

WIAS Discussion Paper No.2019-003

***Kokka, Okakura Kakuzō, and the Aesthetic Construction
of Late Meiji Cultural Nationalism***

November 26, 2019

Keith Hanley
Lancaster University

Aiko Watanabe
Waseda University



WIAS Waseda Institute for Advanced Study
早稲田大学 高等研究所

1-6-1 Nishiwaseda, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 169-8050, Japan

Tel: 03-5286-2460 ; Fax: 03-5286-2470

***Kokka*, Okakura Kakuzō, and the Aesthetic Construction of Late Meiji Cultural Nationalism**

Keith Hanley & Aiko Watanabe

Abstract

This paper outlines the history of *Kokka*, an influential Japanese art magazine founded in 1889, with particular reference to its principal founding presence, Okakura Kakuzō, as they negotiated the ambiguities and complexities of Meiji cultural nationalism. The connection between its creation of a national aesthetic tradition and its experimental adoption of new methods of mechanical reproduction for its illustrations represented its split agenda of both consolidating a unique cultural prestige and advertising its engagement with modernity for the Western gaze. The evolution of Okakura's ideas in cooperation with the American art critic and philosopher, Ernest Fenollosa, was associated with the photographer, Ogawa Kazumasa, reflecting the tensions between aesthetics and propaganda. Okakura resolved his cultural politics with a theory of aesthetic idealism based on his analysis of the distinctive history of Japanese cultural assimilations from India and China in *The Ideals of the East with Special Reference to the Art of Japan*, 1903, offering a model for liberal internationalism, and, in *The Book of Tea*, 1906, for the mutual regard of East and West. The upshot was a diasporic influence in India and Europe while proposing an alternative to cultural fascism in Japan that was available for reconsideration after World War II.

Part One: *Kokka*

Kokka, An Illustrated Monthly Journal of the Fine and Applied Arts of Japan and Other Eastern Countries is a monthly periodical that was first issued in October 1889, originally published by The Kokka Publishing Company, 10 Yazaemon-cho, Kyobashi-ku, Tokyo. The oldest international art periodical from Japan and referred to by its publishers as “The Queen of Art Journals in the East”, it has spanned five eras of Japanese history, from Meiji to Reiwa, and remains “a leading academic journal of East Asian art history” to the present.¹ It started as an innovatory publication that first appeared during a critical moment of Japanese national development: the declaration on its first page was “Art is the Quintessence of the Nation”. At a time when Japan was keen to assert its individual cultural prestige while at the same time emulating Western scientific and industrial power, it attempted to integrate a combined agenda to match the West on both fronts: representing the great traditions of Japanese art and doing so with the most sophisticated modern methods of mechanical production.

The *Kokka* Tradition

The journal brought Japanese art to the serious attention of national and transnational scholarship, fashioning a tradition that gained definition from the 1890s through the rise of international modernism and beyond. The heritage it has consolidated over its history was retrospectively represented in an exhibition in

¹ *Review of Japanese Culture and Society*, trans. by Kevin Singleton, Vol. 24, Dec. 2012 (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2002), p. 10.

Tokyo National Museum in 2018, “Echoes of a Masterpiece: The Lineage of Beauty in Japanese Art: Celebrating the 130th Anniversary of *KOKKA* and of The Asahi Shimbun [Asahi Newspaper]”, highlighting the central canon of Japanese arts over the course of more than 1,000 years through a display of National Treasures and Important Cultural Properties. The artworks were divided thematically into three aesthetic “lineages”: Buddhist Faith; Individual Geniuses (Sesshū Tōyō, Tawaraya Sōtatsu and Itō Jakuchū); and Classical Japanese Literature (*The Tales of Ise* and the *Tale of Genji*). The first two lineages represent particularly the naturalization of Indian and Chinese influences into a developing national culture. A final section on Motifs and Images (“landscapes,” “flowers and birds,” “people,” and “old and new”) demonstrated the continuity and developments of “various motifs, images and forms that were passed down from medieval times to the early modern period, and from the early modern period to the modern era.”² That is, it extended up to the time of ukiyo-e and then acknowledged the influence of Western art in the works, for example, of Kishida Ryūsei, 1891-1929.

Inspired by the American philosopher and art critic, Ernest Fenollosa, 1853-1908, the historical recuperation of *Kokka* involved Ryūichi and Kajima Seibei, a wealthy Tokyo merchant and avid amateur photographer. Also closely involved was the Asahi Shimbun editorial writer, Takahashi Kenzō. A luxury publication, the journal was issued in two binding styles: ribbon-tied and stitch-bound, and appealed to a connoisseur readership. Its originality and impact derived from the combination of its revival of ancient and medieval masterpieces from different eras in Japanese civilization together with high quality experimental plates including fine black and white collotype plates, superb colour woodblock prints, generally engraved by “S. Izumi” with “colour press” by “T. Wada” or “T. Tamura”, and chromo-xylographs.³ Each issue typically contained five or six plates, of which two were in colour, and included a number of articles, mostly by Japanese scholars, on Oriental art, history and architecture, with a strong emphasis on Buddhist works. Occasional special issues focused on a single topic. The aim was to provide authoritative and expert material illustrated by accurate reproductions, so that, unusually, it attempted to print paintings and other art objects precisely as they then existed, including marks of deterioration, soiling and tears.

The journal’s mission was both the identification and transnational transmission of the Japanese art tradition, a drive that was marked by its gradual opening up to an international readership from 1901 with scholarly and commercial motivations owing to the increasing circulation of the magazine among Europeans. That initiative coincided with Taki Seiichi’s becoming chief editor, possibly at the behest of readers and researchers like Laurence Binyon, 1869-1943, who was actively using the publication for instruction at the British Museum, where he curated from 1893 to 1913. Nos. 1-132, 1890-1900, are in Japanese only, though there is occasionally an insert in English simply mentioning titles and artists; Nos. 133-181, 1901-June 1905, are in Japanese with a brief explanation of the plates in English; Nos. 182-337,

² The exhibition catalogue, *Echoes of a Masterpiece: The Lineage of Beauty in Japanese Art, Celebrating the 130th Anniversary of KOKKA and the 140th Anniversary of The Asahi Shimbun*, Tokyo: Tokyo National Museum, 2018, p.ix.

³ By the early 1900s illustrations increased and included black and white halftone plates and text illustrations. Typographical work is credited to the Tokyo Tsukiji Type Foundry. For these and other details see, <http://kazumasaogawa.com/japanese-photographer-baxley-stamps> [accessed 16/03/2017]

July 1905-1918, were published in both Japanese and English language versions, with some French inserts, while they were not always identical in content. Though the journal generally opened from right to left in Japanese style, from 1905-1918 an English version was stitch-bound with gilt edges and assembled in the western format, reading left to right.⁴

Constructing the Tradition

Okakura was the central presence who was well-placed to negotiate the interconnections culturally and linguistically. Yokohama, where he was born and raised, was the first Westernized city in Japan. Living in a shop, where foreign customers spoke English as a main language, he acquired proficiency in the language from the age of six, and when his family moved to Tokyo in 1873 to start up a Japanese-style hotel business, he enjoyed constant contact with overseas guests. According to Irokawa Daikichi, he was unusual in the period in not experiencing any inferiority complex towards Western thought and cultures.⁵ Yet, humiliated by ironically not being able to read Japanese signs in Tokyo at the age of eight, he decided to study Japanese in the Chōenji, a Zen Buddhist temple, where the chief monk, Gendō, was a scholar of the Chinese classics who lectured on *The Analects of Confucius*, *The Great Learning* and *The Doctrine of the Mean*.⁶ When he became a student in the Department of Literature in the Imperial University of Tokyo, he focused on the study of English and Chinese, and, momentarily, became a disciple of Fenollosa, who began lecturing there on Western philosophy and political economy in 1878, focusing on Hegel, Darwin and Herbert Spencer, thereby introducing an emerging élite to Western ideas. He soon became absorbed in collecting the works of the Kanō and Sesshū Schools and Buddhist paintings, inspired by *Kanga-kai*, a Painting Appreciation Society, “the last of the great artists from the Kano lineage”.⁷ After his graduation in 1880, Okakura pursued the same admirations with Fenollosa and their virtual partnership was to develop into a powerful agenda for their recovery and appreciation of neglected Japanese masterpieces.

Fenollosa reacted radically to the early Meiji period’s conversion to Western style arts that in 1876 the *Kōbu Bijutsu Gakkō* (the College of Engineering Art School) had been founded to import. Italian artists such as Antonio Fontanesi, a Barbizon School landscape painter and a professor in the Royal Academy in Turin, a sculpturist Vincenzo Ragusa, and a decorative artist, G. V. Cappeletti, were invited as teachers.⁸ Kawakami Tōgai, for example, who learned Dutch-style methods of composition and perspective in Nagasaki, where he ran his own painting school, sent his pupils to Fontanesi to learn Italian-style landscape paintings. As well as Western realism, new developments in mechanical reproduction of artefacts were also being introduced. In 1877, Ōkubo Toshimichi, a political leader in the Meiji government, promoted the First National Industrial Exhibition in Ueno to display Western technologies for

⁴ From No. 338 it was published in Japanese only.

⁵ Daikichi Irokawa, *Rekishika no Uso to Yume [Lies and Dreams of Historians]*, (Tokyo: Asahi Shimbunsha, 1974), p.97.

⁶ See Emiko Arai, *Okakura Tenshin Monogatari*, (Yokohama: Kanagawa Shimbunsha, 2004), pp.30-31.

⁷ José María Canbeza Lainez and José Manuel Almodóvar Melando, “Ernest Francisco Fenollosa and the Quest for Japan: Findings of a life devoted to the Science of Art”, *Bulletin of Portuguese Japanese Studies*, No.9, December, 2004, p.77.

