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**The context of design cultural identity in a three way positioning of Occident-Japan-Orient and the discourse of ‘everydayness’**

The notion of ‘Japaneseness’ is intrinsic to Japan’s modernity in design. It developed through its encounter with the Euroamerican gaze on Japanese crafts through export trade, and was constructed on the binary identity formation of ‘Occident’ vs. ‘Orient’. The idea for modern design was sought in the direction of western approved ‘Japaneseness’ as demonstrated by foreign advisors such as Bruno Taut who praised the artistic integrity and functional quality of Japanese everyday crafts.[[1]](#endnote-1) **(Fig. 2)** However, this binary design discourse became complicated as Japan gradually expanded its empire in Asia. In the late 1930s until 1945, the development of daily household products for Japanese residents in Manchuria and their export for the market of Asia became an important intensive national agenda. During the course of this, the notion of ‘Japaneseness’ was contested by different Orients within the empire, and found it to be in need of being redefined within the three way positioning of Occident-Japan-multiple Orients. My interest is in investigating how ‘Japaneseness’ in design was discussed in the complex colonial context, and how it promoted Japanese modernity. The examples I draw upon here are daily household crafts produced under the Japanese empire - pottery and chairs in Manchuria where I discuss the relation between the modern design discourse of ‘Japaneseness’ with the idea of ‘everydayness’. ‘Everyday’ has become a field of critical study, and Ben Highmore, for example, identified ‘everyday’ as being globally about the question of the culture of modernity,[[2]](#endnote-2) while at the micro local level of Japan, scholars such as Harry Harootunian, Stephan Vlastos and Marilyn Ivy discussed how the discourse of ‘everyday’ shared with that of global modernity, but also was distinctive in the way that it led to a Japanese modern ideology that was nationally embraced.[[3]](#endnote-3) My intension is in advancing the discussion on ‘everyday’ in the specific context of East Asia, through my study of design under Japan’s empire.

**Contested ‘Japaneseness’ and design discourses: national identity surrounding daily household products in the Japanese empire**

The new Japanese empire was a space imbued with a complex mixture of the exotic and the alien, but also with a sense of sharing a common history. (**Fig. 3**) The Northeast of China comprises a multi-racial international culture of Manchus, Han Chinese, Mongolians, Koreans and Russians. The countryside of Manchukuo is characterised as a new frontier for simple peasant life, while it also borders with Beijing, the capital of the Oriental civilisation that is also Japan’s revered cultural root.

During the Second World War, the elusive idea of ‘Japaneseness’ captivated the national psyche. The famous debate on ‘overcoming modern’ that took place in Tokyo in 1942 among notable intellectuals intensified its war-time cultural discourse of overcoming westernisation by restoring Japanese tradition and spirit[[4]](#endnote-4). The experts in design and industry also passionately discussed ‘Japaneseness’ as a crucial issue, in particular how to modernize and universalize the idea of ‘Japaneseness’ under Japan’s ‘New Order’[[5]](#endnote-5) This debate was also fuelled by the national urgency to increase self-sufficiency in Japan and Japan’s empire when it’s experiencing lack of raw materials and shortage of everyday products as a result of diminishing international trade relations. ‘Everydayness’ was repetitively articulated in this desperate situation.[[6]](#endnote-6)

Designers such as Nishikawa Tomotake and Koike Shinji were dispatched from the national institute of design, Kōgei Shidōsho (Industrial Arts Research Institute: IARI) to different regions of the Japanese empire and were expected to find solutions to this problem.(**Fig. 4**) They reported their discovery of superiority in ‘sturdiness’, ‘universality’ and ‘pragmatism’ in Chinese design[[7]](#endnote-7) and standardisation based on the functionality of *nichiyō zakki/nichiyō hin* (daily utilitarian household product)[[8]](#endnote-8) is in line with the European Modernist ideal whereby ‘form follows function’ and design for mass consumers. This idea of standardisation was regarded as useful for designing daily products for the 520,000 Japanese residents[[9]](#endnote-9) in Manchukuo as well as for designing products for the nation at war. The IARI’s director, Kunii Kitarō, argues how this could not only replace products imported from Euroamerica, but also construct the East Asian standard for daily household products (*seikatsu yōhin*)with ‘function and beauty’ informed by a ‘modern scientific knowledge’.[[10]](#endnote-10)

**Example 1: The Ceramic Industry in Manchukuo: Manchuria Ceramic Company, Modern standardized Oriental tableware for the Japanese residents**

