

Struggles between curators and artists: the case of the Tochigi Prefectural Museum of Fine Arts in Japan in the early 1980s

Masaaki Morishita*

School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London

Abstract

This paper, which takes the form of a case study, focuses on the conflictual relations between two particular agents, the curator and the local artist, which became prevalent in public art museums in Japan from the 1970s. These two agents had affinities to different sets of culture, and their conflict was intensified over the use of regional museums. I discuss the most controversial example of such conflicts, which took place at the Tochigi Prefectural Museum of Fine Arts, and I show the complexity of these agents, their struggles and their outcomes. For this purpose of the analysis, I combine Pierre Bourdieu's field theory and the conceptual framework of transculturation. Field theory explains the mechanisms of ongoing struggles between the agents associated with different cultures over the boundaries of the field. The perspective of transculturation is useful as way of expanding Bourdieu's theory and as a means of understanding the complexity and fluidity of the field structure. Originally developed in relation to postcolonial studies, the concept of transculturation highlights both the hybridity of modern Japanese culture and the interactions between different cultures in the artistic field. The case of Tochigi shows that regional art museums in Japan have been developing not as 'frontiers' or 'fortress' of the curator but as 'contact zones' – i.e. the sites where the curator and the local artist interact.

Key words: Bourdieu, cultural field, transculturation, art museum, Japan, contact zone

Introduction

Tochigi Prefecture¹ (**Fig. 1**) is located north of Tokyo. Tochigi contains the popular mountain resort of Nikkō National Park that includes the famous seventeenth-century mausoleum and shrine (Tōshōgū) and the City of Mashiko, which became the centre of the Japanese arts and crafts (*mingei*) movement in the 1920s–30s, in which Hamada Shōji (1894–1978) and Bernard Leach (1887–1979) worked together. This paper, however, is concerned with neither the grand architecture of Nikkō nor the famous ceramics of Hamada and Leach. My focus is on contemporary artists and the Tochigi Prefectural Museum of Fine Arts (Tochigi-kenritsu Bijutsukan) in the City of Utsunomiya, the prefectural capital (**Fig. 2**).

In March 1984, Ōshima Seiji (1924–2006) resigned from the directorship of the Tochigi Prefectural Museum of Fine Arts. He still had a year to go before reaching the mandatory retirement age of 60, and it was common for



Fig. 1 Map of Japan



Fig. 2 Tochigi Prefectural Museum of Fine Arts (©Tochigi Prefectural Museum of Fine Arts)

Photo by Osamu Murai

senior civil servants of local government to work until the age of 65 or more. In fact, he immediately took up a new position as Director of the Setagaya Art Museum (Setagaya Bijutsukan) in Tokyo. However, Ôshima's resignation was hardly a surprise for those who had known him or known of his involvement in the problems between the Tochigi Prefectural Museum of Fine Arts and local artists. The tension between the Museum and the artists which had been well-covered in regional and national mass media spilled over into the Prefectural Assembly in June/July 1983, and Ôshima, as a representative of the Museum, had by then long been a target of criticism. This so-called 'Tochigi Problem' was one of the best-known examples of a distinctive phenomenon characterizing the development of public art museums in Japan after World War II –namely, the increase and intensification of conflict between curators and local artists over the use of their regional museums. This type of conflict became a conspicuous feature of the process of museum reconstruction and construction throughout the 1970s and 1980s.²

In Tochigi artist-curator conflicts of this type had been smouldering away since the opening of the Prefectural Museum of Fine Arts in 1972, but by the end of 1982 they had become altogether larger in scale. The most eventful period began in December 1982 with the controversy between the Museum and local artists over the timing of the annual competitive exhibition of the artists who were based in the prefecture (Kenten) and came to an end when Ôshima resigned his post in spring 1984. The initial issue over the timing of the Kenten exhibition held in the Museum developed into slanderous criticisms of Director Ôshima, conflicts over the judgement of the triennial competitive exhibition organized by the Museum (Kita-Kantô Art Exhibition), and an allegation of a corruption involving the Museum over the purchase of certain art objects. A wide range of people and institutions were involved: the Museum (Director Ôshima and other curators), the Prefectural Governor, the Prefectural Board of Education, and a number of local artists, and they debated the issues through a variety of 'platforms' including newspapers (local and national), journals, other publications with a small circulation, formal and informal meetings, and the prefectural assembly. However, although this period of just over a year and a quarter was the most intense, the 'Tochigi Problem' has not completely been solved even today.

In this paper, I examine the 'Tochigi Problem' as a case study to show the diversity of Japanese contemporary artists and the complexity of their relation to curators and museums in the broader context of the artistic field. I use the term, 'artistic field', taken from the French sociologist, Pierre Bourdieu. His field theory highlights the structure of the world of art and formed the basis of his well-known account of the European modernist revolution. This theory, which has a broader sociological application than the study of art, allows him to conceptualize an art world as an 'artistic field', whose participants are defined as 'agents'. According to

Bourdieu's general definition, modern societies are composed of a multiplicity of fields such as politics, culture, science, religion and art. A field is 'a veritable social universe where, in accordance with its particular laws there accumulates a particular form of capital and where relations of force of a particular type are exerted' (Bourdieu 1993: 163). Each field is relatively autonomous while homologous with others in structure. Therefore, the artistic field is distinguished from other fields, such as those of literature, politics, and economy. For the purpose of this discussion, I focus on the mechanisms through which the boundaries of each field are defined through the incessant struggles between agents over 'the question of knowing who is part of the universe' (Bourdieu 1993: 164) and who is not – i.e. in the case of the artistic field, for example, what is art, who are considered as artists, which works are ranked as more important and valuable than others, and who are entitled to make such decisions. I pursue what Bourdieu defined as 'the social scientist's task' in studying the boundary of a field; it is 'not to draw a dividing-line between the agents involved in it' but 'to describe a state (long-lasting or temporary) of these struggles and therefore of the frontier delimiting the territory held by the competing agent

Moreover, I shall engage in a critical reading of Bourdieu's model and theory in order to show the complexity and fluidity of the field structure. My critique confirms the value of other recent arguments concerning 'a complexification of the networks of the field' and 'a loosening and de-structuralization of the concept' (Albertsen and Diken 2004: 53–54; also see Casanova 2005). The Tochigi Prefectural Museum of Fine Arts (as well as other regional museums) forms a part of the artistic field where a variety of 'agents' incessantly interact with each other over authorized/authorizing positions on defining the boundaries of the field. The 'Tochigi Problem' certainly shows a case of struggles in the field of cultural production where 'what is at stake is the power to impose the dominant definition of the [artist] and therefore to delimit the population of those entitled to take part in the struggle to define the [artist]' (Bourdieu 1983: 323).³ However, when the 'Tochigi Problem' is relocated in its historical context, it can be seen that these polarized positions that intensified the struggle were taken by local artists and curators only temporarily. The agents involved – who are commonly identified as 'local artists' and 'curators' – constantly re-grouped. Their different forms of cultural capital – or their relations to certain forms of cultural capital – changed. One agent might be more influential than the other at a particular moment in time; in the next, their power relations might have shifted. Thus, the boundaries of the field have never been stable. However, my research suggests that such hostile relations between different agents as are described in Bourdieu's model are rather extreme – they can be more subtle and flexible as the Tochigi case will show.