⁸ These artists’ works are all represented in the Tokyo National Museum.

the home population, especially Japanese art workers. John M. Rosenfield depicts the effects in the beginning of the Meiji period on the entire artistic community:

Scores of old-style artisans—lacquer makers, potters, weavers, wood carvers, bronze casters—were being absorbed into mechanized industries and given entirely new skills. For painters and sculptors, a totally new system of training was devised to replace the master-apprentice method of traditional workshops. A new apparatus of patronage was built to replace the one which had collapsed with the impoverishment of the Buddhist temples and many old samurai or aristocratic families.⁹

In order to counter what was happening, in 1879 Fenollosa and Okakura founded *Ryūchi-kai* (the Dragon Pond Society, that in 1887 became the Japan Art Association) with the aid of the Ministry of Finance and that of Home Affairs, reviving traditional Japanese arts and crafts. It later held exhibitions abroad in Paris in 1883 and 1884. A fresh tendency was entering into the field when in 1882 the first national art school, *Kōbu Bijutsu Gakkō*, that had exclusively taught Western media, was closed down.¹⁰

Over time, Fenollosa's appreciation of Japanese craft skills was to broaden his reception of the diverse heritage. His first important pronouncement for a Western readership was a review of Louis Gonse's chapter on painting in his *L'Art Japonais*, 1883, that criticizes Gonse's emphasis on woodblock printing at the expense of classic art. In his mind at that time it was associated with modern mechanical processes and he suspected the Western vogue for its commercialization, but when he saw its influence on painters in Paris in 1887 he changed his mind and became an assiduous collector and promoter of the technique, so that on his return to Japan he helped to persuade the Japanese art establishment of its importance.¹¹

Okakura had started to work in the Art administration section of the Ministry of Education, and began to make journeys to old temples in Kyoto and Nara with a superior official. "In the summers of 1880 and 1881 [Fenollosa] travelled extensively ... visiting all the temples and castles he could find",¹² and Okakura accompanied his research tours throughout the archipelago, interpreting for Fenollosa's lectures to learned societies. Okakura and Fenollosa took lessons on Buddhism from Keitoku, a learned monk of the Tendai sect,¹³ and Fenollosa also studied with Hirokata Sumiyoshi, the Tosa elder, who advised him on the secrets of the Yamato school painters."¹⁴ "These years between 1886 and 1889 marked the height of [Fenollosa's] personal influence in Japan",¹⁵ as he was given a team of archaeological and art assistants to register all the country's art treasures for the Imperial Commission of Fine Arts. The two enthusiasts collaborated intimately in establishing *Kanga-kai* in 1884 in order to further protect traditional Japanese

⁹ John M. Rosenfield, "Western-Style Painting in the Early Meiji Period and Its Critics", *Tradition and Modernization in Japanese Culture*, ed. Donald H. Shively (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971), p.184.

¹⁰ *Review of Japanese Culture and Society*, p.9.

¹¹ Kevin Nute, "Ernest Fenollosa and the Universal Implications of Japanese Art", *Japan Forum*, Vol. 7, No.1, April, 1995, n.12.

¹² Lawrence W. Chisolm, *Fenollosa: the Far East and American Culture* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1963), p.49.

¹³ Yasuko Horioka, *The Life of Kakuzō, Author of The Book of Tea* (Tokyo: The Hokuseido Press, 1963), p.23.

¹⁴ Chisolm, p.49.

¹⁵ "Ernest Francisco Fenollosa and the Quest for Japan", p.78.

arts, especially the classical art of the Heian and Nara periods.¹⁶ But they were also concerned with sustaining Japanese culture in the present. Along with their recovery of past art was their sponsorship of the contemporary Kanō painters, Hashimoto Gahō, 1835-1908, and Kanō Hōgai, 1828-88, whom they supported in their experimental creation of the *Nihonga* style that sought to combine traditional approaches, excluding literati painting and ukiyo-e, with Western methods.

In 1886-7 Okakura was appointed to the Imperial Art Commission and sent abroad with Fenollosa and the government's Director of the Bureau of Colleges, Viscount Hamao Arata, 1845-1929, to study Western fine arts and art education in Europe and the United States, when they purchased a huge collection of photographs and books for use in Japan, while becoming convinced of the comparative excellence of Japanese work. After these academic travels they helped create *Tōkyō Bijutsu Gakkō* (the Tokyo School of Fine Arts), representing "the first serious reaction against the lifeless conservatism still affected by adherents of the Bijitsu Kyokai Art Association and the equally uninspired imitation of Western Art fostered heretofore in the old Government Art School."¹⁷ Fenollosa taught aesthetics there and Okakura became the principal in 1890, as well as director of the Fine Arts section of the Imperial Museum, today the National Museum. The members published a magazine, *Japanese Art*, and put on travelling exhibitions.

Okakura's address in the first issue of *Kokka*, to which he also contributed an essay on the painter Maruyama Ōkyo, articulated his vision of art in the new nation.¹⁸ He evokes its distinctive range: "the exquisite appearance of Buddhist statues, the high refinement of landscapes, the appeal of picture scrolls showing the lives of holy men, the poetic charm of flower and animal paintings".¹⁹ He presented the Meiji era as ideally placed to celebrate a newly conceptualized tradition, that had been historically impeded by "the feudal system with rivalry among local warlords"²⁰ and its geographical and historical insularity, establishing "strategies for learning from the past and utilizing this knowledge in the present",²¹ displaying it to the world outside and attracting new influences from abroad: "Now is a rare and glorious time... [when] ... we search for models everywhere, drawing on ancient and modern times, and seek knowledge broadly, from the East and West."²² But he was keen to insist on the preservation of his nation's distinctive heritage, as in:

Architectural form [that] must take into account our country's historical development and be based on the particular characteristics of the people, such that the architecture of the future will develop naturally. It is entirely unnatural for the Japanese people to transform Tokyo into a microcosm of Berlin, or to remake Kyoto in the image of Paris.²³

¹⁶ In 1886, Fenollosa became recognized as an art connoisseur by the Kanō school and received the Japanese name, Kanō Eitan, which means the eternal quest. See Michael Sullivan, *The Meeting of Eastern and Western Art* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1997), pp.124-39.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Though anonymous, there can be little doubt he wrote it.

¹⁹ Kakuzō Okakura, *Kokka* (1889), transl. Timothy Unverzagt, *Review of Japanese Culture and Society*, p.176.

²⁰ Ibid., p.178.

²¹ Ibid., p.180.

²² Ibid., p.176.

²³ Ibid., p.181.

He was conscious that the writing of an “[E]astern art history”²⁴ had hardly begun. The broad outlines of the future ideas and concerns that were to preoccupy him are already evident, advocating “the promotion, preservation, supervision, and instruction of the arts ... and the various branches of the art industry”.²⁵ He already supported the combination of characteristic Japanese techniques “of brush movement, the depth and smoothness of ink, and the harmony of colors” with “[a]natomical study ... and perspective ... there is no reason why applying these [European] methods should harm the distinct characteristics of Japanese painting.”²⁶ Furthermore, he made his first attempt to demarcate the period, relatively “hidden away”, when:

Japan developed its own particular style from around the Hōan-Tenji period (1120-25) to the Genkō-Kenmu period (1331-36), when emulating the Tang style had already waned and the Song style had not yet achieved popularity. It was at this point that true Japanese painting was first perfected, with Toba Sōjō casting the first stroke

—to be followed by the artists who “depicted the circumstances of their era, transmitting them to posterity.”²⁷

He ends with promising that it is *Kokka* that will formulate that great tradition and promulgate the practices and policies that would give it effect nationally and abroad:

Kokka also desires to preserve the true essence of Japanese art, and hopes that Japanese art will make advances by building on its distinct characteristics. The art of the future will be the art of the people. *Kokka* will not stop calling upon the people to protect and preserve the art of their country.²⁸

It was a programme he was to pursue throughout the cross-currents of the succeeding decade. Accordingly, when in 1898, as a result of a personal scandal and institutional politicking, Okakura was expelled from both the art school and the museum, he was to inspire a group of his followers to found the alternative, non-governmental Japan Art Institute (*Nihon Bijutsuin*, Hall of Fine Arts) with its emphasis on major and minor arts that became influential, symbolically moving from Yanaka, in central Tokyo, to the remote fishing village of Izura. Hashimoto Gahō was again a close associate together with Yokoyama Taikan, 1868-1958, another influential proponent of *Nihonga*, combining Western techniques of perspective and shading with the native styles. It opposed the serious threat from the unmodified Western-style painting, or *Yōga*, whose chief advocate was artist Viscount Kuroda Seiki, 1866-1924 who imported an enthusiasm for French impressionism and in 1896 became the director of the Department of Western Painting at the *Tōkyō Bijutsu Gakkō* (the forerunner of the Tokyo National University of Fine Arts and Music), introducing a new curriculum that reinforced a new turn to Western taste.

²⁴ Ibid., p.181.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Ibid., p.179.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Ibid., p.182.

A New Medium

Okakura's agenda of recuperating the national tradition was paralleled by Ogawa's assimilation of Western photographic techniques to produce a happy harmonization between Eastern aesthetics and Western technology that brought great art into relation with international modernity. Ogawa's career as a printer and publisher derived from the new techniques he had studied in Boston and Philadelphia from 1882-4, including the high quality colotype printing that provided precise tones that he influentially pioneered in Japan. In 1888 he was appointed as photographer for the Kinai survey that initiated the Japanese Government's project for a Painting Survey Group (*Zuga Chōsakai*), renamed in 1885 as the Painting Investigation Section (*Zuga torishirabe kakari*), to document and catalogue cultural treasures held in shrines and temples throughout the country. It brought him into contact with Okakura and, accompanied by the Chief of the Imperial Library, Ogawa photographed a range of antiquities, including architecture, sculpture and paintings, in the Kinki region of West Central Japan. He was subsequently assigned by the Government to conduct similar photographic surveys throughout Japan, producing images of Japan's cultural treasures that were to be reproduced in *Kokka* and his other publications. His contributions to The Kokka Publishing Company's prized photographic presentations of Japanese and Chinese art was to continue into the next century, as for example in *Choice Masterpieces of Korin and Kenzan*, 1906; *Masterpieces of Thirty Great Painters of Japan (Honcho Sanjikka Meiga-shu)*, c. 1907; *Hokusai's "Nisshin Jomajo"*, c. 1907; and *Art Treasures of the Koyasan Temples*, c. 1910.

Most significantly Ogawa contributed the colour colotype plates for the magnificent 10 volume *Japan, Described and Illustrated by the Japanese, Written By Eminent Japanese Authorities and Scholars*, Boston & Tokyo, J.B. Millet Company, 1897-8, compiled by the English Japanophile and gunnery instructor, Francis Brinkley. He supervised the printing by the Kokka Publishing Company of the covers by the Xylograph process, decorated with brocade, bevel edged and tied with thick cord stitching in traditional Japanese manner. Okakura supplied articles on ten Japanese paintings, and the De Luxe Edition announces on the title page an extra inclusion: "With An Essay on Japanese Art by Kakuzo Okakura".

