

Japanese Contemporary Art and Globalization: Largely Seen from Participation in the Venice Biennale

John CLARK

University of Sydney

Globalization and Globalism

Globalization is the process whereby markets and investment flows for goods, production systems, and cultures previously identified by the control of the nation state have increasingly escaped that control. Flows of people, goods, concepts, and values have also moved across territorial borders in ways which appear to be autonomous of the state units, and even sub-state cultural units, between which the movements take place. Globalism may be thought of as the ideology which defends and fosters these processes, as well as at least latently constituting a system of knowledge about how, why, and for what interests those processes take place. In as much as understanding of the ideology of globalism implies knowledge of the processes of globalization, this provides ground for an external critique which itself may be motivated into a different and critical ideology.

I have examined theories of globalism and globalization elsewhere in the context of Chinese and Thai art of the 1980s and 1990s and do not want to rehearse all those arguments here.¹ But I would like to simply identify certain perspectives based on that study which may also be indicative in looking at globalism and Japanese art.

With regard to the problematics of globalism/globalization in the cultural domain one might ask is there a full-blown absorption of contemporary Japanese art into the global “world-system”, or is the Japanese art world still bifurcated into domestically oriented and an internationally oriented sectors, in Japan². The last reservation is critical because we can quite easily conceive of the Japanese art world being two-tiered, or with two articulations, until the 1980s when there was extensive exhibition of Japanese contemporary art abroad for the first time. This may have resulted in the 1990s in Japanese art assuming a certain importance and automatic inclusion in international art exhibitions curated by non-Japanese. Yet at the same time, despite absolute dependence of the Japanese economy on world markets, Japanese art may have also included a latent desire for intervention and resistance to Euramerican modernism, without quite the force of a search for an alternative modernism one might see in China. Indeed, we could say that the search for a Japanese modernity was already realized by the Taishō period (1912–1926) when the critical identification of an individualized artistic life was achieved relatively free from broader social goals or national

1 See Chapter 7 “The Global” in John Clark, *Asian Modernities: Chinese and Thai Art Compared, 1980 to 1999*, Sydney, Power Publications, forthcoming 2010.

2 See the introductory essay, Yaguchi Kunio, “The Venice Biennale and Japan,” in The Japan Foundation, ed., *Venezia Biennale–Nihonsanka 40nen / The Venice Biennale, 40 years of Japanese participation*, [Bilingual], Tokyo, The Japan Foundation & Mainichi Newspapers, 1995, p. 11.

agendas.³ With fifty years of broad, translated knowledge in Japanese of Euramerican modernism,⁴ there is no way Japanese art in the 1980s can be conceived of as apart from this modernism. It is thus apparent that the relatively small-scale incorporation of post-modernist theories in Japanese art criticism in the 1980s was partly the result of the syncretic tendencies already having been found for a long time in modern Japanese art at least since Meiji.⁵

Of more particular interest is the Japanese reaction to theories of multiculturalism or resistance to Eurocentricity. Here one may assume that resistance to Eurocentricity is in part carried by the very translation culture incorporated in Japanese knowledge systems including those for art. There has been a long trend of resistance especially in aesthetics to find in Japanese identity an ethnic specificity for life forms, tied especially to aesthetic discrimination.⁶ This was not countered with the post-war consumerist flood of mass images, and much *manga* and then *animé* imagery has been tied to specifically Japanese image genealogies and narrative techniques into which other-cultural interpretations can be read post facto. Of course such interpretations of mass cultural images and artefacts depend on the levels of cultural affiliation assumed between Japanese and other international or global material. But in a mass visual culture long exposed to both American cinema conventions and comic books it would make more sense to see Japanese material as the inflection of a visual domain rather than as its reconstitution from an other-culture, i.e. to see it as ethnically or culturally specific Japanese discourse. This does not hinder a Japanese culturalist construction found in *nihonjinron* theories and interpretations from representing a cultural conflict between 'East' and 'West,' but it does so surely as a content rather than a modality of narrative or visual practice. But as pointed out by several Japanese scholars⁷ 'multiculturalism' in a Japanese context is more a plea for a Japanese uniqueness not actually possessed by 'Japanese,' either as ethnos or as culturally specific practice. It may be merely supported as another version of an originally exclusionary tactic found since Meiji Japan, and of course earlier in late Edo nativist thought.

Identification with the national has atrophied in Japan with the increasing residence of Japanese overseas, and with the movement of and new identities for art producers and mediators, i.e. artists and curators. This has increased rapidly since the early 1960s' move of many artists to New York, following on from earlier movements to Paris. But if globalization has increasingly led to a weakened distinction between 'Japan' and its others, usually thought of as 'Euramerican,' the end of cold war had consequences we are still learning to engage with. For the ideological constraints associating art with US' freedom or system superiority against the old Soviet bloc have been lost as social and cultural systems have been re-constructed. This may have led to a 'festivalization' [i.e. spectacularization] of international cultural events with the Olympics in sport or World Fairs as

3 In English see for example, Menzies, Jackie, ed., 1998, *Modern Boy, Modern Girl: Modernity in Japanese Art, 1910–1935*, Sydney, Art Gallery of New South Wales, 1998 (co-curated by Ajioka, Clark, Menzies, Mizusawa); Tipton, Elise, Clark, John, eds., *Being Modern in Japan: Culture and Society from the 1910s to the 1930s*, Sydney: Australian Humanities Research Foundation and Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2000; Weisenfeld, G., *Mavo: Japanese Artists and the Avant-garde 1905–1931*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002; Kaido, K., and Elliott, D., *Reconstructions: Avant-Garde Art in Japan 1945–1965*, Oxford: Museum of Modern Art, 1985; Munro, A., et al., *Japanese Art after 1945: Scream Against the Sky*, New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1994.

4 The most telling index of this knowledge and its thoroughness is in the ten-volume series, *Sekai bijutsu zenshū*, Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1928–30.

5 See for example, Clark, J., "The Conditions for Post-Modernity in Japanese art of the 1980s," in Sugimoto, Y., ed., *The Postmodernity Debate and the Japanese Experience*, London: Kegan Paul International, 1994.

6 See for example the essay by Kishida translated in *Modern Boy, Modern Girl*, 1998.

7 As recently as September 2004 in a personal conversation with Tatehata Akira in Gwangju, Korea.

sites for the display of cultural goods taken as a model types. To these phenomena may be linked the increasing number of art Biennales, or the participation of Japan in these. To borrow the term of Appadurai, 'ideoscape,'⁸ the creation of ever more spectacles of international cultural exchange focussed on art [as well as film, performance, new media, ceramics, to name those Biennales recently founded in Korea] means that a new kind of ideoscape has been established as the consequence of global relativization of the 'national.' But Biennale participation overseas or organization at home also functions at the same time as a strategy for the re-insertion and re-assertion of the 'national' within global discourses, such as art, where the international level may be seen as denying or denuding the 'national.'

For the purpose of debate let me somewhat artificially tabulate the following relationships:

| Country | São Paolo ⁱ | Venice ⁱⁱ | Own Biennale ⁱⁱⁱ | Olympics ^{iv} | 'Meijification' ^v [Development] |
|---------|------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---|
| Japan | 1951 | 1952 [1955] | 2002, Yokohama | 1964 Tokyo | >1890–1950< |
| Korea | 1963 | 1986 [1988] | 1995, Gwangju | 1988 Seoul | >1945–2005< |
| China | 2000 | 2003/[2005?] | 2003, Beijing | 2008 Beijing | >1949–2009< |

ⁱ Year of first participation, Chinese participation was non-official in 2000.

ⁱⁱ Year of first post-1945 participation, [] indicates year of own pavilion. Taiwan and Hong Kong exhibit separately.

ⁱⁱⁱ Japan earlier had the Tokyo Print Biennale and China had Biennales in Guangzhou and Shanghai. These years mark the beginning of a full-scale biennale with official, central government support.

