time pan-Asianist thought became increasingly popular. It was during this time when nationalist and pan-Asianist views ultimately melted into one. Even Uchida Ryôhei’s Kokuryûkai expanded its idea of Asian unity to the concept of a “Greater Asia” that went beyond the old Sino-centric core and included the South Seas. The volume Ajia taikan (Asian Overview) published by the organization in 1918, contained chapters on, amongst others, countries of the Middle East like Persia or Oman, Russian occupied Central Asia, India and Southeast Asian territories as French-Indochina and also the Philippines. The chapter on the Philippine archipelago provided a brief overview of Philippine history, topography, ethnicities and local customs 52. Even though this volume contained no suggestions for a future colonisation of the islands it is obvious that the Philippines was now part of the Kokuryûkai’s vision of Asia.

Nevertheless, pan-Asianism still centered on Japanese domination of China, Korea and Mongolia, the South Seas was only given strategic and economic importance in pan-Asianist thought of the Taishô era. However, the idea of a Japanese mission in Asia that went beyond militaristic interests found its way into nationalist thought of the time and nationalists also started to emphasize Japan’s obligation in leading Asia.
in its struggle for freedom. In his 1918 published work Dai-Nihonshugi (Greater Japonism) the author Kamiizumi Tokuya (1865-1946) linked the idea of a Greater Japan to the concept of Greater Asianism. He therein represented perfectly the fusion of the concepts of Japanese nationalism and pan-Asianism. Kamiizumi was a graduate of the naval academy and fought in 1904 in Manchuria and a year later in the Russo-Japanese War. After his successful career in the Japanese navy where he achieved the rank of a vice-admiral, Kamiizumi became a committed advocate for Greater Japonism. However, different to earlier nationalists who solely called for Japanese expansionism to withstand the Great Western Powers, Kamiizumi came up with a vision of Japan leading the suppressed yellow race towards freedom. Eventually, to Kamiizumi Greater Japonism and Greater Asianism were one and the same thing. In Kamiizumi’s point of view, the foundation of Japan’s superiority towards other nations lay in its unique Kokutai (National Polity). The Imperial bloodline over thousands of years turned the Imperial household and its subjects into one family molding the national polity or national body called Kokutai. According to Kamiizumi, this national polity was “unparalleled in the world”. Contemporary Japanese scholars on the history of the East (Tôyôshi) concluded that the absence of such a national polity as Kokutai was responsible for the decline of China to a point where it could no longer be called a state but merely a civilization and thus put Japan into a position of leadership within the East. Another point that following Kamiizumi made Japan different from other countries was that the vast majority of its population belonged to the same race and thus must certainly “have identical goals and ideals.” This uniqueness of the Japanese people was crucial for its mission in Asia. Just as many of his contemporary Japanese nationalists, Kamiizumi was mainly concerned with the surplus population of his country. Kamiizumi saw a necessity for Japan to expand its territory to solve the surplus problem; however, different to for example Tanaka and Hattori he called for Japanese settlements in Siberia and Central Asia. Kamiizumi was eager to make clear that Japan should not act as an imperial power but as a cultivator making Asia a prospering continent: 

Whatsoever, these regions are places where the natives reside in Asian savage land and as an Asian country our first mission must be to take the lead in the cultivation of Asia, to make it emit the radiant brightness of ancient times and the recovery of this civilization.

Kamiizumi pointed out that Japan’s policy was different from that of other Great Powers because it was led by the concept of Greater Asianism: 

I am not concluding that the question of our country’s population is like other power’s common question of territorial expansion. One result of the accomplishment of the mission of Greater Japonism is people feeling joy by being able to cultivate Asia. The Greater Asianism I am explaining about indeed shows this. As I repeatedly say, it’s very reason is originally that the peoples of the world do not close that territory or fight each other because of a yellow, white, copper or black skin colour but rather open that door along with the nations and let a civilized world emerge without restrictions to equal opportunities; truly a cause that promotes happiness of mankind.

Kamiizumi was a nationalist advocating for Greater Japonism but he also used the same arguments as contemporary pan-Asianists like Uchida Ryôhei. Even though nationalists did propose Japanese expansion to cultivate backward
areas before Kamiizumi explicitly spoke of Greater Asianism as an ideal that needed to be fulfilled. Greater Japonism and Greater Asianism to him was one and the same thing as only Japanese expansion would serve the purpose of all Asia. Kamiizumi considered it Japan’s obligation to lead the Asian peoples towards the cultivation of their continent and Japanese settlements in underdeveloped regions were a means to this end. Even though Kamiizumi came from a navy background he was not an advocate of Nanshinron but called for Japanese engagement in Central Asia. Herein, he also resembled the early pan-Asianist organizations. He did not explicitly call for military actions in China or Siberia but it is obvious that the cultivation of wide landscapes in this region by Japanese settlers could not be achieved by peaceful means. However, different to earlier nationalists propagating Greater Japan he legitimized Japanese expansionism by declaring Greater Japonism a mission for the sake of Asia. Kamiizumi’s vision of Greater Japonism was a mixture of nationalistic and pan-Asianist views of the Meiji and Taishô eras and exemplified the melting together of these two ideologies.

The same was true for the in Japan until today very popular pan-Asianist Gotô Shinpei (1857-1929) who served in the Japanese colonial administration in Taiwan as the head of civilian affairs after Japan had ceded the island from China following the First Sino-Japanese War (1894-95). Later Gotô became director of the South Manchuria Railway (1906) and eventually was appointed Japanese Home Minister (1916 and again 1923) and Foreign Minister (1918). Gotô worked for the Japanese government and exemplified the growing impact of pan-Asianist ideas in Japanese politics. Just as Kamiizumi, Gotô firmly believed that Japanese expansionism was a tool to the emancipation of the entire Asian continent. In his 1921 published volume Nihon shokumin seisaku ippan (One Part of Japan’s Colonial Policy), Gotô praised Greater Asianism as the ideology that would return the Asian continent back to the Asian people:

The Asian continent is the Asian continent of the Asians and political affairs within Asia must by all means be supervised by Asians […] and this is what is called Greater Asianism and it is indeed the eternal, divine right of the people of the Asian continent.

