Refracted Colonial Modernity

Vernacularism in the Development of Modern Taiwanese Crafts

This chapter, which investigates the issue of Taiwanese identity in crafts, focuses mainly on the discourses of “vernacularism” and the invention of “native Taiwaneseess” during the Japanese colonial period and includes some extended discussion on the continuity and transformation of crafts in the postcolonial period. The vernacularism upon which I focus is a politicocultural ideology and a movement initially imposed and promoted authoritatively by Japanese artists and scholars. This led to the institutionalization and popularization of the value of the “native” by local Taiwanese people and developed into “nativism” (xiangtu zhuyi). Distinct from the complex ironic phenomenon of nativism observed in literature and social movements — that clearly manifests a subversive anticolonial stance by using the colonizer’s tools (i.e., language, media, and modern ideas) — nativism in Taiwanese art and craft during the Japanese period does not present visible signs of confrontation. Instead, it appears to have been a mutually nurturing project, with an interaction of elite and popular as well as colonizer and colonized. I use the terms vernacular/vernacularism and native/nativism in an overlapping sense in some places. In general, vernacular/vernacularism is synonymous with local and indigenous, which emphasizes the value of particularity as opposed to the international and universal, as in vernacular style in architecture. I also use the terms vernacular/vernacularism to indicate an idea/ideology itself, whoever the creator may be. In contrast, I use native (xiangtu)/nativism (xiangtu zhuyi) more specifically to apply to the nationalistic ideas expressed mainly from the colonized Taiwanese perspective, as in “native literary movement” (xiangtu wenxue yundong). Nativism also presupposes a natural cohesive organic community as a cultural ground in which one can cultivate “na-
The notion of “native” is as much a discursive product as that of “tradition.” As Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger have demonstrated in *The Invention of Tradition*, much of what is called British “tradition” has been revealed to be a modern invention. It is the same in Japan’s case, as Stephen Vlastos and the other contributors to *Mirror of Modernity* and Marilyn Ivy have demonstrated. They have problematized the notion of tradition in Japan by analyzing, for example, the discourses surrounding the notions of village, *furusato* (home or native place), and folk. As described by Vlastos, the notion of tradition is a reflection of modernity, a “mirror of modernity.” Vlastos has noted two distinct but overlapping senses of tradition, which are “‘the past’ against which the modern is measured” and “specific cultural practices believed to represent cultural continuity.” This “tradition” functioned to create cultural discourses of “authentic, pure and cohesive” Japanese identity constructed against the “modernity” of capitalism and against the “Occident.” Furthermore, as Vlastos and the other contributors demonstrate, during the Pacific War in particular, the notions of village and folk were manipulated politically to support colonial and imperial ideology against the other “Orient.” I examine vernacularism by using the analytical framework of “colonial modernity.” I provide case studies of both aboriginal and Han Taiwanese folkcrafts, with a particular focus on bamboo crafts.

**Japanese Discovery and Esthetic Construction of Aboriginal Crafts**

During the Japanese colonial period, anthropological research on Taiwanese crafts, which had begun at the turn of the century, triggered interest in the material cultures of the aboriginal High Mountain People (*gaoshanzu*). As Tomiyama Ichirō points out, the “complicit relation” between the Japanese academy and colonization saw anthropology developing as part of colonial studies, because it found a suitable “object of observation” in the colonies. Individual scholars such as Inō Kanori, a pioneer anthropologist who studied aboriginal cultures, Sugiyama Suco, a scholar of so-called “primitive crafts” including those of the Ainu and Okinawan people, Miyagawa Jirō, an entrepreneur who was also an amateur scholar, were all interested in the crafts of the so-called Taiwanese “savage” (*hanzoku*) and admired their original, unspoiled beauty and excellent craftsmanship. At the Fifth Domestic Industrial Exhibition held in 1903, under a category called “savage textiles,” crafts and tools by aboriginal people were displayed.
and portrayed in the Taiwanese Pavilion in a way that showed high esthetic appreciation. “Savage textiles” by the Atayal tribe were described as “the most developed and elaborate” of all the tribes, and jackets made by the Pingpu tribe were said to have “the most original design of bird figures.” Various objects of the tribal cultures were collected and classified by the Taiwan Government-General Museum after its establishment in 1908 and by the Institute of Ethnology at Taihoku Imperial University in 1928. As Chia-yu Hu discusses in Chapter 8 in this volume, these objects were also exhibited at various official exhibitions in Taiwan, abroad and in Japan as evidence of “primitive art” within civilized modern Japan. The views of those arranging such exhibitions can be summarized as an esthetic of modern primitivists, based on an evolutionary theory in which primitive natural beauty is measured against civilized and often artificially spoiled beauty.

**Yamamoto Kanae and Aboriginal Industrial Crafts**

The humanist artist Yamamoto Kanae represented a departure from the anthropologists’ primitivism in that his esthetic interest was combined with the idea of socioeconomic and educational reform. He was a painter and a print artist known as the pioneer of the “creative print” (sōsaku hanga) movement in the 1900s. He was also well known as a leader of the peasant art (nōmin bijutsu) movement and the children’s “free drawing” (jiyūga) movement, which were inspired by the Ruskinian and Tolstoyan project of peasants’ and children’s crafts in Russia in 1916, with which he came into contact on his way back from studying in France.