Ogawa's photographic illustrations for *Kokka*, through to approximately mid-1907, were crucial to its quality and success. He was the principal supplier of classic art reproductions in a range of publications, and in the same year as the journal began he also edited and published the monthly *Shashin Shimpo* (East Asia's first and Japan's only photographic journal at the time) until 1896, contributing his newly improved colotype plates for both. Other enterprises based on his photographic work included the monthly *Japanese Art Folio* in 1898-99, and the first six volumes of the 20 volume *Selected Relics of Japanese Art*, published by Nippon Bukkyo Shimbi. After Ogawa's collaboration with *Kokka* ceased in 1907, his kind of collotypes together with the pure woodblock method were retained until around 1913, when a mixed method of

photomechanical printing process resulted in “Chromoxylograph” (woodblock) with “collotype applied” being introduced.²⁹

Within Japan the *Kokka* circle were to maintain and develop their influence, and though the tradition it inaugurated was to be problematized as it developed, the importance of its distinguished illustrations was to be maintained. At the College of Letters of Tokyo Imperial University, a course devoted to Art History was established in February 1914 under the name of “Second Course of Aesthetics” by Taki Seiichi, 1873-1945, who was by then the editor-in-chief of *Kokka* until his death and who had been teaching the History of Japanese Painting at the College since 1909. He became the college’s first professor from 1914, and was the foremost Japanese art historian. He was the son of Taki Katei, the leading literati painter of the 1880s, and in his *Introduction to Literati Painting*, 1922, he was to excoriate the commercialization of the literati-style painting (*bunjinga*) activities that had been directed by some government factions from the 1870s to fashion crafts for export and that had resulted in the market demand for “potato landscapes”.³⁰ His academic instruction and research relied on the crucial function of photographic reproductions, for example of the full-scaled enlarged photographs from *Kokka* shown at the Chinese Paintings exhibition held in September 1911 on the upper floor of the Kokka-sha building in the Kyobashi district that he donated to the Imperial University Library. He also persuaded Maruyama Ryūhei, 1850-1933, executive of Tokyo Asahi Shimbun (the parent company of Kokka-sha), to enlarge the University Museum’s collections with fifteen extra items in the celebrated collotype printing.³¹

Part Two: *The Moment of Japanese Nationalism*

Ambiguities and Complexities

The magazine was conceived amid the culture wars of the late 1880s, after Japanese nationalism had effectively begun its formation with the Meiji Restoration, and when the construction of a distinctive artistic tradition was critically bound up with a concerted but highly complex search for national identity. It played a representative part in the general construction of cultural nationalism (*nihonjinron*) that existed in a conflicted relationship to the political or state-directed ideology that was to evolve through the Taishō period into totalitarian government and the overseas expansionism of Shōwa statism. The arts played a shifting role as from the late Meiji period nationalism was to stem centrally from compulsory education and the conscription of adult males to settle on the dominant orthodoxy of ultranationalist militarism.

The unusual complexity of Japanese nationalism revolves around the inherent consciousness of Japanese exceptionalism that informed the Constitution of 1889, the year in which *Kokka* appeared. Within the Japanese cultural identity itself were endemic internal contradictions described by many sociologists,

²⁹ See n.3.

³⁰ See Rosina Buckland, *Painting Nature for the Nation: Taki Katei and the Challenges to Sinophile Culture in Meiji Japan* (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2013), p.100.

³¹ An exhibition was held at the UMUT in June-July 2015 on the work and donations of Taki Seiichi.

often in stereotyping terms as by Ruth Benedict in her classic *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword: Patterns of Japanese Culture*, 1946, as “both militaristic and aesthetic ... rigid and adaptable ... conservative and hospitable to new ways.”³² A cluster of dualities were at play, including a “form of dual consciousness [that] enabled [the Japanese] to maintain their traditional system of learning based on the Chinese classics, while at the same time expressing patriotic sentiments in support of Japan’s role in East Asia.”³³ These dualities resolved themselves rigidly towards the end of the nineteenth century in an inflexible imperialist gestalt.

Though an Asian country, Japan was never colonized—its complex cultural self-identity had never been compromised—and at the same time that the government was engaged with “the rush to modernize that followed the fall of the Tokugawa shogunate in 1867”.³⁴ Emulating Western industrialization and technology, it was promoting an ideology of patriotic unity. The Japanese state modernized itself organizationally, while preserving its national idiosyncrasies. The aim was to achieve equality with the Great Powers by enabling a fusion of Western modernity with its own separate cultural prestige, and the process of reconstruction, balancing past and present, was being realized at extraordinary speed, as Western observers marveled:

To have lived through the transitional stage of modern Japan makes a man feel preternaturally old, for here he is in modern times, with the air full of talk about bicycles and bacilli and ‘spheres of influence’, and yet he can himself distinctly remember the middle ages.³⁵

That quest was progressively to take the form of a competitively equivalent imperialism, hegemonizing S. E. Asia by subjecting China and Korea, in the face of the West’s assumed superiority to what it regarded as an undifferentiated sphere for its dominating influence. A series of affronts, from the Triple Intervention in 1895, followed by anti-Japanese legislation in California, and the Yellow Peril hysteria, only served to promote the emulative ambition to Westernize.³⁶ An anonymous editorial, “*Datsu-A Ron*” (“Good-bye Asia”), published in the Japanese newspaper *Jiji Shimpo* in 1885, probably by author and educator Fukuzawa Yukichi, 1835-1901, expressed a developing drive by arguing that Meiji Japan should abandon the conservative governments of Qing China and Joseon Korea and align itself with the West. As F. G. Notehelfer comments:

the nation would have to become both strong and acceptable to the West—a recognized member of the club of modern nations. And to do this it would have to appear ‘civilized’ and ‘enlightened’, which, within the context of the late nineteenth century, meant that it would have to appear Westernized.³⁷

³² Ruth Benedict, *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword: Patterns of Japanese Culture* (Cleveland: Meridian Books, 1967), p.2.

³³ Buckland, p.99.

³⁴ Nute, p.25.

³⁵ Basil Hall Chamberlain, *Things Japanese*, 1902; quoted by James W. White, *The Ambivalence of Nationalism: Modern Japan between East and West*, ed. James W. White, Michio Umegaki, Thomas R. H. Havens (Lanham, NY, London: Univ. Press of America, 1999), p.252.

³⁶ *Ibid.*

³⁷ F. G. Notehelfer, “On Idealism and Realism in the Thought of Okakura Tenshin”, *The Journal of Japanese Studies*, Vol.16. No.2 (Summer 1990), p.310.

National growth was urged by a vacillating pattern of internal and external pulsations:

a linear path leading from the particularism of the Tokugawa era through extroversion, attempts at integration, and ultimately overblown nationalism, a path superimposed upon another, a winding path from simplicity to complexity and then back to wartime simplification. But ... neither path was followed to its end.³⁸

Ogawa's photographic career exhibited the nation's self-esteem in its distinctiveness, even while that mediation was effectively creating "orientalizing" images for the Western gaze. His visual representation of Meiji era Japan to the outside world was unequalled by any of the many photographers at work producing contemporary views of the country. Basil Hall Chamberlain describes the foreign tourist market for books like his *Illustrations of Japanese Life*, with descriptions by S. Takashima, 1896, and *Things Japanese, Being Notes on Various Subjects Connected with Japan, For the Use of Travellers and Others*, in its fifth edition by 1905:

Ogawa's albums of collotypes will delight every lover of the beautiful. For coloured illustrations of scenery and the life of the people, the traveller is recommended to the native book-shops and print-stalls:—no foreign artist has succeeded in rendering the peculiar Japanese colouring.

He adds that:

Ogawa's contribution to an understanding of Meiji era Japan, which was just then emerging from hundreds of years of seclusion, by the Western world is incalculable.... His work in printing brought these wonderful views to the public in large quantities ... and at relatively low cost.... While Commodore M. C. Perry opened Japan to the outside world in 1854, in the years that followed Kazumasa Ogawa put the country on display for all the world to see and appreciate.³⁹

His contribution to the *Illustrated Companion to Murray's Japan Guide-Book*, published in 1894, was his first major effort to enter the mass marketing of photographic images reproduced by the traditional halftone printing process.

But Ogawa was serving the nation in another parallel way. In 1885 he had become an instructor of photography for the Japanese Army training personnel who would document the Japan-China war in 1894-5. From depicting the rediscovery of artistic treasures, as a demonstration of national kudos, he progressed seamlessly into becoming a leading advertiser of heroic militarism and the benefits of progressive colonialism. His technically inventive skills served the combined agenda, as he was publishing his art works during the colonizing period in China and Taiwan, illustrating the military campaigns and victories in such works as *The Japan-China War: The Naval Battle at Haiyang*; *The Japan-China War: On the Regent's Sword: Kinchow, Taliwan, Port Arthur*; and *The Japan-China War: The Fall of Wei-Hai-Wei*. In 1904-5 came *Photographs of the Russo-Japanese War*, 13 volumes, printed in hand-tinted collotype and halftone, issued in various forms by permission of the relevant government departments and advertised in

³⁸ White, et al., p.2.

³⁹ *Things Japanese Being Notes on Various Subject Connected with Japan, For the Use of Travellers and Others*, Fifth Edition (Yokohama: Kelly & Walsh, 1905), p.72.

Kokka, No. 182, July of 1905. They disseminated the nation's expanding self-image abroad, as edited versions were printed in London by Frank Craig et al.

Okakura's Cultural Idealism

An alternative tendency to that towards the industrialization and military imperialism of the West arose out of Fenollosa's inspirational ideas, informed by his philosophical readings of Hegel and Zen. In that vein, Okakura constructed an interpretation of Japanese art that evolved into an idealist paradigm for cultural internationalism. In search of the diverse origins that composed it, he acquired a wide knowledge of Western literature and fine arts and travelled across Asia—with two lengthy tours in China where he became deeply versed in its religious, artistic, and political history—and spent nearly two years in India. His research visits to China and India fed into his most important book, *The Ideals of the East: With Special Reference to the Art of Japan*, 1903, explaining the movements of thought and art throughout Asia behind the unique formation of Japanese culture. Its significance for the West was to be explored subsequently in *The Awakening of Japan*, 1904, and *The Book of Tea*, 1906.⁴⁰

Through Japanese art he arrived at a distinctive thesis of pan-Asianism that he held in critical relationship to the current ethos of the Japanese state, though maintaining his own version of the national essentialism, *kokusui*, that arose in the 1890s.⁴¹ *The Ideals of the East* begins with the famous manifesto: “Asia is one”,⁴² incorporating Arabian chivalry, Persian poetry, as well as Chinese ethics and Indian philosophy, a totality that brought the promise of peace to Asia. He argued that Japanese art had historically evolved its distinguishing configuration through a complex process of assimilation and continual individuation from Confucianism in Northern China, Taoism (Daoism) in Southern China and Indian and Korean Buddhism since ancient times. The Japanese tradition had absorbed and made its own the two principal inflowing Asian civilisations: Confucian collectivism and Vedic Hinduism that passed into Zen philosophy. He viewed Japan as a living museum of its various elements:

Thus Japan is a museum of Asiatic civilisation; and yet more than a museum, because the singular genius of the race leads it to dwell on all phases of the ideals of the past, in that spirit of living Advaitism which welcomes the new without losing the old. The Shinto still adheres to his pre-Buddhistic rites of ancestor-worship; and the Buddhists themselves cling to each various school of religious development which has come in its natural order to enrich the soil.⁴³

Japanese cultural exceptionalism accordingly has been shaped by its singularly comprehensive spirit that makes it the leading example for the merging of aesthetic idealism announced in the opening chapter, “The Range of Ideals”:

⁴⁰ As well as his writings in the earlier numbers of *Kokka* and Brinkley's *Japan* he was responsible for other scholarly works, including the government publication, *Japanese Temples and Their Treasures*, that he edited and mostly wrote. He also contributed to *Histoire de L'Art du Japon*, a monumental work compiled for the Japanese Commissioners to the Paris Exposition in 1910.

⁴¹ Especially as promoted by Kuga Katsunan and the Seikyōsha through the Society for Politics and Education).

⁴² Kakuzō Okakura, *The Ideals of the East with Special Reference to the Art of Japan* (London: John Murray, 1903), p.1.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, pp.7-8.