Like Kamiizumi, Gotô also was convinced that Japanese geopolitical hegemony in the continent was the tool to achieve the ideal of an autonomous Greater Asia for the Asians. Furthermore, his administrative work in Taiwan and his approach to “scientific colonialism” based on his education as a medical doctor turned the island into a “model colony” for Japan. Gotô’s idea of Greater Asianism was quite similar to the Greater Japonism of Kamiizumi; the establishment of Greater Japan would eventually lead to the establishment of Greater East Asia. A third example for this symbiosis of ultra-nationalism and pan-Asianism was the journalist and political activist Mitsukawa Kametarô (1888-1936). Mitsukawa was not as influential as Gotô or Kamiizumi but his idea of pan-Asianism provides a perfect example of the way pan-Asianist ideas had changed by the early 1920s. Christopher W. A. Szpilman described Mitsukawa’s Asianism as reflecting the shift from universalistic or regional Pan-Asianism to a nationalistic Pan-Asianism that served as window-dressing for Japan’s military aggression.

In 1921, Mitsukawa published his book Ubawaretaru Ajia (The stolen Asia) including a large section on the South Seas. Mitsukawa quoted the historian Kawashima Motojirô (1877-1922) who claimed that traces would prove
the existence of Japanese trade relations with Southeast Asia since the early Tokugawa era three hundred years ago and that there had been “free Japanese colonies” all over the region, including Manila in the Philippine island Luzon. These settlements were defended in “cases of emergency” against foreign enemies like the Portuguese, Dutch, English and aborigine chieftains.

Mitsukawa’s vision of Greater East Asia obviously included the Nan’yō and he considered this region subject to Western exploitation similar to China. Just like Kamiizumi and Gotô, Mitsukawa was both a nationalist and a pan-Asianist linking the establishment of “Greater Japan” inseparably to the concept of “Greater Asia”. After a journey through various right-wing organizations he eventually took part in the founding of the Greater Asia Society (Dai-Ajia kyōkai). This organization Christopher W.A. Szpilman called “radical pan-Asianist” in its purpose to liberate all oppressed nations worldwide on the basis of a close cooperation between Japan, China and Korea under the leadership of the Japanese Imperial Throne.

Following J. Victor Koschmann, this “Japonists” (Nihon-shugisha) vision of Asia was related to the exoteric form of Asianism [that] emphasized the harmonious, more or less natural continuity from family, to village, to Volk/nation, to Greater Asian community based on racial and cultural affinities between Chinese and Japanese, of the sort captured by the slogan dōbun-dōshu (same culture, same race).

Kamiizumi with his emphasis on Kokutai and advocacy for Japanese expansion in China and Central Asia was a typical representative of a “Japonist” adapting “exoteric” Asianism. The same was true for Gotô Shinpei and Mitsukawa Kametarō. Philosopher and critic Osamu Kuno (1910-1999) described two concurring ideologies in Meiji Japan, one “exoteric” and one “esoteric” stream of thought. In the “exoteric” canon the emperor was an absolute monarch with unlimited authority. The “esoteric” canon represented a school of thought where the true state power was executed by advisory organs on the emperor’s behalf. According to J. Victor Koschmann the coexistence of these two different conceptions eventually “brought that [Meiji] system down in the mid-1930s” and led to two different perceptions of Asianism in Japan, i.e. “esoteric Asianism” and “exoteric Asianism”.

The above mentioned Dai-Ajia kyōkai represented the exoteric, more “traditionalist” stream of Asianism whereas the Shōwa kenkyū-kai (Shōwa Research Association) around Rōyama Masamichi (1885-1980) propagated the esoteric ideology that was more progressive. By the mid 1930s it became apparent that these two factions showed different attitudes towards the realization of the GEACPS.

The clash between these two pan-Asianist streams and the role the Philippines played in both of them will be the focal point in the following section.
The purpose of this paragraph is to illuminate how “exoteric” and “esoteric” pan-Asianists viewed the Philippines and the possibility of its integration into Greater Asia. Even though pan-Asianists in the Taishô era (1912-1926) began to envision an unification of Asia that went beyond the Sino-centric core they did not come up with concrete plans for the inclusion of the South Seas (Nan’yō) into a Greater East Asian Community. It is obvious that advocates of pan-Asianism or Greater Asianism like Kodera Kenkichi and Uchida Ryôhei first of all emphasized the commonalities between Japan, China and Korea (Dôbun dôshu, “One Script, One Race”) as the basis for their ideology and stayed rather vague when it came to the question of Southeast Asia in connection with the concept of Greater East Asia. Nevertheless, pan-Asianism gradually changed from an ideology based on Asian solidarity and the principle of equality among the Asian peoples to the idea of a Japanese mission to take the lead in the liberation of Asia. In this respect it provided a justification for Japanese expansionism that went beyond the old nationalists’ argument of securing merely Japan’s own sovereignty. At the same time liberal forces inside and outside the Japanese government were eager to emphasize that Japan had no desire to invade the Philippines in the event that America granted independence to the archipelago.

As a result of the Washington Naval Conference held in November 1921 Japan accepted American and British hegemony in the South Seas and a confrontation with the U.S. over the Philippines was not a promising perspective. Japan held a passive stance in Southeast Asia throughout the 1920s acting only as a mandate power in Micronesia. However, the phase of internationalism in Japanese policy came to an end with the Manchurian Incident on 18 September 1931 and the establishment of Manchukuo in the following year. In 1933, Japan eventually announced its withdrawal from the League of Nations and the question of a new South Seas policy came up. This new situation induced Japanese pan-Asianists to define a “Japanese destiny” in Southeast Asia and put their attention towards the Nan’yō. The different views within the pan-Asianist community in the 1930s on extending Japanese influence to the South Seas and making them a part of a Japanese-led GEACPS will be the focal point of the following sub-sections that will mainly focus on the pan-Asianism of the Dai-Ajia kyôkai as a representative of the exoteric canon on one hand and the pan-Asianism of Rôyama Masamichi as head of the Shôwa kenkyû-kai on the other. Even though both organizations functioned as advisory organs for the government of Konoe Fumimaro there were hardly any overlapping memberships. Both organizations were influential and had clearly differing perceptions regarding the inclusion of Southeast Asia into the GEACPS.