It is in this respect that the second conceptual framework, that of transculturation, becomes useful. The concept of transculturation highlights the complexity of the processes in which different agents associated with different cultures distinguish themselves, interact with one another, hybridize and diversify, again and again. Transculturation is a conceptual framework which has been developed in relation to academic concerns about the narratives of colonial history. The neologism was first introduced into the theoretical literature by Fernando Ortiz in 1940.⁴ He contrasts transculturation with 'acculturation' that simply implies the acquisition of another culture (Ortiz 1995: 102–3). The 'acquisition of another culture' suggests the transmission of cultural elements from one culture to another – generally from the dominant to the subordinate; it indicates the triumph of the colonist's culture over that of the colonized and, in extreme cases, the loss or erasure of the indigenous culture. However, the perspective of transculturation problematizes this hierarchical understanding of colonial power relations by introducing the prospect of a degree of reciprocity and interaction between the dominant and the subordinate cultures. I apply this theoretical framework to the examination of the Japanese case to show the 'co-presence' of previously separated cultures associated with different agents, their mutual interactions, and the impact of their asymmetrical relations involving 'conditions of coercion, radical inequality, and interactive conflict' (Pratt 1992: 6). Furthermore, I argue that the Tochigi Museum, as a place that stages such conflictual relations, should be regarded as a form of 'contact zone' – i.e. a site at which transculturation takes place (Clifford 1997).

Background – the empty museum, the art group, and the curator

Before examining the case of Tochigi in the early 1980s, I shall introduce background information by examining relations between artists, curators, and museums *before* the ‘Tochigi Problem’ and in their broader geographical context. We have three key words here – empty museum, art group (*bijutsu dantai*), and curator (*gakugei'in*). The relations between regional art museums, curators, and artists had developed in a peculiar way by the beginning of the 1980s. First, a certain type of regional art museum, which I call the ‘empty museum’, had evolved all over the country since the first institution of this kind – the Tokyo Metropolitan Art Museum (Tokyo-to Bijutsukan) – opened in 1926.⁵ It was ‘empty’ in the sense of holding no collection, employing no curator, and having no permanent display in principle. Instead it accommodated travelling exhibitions and group exhibitions organized by local artists. These groups of artists – the art groups (*bijutsu dantai*) – have played an especially important role in the establishment and development of the ‘empty museums’ in Japan.

The ‘art groups’ had developed since the late nineteenth century in a variety of artistic genres (painting, sculpture, craft, prints, photography, etc.) in Tokyo and other cities.⁶ They consisted of both amateur and professional artists who were engaged in the training of artistic styles and skills. After World War II, the art groups expanded dramatically, both in terms of their number and the scale of their shows. The total number of art groups is unknown, but it is known that the increasing number of groups wanting to hold their exhibitions at the Tokyo Metropolitan Art Museum has long been a problem.⁷

The number of exhibitions in the Museum increased; 30 groups used the Museum in 1945, 80 in the mid-1950s, more than 100 by the beginning of the 1960s, and more than 240 a year today. The scale of each exhibition also had become larger. For example, the former official exhibition, the Nitten,⁸ had 99 works in its first exhibition in 1907 and 801 in 1946. The number of items exhibited reached 2,000 by the 1970s and the exhibition continued to show nearly 2,500 works every year. Many groups in Tokyo had regional branches in major cities where local artists there also formed their own groups. However, many cities did not have their regional – prefectural or municipal – museums until the 1970s or later; in such cases provincial groups held their exhibitions at department stores and limited gallery spaces were established in Cultural Centres (*buunka kaikan*) in the regions. In response to the demands of these provincial groups, many regional art museums were built especially for the purpose of those exhibitions.⁹

Curators (*gakugei'in*) kept a relatively low profile in regional art museums until the Kanagawa Prefectural Museum of Modern Art (Kanagawa-kenritsu Kindai Bijutsukan) was built in 1951. This was the first regional art museum in which museum-based curators took the initiative in its establishment and management.¹⁰ The Museum did not have a substantial collection or permanent gallery, but unlike the Tokyo Metropolitan Art Museum it employed curators and excluded art groups. The curators of the Kanagawa Museum established a new method of preparing exhibitions without relying on the temporary exhibitions organized by third parties. It was dubbed the ‘Hijikata Method’ after Hijikata Teiichi (1905 – 1980), a prominent art historian/critic at the time and the leader of the curatorial staff of the Museum. The Hijikata Method was to organize temporary exhibitions (*kikakuten*) with loaned artefacts interpreted according to original research conducted by the museum-based curators. The main purpose of these exhibitions was to present the whole picture of art history both in Japan and other parts of the world. Hijikata allegedly used to say to his colleagues:

We must organize exhibitions so that if someone continued to visit this museum for several years, he would understand the history of art of Japan and the rest of the world (Yagyū 1982).

Several regional museums adopted the Hijikata Method – including the Tochigi Prefectural Museum of Fine Arts.

Two agents and beyond: ‘the curator’ and ‘the local artist’

The most important agents with respect to the ‘Tochigi Problem’ and other similar cases are generally described as ‘the curator’ and ‘the local artist’. Since ‘the curator’ indicates the

museum-based curator, this agent is often identified as 'the regional art museum'. However, neither definition is accurate. In this section, I examine how these conflicting agents should be defined in the Tochigi case. Their definition is complex and fluid; their characteristics in terms of their positioning in the field and relations to other agents are specific to local conditions. Both 'the curator' and 'the local artist', the two conflicting agents associated with the Tochigi Museum, interacted and mixed with each other and other agents inside and outside the artistic field, and diversified into more specific agents (Fig. 3).

Institutions	Established in	Leader	Exhibitions	Members	Others
Tochigi Prefectural Museum of Fine Arts (Museum)	1972	Ôshima Seiji (Director of the Museum)	Kita-Kanto [North Kanto] Triennial (1973 - 83)	Curators of the Museum, Art Critics & Historians	Director Oshima resigned (1984); Kenten still held annually
Tochigi League of Artists (League)	March, 1983	Yoneda Kan (Japanese-style painter, Kenten, Nitten)	Kenten [Prefectural] Exhibition (1947-); Art Group	200 members; Kenten artists	Left the Kenten to organise their own 'Kenten' (1985)
Tochigi Association of Artists (Association)	1976	Seki Masayuki (Western-style painter, Niki)	Kenten; Art Group	83 members; Kenten artists	Not much to do with the Tochigi Problem; No longer active
Roundtable for Considering Art in the Region (Roundtable)	May, 1983	Fujiwara Ikuzo (ceramicist, Inten, Shin-seisaku)	Kenten; Art Group; Kita-Kanto	140 members; Kenten, Art Group & Independent artists	Supported the Museum; No longer active

Fig. 3 Table of the Primary Agents Associated with the Tochigi Problem in the early 1980s

The curator's side was represented by the curators based in the Tochigi Prefectural Museum of Fine Art under the leadership of Director Ôshima Seiji. The Museum adopted the 'Hijikata Method', refusing to house art group exhibitions and focusing on its own original temporary exhibitions (*kikakuten*). Ôshima had been in charge of managing the Museum since its preparatory stage. The preparation committee, chaired by a world-famous potter, Hamada Shôji, also included local artists, those who were in a high position in the local government office,¹¹ and curators and art critics including Hijikata Teiichi from the Kanagawa Prefectural Museum of Modern Art. Seven experts were employed as founding members of the curatorial staff, including Takeyama Hirohiko who had studied fine art at a university in Tokyo and Yaguchi Kunio who later became the Head Curator for the Tokyo Metropolitan Museum of Contemporary Art (established in 1995). The Tochigi Museum started as an 'empty' institution without permanent galleries and substantial collections, but in 1981 it opened permanent galleries in its extension to display the collections which consisted of up to 4,600 works which had been amassed over the decade since its opening.

