



PROJECT MUSE®

Minor Transnational Inter-Subjectivity in the People's Art of Kitagawa Tamiji

Yuko Kikuchi

Review of Japanese Culture and Society, Volume 26, December 2014, pp.
266-284 (Article)

Published by University of Hawai'i Press
DOI: 10.1353/roj.2016.0003



➔ For additional information about this article

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/609727>

Minor Transnational Inter-Subjectivity in the People's Art of Kitagawa Tamiji

Yuko Kikuchi

The Japanese painter Kitagawa Tamiji's (1894–1989) unique transnational idea of people's art originated in New York,¹ where he was a migrant worker and a student at the Art Students League (1916–20), developed gradually over the years of his career in the midst of the well-known muralist art movement in post-revolutionary Mexico (1921–36), and matured during the remainder of his long life in Seto, Japan. Kitagawa's concept of people's art represents the expression of the people's subjective power and is grounded in local grass-roots activities. In his later years, in the 1970s, Kitagawa expressed his adherence to people's art as the “philosophy of a grasshopper” (*batta no tetsugaku*), a phrase that he repeated as a sort of personal motto.² For Kitagawa, the grasshopper or locust (*batta*) served as an alter ego. In pre-Columbian Mexico, the grasshopper (*chapulin* in Nahuatl) was associated with a mythical tribal totem, which explains the name of the prominent site Chapultepec Hill (Grasshopper Hill) in Mexico City, historically an important locus of political power. Although individual grasshoppers are small, Kitagawa explained, they migrate, and “swarms of grasshoppers damage crops in the fields, and can cause famine.”³ He likened art to a grasshopper because art is not only pleasurable and beautiful, but also contains the hidden power of becoming a formidable enemy. Kitagawa's idea of people's art appears throughout his numerous essays and is further articulated in the recollections of his avid supporter, the art critic, collector, and collaborator for children's art education, Kubo Sadajirō (1909-96).⁴ This article investigates how Kitagawa's cross-cultural experiences enriched his idea of people's art and added complexity to his artistic expression after he returned to Japan in 1936. Focusing primarily on Kitagawa's work following his departure from Mexico, I wish to highlight connections to the artist's earlier Mexican experiences in order to provide a post-colonial perspective on transnational art. Toward this aim I have borrowed the concept “minor transnationalism” from the comparative

literature scholars Françoise Lionnet and Shu-mei Shih, as introduced in their *Minor Transnationalism* (2005).

This concept of a “minor transnationalism” proposes a transnational perspective through horizontal studies of relationships among minor-peripheral cultures rather than the normative vertical studies of relations between a major-center and minor-cultures on its periphery. Lionnet and Shih argue that their approach allows one to look at cultures being “produced and performed without any necessary mediation with the center,” giving insight into “less scripted and more scattered” phenomena that occur across “different and multiple spatialities and temporalities.”⁵ Thus, dialogues between multiple minor spaces allow the periphery to develop self-awareness and self-critique. Lionnet and Shih note a level of commensurability and effectiveness in revolutionary philosopher Franz Fanon’s attempt to carry his argument well beyond the center’s self-critique. Fanon reworked the Hegelian or Sartrean critique of alienation into a context for the minor culture’s struggle for national and cultural autonomy and worldwide racial equality. The term “minor” is not used in a pejorative sense here, but positively to provide scholars the freedom to look at the fluid production of art beyond the normative study frame of Western art versus non-Western art. This essay treats Mexico and Japan as “minor” and non-Western, in terms of the art they produce, as nations that searched for modernity and an identity under the overwhelming power of Western art. Kitagawa’s art provides an interesting case of a minor transnationalism operating between Mexico and Japan. By focusing on Kitagawa’s minor transnational connections, this essay also questions the way we look at modernities of non-Western art, which are normally studied as phenomena of reception and appropriation of Western art within a fixed framework of center-periphery cultural relations.

Kitagawa Tamiji was born in Shizuoka in 1894. In 1914, at the age of 20, while a student at Waseda Preparatory College, he emigrated to Portland, Oregon in the United States where his brother lived. He moved to Chicago two years later, but then settled for a time in New York where he survived by working as a day-laborer. In New York, he took evening courses, including a class offered by John Sloan at the Art Students League, and mingled with young, aspiring artists.⁶ Sloan taught Kitagawa two important things that he was to recall throughout his career: the subject of art must be people, and they have to be painted realistically.⁷ Kubo proposes that Kitagawa’s ideas of art as a political strategy for resistance and the idea of people’s art were inspired by progressive artists in New York such as Sloan.⁸

After four years in New York, Kitagawa began his journey to Mexico, first moving to Florida where he worked on a farm, followed by a short stay in Cuba, and finally arriving in Mexico in 1921. He spent several years wandering around Mexico as a “*santero*” (saint-maker)—an artist who painted images of the saints, combining the life of a roaming immigrant laborer with that of a more-or-less self-taught artist. In 1924 he enrolled as a student at the National Academy of San Carlos, an establishment that taught

European classical art, and soon thereafter became involved in the movement called “La Escuela de Pintura al Aire Libre” (The Open Air Art School).⁹ This socialist-driven art movement, led by Alfred Ramos Martinez, began in 1911 right after the Mexican Revolution, and the students included the radical David Alfaro Siqueiros, who opposed the establishment of the National Academy of San Carlos.

The Open Air Art School was inspired by the ideas of the French Barbizon school (c.1830–70). Members painted indigenous landscape and outdoor subjects, and set up outdoor painting schools in the countryside to provide art education for indigenous Indians. Their movement spread and the children’s paintings were exhibited in traveling exhibitions throughout Europe in 1925, generating widespread interest. This movement was contemporary with that of the Muralists led by the so-called “three masters,” José Clemente Orozco, Diego Rivera, and Siqueiros. Both movements were nationalist art movements seeking to express “Mexicanness” as post-revolutionary Mexican identity, and creating an art of the people, not of the elite.¹⁰ The Open Air Art School network expanded further into the wider countryside, becoming “Escuelas Libres de Pintura” (Open Schools of Painters) in 1932, but by then government support had declined and Kitagawa was to serve as the director of the last operating school in this movement.