It is in Japan alone that the historic wealth of Asiatic culture can be consecutively studied through its treasured specimens. The Imperial collection, the Shinto temples, and the opened dolmens, reveal the subtle curves of Hang workmanship. The temples of Nara are rich in representations of Tung culture, and of that Indian art, then in its splendour, which so much influenced the creations of this classic period—natural heirlooms of a nation which has preserved the music, pronunciation, ceremony, and costumes, not to speak of the religious rites and philosophy, of so remarkable an age, intact.⁴⁴

His appreciation of the style that features “the subtle curves of Hang workmanship” refers to the gateway of a Shinto shrine, *Torii*, through which the sacred world is entered from the profane. There are two main styles: one is the traditional shape characterized by a straight and simple design: an unadorned crossbeam is supported by two columns. The other newer shape, developed after the arrival of Buddhism in the sixth century from China, features lintels that are gracefully decorative and curved. On the top are two crossbeams jointed together. The second horizontal bar runs across the columns, while the other is the same size and fits between the columns. These variations of design exemplify how the Japanese national religion of Shinto assimilated Buddhist architectural styles and fused them together from the starting point of Japanese art in the sixth century. In this way, for example, the Nara period in the eighth century and the Heian period in the ninth realize a blending of the spirit with matter: “The idea of the union of mind and matter was destined to grow still stronger in Japanese thought, till the complete fusion of the two conceptions should be reached.”⁴⁵ In the event, the chemistry became singularly Japanese:

One would hope, however, that it is not mere national pride which finds in the rendering of the same themes, not only the abstract beauty of the Indian model, with the strength of the Tang, but also an added delicacy and completeness that makes the art of Nara the highest formal expression of the second Asiatic thought.⁴⁶

He initiated the division of the national tradition in separated periods, after Western scholarship, influenced by notions of the Hegelian “zeitgeist”, through which he followed a recurrent pattern of assimilation. Between his description of successive periods, he inserts three chapters “that investigate Confucianism, Laoism, Taoism, and Indian Buddhism”⁴⁷ to conceptualize their progression. The Fujiwara Period displayed the indigenous capacity to complicate a rigid social and philosophical structure, giving it “an advantage over the Chinese, who are withheld by that strong common sense which is expressed in Confucianism, from the unbalanced development of any single motive to its full development.”⁴⁸ The pliability of the new direction took the form of a regendering, introducing a new element of “the eternal feminine”,⁴⁹ through which women came to the fore: “The prayer which dissolves the self into union with the ocean of infinite mercy takes the place of the proud assertion of the privilege of manhood in self-realisation.”⁵⁰ Great Japanese masterpieces now emerged “with their delicate lines and refined colours ...

⁴⁴ Ibid., p.7.

⁴⁵ Ibid., p.128.

⁴⁶ Ibid., p.120.

⁴⁷ Nagahiro Kinoshita, “Okakura Kakuzō as a Historian of Art”, *Review of Japanese Culture and Society*, Ibid., p.34.

⁴⁸ Ibid., p.142.

⁴⁹ Ibid., p.144.

⁵⁰ Ibid., p.145.

characterised, from the tenth century onwards, by a predominating use of gold... “.⁵¹ In its turn the elitist aestheticization, “pleading in their extreme effeminacy that the true man was a combination of man and woman”,⁵² spelled political collapse.

The Kamakura period from the thirteenth to the fifteenth century issued in the feudalist infrastructure of the Shogunate (that lasted up to the Meiji period). The following Ashikaga period introduced a modern feeling for individualism that Okakura sees as the spirit of Romanticism, the Taoist cohesion of mind and nature, as the Zen sect gained prominence, “representing the Indian trend of the Japanese mind released from Confucian formalism, to absorb the Zen idea in all its intensity and purity”.⁵³

Overall, he created a comprehensive vision of the vibrant energies within Japanese civilization that were radically clarified in its arts: “It will be noticed that in this Eastern struggle between the two forces of communism and individual reaction, the ground of contest is not economic but intellectual and imaginative”:⁵⁴

It is the spirit of Cosmic Change,—the eternal growth which returns upon itself to produce new forms. It recoils upon itself like the dragon, the beloved symbol of the Taoists. It folds and unfolds as do the clouds. The Tao might be spoken of as the Great Transition. Subjectively it is the Mood of the Universe. Its absolute is the Relative.⁵⁵

It is magnificently evoked in its key emblems:

Above all, they bring forth the mighty conception of the Dragon, that awful emblem, born of cloud and mist, of the power of Change, and in their tiger-and-dragon pictures they portray the ceaseless conflict of material forces with the Infinite—the tiger roaring his incessant challenge to the unknown terror of the spirit.⁵⁶

Yet, relating his narrative to his contemporary agenda, Okakura engaged critically with the contemporary prioritization of non-idealizing strands. He argued that during the Toyotomi and Early Tokugawa period in the seventeenth century, a tendency to decorative art featuring gold leaf emerged and continued into the later Tokugawa period up to around 1850 when a pronounced “skill in colour and drawing [lacked] that ideality which is the basis of Japanese art,”⁵⁷ so that the ukiyo-e woodcuts “stand apart from the main line of development of Japanese art, whose evolution has been continuous ever since the Nara period.” The recent popularity of that period, he proposed, had obscured the great tradition:

It is because the prettiness of the works of this period first came to notice, instead of the grandeur of the masterpieces hidden in the Daimyos’ collections and the temple treasures, that Japanese art is not yet seriously considered in the West.⁵⁸

⁵¹ Ibid., pp.148-49.

⁵² Ibid., p.150.

⁵³ Ibid., pp.178-79.

⁵⁴ Ibid., p.47.

⁵⁵ Ibid., p.35.

⁵⁶ Ibid., pp.55-56.

⁵⁷ Ibid., p.198.

⁵⁸ Ibid., p.199.

He searched for signs of recovery. A “modern Kyoto School of Realism”⁵⁹ had prevailed “up to the rise of contemporary Japanese art, in the second decade of the Meiji restoration in 1881”,⁶⁰ when there had been a re-evocation of “[t]hat constant play of colour which distinguishes the religious and artistic life of the nation.”⁶¹ But the “vicissitudes of this new age” make it difficult “to abstract and unify the underlying idea.”⁶² Two major forces were at play:

One is the Asiatic ideal, replete with grand visions of the universal sweeping through the concrete and particular, and the other European science, with her organised culture, armed in all its array of differentiated knowledge, and keen with the edge of competitive energy.⁶³

He urged current adaptations to embrace congenial Western influence while restoring the nation’s “sacred organic unity”,⁶⁴ in a distinctively Japanese manner: “To the instinctive eclecticism of Eastern culture she owes the maturity of judgement which made her select from various sources those elements of contemporary European civilisation that she required.”⁶⁵ The first reconstructive tendency of the Meiji period was the preservation and imitation of the ancient masters, led by the *Bijutsu Kyōkai* (Art Association), but this had become too imitative.⁶⁶ He deprecated the tendency to Western realism, promoted by the Government School of Art, and untouched by later and more sympathetic European developments. He spelled out his version of Asian idealism that he advocated for a new school of Japanese painting:

To this school, again, the old art of Asia is more valid than that of any modern school, in as much as the process of idealism, and not of imitation, is the *raison d’être* of the art impulse. The stream of ideas is the real; facts are mere incidents. Not the thing as it was, but the infinitude it suggests is what we demand of the artist.⁶⁷

It had been the aspiration of the *Nihon Bijutsuin* (the Japan Art Institute) at Yanaka, with its emphasis on artistic freedom, “neither the ideal nor the real”.⁶⁸ It restored the same spirit as in “the old art of Asia”.⁶⁹

It follows that the feeling for line, *chiaroscuro* as beauty, and colour as the embodiment of emotion, are regarded as Strength, and that to every criticism of the *naturalesque*, the search after beauty, the demonstration of the ideal, is deemed a sufficient answer.⁷⁰

He saluted his associates, Kanō Hōgai and Hashimoto Gahō and their followers:

⁵⁹ Ibid., p.203.

⁶⁰ Ibid., p.204.

⁶¹ Ibid., p.205.

⁶² Ibid., p.206.

⁶³ Ibid., pp.206-7.

⁶⁴ Ibid., p.207.

⁶⁵ Ibid., pp.222-23.

⁶⁶ See p.225.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁰ Ibid., p.229.

These two masters, themselves renowned professors of the chief Kano academy at the close of the Shogunate, inaugurated the revival of the Ashikaga and Sung masters in their ancient purity, together with the study of Tosa and the Korin colourists, without at the same time losing the delicate naturalism of the Kyoto School.⁷¹

The cultural idealism that was inherent throughout his critique was supranational. He inferred his conception of a potential synthesizing that affirms a separate identity while absorbing different spiritual discourses from his interpretation of the growth of Buddhism:

Perfection, in order to express itself, must necessarily fall back upon the contrast of opposites, and in announcing the quest of unity in the midst of variety, the assertion of the true individual at once in the universal and particular, we have already postulated all the differentiations of the creed.⁷²

He arrived crucially at a cultural paradigm that would endure throughout his future grapplings with the geocultural diversities of East and West:

Unless we can grasp the secret of this inclusion of opposites, the mutual relations of Northern and Southern Buddhism must baffle us. For it is not possible to say that either is true, and the other false, but it is perfectly comprehensible that as the narrower basis of Southern Buddhism, we have the echo of the great voice itself, crying alone in the wilderness, amongst those who know nothing of its whence or whither, while in the Northern school we listen to the Buddha in his true relativity, as the apex of the religious experience of his country.⁷³

As well as describing his oriental version of modernist traditionalism, combining old and new, he attempted to broker between the restoration of Asian tradition and Western innovation. The fundamental argument is that Asian art and culture represent an integration or complementarity between the sense of order and individuality, and that in Japan the conventions and spiritualities of various traditions were always leavened by a kind of creative inventiveness which acknowledged both tradition and innovation. He views the Meiji restoration as providing an exemplary modern society in which both forces find expression, but argues that in the West bourgeois capitalism had lost sight of its spiritual roots, so that art had become instrumentalized as consumption or heritage. He presented what had been a previously unknown parallelism, seeing the “reaching forth towards a visualisation of the vastness of the universe” as “an intellectual effort ... closely akin to that of modern science.”⁷⁴ But the lesson of Japanese art history had to be actively asserted in the face of increasing Westernisation.

In *The Awakening of the Japan*, he asserted that “the glory of the West is the humiliation of Asia.”⁷⁵ He also noted that Japan’s rapid modernization was received apprehensively in Asia: “We have become so eager to identify ourselves with European civilization instead of Asiatic that our continental neighbors regard us as renegades—nay, even as an embodiment of the White Disaster itself”,⁷⁶ as he had written in *The Ideals* of “the portentous danger with which Western encroachments on Asiatic soil

⁷¹ Ibid., p.231.

⁷² Ibid., p.70.

⁷³ Ibid., p.66.

⁷⁴ Ibid., p.116.

⁷⁵ *The Awakening of Japan* (New York, 1904), p.107.