^{iv} The years the Olympics are held mark significant changes in economic stability and political advance, and the events themselves were accompanied by significant cultural events in both Japan and Korea, as may also be expected too in China in 2008.

^v 'Meijification' refers to relatively closed, state-centred, national development for notionally 60 years.

If globalization in art may be at least partially defined as an increasing level and intensity of participation at recurring exhibitions an international level, it has some relationship to the trajectories of national development, with temporal variation between countries. Before the mid-1950s in Japan with the rise of the Gutai group, or before 1970 in Korea with the local development of the Seoul School of monochromists, or the growth of a secure and self-innovating non-official art in early 1990s' China, we might in the very broadest sense characterize the relation of modern art to development as one of developmentally facilitated transfer and adaptation of formal discourse from Euramerica. Here one should simply note that the principal index of development is economic because it also signs the potential for transfer of capital from economic to cultural fields, although this remains to be actually ascertained in practice.

Such transfer and adaptation from centre to another, from Euramerica to Japan, Korea, or China, is not the case thereafter when globalization marks or creates an increasing sectoral bifurcation of the economic and cultural [and here art] worlds. This is part of processes of role specialization and separation of the production from the life-worlds as considered by Habermas, for example,⁹ which I cannot follow in detail here. However the above time-scales differ, they tend to

8 See Appadurai, Arjun, *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996.

9 See Habermas, Jürgen, *The Theory of Communicative Action*, 2 vols, [tr. Thomas McCarthy], London:

indicate a process where development reaches a certain level, and economic capital is accumulated and then re-directed into cultural capital usually through education and initially by the agency of the territorial state. One expression of this transfer of cultural capital on the plane of a globalized art, if we may so theorize it, is in national participation at exhibitions which transcend the national level, even as significantly they are simultaneously constituted by it. This occurs either through exhibition as single national representatives in São Paolo, in sending national sections to the Venice Biennale, or in the national organization of Biennales themselves.

But in a sense what we see for Japan, as with different periodizations for Korea and China, is the establishment of trans-territorial discourses of the national. This may also be shown internationally by artists identifying as Japanese but living in another country, such as Japanese artists long resident in New York like Kasahara Emiko. This amounts to a 'de-territorialized discourse of Japanese-ness' one which has already been noted for Chinese and Thai artists in similar locations. Artists find themselves having one national origin and often aesthetic affiliation, but living and working at an interface with other nationally defined or sited art worlds. They begin to work at the interstices of cultural contact both in their own practice and in their own institutional location. They become hybrid entities and persons, and operate transnational networks which may bypass national mediators such as curators. One can see an early example of this in the work of Arakawa Shūsaku in 1960s' New York or a later example in the work of Murakami Takashi, originally a *nihonga* painter, who began to work with pop cultural imagery and icons drawn from Japanese everyday life but which also have a very strong base in US' cartoons and the Disney imagination of Mickey Mouse and his plastic toy avatars.

Japanese Art at Venice¹⁰

We may get a convenient picture of how Japanese negotiations with the changing context of international art developed by examining the developing perceptions of Japan's participation at the Venice Biennale. It may be useful to analyse the participation at Venice in detail since the texts on which we can draw are both reliable and indicative of a deepening and developing Japanese understanding of the significance of Biennales, and of the nature of international artistic flows. In the next section, I will subsequently examine how this understanding may change or at least re-contextualize our understanding of Japanese international exhibitions in the 1980s and 1990s.

Shifts in appraisal of Japanese artists internationally are recorded in the commentaries to the various participations at the Venice Biennale. Japan had had sporadic exhibits at the Venice Biennale since the 19th century.¹¹ In the early 1950s it was clear that sending established Japanese *yōga*

Heinemann, 1984.

10 Japanese art at Venice is conveniently surveyed in The Japan Foundation, ed., *Venezia Biennale–Nihon-sanka 40nen/The Venice Biennale, 40 Years of Japanese Participation* [Bilingual], Tokyo: The Japan Foundation & Mainichi Newspapers, 1995. I quote extensively from this work which is not widely available and as an important survey touching on many aspects of post-World War II Venice Biennales deserves to be better known outside Japan. In 1995, when Jean Claire the French director cancelled *Aperto*, there was also an important Japanese intervention at Venice in the form of the exhibition funded by the Fukutake Science and Culture Foundation which sought to situate work of artists from a wide range of non-Euramerican cultures. See Nanjō Fumio et al., *Transculture: La Biennale di Venezia 1995* [Bilingual], The Japan Foundation & Fukutake Science and Culture Foundation, Tokyo, 1995. Japanese reports about Venice usually appear in *Bijutsu techō* at the time of the Venice Biennale, such as the special issue in September 1995.

11 In 1897 at the 2nd Biennale, a large display of Japanese arts and crafts was sent of 75 works, including 35 *Nihonga*, and was organized by Nihon Bijutsu Kyōkai which then had 1067 members, Naganuma Moriyoshi being sent to handle works. In 1924 the 14th Biennale included a display of 13 paintings and prints, and in the

artists to Venice was unlikely to meet with international success. Takiguchi Shūzō noted in 1952 that,

Established Japanese painters have just emerged from an exclusionist, reactionary period, but they need to look back even further in the past and reflect on the path of modernization taken since the Meiji period. That is, they need to undertake a re-examination of modern art, beginning with its fundamentals. What has become as new problem for us is the relevance of Japanese-style painting for the world. A new Japanese art can only be created from Japanese reality, and this reality is not isolated from developments in the rest of the world. If one tries to shut one's eyes and make a unique Japanese art, it will only be treated as a local or regional art. I believe that the *poésie* [poetics] of a global spirit will have the utmost effect on others when it appears in a different form. This is the kind of dialogue that we desire.¹²

This a frank and immediate postwar declaration that the international level provides a global aesthetic for art which can take Japanese art out of a mere localism or contingent history. This position, so important for having been adopted by the leading Japanese pre-war surrealist poet and critic, could easily have been countered because of the award of prizes to the print-maker Munakata Shikō at São Paolo in 1955 and at Venice in 1956. Although trained as an oil painter, Munakata was in many sense a kind of modern traditionalist whose subject matter was a kind of 'Japanese spirit'. But some Japanese de facto curators at early post-war Biennales such as Hijikata Teiichi early on noted that,

As international contacts in art have increased since the war, the inconsistency between domestic and international judgement has become obvious to everyone'....¹³ 'being different from others, not slavish copying, is an attribute of originality, but penetrating to the source of undiscovered plastic form to achieve self expression is most important.... We need to get rid of the bad habit of leaving international valuation up to foreigners. Here too, a contemporary tradition in our own country is badly needed.¹⁴

So here is the basic contradiction, found later in many discourses on global/local comparison and strategies of artistic choice. Hijikata thinks that the evaluation of self-expression should be an internalized, domestic contemporary art. He falls back into the domestic evaluation so disliked by Takiguchi who had favoured international appraisal. In addition, the appraisal of domestic art circles was always likely to favour artists who were not known internationally. Kamon Yasuo in the summary of his later overall analysis of Japan's participation at Venice posited that the

basic concept of international exhibitions is to introduce a large number of promising young artists. Perhaps we should reflect on the fact that, in the early days, we only exhibited well-established masters who were nonetheless unknown outside Japan.¹⁵

1928 16th Biennale Léonard Foujita [Fujita Tsuguharu, then resident in Paris] was included in special School of Paris section. In the 1930 17th Biennale one work by Terasaki Takeo was shown. He had studied etching in Italy. In 1931 planning of Japanese national pavilion was begun, but was scrapped after outbreak of the war with China. It was also later proposed that Japan take over the pavilion of Austria in 1942. In 1934 at the 9th Biennale, work by Kuniyoshi Yasuo was shown in American pavilion, as also in the 22nd Biennale of 1940. See historical materials in *Venezia Biennale–Nihonsanka 40men*, 1995.

