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The Impossible Avant-Garde in Japan
Does the Avant-Garde Exist in the Third World?

Japan’s Example: A Borderline Case of Misunderstanding in Aesthetic Intercultural Exchange

AVANT-PROPOS

My subject will be incommunicability while forgoing the incommunicable, for how can one communicate the incommunicable? The latter constitutes the limit of what I will communicate here, and indeed of communication itself.

Ten years ago, much was said about intercultural dialogue. Dialogue is only possible about that which is dependent upon the logos. For a culture in which the logos is considered a form of ethical betrayal (Confucius), dialogue is no more than an expression of infidelity, perfidy, and ingratitude. Everything communicable is merely a rhetorical subterfuge seeking to satisfy a diplomatic need.

Dialogue with such a culture obscures rather than reveals its intended subject, at the cost of multiplying illusions of this ‘other’ which eludes presentation.

Without getting into a philosophical or sociological discussion on this subject, and so as not to repeat yet again the myth of ‘incrutable Japan,’ I will limit myself to the analysis of a specific example of the tragi-comedy brought about by this (by definition unmaintainable) ‘dialogue.’ In so doing, I will pose a concrete question: is the Japanese avant-garde (re)prensentable to the Western public?

Here, words such as ‘avant-garde,’ ‘Japan,’ ‘the Orient,’ ‘the non-Western (or Western) world,’ are granted purely operational and provisional value. They will be, then, subject to replacement...

If dialogue between France and Japan proves problematic, it follows that one must reexamine not only the relation between Japan and Korea along with other Southeast Asian countries, but also that between France and England, or England and Scotland or Ireland, or between France and Francophone (and non-Francophone) African (and non-African) countries. Our considerations of this question would then have to be increased in number. My own is simply a modest point of departure towards this end.
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THE FUNDAMENTAL AMBIGUITY OF JAPANESE AVANT-GARDE

In relation to Japanese fashion, I would like to begin with concrete examples (without rushing towards a synthesis which, in the final analysis, seems pointless to establish in the case of cultural misunderstanding). Let’s look at the case of Fauvism and Cubism. As we know, the adoption of an avant-garde stance in early 20th century Europe was made on the authority of its reference to African and Oceanic art. Now, if the ‘autochthon’ African people referred to the same sources as did Westerners, it could under no circumstances claim to be avant-garde; on the contrary, this choice of sources would merely signify, within autochthon culture, a type of ‘traditionalism’ which would be seen as, if not outdated, at least antimodernist to the extent that ‘modernization’ means, by definition, Westernization within the historical framework of this question.

The same dilemma is perfectly applicable to Japan’s case. Consider an example from poetry. If ‘haïku’ served as a decisive inspiration for the incontestably ‘avant-garde’ imagist movement, in France as in the English-speaking world, the same genre of ‘traditional’ poetry in Japan was apparently viewed as nothing more than an outmoded tradition to be consigned to the past through efforts at modernization. What may be considered avant-garde in the Western context is, in the Orient, nothing other than a type of ‘feudalism’ to be rejected in favor of modernization;

Hence here lies the fundamental ambiguity of claims to an avant-garde orientation in Japan. On the one hand, one cannot automatically consider haïku avant-garde simply because haïku poets inspired Western imagists. On the other, one would obviously be overly selective to see Japanese avant-garde poets as coming exclusively from among dadaists and Japanese surrealists. Rather than attempting to draw a line of demarcation between the avant-garde and the non-avant-garde, our interest lies in questioning the very possibility of doing so.

The notion of ‘modernization’ is therefore problematized. Take the case of painting as an example. The modernization of painting in Japan after the country was opened to foreigners in the mid-19th century consisted in learning the basic techniques of Western academicism: namely, modeling, chiaroscuro, and linear perspective to cite only three criteria. During precisely the same period, the agenda of Western avant-garde painting was formed through the abolition of these academic rules. It is in this context that the vogue of traditional Japanese art in Europe in the second half of the 19th century should be understood. Japan’s traditional art was free from the rules of Western academism, and it was due to this freedom that Japan served as a model for the European avant-gardes. ‘Japonisme’ in Europe was characterized above all by its negation of Western academic rules.