He first worked as a teacher in The Open Air Art School in Tlalpam near Mexico City for seven years starting in 1925, and after it closed he became the director of another school in Taxco. Informed by the progressive ideas of Sigmund Freud and Frank Cizek, a reformer of children’s art education, Kitagawa experimented with his teaching methods and observed how Indian children, free from Western art education, would see and paint the outdoor world. These experiments were also motivated by his own questions about the binary preoccupations of “*Tōyōga*” (Oriental-style painting) and “*Seiyōga*” (Western-style painting), and he acquired some unique perspectives on the direct relation between art and life.¹¹

Kitagawa returned to Japan in 1936, following increasing difficulties resulting from the closure of The Open Air Art School. Additionally, the approaching war, and the souring of diplomatic relations between Mexico and Japan, caused uncertainty for Japanese residents in Mexico.¹² He settled in the hometown of his wife, Tetsuno, in Seto near Nagoya. After a twenty-two year absence, his readjustment to life in his home country was remarkably smooth. Nominated for membership in the progressive artists’ group Nikakai (The Second Division Society) by the painter Fujita Tsuguharu, who had been a senior member, Kitagawa soon became a very active member of the society.¹³ Fujita and Kitagawa were both accomplished, international artists. Nonetheless, unlike Fujita—who went on to Paris, becoming world famous and well-documented in mainstream Euro-American art history—Kitagawa never became well known, even in Japan. Kitagawa’s works, which were exhibited at the Nikakai Society, were less popular than Fujita’s, and Kubo, his passionate supporter characterizes him as an “outsider of modern Japanese art” whose true value has never been properly understood because critics often labeled his art as “peculiar.”¹⁴

What critics found “peculiar” about Kitagawa’s work was that it was “not of the proper French school but Mexican school...used muddy grotesque materials depicting grotesque things...and lacked sensitive emotion that arouses antipathy.”¹⁵ Additionally, his large scale and mural-style works were criticized for “ignoring the aesthetic on the surface” and “rejecting decorative quality”¹⁶ and were described as “dry powdery”—aspects unattractive to “many of the Japanese audience who like sentimental things.”¹⁷ Kitagawa had a handful of passionate supporters such as Kubo, and collectors in the Nagoya area, while Fujita’s works were collected worldwide and continue to be studied much more broadly in the international context. The lesser degree of Kitagawa’s reputation may be due to his painting style, but is perhaps better accounted for by the way art is studied with a bias for Euro-American perspectives that are often presented in a restrictive framework of center versus periphery. This may be one result of conventional training that emphasizes how modern Euro-American ideas and movements were transferred and appropriated by non-Euro-American cultures, but pays little attention to what happened *between* non-Euro-American cultures. Therefore, Kitagawa not only presents an interesting and unique case for the study of relations between two non-European cultures that are highly remote from one another, but also raises questions about the way we look at global art.

The Idea of Mingei Nurtured in New York and Mexico

In 1936, when Kitagawa returned to Japan, he entered a society that placed restrictions on artistic and political freedoms. Yet this was also a time of marked development of the Mingei or folk crafts movement with the establishment of what became its key platform, the Japan Folk Crafts Museum. Kitagawa’s Mexican-infused idea of people’s art thus met with a similar idea that had developed locally in Japan, and the resulting cultural dialogue between minor positions informed his creative thinking. Inspired by the English Arts and Crafts movement, the Mingei movement had emerged in the late 1920s.¹⁸ The term *mingei* is an abbreviation of *minshūteki kōgei* (art of the people) and refers to a type of Japanese craft object made by local craftsmen using local materials and techniques, primarily for household and daily use. It was aestheticized by Yanagi Sōetsu, through his writings on Mingei theory, and developed as a contemporary style that became an international movement, through the work of artists such as Hamada Shōji and Bernard Leach.¹⁹ Kitagawa was not directly involved in the Mingei movement, but he visited Okinawa twice (1939, 1941) to see examples of Mingei work such as Tsuboya pottery a few years before the Mingei movement made Okinawa widely known as a “treasure island” of Mingei. When interviewing the late Asakawa Yukio, Kitagawa’s former assistant and secretary, I learned that Kitagawa knew Hamada well and, on Hamada’s advice, visited the picturesque southern Korean pottery village of Hahanri around 1941, marveling at its “simplicity and originality.”²⁰ While Kitagawa often criticized interventions by the contemporary Mingei movement, which he felt ultimately spoiled

the locally produced Mingei,²¹ he also frequently used the term “Mingei” in reference to both Mexican and Japanese folk art, and wrote an essay on Mexican Mingei for *Mingei* magazine,²² in which he discusses their shared ideal of an “art of the people.” Furthermore, he developed an interest in clay and pottery after he moved to Seto in 1937, as Seto had been the center of the ceramic industry over many centuries, and a focal point for Mingei.

In agreement with Yanagi’s idea of the “beauty of function/use” (*yō no bi*), Kitagawa defined art of the people as living art whose value lies “not in the product itself, but in the product as loved by the people who want it, and the product made for the people who want it with their love.”²³ He explains further, “It is like a sarape shawl.”²⁴ The dirty and faded shawl appears beautiful when worn by a Mexican Indian man, but once removed from its living context the beauty disappears and it becomes a mere object of decoration.²⁵ Like the Mingei leaders, Kitagawa was struck by the powerful expression of Mingei beauty, but he also emphasized the “reality of life” (*seikatsu jittai*) and the living state of art, which apparently indicates a slightly different viewpoint. Although both the Mingei leaders and Kitagawa were well-read and traveled, Kitagawa’s outlook was less elitist for he could relate to Mingei through his experiences as an immigrant laborer in the United States, as a *santero* selling paintings of Christian saints among indigenous people in Mexico, and through living in a humble, self-built cottage with few possessions in the middle of an area where clay was quarried in the small town of Seto. Such experiences may further explain differences between his views and those of the Mingei leaders who lived in rather tasteful Mingei model houses in urban centers where they occupied influential positions.

Kitagawa apparently first became aware of what he would later call Mingei while in New York, where he may have been inspired by his friend, the painter Yasuo Kuniyoshi, who is known to have been an avid collector of American folk art and crafts. As Kuraya Mika, chief curator at MOMA Tokyo, points out, this was the period when Americans began actively searching for a sense of cultural identity and found a partial solution in the elements of “simplicity,” “naivety” and “intuition” of American folk art that would make for a distinctive American art separate from European art.²⁶ There was also a strong interest in Mexican folk art at that time in the United States. As James Oles, an art historian specializing in Latin American art, has observed, Americans had a fascination with Mexican folk art, which they imagined to be “expressions of a genuine and living culture,” in “their search for an unspoiled and more authentic world,” even though Mexican folk art, however, was only “relatively pure,” for many of its products were not indigenous, having emerged as a result of materials or techniques that had been introduced to Mexico from Europe and Asia during the colonial period.²⁷ Therefore, it is not surprising that Kitagawa was conscious of the American romantic gaze on Mexico, and this led to his initial interest in Mexican Mingei as his creative source in Mexico.