12 Ibid., p. 12.

13 Ibid.

14 Ibid., p. 13.

15 Ibid., p. 216.

Thus the contradiction of domestic evaluation is not merely that it is likely to deal with art which will not find international acceptance, it also actively removes the possibility of recognition to younger artists. Kamon, was the commissioner of the Japanese exhibit in 1964 when Paris-based Dōmoto Hisao won the Arthur Lejwa Prize at Venice. He thought by that time that the wave of new international currents in 1960s and its concomitant outburst of creative energy meant that the distinction had become even clearer between 'domestically-oriented artists who participate in art association exhibitions' and 'internationally oriented artists who work and show as individuals and respond to international art trends'. After a hiatus between 1968 and 1974 which I will return to shortly, it became clear in the 1978 Venice Biennale with Nakahara Yūsuke as Commissioner, that some younger artists would see the Biennale as a way of changing Western perceptions of Japan. Suga Kishio, then exhibiting at Venice, wanted to break down the illusory idea of Venice (the West) held by previous Japanese participants as well as the illusions about 'Japanese things' held by Westerners thus changing the structure of these ideas.' Suga hoped to introduce an 'intrusive feeling' 'enabling it to disturb "the typical preconceived ideas of Japan" seen from the West.'¹⁶ By the 1980s the view had prevailed that the function of the exposition and the Japan Foundation which supported it was 'how to nurture and develop international artists.' This was interestingly the year when the old structure of the national pavilions was to be circumvented by the advent of the independently curated *Aperto* sections which from now on were to be concerned 'with effectively presenting the direction of the moment, the dramatic appearance of New Painting or Neo-Expressionism.'¹⁷ By 1988 the freshness and langour of the figurative wood sculpture of Funakoshi Katsura was remarked on, 'this was probably the first showing in the Japanese pavilion of an artist with a postmodern (or quasi-postmodern) sensibility.'¹⁸ By 1993 it was felt by Tatehata Akira that the Japanese Pavilion and *Aperto*,

have enhanced steadily the international reputation of Japanese art. Quite a few of the artists have been able to go on and exhibit their work in major galleries and museums outside Japan, so generally speaking, the determined efforts of the Japanese officials and participants in the Biennale have been repaid.¹⁹

Overall participation in Venice, particularly after the *monoha* expansion overseas from the mid-1970s, was felt to be different from earlier locally oriented activities. Internationale exhibitions had become seen as a step to greater opportunities like artist in residence programmes' and excessive concern with the impact of the exhibition at Venice had implied quite a change in priorities.²⁰ It would appear that the general consensus had always been that the Biennale should provide the opportunity to activate the domestic art scene. Presumably it was to do so by providing a different set of opportunities to younger artists. The next step was a choice between a single-person show or a group show, and there were only two one-person shows, those of Shinoyama Kishin and Kusama Yayoi in the whole period of post-war participation at Venice.²¹ By the time the 40 years' of participation was being re-examined in 1994/5 its historical analysis led to the con-

16 Ibid., p. 33. Suga also thought in a kind of internationalized manifesto of *mono-ha* ideas that 'from their position seeing means that something must be seen, but in contrast to this, in the content of the "completely Japanese thing" I am seeking, I give positive value to the vague, indistinct realm on the periphery of objects which have definitive presence, things which can be seen but cannot, which exist but are not there.'

17 Ibid., p. 33.

18 Ibid., p. 38.

19 Ibid., p. 39.

20 Ibid., p. 15.

21 Ibid., p. 218.

clusion that 'we must be aware that it is time Japan attempted its own international exhibition.'²² Recognition was beginning to be firmer, although a fact of Japanese artists' residence and work abroad since the 1960s, that for Japanese artists according to Sakai Tadayasu,

[A]wareness of their native country is not necessarily an imperative. There exists, however, a mechanism which compels them to feel uneasy unless they have something that somehow relates to the heart of Japan, especially when looked at from the outside.²³

But this position was compromised according to Nakamura Yūsuke because 'when Japanese artists are described by non-Japanese as having typically Japanese qualities, they tend to get hurt, thinking that they are associated with a very old-fashioned image of Japan.'²⁴

Thus by the mid-1990s Japanese participation was directed at positioning younger artists internationally, but this was still problematic because artists were caught between themselves identifying with Japan and yet being over-identified as Japanese by outsiders.

Structure of Japanese Participation

A few points about the structure of Japanese participation, the method of selection of commissioners and artists are also indicative of changing Japanese official perceptions about the structure of international artistic relations. The 1950s' rather ad hoc appointment of specialists in literary exchanges with Europe such as Takiguchi, or of curators who were specialists in modern European art such as Hijikata were followed in 1960 by the Japanese decision to appoint a commissioner for Venice. The choice of artists was left up to this one individual rather than letting a committee select a broad range of artists which reflected a Japanese domestic range of appraisals, including then still influential art groups. This system continued until 1982 when Tani Arata was appointed commissioner, and he was the first commissioner born since World War II. The appointment of a professional to whom choice was left, and then of a person outside the Japanese art association and museum hierarchies, spoke both of an increasing self-confidence in the appointment procedure, but also of a wish to match younger or more contemporary art practices with those thought to be more current internationally. From the 1980s artists were now to be selected from a group of three to five artists born after the war who had been nominated from six different regional recommendations and information. The final decision was made by Tani and then approval sought from those who had made the recommendations. This was clearly a procedure adopted after French antecedents, but there was also study of British Council methods to 'strategically introduce British artists to the world. An intensive effort is made to give the artists international exposure, and an international tour is arranged for the work shown at the Biennale.'²⁵

In the 1980s Venice exposition was increasingly seen in Japan as part of a cycle of other international exhibitions in which the Japanese art and the artists selected were to be positioned. In 1983, there was an exhibition of *Five Contemporary Japanese Artists* at the Düsseldorf Kunsthalle three of whom were artists selected from the 1982 Venice Biennale. Kunsthalle exhibitions had become the site for a new phenomenon, the theme show curated by an independent curator.²⁶ In other words, Japanese selection for Venice was increasingly being tied in with perceptions of other international contemporary art, and when in 1984 Tani Arata, was again appointed Com-

22 Ibid.

23 Ibid.

24 Ibid., p. 217.

25 Ibid., p. 14.

26 Since that curated by Harald Szeeman, *When Attitudes Became Form* of 1968 at the Bern Kunsthalle.

missioner, the exhibited artists all had prior international exhibition records. The artists were: Itō Kōshō [4th India Triennale, 1978], Takubo Kyōji [9th Paris Biennale 1975], Hori Kōsai [10th Paris Biennale 1977]. The need to promote European exposure was recognized and a Japan Foundation staff member assigned as assistant commissioner, the person to occupy this post being Nanjō Fumio.²⁷ Furthermore, greater sovereignty was given to the curatorial team's decision to select artists who would succeed internationally and the procedure of regional nomination was no longer used, judgement on selection being made by the commissioner alone.

1986 saw the choice of Sakai Tadayasu as Commissioner. It was thought that the choice of a museum curator probably reflected a greater concern for effective planning of the exhibition 'as well as the selection of the artists'. The importance of selection for exhibition at other than the national pavilion became increasingly recognized through the 1980s with the creation of *Aperto* as a new site at Venice for curated shows of contemporary practice. The 1988 *Aperto* included Morimura Yasumasa, Ishihara Tomoaki, Endō Toshikatsu, Nishikawa Katsuhiko, and Miyajima Tatsuo. Most importantly Nanjō Fumio became a member of the international selection committee for *Aperto* due in part to recognition of Japan's economic strength, and in part to the effective intervention of a British Council official who supported Japan's inclusion. This was followed in 1993 when Jeffrey Deitch, an international curator for *Aperto* chose Yanagi Yukinori [*World Flag Ant Farm*, which won the Swatch prize], Tsubaki Noboru, and Nakahara Kōdai. In the same year *Transactions*, another supplementary exhibition included *Chiezō*, Morimura Yasumasa, and Yoko-o Tadanori.