The Japanese reaction to this change of direction initiated by Western painting could not help but be a contradictory one, indeed triply so. First of all, modernization stands in sharp contrast to the avant-garde agenda, given that the members of the Japanese avant-garde were to abandon what they had only just learned from the Western academic tradition, all in the name of ‘modernization’. It would require enormous naivété not to take note of this discontinuity, indeed of this contraction, between modernization and the avant-garde in the Third World.

Secondly, this abandonment of academic techniques ironically intersects with Japanese tradition, which the Japanese avant-garde was above all supposed to denounce. Ostensibly an obstacle to the latter’s emancipation, the national tradition found itself, contrary to all expectations, in tacit complicity with the Western avant-garde. Given this troublesome complicity, reference to the West no longer afforded Japanese artists the possibility of resolutely opposing a Japanese tradition as something to be left behind. At the same time, the Japanese avant-garde in the plastic arts was left without the internal necessity for a revolt against the national artistic tradition’s authority.
Thirdly, the dream of a synthesis of the Western avant-garde and Oriental tradition proves theoretically impossible because it is tautological. Remaining true to the avant-gardist spirit, moreover, requires a revolt against tradition. In the case of Japan, then, it is in fact this national tradition which guarantees the plastic arts’ faithfulness to the Western avant-garde. Under these conditions, an East-West synthesis could only be accomplished in spite of the avant-garde artists, as they must inevitably be unfaithful to its spirit so as to remain faithful to its form, and vice versa (we will come back to this point). One would have to be hypnotized not to sense the threat of betrayal implied by any such optimistic dream of East-West synthesis.

THE AVANT-GARDE, AN OVERLY WESTERN NOTION

Separating traditionism from avant-gardism within such an osmosis would be tantamount to cutting the Gordian knot, whereas it is this separation, this distinction, that stands as the avant-garde’s very definition. Put another way, it is logically impossible to find an authentically avant-gardist position within Third World culture. What causes this ambiguity? The notion of tradition itself is based on a Eurocentric point of view. It is not by accident that the avant-garde came into its own during the colonial period. The appropriation of the Other by a Western Europe hoping thereby to regenerate its own traditions attains at this point its ultimate manifestation, and brings with it an inevitable identity crisis within Western Europe itself. That which is considered traditional in a non-Western context becomes avant-garde as it is integrated into a Western context. But this transplantation is a one-way dispossession. For a non-Western culture, this represents a double alienation: non-Western culture provides the Western avant-garde with an alli but, in so doing, the non-Western avant-garde is uprooted, and is capable of basing itself upon its own culture only through reference to the Western avant-garde. From this indirect means, moreover, can only result an Eastern 'enlite-garde.'

A BLIND SPOT AND ITS THREE CONSEQUENCES

The definition of the Western avant-garde is thus not applicable to non-Western reality. Yet whenever a constitution of an avant-garde corpus for non-Western countries is attempted, it is inevitably the definition of the avant-garde forged in the context of European art, which is invoked as the criterion of demarcation. This tendency creates a blind spot which makes doubly impossible any constitution of an avant-garde belonging to the non-Western world. On the one hand, that which is identifiable in Japan as avant-garde through its formal resemblance with examples of the West is, by definition, an epigone of Europe. On the other hand, that which does not fit into the latter 'déjà vu' category is automatically subsumed into ' Tradition'.

Divided between imitating the West and regional tradition, the non-Western world is refused the right to its own 'authentic' avant-garde. This is clearly a tautology, for once such an 'authentic' avant-garde appears in the Third World, it goes beyond the very definition of the avant-garde. Is not the avant-garde label in the non-Western world, then, devoid of originality by its very nature? Is it a creation from these countries must seek another label than that of avant-garde. (Here we see a clear and surely incoherent solution; nevertheless a dilemma of irreconcilability remains unresolved. We will come back to this.)

It would be difficult to play a double game as absurd as this self-censorship, for the object of interest is removed in advance from the corpus to be established towards this end. Repression at once self-justifying and self-mystifying, since it is the logical coherence of this double operation which creates lacunae. We will mention three such types.

