which fixed a particular image of Tibet in the British mind for many generations. The afterlives of these photographs are also intriguing. From the idea of the "actuality effect," coined by Raphael Samuel—since visual materials hold a level of credibility similar to that of textual sources, pictures also come to possess retrospective meanings over the course of their career—Harris explains how Tibet was politicized via photography to fabricate an "imagined memory" of its past. The Chinese government also strategically used this method. Officials excavated photographs of Tibet's own imperial period to highlight and decry the brutality of its old regime and the pre-1950 feudal system in order to make China appear to be the savior of the Tibetan people. Such images of Tibet's past, however, elicited quite a different set of emotions from Tibetans in exile, ranging from sentimental nostalgia to hopeless despair at the impossibility of returning to their homeland, their own traditions, and independence.

The different meanings and emotions generated by old photographs of Tibet are also cultivated in museums established by exiled Tibetans and the Chinese government. Chapter 5 provides an account of the Tibetan museum-in-exile at McLeod Ganj near Dharamsala. Its primary pedagogic function is presenting a construction of Tibetan nationhood while exposing the propaganda of the Chinese government to its mostly non-Tibetan audience. In contrast, as explained in the following chapter, another museum in Tibet sets forth the opposite view. The Tibetan museum in Lhasa is run by the Chinese authorities and displays significant artifacts from the Potala Palace. One of the primary purposes of this museum is to portray the Dalai Lama, if not outright demonizing him, as a cultural relic of the theocratic and aristocratic past. Sacred objects of Tibetan Buddhism are encased behind glass, while the symbol of the Dalai Lama, the Potala, is designated not as a pilgrimage destination or a sacred place for religious functions but as an obsolete item of cultural heritage and a theme park that welcomes tourists. Tibet has been captured, domesticated, and finally deactivated by the cultural engineering of the Chinese state, a practice that has been criticized as "cultural genocide" by the Dalai Lama.

The final two chapters bring readers up to the present. To address the current status of Tibetan art and predict its future, Harris provides counter-narratives created by contemporary Tibetan artists as they try to disengage from both the utopian visions of their country prevalent in the West and the dystopian assessment of their heritage by the Chinese government. The recent glamorization of contemporary Tibetan art is handled in a nuanced way that touches on a series of theoretical terms and methodologies—identity politics, the cult of origin, self-marginalization, and strategic essentialism.

That discussion leads into the final chapter, where the author, while focusing on the career of an international superstar artist, Gonkar Gyatso, examines transnational and transcultural practices of art making among contemporary Tibetans. She questions what meaning being "Tibetan" may offer in our ever-more-globalizing art world.

Overall, Harris's book is a remarkable work that reveals how state and its culture can have changing and even multiple identities when placed in different national and political contexts over time. Her critiques expose stereotypes designed by the cultural engineering efforts of the British and Chinese governments and taken up by various publics that continue to perpetuate them. The book also clearly suggests how such a demythologizing effort, by illuminating the instability and indefinability of Tibet's identity in a given time frame, can turn into its own anathema, in effect asserting the impossibility of ever seeing true Tibetan-ness. To the extent that images of Tibet have been invented, imagined, and promoted by people both in and outside Tibet, there will never be a perfect portrait of it. What is at stake is not what we see, but how we see Tibet.

J. P. PARK is assistant professor at the University of California, Riverside (Department of the History of Art, University of California, Riverside, Calif. 92521).
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ASA TO IKEDA, AYA LOUISA MC DONALD, AND MING TIAMPO Art and War in Japan and Its Empire, 1931–1960 Leiden: Brill, 2013. 400 pp.; 185 color illus. $178.00