By the mid 1990s the increasingly trans-national location of artistic practice was recognized both in the Biennale theme which was 'Cardinal Points of Art' and referred to nomadism and 'a flexibility transcending national or regional barriers.'²⁸ This was shown in the selection of a single artist Kusama Yayoi, only the second one-person show in the national pavilion, and an artist who had spent much of her creative earlier years in the USA. The selection rather forced the need to consider notion of an "international artist" in the Japanese context, and 1995 saw the turning point exhibition *Transculture* which was the first Japanese-sponsored exhibition outside the national pavilions of the Giardini, and a truly international exhibition where nationality was secondary to curatorial categories and type of artistic practice.²⁹

27 Nanjō mentions there were three jury meetings to plan *Aperto* 1988. The first meeting was for getting to know the other curators discuss basic issues, the second meeting deliberated artists' selection. Nanjō showed some but not all of his slides, and at a third meeting eight artists were selected, and guidelines laid down based on key words between curators agreed at the second meeting. Selection was by strong support or majority support, rejection by not particularly strong support or opposition by one of the juries. Nanjō took fifteen portfolios to the third meeting, of which five were accepted (*Venezia Biennale—Nihonsanka 40nen*, 1995, p. 202). One juror said that 'since the artists chosen by *Aperto* have increased in value in the art market, we must be very careful,' thus indicating a sharp awareness by curators of the economic impacts of their selection judgements (*Ibid.*, p. 200).

28 *Ibid.*, p. 39.

29 The artists exhibited at *Transculture* were: Gordon Bennett [born and working in Australia], Frédéric Bruly Bouabré [born and working in Ivory Coast], Cai Guoqiang [born in China and working in New York], Ping Chong [born in Canada and working in USA, New York], Simryn Gill [born in Malaysia, then living and working in Singapore], Joseph Grigely [born and working in USA], Kōmura Masao [born and living in Japan], Shani Mootoo [born in Ireland, working in Canada], Murakami Takashi [born in Japan, then working in Japan, also in USA, New York], Shirin Neshat [born in Iran, working in USA, New York], Alwin Reamillo & JulietLea [born in Philippines and UK, working in Philippines & Australia], Technocrat [artist group founded in 1990 in Japan by Ameya Norimisu], Adriana Varejão [born and working in Brazil], World Tea Party [artist

Nanjō made several important observations about the structure of the Venice Biennale:³⁰

1. The grand prize tended to go to only the most powerful countries. To middle-sized and smaller countries, this appeared to be a reflection of power politics. However, there was a loss of goal for artists once prize system abolished.
2. Giardini exhibitions were conservative and there was a need for a place to introduce young talent.
3. There was a lack of unitary theme or overall direction for the Venice Biennale.

But Nanjō made a most frank statement that the role of national artistic selection was over, and in which the production of art is tellingly likened to a multi-national car corporation's design and assembly techniques:

My belief that the time is past for simply selling the artist of ones own country to the world. In this postmodern, multicultural period, there are problems with the very idea of categorizing artists according to nationalities. The most important issue is the country where the artist and curators find the source of his or her ideas or where they live. It is like determining the identity of a car which is designed by an American, made in a British factory, and sold under the name of Honda.³¹

Perception of Structure of Venice Biennale

Interacting with the perception of what it means to exhibit Japanese artists at Venice, and how their selection and curator should be determined, lies the issue of the kind of site Venice is in Japanese perceptions.

The clearest perception is that Venice, and indeed most international exhibitions are about modern art, and by implication 'Western' modern art: 'an international exhibition of this kind in the West has a single orientation, toward modern art.'³² What is called 'international' or 'modern' at least until *Transculture* in 1995 is 'Western' and does not involve, or does not yet imply, a separate, parallel, or competitive-conflictual notion of 'non-Western' or 'Asian' modern art. Japanese reports about Venice are full of shrewd and accurate perceptions about the politics of prize-giving, and the relative significance of this as a means of appraising the significance of artists. In 1958 it was noticed that major prizes in painting and sculpture went to Italians, that Mark Tobey won the Venice Mayor's prize, and that Antoni Tapies won the David E. Bright foundation prize. Okada Kenzō won the Astore Meyer prize and the work was purchased by National Gallery of Modern Art, Rome. But then it was noticed that the French were scandalized by the lack of award to French artists. In 1960 the international jury now kept independent of the national committees. Nonetheless there was conflict over the prize for the French progenitor of *art informel*, Fautrier [in the Italian pavilion], or for Hans Hartung [in the French pavilion], and there was a telegram intervention by André Malraux on behalf of Fautrier. The most significant shock to French pride came in 1964 when the American Rauschenberg won the Grand Prize for painting, so marking the shift, of the world centre for contemporary art from Paris to New York. This had only partially been deferred in the late 1950s by the international tendency towards *art informel*, in part typified by the work

group born and working in Canada), Rene Yung [born in Hong Kong and working in USA, San Francisco]. For details see Nanjō Fumio et al., curators, *Transculture* [Bilingual], The Japan Foundation & Fukutake Science and Culture Foundation, Tokyo, 1995.

30 *Venezia Biennale—Nihonsanka 40nen*, 1995, p. 197–202.

31 *Ibid.*, p. 201.

32 *Ibid.*, p. 11.

of Fautrier. In retrospect Malraux's action was clearly observed in Japan as shift towards state intervention in the prize awarding: 'what used to be a contest among art dealers for a prize suddenly seemed to have turned into a national competition.'³³

The 1968 Venice Biennale came after the almost year long student unrest in France and other parts of Europe and there was much media attention on the protests. The Biennale was criticized as a 'festival of commercialism and super-powerism',³⁴ and all artists except Arman closed their exhibitions. The French commissioner Michel Ragon even went to so far as to state 'it is an insult to be assigned by the De Gaulle regime'. The Japanese commissioner was Hariu Ichirō, and the 'situationist' Takamatsu Jirō won the Carlo Cardazzo prize. Two of the Japanese artists, Takamatsu and Miki left the decision about opening or closing the Japanese pavilion to Hariu. He decided to keep Japanese pavilion open because of the request of Sugai Kumi and Yamaguchi Katsuhiro who wanted this since they had come at their own expense and did not have much chance to exhibit elsewhere.³⁵ This must have been a considerable irony for a well-known leftist art critic like Hariu, but it is greatly to his credit in the support for the artists above all. It may perhaps also indicate the emergence of a certain Japanese distance from international art fashions that he decided to keep the Japanese pavilion open.

In 1970 the Biennale Council abolished the prize system. It was observed in Japanese reports that the Biennale authorities sought to put the emphasis on the participation of artists as individuals around a given theme rather than as representatives of countries, despite the costs of their exhibiting still being borne nationally. This position was ignored by national governments. But the problem was more acute for the political problems of Venice were overshadowed by other large openings in the international art scene. Modernist art was being criticized on all sides during 1970s [because of its implication in established or repressive state positions], and there was a real risk of Venice being supplanted by the much better funded Kassel Documenta and Paris Biennale for Young Artists [since 1959].³⁶

Exhibitions in the 1970s suffered from the absence of prizes, but the problem was more the authority of the Venice Biennale itself. Hariu wrote that 'although there has been some modernization in structure and operations, everyone felt that it had lost its authority as an international stage.'³⁷

Venice was indeed in danger of being superseded from the outside because Szeeman had 'successfully presented a representative sampling of the hottest new art movements, including Hyper-Realism, Conceptual Art, and Happenings.'³⁸ Prominent contemporary artists like Estes, Richter, Dibbets had all been shown in Documenta. At Venice, from the inside, the Japanese commissioner Tōno Yoshiaki noticed that the Italian exhibition of 'Works or non-works' challenged the notion of the exhibitible art work. He wrote that this sub-exhibition:

focused on the opposition between artists who stick to the old forms of "works of art" like painting and sculpture, and the "non-works" which depart from these forms, entering into the space of real life or presenting conceptual situations prior to works of art.³⁹

The 1974 Biennale was cancelled but by 1976 the Biennale had established on a four-year

33 *Ibid.*, p. 216.