⁷⁶ Ibid., p.101.

threatened our national existence”.⁷⁷ While the chiasmic interchange he advocated in his aesthetic writings was in danger of an imbalance of Western tendencies, he realized that the West had repressed the opportunity of reciprocal insights: “Has not the West as much to unlearn about the East as the East has to learn about the West?”⁷⁸ But as his wider Asian experience had taught him, Japan was only able to achieve its spiritual message by transcending its own inner Occidentalism: “It may be that, as our problems have been none of the simplest, our attitude has been often paradoxical.”⁷⁹ As the colonizer of Taiwan, Korea and China it urgently needed to assert the better ethos that derived from its rhizomatic Asian complexity.⁸⁰

This contradictoriness was not spelled out in *The Awakening of the East*, written 1901-2, and published in English in 1940. The book was discovered in manuscript by his grandson in 1938 and first published that year in Japanese as *Risō no Saiken*, and then in 1940 as *Tōyō no Kakusei*.⁸¹ From the later 1930s, especially after Japan started its military operations in China in the Marco Polo Bridge Incident in 1937 extending its territory to Southeast Asia, scholars and critics attempted to theoretically justify the war,⁸² so that after 1940, when Japan celebrated the 2,600th anniversary of its imperial era and began to invade Asian countries, the book was viewed as “propaganda for the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere”,⁸³ promoting imperialist expansionism as a challenge to the Western powers. It was at this date, two decades after his death, that he was rediscovered and accorded the sobriquet “Tenshin” by his family members, devotees, and the nationalist Japan Romantic School, that flourished in the 30s until 1945. The ultranationalist poet Asano Akira “[declared] Okakura’s writings to be Meiji Japan’s greatest ‘war literature’”, and “the name ‘Tenshin’ was invoked to justify Showa Japan’s war in Asia and the Pacific as the necessary and cumulative destiny of modern Japan.”⁸⁴ Current critics, evading the embarrassment that had resulted in the subsequent neglect of his importance, prefer to avoid the association of that name attached to a misleading construction of his contribution, reverting to his given name Kakuzō.⁸⁵ It should, however, be noted that this association was confined within Japan, and was at odds with his international reputation. Even the war-time adoption by the nationalist Japan Romantic School had focused on a “total disavowal of ‘civilization and enlightenment’” and had attempted confusingly to separate Okakura’s

⁷⁷ Ibid., p.211.

⁷⁸ *The Awakening*, p.4.

⁷⁹ Ibid., p.5.

⁸⁰ See Daisuke Nishihara and نیشیهارا دایسوکى, “Said, Orientalism, and Japan”, *Alif: Journal of Comparative Poetics*, No.25, *Edward Said and Critical Decolonization*, pp. 241-253, for an exploration of this paradox.

⁸¹ It is uncertain if Okakura himself ever intended its publication as he had previously refused to bring out a Japanese translation.

⁸² Regarding the specific examples of such attempts, Yusuke Suzumura makes a list as follows: from the philosophical viewpoint: Masaaki Kousaka, *Minzoku no Tetsugaku* (1941), Iwao Takayama, *Sekaiishi no Tetsugaku* (1924); from the archaeological viewpoint: Kosaku Hamada, *Tooa Bunmei no Reimei* (1939); from the sociological viewpoint: Masamichi Shinmei, *Tooa Kyodotai no Risou* (1939). See Yusuke Suzumura, “The Structure of the Argument over Asia in Okakura Kakuzō’s The Ideal of the East” in *Researchgate* <<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/236325629>> [accessed 14 August 2017].

⁸³ Shigemi Inaga (transl. Kevin Singleton), “Okakura Kakuzō and India: The Trajectory of Modern National Consciousness and Pan-Asian Ideology Across Borders”, *Review of Japanese Culture and Society*, p.40.

⁸⁴ Noriko Murai and Yukio Lippit, “Okakura Kakuzō: A Reintroduction”, in “Beyond Tenshin: Okakura Kakuzō’s Multiple Legacies”, *Review of Japanese Culture and Society*, p.3.

⁸⁵ See *Review of Japanese Culture and Society*, pp.1-14.

concern with beauty from scientific warfare, revealing the awkwardness of the appropriation of a critic whose “[apostleship of] transcendent values [was] alienated from the Japanese state.”⁸⁶

But his most widely read book over time was to be *The Book of Tea* that effectively deconstructed the binary classification of East and West. Horioka writes that “Okakura’s larger strategy in his book turns not on a cultural exclusivism, but quite the opposite, on an assertion of universality and the need to overcome mutual ignorance.”⁸⁷ The perception of universality depends on a shared high culture that is counter to the superficial consumerism of democracy. His “Teaism” was an explicit critique of Bushido. When Japan was fighting Russia, Western commentators talked about Bushido, the Code of the Samurai, “but scarcely any attention has been drawn to Tea-ism, which represents so much of our Art of Life.”⁸⁸

The book begins with a vehement expression of offence felt from the “sleek complacency”⁸⁹ of Western attitudes to the East: its sense of moral and infantilizing superiority. In modern times, he blames the West for encouraging a spirit of militarism, writing that the West only called the Japanese “civilised since she began to commit wholesale slaughter in the Manchurian battlefields,”⁹⁰ and “Fain would we remain barbarians, if our claim to civilisation were to be based on the gruesome glory of war.”⁹¹ There is no reciprocity, even in religion: “The Christian missionary goes to impart, but not receive.”⁹² His denunciation takes the form of direct address: “You may laugh at us for having ‘too much tea’, but may we not suspect that you of the West have ‘no tea’ in your constitution?”⁹³

Okakura argued for the West to fuse with his Eastern idealist model, employing tea as a metonym for the character and influence of Asiatic culture in the West. It represents the emergent worldview of Taosim and Zennism, providing the first popular account for Western readers: “Zennism, with the Buddhist theory of evanescence and its demands for the mastery of spirit over matter, recognised the house only as a temporary refuge of the body.”⁹⁴ “True beauty could be discovered only by one who mentally completed the incomplete.”⁹⁵ “[T]he art of the extreme Orient has purposely avoided the symmetrical as expressing not only completion, but repetition.”⁹⁶ Art represents the *universal* rhythm in all things.

Part Three: *The Cultural Diaspora*

International Cross-Currents

⁸⁶ See Takeuchi Toshimi, “Okakura Tenshin: Civilization Critique from the Standpoint of Asia (1962)”, transl. Christopher L. Hill, *Review of Japanese Culture and Society*, p.16 and p.22.

⁸⁷ Yasuko Horioka, *The Life of Kakuzō*, p.13.

⁸⁸ *The Book of Tea* (New York: Penguin/Random House, 2016), pp.5-6.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p.6. Herbert Spencer had been a dominant influence on Japanese constructions of the progress of Western civilization as being bound up with industrialization and warfare.

⁹² *Ibid.*, p.7.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, pp.8-9.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, p.62.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p.65.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, p.66.

The circle around *Kokka* were preoccupied with these pressing perspectives. The arts became part of a “more fluid and flexible” construction by “the articulate elites inside and outside of government” in a “discourse which links a variety of projects, policies and movements undertaken in the name of the nation.”⁹⁷ One strand that emerged from that moment took the form of a comparativist argument for a version of cultural internationalism claiming both equivalence and difference in the fruitful exchange of Asian and Western traditions.

An important feature of their cultural nationalism went against the official grain of incipient sinophobic nation-building. While state Shintoism was engaged in the exclusion of imported Buddhist philosophy, *Kokka* aesthetics depended on recuperating its prioritization of Buddhist art with its integral Chinese influence. The Chinese-inflected heritage was challenged by the shift in the economic structure of society due to loss of hereditary stipends following the abolition of the *han* system, as displaced samurais discarded their family treasures, and also by the purge described by Yoshida Chizuko:

... in March 1868, the new government issued ‘the Ordinance to Separate Buddhism and Shintoism’ to establish Shinto as the national religion and this accelerated the destruction of antiques. Temples, Buddhist pictures, statues and altar supplies and old documents were destroyed and scattered. Buddhist statues in ruined temples were used as firewood, piled up and neglected.⁹⁸

“The *haibutsu kishaku* (exterminate Buddhism) movement of 1869-71 resulted in “hundreds of temples being closed down” or ransacked.⁹⁹

The rediscovery of this other Japan was in fact stimulated by a powerful Western intervention that would provide the rising nation with an alternative self-assurance. From its formation, Japanese nationalism has navigated between its relations to China and America with their fluctuating ties of co-existence and rivalry. Fenollosa’s career enacted his own passage from the assumption of Western dominance to an appreciation of interdependence, “[searching] the cultures ... for the outlines of an emerging world civilization”, working towards “the coming fusion of East and West”.¹⁰⁰ His vision arose from the continuities and distinctions within Sino-Japanese culture that could be extended so as to “spur the scholars of a new Renaissance toward a cosmopolitan culture whose history was not parochially Western but a genuine world history.”¹⁰¹ The aspiration was further fostered by comparable hybridities within American culture, as Henry James wrote to Thomas Sargent in 1867:

⁹⁷ See Sandra Wilson, “Rethinking nation and nationalism in Japan”, in *Nation and Nationalism in Japan*, ed. Sandra Wilson (Abingdon: Routledge Curzon, 2002), p.3 and p.2.

⁹⁸ Chizuko Yoshida, *‘Nihon Bijutsu’ no Hakken, Okakura Tenshin ga Mezashita-mono [The Discovery of ‘Japanese Fine Art’, Aims of Tenshin Okakura]* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kohbunkan, 2011), p.11. The original passages are as follows: 「金地屏風や蒔絵の器物などは金を削ぎ取って破却されたという。それに加えて古物の危機に拍車をかけたのは、神道国教化を図る新政府が明治元年（一八六八）三月に出した神仏判然令の布告であった。それによりたちまち廃仏毀釈の嵐が起こり、寺院の建物や仏画・仏像・仏具・古文書その他が多数破壊され、散逸するという事態に至った。廃寺にされた寺の仏像が薪にされたり、各所から集められた仏像が積み上げられ放置されたりしていた。」

⁹⁹ Chisolm, p.51.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., p.vii.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., p.50.