Against these newly emerging discussions on the design discourse of ‘Japaneseness’ in everyday necessity products, I would like to offer my first case study on the ceramic industry in Manchukuo. The Manchuria Ceramic Company (満州陶磁器株式会社) in jiutai (九台) in Jilin (吉林) province in the north, was established in 1939 fully backed by the government to manufacture tableware mainly for Japanese residents. They made use of the nearby existing traditional Xinglongshan（兴隆山）pottery (famous for bowls) and gangyao (缸窑) pottery (famous for jars), both of which had a history dating back more than 300 years.[[11]](#endnote-11) The company also introduced a mechanized production system by bringing in machines and ceramic engineers from Seto, the ceramic centre of Japan to enable quantity production. **(Fig. 5)**

Before this national venture, the Central Research Institute Ceramic Division of the South Manchurian Railway Company (南満州鉄道株式会社) which was established earlier in 1908 in Dalian and its privatized company Dàhuá yáo yè gong sī（大華窯業公司、1920設) manufactured tableware. Komori Shinobu was the head of the Ceramic Research Institute until 1921 and also appears to be involved in this privatized company. Before he went to Dalian, he worked at the Kyoto Ceramic Research Institute where he taught scientific knowledge of glazes to the likes of Kawai Kanjirō and Hamada Shōji who later became key figures in the Mingei movement. (**Fig. 6)** Komori’s research connects the Kyoto Ceramic Research Institute and the Manchukuo’s imperial business as well as the Mingei artists under the name of scientific research on how to recreate the classical Chinese ceramic glazes.[[12]](#endnote-12) Given the urgent need for developing modern tableware, this research was applied to the project which saw the ‘orientalisation of western tablewares’. In this way the Asian tradition was discovered through scientific methods and technology in order to create modern Oriental ceramic wares for everyday use.

It was not only through Komori’s link with Hamada and Kawai, that the Mingei movement’s involvement in Manchuria became significant. The Mingei or folkcrafts movement led by Yanagi Sōetsu was influential modern movement in its discovery and aestheticisation of daily ‘folkcrafts’. It reached a maturity in mainland Japan by the mid-1930s and developed further in Japan’s empire. As you have already heard in Yasuko Suga’s paper, Yoshida Shōya was the key figure. An elite medical doctor who worked first as an army surgeon, then a civilian living in Beijing, and a trusted friend of Yanagi Sōetsu and Bernard Leach,[[13]](#endnote-13) facilitated the establishment of various colonial organisations which acted as guardians of Chinese folkcrafts. [[14]](#endnote-14) **(Fig. 7)** He passionately believed this Japan’s mission on preservation[[15]](#endnote-15) but also initiated and directed a number of new craft making schemes for ‘self-sufficiency’ in villages. The newly designed crafts produced from these projects including furniture, pottery, embroidered accessories, clothes and woven textiles were sold at the ‘Kahoku Seikatsu Kōgei Ten’ (華北生活工芸店North China Household Crafts Shop) and exhibited in China and Japan.[[16]](#endnote-16) He urged Japanese customers to use local Chinese folkcrafts carefully chosen with modern Japanese knowledge. This idea of Japanese cultured life in a selective adoption of Chinese-style, is well presented through an illustration showing his family dinner table using folk country ware at his home in Beijing.[[17]](#endnote-17) **(Fig. 8)** Unlike *Jingdezheng*, an internationally acknowledged ceramic industry centre for many centuries, these potteries in Northeast China are marginal country kilns that produce lower grade pottery, not for the refined taste. However, these potteries excited the Mingei activists who found in these the acquired taste for ‘shibusa’, the Japanese traditional tea aesthetic’[[18]](#endnote-18) that also corresponds with Mingei taste —natural, rough, simple colour and design. The Japanese selective appropriation and translation of Chinese pre-modern folk tradition, in line with the aesthetic of Japanese tea created a new integrated discourse of cultural ‘Orient’ through everyday objects.

These pots were also valued for the way they salvaged the pure uncontaminated ‘Chineseness’ of Chinese people. Yoshida says, the ‘potteries in the Northeast of China are still in a sound state…unaffected by western invasion, they still remain pure and are genuinely making household products for peasants and lower class people’.[[19]](#endnote-19) While he argues that unpolluted pure ‘Chineseness’ is something which Japan should restore, he also stresses an overall Oriental superiority represented by this pure ‘Chineseness’ in his intriguing comments on superior functional beauty of Chinese wok over western frying pan.[[20]](#endnote-20)