He visited Taiwan for a month in 1924 to observe Taiwanese crafts and to advise the government on how to develop the craft industry. He wrote many articles on aboriginal crafts and submitted a report on vocational craft education at public schools. Among his numerous recommendations, his ideas on “aboriginal crafts” are noteworthy. He found them to be of excellent quality, “beyond the level of my expectation,” noting that their functional nature was an integral part of the self-sufficient lifestyle of the aboriginal people (jiyō kōgei). As an expert on world folkcrafts, he admired Taiwanese aboriginal crafts as exhibiting the equivalent skill and design quality of Scandinavian, German, and Russian peasant crafts. At the same time, he found the Han Taiwanese crafts to be unimpressive. He challenged the view of most Japanese advisers on crafts, who considered bamboo and rattan crafts to be the most promising for development. His justification for this argument was threefold: first, he felt such crafts were not competitive with mainland Japan, where there were many bamboo
and rattan makers with better designs and skills; second, there would be a high transport cost for such exports because of their bulky and complex shapes; and third, he felt they employed poor techniques in dyeing and lacquering.¹⁹

Instead, he proposed the development of Aboriginal Industrial Crafts (Banchi Sangyō Kōgei). He advised that aboriginal crafts should be used as the main source for the development of the Taiwanese crafts industry, and that they should emphasize distinctive “local color.”²⁰ He proposed two strategies: to copy the best examples of the aboriginal crafts and sell these reproductions as souvenirs,²¹ and to create new products with a “new function,”²² using aboriginal designs as well as adding designs suited to modern urban life from nearby South Asian countries. These export products would be aimed at consumers on the Japanese mainland and in Euroamerica.²³ Yamamoto’s colored sketches of aboriginal crafts, with notes of his ideas about redesign, now collected at the Yamamoto Kanae Memorial Museum in Ueda, Japan, clearly illustrate his ideas. Examples of his innovative ideas include using a Paiwan wood carving of the poisonous “hundred steps” (baibu) snakes as the lid of a cigarette box (Fig. 9.1), using a Paiwan bamboo water container as a sweets caddy or a handbag (Fig. 9.2),

Fig. 9.1. Yamamoto Kanae, design drawing of the top lid of a cigarette/cigar box, using the Paiwan tribe’s wood carving pattern of the poisonous “hundred steps” (baibu) snakes, watercolor, ink and pencil, 58.5 × 38.2 cm, c1924, Yamamoto Kanae Memorial Museum, Ueda.
using a betel-nut bag as a lady’s handbag, and turning a wraparound Tsou skirt into a table centerpiece.

His objectives were twofold: ethnographical preservation and economic improvement for the aborigines. He stressed that the design skills and production process of aboriginal crafts should be preserved by promoting “aboriginal industrial craft.” This would save the costs of training since some aboriginal people would still remember how to make these objects, and it would give them confidence about their own taste and skills. He observed the degeneration and extinction of aboriginal crafts that had been brought about by colonialism and lamented the Japanese visitors, including the “barbarian subjugation army” and “cunning merchants” who destroyed or bought almost all the crafts from the aboriginal people and left nothing in the villages. Their crafts became collector’s items, which were later sold for a high price in antique shops. The aboriginal people, who no longer created these crafts, were instead employed by Japanese pharmaceutical and sugar companies, and Yamamoto noted the irony that the aboriginal people now had to spend the money they earned to buy inferior items. He also stressed the necessity of improving the economic situation by increasing the number of employed aboriginal people and by increasing trades and consumption with mainland Japan and Euroamerica.
Yamamoto’s mixture of artistic and pragmatic ideas on aboriginal crafts and industry is based upon the basic key notion of local color. This particular notion is extensively discussed in this volume by Yen, Liao, Lai, and Kojima in the field of fine art, but its significance can also be seen in the craft field, which I will discuss below. The notion of local color had been developed by the ethnocentric national design movements that had spread throughout the world from the late nineteenth century to the twentieth century. One can identify a “refraction” of modern design ideology in Yamamoto’s trajectory of ideas, for he had appropriated many ideas from the Russian peasant crafts movement. He introduced these to the Japanese peasant art movement, and later drew upon the Japanese experience for his Taiwanese aboriginal crafts project.

Yanagi Sōetsu and His Views on Taiwanese Folkcrafts

The view which defines Taiwanese crafts primarily in esthetic terms was promoted by Yanagi Sōetsu, a leader of the Japanese folkcrafts movement (Mingei movement). The Mingei movement evolved in the 1920s and launched a nationwide campaign for the revival of folk crafts; it later spread worldwide as an influential modern studio craft philosophy. Mingei theory, which centered on the “criterion of beauty” (bi no hyōjun), highlights the supreme beauty of handmade folk crafts for ordinary use. Mingei theory has an Oriental outlook based on Buddhist esthetics, but in fact is a modern “hybrid” product that deeply imbibed Euroamerican modernist esthetics ideas from the English Arts & Crafts movement; antirationalism, primitivism, medievalism, esthetic nationalism, as well as the Orientalism defined by Edward Said. This hybrid nature facilitated its universality because it had adopted a modern esthetic, but it also had a nationalistic aspect because it revolved around notions of “Japanese traditional folk crafts” and the “new Japanese esthetic.” These dual intrinsic elements developed a highly politicized Japanocentric modernism during the Mingei movement’s expansive activities in the Japanese peripheral cultures and colonies. I call this phenomenon of cultural transfer “Oriental Orientalism,” or to use the word I employed in the Introduction, “refraction.” Refraction encompasses the transferable nature of modernism as well as implying a degree of local modification during the course of that transfer; specifically it describes a Japanese version of Orientalism projected onto the rest of Asia. This “Oriental Orientalism” phenomenon is evident in Yanagi’s views on Taiwanese folk crafts.