The 'local artist' as an opponent to the 'curator' was represented by a group of artists, the Tochigi League of Artists (Tochigi-ken Bijutsu Sakka Renmei), led by Yoneda Kan (1917–2005), who was a Japanese-style painter¹² and eminent member of the Nitten exhibition. The group originated in a dozen of the eminent local artists who were the members of the Steering Committee for the Kenten exhibition. (The Kenten is a generic term for the annual, competitive exhibition sponsored by the prefectural government.¹³) The exhibition was open to any artists based in the prefecture, no matter if they were professional or amateur or which art groups they belonged to. In Tochigi, the Kenten was the largest and oldest institution for competitive exhibitions.¹⁴ It started in 1947 as a part of the prefectural 'Art Festival' (*geijutsu-sai*) which ranged from classical concerts by renowned musicians to the drama performances by high school students. By the early 1980s, the Kenten exhibition displayed 700 works and attracted more than 4,500 visitors in three weeks of its opening. The Tochigi League of Artists was launched in March 1983. According to a contemporary source (*Shimotsuke Shinbun* 6 March

1983), more than 200 locally-based artists in six major categories (Japanese-style painting, Western-style painting, sculpture, crafts, calligraphy, and photography) participated in its inauguration, which made it the largest group of artists in the prefecture. However, the number of people said to be members actually varies in different sources,¹⁵ and an insider later wrote that no small number of artists seemed to have been listed as its members without knowing what kind of group it was and that they withdrew from the League soon after (Watanabe 1998). Therefore, it cannot be said with certainty that the League consisted of the majority of the local artists or of the most powerful members of the Kenten exhibition. This issue will be discussed at greater length later on in the paper. The same contemporary source also wrote that the League intended to organize exhibitions for the works of its members like other art groups. However, it never organized an exhibition and its main purpose was evidently to criticize the 'curator' or 'Museum'.

In the process of the conflict, we can identify at least two other groups of local artists in Utsunomiya City; the Tochigi Association of Artists (Tochigi-ken Bijutsu Sakka Kyōkai) and the Roundtable for Considering Art in the Region (Chiiki no Bijutsu wo Kangaeru Konwakai). The former was established in 1976 by the Kenten artists in the three sections (Japanese-style painting, Western-style painting, and sculpture) who called for reform of the Kenten exhibition. It consisted of 83 members in 1983. The latter was founded in May 1983, two months after the Tochigi League of Artists was established. Its 140 members included artists and intellectuals from Tochigi and other parts of Japan, led by Fujiwara Ikuzō (1946–),¹⁶ a young ceramic artist from Mashiko City in Tochigi Prefecture. This group was not directly connected to the Kenten, though it included some Kenten artists. Its main purpose was to 'promote healthy development and dissemination of the art in the region from broader perspectives beyond the closed locality' (Watanabe 1998: 123). The Tochigi Association of Artists did not contribute much to the controversy, but the Roundtable for Considering Art in the Region, though emphasizing its neutrality vis-à-vis the Museum and the League (*Shimotsuke Shinbun* 8 May 1983), generally defended the standpoint of the Museum and attacked the views of the League (*Shimotsuke Shinbun* 7 May 1983).

Many artists in Tochigi including those who belonged to the Kenten, the League, the Association, and the Roundtable participated in 'art groups' (*bijutsu dantai*). Some of the groups were the regional branches of major groups in Tokyo (such as the Shun'yō Kai, the Nika Kai, the Kōfū Kai); others were local groups. Both in Tochigi and in Japan as a whole, the art groups played an important role throughout the twentieth century; but the diverse positions 'local artists' took in the artistic field should not be neglected. In Tochigi in the early 1980s, two particular positions can be identified. One is the increasing number of the artists who were independent of the Kenten and the art group system. Those artists included a Japanese-style painter well-known abroad, Tsukahara Tetsuō (1933–),¹⁷ and a young talent of the Western-style painting at the time, Miyasaka Takeshi (1949–).¹⁸ They were both 'independent' and 'anti-art-group' in principle. Tsukahara was an executive member of the Roundtable. The other position was more ambivalent – those who were important members of the Kenten and the art groups but were not part of the League to protest against the Museum. Those artists included Matsumoto Tetsuo (1943–), a member of the Japan Academy of Art (Japanese-style painting), Seki Masayuki and Soga Yoshiko (1921–) of the Niki Kai (Western-style painting), and Kasuya Keiji of the Kokuga Kai. They did not participate in the 'anti-Museum/curator' campaign of the League; Matsumoto was at odds with the League as an important member of the Roundtable, and Seki chaired the relatively neutral Association.

Thus the complexity and fluidity of the positions of different agents make it difficult to identify and define them and their cultures. Such cases as the 'Tochigi Problem' are usually described as 'struggles between the curator (or the museum) and the local artist'; but both the curator and the local artist essentially consist of those who take various positions in relation to others. Nevertheless, at least in the most eventful period of the Tochigi Problem (1982–84), the two conflicting parties were represented respectively by the Museum-based curators and the Tochigi League of Artists. The distinguishing features of their particular 'cultures' are most evident in the two different exhibitions of contemporary art they organized – the Kenten and the Kita-Kantō. In other words, these exhibitions symbolized two polemic positions that could be taken by the two conflicting parties.

Two exhibitions: the Kenten and the Kita-Kantô

The Kita-Kantô was launched by the Tochigi Prefectural Museum of Fine Arts as a triennial competitive exhibition in 1973 and abandoned after the fourth exhibition in 1983. It was one of the key projects on which the Museum rigorously worked. In contrast to the Kenten where access was restricted to the artists based in Tochigi Prefecture, this exhibition covered artists from the North Kantô (Kita-Kantô) region including five prefectures – Tochigi, Ibaragi, Gunma, Fukushima, and Saitama.¹⁹ The Kenten and the Kita-Kantô were both focal points of the struggles between the various agents associated with the artistic field in Tochigi. The ‘Tochigi Problem’ was exacerbated by the conflict between the Kenten artists (who formed the Tochigi League of Artists) and the Museum based curators over the timing of the Kenten exhibition at the Museum. The relationship between the Kenten and the Museum had never been a harmonious one. The Museum, on its opening in 1972, refused to accommodate the Kenten exhibition which had been organized entirely by ‘local artists’ like the art group exhibition. However, the Kenten was included in the annual programme of the Museum in 1974 on condition that the Museum should co-sponsor the event and three curators from the Museum should be involved as members of the hanging committee. The Kenten artists complained that their exhibition should be moved from December, on the grounds that many people were too busy to go to art exhibitions, to October and November – the best season for art and culture.²⁰ The Kita-Kantô exhibition was severely criticized by the Kenten/League, and consequently had to be discontinued after the fourth exhibition in 1983. In order to examine the distinct cultures represented by the two different exhibitions and associated with the two conflicting agents, I focus on the three most controversial issues: (1) the areas covered by the exhibitions; (2) the ways in which the exhibitions were characterized (whether as a festival or as a serious competition); (3) different values of art.