1. Going to the Philippines is like Coming Home: The Perception of the Philippines in “Exoteric” Pan-Asianism

According to J. Victor Koschmann the “exoteric” pan-Asianism was based on the principle of “One Culture, One Race” (Dôbun dôshu). Hence it was necessary for the advocates of this ideology to apply this principle not only to the Sino-Japanese realm but also to Southeast Asia if they wanted to justify the expansion of the GEACPS into
this region. The Dai-Ajia kyōkai (Greater Asia Society) typically represented this “exoteric” stream of Japanese pan-Asianism. Many of its members as the afore mentioned Mitsukawa Kametarō were both ardent nationalists and advocates of Greater Asia that in their opinion could only be achieved by the creation of Greater Japan. Founding members of the organization included Prince Konoe Fumimarō (1891-1945) who from 1937 on for three times served as Japanese prime minister and Army General Matsui Iwane (1878-1948). Matsui served as the first president of the Dai-Ajia kyōkai from 1933 to 1945, and was executed as war criminal in 1948 for being commander of the Japanese Expeditionary Force that committed the Nanking Massacre starting on 13 December 1937. Since his days at the military academy Matsui was a devoted Asianist and advocate for close Sino-Japanese cooperation. This he considered the precondition for an Asian revival leading to a Greater Asian alliance and he felt sympathetic with Chinese revolutionists Sun Yat-sen and Hu Hanmin (1879-1936). The founding prospective of the Dai-Ajia kyōkai emphasized Japan’s obligation of leading Asia towards its renaissance:

Yes, and then it is the duty of the Japanese Empire to carry the heavy responsibility on its shoulders of rebuilding Asia and changing the (world) order. [...] It is time that Imperial Japan suitably expands the worldwide historical significance of the Russo-Japanese War and concentrates all its cultural, political, economic and organizational power and must plan to take one further step in the rebuilding and unification of Asia. [...] The formation of a “Greater Asian Union” is today’s historical task of the Japanese people.

After the outbreak of the Second Sino-Japanese War in 1937, Matsui wrote in his diary in December of that year about the purpose of the war and its implications for the Asian continent. He expected the war to become a “Greater East Asian War” and suggested immediate independence for the Southeast Asian countries ruled by Western powers as Japanese war aims:

Thus, the China Incident suddenly turned into a war against America and England = rushing towards a Greater East Asian War. [...] The Greater East Asian War starts, the empire occupies Southern Asia and our government will following its past China policy, with an open and calm mind stimulate the awakening of every people to the idea of independence and unity of all the peoples of all countries in entire Asia. It is crucial for it to quickly guarantee independence to both the Philippines and Burma; furthermore, along with supporting preparation for independence of Indonesia and Indochina (Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos) to implement the Greater East Asia pact and explain this to the Asian peoples in detail along with the sacred purpose of the Greater East Asian War.

Matsui typically represented the “exoteric” pan-Asianism of the Japonists. The realization of Greater Japan would in his understanding ultimately lead to the establishment of Greater Asia and independence of the Western colonies in Southeast Asia, such as the Philippines. Matsui wrote of the necessity to communicate the “sacred” purpose of the war and the good intentions of the Japanese empire to the Asian peoples and he seemed convinced that these peoples would appreciate a Japanese invasion as an act of liberation if they were provided with sufficient information on the Japanese mission.

The growing interest in the South Seas was also reflected by various other articles published in the monthly magazine of the association, Dai-
Ajia shugi (Greater Asianism) founded in 1933. In this journal, members of the organization and other Japanese and non-Japanese (as the Philippine revolutionary Benigno Ramos and Pio Duran) pan-Asianists published articles on the political situation in Asia. It included also a news section about developments in the various regions in the continent. In the first year of its publication the Philippines was not mentioned in the journal; however, starting from January 1934 there were articles on the archipelago almost every month and it was frequently featured in the section “Southeast Asia News” (Tônan Ajia jôhô).

In September 1934, the pan-Asianist professor Imamura Chûsuke (1899-1954) published the article “Firipin dokuritsu to Dai-Ajia shugi” (Philippine Independence and Greater Asianism) in the journal. Imamura was head and founder of the Department of Colonial Economics at Nihon University and thus an influential scholar in pre-war Japan. Imamura bemoaned that despite the geographical proximity of the two countries, the Japanese people would not know too much about the Philippines. They failed to accept Philippine culture and believed they had nothing to learn from the Filipinos. The reasons were the location of the Philippines away from the European sea routes, lack of economic value for Japan, the closed door policy of the white race towards Japan and the “evil practice of isolation” (Sakoku no heifû) that had survived in Japan from the Tokugawa era until the present Shôwa period. Thus it was the ideology of Greater Asianism that had to win over the Japanese people for the case of Philippine independence: This is today’s new problem—the topic of independence and the Philippines—and how to introduce it to the Japanese. Furthermore, Great Asianism has become of much more importance to deepen cooperation among Japanese people today as before for the construction of Manchuria, as self-awareness towards the outside world increases.

Imamura was convinced that it was Japan’s obligation to help the Filipinos win independence following the spirit of Greater Asianism as Japan had a “fateful connection geographically, ethnically and historically” with the islands. There was “no other way” but to support Philippine independence since otherwise the archipelago would become subject to Western indoctrination like Siam. Imamura was sure that the Philippine independence movements would eventually prefer Japanese Asianism over Western domination and support the idea of the Philippines becoming part of a Japanese-led regional bloc. His emphasis on historical, geographical and even ethnological ties was typical for the “exoteric” stream of Japanese Asianism.

The question of independence for the Philippines in connection with Greater Asianism remained a key issue in articles published in Dai-Ajia shugi throughout the 1930s.

During the early years of the Dai-Ajia kyôkai it became apparent that the advocates of “exoteric” pan-Asianism who published in Dai-Ajia shugi considered the Philippines a part of Greater East Asia. A strong proponent of regional integration was the Waseda professor Sugimori Kôjirô (1881-1968). Sugimori gave lectures in the Philippines and became a prominent expert in the field of Philippine politics. Already in the early 1920s Sugimori divided the world into the three entities of Greater America, Greater Europe and Greater Asia; the latter consisting of Japan, China, Siberia and parts of Southern Asia. Sugimori opposed trends towards nationalism and considered the nation state as a passing phase on the route towards an international world society. The next step following the nation state was regionalism which meant for Asia the construction of Greater Asia under Japanese leadership. In
1936, Sugimori paid a visit to the Philippines where he lectured on various topics. After his return to Japan, he published several articles on the political situation in the Philippines, Thailand and China and how Japan should respond to it\[^{80}\]. In his article for *Dai-Ajia shugi* that was published in the May 1937 issue, Sugimori described the Philippines, Siam and China as countries that had “a good opportunity” to become a “modern state” (*Kindai kokka*). Sugimori considered the societal and political conditions as sufficient in these countries but the underdeveloped economies were the main obstacle in his opinion. Thus, industrialization was necessary, just as in Japan in the course of the Meiji Restoration after 1868. Regarding the Philippines, he praised the NEPA movement (National Economic Protectionism Association) as a “peoples’ movement” for Philippine industrialization since it did not receive any financial support from the state and as a “movement for economic nationalism” (*keizai-teki kokumin shugi*). Nevertheless, he bemoaned the strong dependence of the Philippine economy on the United States even after the inauguration of the Philippine Commonwealth. Economic dependence in Sugimori’s point of view automatically led to colonisation:

> It is needless to explain that a people, nation or society that cannot develop its resources by itself and that cannot complete production until the finished product, in the modern world beckons for its own colonisation\[^{81}\].