While in Mexico, Kitagawa became a collector of folk art or what he regarded as Mexican Mingei. Here he was surrounded by artists including Diego Rivera and

Frida Kahlo, who led the post-revolutionary Mexican trend in search of “Mexicanness” within its own popular art form, and who were also collectors of Mexican folk crafts as inspiration for their paintings. Kitagawa’s interaction with his environment during his travels parallels the trajectory of American interest in American and Mexican folk art, and Mexican interest in Mexican folk art. In his short articles “Mingei Objects in Mexico” (Mekishiko no mingeihin, 1956) and “Mexico—A Country of Mingei” (Mingei no kuni Mekishiko, 1957), he describes Mexico as the country in which Japanese Mingei collectors would be thrilled to see people “living with Mingei, and wrapped up in Mingei from head to toe.”²⁸ He also proudly shares his experience of collecting Mexican Mingei and explains how to become a “top class collector” by visiting remote villages.²⁹ It is not known exactly what he collected while he was in Mexico at this time, but the objects he brought back from his later trip to Mexico in 1956 offer some indication.

Kitagawa purchased twenty pieces of Mexican folk pottery, which he later donated to Seto City for use as design reference materials to inspire designs for Japanese export ceramics. The pieces he acquired were functional items of tableware, such as plates, coffee cups and saucers, jugs and animal figures. Kitagawa states:

This [Mexican] Mingei pottery is very similar to Japanese *raku* pottery and Chinese Tang three-color pottery. They are simply made and not refined, but have a distinctively Mexican design—brightly decorated in red, yellow, and blue colors. The exotic quality that comes out of the complex mixture of the infantile (*yōchi*) and primitive Indian culture and the Spanish sensibility, appeals to our taste.³⁰

Kitagawa adored these Mingei objects because of their distinctive Mexicanness, which appeals to Japan’s romantic yearnings for exotic things, and also their fundamental character as people’s art, a character shared by Mexican, Japanese, as well as Chinese folk art.

Mingei and Seto

Seto is one of the largest pottery production centers in Japan, producing iconic Mingei objects such as horse-eye plates and blue and white tableware. Mingei objects are defined by Yanagi Sōetsu’s criteria established in the Mingei movement as objects that are handmade, functional, and inexpensive household items made by unknown craftsmen, as opposed to artists who are conscious of their creation, and have a certain beauty of “healthiness,” “naturalness,” “simplicity,” “tradition,” and “irregularity.”³¹ As had been the case during his time in Mexico, such Mingei objects seem to have become part of Kitagawa’s life in Seto, whether he chose them consciously or unconsciously. An old photo of his studio reveals a Mingei-style *noren* curtain with a resist-dyed pattern of a Mingei toy (a *tai guruma*, red bream cart) from Niigata prefecture, and a large vase holding paint brushes, which has a rough Mingei-style decoration in blue and red,

possibly decorated by Kitagawa himself.³² In Kitagawa's kitchen cupboard there are also ordinary Mingei examples of local Seto pottery such as *kiseto* bowls and blue and white *sometsuke* plates. Asakawa Yukio, Kitagawa's assistant, observed that the artist liked using Mingei tableware, mostly from Seto and Mashiko, at home.³³ Kitagawa also experimented with glass painting, a medium warmly embraced by the Mingei movement, and praised *Ôtsue* pictures, folk art produced and sold around the area of Ôtsu near Kyoto since the seventeenth century, as representative of Japanese painting.³⁴ *Ôtsue* were highly regarded in the Mingei movement as "people's art" because such paintings are very rough and amateurish, painted by anonymous artisans without professional refinement and sold on the street. Yet, they depict popular Buddhist teachings on moral behavior, often with sarcastic humor and social criticism. There are similarities between the function of this art form with the use in Mexico of ex-voto paintings or caricatures by José Posada (1852-1913), the Mexican print maker of political satire. Kitagawa's view that *Ôtsue* represented Japanese painting and "Japaneseness"³⁵ is consistent with his belief that Mingei as a whole represented the "people's art" and revealed "Japaneseness." Kitagawa was perhaps influential in his friend Isamu Noguchi's purchase of an *Ôtsue*, *Devil's Sutra Chanting* (Oni no nenbutsu), the only souvenir of his entire 1950 trip to Kyoto. They shared their enthusiasm for new qualities derived from the cultural crossing of folk art and modernist art.³⁶

Clay and Ceramic Art

Kitagawa's experimentation with clay and ceramics can be seen as his own realization of Mingei that embodied locally and internationally coded visual signs and political resistance. Clay and ceramics have been integral to Seto's local industry and culture for many centuries, but they are also key to the modern popular visual culture of Japan. Indeed, pottery was the most iconic medium of Japanese Mingei. Kitagawa discovered an ideal platform for his transnational ideals of Mingei in the local character of Seto ceramics contextualized by the larger vibrant environment of post-war visual culture.

Kitagawa started working with ceramics in the 1950s, a period when Japanese visual culture underwent a radical restructuring. Under American influence, crafts (*kôgei*), and especially pottery and ceramic art, were recentered in Japanese visual culture and the design industry.³⁷ Mingei pottery, discovered by American artists and connoisseurs during the Occupation period, was promoted to legitimize Mingei-style artists as "national treasures." The idea of Japanese "tradition" was also reinvented in the postwar world with the help of American "soft power,"³⁸ and modern Mingei-style craft-design was developed for American consumption. Meanwhile, ideas originating from the Euro-American avant-garde caused embarrassment about the "old-fashioned ornamentalism" (*furukusai sôshoku shugi*) attached to crafts.³⁹ As the Japanese art world became exposed to a new wave of American art, artists became keenly interested in using pottery and ceramic materials from a new perspective. Pottery and new awareness of



15.1

Kitagawa Tamiji, *Clay, Mountain and Clay Digger, Potters Wheel, and Climbing Kilns*, for the three walls of the Seto Civic Center (Current Setogura Museum), 1959. 2.54m height x 4m length. Courtesy of the Seto City Cultural Promotion Foundation.

its raw material, clay, converged in modern ceramics and avant-garde art such as Yagi Kazuo's fired-clay *objet*, or ceramic sculptures by Wakita Kazu, Fukuda Toyoshirō, and Okamoto Tarō, the latter also inspired by Mexican folk art. The idea of pottery *okimono* (objects to be specifically displayed in the *tokonoma* space in a Japanese-style room) was refashioned as ceramic sculpture (*tōchō*) by Numata Kazumasa, while crafts and design created a new cross-over category of progressive *kurafuto* (an invented term combining the concepts of “craft” and “design”) by an industrial-design-conscious Hinone Sakuzō and Kumakura Junkichi. Noguchi's 1950 visit to Japan accelerated this convergence of “tradition” and avant-garde art, and Kitagawa created his ceramic work during this period of visual reconfiguration.