First, the Kenten, as the ‘prefectural’ exhibition, focused on its own prefecture, while the Kita-Kantô included five neighbouring prefectures in the Kita-Kantô (North Kantô) area. The Kenten/League criticized the ‘generosity’ of the Kita-Kantô in supporting artists from other prefectures with public funds. One member of the League observed:

It is a waste of tax money for the Museum to take care of other prefectures while neglecting the citizens of Tochigi (*Tochigi Shinbun* 26 December 1982)²¹

To such accusations, Director Ôshima responded that the Kita-Kantô provided local artists with an opportunity for their own improvement through their interactions with artists from other regions (Ôshima 1983). The ultimate goal, he continued, was to create the conditions whereby ‘those who do good work in Tochigi would be introduced to the whole Japan and to the world’. He compared the Kita-Kantô to other successful international exhibitions in the peripheries of the art scenes such as the International Biennial of Graphic Art in Ljubljana, Slovenia. Secondly, the Kenten characterized itself as a ‘festival’ for both professionals and amateurs, while the Kita-Kantô decisively manifested itself as a serious, competitive exhibition exclusively for professionally-motivated new artists (Tochigi-ken 1983: 40–41). The Kenten accepted more than three hundred works each year; the Kita-Kantô accepted 180. The ratios of the winners to entrants were 53.2% at the Kenten and 18% at the Kita-Kantô.²² The maximum prizes were ¥50,000 (£200) for the Kenten and ¥1,000,000 (£4,000) for the Kita-Kantô. The hanging committee of the Kenten was occupied by established artists in Tochigi; all the members of the Kita-Kantô’s committee were art critics and historians from other parts of Japan. The Kenten invited twenty eminent artists in each category to exhibit their works without judgment, which added to the festivity of the exhibition. In contrast, the Kita-Kantô accepted no unjudged works. Thirdly, the Kenten covered a range of artistic styles, while the Kita-Kantô supported particular forms of art. This tendency of the Kita-Kantô was criticized by the Kenten/League as ‘the taste for the avant-garde’ and ‘the taste for abstract’.²³ The Kenten/League accused the Kita-Kantô/Museum as ‘biased’ and the Kita-Kantô/Museum insisted that their decision was based on a fair, professional judgment by art critics and historians.

These issues are all derived from the different cultures associated with those two exhibitions and the agents concerned. The Kenten was based on the ‘art group’ system, which had developed in Japan since the late nineteenth century.²⁴ These art groups generally

functioned as schools of training artists, which involved frequent (weekly/monthly) workshops with 'masters' in local areas and annual group exhibitions. The Kanten was a composite exhibition consisting of various groups of local artists. Thirty-two groups of painters, sculptors, ceramicists, and print makers were listed in the 20th anniversary publication of the Kanten in 1967 (Tochigi-ken 1967: 121–23). The masters from those groups formed the hanging committee, and they decided which works were to be displayed and awarded prizes in the annual Kanten. They usually selected their own disciples, which was often criticized as 'favouritism' from the inside and the outside.²⁵ The characteristics of the Kanten/League that were highlighted in relation to the three issues above were all aspects of the art group culture. Art groups tended to be insular. Each group formed the genealogy of its masters and masterpieces, which were rarely displayed with those of other groups. The annual Kanten was one of those rare occasions on which artists from different groups gathered and organized one exhibition. However, over the years, the Kanten itself had become a kind of art group, and it was reluctant to participate in the Kita-Kantô that involved the outsiders. The festive character was also important for the art groups which included both professional and amateur artists. The invitation of established artists was a common practice at the art group exhibitions. Masters had responsibility to make it sure that their disciples would be well represented in the exhibition. Therefore, each group had to send its representatives to the hanging committee and a certain level of success rate should be maintained. The eclecticism of the Kanten reflected various styles associated with different groups and masters.

The Kita-Kantô exhibition was founded on a culture associated with curators, art critics and historians. As their museums rejected the art group exhibition, these agents were critical of the longstanding tradition of the art group. They were responsible for introducing the new curatorial policy to public art museums in Japan – the Hijikata Method. The main purpose of this Method was to historicize Japanese modern art through a series of *kikakuten* exhibitions prepared by museum-based curators. This was not to conform to the genealogies of the masters and masterpieces of the art groups but to configure a cross-group history of Japanese modern art in the broader context of the national and international art scenes. The Tochigi Museum adopted and developed this Method from its opening in 1972, and the Kita-Kantô exhibition shows one of the Museum's attempts to reshape contemporary art in Tochigi. The Kita-Kantô committee was occupied by curators, art critics and historians from other parts of Japan. Moreover, they all belonged to the AICA Japan (Association International des Critiques d'Art, Japan), which was established in 1954 to make a distinction from the Association of Art Critics (Bijutsu Hyôronka Kyôkai), which mainly consisted of critics and journalists who were deeply rooted in the art group system.²⁶

In the next section, I examine the Tochigi Problem as an illustration of the struggle between different agents in the artistic field – i.e. the struggle between the Kanten/League and the Kita-Kantô/Museum associated with the different cultures as I have described above. I focus on the struggle to draw the boundaries of the inside and the outside of the field. The boundaries of the artistic field are fluid. They are extended to one side and receded on the other on constant and contingent movements as agents struggle for the boundaries. They are only temporarily defined by the 'stakes which are at stake' (Bourdieu 1993: 164), whose location was constantly reviewed and altered in relation to the incessant struggles between agents. The fundamental stake in these struggles is 'the monopoly of the power to consecrate producers or products' – i.e. artists or works of art (Bourdieu 1983: 323). The rivalry between the Kanten/League and the Kita-Kantô/Museum over the use of the Tochigi Prefectural Museum showed precisely a case of these struggles over the authorizing and authorized positions in the artistic field on the issues concerning its boundaries. The two competitive exhibitions – the Kanten and the Kita-Kantô – represented their attempts to draw their own boundaries of the artistic field; the access to the Museum galleries was so controversial because of its symbolic value of authenticity as well as for practical reasons.