34 *Ibid.*, p. 24.

35 *Ibid.*

36 *Ibid.*, p. 31.

37 *Ibid.*

38 *Ibid.*

39 *Ibid.*, p. 32.

plan, 1974–1977 being the first quadriennium. This envisaged a change of emphasis:

1. to make the exhibition more audience-centred.
2. to take an anti-fascist position and cooperate with democratic forces in exile.
3. rather than making a festive, tourist-oriented event, to carry out continuous activities over a four-year period.
4. to expand the exhibition to the entire Veneto region.

Curators were recruited from outside, like Achille Bonito Oliva, promoter of the concept of *Transavanguardia* and Harald Szeeman from Documenta 5 chosen in 1980. This seismic shift in the positioning of younger curators away from national intervention within the Biennale was followed by other structural changes such as the introduction in 1984 of a substantial catalogue rather than a pamphlet. This post-exhibition documentation was to become a permanent feature of Biennales thereafter and was absorbed, so far as I know, by every other new Biennale in the 1980s and 1990s. In 1986 the prize system reintroduced, and gradually the policies of participating countries became ‘more international, politics [as a theme] assumed a prominent place in art.’⁴⁰

Official receptions at hotels outside the Biennale became more prominent part of the social networking among curators and art world people and in 1990 for the first time the Japanese curators and officials held an official party at an hotel. A much more multi-cultural or other-than-exclusively national approach became evident on the part of national pavilions. This had in part been signified earlier by the participation of artists in their country of residence or affiliation rather than natal origin. The Japanese-born artist Kuniyoshi Yasuo had shown in the American pavilion in 1952. In the participation of artists Venice was becoming the site for the manifestation of the ‘borderless nature of the modern world.’⁴¹ Some Japanese curators in retrospect even thought that:

From now on, in my opinion, it is desirable to work together with curators and artists from other countries to plan Biennale exhibitions, searching together for new directions in art rather than simply showing off Japanese art on a larger scale.⁴²

It was the smaller or non-national pavilion exhibitions in *Aperto* at the Arsenale which became the most important markers and certifiers of contemporary practice.

Participation in these exhibitions has been related to fundamental issues of living in today’s world, specifically the issue of contributing to world culture from a global point of view.

However, some Japanese curators like Nakahara Yūsuke presciently warned that if the national system were to be abolished then there would be no need for commissioners. The selection of artists would narrow down and privilege some art world actors: ‘selection would inevitably concentrate on a number of countries, since there is no one who is perfectly well-informed about contemporary art all over the world.’⁴³

In other words, a curator well experienced in international exhibitions in Japan during the 1970s and overseas in the 1980s recognized in a highly prescient manner that the removal of national curators would present problems of evaluation, and would also make possible the concentration or reduction in the choice of selected artists, a phenomenon which was exactly what was to occur.

40 Ibid., p. 38.

41 Ibid., p. 201.

42 Ibid.

43 Ibid., p. 217.

Brief Re-examination of the International Exposure of Japanese Art in 1980s and 1990s

If we briefly go back to 1980s and early 1990s, there was a concerted effort to position Japanese art in Europe and North America via various exhibitions. I have analysed the selection of artists for these exhibitions elsewhere, and it remains a feature that there were only about 30% or less new artists introduced to foreign viewer by each successive exhibition.⁴⁴ Indeed what was clear about this kind of horizontal, inter-state positioning of Japanese art was that a small cohort was drawn for the purposes of international introduction from a much larger cohort of Japanese artists. This reduced and replicated fraction of national artists became a feature of international circulation of art and artists under the conditions of globalization, almost as if only a limited numbers of names could be identified and circulated. But the functionality of this restriction can only be seen, I think, as a feature of curatorial interest on the side of Japanese mediators restricting the outwards flow of Japanese artists. On the reception side it is reflected in the knowledge base of local curators, or in their perception of the reception demand of a local audience for non-Euramerican and specifically Japanese contemporary art. If the variation in the Japanese artists was too large, the flow would increasingly go beyond the capacity of a limited range of Japanese outward mediators to position them; if the flow was too small, Japanese production would seem monotonous and limited. However, with the movement of Biennale curation into the hands of independent curators like Bonito Oliva in 1993 and Harald Szeeman in 1999 and 2001 at Venice, as well as the entry of Nanjō Fumio, a Japanese curator to selecting for *Aperto* in 1988 and in creating a substitute for it in 1995 in *Transculture*, we might see the level of international Biennales as having been penetrated by globalization. The wish to select artists who indicated such transculturality in what we may identify as the artistic component in the ideology of globalism. This would be the case whatever particular styles or artists these curators favoured, such as Oliva's selection of Chinese artists in 1993 and Szeeman's showing of many Chinese artists from the Swiss Sigg collection in 1999.

In other words, if the number of Japanese artists in international circulation was more or less circumscribed at bi-national exhibitions in the early 1990s, it was also to be restricted by the advent of new curators at the international level who were seeking for tendency representation from Japanese artists in terms of criteria were set internationally. It usually meant selection of artists, curators, and gallerists active in New York, almost exactly as implicitly foreseen by Nakamura Yūsuke. Thus the exhibitions of Japanese artists in the late 1980s and early 1990s which it should be re-

44 See Chapter Eleven of Clark, John, *Modern Asian Art*, Sydney: Craftsman House & Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1998. This text was written in 1995. The exhibitions were:

Halbreich, Kathy; Kōmoto Shinji; Nanjō Fumio; Sokolowski, Thomas; *Against Nature: Japanese Art in the 1980s*, New York: New York University Grey Art Gallery, 1989. [Toured USA, 15.6.1989–12.2.1991]

Nakahara Yūsuke et al., *Europalia 89: Japan in Belgium*, Gent: Museum van Hedendaagse Kunst, 1989. [Belgium, 28.10.1989–7.1.1990]

Hara Toshio; Fox, Howard T.; *A Primal Spirit: The Contemporary Japanese Sculptors*, Tokyo: Hara Museum of Contemporary Art & Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1990. [USA, toured 10.3.1990–22.9.1991]

Kondō Yukio; Nanjō Fumio; Weiermaier, Peter; *Japansicher Kunst der Achtziger Jahre*, Frankfurt: for the Frankfurter Kunstverein, Edition Stemmler, 1990. [Frankfurter Kunstverein then 15.2.1991–7.4.1991, Museum der moderner Kunst, Wien]

Namba Hideo, Okada Takahiko; *Japan Art Today*, Tokyo: Sezon Museum of Art, 1990. [Scandinavia, 24.1.1990–25.8.1991]

Annear, Judy, Tatehata Akira; *Zones of Love*, Sydney: Museum of Contemporary Art, 1991. [Australia, 5.1991–9.1992].

called almost all involved selection in collaboration with non-Japanese curators, seem to represent the leading edge of a phenomenon to be much clearer by the end of the 1990s and early 2000s. That is, the restriction of artists and art works is in circulation at the 'international' or 'global' level, rather than the supposed inverse, the increase in the possible range of such circulations under the effects of globalization. This restriction may have been due to the motivated ability of a small number of curators who had access to information to control its flow, as much as to the demand of international curators for a 'new' art from 'other' cultures. This occurred simultaneously with the restriction on their own absorption and learning capacities due to their status as independent curators with restricted time and budgets for research investment.