Yanagi traveled to Taiwan in 1943 and “discovered” Taiwanese folk crafts, which included both aboriginal crafts and Han Taiwanese crafts.
His trip was assisted by high-ranking officials of the Culture and Education Department in the colonial government as well as by other important local officials and intellectuals. He traveled extensively throughout the island collecting several dozen folkcraft objects, exhibited them for two days in the Civic Hall in Taipei, and gave a lecture before he went back to Japan. On his return to Japan, an exhibition of “Savage Textiles” was also organized at the Japan Folk Crafts Museum. This visit of Yanagi to Taiwan took place during the period in which the Mingei movement was highly politicized. Yanagi observed the “primitive” and “Oriental” beauty in Taiwanese folkcrafts. He highly prized “savage textiles” (bampu), which he collected for his Japan Folk Crafts Museum in Tokyo (Plate 24). He wrote that unlike civilized Japanese, the High Mountain People, who “have not yet lost the primitive nature of making beautiful things” in their lives where “there is no historical development,” could still produce very beautiful textiles. He said that the beauty of these textiles could not be found elsewhere in the world, and they should be called meibutsu gire rather than “primitive” or “savage” textiles. While denouncing the derogatory connotations historically attached to these words, he redefined and repositioned them in the modern esthetic discourse of primitivism. Among Han Taiwanese crafts, Yanagi discussed bamboo crafts, with a particular emphasis on their “healthy” beauty. Claiming that “bamboo only exists in the Orient (tōyō),” Yanagi used metaphors and poetic descriptions such as “soft,” “magnificent,” “straight,” “pure,” “faithful,” and “moralistic,” seeming to imply that these were also inherent virtues of Oriental people. The “enormous power” and “strength” of the bamboo steamers (lan zheng), the “stunning” bamboo houses and bamboo chairs and furniture with the “sturdiness” and “natural beauty of bamboo,” were among the items Yanagi lavished with praise. In addition to their special significance because of their symbolic “Orientalness,” bamboo crafts employed original techniques that Yanagi believed could not be found “anywhere else in the world.” The Guanmiao village in Tainan, the center for the bamboo crafts, was described by Yanagi as “the best and almost ideal craft village in the world,” and as “utopia in reality.”

European Modernists’ Validation of Oriental Beauty

Bamboo was also validated by the Orientalist modernist designers such as Bruno Taut and Charlotte Perriand and became a crucial interface between Japanese and European modernity. Bruno Taut was an eminent architect-designer who was involved in the Deutscher Werkbund to promote German modern industrial design. Charlotte Perriand was Le Corbusier’s
right-hand designer and created modern classic furniture that became icons of modernism. Both Taut and Perriand visited Japan and highly praised Japanese traditional crafts and architecture, stressing the Orientalness of bamboo crafts. As their close friend, Yanagi repeatedly related anecdotes about his experiences with Taut and Perriand. Taut used bamboo, because of its Oriental beauty, to design many products during his stay in Japan from 1933 to 1936, when he was working for the Industrial Arts Research Institute (IARI) under the Ministry of Commerce and Industry in Sendai and collaborating with designers and craftsmen in Takasaki, Gunma prefecture, to promote industrial crafts (Fig. 9.3). Taut was stunned by the simple Taiwanese bamboo stools (yi qiao) and made many drawings of bamboo chairs brought back from mainland China by Hamada Shōji. Perriand, who was invited to Japan by the Japanese Ministry of Industry and Commerce in 1940 to give advice on the promotion of industrial crafts, was also captivated by the bamboo furniture. In the exhibition “Tradition, Selection, Creation” held at the Takashimaya department store, she exhibited Taiwanese bamboo stools (yi qiao) and a Taiwanese-style chair made under the instruction of Kawai Kanjirō (Fig. 9.4). She also exhibited several bamboo furniture pieces designed by herself, including a chaise longue, a version of her modernist masterpiece originally made of steel and leather, but here made of bamboo, thereby successfully translating bamboo into modernist language (Fig. 9.5).

Both Taut and Perriand stressed the “simplicity,” “healthy beauty,” and “total beauty” of architectural space, painting, and crafts, and the sophisticated unity of form, material, and function in Japanese traditional crafts and architecture. They also convinced Japanese people that they should recognize that the Oriental beauty of bamboo was a selling point that they could use to influence the future of modern design as well as for industry and exports to the West. Their views clearly reflect the esthetic trend in the modern movements in Europe, which were a continuation of those of the late nineteenth century. The mission of the modern movements was to rationalize and democratize design, to abandon the European upper-class tradition of overdecoration, to demarcate a strict division of fine art and crafts, and finally to seek an alternative aesthetic philosophy for total and functional design. In this European context, Japanese art attracted the European modernists’ attention as an inspired alternative, and, in John MacKenzie’s words, Japanese art was used as a “vehicle for radicalism” in Europe. At the same time, these European modernists empowered Japanese people such as Yanagi, who had been contemplating the uniqueness of Japanese art and design within the ongoing cultural debate about how to overcome the gap between the Orient and Occident. Nagata Kenichi astutely observes that Yanagi invented the “Japanese ethnic aesthetic” from the creed of “functional beauty” that had been the slogan of European modernism. Yanagi used the Occidental modern esthetic to validate his ideas, thereby making a compelling argument that Orientalness and modernity are compatible. This rhetoric continued to have a strong influence on the development of Japanese design after World War II and crystallized in the so-called Modern Japanese-style Design (Kindai Nihonchō Dezain) as part of the international Good Design movement.

This European Orientalist and modernist validation developed further in the colonial context through Kawai Kanjirō’s bamboo furniture project. Kawai was one of the most important potters and orators of the Mingei movement. As in the case of Taut and Perriand, Kawai was also struck by bamboo craft, but in particular by Taiwanese bamboo craft. He found in a Taiwanese bamboo stool and cupboard that Yanagi owned a “strong” and “healthy” character, and he developed the idea of correcting the weakness of Japanese bamboo craft, in which he had noted a neglect of the intrinsic nature of bamboo and an overmanipulation of material. Kawai found a company called the Japanese Bamboo Bed Manufacturing Company (Nihon Takesei Shindai Seisakujo) in Saga, Kyoto, owned by Ōyagi Harukazu, where bamboo beds were made of local Saga bamboo by Taiwanese craftsmen. In partnership with this company, Kawai designed various pieces of furniture, which were then handmade by three skillful
Taiwanese craftsmen (Fig. 9.6).48 They were exhibited at the Takashimaya department store in Osaka and Tokyo in 1941. Kawai happily described the work as having both “the skills coming out of the bodies of the Taiwanese craftsmen” and “vernacularity,” which had “a distinct flavor of mainland Japan.”49 The outcome of this hybrid product gave him “joy and hope,” directing him to a new creative path. Kawai was also greatly encouraged by Yanagi and other members of the Mingei movement who appreciated Taut’s and Perriand’s remarks on bamboo crafts but were not fully satisfied by their design.50 It is possible to observe Kawai’s appropriation of these European modernists’ projects as he attempted to achieve their design ideal using Japanese materials. Kawai became a Japanese modernist, challenging European modernists.