Finally, Sugimori raised the question what Japan was supposed to do regarding the Philippines. He stressed the variety of resources the Philippines possessed and called it Japan’s obligation to provide aid to the Filipinos in cultivating them. Japan should foster Philippine industrialization.

The American tariff policy in the Philippines that privileged a minority of manufacturers whilst ignoring the desires of the consumers, Sugimori called a contradiction to “the moral principles of the founding of a nation”. Therefore, he considered a shift of morals necessary in both “ethnic nationalism” (*minzokushugi*) and “popular nationalism” (*kokuminshugi*)\[^{82}\] in the present world\[^{83}\]. Sugimori was convinced that most Filipinos favoured complete independence from the United States and would welcome Japanese aid in the building of a new nation. Sugimori was first of all interested in economic cooperation between Japan and the Philippines and showed a vivid interest in the Philippine raw materials like cotton and gold. A strong economy he named a precondition for the establishment of a sovereign state and without Japanese support the Philippines would remain dependent on the U.S. or become subject to colonisation.

From May 1938 onwards mostly Hayashi Naoki kept publishing articles on the Philippines in *Dai-Ajia shugi* as a kind of foreign correspondent for *Dai-Ajia kyôkai* in Manila. Hayashi reported directly from the Philippines and was the most valuable source concerning the archipelago for the *Dai-Ajia kyôkai* representing the organization’s view on the Philippines. Therefore, some of his articles are introduced here. Overall, the independence issue remained the most prominent topic. Hayashi was doubtful about Philippine president Quezon’s true desire for complete independence of his country and he quoted several American newspapers reporting that Quezon would prefer the Philippines remaining under American leadership. Hayashi also mentioned the “great challenge” Quezon had to face as amongst others the former president of the First Philippine Republic, Emilio Aguinaldo (1869-1964), harshly criticized him for allowing the U.S. to maintain its naval bases in the Philippines even after the end of the Commonwealth and thus “abandoning the ideal of independence”\[^{84}\].
Hayashi also took a critical stance towards Quezon’s in the Ramos-Affair. Benigno Ramos (1893-1946) was a long time fighter for Philippine independence and a comrade of Quezon in the Nacionalista Party in the late 1920s. He alienated from Quezon in the 1930s and accused him of keeping too close ties with America and not being a true advocate of complete Philippine independence. Ramos’ Sakdal-Movement and the Sakdal-Party established in 1933 that later turned into the Ganap-Party, proposed radical economical and political reforms and “immediate and total independence” from the United States. After a failed coup in 1935, Ramos went to exile in Japan from where he returned in 1938 on the German ship Gneisenau. He got arrested on his return but was soon released from prison again. In his November 1938 article for Dai-Ajia shugi titled Ramosu no kikoku to sakudaru-tô (Ramos’ Return Home and the Sakdal-Party), Hayashi showed great sympathy for Ramos’ will to reconcile and work together with Quezon for an independent Philippines and a “policy of social justice” (shakai seigi seisaku). At the same time Hayashi criticized Quezon for not retarding Ramos’ detention on his arrival in Manila and for being overall unclear about his willingness to accept Ramos’ offer of “mutual understanding” (ryôkai) and future cooperation. Hayashi also praised Ramos as an advocate for close Japanese-Philippine relations who neglected any Japanese intentions to invade the Philippines. He quoted from Ramos’ speech to his fellow party members at the Rizal Monument on 29 August 1938:

Because Japan will respect our independence there is no need to worry. Even after independence Japan will not invade the Philippine Islands as she recognizes the Philippines’ power of self-administration. In the cases where Japan invaded foreign territories the respective governments needed protection by the Japanese nation. However, this will not occur in the Philippines because she will preserve her inner order and will expect security from foreigners. [...] During the four years I have spent in Japan it never came to my ears that any Japanese revealed the Japanese intention to invade the Philippines. [...] Japan invaded China because in the present its own existence is being threatened.

Hayashi used Ramos as the chief witness for both the peaceful Japanese policy towards the Philippines and for the Japanese invasion in China as a matter of national security. He obviously mistrusted Philippine president Quezon is proximity to the U. S. and saw in Ramos the better advocate for Philippine independence within Greater Asianism. Assuming that Hayashi represented the mainstream thought within the Dai-Ajia kyôkai by the end of 1938, it is obvious that there was an interest in the Philippine independence issue in connection with the future influence of both Japan and the United States in the archipelago. The ongoing emphasis on the Japanese disinterest to invade the islands still showed the anxiety of provoking America by Japanese ambitions in the Philippines. Nevertheless, Hayashi considered Japan an ally of Ramos and praised him and his Sakdalistas as “a blessing” for the Japanese cause of an “Orient for the Orientals” and the “revival of Greater Asia”.

However, a few months later, in an article on the restructuring of the Philippine executive, Hayashi had to admit that the political influence of Ramos and his newly founded Ganap-Party was on the decline and that Quezon’s National Party held all political power in the Philippines.

Despite the mistrust he showed towards Quezon or maybe because he had realized that there would be no alternative Filipino leader in the near future, Hayashi also stressed affiliations
between Quezon and Japan when he wrote an article in November 1939 on the president’s 16 moral principles for Philippine education and linking these to the Japanese Bushidō (Way of the Warrior). On his 60th birthday on 19 August 1938, Quezon delivered a speech in front of professors and students at a conference for moral ethics in education at Santo Tomas University in Manila. In his address he emphasized the importance of morals in education and listed 16 centre principles as cornerstones of a civil code for the Philippines. This Code of Citizenship and Ethics became the Presidential Executive Order No. 217 on 19 August 1939 and covered the responsibility of each citizen towards the Philippine state and its people. Hayashi described these 16 principles as “President Quenzon’s Bushidō” in which he was lamenting the degradation of Philippine national character and calling for a mental renaissance. For this purpose he said he was to use Bushidō.