To begin with, all attempts at grafting the Western avant-garde onto Japanese culture are automatically excluded from consideration of the avant-garde. One need only think of the so-called 'national traditional' (Nihonga) genre of painting in modern-day Japan. The translation of the term for this type of painting into European languages in itself leads to the term 'national' style is equivalent to substitution; but what other option, consequently outside the avant-garde, self-contradictory designation of a tautological and modern, any possibility of this renewing or 'modernizing' itself is communication cuts both ways. Non-Japanese term Nihonga which, on translation, would make it a tautology. Yet once paraphrased, the term enforces its original meaning.

Second omission: everything that is an equivalent, either anterior or posterior categorically excluded from consideration of the avant-garde. This would include flower art—making the flower live); what is called and crafts (kōgei, a neologism in Japanese since the 1870s), or calligraphy. I am irresistibly tempted to add to this list of these arts are Japanese culture’s being traditional and antiquated, they are alive and are not banished, unlike enjoy a 'status' that is at least social.

This is a doubly meaning: it functions as a Procrustean bed to fit into its own category; it properly Japanese areas dominate a contradictory statement at first glance: paradoxical one; because it was enter Japan to import and adopt the idea to call itself avant-garde, whereas
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Divided between imitating the West and regional tradition, the non-Western world is refused the right to its own 'authentic' avant-garde. This is clearly a tautology, for once such an 'authentic' avant-garde appears in the Third World, it goes beyond the very definition of the avant-garde. Is not the avant-garde label in the non-Western world, then, devoid of originality by its very nature? An original creation from these countries must seek another label than that of avant-garde. (Here we see a clear and surely incisive solution; nevertheless a dilemma of irre recuperability remains unresolved. We will come back to this.)

It would be difficult to play a double game as absurd as this self-censorship, for the object of interest is removed in advance from the corpus to be established towards this end. Repression at once self-justifying and self-mystifying, since it is the logical coherence of this double operation which creates lacunae. We will mention three such types.

To begin with, all attempts at grafting the Western avant-garde onto Japanese culture are automatically excluded from consideration of the avant-garde. One need only think of the so-called 'national traditional' (Nihonga) genre of painting in modern-day Japan. The translation of the term for this type of painting into English languages in itself leads to confusion. To Westerners, the term 'national' style is equivalent to 'traditional' style (a debatable substitution; but what other options are there?). This genre is consequently outside the avant-garde. What's more, through this self-contradictory designation of a type of painting both traditional and modern, any possibility of this branch of Japanese painting renewing or 'modernizing' itself is ruled out. Here the effort at communication cuts both ways. No such ambiguity exists in the Japanese term Nihonga which, on the other hand, is meaningless to foreigners. Leaving Nihonga as the genre designation without translating it would make it a euphemism reserved for specialists. Yet once paraphrased, the term engenders inevitable confusions. Explanation leads to deviation.

Second omission: everything to which one cannot assign an equivalent, either anterior or posterior, in Western culture is categorically excluded from consideration of the Japanese avant-garde. This would include flower arrangement (the way [tachi] of making the flower live); what is called, for lack of a better term, art and crafts (kôgei, a neologism in Japanese as is kôitsu for 'fine arts' since the 1970s), or calligraphy (the way [tsuo] of ink writing).

I am irresistibly tempted to add to these the martial arts, since all of these arts are Japanese culture's only export products. Far from being traditional and anticipated, these last art forms are very much alive and are not banished, unlike in Europe, as lesser arts, but enjoy a 'status' that is at least socially equivalent to 'high' art.

This is a doubly meaningful exclusion: first, insofar as it functions as a Procrustean bed, mutilating realities which fail to fit into its own category; next because, in reality, the Western avant-gardist-inspired revolts arose precisely in these properly Japanese areas dominated by traditional authority: a contradictory statement at first glance, to be sure, but not a paradoxical one; because it was enough for the Western school in Japan to import and adopt the latest Western styles in order to call itself avant-garde, whereas it was the national schools which were to undertake a general self-questioning to renew themselves. This renewal, which should be an avant-garde option par excellence in autochthonous eyes, is nonetheless not deserving of the title 'avant-garde' from the Western point of view. An inevitable difference of perspective!