This idea of the creation of Japanese modernism also corresponds with the statement by Kenmochi Isamu, Taut’s disciple and an influential designer specializing in chair design, who was working at IARI. Reflecting the contemporary imperialistic atmosphere, Kenmochi proposed the creation of Oriental chairs in “the original Greater Eastern Asian Style” inspired by mainland Chinese and Taiwanese bamboo chairs.51 Here we can...
identify the phenomenon of refraction operating within a circular model. Starting with the European modernists’ validation, it is possible to observe the mirroring of their validation and appropriation in a Japanese context by people such as Yanagi. In projects such as that of Kawai, this becomes a Japanocentric discourse of “Oriental” culture involving colonialism, thereby strengthening European modernism.

Kanaseki Takeo, Tateishi Tetsuomi, and Minzoku Taiwan

Yanagi and the Japanese nationalists’ discourse on national art and “native” art, characterized by an essential Orientalness that was also supported by European modernists, was transformed into the discourse on Taiwanese native art by the activists of the Taiwanese folkcrafts movement, which centered on the magazine Minzoku Taiwan (Taiwanese Folklore) (Fig. 9.7).

Heavily influenced by Yanagi’s view, this journal of folklore studies was published monthly during 1941–1945 under the editorship of Kanaseki Takeo. Kanaseki was a professor of medicine at Taiboku Imperial University specializing in physical anthropology, but he was also a devoted amateur scholar of Taiwanese folklore and folkcrafts. When Yanagi visited Taiwan, Kanaseki was his main guide and showed him the crafts that Kanaseki had already “discovered” and studied. Minzoku Taiwan involved both Japanese and Taiwanese intellectuals and artists. There were three important regular columns: “Mingei kaisetsu” (A Guide to Folk Crafts) by Kanaseki, introducing folkcrafts; “Minzoku zue” (Folklore Pictures) by Tateishi Tetsuomi, a painter who depicted traditional street scenes and folklore; and “Kōbō zufu” (Studio Pictures) by Yan Shuilong, a painter and designer, introducing craft studios. These three initiated the Taiwanese folkcrafts movement in Taiwan under the theoretical guidance of Yanagi and Yanagita Kunio, a scholar of folklore. They “discovered” the folklore of Taiwan, recorded it, collected folkcrafts, and encouraged the Taiwanese craftsmen to continue using their traditional craft skills in creating modern folkcrafts. Like Yanagi, Kanaseki and his friends also paid special attention to bamboo crafts as being “the most remarkable folkcrafts in Taiwan.”

They featured bamboo crafts as having a supreme, “healthy” beauty. The images of vernacular things featured in Minzoku Taiwan through many illustrations and photographs were particularly attractive to the readership. Kanaseki’s column included photographs of objects, Tateishi’s column made use of his own woodblock prints, and Yan’s column had his own illustrations. In particular, Tateishi’s column used vivid depictions of street scenes, craft studios, food, and people to create a powerful visual effect in the modern individualistic style of sōsaku hanga (creative prints),
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which had been initiated by Yamamoto Kanae in Japan in the early twentieth century. His prints are attractively expressive, reflecting his personal attachment to and passion for Taiwanese culture (Fig. 9.8). Tateishi was born and raised in Taiwan until the age of seven and returned to Taiwan to work for nine years in later life. He had a bicultural identity as a Taiwanese, but also as a Japanese. His observation of the human aspect of culture shows his deep understanding of the Taiwanese culture. He was a partial insider, but was also equipped with the objective eyes of an outsider filled with insatiable curiosity. Tateishi propagated the idea of the native and local color by means of powerful modern images.

Development of Local Business and Consumers of Native Crafts

While the discovery and esthetic construction of Taiwanese crafts by Japanese intellectuals continued, a new craft industry of pottery, lacquer, wood, bamboo, rush, glass, and paper was rapidly developed by the Japanese. Although all the crafts, except those of lacquer and glass, had already

Fig. 9.7. Minzoku Taiwan (Taiwanese Folklore) 4, no. 3 (1944).
existed in Taiwan, this new craft industry, employing modern technology and business management, was developed during the Japanese period. Initiated by Japanese entrepreneurs, the new craft industry was often heavily subsidized by the colonial government. The government and entrepreneurs created a large number of local jobs and also implemented craft training as part of vocational and art curricula at schools. Apart from a few traditional crafts, such as Nantou pottery and Sanyi and Tongshao wood carvings, which continued to be made, the new crafts industry focused mainly on items that fitted Japanese-style living in Taiwan and mainland Japan. The list of items manufactured includes building materials, sanitary wares, scientific instruments, furniture, kitchen crockery, tableware, clothing, and household objects made of pottery, lacquer, wood, bamboo, rush, glass, and paper.