Even in 2004 the restriction on flow is quite clear in, for example, an exhibition in Seoul, 'The New Trend of Contemporary Art and Culture of the New Generation,' which despite the title actually consisted of the works of only two artists and one lecture by a Japanese commentator.⁴⁵

Very Recent Biennales: Yokohama 2001, Gwangju 2004, Busan 2004, Shanghai 2004⁴⁶

What can be gleaned from very recent Japanese organization and participation at Biennales for understanding of the relation of Japanese art to globalization. Indeed does it point any further to the nature of globalization processes in art?

The peculiarity of Yokohama 2001 was that it was curated by four different curators each with their own conceptual analyses. Overall the Triennale was premised on the obsolescence of the scientific approach which would not provide any answers to the problem of 'how to relate as individuals to the whole, or how the individual can be singled out from the whole.'⁴⁷ The exhibition envisaged a flexible approach crossing traditional, professional boundaries with the aim that 'we want this exhibition to present a new, more comprehensive vision of the role that art can play in society.'⁴⁸ The exhibition was envisaged in the title "Mega-Wave" as 'drawing in the accomplishments of all fields of human endeavour.'⁴⁹ These grand designs are found in many other Biennale catalogues and here we may see that Japanese curation overall sought the same kind of scale and obvious pretension as other such exhibitions. One can only think the intention was to meet an international standard, however different the practical implementations were to be. Nakamura Nobuo also lays down a progressivist dimension into which this exhibition fits from *Les magiciens de la terre* [1989, Paris] through *Cities on the Move* [1998–2000, Vienna, Bordeaux, New York, Humlebaek (Denmark), Helsinki, Bangkok] to *Laboratorium* [1999, Antwerp], to *Mutation* [2000, Bordeaux]. Albeit this a progressivist development against the trend of the other major international exhibitions including Biennales. Nakamura doesn't present much substantive argument as to why Yokohama should be on this track save by implication its intention and willingness to 'rethink issues' and address 'the creativity of the human race in the 21st century.'⁵⁰ The modality which Nakamura presents is that of 'a dialogue that is starting to take place amongst people with

45 The exhibition was *Saki + Eri: New Stances and Popular Imagination of Contemporary Art in Japan* held from 17th September to 16th November 2004 on the ground floor of the Hungkuk Life Insurance Building and organized by Ilju Art House. The same building houses the Japan Foundation Korea offices as well as those of the British Council. The artists were Yoshimiura Eri and Satomu Saki and the lecture was by Matsui Midori. In addition there was a lecture by Yee Yongro, as well as performances and talks by the artists.

46 See the Appendix for more detail on these biennales. This year also included Geangu 2004, Busan 2004, and Shanghai 2004.

47 *Yokohama Triennale 2001*, p. 18, from Nakamura Nobuo 'Future for Today.'

48 *Ibid.*, p. 13.

49 *Ibid.*

50 *Ibid.*, p. 18.

heightened sensibilities and new ideas about the future', thirty years after their first appearance in English.⁵¹ The second curator, Nanjō Fumio includes an essay in the catalogue which is basically a compendium of recent ideas from genetics and chaos theory, with citations of the artists Miyajima Tatsuo, Cai Guoqiang, and Mario Merz.

He praises ambiguity and concludes after citing Tanizaki Jun'ichirō's 1933 essay *In'ei Raisan* [In Praise of Shadows], that, 'seeing positive value in grey zones is an extremely important attitude for we who are setting sail from desert of chaos for the sea of the post-genom[ic]. The domain of shadows is indeed a fertile source for new life.'⁵²

I am not quite sure what this mixing of intellectual mode or metaphor is intended to achieve save the freedom of the curator to select.

The third curator Tatehata Akira in a more thought-through piece, positions the value of nostalgia as a way out from, or for simply handling, the colonial and its residues, and suggests the flexible use of the notion of 'Asia as passage' in order to put the 'concept of Asia in as broad a perspective as possible.'⁵³ Tatehata is clearly aware too that supposed mutual respect for cultural difference can also be a ploy by which chauvinist essentialism is let in by the back door:

if pluralism means that each regional culture should be maintained in a pure condition, there will be too much emphasis on difference and an un fortunate disdain for eclecticism and mixing. This ultimately leads to the position that it is impossible to translate the meaning of one culture to another.⁵⁴

This is a remarkably supple understanding of the way the globalist acceptance of difference can be a masquerade for the lack of its actual acceptance, and by implication, above all in Japan. That this should be the position of at least one curator in the first Japanese international triennale means that some Japanese understanding of globalism in art has gone beyond the national, not as an international compact between nationalities or nation-states as they are, but as a trans-nationality.

The fourth and last curator Kōmoto Shinji criticizes the application of an "International Standard" for the selection of artists and hopes that the system of four curators has allowed the Yokohama Biennale to step outside this. Moreover he also considers his own exhibition area, which was in a re-built brick 19th century warehouse separate from the large trade-fair type exposition hall of the other three curators, as in a kind of critical opposition to its chaos. Kōmoto, like Nanjō, also resorts to metaphors drawn from recent biological thinking to structure his concepts but in his case uses the notion of transmission across cell membranes as a way of understanding how boundaries might be transcended. For him,

The boundary is not a restrictive barrier that needs to be removed. It is an active intermediary zone that connects the inner and the outer (the self and the other). It can be interpreted as an interface that vitalizes the organism.⁵⁵

In a conclusion which might be an extension of Tatehata's concepts, Kōmoto writes, 'We must transmit ourselves in order to know what position we occupy in the world. It thus follows that

51 *Yokohama Triennale 2001*, p. 18. As his sole cited intellectual support Nakamura chooses the 2000 Japanese translation of Gregory Bateson's collection of earlier essays brought together in 1971. See Bateson, Gregory, *Steps to an Ecology of Mind*, New York, Ballantine Books, 1972. Bateson's earliest celebrated work was *Naven* published in 1936.

52 *Ibid.*, p. 49.

53 *Ibid.*, p. 88.

54 *Ibid.*, p. 89.

55 *Ibid.*, p. 117.

in order to know our own positions, we must also understand that in a certain sense, we are also forgetting the other.’

It is interesting that the language used to position artists so clearly relates across these curators to the problem of barrier, the relocation of the knowing subject—be it the curator or the nation-Japan as subject—that indeed despite all the inter-connectedness of Japanese economy and culture to the world, increased many times beyond that which followed the Second World War and US’ occupation, that the notion of incommensurability and barrier should still be the implicit tenor of this discourse. Despite the complexity of the process of artist selection across putative cultural boundaries, the methods used to understand this or to conceptually position artists and works are those germane to this field only in the case of Tatehata. In the other three curators they are those of anthropology, genetics, and cell biology. It is difficult to judge whether this discursive trope is simply the Japanese avatar of an international tendency to use elaborate metaphors imported from other disciplines—rather than acute and direct social analysis—as the hermeneutic mode. Certainly light thinking with heavy ideas is a curatorial habit elsewhere and we could simply see its manifestation in this Japanese site as a global tendency within a Japanese context. Alternatively, it could be seen as the claim of curators to intellectual status within the Japanese art world which has local and more deep-seated causes.⁵⁶