Finally, the third lacuna: one which strikes me as the most ironic of all, especially in the conscience of the Japanese avant-garde's specificity that had been systematically eliminated during the establishment of the corpus in question. The irony is that anyone doing so must seek out typically Japanese traits in artistic efforts which had the specific intention of doing away with their 'Japanese' nationality. Indeed, the dream of the Japanese avant-garde between the wars was one of unconditional identification with the European avant-garde.

REPRESENTABILITY AS BETRAYAL

The ironic contradiction doesn't end there. This cosmopolitan dream of identification with the West proved alienating once these Japanese artists came into contact with the real Europe. The fate of these Japanese artists was peculiar; they could only make their mark in Europe by playing up their 'Japaneity' even though the desired end of their trip to Europe was to separate themselves from it. In the West, they were called upon to represent typical Japanese people in spite of the fact they desired to reject their Japanese background; in Japan, however, they could be recognized as being international, to the extent that they affected to have freed themselves from Japan. In both cases, recognition is only made possible through the filter of what they reject.
This presents an impossible situation, unless the artist, Janus-like, could exploit this antinomy by presenting himself to the Japanese as a Parisian artist, while in Paris exploiting himself as an incarnation of Japanese aesthetics, a temptation as irresistible as it was dishonest. Yet this brand of twofaced opportunism was the only remaining compromise that permitted a work of art’s originality to be communicated and recognized. This recognition was tragic in itself, for it could only be assured to the Japanese as a Parisian artist, while in Paris exhibiting him Janus-like, could exploit this antinomy by presenting himself through an act of cultural betrayal. This constitutes, after all, the only brand of eclecticism which allows for coexistence between Japan and the avant-garde. But was Japanese nationality, in fact, still involved? To respond to this question, one need only consider the Ecole de Paris of the 1920s: the members of this school were, for the most part, exiles lacking any sense of nationality, or were even marginalized Heimatlos.

JAPANEITY AS A LACK OF ORIGINALITY

An avant-garde considered typically Japanese would therefore be merely a product of intellectual hypocrisy. Indeed, nothing could be more absurd than seeking out Japanese originality in faithful imitations of the Western avant-garde. ‘Japaneity’ in this context would only serve to emphasize the shortcomings of these attempts at unconditional identification with the West, unless it is a kind of nationalistic excess subject to rejection before it can be recognized as being avant-garde.

Does not this negative condition call for a change in perspective? The famous ‘Japaneity’ should not be viewed as a kind of idiosyncrasy unique to Japan, but rather should be defined by its very lack of originality, for ‘Japaneity’ resides nowhere else but in absolute fidelity to the Western model, in other words in the lack of originality itself.

This leads us to an aberrant consequence, since it would surely be asking too much of the general public to appreciate a lack of originality. Herein lies the deadening dilemma faced by any serious organizer of a Japanese avant-garde exhibition, despite his best efforts to avoid it.

A CONSIDERATION OF THREE BORDERLINE CASES

How can this vicious circle be escaped? How is such self-intoxication to be prevented? The problem is that this impasse is inherent to the methodical approach itself. As long as we grant ourselves the authority of selecting works to be filed away in our prefabricated desk drawer labeled ‘avant-garde,’ we will be blocked at every turn. This said, it is not for us to propose another classification system, given that an ‘autochthon’ point of view no more guarantees an ‘authentic’ vision than does the Western perspective. We resist any such normative and authoritarian attitude. More useful to our purpose is a look at the incompatible interplay of intercultural glances as they meet over certain borderline cases. We will briefly consider three examples ordinarily excluded from the definition of avant-garde, in the West as well as in Japan. The logic of exclusion at work here is worthy of examination.