Struggles over the boundaries of the artistic field

The struggle between the Kanten/League and the Kita-Kantô/Museum over the boundary of the artistic field through their competitive exhibitions is best represented by reference to a series

of issues concerning the recognition of the 'avant-garde'. For nothing would be more vulnerable to the alteration of the boundary than the position of the 'avant-garde' in the artistic field. The conflict in Tochigi showed that the Kanten did not approve of the tendency of the Kita-Kantô towards the 'avant-garde' (or the 'abstract' artists) and that the Kita-Kantô defended their decision. The 'avant-garde' occupied a uniquely privileged status in the Kita-Kantô, while they were marginalized by the Kanten. To be more precise, the concept of the 'avant-garde' itself was closely linked to a particular historical perspective associated with the Kita-Kantô/Museum, which was not shared by the Kanten/League.²⁷ The difference between them in their sense of art history is a key issue in my analysis of the conflictual relations between the Kanten/League and the Kita-Kantô/Museum over the boundaries of the field. For it was one of the most significant factors according to which those stakes were laid out in the struggle to determine who counted as artists and judges. In the processes of historicization – associated with either the Kanten/League or the Kita-Kantô/Museum, both artists and works of art were selected and appropriated according to particular historical narratives. Many products and producers were neglected because there was no room for them in the historical sequences – in other words, because they were considered as lying outside the 'stakes at stake' or more precisely 'outside the pale of history'.²⁸ Both the Kanten and the Kita-Kantô were developed as significant opportunities for the respective agents to compose, display, and authorize their respective 'stakes' or 'pales' according to their respective historical values. Each exhibition was also meant to undermine the credibility of the other through the presentation of incompatible historical perspectives on contemporary art.

In the Kita-Kantô, 'avant-garde' artists and their styles (including 'abstract' artists) were the strongest and most evident candidates for what we can think of as 'the future's past' (Fisher 1991: 28) – that is, these artists and works are seen as the masters and masterpieces which potentially constitute the consecrated past at a point in the future. This perception was based on the privileged position that was assigned to the avant-garde by the prevailing idea of art history as an evolutionary historical process – these artists were understood to be agents in the evolutionary development of the field.²⁹ They were, as their name suggests, seen as 'vanguard' artists, 'innovators', or as 'pioneers'. The market for such artists as these is usually restricted, as Bourdieu has argued, to their fellow artists, and their symbolic value is also – if temporarily – minimal (Bourdieu 1996: 81–85). However, their position is firmly founded on an evolutionary understanding of the history of art and of an artistic past that they have rejected and surpassed. The point is that the avant-garde rebellion against the tradition of the field by no means indicates their ignorance or nonchalance about the tradition against which they stand; on the contrary, in order to succeed in their artistic revolution it is essential that their stance should be clearly presented against their predecessors. Indeed, the relationship between the past and the present as it appears to be here is best described, not as inheritance, but as rejection. Nevertheless, such rejection does not necessarily mean the extinction of the past from the history of the field; on the contrary, the artists and their past styles are paradoxically perpetuated in art history when they are successfully rejected and surpassed.

For the Kanten/League/art group, the avant-garde were nothing more than heretics. From the point of view of the former the genealogies of masters and disciples showed the inheritance of techniques and styles – not their evolutionary progress. Looking back the development of the art groups, we can see that heretics and rebels continuously separated from their groups to form new groups. The new groups developed new genealogies of artists independent of the groups they derived from.³⁰ In this kind of art world radicalism is not considered as a sign of the future or an indication of progress; indeed for the Kanten artists who criticized the Kita-Kantô, it was merely a matter of 'bias' and of 'taste'.

However, it was not only the position of the avant-garde that was at stake in the conflict between the Kanten/League and the Kita-Kantô/Museum; the position of the Kanten masters was also at issue. The notion of historical authenticity which allowed the avant-garde to be located as the driving force of the evolution of the field meant that the Kanten/League artists were positioned at the margins of the field. In making this argument, I have found it useful to draw on Bourdieu's model of the French artistic field to show how a variant of the Kanten/League artists were marginalized as 'fossilized artists' (Bourdieu 1996: 150–52). The notion of 'fossils' does not mean the old masters whose styles and techniques seem considerably outmoded

today; but those artists who are contemporary with the avant-garde and who 'do in the present what was done by the avant-garde of the past (just like *forgers*, but on their own account)' (Bourdieu 1996: 150). In other words, they 'make an art that is not ... of their age' (1996: 150). In the field associated with the historicity of the Kita-Kantô/Museum/art critic, the 'fossils' are located at a far end from the avant-garde. While the avant-garde attempted to distinguish themselves from the avant-garde of the past and position themselves at the frontier of their age, the fossilized artists reproduce the artistic styles of the past. Moreover, the profiles of these 'fossils of another age' (1996: 150) whose works one may come across at Galerie Drouant on the Right Bank in Paris today are identical to those of the most celebrated artists in the Kenten/League/art group. In both cases the artists are likely to have formal education in fine art, identify themselves as "students" of such-and-such, choose conventional subjects, gain plenty of recognition for their achievements (prizes and medals), and occupy prestigious positions in 'the institutions of consecration and legitimation' (1996: 152). For example, Yoneda Kan who chaired the Tochigi League of Artists won the highest prize at the Nitten twice in the 1960s for his Japanese-style paintings, became a counsellor of the exhibition, and was awarded a distinguished service medal for culture of the Tochigi Prefecture. The office manager of the League, Watanabe Yasutomo (1916–), learned Japanese-style painting under Professor Kawasaki Shôko (1886–1977) at the Tokyo Art School and taught at the Utsunomiya University in Tochigi Prefecture. His work was first accepted by the Bunten exhibition in 1943 and by the Inten exhibition in 1950, and he became a regular contributor to the Inten. He is now Professor Emeritus of the Utsunomiya University and the honorary member of the Japan Academy of Art.

Thus, according to the boundaries drawn by the curator, these artists associated with the Kenten/League/art group were denied the authority to consecrate themselves as both producers and judges. They were 'fossilized artists' who were located at the opposite pole to the avant-garde who were expected to advance the developmental progressive history of art. At the Kita-Kantô exhibitions, many local artists who had gained a certain degree of reputation at the Kenten found themselves unsuccessful – especially those who created their works in the representational style. To the judges of the Kita-Kantô, it was a style belonging to the past; the abstract was more suitable for contemporary art. Among the Kenten artists, the curators would be denied their authority to consecrate artists and works of art. Their limited knowledge of and respect for the Kenten/art group system disqualified them as the judges of the Kenten. Their bias in favour of the avant-garde and abstractionism was repeatedly criticized by the 'local artists' who did not recognize those artistic styles as readily as the curators.

Thus the Kenten/League was associated with the tradition of the art group and its static historicity, while the Kita-Kantô/curator was connected to the specialist interests of the art historian/critic and its evolutionary historicity. However, these two kinds of historicity are also identified in Bourdieu's model of the artistic field as differentiated according to two different cultural logics – one of economic autonomy which celebrates the ideal of a 'pure art' and one of commercial production which oriented to the pre-existing demands of the market (Bourdieu 1996: 141–42). Neither 'absolute independence' from economic value nor total subordination to demand from the market is ever achieved though those two extreme stances symbolically exist in the artistic field. They are the 'extremes that are . . . never attained', and the agents as producers of materials and value are, in fact, distributed between them. Some agents may be closer to one side than to the other, but none could reach the ultimate economic autonomy or dependency. It is in this state of a field that transcultural interactions occur between the local artists and the curators. These agents, both as groups and as individuals, operate in the relations between their different cultures and constantly review their positions while they mutually and incessantly interact.