For Kitagawa, ceramic work was partly a “side business,” but he pursued it mostly as his own artistic exploration, inspired by this 1950s climate of artistic experimentation and the environment of Seto's “living pottery.” His ceramic work was not known to the professional ceramic world, except for his ceramic mosaic tile murals created for public spaces, and he had no intention of being a ceramic artist.⁴⁰ Unlike artists working in clay and modern *okimono*, Kitagawa's interest in clay was unrelated to sculptural form. It was, however, a source of original pigments for his painting, or the uniquely colored mosaic

tiles that form the painterly surface and texture of his murals, as in the example of his own favorite mural, that at the Seto Civic Center depicting Seto's working pottery scene (fig. 15.1). Though he surmised that the spheres of painting and ceramics would never converge, he was thrilled to experience some moments of "painter and ceramics coming together" through his experiments with making new glazes and their transformation in the process of firing, often achieving unexpected results.⁴¹ Kitagawa's DIY approach to making his own original pigments by mixing unusual things began as a necessity due to a lack of oil paints in Mexico, but he further developed this pursuit into creative experimental work after returning to Japan. In Seto, he made his favorite colours, ranging from black to yellow, from a mixture of white clay and clay containing oxidized iron. He also experimented with various clay glazes, which he used for overglazing Seto pottery and was pleased with the effect of these original colorants. Indeed, the experimentation with ceramic clay and glazes gave his paintings a rough sandy matte quality that became a trademark.⁴²

Ceramic Decoration: Seto Blue and White (*Sometsuke*)

Kitagawa also experimented with blue and white porcelain decoration. The renowned Itō family was the guardian of the master potter tradition of Seto blue and white that had existed for many generations. Itō Ihei, who managed the Itō studio at that time,⁴³ was not a master potter, but a high-school teacher of classic literature who married into the Itō family and to whom the responsibility for continuing the family tradition was transferred. According to Ihei's daughter, Moriyama Emiko, Ihei was a highly cultured person and his studio was like an international art salon where GHQ officers, local artists, industrialists, and intellectuals gathered, creating a liberal atmosphere. Itō allocated a corner space for Kitagawa, whom the locals had named *ero jīsan* (dirty old man—as Kitagawa appeared to be a simple man who loved sex, drinks, and nightclubbing) in a friendly, if derogatory way—where he could come regularly to decorate pots, and this salon supported Kitagawa both mentally and financially.⁴⁴

Noguchi also joined Kitagawa in 1950 and created some blue and white pottery with abstract decorations at Itō's studio. Kitagawa introduced Noguchi, whom he had befriended in Mexico, to Itō's salon, as well as to the Oriental Decorative Ceramic Sculpture Research Institute (Orientalu Dekorachibu Tōji Chōkoku Kenkyūjo), led by Numata Kazumasa, in Seto. As Bert Winther-Tamaki's studies show, Noguchi had "one furiously creative week" in Seto in which he made many terracotta figures, immersing himself in "Japanese earth as a medium of self-discovery" and in his creative exploration of "East and West."⁴⁵ Numata, an artist and designer who had studied at Sèvres and trained in sculpture under Rodin, promoted his own concept of ceramic sculpture (*tōchō*). His interest lay in combining sculpture and crafts by introducing Western sculptural ideas and applying them to ceramic crafts. For example, his "connoisseur's *okimono*" were to be produced as Arts and Crafts-type objects that would be affordable and meaningful



15.2
A blue and white porcelain jar decorated by Kitagawa at Itō Ihei's studio around 1950. Collection of the Itō family.



15.3
A blue and white jar with a figure of a devil decorated by Kitagawa at Itō Ihei's studio around 1950. Collection of the Itō family.

for ordinary people, thus epitomizing modern Mingei.⁴⁶ Although the Seto works by Numata, Noguchi, and Kitagawa differ dramatically, their new ways of looking at Japanese clay and ceramic work and their rediscovery of local subjectivity, which resulted from their cross-cultural experiences in different visual cultures, apparently created synergy between these artists.

Two jars among Kitagawa's blue and white pottery works, while typical of the style of vessels used in the Japanese tea ceremony, are decorated with images of exotic non-Japanese figures (fig. 15.2). These motifs evoke interpretations prompted by Kitagawa's strategy of working as a "hieroglyphist" trying to layer ideologies, thoughts, art, and history into realistic patterns and figures in "hieroglyphs."⁴⁷ Kitagawa disapproved of informal and abstract art that merely "stimulates the human senses" and avoids the artist's responsibility for proposing intellectual ideas and ideologies.⁴⁸ The jars are decorated with dancing male figures, one of which could be a Middle Eastern man with a loose outfit, while another is a black person, possibly a Pacific Islander, wearing a sarong. Another jar depicts two men of Middle Eastern appearance carrying a pomegranate (*zakuro*). The pomegranate is a favorite recurring image in Kitagawa's later painting and ceramic work, representing universal truth and humanity, while also evoking a biblical allegory. The depiction of a pomegranate carried on a pole between two men can be read as referring to the story of the twelve men sent as spies by Moses to the land of Canaan. Their return, with two of the men carrying bunches of grapes, pomegranates, and figs, confirmed Canaan as the land of

hope. In Mexican Christian churches, pomegranates also appear frequently in reliefs carved in the unique Mexican regional baroque-style.

Blue and white porcelain, used as ordinary functional Mingei tableware, also has a long transnational history through trade and imitation, from its origin in China, through the variations found in Japan and Southeast Asia, to the copies made in European centers (e.g. Meissen, Delft, and Staffordshire). Asian porcelain stimulated artistic imagination and creation all over the world, as seen in the developments of Chinoiserie and Japonisme in Europe. And in Japan, *Nanbanjin* (literally, southern barbarians), or exotic Dutch, Portuguese, and black people, inspired the artistic imagination and became a special category of subject matter in porcelain and other media in the Edo period (1603-1868). Kitagawa's work seems to make reference to these historical and traditional aspects of blue and white porcelain, to which he adds contemporary ideas from his experience of Mexican and Japanese Mingei.