Despite Bushidō being a moral code designed to explain Japanese chivalry as “Precepts of Knighthood”, Quezon indeed took inspiration from it when he created his code of ethics for the Philippines. Quezon was eager to strengthen both the Philippine government and his own position as a president and to him Bushidō was a reason for the strong position of (the state in) Japan. Quezon showed sympathy for totalitarian regimes as those of Hitler and Mussolini but had to be careful not to offend his American overlords. Thus, Bushidō, less a political agenda but wore of a moral code seemed suitable to him in the Philippines to support the development of an original Philippine national identity and enhance the authority of the Philippine government. Quezon’s emphasis on honour, respect for the sovereign, patriotism and memorial of national heroes indeed resembled Inazō Nitobe’s (1862-1933) definition of Bushidō. Hayashi in his review on Quezon’s address stressed the president’s emphasis on the moral decline of the Filipino people as a result of the long the years of Spanish and American rule in the archipelago that misled the Filipinos in many ways. Quezon’s turn towards Bushidō and his criticism of the Western influence on the Filipino people was of course welcomed by the pan-Asianists of the Dai-Ajia kyōkai as they could take it as an invitation for Japan to engage in the “Re-Orientalisation” of the Philippines. Despite being still critical towards Quezon’s attitude regarding the independence issue, Hayashi was convinced that the president succumbed to the political realities and would stick to the plan of Philippine independence for 1946. Even more, the president’s affection for Bushidō seemed to have completely assured Hayashi that Quezon would lead the Philippines into a Japan-led Greater Asian Union:

When looking at Mr. Quezon’s attitude, he now shows nothing but sympathy (rikai) for Japan and due to his visit to Japan last year he knows the true meaning of our national power. After all, he can see that we are Oriental peoples and as Oriental peoples we finally have to understand that we must plan co-existence and co-prosperity (Kyōzon kyōei). Therefore, he can see that he needs to push forward the already determined policy for independence, adopt our Bushidō, plan a mental renaissance and bind close ties with Japan; this will not be difficult at all under the great leadership of Mr. Quezon.

By November 1939, Hayashi seemed to be enthusiastic about the perspectives of the Philippines to become part of a Japanesedominated Greater Asia. To him, President Quezon’s positive remarks on Japan and his obvious sympathy for Bushidō completely outweighed the president’s long-term pro-
American attitude. However far-fetched Hayashi’s conclusion that Quezon would from then on lead the Philippines according to Greater Asianist principles might appear, they were to an extent typical for the “exoteric” stream of pan-Asianism. Hayashi assumed that Quezon finally became aware of Japan’s good intentions and how beneficial it would be for his country to become part of a Japan-led Greater Asia. Greater Asianism was thus a kind of self-fulfilling prophecy: sooner or later the world would have to see the benevolence of the Japanese Empire in leading the Asian peoples towards their liberation.

Hayashi’s conviction that President Quezon would alienate himself from the Americans became even stronger by autumn 1940. Quezon’s affection for totalitarianism made Hayashi believe in a shift in Philippine policy towards a more authoritarian form of governance. In his article Hitô no seijiteki dôkô (The Political Trend in the Philippines) from October 1940 in Dai-Ajia shugi, he analyzed Quezon’s attitude towards the elimination of political parties in favour of a one-party-rule in the Philippines. Hayashi pointed out that Quezon attempted to deny his affection for a one-party-leadership because he might have come “under negative influence” (i.e. American influence) but that his real beliefs were that a wide range of political parties would harm the political development in the Philippines. He only could not make his real intentions public.95

The article on the trend in Philippine politics was the last article by Hayashi Naoki and the last article dealing with president Quezon in Dai-Ajia shugi before the Japanese invasion of the Philippines 14 months later in December 1941. The articles on the Philippines published in Dai-Ajia shugi show the growing sympathy of the Dai-Ajia kyôkai throughout the 1930s for the cause of Philippine independence along with increasing resentments against the United States. In the wake of the Pacific War, the organization seemed convinced that the Filipinos would highly appreciate membership in a Japanese-led regional bloc since the majority of the Philippine population would seek complete independence from the U.S. and only Japan could provide them with that. Typical for the “exoteric” or “traditionalist” stream in Japanese pan-Asianism, the Dai-Ajia kyôkai emphasized the common Asian identity of the Japanese and the Filipinos and considered cultural differences to be a result of foreign, especially American rule that would vanish as soon as the Philippines became part of Greater Asia. When the concept of the GEACPS became the official agenda of Japanese foreign policy in 1941, advocates of “exoteric” pan-Asianism turned even more eager to prove cultural, historical and even racial communalities between the Japanese and the Filipinos. The historian and anthropologist Nishimura Shinji (1879-1943), who was not a member of any pan-Asianist organization, called in his book Daitôa kyôeiken (The Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere) the Philippines as “a branch in the great Japanese tree” and thus “topographically inseparably connected with Japan.”96 Nishimura published his work in 1942 after with the outbreak of the war in the Pacific. He added an extra section to it in which he emphasized Japan’s leading role in the establishment of the GEACPS97. In Nishimura’s opinion, the inclusion of Southeast Asia into the sphere could easily become reality due to topographical and ethnological factors. Access to the sea and the industries of sea fare and ship building in Nishimura’s point of view naturally connected the regions of the GEACPS and since Japan was the most developed country in these industries it had to be the natural leader of the sphere98. Ethnically, according to Nishimura, there were obvious similarities between the Japanese people and the people of East Siberia, Manchuria,
China, Indochina and the islands of the South Seas as cephalic index and body height showed. Nishimura aimed to prove a racial kinship between the Japanese and the Filipinos by the example of the Tagalu and Visaya peoples who landed in Japan during the Asuka period (552-646). Overall he believed in the feasibility of integrating the Philippines into a Japanese-dominated Co-Prosperity Sphere and agreed that for Japan “going to the Philippines is like coming home”.

2. The “Esoteric” Stream: Pan-Asianism and Geopolitics

The other stream of thought in Japanese pan-Asianism took a much more critical stance towards the integration of the South Seas into Greater Asia. Just as the Dai-Ajia kyōkai, the Shōwa kenkyū-kai functioned as a brain trust for the government of Prime Minister Konone Fumimaro (1891-1945) since the late 1930s. Like the Dai-Ajia kyōkai that gave home to political scientists, philosophers, politicians and military officers, the Shōwa kenkyū-kai also contributed “philosophical, cultural as well as social-scientific” to Asianism and was politically affiliated to the “Control faction” (Tōseiha), whereas the Dai-Ajia kyōkai was “aligned with the military’s Imperial Way faction (Kōdōha)”.

According to J. Victor Koschmann, “the SRA’s contribution to Asianism should be understood as a reform-orientated alternative to the exoteric views of the status of the emperor and of Japan’s ‘manifest destiny’ in Asia that were gaining ground within the Japanese establishment.” In this paper I will focus on its head Rōyama Masamichi (1895-1980) who was one of the most prominent figures in the field of political science in Japan before and after World War II. Rōyama on one hand played an active role in winning over intellectuals and public opinion for the purpose of the establishment of an East Asian Community and the GEACPS but on the other hand he was also aware of the difficulties this project would bring about. According to J. Victor Koschmann, Rōyama’s position “belonged to” the rationalist extreme of Pan-Asianism thus separating him from the above mentioned “exoteric” pan-Asianists. Different to the “exoteric” pan-Asianists, Rōyama did not consider the principle of “One Culture, One Race” applicable to Southeast Asia.