Among these new crafts, those relevant to my discussion are the ones imbued with Japanese views of Taiwanese local color. The first example is the Taiwan hat (Fig. 9.9), often called the Tanshui [Danshui] hat or the Taiwan/Oriental panama hat, which was made from either local materials,
such as Taikō [Dajia] rush (Scirpus triqueter) or Rintou (Pandang/Pandanus tectorius sol) or from twisted paper strings. It was manufactured, in general, by women working in family businesses and factories in the western seaside towns and central areas, or by prisoners, and this became a major industry. The hats became an icon of modern Western fashion as well as the symbol of a successful local Taiwanese crafts industry. The second example is tableware pottery, which was mass-produced in the newly developed pottery centers such as Inge and Miaoli. Typical examples are the plates decorated with an exotic Taiwanese landscape that often resembles Tanshui, an idealized image of Taiwanese scenery favored by the Japanese, with palm trees, and boats on the sea, as well as a mountain that frequently seems to resemble Mount Fuji rather than Mount Guanyin (Plate 25). There are also plates and rice bowls with Taiwanese tropical plants and flowers, such as the pineapple and the moss-orchid (Phalaenopsis aphrodite reichb). The third example is Hōrainuri (Formosan lacquerware) (Plate 26). The history of Taiwanese lacquer proper began in 1921, when Yamashita Shinji, a Japanese entrepreneur, planted lacquer trees imported from Vietnam, but the lacquer craft industry had actually begun earlier, in 1916, when lacquer artist Yamanaka Kō established a studio. This developed into the officially funded Yamanaka Gakkō (Yamanaka School)/Taichū Shiritsu Kōgei Denshūjo (Taichung [Taizhong] City Craft Institute) where the first generation of lacquer artists, such as Lai Kao-shan [Lai Gaoshan], Wang Qingshuang, Wang Lucun, and Chen Huoqing, trained. There was a heavy demand for Hōrainuri (Formosan lacquerware) during this period, and typical examples include round trays, flower vases, coasters, cigarette and stationery boxes, with designs that included dancing aboriginal people, pineapples, bananas, and exotic tropical plants and insects. The fourth example is the hanging wood sculpture panel with a design based on tropical plants and flowers such as moss-orchid, which was popular as a wedding gift, and plates in the shape of a banana or lotus leaves. The Japanese-imposed local color was also transferred from the schools of Western-style fine art, mainly through Huang Tushui, the first Taiwanese sculpture student to study at the Tokyo School of Fine Arts from 1915–1920. Huang influenced Taiwanese wood carvers particularly in terms of the realistic style, which reflected modern Japanese Western-style sculpture, and the subject of Taiwanese local color, which depicted idealized images of the countryside that the Japanese favored. For example, it is evident that the works of Li Yucang, an eminent Taiwanese wood carver, pursue the theme of Taiwanese local color through his wood sculptures of water buffaloes and tigers.

The ideas of local color that had been imposed by Japanese designers
and manufacturers were propagated among thousands of local factory workers and consumers through ordinary consumable objects, the designs of which included exotic and tropical images of Taiwan.

Craft Industry and Colonial Policy

As Chiang Shao-ying [Jiang Shaoying] and Chuang Po-ho [Zhuang Bohe] have already pointed out, craft goods are not only esthetic objects, but are also of economic and practical importance. Certain Taiwanese crafts — most notably Taiwan hats and bamboo products — had been carefully selected for promotion as new industries in order to bring profits to Japan without directly competing with Japanese industry. Crafts that did not inspire Japanese interest, such as the creation of dolls for the traditional puppet theatre and crafts related to indigenous religions, were suppressed and left to disappear.

Bamboo was selected as an important export product for Western markets and as a product that would enable local industry to develop. Bruno Taut and Charlotte Perriand also chose bamboo as the appropriate material for export product designs and gave influential advice to that effect to the Japanese Ministry of Industry and Commerce. Yanagi talked about promoting Taiwanese folkcrafts to preserve and develop local handicraft industries, and referred to cases in Germany and Italy in support of his

Fig. 9.9. Women and children making “Taiwan hats.” Reprinted from Taichūshū, *Hontō ni okeru bōshi* (Hats in Taiwan), Taichūshū, 1930.
Kanaseki also expressed his support for the development of local industries as providing an additional business opportunity for farmers. Yan Shuilong, another enthusiastic advocate, articulated the national benefit of the industry and proposed that promoting Taiwanese folkcrafts would improve the living standards of farmers. He stressed the rationale that crafts were important for the nation as “the silent tools to achieve the diplomatic mission of propagating one’s own culture.”

Some crafts were promoted as useful substitutes (daiyōhin) for metal or precious materials such as leather during the war, and new ideas for substitute crafts were widely encouraged and subsidized as part of national policy (kokusaku). For example, bamboo was a much talked-about material for substitute products. Bamboo became the “hero of the time” (jidai no chōji), and this dispelled its prior image, which was associated with malaria. The reinforcement of concrete for buildings with bamboo instead of iron was enthusiastically discussed during the late 1930s and 1940s. Bamboo belts and bamboo scoulers were manufactured. In the Zhushan district, bamboo stretchers and bamboo suitcases were manufactured for the Japanese army from the late 1930s into the 1940s (Fig. 9.10). Bamboo represented the “simple,” “plain,” “healthy,” “thrifty” lifestyle that was appropriate for a nation at war, and it became a focus of national interest as well as the national icon of Taiwan. In Nantou pottery, shelter jars—a modification of the traditional water jars—were also produced for the military. In the field of lacquer, Chen Huoqing recalled manufacturing black thermos flasks for soldiers.