The unidentifiable devil-like image on another porcelain jar by Kitagawa is open to multiple interpretations (fig. 15.3). Perhaps this figure represents *kappa* (imaginary water creature, literally meaning "river child") from old Japanese beliefs and folklore, since Kitagawa chose *kappa*, from among the indigenous deities and folk mythic figures, for the motif of a group of late ink paintings. This imaginary water creature, resembling both a frog and a human being, is believed to cause mischievous trouble. *Kappa* images have traditionally been favored by literati ink painters and Nihonga or Japanese-style painters, but also appear in *manga* contemporary to Kitagawa. *Kappa* was even used as a political caricature in the leftist anarchist context by Ogawa Usen (1868-1938), a unique Japanese-style painter in Ushiku, Ibaraki prefecture, who combined its image with local scenery and folklore.⁴⁹ Therefore, *kappa* denotes mythic folklore, Japanese aesthetics, and grass-root political subversion. Alternatively, this devil image could be a *nahual* from Mexico, a witch-like human being with magical powers who turns into animal forms such as donkeys or jaguars. Whether this figure is a *kappa* or *nahual* (or an ambiguous cross-reference to both), such imaginary creatures are rooted in folklores that form the living art of Mingei, and represent the magical power of metamorphosis.

Such powers are cleverly visualized as the magical transformation of clay into a beautiful vase in Kitagawa's children's book *Magic Pot* (Mahafu no tsubo, 1942) (fig. 15.4). The title is written in *katakana*, as if transcribing a foreign word, but the word *mahafu*, if written in *hiragana* in classic Japanese, reads as *mahō*, meaning "magic," and thus, this title together with the text, which is mostly in *katakana*, is puzzling at first and gives an impression that one is being tricked. The story is about a boy's search for a replacement for an expensive vase, which he has broken in his middle-class home in Tokyo. The search leads him on an adventurous trip to Seto's pottery-making site, guided by a mysterious old man who has magical powers. Superficially, the story is educational, teaching children about Japan's indigenous ceramic industry and the hard labor of ordinary working people. But it also tells of the "magic" that transforms



15.4

Kitagawa Tamiji, *Magic Pot* (Mahafu no tsubo) (Tokyo: Sankyōsha, 1942). Collection of the Division of the International Library of Children's Literature, National Diet Library.

dirty clay into a beautiful and expensive pot. This educational pretense of this story was probably necessary to allow it to pass through the strict wartime censorship of all publications. Nonetheless, in the view of Yamanaka Hisashi, a writer of children's literature, this book, with exquisite illustrations, remains "a mysterious book from the war period, full of unanswerable questions but ultimately unclassifiable" as it does not include any of the nationalistic signs that characterized children's books during wartime, such as militaristic exhortation and political slogans like *hakkō ichiu* (the eight corners of the earth united under a single roof).⁵⁰ Thus, Kubo sees *Magic Pot* as Kitagawa's "magic," symbolizing human skills and labor as "humanistic resistance" against war.⁵¹

This magical power can also be interpreted as the people's power, even a subversive power. Two of Kitagawa's war period paintings form similarly complex layers of meaning through a network of literary references and reveal more about his political stance against oppression. The inscription "ASNO de ORO" (Golden Ass) on Kitagawa's oil on canvas *Ranchero's Song* (Ranchero no uta, 1938) refers to the novel by Lucius Apuleius from classical antiquity, *Metamorphoses* (or *The Golden Ass*). This



15.5

Kitagawa Tamiji, *The Earth* (Daichi), 1939, 112 x 162 cm. Collection and courtesy of the Niigata Prefectural Museum of Modern Art.

work alludes to the “magical power” of brainwashing in militarist Japan at the outset of the war. Meanwhile, another powerful painting suggestive of magic, *The Earth* (Daichi, 1939) bears the words “Noli Me Tangere” barely visible on the ground above the waist of the woman’s body to the right of her arm (fig. 15.5). The phrase “Noli Me Tangere” (do not touch me) refers not only to the biblical miracle in the Gospel of St. John where the resurrected Christ appears to Mary Magdalen, but also to the highly significant and controversial novel by Filipino author José Rizal, which includes anti-colonial statements about the Philippines under Spain.⁵²

The unveiling of Rizal’s bust at the Plaza Mexico-Filipinas in Acapulco in November 2011, commemorating the Manila-Acapulco galleons’ colonial trade relations over 250 years and the 150th anniversary of Rizal’s birth, symbolizes the anti-colonial solidarity shared by these two countries. Mexico was much closer to the heart of artists in Asia than geographical distance suggests. Recent studies, such as that by Alison Carroll, reveal that the Mexican muralist movement had a great impact in China, Java, India, and particularly the Philippines from the 1930s to the 1950s. Carroll attributes

this impact to “the confidence that the then-colonized artists in Asia gained from the internationally recognized achievements of the non-European, non-Caucasian Mexicans, and the Mexican style became enmeshed with the prevailing political expression in Asia.”⁵³ Kitagawa witnessed muralism in Mexico, America, and Asia, and while his artistic intention may have appeared slightly alien in Japan’s context, in the wider picture of Asia in relation to Mexico it is clear that he was not isolated and that his work reflected a minor transnational art movement.

Kitagawa advanced this colonial solidarity through his narration of Mexico’s history as three hundred years of struggle and revolt against the white Spanish by the oppressed non-whites. He also described how the Mexicans understood Asia as sharing “our common problem,” that is, “the conflict between the non-whites and whites”⁵⁴ at the time of the Asian–African Conference held in Bandung, a landmark event proclaimed by the host, President Sukarno of Indonesia, as “the first intercontinental conference of coloured peoples in the history of mankind.”⁵⁵ These comments show Kitagawa’s urge to revitalize solidarities among “minor” countries in the “Third World” by connecting his historical and contemporary postcolonial political concerns. The use of “layers of symbolism” was a strategy for creating art, which he believed “should excite the human mind, provide the power to resist oppression, and provide the virtue that will guide the way for victory.”⁵⁶ Therefore, Kitagawa’s layering of multiple references to images and symbols in this ambiguous space characterizes his transnational art. Frequently frustrated by conventional and politically passive Japanese attitudes, Kitagawa was also hoping for a mini revolution in Japan when he supported the Japanese Communist Party.⁵⁷ His political ideas correspond with those of Fanon, who saw black artists’ work “at the very heart of the liberation struggle these countries are waging” and the characteristic signs of “new stimulus” emerging in contemporary handicrafts that represented a significant aspect of the colonized people’s anti-colonial subjectivity.⁵⁸

Conclusion

This article has traced Kitagawa Tamiji’s trajectory of interest in people’s art, which crystallized through his transnational experience as both a world citizen and a regionalist. For Kitagawa, people’s art was a living art that arose from the daily local activities and the characteristics of local people and formed a national and local cultural identity. Once he returned to Japan, his pursuits intersected with the Japanese Mingei movement, but developed uniquely through his chosen milieu of local Seto potters and pottery as well as his exploration of clay and ceramic art.