Nanjō Fumio also wrote a retrospective summary of his experience of the Yokohama Triennale⁵⁷ in which he very roundly criticizes the system of four curators, and wishes to see it replaced by a single overall director who can take responsibility, together with a Non-Profit Company to take charge of organization. This would be rather than the system at Yokohama 2001 where the Japan Foundation, Yokohama City, NHK, and Asahi Shinbun were all on the actual organizing committee. Some of the other four curators he criticizes—although not by name—for only concerning themselves with curation and not taking up the ancillary curatorial tasks, such as talking to sponsors, operating the appropriate managerial environment, or trying to arrange additional satisfaction for the unpaid volunteers who assisted the Triennale, such as organizing a party for them and the artists. For Nanjō one of the significant features of the Triennale was its ability to attract about 350,000 visitors on a two-day pass, probably around 200,000 individuals of which he calculates around 180,000 were new to contemporary art. His only observation about criticism are that there was a view that from overseas the exhibition overall seemed to lack a clear direction and from the domestic side that ‘there were [too] few paintings.’ Nanjō does not comment on the relationship of works shown to tendencies in art elsewhere and indeed refers to the layout of the four sub-exhibitions in terms of the curators such as in ‘Nanjō’s artists,’ ‘Tatehata’s artists’ et cetera, naming neither tendencies nor their international connections or significance, although there is considerable attention to how the artists and some works were placed in the various spaces for ‘exhibition effect.’ Another critic Minamishima Hiroshi commented on the absence of a symposium which meant that even though ‘there were not very many overseas critics and curators’ who came, they could at the next meeting of *aica* ‘make meaningful suggestions to the organizers.’⁵⁸

56 These are too deep to go into here but involve the culture of translation and use of translated terms in intellectually fashionable Japanese discourse, in a kind of institutionalized intellectual snobbism. There is also a prejudice against non-intellectual art which is part of one side of the history of the Japanese avant garde. On the other side is a grandiose and sometimes aggressive expressionism as seen in the work of Okamoto Tarō, for example.

57 See *aica Japan Newsletter* no.2, in November 2001, ‘Yokohama Toriennaare 2001 kōki—sono tenmatsu no kojinteki memorandum.’

58 *Ibid.*, p. 8.

Analysis by Hasegawa Yūko about Istanbul 2000 which she curated is far more forthright in situating that Biennale. She intended,

a positive proposal on how culture could function as a device for resistance under conditions where there had been much criticism given about the influence on spiritual and cultural matters of the global economy such that it could be called a new colonialism.⁵⁹

Hasegawa clearly situated her Biennale in a globalizing context using some biological concepts to suggest a theme based on the idea that ‘whilst recognizing the ego, there would be a “lithe” [*shinayaka*] escape from it, in which a separation and a distance could be held whose result was that a field of consciousness could be held in common with the other.’⁶⁰

As in the warm acceptance by the people of Istanbul, the success of the first large scale exhibition in our country the Yokohama Triennale showed the present multiplicity of expression just as it is through the high quality of the works. How each exhibition actually functions differs in each country and city. The most important thing is that the curator first of all creates for the people living there and combined with their own history truly considers what kind of dialogue is possible in that temporal space.⁶¹

It is interesting that whilst Hasegawa is full of praise for the ‘multiplicity of expression’ shown at Yokohama she is more concerned to relate her exhibition conception and selection to the demands of a place, and fairly clearly to a quite different and globalized problematic than Nanjō. His position, such as it is visible, seems more to be derived from the pragmatics of his experiences at Venice and other Japanese exhibitions in Europe where the relevance of the nation-state as a constructor of the art expressions of artists not longer seems valid, either due to the artists’ very mobility or to the permeability of the nation-state as a unit. But like three of the curators at Yokohama, including Nanjō, Hasegawa resorts to heavily biological metaphors to interpret the context in which she works and has established exhibition goals: she does not offer an analysis of the structures of art institutions themselves. This detachment of reflective, conceptual analysis from the avowed practice of a good few curators may be due to the complexity of the interests they must satisfy, and, it must be noticed, to their own self-interest in career benefits and cultural brokerage which are almost never mentioned. That they are so enabled in their practice or their representation of it may be seen as one of the most telling effects of globalism. Why, after all, should national actors, be seen as making non-national aesthetic decisions in selecting artist and works?

By Way of a Conclusion:

It is quite revealing to look at some simple statistics which show the overall structure of Biennales into which Japanese exhibition has fitted. We can see that against the 28.3% of Japanese artists to total artists exhibiting at Yokohama, there were 26.9% Koreans in the main exhibition *A grain of dust* at Gwangju, 16% Koreans in the *Contemporary Art Exhibition* at Busan, and 61.8% Chinese artists at Shanghai. However, if we take the total number of Korean artists in all the collected exhibitions at Busan the real percentage of Korean artists to total artists exhibited is more like 65.4%.⁶² There were around two times as many Korean artists at Gwangju and Chinese artists at Shanghai than Japanese artists at Yokohama. Around 2–8% of artists at Gwangju and Shanghai were Japanese or Chinese, whereas around 4–7% were Korean or Chinese at Shanghai. We can thus see,

59 Ibid., p. 9.

60 Ibid., p. 10.

61 Ibid., p. 11.

62 I.e. $127/194=65.4\%$ or $[21+6+31+50+19/78+8+31+50+27] \times 100=65.4$

perhaps counter to expectations, that the Yokohama Triennale was far more internationalized than Gwangju and Shanghai—although not as highly as Busan. This should be taken to indicate that the Yokohama Triennale as an exhibition event is far more strongly constructed as a world event than the other two Asian biennales. This indicates both deliberate policy on the part of the exhibition organizers, but also the far greater openness of the Japanese art world to outside currents.

The Japanese experience of exhibiting at Venice, with its careful if bureaucratically directed history, also indicates, if we take the Yokohama Triennale as its result, that globalization of a domestic art world or its contact zone with a putatively international one, is only achieved as the result of a long-drawn out series of contacts from the national to the international level, and not by the immediate organization of a Biennale or Triennale as such. Thus however often argued by its artists or art theorists, the globalization of the Korean and Chinese art worlds is yet to occur, or occur on the scale it has already taken place in Japan.

Appendix. The Biennales of Yokohama 2001, Gwangju 2004, Busan 2004, Shanghai 2004

The primary information on Yokohama is derived from the catalogue, Makabe Kaori, Mikami Yutaka, Yokohama Triennale Office, eds., *Yokohama Triennale 2001*, Yokohama, The organising Committee for Yokohama Triennale, 2001. I have also referred to earlier statements on the website by the curators. There is also a special issue of the *aica Japan Newsletter* no. 2, in November 2001 including articles not only by Nanjō Fumio on 2001 Yokohama, but also by Hasegawa Yūko on the 2000 Istanbul Biennale, and by Shimizu Toshio on the 2000 Shanghai Biennale where both were curators. ‘aica’ stands for *association internationale des critiques d’art*.

The Japanese, Korean, Chinese, and other Asia-Pacific artists exhibited at these exhibitions were as follows, with the ratio of each category of artists to total artists given as percentages. Collectives were counted as one artist for this purpose. I have not attempted to derive separate figures for the categories of European, North America, Latin American, African, or Middle Eastern artists who also make up the figure for total artists:

Yokohama, 2001, 113 artists

Japanese: Aida Makoto, Akasegawa Genpei, Akimoto Kitsune, Akita Masami [Merzbow], Endō Toshikatsu, Fujihata Masaki, Ichihara Hiroko, Ichiyanagi Toshi, Itō Zon, Kasahara Emiko, Kusama Yayoi, Nakagawa Sōchi, Muraoka Saburō, Nakagawa Sōichi [+Laurent Moriceau], Nakazawa Ken, [Nguyen-Hatsushiba Jun], Oda Masanori, Oki Keisuke, Ōno Yōko, Orimoto Tatsumi, Ōzawa Tsuyoshi, Shimabuku, Shinoda Tarō, Shiota Chiharu, Sone Yutaka, Sugimoto Hiroshi, Tabaimo, Tomoita Toshiaki, Tone Yasunao, Tsubaki Noboru [+Muroi Hisashi], Tsuzuki Kyōichi, Yanagi Miwa. [32/113=28.3%]

Korean:

Bahe Yiso, Choi Jeong-hwa, Ham Kyung, Koo Jeong-a, Sowon Kwon [5/113=4.2%]

Chinese [including Overseas, Hong Kong & Taiwan]:

Cai Guoqiang, Ding Yi, Huang Yongping, Sun Yuan, Peng Yu, Wu Ershan, Xing Danwen, Yang Fudong, Zhang Huan [9/113=7.9%]

Other Asia-Pacific:

Atul Dodiya [India], Destiny Deacon [Australia], Anita Dube [India], Katya Guerrero [Philippines], Heri Dono [Indonesia], Navin Rawanchaikul [Thailand], Stelarc [Australia], Fiona Tan [Indonesia] Rirkrit Tiravanija [Thailand] [9/113=7.9%]

Gwangju, A Grain of Dust, A Drop of Water, 2004, 78 artists

Japanese: Torimitsu Momoyo, Iijima Kōji [with Daredemo Picasso TV show], Miyajima Tatsuo, Muzucks

[Mori Yoshiaki, Mori Masaaki, Horiguchi Kazunori] [4/78=3.1%]

Korean:

Jheon Soo-cheon, Park Bul-dong, Jeon Joon-ho, Kim Byung-jon, Kim Seong-young, ECO Artists, Geum Yoong-ki, Buan People, Lee K.H., SAA, Kim Jin-ran, Lim Ok-sang, Lee Jin-yong, Lee Doh-soo, Hwang Ho-sup, Kim Min-jung, Pai Dong-hwan, Koh Hon, Cho Young-nam, Baik Soon-shil, Hong Sin-cha [21/78=26.9%]

Chinese [including Overseas, Hong Kong & Taiwan]:

Yue Minjun, Sun Yuan & Peng Yu, Sun Xiaofeng [3/78=3.8%]

Other Asia-Pacific:

Francis Ng [Singapore], Anish Kapoor [India/UK], Nguyen Minh Thanh [Vietnam], The Kingpins [Australia], Alfredo & Isabel Aquilizan [Philippines], Moelyono [Indonesia], Tisna Sanjaya [Indonesia], Michael Perkowhai [New Zealand] [8/78=10.2%]

Gwangju, Biennale

Amusing footsteps, 8 artists

Korean / other [6/8=75%]

Korea Express 31 Korean artists [100%]

And others 50 Korean artists [100%]

Ecometro, 2004, 27 artists

Japanese:

Majima Ryōichi, Yamamoto Motoi, Matoba Satami, Tamai Takeshi, Ōishi Hirokazu [5/27=18.5%]

Korean:

14 artists & 5 institutions [19/27=70.3%]

Chinese [including Overseas, Hong Kong & Taiwan]:

Lin Tianmiao & Wang Gongxin [1/27=3.7%]

Busan, Contemporary Art Exhibition, 2004, 137 artists

Japanese:

Takamine Tadasu, Novaia Liustra [group], Nakamura Masato [3/137=2.1%]

Korean:

Bahc Yiso, Choe U-ram, Choi Gene-uk, Han Kye-roon, Park Eun-kuk, Sim Jun-hwan, Yang Haegue, Yoo Young-ho [+Bernhard M. Kinzler], Ahn Chang-hong, Anh Sung-keum, Chang Yong-chnag, Ipgim, Lim Song-ryong, Li Set-byul, Gyon Son-kuk, Song Sang-hee, Yang Man-ki, Hong Sung-min, Im Heung-soon, Jo Seub, Kim Sung-hwan, Lee Yoon-jean [22/137=16%]

Chinese [including Overseas, Hong Kong & Taiwan]:

Lu Hao, Shi Qing, Wu Ershan, Yang Fudong [3/137=2.1%]

Other Asia-Pacific:

Nindityo Apurnomo [Indonesia], Herman Chong [Singapore], Tran Luong [Vietnam], Tsangaandarin Enkhjargal [Mongolia], Emil Goh [Malaysia/Australia], Rosemary Laing [Australia], Apichatpong Weetra sethakul [Thailand], Trinh T. Min-ha [Vietnam/USA] [8/137=5.38%]

Busan, Sea Art Festival, 2004, 46 artists

Japanese: Hayakawa Mayu, Kaji Mizuho, Tsubakihara Akiyo [performance] [3/46=6.5%]

Korean:

Chung Hyun, Ha Suk-won, Kim In-tae, Kim Yoon-joon, Park Jong-hyun, Choi Hbok, Group [Choi Soon-hwan, Shin Jae-hong, Youn Sung-june], Group [Choi Ji-yeon, Lee Khyung-hou], Chon In-sik, Jang Jun-seok, Jung Dong-myung, Kim Hee-young, Kim Kyoung-ah, Group [Lee Hyun-geol, Kwon Min-gyu, Lee Dong-ju], Sleeping Bird [collective], Yang Hae-chung, Kim Chun-gee [performance], Zo Sung-zin [performance] [18/46=39.1%]

Chinese [including Overseas, Hong Kong & Taiwan]:

Chen Jianhong, Lu Sun [2/46=4.3%]

Other Asia-Pacific:

Ajesh S. Kumar [India], Chumpon Apisuk [Thailand, performance] [2/46=4.3%]

Busan Sculpture Project, 2004, 20 artists

Japanese:

Saitō Tōru [1/20=5%]

Korean:

Kang Yi-soo, Kim Byung-chel, Kim Dong-yeon, Kim Czong-ho, Kim Jin-Soo, Park Eu-seang, Kim Chang-gon, Lee Jong-bin, Kim Jong-gu, Pae Jin-ho, Yi Hwan-kwon [11/20=55%]

Chinese [including Overseas, Hong Kong & Taiwan]:

Huo Liang, Sui Jianguo [2/20=10%]

Other Asia-Pacific:

Pintor Sirait [Germany/Indonesia] [1/20=5%]

Shanghai, 2004, total, 110 artists

Japanese: Suzuki Ryōko [with Wang Qiang], Nibroll, Ono Yoko [Japan/USA] [2/110=1.8%]

Korean:

Choi Jongbum, Park June-bum [2/110=1.8%]

Chinese [including Overseas, Hong Kong & Taiwan]:

Big Dipper group, Sun Zhezhen, Wang Kia, Yan Fenglin, Chen Haiyan, Chen Chieh-jen, Chen Shunchu, Chen Xiaoyun, Digital Art Group of Peking University, Zhu Qingsheng, Feng Mengbo, Feng Qianyu, Fu Yu & Jia Haiqing, Gan Zhao & Liang Zi, Geng Jianyi, Gu Xiong, He Jianjun, Hung Tung-lu, Hong Kong Art Centre, Hu Jieming, Hung Keung, Jia Zhangke, Jiang Yue, Ladder to Heaven Group, Cao Fei, Yang Fudong, Leung Meeping, Li Tiangbing, Li Xiao, Li Yang, Liu Shumin, Liu Bingjian, Liu Wei, Liu Zheng, Lü Chunsheng, Ni Haifeng, Ellen Pau, Qiu Shihua, Qiu Zhijie, Qiu Ting, Rongrong & Inri, Shao Yinong & Mu Chen, Su Xia, Sun Liang, Tsai Wen-yin, Tseng Kwong-chi, Tsui Miranda Ngai, Wang Bo, Wang Ningde, Wang Qiang, Wang Xiaoshuai, Wang Youshen, Wei Xing, Wu Ershan, Wu Quan, Xiao Yu, Xu Zhen, Young Hay, Yu Hong, 25000 Cultural Transmission Center & Government of Yanchuan County, Yue Minjun, Zhang Hui, Zhang Peili, Zhang Xiaogang, Zhao Gang, Zhou Hao & Ji Jianzhong, Zhou Tiehai [68/110=61.8%]

Other Asia-Pacific:

Tiong Ang [Indonesia], Jun Hatsushiba Nguyen [Vietnam/Japan], Khyentse Norbu [Bhutan], Vong Phaophanit [Laos/UK], Vivan Sundaram [India], Trinh T. Min-ha [Vietnam/USA] [6/110=5.4%]