Vernacularism and Colonial Cultural Policy

Behind these practical objectives was a strong incentive involving a romantic but also highly political key concept—vernacularism. As Chuan-ying Yen notes, “local color” was the key idea in the Taiwan Fine Arts Exhibition (Taiten) sponsored by the colonial government, which aimed “to improve Taiwan’s status by propagating the achievement of Taiwan both in Japan and the world through art works which introduce the characteristics of Taiwanese climate and human nature.” This idea of local color, a synonym for vernacularism, functioned as colonial propaganda by stressing Taiwan as one of the regions of Japan. This propaganda was fulfilled visually by the selection of works for prestigious awards and led to the construction of a particular genre: the “art of the southern country” in the Western-style paintings and the “Taiwanese-type” in the Oriental/Japanese-style paintings. In crafts, too, slogans such as “love native culture” (kyōdo ai) and “native awareness” (kyōdo ishiki) were often cited.
as part of the nationalistic campaign. During the 1940s, to lift the nation's morale as well as to control production and consumption, the government implemented a standardization policy on household products both on the Japanese mainland and in Taiwan. Regulatory organizations were established, such as the Great Japan Crafts Association (Dai Nippon Kōgeikai) in 1942, which later became the Japanese Association for Regulating Art and Crafts (Nippon Bijutsu oyobi Kōgei Tōsei Kyōkai), the Taiwan Crafts Association (Taiwan Kōgei Kyōkai) in 1941, and the Taiwan Household Culture Promotion Council (Taiwan Seikatsu Bunka Shinkōkai) in 1943. Local folkcrafts came into the spotlight as icons of the national culture and became an inspirational model for the household products of the nation at war. Their "simple and healthy beauty" and "local color" were idealized within a "bottom-up" rhetoric that asserted that national solidarity results from unity at the local level. Local folkcrafts were ever more openly politicized and became instruments of nationalism. Yanagi Sōetsu praised the model of Nazi Germany, which promoted the use of local handicrafts in daily life in the barracks in the belief that “the nation is strengthened by the people who love the nation and love local culture.”73 Yan Shuilong, as a trustee member of the Taiwan Household Culture Promotion Council, also enthusiastically promoted Taiwanese folkcrafts as having a distinctive...
local color among the Japanese regional cultures and stressed their importance in strengthening the Japanese national culture.\textsuperscript{74}

This vernacularism was a key vehicle for the Japanization of the Taiwanese under the late colonial cultural policy, particularly during the 1940s. The sophistication of its techniques are particularly apparent in the \textit{kōminka} policy under the “New Order” (\textit{shin taisei}), proclaimed by the Prime Minister Konoe Fumimaro in 1938 after Japan went to war with China. \textit{Kōminka} forced the Taiwanese people to assimilate and integrate into Japan as imperial subjects. It imposed various reforms to standardize and “Japanize” the subjects of the Japanese empire, which became known as the Greater East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere (Daitōa kyōeiken).\textsuperscript{75} The purpose of \textit{kōminka} was to create “national unity” and solidarity in order to mobilize for the coming war. Counterbalancing the tight control of \textit{kōminka}, vernacularism was encouraged as part of cultural policy in order to play a conciliatory role.

“Vernacular education” was considered to be instrumental in making Taiwanese people aware of their local culture as a part of Japanese culture. It served to strengthen their ideological stance in respect of the development of the Japanese race and was a basis for Japanese expansion into the southern regions as the heart of the Greater East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere.\textsuperscript{76} It was also frequently suggested that vernacularism should be imposed with “paternal compassion.”\textsuperscript{77} Yanagi is apologetic, for example, about his use of the terms “primitive” and “savage,” saying they were “our careless expressions”\textsuperscript{78} and praised the beauty of Taiwanese aboriginal textiles, which he regarded as superior to Japanese textiles produced on the mainland.\textsuperscript{79} But he also wrote, “Certainly they [Taiwanese] can not differentiate between good and bad things. The Japanese are the people who discover beauty. Therefore the Japanese have to raise their [Taiwanese] aesthetic sense by displaying beautiful things. This is the responsibility of the Japanese.”\textsuperscript{80}

Like Yanagi who, as a privileged Japanese colonizer, evaluated beauty through the dominant power, the Japanese imposed vernacularism as an integral part of their colonial cultural policy.

Vernacularism and Imperialism

The theme of vernacularism inspired heated debate among intellectuals toward the end of the war. \textit{Minzoku Taiwan} showed a keen interest in this topic and organized two important panel discussions. The 1943 discussion focused on how Taiwanese folklore studies could contribute to Japanese folklore studies and the \textit{kōminka} movement. For example, “ancestor worship” (\textit{sosen sūhai}) was nominated by Yanagita Kunio, an authority on
folklore studies, as an important subject, not only because it highlighted the similarity between Japanese, Koreans, and Taiwanese, thereby creating a sense of solidarity and community among them, but also because ancestor worship provided a smooth route for the propagation of worship of the Japanese emperor. A good-luck talisman from the Ise Shrine could thus be placed on the family altar in every household. This kind of idea spurred on Kanaseki’s realization that the effective manipulation of folklore studies could be used for political ends, such as the eradication from the memory of the Taiwanese people of their ancestral past as Chinese.

From 1940 to 1945 Mingei, the instrumental magazine of the Mingei movement, also focused on the role of crafts in the New Order. Discussions of this started in 1940 with the proposal by the Japanese Folkcrafts Association of a “Standard Beauty in the New Order,” which represented the “national” and “healthy” beauty of collective local crafts. The debate moved on to “careful selection” of local handcrafts in the colonies and the promotion of vernacularism by stressing the superiority of handwork over Western machine products, so as to manipulate the psychology of the colonized to direct their interest towards cooperation with Japan. It developed further into the idea of a Japanese mission to “wake up nativism” by demonstrating their protection of primitive crafts in the southern colonies as a significant part of the “development of the colonial race, and to establish “the Greater East Asian Craft Culture” as a collective of local crafts. Different kinds of posters astutely combined the progressive images of vernacular craft: one showed a Taiwan hat (the Oriental panama), another showed the Asian cultures and races within the Greater East Asia protected by the hat, and yet others combined the hat with a fighter airplane or a battle ship to symbolize the strong Japanese imperial power (Fig. 9.11).