Kitagawa’s work expressed his interest in magical powers, miracles, and metamorphoses combined with literary associations. His metamorphosed alter ego of the grasshopper (*batta*)—and perhaps what was its variant, the *kappa* or *nahual*—represents the explosive energy of humanity and people’s power. This power also signifies the resistance of the people to any kind of oppression and exploitation, whether colonialism,

fascism, or capitalism. Kitagawa celebrated this “people power” by layering transnational references and meanings through a uniquely synthesized visual language found in people’s art. It is this aspect of Mingei, which contains the subversive people’s power that makes Kitagawa’s art unique and different from that of the Mingei movement itself.

Kitagawa’s work is thus a highly useful case study for Lionnet and Shih’s idea of minor transnationalism. Traveling from the Caribbean Martinique to Algeria via France, Fanon linked his anti-colonial ideas through one colonized minor location to another and shared the sense of struggle, horizontally. He articulated “oppression” and the white colonialists’ violation of the black colonized humanity and culture in this minor horizontal view, and his idea was inspired by and applied to the wider non-black political struggles for independence and the reclaiming of autonomy and subjectivity. Kitagawa connects the idea of people’s art in Mexico and Japan with that of the people’s subversive power under oppression. His life was characterized by often being on the side of the opposition and an alternative to the main central authority. This also applies to the locations with which he associated himself (for example, Mexico not Paris, the Outdoor Painting School not the Academy of San Carlos, Seto not Tokyo). This intentional distancing from various cultural centers seems to have provided freedom, space, and independence from the condescending patronage of the powerful, and allowed him to be close to the oppressed. Unlike his friends Fujita and Kuniyoshi, Kitagawa did not seem to enjoy, nor try to gain the attentions of, the mainstream. From this opposition camp, he tapped different positions of “resistance,” as in the way he links his disguised and quiet subjective resistance to militarist Japan, with historical resistance to Spanish colonialism that extended beyond Mexico and into Rizal’s Philippines.

Kitagawa was not Fanon, nor was Japan a colonized country, yet he witnessed Mexico’s and Japan’s struggles to find their own “modernity” and “cultural identity” in their indigenous art of the people in the shadow of Euro-American powers. The quiet and creative political subversion in his work is not as radical as Fanon’s, but comparably unique. Furthermore, in 1960 Kitagawa discussed his interest in the Near and Middle East as cultures “where the tradition of their civilization still remains in their blood, thus [they] are unaffected by modernization despite colonization by British and French. That situation is what I want to see with my own eyes.”⁵⁹ This statement indicates the limitless extension of the scope of Kitagawa’s minor transnationalism. His people’s art is his subjectivity—his stance as an ordinary worker resisting any form of oppression that interconnects Mexico and Japan and, furthermore, connects with those in minor locations throughout the rest of the world.

Notes

This article developed from a paper presented at the symposium “Seki Sano and Kitagawa Tamiji: Japanese Artists in Mexico in the 1920s–1960s” at El Centro de Investigación Teatral Rodolfo Usigli, El Colegio de México (November 2012). I would like to thank Murata Masahiro (The Aichi Prefectural Museum of Art) and Yamada Satoshi and Takeba Jō (The Nagoya City Museum of Art) for facilitating my research on Kitagawa during a research trip in 2005. I am particularly indebted to Murata, who generously shared his materials collected in Japan, New York, and Mexico, and introduced me to key people working on Kitagawa. Kikuchi Yuka, then a graduate student of Nagoya University, and the late Asakawa Yukio also provided me with valuable information on Kitagawa. I am also grateful to Masaki Katō (Cultural Division of Seto City) for arranging my visit to Kitagawa’s studio.

1.

There is no one simple term that Kitagawa uses to describe his idea of people’s art. He explained it by using various metaphors such as *batta no tetsugaku* and *kappa* and *nahual* representing the people’s power, and most importantly by using the term *mingei*, which is Yanagi Sōetsu’s invented neology. However, Kitagawa uses it very differently in the transnational context of America, Mexico and Japan as I discuss throughout this article.

2.

Kitagawa Tamiji, *Batta no tetsugaku=Aphorism: Kitagawa Tamiji hangashū* (Batta Narrates Aphorism: Original Etchings and Aphorisms by Tamiji Kitagawa [sic.]) (Tokyo: UNAC Tokyo, 1974).

3.

Kitagawa Tamiji, *Roba no tawagoto: Kitagawa Tamiji zuihitsu* (Trivial

Talk by a Donkey: Collected Essays by Kitagawa Tamiji) (Nagoya: Nichidō Garō, 1983), 232.

4.

Most of Kitagawa’s essays are included in *Roba no tawagoto* (Trivial Talk by a Donkey, 1983), *E o kaku kodomotachi* (The Children Who Paint, 1952), *Kitagawa Tamiji: Mekishiko no seishun jūgonen o Indian to tomo ni* (Kitagawa Tamiji: My Youth in Mexico Spending Fifteen Years with the Indians, 2002), *Bijutsu kyōiku to yūtopia* (Art Education and Utopia, 1969) and *Kubo Sadajirō bijutsu no sekai: Kitagawa Tamiji* (Kubo Sadajirō’s World of Art: Kitagawa Tamiji, 1984). The Kitagawa Tamiji exhibition catalogue compiled by Murata Masahiro at the time of Kitagawa’s major retrospective traveling exhibition, organized by Aichi Prefectural Museum of Art in 1996–97, is the ultimate source for information about Kitagawa and his artwork. There are also postgraduate theses on Kitagawa, including Tsuzuki Mutsumi’s M.A. thesis: “A Study of Tamiji Kitagawa’s View on Art Education” (Aichi University of Education, 2004) and Kikuchi Yuka’s Ph.D. thesis “Kitagawa Tamiji kenkyū: 1936 nen kara 1938 nen ni oeru ‘Hekiga’ teki Taburō seisaku ni tsuite” (A Study of Kitagawa Tamiji: Mural-style Paintings from 1936 to 1938) (Nagoya University Graduate School, 2005).

5.

Francoise Lionnet and Shu-mei Shih, eds., *Minor Transnationalism* (Durham, North Carolina, and London: Duke University Press, 2005), 5–6.

6.

Murata Masahiro, Miyamoto Takaaki and Kinoshita Kyōko, “Nyū Yōku āto shūdentsu rīgu ni mananda Nihonjin bijutsuka tachi” (Japanese Artists Who Studied at the New York Students

League), in *Kajima bijutsu kenkyū* (Kajima Journal of Art Studies), 16 (1999) provides information on the Japanese students registered with the school and the courses they took.