As part of the Mingei mission sent by Yanagi in 1943, two potters Kawai Takeichi and Ueda Kōji stayed at Xinglongshan pottery and developed approximately 500 types of standard tableware for the nation (*kokumin shokki*). **(Fig. 9)** They also developed various jars, containers and charcoal *hibachi* (Japanese-style heater/hand-warmer) at the Ganyao pottery. Although produced in large quantities using mass production techniques such as moulds in automation, the Xinlongshan pottery retained its original folk pottery style that is characterised by hand painted flowers and plants, in cobalt. In this way they satisfied the Mingei taste. These bowls that were used by the Manchurian Railway Company and are collected in their museum in Dalian appear to be these new products made by the Manchuria Ceramic Company which are restyled products of original Xinlongshan bowls with improved underglazed flower patterns in blue, following the suggestions by the Mingei promoters such as Yoshida. [[21]](#endnote-21)

Tonomura Kichinosuke states, ‘the future will be determined by the trust and joy from the foundation of life that is *nichiyō kōgeihin* (daily household crafts) rooted in reality of life’ and that delivers ‘healthiness and simplicity’. [[22]](#endnote-22) The Mingei movement managed to combine the idea of ‘everyday’, the modern design ideal of functional beauty, with the Mingei aesthetic of ‘healthiness’ and ‘simplicity’ in a politically charged context. Thus, ‘everyday’ became the characteristic of modernity that reveals a temporal and spatial consciousness whereby ‘now’ and ‘newness’ is articulated by occupied-China’s folk crafts. In turn, these everyday objects points to uncontaminated-China’s past but also present as they have been uncovered by modern Japan’s Mingei aesthetic.

**Example 2: Chinese inspired ‘modernity and ‘Japaneseness’ in Chairs and interior design/arrangement**

What we can see here in this site of ‘everyday’ is a transformation of ‘Japaneseness’ through its encounter with China under Japan’s empire, and creative inspiration for everyday design. I would like to draw upon another example that illustrates hybrid creative design of chairs and interior design/arrangement.

Chairs were introduced in modern Japan as a symbol of western modernity, and had been the focal point for the Japanese adoption of western culture and lifestyle since the Meiji Restoration. In the 1920s, it became the most visible government-led design reform movement called *seikatsu* *kaizen* *undō* (Daily Life Improvement movement). A progressive designer such as Kogue Joichi, spearheaded this design movement, and promoted his idea of ‘Japanization of Western-style furniture’. **(Fig. 10)** Modernity of chairs for Japanese is a complex issue. Initially chairs represented western modernity, however, the encounter with China transformed the modernity discourse of chairs. Unlike Japan and Korea, China did have a tradition of chairs within the Orient. Thus, Chinese furniture was highly inspirational for Japanese designers such as Kogure. When he was sent to a Sino-Japanese venture - Andong wood work company (安東木工廠)[[23]](#endnote-23) in Manchuria in 1914, he pointed out that Chinese people’s chair-sitting lifestyle was more modern than that of the Japanese, and noted the Chinese people’s sound judgement in matters of quality and price.[[24]](#endnote-24) The modernity of Taiwanese bamboo chairs was a further twist, as it was first authorised by westerners such as by Charlotte Perriand who used Taiwanese bamboo stools for her exhibition in Japan in 1941. **(Fig. 11)** In chorusing with Toyoguchi Kappei, chief designer of furniture at IARI who was sent to Taiwan in 1943 and an admirer of Perriand’s use of Taiwanese bamboo,[[25]](#endnote-25) almost all Japanese designers started to propose that Chinese and Taiwanese design should be set as guiding principles for improving Japanese design. Japanese designers found the idea of ‘standardisation’ that they first learned as a German modernist concept was discovered to be also a Chinese idea. It was a revelation that the Orient could also lay claim to this advanced modernity. They also realised that there was much to learn about technical aspects from Chinese design. By introducing design drawings and comments sent by his designer colleague ‘Mr K’ (quite likely to be Koide Yūzō) from war zones in Northeast China, Nishikawa Tomotake comments on the typically Chinese technique − a piece of wood and bamboo is seamlessly connecting bodies and legs in both Chinese wooden chairs and bamboo chairs without using nails.[[26]](#endnote-26) Nishikawa also comments that the chaise longue, like this, typically exists in the households of every commoner in China, as if to imply a discrediting of the chaise longue as the iconic example of the high modernist. **(Fig. 12)** The material bamboo, which is the main material for furniture in Taiwan but didn’t exist in Manchuria and northeast China, excited many Japanese designers to express ‘Orientalness’ and experiment in Chinese techniques. This set of furniture designed by Kawai Kanjirō, made by Taiwanese craftsmen using Kyoto bamboo is a typical example of such experiments.[[27]](#endnote-27) **(Fig. 13)**