Vernacularism was embraced in the idea of multiculturalism under the empire, though it was obviously multiculturalism with a Japanocentric bias. In the ongoing development of close relations between politics and studies on folklore and folkcrafts during the war, vernacularism was praised as a way to stir up hostility toward the enemy and to replace Westernization, which was identified with the enemy. Yanagi Sōetsu contrasted “Oriental beauty” with “Occidental beauty” by taking examples of Okinawan ka-suri and Taiwanese bamboo crafts to emphasize the “innate and original” beauty of the Orient. When Yanagi gave a lecture and an exhibition in 1943, the government enthusiastically supported him with the following propaganda: “Yanagi’s project is welcomed by various people . . . who expect that his efforts to show that the Oriental beauty in Taiwanese crafts that are deeply rooted in Taiwanese everyday life will overcome the taste for American and British styles.” Tomiyama Ichirō points out that “coop-
erativism,” as the ideology of the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere, functioned to “justify Japanese invasion in contrast to ‘white’ colonial rule” by adopting Japanocentric multiculturalism to respect unique cultures, thereby masking “a naked racism or nationalism.” Here, vernacularism has been clearly used as part of this cooperativism.

Nativism in the Postcolonial Period:
Yan Shuilong and Others
The vernacularism imposed by the Japanese seems to have been embraced by the Taiwanese in the postcolonial period. Its continuity and development in new directions are particularly evident in the work of Yan Shuilong, a graduate of the Tokyo School of Fine Arts and a multitalented artist. On the one hand he was a leading painter in the modern Western style, but he was also a pioneer product designer and a leader of the folk-crafts movement in Taiwan. Before World War II, Yan was already integrated into the major craft scene in Japan and Taiwan. In 1941 the Industrial Arts Research Institute (IARI) organized the first Exhibition of

Fig. 9.11. Poster of “Oriental Panama/Taiwan Hat,” 1935. Reprinted from Shisei 40 shū nen kinen taiwan hakurankai shi (A Record of Taiwan Exhibitions in Commemoration of 40 Years of Japanese Rule). Taipei: Taiwan Hakurankai, 1939.
Household Products for the Nation (Kokumin Seikatsu Yōhin Tenrankai) at Takashimaya department store in Tokyo. It was a large-scale official exhibition designed to deliver national propaganda to the public by showing what was regarded as appropriate as a standard lifestyle for a nation at war. Yan, who exhibited much-praised rush shopping bags in this important exhibition, was the only exhibitor from the Japanese colonies. Yan was also active in the Japanese-inspired Taiwanese folkcraft movement scene, working together with Yanagi and Kanaseki; he was also a trustee member of the Taiwan Household Culture Promotion Council (Taiwan Seikatsu Bunka Shinkōkai) in the 1940s. On his return from studying in Japan and France, fueled by a vision of establishing an institution of crafts in Taiwan, he carried out colonial government-sponsored field research on Taiwanese folkcrafts in 1941. He also called for the nationwide development of indigenous crafts, which he called “jiyū kōgei” (freeborn crafts), a notion equivalent to the modern concept of “primitive folk craft.” He did this by praising Scandinavian and French models as well as the German national promotion of their crafts and the Nazi cultural policy that officially promoted indigenous crafts — including those from the colonies — for use in modern life and industry. It is clear that Yan’s ideas were in line with those of the English Art & Crafts movement and its Japanese equivalent, the Mingei or folkcrafts movement. Chiang Shao-ying [Jiang Shaoying] recalls from his student days that Yan often referred to the ideas of Ruskin and Morris as well as Yanagi’s Japanese folkcraft theory. At the same time, Yan’s practical ideas also seem to have reflected Yamamoto Kanae’s ideas of social reform and the improvement of the local economy, and this was in line with the ideas of Ruskin, Morris, and Tolstoy. Armed with these modern ideas of a national “art and industry for life,” he experimented with creating modern marketable designs for local folkcrafts, such as bamboo furniture, wood work, rush crafts, and textiles (Figs. 9.12 and 9.13).

After the war his ideas blossomed. In 1952, he wrote a seminal book on the crafts of the Taiwanese aboriginal and Han people, *Taiwan gongyi* (Taiwanese Crafts), the first of its kind by a Taiwanese. His ideas and works greatly appealed to the public and officials, and, as a result, academic and industrial institutions for crafts, including the Nantou-xiang Gongyi Yanjiuban (Nantou County Crafts Research Institute), were established throughout Taiwan during the 1950s and 1960s. He himself became widely engaged in crafts education during this period. Yan’s ideal was also realized when he was appointed as chief designer for Taiwan Shougongye Tuiguang Zhongxin (THPC: the Taiwan Handicraft Promotion Center). This center was established in 1956 on the advice of an American designer, Russel Wright, who had been commissioned by the United States Department of

State. The purpose of this center was based on the Taiwanese version of the proposal, called the Japanese Good Handcrafts Promotion Scheme, that Wright had presented to the Japanese government some time between 1955 and 1957, and which was only partially realized in Japan in 1958 as Marute or the Hand project. The mission of THPC was to encourage research and development of modern design as sourced from Chinese traditional design, Han Taiwanese folkcrafts, and Taiwanese aboriginal crafts; the organization was also to conduct marketing and promotion of these export products. On the occasion of being invited by the Taiwanese government to give advice on craft industry, Koike Shinji, an influential design historian, reported that this scheme was more successful in Taiwan than in Japan.95

During and after the Japanese period, Yan maintained an excellent balance between Japanese colonial policy and Taiwanese nationalism, supporting the Japanese interest in promoting Taiwanese export crafts and wartime substitute production, but also encouraging the promotion of local industry, increasing the employment of Taiwanese people, and creating a distinctive Taiwanese cultural identity to promote its “excellence.”