We are ahead of the European races in the fact that more than either of them we can deal freely with forms of civilization not our own, can pick and choose and assimilate in short (aesthetically etc) claim our property wherever we find it. To have no national stamp has hitherto been a regret and a drawback, but I think it not unlikely that American writers may yet indicate that a vast intellectual fusion and synthesis of various National tendencies of the world is the condition of more important achievements than any we have seen.¹⁰²

Chisolm writes of Fenollosa:

He was the first philosopher, perhaps the first modern writer in any field, to think in a genuinely historical world perspective—that is, with respect for the particulars of non-Western cultures and a regard for their own patterns of development.¹⁰³

He had gone to Japan to teach the rising governing élite about Western thought, but he soon became fascinated by his host culture, and progressed to the enlarged worldview he imagined in his poem, “East and West”, where he:

Foresaw a conscious blending of oriental and occidental ideals as a means of raising the level of human civilisation generally. Convinced that both the West and the Far East could each gain what they lacked from a mutual exchange of complementary values, he declared: “Within the coming century the blended strength of Scientific Analysis and Spiritual Wisdom should wed for eternity the blended grace of Aesthetic Synthesis and Spiritual Love.”¹⁰⁴

The vision was fundamentally aesthetic. In a lecture, “The True Meaning of the Fine Arts”,¹⁰⁵ for the aristocratic *Ryūchi-kai* (the Dragon Pond Society) in 1882, he rejected both imported Western oil painting and the literati-style painting (*bunjinga*) that by the 1880s had developed into the contemporary *nanga* school of the Chinese *kanga* tradition of Japanese painting: “if *bunjinga* is the upper millstone, oil painting is the lower, between which Japanese painting is being ground to powder.”¹⁰⁶ Literati art was also the casualty of anti-Chinese sentiment (to be eventually confirmed by victory in the Sino-Japanese War of 1894), but Fenollosa was calling for a revival of his rediscovered Japanese art, originally drawn from China but then naturalized into the national art, that he summarized for “[a] generation of painters [that] was growing up who had never heard of the Kano or Tosa styles or Sesshu, or of the great Chinese painters of the past.”¹⁰⁷ The *Kokka* construction was to exclude *bunjinga*, though Takahashi Kenzō, one of its chief founders, was the brother-in-law of its chief exponent, Taki Katei. Kenzō distanced himself somewhat reluctantly as he “published some *bunjinga* examples, among them an ‘ink-sketch portrait’ of the Buddhist deity Fudō Myōō by Watanabe Kazan”, but he was persuaded that “it would affect sales”.¹⁰⁸ Fenollosa discarded the literary connection, especially its incorporation of inscriptions that he thought were not spatially representational and restricted international reception. His enthusiasm was deeply engaged, as he

¹⁰² William Veeder and Susan M. Griffin, Introduction, *Henry James and the Theory and Practice of Criticism*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986, p.1.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, p.6.

¹⁰⁴ Nute, p.28.

¹⁰⁵ The original manuscript does not survive but was interpreted and transcribed by Ōmori Ichū and published in the same year.

¹⁰⁶ See Buckland, p.100.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, p.47.

¹⁰⁸ In *Kokka* 226, March 1909.

enthusiastically explained, with a kind of idealism in Far Eastern art that corresponded with the universalist principles of the Western intellectual systems of Emersonian pantheism and Hegelian metaphysics he had been introducing:

Painting is an art that expresses Idea by means of lines, colours, and shading done in perfect harmony, and Japanese art ... excels universally in this expression of Idea.... Japanese art is really far superior to modern cheap Western art that describes any objects at hand mechanically, forgetting the most important point, of how to express Idea. Despite such superiority the Japanese despise their classical paintings, and, with cheap adoration for Western civilisation, admire its old racial traditions, and then take, if there are any, the good points of Western paintings.¹⁰⁹

He was effectively, as Karatani Kojin notes, inventing a new valorization of Japanese art:

First of all, Fenollosa introduced the notion of looking at Japanese art as ‘art’. Art cannot exist apart from something that makes it art or, to say it differently, without a discourse on art. Although up until then Japanese art did in fact exist, the process of perceiving it as ‘art’ was actually the result of Fenollosa’s activities.¹¹⁰

Together with Okakura, as Victoria Weston comments, he invented the idea of national art: “one consciously made and promoted as such, and of an entire school of painting founded for the express purpose of making ‘national art’”, which had to be “modern”.¹¹¹ As his contributions gained influence, the emperor praised him for having invented Japanese culture for the nation. His regular lectures on art were published in *Dai Nippon Bijutsu Shinpo*, the new art journal founded in 1883 by Okakura.

His crucial impact had been registered, and intending to spread his aesthetic theories in the West Fenollosa accepted the position of curator of the Asiatic Department in the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston in 1890.¹¹² Having introduced Western thought into the appreciation of Far Eastern art, he then undertook to introduce that art to educate American capitalist society in Eastern spirituality, educating it in what he considered its generally democratizing principles while observing its distinctness. He described his role in 1891: “I must remember that, however much I may sympathize with the past civilizations of the East, I am in this incarnation a man of Western race, and bound to do my part toward the development of Western civilization.”¹¹³

Fenollosa had been the first in the field of Japanese art criticism and was anxious to establish his priority registered in the form of some articles on Japanese art for *The Century*. But his major achievement, the two-volume, *Epochs of Chinese and Japanese Art*, was only published posthumously in 1912, brought to a conclusion by his wife, Mary, with a friendly team of advisory experts, especially the Belgian art expert, Raphael Petrucci, who produced a revised and annotated edition. He returned to Japan twice but no

¹⁰⁹ Quoted in Nute, p.26.

¹¹⁰ Kojin Karatani, “Japan as Art Museum: Okakura Tenshin and Fenollosa”, in *A History of Modern Japanese Aesthetics*, ed. Michael F. Marra (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2001). p.44

¹¹¹ Victoria Weston, *Japanese Painting and National Identity: Okakura Tenshin and His Circle* (Ann Arbor: Center for Japanese Students, The University of Michigan, 2004), p.7.

¹¹² See Mary Fenollosa, Preface to *Epochs of Chinese and Japanese Arts* (New York and London: Heineman and Stokes, 1913), p. xvi.

¹¹³ Manuscript “My Position in America”, quoted in Nute, p.28.

longer occupied a central role in the developments he had helped to initiate. In the meantime, however, Okakura actively spread his ideas. The exchange between East and West was operated on a personal basis in the relations between Fenollosa and Okakura, creating an international network between their respective provenances, as they collaborated in various ways. In 1893, for example, when Fenollosa represented Japan on the Fine Arts Jury for the World's Columbian Exposition in Chicago, where Japan exhibited her works for the first time (and significantly among "Fine Arts" rather than "Industries" section), Okakura was the Official Commissioner of the Japanese Pavilion, and issued several catalogues and explanations of art, architecture and Japanese customs for the American audience.¹¹⁴

Fenollosa had promoted the export of Japanese art to Boston in an effort to educate the American public. The antique treasures found their way onto the open market where they were mostly purchased by Westerners, who were more concerned about the collapse of the traditional arts than the Japanese themselves and exported them to their home countries. Ironically, Western interest was characteristically motivated by the urge "to 'overcome' Western modernity",¹¹⁵ seeing in Japanese traditional art the reflection of their own desire for deeper and more complex cultural experience. But as great religious paintings and sculptures continued to disappear into private collections internationally, Okakura actively pursued the critique he had first announced in the opening address in *Kokka*: "And small-minded people, with an eye to profit, have carelessly tossed away these treasures to distant lands in the West, without fixing a time for their return to the East."¹¹⁶ He successfully campaigned for them to be recognized as National Treasures, and for legislation prohibiting their sale or removal once they had been so designated by a body of artists and scholars known as the Imperial Archaeological Commission. A new generation of Japanese collectors was forming.¹¹⁷

Yet Okakura was also devoted to the dissemination of the influence of Japanese arts, travelling between Japan and the US and through Europe and Asia in that pursuit. He actively asserted his nationality and writes that "From [his] first trip to Europe"¹¹⁸ he studiously wore formal Japanese clothes. He left for the US on February 10, 1904, the day Japan declared war with Russia, and over the following nine years he travelled between Boston and Japan five times. He was eventually to begin his association with the Boston Museum of Fine Arts in 1906, at first as Advisor and then Curator, focused primarily on the classification and cataloguing of the collections of paintings and sculptures, mostly those of Fenollosa, Edward S. Morse, and William Sturgis Bigelow, whom he was said to have been responsible for persuading to lend and later

¹¹⁴ "Ernest Francisco Fenollosa and the Quest, p.78. Okakura served also on subsequent exhibitions of Japan's manufacturing achievements, for example for the 1900 Paris Universal Exposition, for which he wrote an officially authorized discursive *History of Japanese Art* that was published in French.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p.44.

¹¹⁶ Okakura, *Kokka* (1889), transl. Timothy Unverzagt, Review of Japanese Culture and Society, p.178.

¹¹⁷ After 1868, "it was the great industrialists, members of the zaibatsu families, who with characteristic zeal took the place of the feudal nobles as collectors." Foreword by Lawrence Sickman, Laurence P. Roberts, *The Connoisseur's Guide to Japanese Museums* (New York: C.E.Tuttle, Published for the Japan Society of New York, 1967), p.viii.

¹¹⁸ Horioka, p.24.

donate his large collection of Japanese treasures to the museum, “[making] its Asiatic department the finest and biggest in the United States”¹¹⁹ and the most considerable outside of the Imperial collections in Japan.

Asian Formations

The incorporation of the Indian influences, modifying the Chinese, was the crucial foundation of Japanese cultural identity. Okakura had been impressed with a speech on Hinduism (“Sisters and brothers of America...”) by the Hindu monk and follower of the mystic Ramakrishna, Swami Vivekananda, delivered in Chicago in 1893, and one of his disciples, the American Josephine MacLeod, had invited him to India from 1901-02, though Vivekananda had died prematurely in the meantime. In India Okakura came into contact with the artistic circle around Vivekananda devoted to fostering nationalism in colonial India, including the Tagores of Jorasanko. Back in Japan, Okakura sent two artists, Yokoyama Taikan and Hishida Shunsō, to teach the techniques of Japanese brush-and-ink works and watercolour wash. Abinindrath and Gagonendranath Tagore learned them, and the former passed them on to his students who were to specialize in them and become known as the artists of the Neo-Bengal School, promoted by the Indian Society of Oriental Art founded by European backers in Calcutta in 1907. Exhibitions were held in India and abroad and their work became known for “exquisite color reproductions of original paintings”, many of which “were printed by the expert technicians of *Kokka*”.¹²⁰ The exceptional quality of the *Kokka* woodblock printing is described:

The first thing you would notice in a woodblock print is the total absence of those half-tone screen patterns with their constant disturbing suggestion that the image you see is mass produced by a machine. Next is the tactile sensation of the paper on which the print has been made.... Combined with this was the superb skill of the Japanese printmakers, pulling each impression with perfect color registration.

Okakura was to leave “a lasting impression on twentieth century Indian art and aesthetics.”¹²¹

Okakura was intent on recovering the ancient origins of what he had recognized in their Japanese assimilation. In some instances, he even judged that the origins of what had become integrated into Japanese culture had disappeared from their sources, so that on his travels he even commented, in frustration, that “there is no China in China”, that he considered had become more “Westernized” than Japan.¹²² But in India he addressed youth groups, stressing the need to express their diverse Asiatic roots in order to communicate its cultural summation internationally:

¹¹⁹ Ibid., p.22.

¹²⁰ Ibid.

¹²¹ Satyasri Ukil, “Kokka Woodblock Reproductions of Early Neo-Bengal School Paintings”, Mukul Dey Archives, [accessed 22/05/2019]

¹²² Ibid., p.35.