In his 1938 essay Tōa kyōdôtai no riron (Theory of the East Asian Cooperative Body), Rōyama referred to the China Incident of 7 July 1937, which triggered the Second Sino-Japanese War. He emphasized the necessity to clarify the Japanese mission in Asia to the people of China who were still reluctant to comprehend Japan’s approach to launch an “awakening of the Orient” (Tōyō no kakusei) and completely misunderstood the significance of this “holy war” (Seisen) that was according to Rōyama not fought for materialistic purposes. In Rōyama’s point of view, the “world historical significance” of the Japanese mission did not find its way to the peoples of the Orient yet.

Rōyama pointed out that even though “the belief of hakkō ichiü existed already during the founding days of Japan” the Japanese society and culture were taken over by European influence throughout the Meiji era and the pan-Asianists opposed this development. However, this pan-Asianism of people like Okakura Kakuzō and Sun Yat-sen did not find large proliferation in the regions of the Orient, remained limited to a small group of intellectuals and lacked “whatever substantial, systematical content”. In Rōyama’s point of view, the “awakening of the Orient” meant with respect to the West that the Orient awakes globally as the Orient. Thus, at the same time the world has to recognize the Orient as the Orient. Therefore, there must
never be the general thought that Europe is the world and European culture is world culture\textsuperscript{106}.

Rôyama stressed the necessity of the formation of an Oriental bloc but at the same time he strongly neglected the existence of a historical Asian unity: however, since the dawn of history until today the Orient has not been aware of any political unity of course and not even of any cultural unity\textsuperscript{107}.

Different to the West where Christianity provided a religious unity since the Middle Ages, the religious beliefs in the Orient were differently shaped by Confucianism and Buddhism. Even though both were originally Oriental they did not “incarnate an Oriental unity”. Nevertheless, Rôyama was convinced that “finally the autumn of an ‘awakening of the Orient’ has come” and that the Orient would find its place as “part of the world system (\textit{sekai taisei})”, unaffected by the League of Nations that was dominated and created by the ideas of the Western powers. Rôyama concluded that “an ‘Oriental awakening’ and an ‘Oriental unity’ resulting from such a concrete world historical progress are now not a simple myth of the 20th Century”. Instead there were various movements within the present Japanese society that believed in these causes that were not a myth but something that was able to provide a “definite historical, sociological foundation (\textit{ittei no rekishiteki shakaiteki jiban})” and “definite, practical and systematical content (\textit{ittei no gijutsuteki seidoteki naiyô})”. These were exactly the attributes the early Japanese pan-Asianism in Rôyama’s point of view was lacking. He was convinced that after the China Incident the time was ripe for a “Japanese awakening” that could trigger an “Oriental awakening”. Even though he shared his belief with the earlier Japonists of the “exoteric” faction that the fate of Japan and the fate of Asia were inseparably connected to each other, he did not consider Asian unity a natural thing but as something that had to be achieved by political means. According to Rôyama, “the shape of a new unified culture and thought of the Orient does not appear immediately” because the region had to overcome the Western imposed nationalism first. Before a “new ideology of the Orient” could emerge it was necessary to create an “idea of East Asia” (\textit{Tôa shisô}). Rôyama justified the Japanese expansion in the continent with the fulfillment of a “common regional destiny” (\textit{chiikiteki unmei kyôdôtai}) and was convinced that the Orient needed to “overcome the tragedy caused by the misleading nationalism (\textit{minzokushugi})” using an “ideological weapon” (\textit{shisûtetsuki buki}). Rôyama’s abandoning of the nation state and concept of regionalism very much resembled the “exoteric” pan-Asianist Sugimori Kôjirô and he also shared the goal of creating an East Asian Community under Japanese leadership with the pan-Asianists of the “culturalist” faction. However, Rôyama considered this a political project and not a self-fulfilling prophecy:

\begin{quote}
However, this is not a simple intuitive ideal or poetic illusion and to be a theory it must be something creatively progressive (\textit{sôzôtekinden shinpotekinden mono}) that has certain experiential substance and logical structure\textsuperscript{108}.
\end{quote}

Three years later Rôyama examined the perspectives for the GEACPS from a geopolitical point of view in his contribution to the volume \textit{Taiheiyô mondai no sai kenntô} (A Reconsideration of the Pacific Problem) titled “Daitôa kôiki ken ron: chiseigakuteki kôsatsu” (On the Greater East Asia: A Geopolitical Point of View). Again he wrote of the necessity for an “awakening” (\textit{kakusei}) of the Oriental peoples and an awareness for mutual cooperation within the envisaged GEACPS. Rôyama called this “geopolitically speaking
Japan’s matter and mission”. Nevertheless, it was also the Japanese obligation to awake these peoples by force if they did not develop an awareness of their Oriental identity themselves. In the case of Korea, Rôyama emphasized the “ancient ties” between the peninsula and Japan but at the same time he praised “the Great Saigô”, Saigô Takamori (1828-1877), for his strong stance towards an annexation of Korea after the latter had failed to accept the policy of the Meiji administration. Chastisement (yôchô) of peoples reluctant to accept or recognize the well-intended Japanese policy was an appropriate means to Rôyama on the road to realization of the GEACPS:

We punish those adjacent peoples who do not understand our real intentions [...] By all means there is this relation of being the same Oriental peoples; however, there is no choice but awakening those peoples who are completely lacking self-awareness.

Rôyama was proposing the implementation of an Oriental self-awareness by force if the peoples of the sphere were reluctant to cooperate. Therein he was more straightforward than the “exoteric” faction that regarded cooperation of the fellow Oriental peoples something that would come naturally.