7.

Kubo Sadajirō, *Kitagawa Tamiji* (Tokyo: Sōbunsha, 1984), 125.

8.

Ibid., 128.

9.

Kitagawa writes vivid details of his day-to-day life and the trials and errors he experienced in his experiments at the schools in Tlalpam and Taxco in *E o kaku kodomotachi: Mekishiko no omoide* (1952) (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2000).

10.

For the relation between these movements, see Karen Cordero Reiman, “Constructing a Modern Mexican Art, 1910–1940,” in James Oles ed., *South of the Border: Mexico in the American Imagination 1914–1947* (Washington and London: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1993).

11.

Kitagawa, *E o kaku kodomotachi: Kitagawa, “Watashi no bijutsu kyōiku”* (1938), in *Bijutsu kyōiku to yūtopia* (Art Education and Utopia) (Tokyo: Sōgensha, 1969), 35.

12.

Mexico broke off diplomatic relations with Japan in 1941 at the outbreak of the war.

13.

Although part of the establishment by the 1930s, Nikakai, founded in 1914, was originally a notable society of progressive artists who positioned themselves against the Bunten (Ministry of Education Fine Arts Exhibition), the official national salon in Japan. After Kitagawa won his place with the Nikakai, he wanted to gain membership in the Bunten, but was told by Fujita to stay with the Nikakai so he could be

in the opposition camp, since “real artists are born from the opposition.” Kitagawa Tamiji, “Boku no Nikakai” (1970), in *Roba no tawagoto* (Trivial Talk by a Donkey), 191.

14. Kubo, *Kitagawa Tamiji*, 39.

15. Ibid.

16. Ibid., 216.

17. Kubo Sadaijirō, “Hōmon-Kitagawa Tamiji” (Visiting Kitagawa Tamiji), *Bijutsu techō* (Art Notebook), no. 124 (1957): 76.

18. For Japan’s reception of these ideas and the idea of a “people’s art,” see Yuko Kikuchi and Toshio Watanabe, *Ruskin in Japan 1890–1940: Nature for Art, Art for Life* (Tokyo: Cogito, 1997).

19. For further discussion on modernity and “Japaneseness” in the Mingei movement, see Yuko Kikuchi, *Japanese Modernisation and Mingei Theory: Cultural Nationalism and Oriental Orientalism* (London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2004).

20. Kitagawa Tamiji, “Hahanri e no tabi” (A Trip to Hahanri), *Kobijutsu* (Antique), 13–3 (1943): 90. Hamada had already been a regular visitor to the Tsuboya pottery village in Okinawa since his stay as a resident artist in 1925, and in Korea since 1936. The date of Kitagawa’s visit in 1941 is based on Asakawa Yukio’s recollection. Hahanri is a small scenic pottery village in Chollanamdo province in the south of South Korea. Yanagi’s group “discovered” this pottery hidden deep in the valley of Gokseong during their trip in 1938 and was fascinated by the villagers’ work. Yanagi Sōetsu, “Zenra kikō” (A Travelogue to Chollanamdo), in *Yanagi Sōetsu zenshū* (Collected Works of Yanagi Sōetsu), vol. 6 (Tokyo: Chikuma

Shobō, 1981), 383–84.

21. Kitagawa Tamiji, “Setomono zuisō” (An Essay on Pottery, 1965), in *Roba no tawagoto* (Trivial Talk by a Donkey), 94–97; Kitagawa, “Boku no geijutsuron (1)” (My Theory of Art, 1969), in *Ibid.*, 151–52.

22. Kitagawa Tamiji, “Mekishiko no mingei” (Mexico’s Mingei), *Gekkan mingei* (Monthly Journal of Mingei) (August 1941): 28–35.

23. Kitagawa, “Setomono zuisō” (An Essay on Pottery) 97.

24. A sarape is like a blanket poncho with a hole for the head, worn by men.

25. Kitagawa Tamiji, “Mekishiko no mingei (Mexico’s Mingei)” *Chūbu Nihon shinbun* (The Central Japan Newspaper) (20 November 1956); Kitagawa, “Setomono zuisō” (An Essay on Pottery).

26. Kuraya Mika, “Kuniyoshi no fushigina kūkan” (The Wonderous Space Created by Kuniyoshi), in *Yasuo Kuniyoshi*, exhibition catalogue (Tokyo: The National Museum of Modern Art, 2004), 21–26.

27. James Oles ed., *South of the Border: Mexico in the American Imagination 1914–1947* (Washington and London: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1993), 113.

28. Kitagawa, “Mekishiko no mingei” (Mexico’s Mingei); Kitagawa Tamiji, “Mingei no kuni Mekishiko” (Mexico—A Country of Mingei) *Shumi no kai* (A Society of Taste) (February 1957).

29. Kitagawa, “Mingei no kuni Mekishiko” (Mexico—A Country of Mingei) 1957.

30. “Mekishiko no ‘Setomono’: Kitagawa

Gahaku no omiyage todoku” (The Arrival of Painter Kitagawa’s Souvenirs), *Mainichi shinbun* (The Mainichi Daily News) (25 August 1956).

31. For further information about Mingei theory and its criteria, see Kikuchi, *Japanese Modernisation and Mingei Theory*, 53–59.

32. Some images of the current state of Kitagawa’s studio in Yasudo-chō, Seto, which opens to the public twice a year in spring and autumn, can be found on the following blogs. http://blogs.yahoo.co.jp/under_the_shiny_sky/61540067.html and http://blog.goo.ne.jp/sunflower_red/e/04381f614d01a7e7049249528335702f (accessed on 9 June 2013).

33. Author’s conversation with Asakawa Yukio in 2005.

34. Kubo, *Kitagawa Tamiji*, 244.

35. In response to the question, “What’s your view on techniques and materials of *Nihonga*,” Kitagawa answered in a curious and ambiguous manner, “You will know if you provide Western-style painters with [*Nihonga* painters’] materials such as Japanese *gosenshi* paper, sheep hair brush, and mineral pigments for the next five years; it will become obvious without any word.” He seems to imply that *Nihonga* is defined neither by technique nor materials, but for him it is obvious—an expression of “Japaneseness” that is rooted deeply in Japanese culture. Kitagawa Tamiji, “Nihon o kō kangaeru” (My Views on Japan), *Sansai* (Tricolor) (November 1967): 106.