The creation of ‘Oriental’ style chairs became the goal of Japanese designers and in effect this produced a hybrid design space. Nishikawa curiously observed hybridity of the lifestyle of Japanese residents in Manchuria that presented a modern alternative to the totally coordinated western-style space with western furniture. One could find a room with Chinese tables and chairs, and in the other *tatami* mat room with direct seating centred around a *hibachi* (Japanese-style heater/hand-warmer) or *kotatsu* (foot warmer under the table), and maybe Russian-style stove *pechka* at the corner of the room. **(Fig. 14)** Akita Mokkō, a furniture manufacturer who started the Thonet-style bent furniture in 1910 in Japan also had a business in Dalian selling luxury western-style chairs for the wealthy residents in Manchukuo, [[28]](#endnote-28) but they were also selling Thonet *kotatsu* in 1938 probably to support the needs of Japanese residents who had a hybrid lifestyle. **(Fig. 15)** Yoshida Shōya’s house in Beijing is also in hybrid living style. This shows the family’s living space, his wife in a kimono sitting on a raised *tatami* mat and his daughter in a Chinese dress siting on that bench, and Yoshida-designed Oriental-style chairs are place in the lounge. Interesting hybridity can be seen in the variety of Yoshida’s Oriental-style chairs,[[29]](#endnote-29) and its trajectory can be traced in this larger map starting with the iconic Bauhaus aluminium tubular chair (**Fig. 16**), Alvar Aalto’s adaptation of that in wood, and then Toyoguchi’s adaptation of that in bamboo.[[30]](#endnote-30)

The most articulate ‘Oriental’ and ‘Greater-Asian’ chairs were designed by Kenmochi Isamu, Nishikawa’s colleague at IARI. **(Fig. 17)** As I’ve discussed elsewhere, he classified western chairs as ‘kairaku gata’ (pleasure-type) which, because of their flexible back design, created comfort and offered pleasure in seating that ultimately makes people lazy, while, Oriental chairs (i.e. Chinese chairs) were classified as ‘kugyōgata’ (ascetic-type) and were designed ‘to restrict comfortable pleasure seating to the point of just one step before pain.’[[31]](#endnote-31) His project aimed to create the latter type of Oriental chairs with something like these examples from 1950 and 1964 manufactured by Akita Mokkō which was awarded the good design prize. These Oriental-style chairs, which evolved into Japanese-style or ‘Japanese modern’ chairs in the 1950s-60s, are typically of low height and were intended for putting onto a *tatami* mat. **(Fig. 18)**

**Conclusion (Fig. 19)**

These case studies on design within Japan’s empire supports the view that the idea of ‘everyday’, modernity and imperialism are inter-twined.

Firstly, the idea of ‘everyday’ formed imperial economy in occupied Manchukuo where self-sufficiency of ‘Seikatsu Yōhin’ (daily household products) was an urgent need due to the shortage of supply during the wartime. Design for ‘everyday’ is embedded in imperial projects.

Secondly, the idea of ‘everyday’ in design is derived from modern and democratic values in western design, and associated with concepts such as standardisation, function, scientific and technological innovation and affordability. This initial appraisal of western modernity, was however transformed to Oriental/East Asian modernity when Japan encountered Chinese design, and that resulted in dismissing western modernity.

Thirdly, both the idea and a dialectical consciousness of ‘everyday’ were embraced as western modernity in inter-war Japan, in a similar manner as in the street of Paris and Berlin. However, when it gradually began to expose social problems of unevenness, it turned to anti-west sentiment, combined with wartime jingoism and escalated into becoming a Japanese ideology. This ideology advocating the idea of ‘everyday’ claimed a primordial Japanese cultural essence that worked as negation of the west by ‘overcoming modern’ – thus restoring Japanese tradition and spirit.[[32]](#endnote-32) Moreover, a primordial Japan was combined with primordial China in the imperial Japanese context for the claim made for ‘pure Chineseness’ which was uncontaminated by Euroamericans, – a superior value that had been shared in East Asia for generations before westernisation came. ‘Everyday’ became the value of the countryside represented by rural folkcrafts in Manchuria. This is a niche where the Japanese could boast its ideology of ‘everyday’ by both dissociating from the revered past of Chinese High art as well as denouncing Euroamerican contamination.

Lastly, a variety of everyday objects were newly created. They were inspired by the great Chinese tradition from the past, but were also selectively appropriated and hybridised by the Japanese. In the examples of ceramic tableware and chairs that we have examined, a great deal of creativity in the idea and style of modern Orientalisation under the politically charged and materially tight conditions of the Japanese empire.
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