Any history of Japanese art-ideals is, then, almost an impossibility, as long as the western world remains so unaware of the varied environment and interrelated social phenomena into which that art is set, as it were a jewel.¹²³

In composing *The Ideals of the East*, Okakura's knowledge and understanding was significantly influenced by a London-born Scots-Irish woman, Margaret Elizabeth Noble, 1867–1911, who was a prolific writer and intellectual taught by Swami Vivekananda and who had become a central member of Vivekananda's circle. As Sister Nivedita, she actively engaged with social and educational reform and nationalist movements in India, becoming closely connected with many intellectuals and artists in the Bengali community, including Rabindranath and Abanindranath Tagore, while taking up the cause of Indian independence that she boldly promoted for the anti-imperialist Swadeshi movement. Among her numerous pursuits, she inspired and guided the talented students of the Calcutta Art School to emulate conceptions of ancient India. She became familiar with Okakura after his visit to Calcutta in 1902, and according to Inaga Shigemi she was effectively a co-author of *Ideals of the East*, reading and correcting what was his first English book, and also becoming closely engaged in the publication of his subsequent English writings. Inaga writes that "Nivedita was essentially Okakura's partner, correcting his manuscript and facilitating the publication of *The Ideals of the East* in its present form and contributing to *The Awakening of Japan*, 1904."¹²⁴ Her collaboration accounts for the excellent command of the language, aiding his reception by a readership, the majority of whom would be non-Asian and international. His prefatory note to *Ideals* comments: "Mr Murray wishes to point out that this book is written in English by a native of Japan."¹²⁵ The book was not translated into Japanese until seventeen years after his death. She developed their vision in her treatise *The Function of Art in Shaping Nationality*, 1907.

The leading proponent of Indian national art and principal of the Government School of Art, Ernest Binfield Havell, was a member of the mutually influencing Calcutta circle. His argument for the spirituality of "essential Indianness" informed his *Indian Sculpture and Painting*, 1908, opposed to Westernizing elements.¹²⁶ It was a shared theme that influenced Ananda Coomaraswamy's "The Aims of Indian Art", 1908, who referenced Okakura. Their common perspectives resurfaced in Okakura's Boston lecture, "Nature in East Asian Painting", 1911, where he spoke of the idealist "super human divinity" in "the 'airy style of beauty' of the Han-period images of Avalokitesvara" and in Havell's *The Ideals of Indian Art*, 1911, that was explicitly indebted to Okakura.¹²⁷ Subsequent scholarship disqualified some of these critics' historical sequencing, especially their rejection of Hellenistic influence on Gandharan art, but the ideological embarrassments that were to develop with their views served to obscure the positive promise of their cultural idealism and a vision that was more than academic.

¹²³ *Ideals*, p.10. For Okakura's relation to the construction of "indianness" in the early twentieth century, see Shigemi Inaga, "Okakura Kakuzō and India: the Trajectory of Modern National Consciousness and Pan-Asian Ideology Across Borders", in *Review of Japanese Culture and Society*,

¹²⁴ Inaga, p.41.

¹²⁵ Horioka, p.48. There are evident tensions in negotiating authenticity in the Western language of English.

¹²⁶ Inaga, p.44.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, pp.44-45.

Kokka, for example, did not commemorate Okakura's death in 1913 but contained a notice in the subsequent issue deriding the Japan Art Institute that he inspired. Taki Seiichi, as editor, either approved or wrote the piece and in his papers for *Kokka* and elsewhere, as in his "On the Influence of Indian Art on East Asia" in the 1916 issue, lightly dismisses Okakura's authority along the lines of other critics. Art historical specialism evaded anxious ideological associations while *Kokka* subsequently "gradually paid less attention to events in the contemporary art world and came to take on the form of an authoritative scholarly journal for the appraisal of works of antique art."¹²⁸

Western Formations

Other models of Japanese cultural dissemination preceded Okakura's. Lafcadio Hearn, 1850-1904, whom Okakura admired, had written how the country had always ingested and integrated foreign waves of influence from India, Korea, and China on the basis of a continuous religious/spiritual identity, successfully amalgamating Shinto, Buddhism and Confucianism, that originated he believed in ancestor-worship, as Herbert Spencer had argued. Porousness to the West had been severely restricted and Christianity had had to be suppressed, Hearn claimed, precisely because it had threatened that coherence on which the union of the clan system depended. "Western studies were largely mediated by the Chinese language [in the form of Chinese translations] until the 1860s."¹²⁹

Fenollosa was to be the leading Japan-based importer of Western ideas before attempting to reconcile his adherence to philosophical idealism with his conversion to Zen in an aesthetic theory that came to frame an internationalist social and political vision. An Hegelian worldview underpinned his comprehensive thinking on universal interfusion:

As an enthusiastic Hegelian he was convinced that contact of the West with the Far East would lead to a new and broader synthesis, possibly world-wide, in which the thesis of Western values would elicit a responding antithesis restating Eastern values, the cultural dialogue proceeding in dialectical fashion towards the fusion of a new synthesis.¹³⁰

The upshot stood squarely in opposition to the recurrently opposed comparativist proposition, for example by Endō Shūsaku, that West and East, in the case of Japan, are finally incompatible.¹³¹ But the synthesizing notion of One World idealism was complex and, as distinguished from the discourse of global capitalism for example, had to accommodate the ongoing vibrancy of diversity, based on the dynamics of exchange and sustained difference. Indeed, the attempt to define Japanese exceptionalism in particular challenged the greater sophistication of that construction.

¹²⁸ Ibid., p.49.

¹²⁹ White, p.3.

¹³⁰ Chisolm, p.54.

¹³¹ See, for example, the conclusion of 沈黙, 1966.

For Fenollosa, the rejection of Western realism foregrounded the formalist aspect, as he urged in “The Lessons of Japanese Art”:

Lines and shades and colors may have an harmonic charm of their own, a beauty and infinity or pure visual idea, as absolute as the sound in music.... The fact that such a line organism may represent natural fact does not interfere with its purely aesthetic relation as line....¹³²

He posited an “organic wholeness”, derived from the mutual interdependence of each contributing part, that could reflect individual synthesis:

Thus such a synthetic whole is an individual, a separate entity, [with] a peculiar organic nature, an unchangeable possibility, a foreordained unit from all eternity. Now [the] Japanese feel that every case of artistic beauty is just such an individual synthesis.¹³³

It was a line of formalist thought that fed into internationalist modernism.¹³⁴

The comparison of German philosophical thought and Japanese aesthetics commenced by Fenollosa and developed by Okakura was to re-emerge in Heidegger’s engagement with Buddhist ideas of nonduality in *Chanoyu*, the tea ceremony, as interpreted in *The Book of Tea*.¹³⁵ One of the several Japanese philosophers who were close to Okakura and had studied with Heidegger in the 20s and 30s presented him with a copy, and it is probable that Heidegger’s key formulation of “Kunst des In-der-Welt Seins” derived from the 1919 German translation of the highly influential chapter on “Taoism and Zennism” by Marguerite and Ulrich Steindorff, where Okakura described how “Chinese historians have always spoken of Taoism as the “art of being in the world””.¹³⁶ Okakura makes the Heideggerian equation of human being and temporality, and like Heidegger he sees “human perception as at once made possible and constrained by historical locale and cultural tradition.”¹³⁷ The individual has to realise his part in the whole, a holism that enables the diversity of individual participation. For both, “the artwork is the disclosure of a world.”¹³⁸

Though in the 1880s and 90s Hegel’s influence on the idea of the State as an Absolute helped the reception of Fenollosa’s lectures on German idealism, the direction of his all-encompassing teaching ran counter to what Marilyn Ivy describes as Japanese fascism’s fear “of that which embodies abstract universality—‘the stigmata of Western modernity’ ... [that] cried out to be overcome in the name of an

¹³² MS Quoted in Nute, p.28.

¹³³ Ibid.

¹³⁴ He influenced an American line of aesthetic continuity from Japanese art. Via Arthur W. Dow’s *Composition* and Frank Lloyd Wright’s *The Japanese Print*, 1912, where woodblock prints are seen as “designs, patterns, in themselves beautiful as such; and, what other meanings they may have are merely incidental, interesting or curious by-products.” Quoted in Nute, p. 37. This was an aspect of ukiyo-e that the West had not at first appreciated as a continuation of traditional Japanese aesthetics.

¹³⁵ See Dennis Hirota, “Okakura’s Conception of ‘Being in the World’: 岡倉天心における「処世術」 (In- (*In-der-Welt-Sein*))”, *Ryūkoku Daigaku Ronshū*, no. 478 (Oct 2011), pp.10-32.

¹³⁶ Hirota notes that “it probably represents his English translation of the phrase *shosei* (処世, Ch. *chushi*, ‘in the world,’ ‘getting along in society’), which occurs in such Daoist texts as *Zhuangzi*.” Ibid., p.11.

¹³⁷ Ibid., p.17.

¹³⁸ Ibid., p.29.

organically unified nation-culture.”¹³⁹ He and Okakura were effectively working against the seeds of fascist state nationalism that was to find increasing expression in the interwar culture before becoming politically overt. They rejected the occlusion of the division between capitalism and organic tradition that Ivy argues “stylized” “the ideological-political domain ... through the techniques and technologies of mass cultural production,”¹⁴⁰ so that propagandized stereotypes could be manufactured as “mass ornament”. Crucially, the two art critics were recuperating a more complex complementarity between Western techniques of mediation and Eastern spirit than was expressed in the current watchword, “Japanese spirit, Western technology” (*wakon yōsai*), “the Japanese version of the amalgam of technology and culture,” a “split position [that] is a fundamental armature of the fascist fantasy in Japan.”¹⁴¹

Bibliography

- Arai, Emiko, *Okakura Tenshin Monogatari* (Yokohama: Kanagawa Shimbunsha, 2004).
- Askew, Rie, “The Critical Reception of Lafcadio Hearn outside Japan”, *New Zealand Journal of Asian Studies* 11 (2), 2009.
- Benedict, Ruth, *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword* (Cleveland: Meridian Books, 1967).
- Brinkley, Francis, *Japan, Described and Illustrated by the Japanese, Written by Eminent Japanese Authorities and Scholars*, 10 vols (Boston & Tokyo: J.B. Millet Company, 1897-8).
- Buckland, Rosina, *Painting Nature for the Nation: Takki Katei and the Challenges to Sinophile Culture in Meiji Japan* (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2013).
- Chamberlain, Basil Hall, *Things Japanese Being Notes on Various Subject Connected with Japan, For the Use of Travellers and Others*, Fifth Edition (Yokohama: Kelly & Walsh, 1905).
- Chiba, Yoko, “Japonisme: East-West Renaissance in the Late 19th Century” in *Mosaic: A Journal for the Interdisciplinary Study of Literature*, 31.2, June 1998.
- Chisolm, Lawrence W., *Fenollosa: the Far East and American Culture* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1963).
- Coomaraswamy, Ananda K., *The Aims of Indian Art* (Broad Campden: Essex House Press, 1908).
- Doak, Michael, *Dreams of Difference: The Japan Romantic School and the Crisis of Modernity* (Berkeley, Univ. of California Press, 1994).
- Fenollosa, Mary, “Preface” to *Epochs of Chinese and Japanese Arts*, Mary Fenollosa (New York and London: Heineman and Stokes, 1913).
- Guo, Nanyang, “Interpreting Japan’s interpreters: the problem of Lafcadio Hearn”, *New Zealand Journal of Asian Studies* 3 (1), 2000.