Rôyama referred to the different scientific methods among advocates of the GEACPS of examining the economy of the envisaged region. He distinguished three approaches; one was to look separately at each country (method also applied by the League of Nations and the Western powers) which Rôyama called “an extremely planar, mechanical survey”. As the second method he described an approach to look at certain aspects of each country of the sphere with regard to the colonial character of the country. Rôyama praised this method as “a three-dimensional, world-political view and an appropriate method” but he himself favoured a third method which was based on the division of the GEACPS into two spheres: the Eastern Co-Prosperity Sphere (ECPS, Tôhô kyôeiken) consisting of Japan, Manchukuo and China (“Yen-bloc”) and the Southern Co-Prosperity Sphere (SCPS, Nanpô kyôeiken) consisting of the Philippines, India, Malaya, Thailand and Dutch-Indochina. Rôyama wrote of the need to provide a “two-staged examination” (Nidan no kenkyû) of the sphere; the first stage being an examination of the ECPS, the second stage being an examination of the SCPS. Finally, the mutual relations of these two regional blocs needed to be analyzed. Rôyama then described the economic situation within the so called “Yen-bloc” stating that 50 percent of Japan’s exports went into that very region with Manchukuo being the biggest receiver. The import volume made only half of the export volume and those goods needed by Japan could not yet be provided by the ECPS. 74 percent of these goods had to be imported from regions outside the ECPS, especially from America. On the other hand Japan maintained a balanced export-import rate with the SCPS but the great deal of this region’s trade was still conducted with the Western powers, foremost America and England. Rôyama quoted data from the year 1938 showing that by then only 6.4 percent of the whole export volume of the Philippines, India, Thailand, Dutch Indochina, the Straits Settlements and British occupied Burma altogether went to Japan. The import rates showed quite a similar figure with 8.5 percent of the SCPS’s overall imports coming from Japan. According to this data only 10 percent of the region’s trade volume consisted of trade with Japan. Rôyama saw the concept of the GEACPS in context with other “wide spheres” (kôiki) in the world and compared the plan for the establishment of the GEACPS to existing pan-movements in Europe and America. He especially praised Germany’s advance into the Balkan
region quoting the German political economist and statistician Ernst Wagemann (1884-1956) from his book *Der neue Balkan. Altes Land-Junge Wirtschaft* (The new Balkan. Old Country-Young Economy). According to Wagemann, since in 1938 40 percent of the Balkan region’s overall trade volume consisted of trade with Greater Germany, the latter’s economic predominance in the region was apparent. Rōyama concluded that Germany’s rivalling powers England, America and France were unable to compete with Germany any longer and hence the latter’s “relative weight” increased. Regarding the GEACPS, Rōyama claimed that Japan made comparable progress only within the ECPS, especially in the “organic economic relations” (yûkiteki keizai kankei) with Manchukuo. Nevertheless, he conceded that in the SCPS where only 10 percent of the trade volume consisted of trade with Japan, in the future “much energy” (tadai seiryoku) would be necessary to achieve the same results.

Following again the argumentation of Wagemann, the German Balkan policy was not only for the benefit of the German economy but also for the economy of the whole Balkan region itself. The Balkan economy however could only be developed if the native population’s solidarity could be won. Rōyama considered this plan for an “entire prosperity” (zentai ga sakaeru) a new meaning (atarashiki igi) of economy and the aspect of solidarity of the natives a “highly important point” (kiwamete daijina pointo). For Rōyama, Wagemann’s outline of a German Balkan policy functioned as a role model for the future Japanese role within the GEACPS. Japan had to adopt a policy to “enhance the whole Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Economic Sphere (Daitōa kyōkeien)” as the colonial character of the other member countries would slow the economic development. However, Japan itself would benefit from the increasing productivity and buying power within the sphere. Japan had to take the greatest efforts of all involved countries but would in return take advantage of the overall prospering economy within the sphere and also had a chance to win the solidarity of the other peoples. According to Rōyama, it was necessary to “establish a Japanese national policy” and a “new Japan” in connection with the GEACPS that unified these two objectives of making the entire sphere prosper and winning over the native peoples of the various regions. Again following German scholarship, Rōyama was eager to emphasize the necessity of establishing a new international law as well as conducting further cultural and sociological studies, especially on the Southern regions, since knowledge in the respective fields was still rather scarce in Japan.

In Daitōa kyōkeien the “culturalist” Nishimura Shinji criticized the economic dependence of Southeast Asia on the Western powers as well; however, since he was convinced the native peoples of the GEACPS would come to appreciate the Japanese policy for automatically its benevolence he did not mention any need for further investigations on the specific conditions of each region. Nishimura asked the question if all the various regions of the sphere ranging from the “Soviet occupied coastal provinces in the North until Dutch Indochina in the South” could be integrated economically into one bloc. His answer was quite simple: mutual understanding was the key to mutual economic aid and growing prosperity for all member countries of the sphere. “Liberal” (jiyūshugiteki) and “egoistic” (rikoshugiteki) trade had to be abandoned and eventually just distribution of goods within the sphere was just a matter of the good will of the peoples. Nishimura, arguing from an “exoteric” pan-Asianist point of view, had no intention to divide the GEACPS into an Eastern and a Southern sphere but was convinced that the ethnological,
racial and historical bonds would make economic cooperation come naturally.

Rôyama on the other hand showed even more criticism on the practicability of the GEACPS in his major work Tôa to sekai. Shin chitsujô e no riron (East Asia and the World. A Theory towards a New Order), published in 1941. Rôyama here criticized the Japanese government for its imprecise definition of the geographical outline of the sphere:

Nevertheless; however, considering the determination of this area one cannot avoid the impression that the explanations on the substance of the sphere are extremely abstract and vague.\(^{116}\)

Rôyama repeated his demand for intense research on the sphere that should be conducted by private scholars to “evaluate to what extent the determination of its limits and its content is relatively possible”. In this respect Rôyama praised the positive influence of German and English private scholars and research institutions on public discourse. Rôyama stressed that the government was unable to “fulfil the function of scholarship culture” and the concept of the GEACPS needed scientific examination.\(^{117}\)

Different to “Daitôa kôiki ken ron” where he divided the sphere into two main parts; the EACPS and the SCPS, Rôyama drove this division further in Tôa to sekai. He described the whole body of the envisaged GEACPS as consisting of three regions; namely the “Eurasian continental region” (Yûrashia tairikuteki chiiki), the “continental peninsula region (tairikuteki hantô chiiki) and the “region of the islands in the Southwest Pacific” (Seinan taiheiyô tôsho chiiki).\(^{118}\) Rôyama was very sceptical towards the fulfilment of the geopolitical preconditions for the creation of the GEACPS out of these three regions. Geopolitics he defined following Karl Haushofer (1869-1946) as science that aims to understand the political organism (seijiteki seikatsutai) in a natural living space (shizenteki seikatsu chiiki) by the restrictions set by its geographical shackles (chiriteki kisoku) and historical dynamics (rekishiteki undo).\(^{119}\)

Even with regard to the core region (or first region) of the sphere consisting of Japan, China and Manchukuo Rôyama regarded the present situation as difficult. Although there was a possibility to concede a geopolitical connection between Japan and the coastal regions of China, the Chinese hinterland (ouchi) had “close geographical-political connections with the Soviet Union and military-geographical connections also developed”. Transport routes between China and the continental peninsulas of India, Thailand, Burma and Malaya were also insufficient due to the incomplete Chinese railway and road transport infrastructure.