Transcultural phenomena in the Tochigi Prefectural Museum of Fine Arts

The Kenten and the Kita-Kantô exhibitions, which represented the two different cultures and historicities, or historical values, associated with the two agents, were both transformed through their reciprocal relations. Despite the initial refusal by the Museum for the use of its galleries for the Kenten, the prefectural exhibition became a regular event taking up all the Museum galleries for a month after 1974 – two years after the opening of the Museum. This was not to

commemorate a triumph of the Kanten system over the Museum's policy. It was also the beginning of the transformation of the Kanten. First, the exhibition which had been exclusively organized by 'local artists' for nearly two decades, included some of the Museum curators on the hanging committee. Although the majority of the committee positions continued to be occupied by the artists, the inclusion of the curators indicates that the Kanten became a site of interaction between the two agents and their different cultures in an asymmetrical balance of power. Secondly, the artists associated with the Kanten exhibition became diversified in terms of their relations to its culture; some were more sympathetic to the historical view of art promoted by the Museum-based curators, and some were inclined to persist in the Kanten/art group tradition. It was by this most conservative sect of the Kanten artists, most closely associated with the Kanten system, that the practices of the Museum were most aggressively criticized at the beginning of the 1980s. Furthermore, this group of artists split up from the Kanten to organize their own annual exhibition, which was also called 'Kanten', in 1985. Those who were relatively in favour of the Museum were left in the original Kanten.

The Kita-Kantô exhibition was held in 1974, 1977, 1980, and 1983. It was abolished after the fourth exhibition as a consequence of the Tochigi Problem. However, the Museum is now developing a new form of exhibition to replace the Kita-Kantô.³¹ This new exhibition was explicitly devised as a site which would accommodate the co-presence of and interactions between the two different historicities. It was launched in December 2000, inviting 253 local artists from six genres including painting (both Japanese-style and Western-style), sculpture, arts and crafts, calligraphy, photography, and audio-visual installations.³² The second exhibition was held at the beginning of 2004, and this large-scale, special exhibition is to be a regular feature of the Museum.³³ It is distinguished from both the Kanten and the Kita-Kantô in that its contributors are all 'invited' and therefore no competition is involved. Although having been led by the curators, this project positively included the perspectives of local artists associated with the Kanten/art group system. I make two particular points concerning the new exhibition. One is the diversity of the invited artists. They ranged from the local artists whose authority depended on the Kanten system to the young talents who had little to do with the Kanten politics of the prefectural art world. The second point is a distinction between the artists living in the prefecture and outside the prefecture. The 'local artists' eligible for invitation to the exhibition were composed of the current residents of the prefecture and those who came from the prefecture but lived somewhere else. The exhibition in 2000 focused on the former and the 2004 exhibition focused on the latter. The prospect for the future is to continue them alternately. The significance of the distinction between those who reside in the prefecture and those outside is associated with the different dispositions of these artists depending on their residence. Those who live in the prefecture are likely to be closely related to the Kanten and the local art groups, whereas the artists living outside the prefecture tend to be detached from the regional art world of Tochigi and more concerned about the politics of Tokyo art groups or the art-historical currents associated with the Western art world. The new exhibition is a conscious attempt to demonstrate the diversity associated with different historicities and to further generate a new, hybrid form of art history.

Thus the interactions between the two agents in the artistic field in Tochigi revealed complex processes and consequences of transculturation. Both the Kanten and the Kita-Kantô have developed as sites of mutual hybridization between the different cultures associated with the 'local artists' and the 'curators'. The Tochigi Prefectural Museum of Fine Arts which accommodated those exhibitions has become a particular form of 'contact zone'. This term indicates a space in which processes of transculturation are enacted (Pratt 1992; Clifford 1997). Pratt coined this term in her book on Latin American travelogues, in which she uses it to describe what might be otherwise called 'colonial frontier' which implies 'a European expansionist perspective (the frontier is a frontier only with respect to Europe)' (Pratt 1992: 6). James Clifford (1997:204) extended this perspective to argue for the view of 'museums as contact zones'. Museums could stage transculturation between the socially separated peoples and cultures in a multi-cultural society. They could function as 'contact zones' where the reciprocal relations, mutual exploitations, and contestations between different ethnicities and cultures could take place. Their interactions would bring about neither permanent solution nor a happy ending; their reciprocity does not mean 'a give-and-take that could lead to a final meeting of minds, a coming

together that would erase the discrepancies, the ongoing power imbalances of contact relations' (Clifford 1997: 193). The Tochigi Museum is neither a 'frontier' nor a 'fortress' of the curators; but it is a 'contact zone' where the local artists and the curators are engaged in constant interactions. Moreover, their relations will be more precisely explained in reference to the broader context of Bourdieu's field theory. The conflict between the local artist and the curator over the use of the Tochigi Museum that culminated in the early 1980s showed a process in which these agents struggled over the boundaries of the artistic field. It was a case of the ongoing struggles between the agents over the questions concerning what is art, who are artists, and who has a right to make such decisions.

Conclusion

My case study concerning the conflict between the local artists and the curators in the Tochigi Prefectural Museum of Fine Arts has shown two important aspects in the light of the conceptual frameworks of transculturation and Bourdieu's field theory. The first aspect is that the cultures associated with the two agents interacted and transformed through the processes of transculturation. The second is that their conflictive relations manifested a case of the struggles over the boundaries of the artistic field. The two theoretical frameworks complement each other by highlighting different dimensions of these two aspects associated with the 'Tochigi Problem'. The process of transculturation has revealed that the agents and their cultures were by no means fixed but that they constantly reinvented themselves in the course of mutual interactions. Field theory has shown the mechanisms of the conflictual relations between the agents and the wider context (i.e. field) in which these relations were made possible. Both as a 'contact zone' and as a part of the 'artistic field', the Tochigi Museum will continue to stage the reciprocal relations between different cultures and the struggles between different agents.

This transcultural phenomenon observed in the Tochigi Museum is by no means a unique case. Many regional art museums have developed as spaces for the co-presence of and transculturation between the local artists and the curators. This tendency was most evident in many prefectural art museums established after the 1980s. They were designed to accommodate both agents and their exhibitions. In those museums, local art groups organized their exhibitions, while curators worked on their permanent and temporary exhibitions based on their research and the museum collections they systematically amassed. About a half of the 60 prefectural art museums operate in this style today. These museums are different from the Tochigi Museum in which the curators possess both the right and responsibility for gate-keeping.

Moreover, two other museums representing the two different types of Japanese museum have also staged the transcultural relations between the local artists and the curators. The Tokyo Metropolitan Art Museum which was originally built for the local artists associated with the art groups started to organize temporary exhibitions of their own make and systematically collect works of art when it set up a curatorial department and employed full-time curators in 1975. The Head Curator was Asahi Akira, a funding member of curatorial staff of the Kanagawa Prefectural Museum of Modern Art. The Kanagawa Museum initially refused to accommodate any art group exhibitions and the Kanten of Kanagawa Prefecture. However, as a 'prefectural' institution, it was obliged to accommodate the annual Kanten exhibition from 1966. The Tokyo Museum, though, abandoned their collection and curators to the newly established Tokyo Metropolitan Museum of Contemporary Art in 1995 and became a typical 'empty museum' again. The Kanagawa Museum also succeeded in removing the Kanten to the brand-new Kanagawa Prefectural Gallery (Kanagawa Kenmin Garari) in Yokohama City in 1975. However, Yagyū Fujio – a funding member of the curatorial staff of the Kanagawa Museum – was appointed the Head of the Gallery, and the involvement of the Museum's curators to the Kanten continued.