Yan’s nationalistic advocacy of Taiwanese native “art for life” has continued to inspire the contemporary Taiwanese craft world.96 Takeyama-gun Takezai Kōgei Denshūjo (the Zhushan County Bamboo Crafts Institute), which was initially set up by the Japanese colonial government to train craftsmen to make woven bamboo crafts for the export industry in 1938, continued to develop under the guidance of such people as Yan Shuilong. Now called Guoli Taiwan Gongyi Yanjiusuo (the National Taiwan Craft Research Institute), it has functioned as a think tank and a training center for product design as well as for one-off crafts, promoting the idea of “native Taiwaneseness.” In close liaison with the National Taiwan Craft Research Institute and the Nantou County Bamboo Crafts Association (Nantou-xiang Zhuyi Xuehui), founded in 1997, a large community of commercial bamboo manufacturers and designers in Nantou county have been carrying out research on technical and design development and on production for domestic and export markets. Lin Chunhan [Lin Qunhan] of Green Bamboo Art Co., for example, has been actively designing bamboo public art as well as unique household objects and furniture (Fig. 9.14). The first generation of bamboo weavers, including Huang Tushan, Wu Shengzong, and Chang Zhenjing, trained in the Zhushan County Bamboo Crafts Institute during the Japanese period and went on to become leading figures in studio bamboo art (Fig. 9.15).97 Bamboo craft artists also formed a community in the Zhushan (Bamboo Mountain) district in the Nantou county. Yu Weizhi, for example, has been creating a new “native” art of bamboo carving, while Chen Jingfu of Shenghuo Gongzuo Fang has been
pursuing his grand vision of a Taiwanese “bamboo paradise” and a functional native art for life, in line with Yan Shuilong's ideas, in his Bamboo Culture Park. This park is a tourist site where people can see a large bamboo forest with 108 different kinds of bamboo and learn all about the importance of bamboo from ecological and cultural perspectives. Visitors can also taste a set meal of bamboo dishes served in bamboo containers, and can view and purchase Chen's bamboo craft works ranging from tea sets to furniture. Subsidized by the government, aboriginal communities have also been actively working on reviving their craft tradition, based upon the objects collected during the Japanese colonial period. The work of Fan San-mei (Awhai) of the Saisiat tribe, one of the most talented bamboo and cane artists, shows how makers creatively weave the traditional patterns (Fig. 9.16).

A strong desire to construct a native identity is also particularly identifiable in pottery and lacquer work, which has continued from the Japanese period. Nantou pottery has developed further, with Lin Kuo-long (Lin Guolong)'s Sheyao (Snake kiln), the oldest kiln existing in Taiwan from the Japanese period, as a center of cultural and educational activities. Meanwhile, Inge has also developed as a commercial pottery town, and has become the center of a historical archive of Taiwanese pottery with the opening of the Taipei County Yingko [Inge] Ceramic Museum (Taipeixiangli Inge Taoci Bowuguan) in 2000. This museum collects pottery produced during the Japanese period (Plate 25), recognizing its importance in the history of Taiwanese pottery, and recently started to sell reproductions of tableware at the shop, reflecting the trend that those original folkcrafts have increasingly become esthetic and collectable objects (Fig. 9.17).

The first generation of lacquer craftsmen, such as Lai Kao-shan (Lai Gaoshan), Wang Qingshuan, Wang Lucun, and Chen Huoqing, trained at the Yamanaka Gakkô (Yamanaka School)/Taichū Shiritsu Kōgei Denshūjo (Taichung [Taizhong] City Craft Institute) during the Japanese period. They became leading figures in studio lacquer art and taught many of contemporary lacquer artists such as Hwang Lih-shwu (Huang Lishu) (Plate 27), Lai Tsough-ming (Lai Zuoming), and Li Hsing-lung (Li Xinlong) (Plate 28), whose works have innovative, native style. Craft awards and exhibitions have been encouraged by the Council for Cultural Affairs (CCA). The Weaving and Textile Crafts Awards, started in 1995, the National Crafts Awards in 1997, and the Traditional Crafts Awards in 1998 have been functioning as an official framework for the preservation of traditional craft skills and the encouragement of traditional native art. The activities of research, collection, and preservation have been carried out by Chuantong Yishu Yanjiusuo (the School of Traditional Arts) in Guoli

Taipei Yishu Xueyuan (the National Taipei Institute of Arts), Peitou (Beitou) Wenwu Guan (the Taiwan Folk Arts Museum [sic]) in Peitou (Beitou) established in 1983, Zhuyi Bowuguan (the Bamboo Art Museum), and Bianzhi Bowuguan (the Weaving and Textile Museum) in Fengyuan established in 1987 and 1990 respectively.


Fig. 9.17. Reproductions of tableware developed during the Japanese period and sold at the shop in Taipei-xiangli Inge Taoci Bowuguan (Taipei County Yingko [Inge] Ceramic Museum), photographed by Kikuchi Yuko in 2005.
Conclusion

Modernity in Taiwanese crafts was brought about by Japanese colonialism. With the start of academic research on crafts as part of colonial scientific studies, Taiwanese crafts were scrutinized, collected, preserved, and taxonomized according to the modern European system. Japanese colonizers involved in the study of Taiwanese crafts were all trained in European academic disciplines, and therefore it was inevitable that Taiwanese craft studies would reflect their European modernist gaze. Vernacularism was one of the most influential modern, colonial discourses, and it constructed a selective representation of Taiwanese crafts. Sakai Naoki problematized universalism and particularism, positioned as two sides of the same coin in the idea of modernism. On the one hand, the idea of universalism in the Occident subordinated and neglected the Orient as an impenetrable entity. On the other hand, Japanese modernism was created as a particular antithesis of the universal Occidental modernism, which culminated in the wartime slogan of “overcoming the modern” (Kindai no Chōkoku). Vernacularism cannot exist independently without a universal historiography. As Ranajit Guha points out, it is contained under the framework of a colonial power relation. Certainly, the discourse of native Taiwaneseness under the Japanese colonization is such a case. How we should analyze its transformation by Yan Shuilong and other postcolonial Taiwanese movements, and its continuity into present activities in Taiwanese crafts, is not certain, but in view of the fact that they are now being boosted by the ruling Democratic Progressive Party’s ideological localism and the neonationalistic independence movement, it may not be untenable to argue that the same recurrent formula can be applied in this creation of a particular Taiwan.
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