¹³⁹ In her Foreword to Alan Tansman’s edited collection, *The Culture of Japanese Fascism*, Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2009, p. ix.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p.x.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*

- Havell, Ernest Binfield, *Indian Sculpture and Painting* (London: John Murray, 1908).
- Havell, Ernest Binfield, *The Ideals of Indian Art* (London: John Murray, 1911).
- Hirota, Dennis, “Okakura’s Conception of ‘Being in the World’: 岡倉天心における「処世術」 (In-*der-Welt-Sein*)”, *Ryūkoku Daigaku Ronshū* no. 478, Oct 2011.
- Horioka, Yasuko, *The Life of Kakuzō, Author of The Book of Tea* (Tokyo: The Hokuseido Press, 1963).
- Inaga, Shigemi, “Okakura Kakuzō and India: The Trajectory of Modern National Consciousness and Pan-Asian Ideology Across Borders”, in *Review of Japanese Culture and Society*, trans. by Kevin Singleton, 24, 2012.
- Irokawa, Daikichi, *Rekishika no Uso to Yume [Lies and Dreams of Historians]* (Tokyo: Asahi Shimbunsha, 1974).
- Kamei, Schōichirō and Torao Miyagawa, eds, *Works of Okakura Tenshin* (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo, 1968).
〔龜井勝一郎・宮川寅雄編『岡倉天心集』明治文學全集 38、筑摩書房（1968年）〕
- Karatani, Kojin, “Japan as Art Museum: Okakura Tenshin and Fenollosa”, in *A History of Modern Japanese Aesthetics*, ed. Michael F. Marra (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2001).
- Kinoshita, Nagahiro, *Okakura Tenshin, Mono ni Kanzureba, Tsuini Korenashi* (Tokyo: Minerva, 2005).
- Kinoshita, Nagahiro, “Okakura Kakuzō as a Historian of Art”, *Review of Japanese Culture and Society*, trans. by Kevin Singleton, 24, 2012.
- Lainez, José María Canbeza and José Manuel Almodóvar Melando, “Ernest Francisco Fenollosa and the Quest for Japan”: Findings of a life devoted to the Science of Art”, *Bulletin of Portugese Japanese Studies*, No.9, December, 2004.
- Marra, Michele, “Hegelian Reversal: Okakura Kakazo”, in *Modern Japanese Aesthetics: A Reader* (Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai Press, 1999).
- Mizuo, Hiroshi, “A History of *Kokka*: <1> How It was Founded” (Tokyo: Asahi Shimbunsha, 2003). [水尾比呂志「名品探索百十年『國華』の軌跡〔1〕～創刊事情～」、朝日新聞社（2003年）]
- Mizuo, Hiroshi, “A History of *Kokka*: <2> The Management and the Characteristics of the Journal” (Tokyo: Asahi Shimbunsha, 2003). [水尾比呂志「名品探索百十年『國華』の軌跡〔2〕～経営と誌性～」、朝日新聞社（2003年）]
- Mizuo, Hiroshi, “A History of *Kokka*: <3> How It Survived” (Tokyo: Asahi Shimbunsha, 2003). [水尾比呂志「名品探索百十年『國華』の軌跡〔3〕～危機を超えて～」、朝日新聞社（2003年）]
- Mizuo, Hiroshi, “A History of *Kokka*: <4> The Journal after the War” (Tokyo: Asahi Shimbunsha, 2003). [水尾比呂志「名品探索百十年『國華』の軌跡〔4〕～戦後の歩み～」、朝日新聞社（2003年）]
- Mizuo, Hiroshi, “A History of *Kokka*: <5> Inexhaustible Art Works” (Tokyo: Asahi Shimbunsha, 2003). [水尾比呂志「名品探索百十年『國華』の軌跡〔5〕～國華無尽蔵～」、朝日新聞社（2003年）]
- Murai, Noriko, and Yukio Lippit, “Okakura Kakuzō: A Reintroduction”, in “Beyond Tenshin: Okakura Kakuzō’s Multiple Legacies”, *Review of Japanese Culture and Society*, Vol. 24, December 2012.

- Nakagawa, Mirai, *Meiji Japan Nationalistic Thought and Asia* (Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2016). [中川未来『明治日本の国粋主義思想とアジア』、吉川弘文館(2016年)]
- Nishihara, Daisuke and نيشيهارا دايسوكي, “Said, Orientalism, and Japan”, *Alif: Journal of Comparative Poetics*, No.25, 2005.
- Nivedita of Ramakrishna-Vivekananda, “Introduction” to Kakuzō Okakura, *The Ideals of the East with Special Reference to the Art of Japan*, Kakuzo Okakura (London: John Murray, 1903).
- Noguchi, Yone, *Lafcadio Hearn in Japan* (New York: Mitchell Kennerley, 1910).
- Notehelfer, F.G., “On Idealism and Realism in the Thought of Okakura Tenshin”, *The Journal of Japanese Studies*, Vol.16. No.2, Summer 1990.
- Nute, Kevin, “Ernest Fenollosa and the Universal Implications of Japanese Art”, *Japan Forum*, Vol. 7, No.1, April, 1995.
- Ohkubo, Takaki, “Tenshin Okakura and the Possibility of De-modernization Thinking: His Consciousness of Language, Time and Space”, in *The Izura Bulletin*, 9 (Mito: Ibaraki University, 2002).
- Ohwada, Noriko, “The Legacy of Okakura Kakuzo (Tenshin) at the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston: Based on the Display of ‘Tea Instruments’”, in *Osaka University Knowledge Archive*, 34, Spring 2013.
- Okakura, Kakuzō, *The Ideals of the East with Special Reference to the Art of Japan* (London: John Murray, 1903).
- Okakura, Kakuzō, *The Awakening of Japan* (New York: Century, 1904).
- Okakura, Kakuzō, *The Book of Tea* (New York: Penguin/Random House, 2016).
- Rosenfield, John M., “Western-Style Painting in the Early Meiji Period and Its Critics”, *Tradition and Modernization in Japanese Culture*, ed. Donald H. Shively (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971).
- Saaler, Sven, and Christopher W. A. Szpilman, eds, *Pan-Asianism: A Documentary History, Vol. 1: 1850-1920* (Lanham: Bowman and Littlefield, 2001).
- Sato, Michinobu, “Takahashi Kenzō as the National Essentialist (*Kokusuishugi-sha*), Government Official in Publicity, and Intellectual” in *A Study in relation to the Foundation of Kokka: Based on the Newly Discovered Material about Takahashi Kenzō*, ed. by Tsunoda Takurō (Tokyo: POLA Art Foundation, 2013), pp. 7-12. [佐藤道信「高橋健三～国粋主義のメディア官僚、言論人～」、角田拓朗監修「『國華』創刊に関する研究～新出の高橋健三資料を中心として～」研究成果報告書、ポーラ美術振興財団(2013年/平成25年3月), pp. 7-12.]
- Sickman, Lawrence, “Foreword” to Laurence P. Roberts, *The Connoisseur’s Guide to Japanese Museums* (New York: C. E. Tuttle, Published for the Japan Society of New York, 1967).
- Sullivan, Michael, *The Meeting of Eastern and Western Art* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1997).
- Suzumura, Yusuke, “The Structure of the Argument over Asia in Okakura Kakuzo’s *The Ideals of the East*” in *Researchgate* <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/236325629>

- Takeuchi, Yoshimi ed., *Pan-Asianism* (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo, 1963). [竹内好編『アジア主義』現代思想体系 9、筑摩書房 (1963年)]
- Tanaka, Stefan, “Imaging History: Inscribing belief in the Nation”, *The Journal of Asian Studies*, vol. 53, no. 1, Feb. 1994.
- Tansman, Alan, ed., *The Aesthetics of Japanese Fascism* (Oakland: Univ. of California Press, 2009).
- Tansman, Alan, *The Culture of Japanese Fascism* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2009).
- Takeuchi, Toshimi, “Okakura Tenshin: Civilization Critique from the Standpoint of Asia (1962)”, transl. Christopher L. Hill, *Review of Japanese Culture and Society*, Vol. 24, Dec. 2012.
- Terasaki, Hiroyasu, “The Personal Connection of Takahashi Kenzō Seen through Takahashi Sei’s Diaries” in *A Study in relation to the Foundation of Kokka: Based on the Newly Discovered Material about Takahashi Kenzō*, ed. by Tsunoda Takurō (Tokyo: POLA Art Foundation, 2013), pp. 13-22. [寺寄弘康「明治20年代の高橋健三の人的交流～「高橋清日記」を通して～」、角田拓朗監修「『國華』創刊に関する研究～新出の高橋健三資料を中心として～」研究成果報告書、ポーラ美術振興財団 (2013年/平成25年3月) , pp. 13-22.]
- Tsunoda, Takurō, “The Foundation Period of *Kokka*: Its Management, Structure and Ideal” in *Study in relation to the Foundation of Kokka: Based on the Newly Discovered Material about Takahashi Kenzō*, ed. by Tsunoda Takurō (Tokyo: POLA Art Foundation, 2013), pp. 39-58. [角田拓朗「『國華』草創期の実体～経営・組織・理念～」、角田拓朗監修「『國華』創刊に関する研究～新出の高橋健三資料を中心として～」研究成果報告書、ポーラ美術振興財団 (2013年/平成25年3月) , pp. 39-58.]
- Ukil, Satyasri, “Kokka Woodblock Reproductions of Early Neo-Bengal School Paintings”, Mukul Dey Archives, [accessed 22/05/2019]
- Veeder, William and Susan M. Griffin, Introduction, *Henry James and the Theory and Practice of Criticism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986).
- Weston, Victoria, *Japanese Painting and National Identity: Okakura Tenshin and His Circle* (Ann Arbor: Center for Japanese Students, The University of Michigan, 2004).
- Wilson, Sandra, “Rethinking nation and nationalism in Japan”, in *Nation and Nationalism in Japan*, ed. Sandra Wilson (Abingdon: RoutledgeCurzon, 2002).
- White, James W., Michio Umegaki, Thomas R.H.Havens, eds, *The Ambivalence of Nationalism: Modern Japan between East and West* (Lanham, New York, London: Univ. Press of America, 1999).
- Yoda, Tōru, “Takahashi Kenzō and Okakura Tenshin: Their Friendship and Breakup” in *Study in relation to the Foundation of Kokka: Based on the Newly Discovered Material about Takahashi Kenzō*, ed. by Tsunoda Takurō (Tokyo: POLA Art Foundation, 2013), pp. 23-38. [依田徹「高橋健三と岡倉天心～『國華』創刊者の交誼と別離～」、角田拓朗監修「『國華』創刊に関する研究～新出の高橋健三資料を中心として～」研究成果報告書、ポーラ美術振興財団 (2013年/平成25年3月) , pp. 23-38.]
- Yoshida, Chizuko, “*Nihon Bijutsu*” no Hakken, *Okakura Tenshin ga Mezashita-mono [The Discovery of “Japanese Fine Art”, Aims of Tenshin Okakura]* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kohbunkan, 2011).

Zatlin, Linda Gertner, *Beardsley Japonisme and the perversion of the Victorian Ideal* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).