Thus the interactions between artists and curators over the use of regional art museums have generated diverse outcomes in relation to their different local contexts. In some prefectures, local artists, art groups, and the Kanten exhibitions are more influential than the curatorial authority; in others, the museum-based curators and their supporters are more dominant. However, these conditions which are only ever temporarily fixed are continuously revised, and the fact that many regional museums today accommodate both art group

exhibitions and collection-based curatorial practices indicates the continuous co-presence of the two agents. The agents position and reposition themselves in relation to different cultures associated with the artistic field – such as the art group system and the different historicities, their relations to each other change over the years as the Tochigi Museum is now making more efforts to negotiate with the ‘local artists’, and the transcultural relations between the agents and their cultures and the interactions between the different agents will continue.

Received 26th September 2006
Finally accepted 17th April 2007

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the Japan Foundation Endowment Committee for funding my field trip to Japan for my PhD research in 2001, on which this paper is based. I am also very grateful to all the interviewees who were both generous and resourceful, including Mr Ōshima Seiji OBE who regretfully passed away late in the last year.

All Japanese names in the text are presented in the Japanese order – the family name and the first name.

Notes

- ¹ Japanese ‘prefectures’ indicate the largest denomination of local authority, equivalent to counties in Britain. Japan is divided into 47 prefectures.
- ² Such institutions included the Tochigi Prefectural Museum of Fine Arts (Tochigi-kenritsu Bijutsukan, est. 1972), the Hokkaidō Prefectural Museum of Modern Art (Hokkaidō-ritsu Kindai Bijutsukan, est. 1977), the Yamaguchi Prefectural Art Museum (Yamaguchi-kenritsu Bijutsukan, est. 1979), the Toyama Prefectural Museum of Modern Art (Toyama-kenritsu Kindai Bijutsukan, est. 1981), and the Shizuoka Prefectural Art Museum (Shizuoka-kenritsu Bijutsukan, est. 1986).
- ³ I replaced ‘writer’ in the original text with ‘artist’, because, in the footnote of this passage, Bourdieu states: ‘Throughout this passage, “writer” can be replaced by “artist”, “philosopher”, “intellectual”, etc.’.
- ⁴ Ortiz (1995). The first edition, *Contrapunteo cubano del tabaco y el azúcar* (Habana: Jesús Montero), was followed by a series of revised versions (New York, 1947 and 1970; Las Villas, 1963; Barcelona, 1973; Caracas, 1978; La Habana, 1983). The first English translation was published in 1947 (New York: Alfred A. Knopf).
- ⁵ For details of the development of the ‘empty museum’, see Morishita (2003).
- ⁶ For detailed accounts of ‘art groups’, see Morishita (2003; 2006).
- ⁷ The Tokyo Metropolitan Art Museum had continuously been under pressure of providing more gallery space. Its original building was completed in 1926, which was extended by more than 60 % in 1928 with the construction of an annex and more than 80 % in 1958 with the addition of the third floor. In 1975, the new building replaced the old building; its total floor space was approximately 1.7 times as large as the old one.
- ⁸ The Nitten (Japan Fine Arts Exhibition) was launched as ‘Bunten’, the annual competitive art exhibition sponsored by the Ministry of Education, in 1907. After being restructured several times, it was privatized in 1958 as the exhibition of the Nitten Corporation.

- ⁹ For details of these conditions of the provincial cities and the art groups, see Morishita, 2003. The 'empty museums' opened after the World War II include the Aichi Prefectural Art Museum (1955), Ishikawa Prefectural Art Museum (1959), Toyama Prefectural Museum (1964), and Osaka Prefectural Art Gallery (1974).
- ¹⁰ This important institutional change took place for various reasons such as the initiative of the national government which enacted the Museum Law in 1950; but, considering the relatively small number of institutions established in this way and the phenomenon of 'empty museums' developed in this period onwards, it mainly depended on local politics of each region. See Zolberg (1981) for an account of the institutional change in American art museums.
- ¹¹ The government officials included Governor Yokokawa Nobuo and Lieutenant Governor Ogiyama Yoshio.
- ¹² It is a common practice that paintings in Japan after the Meiji period be divided into two major categories – Japanese-style (*nihon-ga*) and Western-style (*yō-ga*). Accordingly, many art groups adopt these divisions. Some (like the Nitten) consist of them both; others (like the Nika and the Inten) specialise in one of them.
- ¹³ The origin and development of the Kenten exhibitions remains unknown today. Some of them started as early as in the 1930s, but no study has yet fully investigated to what extent they developed before World War II and how they were resumed and reintroduced after the War. However, it seems clear that their trajectories vary in different prefectures.
- ¹⁴ For the details of the history of the Tochigi Kenten, see Tochigi-ken Geijutsu Tochigi Kankōkai (1967) and Tochigi-ken (1983).
- ¹⁵ For example, Sugawara (1984: 150) states the number of the League members is 130, which is no larger than the Roundtable which held 140 members.
- ¹⁶ Fujiwara Ikuzō graduated from the Department of Japanese-style Painting, the Tokyo University of Fine Art and Music in 1970. He was accepted for his ceramic objects by the Inten (1971, 1972), but it was after he was accepted by the Kita-Kantō exhibition at the Tochigi Prefectural Museum of Fine Arts in 1983 that he established his reputation and set up his own studio in Mashiko City. He is now a member of the Shinseisaku Kyōkai (est. 1936).
- ¹⁷ Tsukahara is now Professor of Japanese-style Painting at Hakuō University.
- ¹⁸ Miyasaka launched his career as member of an art group in Tokyo, the Ogen Kai (est. 1933), which he had left by the late 1970s.
- ¹⁹ Fukushima and Saitama were added on the fourth (and the last) exhibition in 1983.
- ²⁰ In Japan, autumn is regarded as the best season for 'doing cultures' – especially on and around a bank holiday called 'Culture Day' (3 November).
- ²¹ Also see *Asahi Shinbun* 20 November 1982, *Bijutsu Jānaru* 8 December 1982; 25 December 1982.
- ²² The figure of the Kenten was taken from its exhibition in December 1982, and the one of the Kita-Kantō was from its last exhibition in January 1983.
- ²³ See Yoneda (1984) and Yoneda's statement quoted in Sugawara (1984: 156). These

'tastes' and 'tendencies' were also criticized by the Superintendent of Educational Affairs at the Prefectural Assembly Committee Meeting on 7 March 1983 (Watanabe 1998: 80–86).