First of all, “The Popular Craft Movement in Japan” (mingei-undō), which sought to question the typically Western distinction between high and low art. According to YANAGI Sōetsu, who founded the movement in the 1920s, nothing is more pure and beautiful than everyday objects fashioned by anonymous and innocent artisans, ‘untainted’ by the wealth and ambition of modern artists. Unlike other avant-gardes in Japan, this movement did not model itself on the Western avant-garde but drew from its basic precept, namely the inversion of the scale of values. From the West, it took not the fruits but the tree which produces them, in order to transplant it into Japanese soil. It would be all too easy to call this a ‘traditionalist’ movement directly descended from William Morris, but it should instead be recognized that this traditionalist stance was itself part of the lessons learned by Japan from the West. The rehabilitation of Japan’s cultural heritage required the help of a foreign eye. One should not lose the sight of the as well, medievalism and primitivism avant-garde. We have come this starting point: in the Third World, equals infidelity to the avant-garde.

The second example is what is called Mingei (ukiyo-e hanga). If the Mingei tried to avoid the help of Western ideology, in negotiating both Western and East, it was not as an avant-garde artist, but as an avant-garde artist, but for it was called upon both to contribute to engraving within the Western fine arts, and to sensitize the Chinese people in some way to the new art, that is, to the popular art. The third example is what YANAGI Sōetsu termed ‘the popular craft movement in Japan’ (mingei-undō), which sought to question the typically Western distinction between high and low art. According to YANAGI Sōetsu, who founded the movement in the 1920s, nothing is more pure and beautiful than everyday objects fashioned by anonymous and innocent artisans, ‘untainted’ by the wealth and ambition of modern artists. Unlike other avant-gardes in Japan, this movement did not model itself on the Western avant-garde but drew from its basic precept, namely the inversion of the scale of values. From the West, it took not the fruits but the tree which produces them, in order to transplant it into Japanese soil. It would be all too easy to call this a ‘traditionalist’ movement directly descended from William Morris, but it should instead be recognized that this traditionalist stance was itself part of the lessons learned by Japan from the West. The rehabilitation of Japan’s cultural heritage required the help of a foreign eye. One

Indeed, the logic of exclusion at work here is worthy of examination.

Thirdly, a glance at architecture, as well as the end of the avant-garde. Scarcely has the concept of national identity been more popular than now, and is even more so in Japan, where the concept of national identity is still involved? To respond to this question, one need only consider the Ecole de Paris of the 1920s: the members of this school were, for the most part, exiles lacking any sense of nationality, or were even marginalized Heimatlos.
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Cluster of the general public to appreciate a...
ask the question: what of Japan can be presented to a foreign audience? Paradoxically, representative Japan is not deserving of representation, leaving only the exceptional as representable, either in the form of ancient cultures or in its more peculiar aspects. Japanese who are internationally representable therefore conceal the 'true' Japanese. So long as they live in Japan, the Japanese need never question their identity. The issue surfaces only in relation to foreigners who are, in effect, non-existent in Japan (or so claims Japanese collective consciousness). What requires no explanation on the national level suddenly becomes problematic once a foreign gaze is focused on it. How, then, is one to represent to a gaze exterior to the culture that which has not been represented within the culture? Responding to questions that go unasked in Japan is in itself an experience of displacement; only through suffering the stigma of transgression can we reach the goal we have set ourselves.

Yet this wound alone constitutes the cause and effect of Japan's power to fascinate as a (fictive) site of unknowability. We are incapable of crossing this threshold of intelligibility, this epistemological border. What we can communicate and transmit is limited to truth wounded by symbolic violence. But does not the intellectual task before us consist, rather, in constantly representing this wound, instead of arrogantly claiming to be Truth's keepers?

I should no doubt bring this to a close. In doing so, I venture to remind you of an old aporia. Its subject is tolerance. Can tolerance be tolerant towards intolerance? Our intellectual goal will ultimately consist in bearing up resolutely under this intolerable condition, even if we should fail victim to it.

Notes
1 The word katasuy significa in Japanese 'to talk,' 'to converse' and also 'to tell a lie'.
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Notes
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The original French text was read in the Actes du Colloque "Connaissance et réciproque (Louvrain: Presses universitaires de Louvrain, 1988), pp. 197-207.

The English translation was first published in Comparative and General Literature 41 (1993): 67-75. Translated by Margaret J. Flynn.
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