36. Masayo Duus, *Isamu Noguchi: shukumei no ekkyōsha, ge* (Part 2) (Tokyo: Kōdansha, 2000), 23. For the English version of this book, see Masayo Duus, *The Life of Isamu Noguchi: Journey without Borders*, trans.

Peter Duss (Princeton: University of Princeton Press, 2004). Hasegawa Saburō's interest in *Ōtsue* might be also linked to Kitagawa's interest through Noguchi.

37.

Takuya Kida, "Japanese Crafts and Cultural Exchange with the USA in the 1950s: Soft Power and John D. Rockefeller III during the Cold War," *Journal of Design History*, vol. 25, no. 4 (2012): 379–99; Yuko Kikuchi, "Russel Wright and Japan: Bridging Japonisme and Good Design through Craft Design," *Journal of Modern Craft*, vol. 1, no. 3 (2008): 357–82.

38.

The idea of "soft power" is developed by Joseph S. Nye Jr. in *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics* (New York: Public Affairs, 2004).

39.

"Kōgei kyōiku saikentō no hitsuyō" (The Need to Review Craft Education), *Bijutsu techō* (Art Notebook), no. 4 (1959): 87.

40.

His ceramic mosaic mural works include *Peace and Art* for CBC (Chūbu Broadcasting Center, 1959); *Clay, Mountain and Clay Digger, Potter's Wheel, and Climbing Kilns*, for the Seto Civic Center (Currently the Setogura Museum, 1959); *Tomato no yurai* (The Origin of the Tomato) for Kagome (a tomato ketchup company, 1961); and *Muchi to eichi* (Ignorance and Wisdom) and *Chishiki no shōri* (The Victory of Knowledge, 1970) for the Seto City library.

41.

Kitagawa Tamiji, "Tōga o kaku no ki" (Notes on Ceramic Painting, 1959), in Kitagawa, *Roba no tawagoto*, 39.

42.

Kitagawa Tamiji, "Boku to iro enogu" (Color Paints and Me, 1970), in *Roba no tawagoto*, 180–3.

43.

Itō Ihei's studio is now called Seto Maruchi Media Denshō Kōgei Kan—

Seto Sometsuke Kenshūjo (Seto Municipal Center of Multimedia and Traditional Ceramics—Institute of Seto Blue and White Ceramics).

44.

Author's interview with Emiko Moriyama on 19 December 2012.

45.

Bert Winther-Tamaki, "The Ceramic Art of Isamu Noguchi: A Close Embrace of the Earth," in *Isamu Noguchi and Modern Japanese Ceramics* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003).

46.

The Oriental Decorative Ceramic Sculpture Institute was established in October 1946 in Seto by Hokkaidō Kōnō Kōsha (later Yukijirushi) to manufacture something similar to ceramic sculptural work made in Sèvres, France, but it was also a project that sought to create a craft village for part-time craftsmen and farmers. Numata Kazumasa was invited to be the first director of this Institute. The main works designed by Numata are small animals, but the institute also produced plates, candle holders, ash trays, cups, and decorative wall hanging objects for the occupation forces. Isamu Noguchi created some twenty terracotta works at this Institute during a week in July of 1950, exhibiting them in Tokyo in autumn of the same year. For the detailed history of the Oriental Decorative Ceramic Sculpture Institute, see Nakano Yasuhiro, "Orientaru Tōchō Kenkyūjo to sakkatachi" (The Oriental Decorative Ceramic Sculpture Institute and the Artists), *Kyōdo bijutsu* (Provincial Art) (*jō*, 28: 1–3), (*chū*, 29: 1–3); (*ge*, 30: 1–4), 1989; and "Numata Kazumasa no chōkokuron" (Numata Kazumasa's Ideas on Sculpture), on the website of Nihon Tōchō Kai's website http://www.nihontouchoukai.org/history_of_touchou.html (accessed on 9 June 2013).

47.

Kubo, *Kitagawa Tamiji*, 116–17.

48.

Ibid., 116.

49.

Ogawa Usen, nicknamed "Kappa no Usen" (Usen the Kappa Painter), contributed Nanga-style ink painting illustrations to Socialist magazines such as *Heimin shinbun* (The Commoner's Newspaper) and *Kaben* (A Whip of Flame) to show his support in the early twentieth century. See Fujimoto Yōko, "Ogawa Usen," in *Ogawa Usen: Selected Works from the Collection of the Ibaraki Prefectural Museum of Modern Art* (Mito: Ibaraki Prefectural Museum of Modern Art, 1998).

50.

Yamanaka Hisashi, "Kitagawa Tamiji no ehon" (Kitagawa Tamiji's Illustrated Book for Children), *Haha no tomo* (Friends of Mothers) 558 (1999): 55–58.

51.

Kubo, *Kitagawa Tamiji*, 152.

52.

Since its original publication in Spanish in Berlin in 1887, it has been translated into many languages. The English translation of *Noli Me Tangere*, titled *The Lost Eden*, was published in the United States in 1961. It was translated by Leon Ma Guerro (Philippine Ambassador to the United Kingdom) with an introduction by James Michener, an American novelist and a collector of Japanese prints during the cold war.

53.

Alison Carroll, "East and West? A Different Story: The Impact of Mexico on 20th Century Asian Art," *Art Monthly Australia* 213 (2008): 11.

54.

Kitagawa Tamiji, *Kitagawa Tamiji: Mekishiko no seishun jūgonen o Indian to tomoni* (Kitagawa Tamiji: My Youth in Mexico Spending Fifteen Years with the Indians) 220–2.

55.

President Sukarno's opening speech, in Kweku Ampiah, *The Political and*

Moral Imperatives of the Bandung Conference of 1955 (Folkstone: Global Oriental, 2007), 233.

56.

Kitagawa Tamiji, “Boku no geijutsu Ron—2” (My Theory of Art), in Kitagawa, *Roba no tawagoto* (Trivial Talk by a Donkey), 153.

57.

On a number of occasions, Kitagawa expressed his frustration about the

Japanese people. He believed they were too conventional, yielding easily to unreasonable authoritative power by sacrificing their freedom, and did not express resistance to authority as did the Mexicans. Kitagawa, *Roba no tawagoto* (Trivial Talk by a Donkey), 22–3, 192; Kitagawa Tamiji, “Kyōsantō ni kitaisuru” (Hope for the Communist Party) *Akahata* (Red Flag) (27 June 1965).

58.

Franz Fanon, “On National Culture,” in *The Wretched of the Earth* (New York: Grove Press, 2004), 168, 175.

59.

“Kitagawa Tamiji-shi no chikagoro” (Recent News from Mr. Kitagawa Tamiji), *Asahi shinbun* (The Asahi Newspaper) (9 April 1960).