- ²⁴ For a detailed history of the art groups and their connection to the *iemoto* system (the training and evaluation system based on the master-disciple relations, which first developed in various cultural practices in eighteenth-century Japan), see Morishita (2003; 2006).
- ²⁵ For example, see Kobayashi (1997: 11).
- ²⁶ See Morishita (2003: 241–42).
- ²⁷ For the relation between the avant-garde and the art groups, see Morishita (2006).
- ²⁸ This expression originally used by Hegel was taken by Danto (1997: 9, 26) in his analysis of modernist history. Fisher (1991: 5–6) also makes a similar point concerning with the exclusiveness of art history.
- ²⁹ Danto (1997) calls this particular form of history 'developmental progressive' (62–64). This is specifically associated with modernist philosophy which prevailed in the West roughly between the last quarter of the nineteenth century and the mid-1960s (65) and does not apply to either 'mimetic' pre-modernist art (8) or 'post-historical' contemporary art (12).
- ³⁰ For example, the Nitten exhibition generated a number of heretic groups since its establishment in 1907. The first two major factions separated from the Nitten were the Nika and the Japan Academy of Art (both established in 1914). Others include the Kokuga Kai (1918), Kaiju-sha (1924), Kôzô-sha (1926), and Shinseisaku Kyôkai (1936).
- ³¹ The subsequent discussion on the new form of exhibition sponsored by the Tochigi Museum owes a lot to the interview with the present head curator of the Museum, Aoki Hiroshi (Aoki 2001).
- ³² The exhibition was titled 'Door of Thousand Years' ('Sen-nen no tobira'), which commemorated the millennium and the turn of the century.
- ³³ The exhibition, 'Distance: Artists from Tochigi' ('Disutansu: Tochigi-ken shusshin sakka no genzai'), was held from 31 January to 21 March 2004.

References

Aoki, H. (2001) personal interview, 3 August 2001, Tochigi Prefectural Museum of Fine Arts, Utsunomiya City, Tochigi.

Asahi Shinbun (1982) 'Ken-geijutsusai: Nenmatsu ni bijutsu-ten keishi dewa'. [Asahi Newspaper, 'Prefectural Art Festival: Art Exhibition at the End of the Year – Is It Slighted?'] 20 November

Bijutsu Jânaru (1982) Sôkan-go [Art Journal] 8 December

Bijutsu Jânaru (1982) Sôkan-go [Art Journal] 25 December

Bourdieu, P. (1983) 'The Field of cultural Production, or: The Economic World Reversed', *Poetics*, 12: 311–356.

Bourdieu, P. (1993) *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*, R. Johnson (ed), Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Bourdieu, P. (1996) *The Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*, Suzan Emanuel (trans), Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Clifford, J. (1997) *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Danto, A. C. (1997) *After the End of Art: Contemporary Art and the Pale of History*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Fisher, P. (1991) *Making and Effacing Art: Modern American Art in a Culture of Museums*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kobayashi, T. (1997) *20-nen shi: Tochigi-ken Bijutsu-ka Kyôkai. [20-year History: Tochigi Association of Artists]*
- Morishita, M. (2003) 'Empty Museums: Transculturation and the Development of Public Art Museums in Japan', unpublished doctoral thesis, Open University.
- Morishita, M. (2006) 'The *Iemoto* System and the Avant-gardes in the Japanese Artistic Field: Bourdieu's Field Theory in Comparative Perspective', *The Sociological Review*, 54 (2) 283 – 302.
- Ortiz, F. (1995) *Cuban Counterpoint: Tobacco and Sugar*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Ôshima, S. (1983) 'Iwayuru Kita-Kantô Bijutsu-ten mondai wo megutte', in Tochigi-kenritsu Bijutsukan (ed) *Kita-Kantô Bijutsu-ten, dai 4-kai*, exhibition catalogue. ['Reflecting on the So-Called Kita-Kantô Art Exhibition Problem', in Tochigi Prefectural Museum of Fine Arts (ed) *4th Kita-Kantô Art Exhibition*]
- Ôshima, S. (2001) personal interview, 28 July, Setagaya Art Museum, Tokyo.
- Pratt, M. L. (1992) *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*, London: Routledge.
- Sato, S. (2001) personal interview, 8 August, Utsunomiya City, Tochigi.
Shimotsuke Shinbun 6 March 1983, 'Kenritsu-bijutsukan-chô no hanron keisai: Kômuin to shite ayamari'. [*Shimotsuke Newspaper*, 'The Publication of the Response of the Museum Director: Mistake as a Civil Servant']
- Shimotsuke Shinbun* (1983) 7 May, 'Ken-bijutsukan yôgo wo hyômei: Chiiki-no Bijutsu-wo Kangaeru Konwakai, kyô sôritsu sôkai'. [*Shimotsuke Newspaper*, 'Declared Support for the Prefectural Art Museum: Roundtable for Considering Art in the Region Holding the First Meeting Today']
- Shimotsuke Shinbun* (1983) 8 May, 'Dai-sansha-teki tachiba wo kyôchô, Chiiki-no Bijutsu-wo Kangaeru Konwakai, ken-bijutsu-ronsô no naka-de hossoku'. [*Shimotsuke Newspaper*, 'Emphasis on the Objective Stance: Roundtable for Considering Art in the Region Launched in the Middle of the Prefectural Art Controversy']
- Sugawara, N. (1984) *Bijutsukan ima*, Tokyo: Kyuryudo. [*Art Museum Now*]
- Takeyama, H. (2001) personal interview, 9 August, Tochigi Prefectural Museum of Fine Arts, Utsunomiya City, Tokyo.
- Tochigi-ken (1967) Tochigi-ken Geijutsu Tochigi Kankôkai (ed), *Geijutsu Tochigi: Tochigi-ken Geijutsu-sai 20-nen shi*. [Tochigi Prefectural Committee for the Publication of Art Tochigi (ed) *Art Tochigi: The 20-year History of Tochigi Art Festival*]

Tochigi-ken (1983) Tochigi-ken Kyōiku linkai and Tochigi-ken Bunka Kyōkai, *Geijutsu Tochigi: Tochigi-ken Geijutsu-sai 35 nen-shi*. [Tochigi Prefectural Board of Education and Tochigi Prefectural Association of Culture, *The 35-year History of Tochigi Art Festival*]

Tochigi Shinbun (1982) 26 December, 'Kiro-ni tatsu kenritsu-bijutsukan bunka'. [*Tochigi Newspaper*, 'Prefectural Art Museum Culture at Turning Point']

Watanabe, T. (1998) *Dai-sōdō: Tochigi-kenritsu Bijutsukan mondai no shinsō*, Mibu: Sano Kanzan Kenkyujo. [*Great Confusion: The Truth about the Tochigi Problem*]

Yagyū, F. (1982) '1950-nendai no omoide', in Kanagawa-kenritsu Kindai Bijutsukan (ed) *Kanagawa-kenritsu Kindai Bijutsukan 30-nen no ayumi: shiryō, tenrankai-mokuroku, 1951–1981*, n.p. ['My Memory of the 1950s', in Kanagawa Prefectural Museum of Modern Art (ed) *The First Thirty Years of the Kanagawa Prefectural Museum of Modern Art: Archives and the List of Exhibitions, 1951–1981*]

Yagyū, F. (2000) personal interview, 12 May, Ueno, Tokyo.

Yoneda, K. (1984) 'Sakkon no ken-bijutsu-kai ni tsuite', *Shimotsuke Shinbun* 31 October. ['On the Recent Situation of the Art World in the Prefecture'].

***Masaaki Morishita** is a Research Associate for the Sainsbury Institute for the Study of Japanese Arts and Cultures, School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London. His research interests include the sociology of art, the cultural history of museums, and modern and contemporary art. He currently lives in Japan to develop his new research project concerning the increasing popularity of Asian contemporary art in the global and the local artistic fields.

Address

Email: mm94@soas.ac.uk: masaaki66@mac.com