Thus, Japan had to “overcome many obstacles” in establishing co-prosperity in the “Eastern region” (Tôhô chiiki) and the geopolitical consideration of this part of the sphere showed “great complexity”.\(^{120}\)

However, Rôyama’s main concern was the practicability of including the islands of the South Pacific around Dutch Indochina, the “so called Nan’yô” into a “geographic order” (chiikiteki chitsujo) following geopolitical principles. Even though this region had to some extent relations with the “second region” of the continental peninsulas there were only little economic relations with the “first region” (Japan, China, Manchukuo) and a “unified regional order” (tôitsuteki chiikichitsujo) did not exist yet.

According to the principles of geopolitics it was also necessary to compare the “historical dynamics” of the various regions with those of Japan. The historical dynamics in the sphere outside Japan were shaped by Western colonisation.
and the Orient as such was a product of Western politics:

Until today the history of these regions was composed (kôseisuru) by the Western countries and it is no exaggeration to say that it almost cannot be thought of these regions’ history without these historical dynamics. Even today America’s and England’s cognizance (ninshiki) of the Orient is a result of the balance of power in Western Europe. The fate of the Orient is not decided by the Orient and there is a high degree of non-independence of the Orient that is determined by the fate of Western Europe.

The colonial character of the various regions was for Rôyama one of the main impediments on the way to the creation of the GEACPS. It was obvious to him that Western imperialism left its marks on the societies of many Asian regions and the “practical possibility” (jissenteki kanôsei) of implementing the idea of the sphere there would thus not be easy. Rôyama defined three historical dynamics for the region of the GEACPS; the first one was the movement from ancient, smallest communities to the nation state (minzoku kokka), the second was the “imperialist colonisation movement on land and sea” of the Western European countries and the third was the movement towards self-determination of the colonies with the aim of liberation from imperialist colonisation. For the successful establishment of the GEACPS, Rôyama declared a forth historical dynamic necessary that would describe a movement towards the “formation of a Greater Regional Bloc (Daichiiki kyôdôtai keisei)”.

Without this fourth historical dynamic the project of the GEACPS could not be accomplished. Regarding the Philippines there always had been independence movements since the years of Spanish colonisation but their impact weakened throughout the American occupation and especially during the Philippine Commonwealth. Furthermore, apart from a few pro-Japanese Asianists like Pio Duran there was no popular support for a membership of the Philippines in a Japan-led regional bloc. Following Rôyama’s argumentation, it would be necessary to evoke a desire for becoming part of the GEACPS in the Philippines that would create a dynamic movement among the Filipino people.

According to the geopolitical view of Rôyama Masamichi, the liberation movements in the colonies needed to be transferred into movements towards the establishment of the GEACPS. This would mean that all peoples within the envisaged sphere needed to be convinced that being part of the GEACPS would be more beneficial to them than being an independent nation state. Regarding the lack of such a fourth historical dynamic, Rôyama was highly critical towards the existing preconditions for the integration of especially the South Seas into the sphere. The whole project of the sphere in Rôyama’s point of view was “not at all an easy task but an extremely difficult project with many obstacles” and he concluded that “to date the preconditions for the establishment of the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere are not sufficient”.

The “exoteric” faction within the Japanese pan-Asianist community like the members of the Dai-Ájia kyôkai or Nishimura Shinji saw in the GEACPS the tool to end the Western dominance in Asia. In this respect there is no difference to the “esoteric” pan-Asianists like Rôyama. However, whilst the “culturalists” were convinced that the project would find approval among all Asian peoples as soon as it was implemented, Rôyama considered the sphere a political project under construction that needed careful cultivation. The establishment of the GEACPS to him was a dynamic process that by the year of 1941 had not even begun yet.
IV. Conclusion

In the beginning of the Meiji Restoration during the second half of the 19th Century an opposition against the national policy of the government emerged in Japan. This opposition firmly criticized the adaption of Western manners and culture in the course of Japan’s modernization. Different to the ruling Meiji oligarchs the opposition leaders saw the answer to Western encroachment not lying in copying the enemy but in a re-orientation towards original (superior) Asian values and the creation of an Asian bloc. This in its early stages rather romantic pan-Asianism had its nucleus in the Sino-centric sphere consisting of China, Manchuria, Korea and Japan. On the other hand, Japanese nationalists, especially among the navy, advocated for a Southward expansion to secure Japan’s political and economical independence. These nationalists however, solely legitimated their agenda by Japanese national interests and not by the concept of mutual cooperation between Japan and other Asian regions. The nationalists embraced imperialism whilst the Asianists condemned it. Throughout the Meiji period among pan-Asianists the idea of Japan becoming the leader of an Asian bloc gained prominence as only Japan was considered economically and militarily capable to play this role. Throughout the Taishô era and early Shôwa period the concept of a Greater East Asian Cooperative Body that was no longer limited to the Sino-centric area developed. Finally, nationalist concepts of Southward expansion and pan-Asianist ideas melted into one and Southward expansion took place under the slogan of “Liberating Asia”. Imperialism that was associated with aggressive and oppressive Western policy was abandoned. In the wake of the Pacific War pan-Asianism became the outline of Japanese foreign policy and the moral justification for Japanese expansion into the South Seas. The establishment of a GEACPS was the manifestation of the Japanese pan-Asianist vision of a new order in the Far East. However, there was a discourse within the pan-Asianist community on the possibility of an immediate integration of the Nan'yô into this sphere under Japanese leadership.

One “exoteric” or “culturalist” faction argued for a simple application of the same principles underlying the old concept of an East Asian Community consisting of Japan, China, Korea and Manchukuo in Southeast Asia since this region also had natural geographic and ethnological ties with Japan. Therein, the peoples of the Nan’yô (as the Filipinos) would automatically come to appreciate participation in a Japanese–led regional system designed to emancipate and liberate the colonized people from their Western overlords.

The other “esoteric” or “realist” faction was far more critical towards an integration of Southeast Asia into the sphere. Even though they advocated the same fundamental principle of hakkô ichiu as “the culturalists”, the “realists” were also aware of the cultural and historical specifics which made an integration of the region into the sphere difficult.

The pan-Asianism that underlay the outline of the GEACPS was in itself by no means a monolithic theory. On the contrary, prominent scholars within the pan-Asianist community showed great skepticism towards the realization of the concept in Southeast Asia due to the lack of commonalities between this region and the Sino-centric core of the sphere.
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