Times are good for Japanese modern art. Three recent publications covering roughly 1920 to 1945, a period bookended by the twin catastrophes of the Great Kantō earthquake and World War II, offer ample evidence of profound (and profoundly consequential) shifts that are changing how we look at, think about, and constitute modern art in imperial Japan. Though still slim by just about any measure, the field, if we may call it that, now comprises a critical mass of scholars in and out of Japan who are doing work that in some cases would have been unthinkable twenty-five or so years ago, when the reign of the Shōwa emperor had just come to a close. Hirohito's death in 1989 marked the end of Japan's long postwar and lifted the "chrysanthemum taboo" that had inhibited serious reflection on the period of his reign, which, beginning in 1926, encompassed the nation's glorious rise as an imperial power and its calamitous fall in defeat and occupation. By 1995, when the fiftieth anniversary of the war's termination was observed, the Cold War had been put to bed, nationalism in Japan's former Asian colonies were on the rise, and Japan's imperial aggressions had become the source of bitter historical disputes. Postcolonial studies, meanwhile, precipitated English-language art history's engagement with the disciplinary challenges presented by non-Western modernisms and, more recently, with the daunting question of what it means to imagine, let alone write, a global art history or histories. The three books under review—a monograph, a museum publication, and an anthology that were published in 2012 and 2013—represent pertinent and valuable contributions to these pressing disciplinary endeavors, while demonstrating the centrality of art and visual culture studies to our understanding of modern Japanese culture and cultural production.

Remarkably, not one of the publications takes as its starting point the proximity of its object of study to a (geographically) distant "Western" center of modern art. Although we see this problematic—of grappling with externally determined values and standards of measure—at the core of what it has meant to be modern and Japanese, for the artist as for others, today's art historian is thankfully no longer beholden to it. Rather, with primacy given to images broadly defined, rather than solely to art with its attendant baggage, the dynamic has shifted, and an increasingly nuanced picture of twentieth-century Japanese art and visual culture has begun to emerge. In Gennifer Weisenfeld's magisterial Imaging Disaster: Tokyo and the Visual Culture of Japan's Great Earthquake of 1923, the Boston Museum of Fine Arts' multiauthored The Brittle Decade: Visualizing Japan in the 1930s, and the hefty anthology Art and War in Japan and Its Empire, 1931–1960, a volume of twenty essays by nineteen authors, we are shown that the value of Japanese modern art may be located not in relation to any particular artistic canons but in the very stuff of its historical and cultural situatedness. This is not mere historical contextualization. By recapturing the embeddedness of images and imagery, these publications together illuminate how art, along with visual and material culture more broadly, were grounded in, reactive to, and, most interestingly, productive of a distinctive modernity, one that evolved according to its own logic and that involved both proximity and distance from "Western" and "Asian" others.
images conveying innocence (Japanese) victimhood in order to "create a unifying symbol for the Japanese nation." The alternative history, she writes, was "visible only to the knowing eye" (p. 68). In "Disaster as Spectacle," the discussion moves to modernity and modernism. Noting the "uncanny congruence between the shock of the quake and the shock of modernism," Weisenfeld analyzes how artists exploited the expressive possibilities of prints, painting, and cinema, evoking with their images of disaster the "radical ruptures" (p. 85) that modernists (and others) perceived in modernity itself.

This theme is further developed in a subsequent chapter that treats, as one of a number of topics, the decoration of temporary living structures called "barracks" by members of the avant-garde who envisioned them as templates for societal transformation; we also see the use of humor in political cartoons as a vehicle for social criticism. Additional chapters consider the paradox of the modern ruin and its challenge to Japan's ongoing modernization program of "civilization and enlightenment" (bunmei kaisen), the role played by rationalist modes of visualization in the reconstruction of Tokyo, and the final triumph of state authority not only in the form taken by that reconstruction but also in the state's selective shaping of the collective memory of the event into a future-oriented national narrative.

With its holistic inquiry into the question of how media mediates meaning, Imagining Disaster, though focused on the 1920s, offers a conceptual and methodological model for an expanded notion of art and visual culture and their relation to the social fabric in the interwar and war years. The Brittle Decade, a publication of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, with contributions by the historian John W. Dower, curator Anne Nishimura Morse, textile scholar Jacqueline M. Atkins, and collector and trustee Frederic A. Sharf, takes on the ten or so years that followed the passing of the Great Kanto earthquake into history.

Using images to describe Japan's complicated relation with modernity from the dramatic postquake modernization of Tokyo until the eve of the Pacific War, it, too, is concerned to integrate a range of visual culture mediums: prints, postcards, paintings, magazine illustrations and poster designs, and (most spectacularly) textile design, which is represented by an extensive group of kimono decorated with popular culture motifs. Not an exhibition catalog, the book is nevertheless built around the museum's collections, particularly items acquired in the 2000s. These include the Leonard A. Lauder Collection of Japanese Postcards and a group of neotraditional nihonga painted in mineral pigments on paper and silk and featuring modern women and landscapes that was showcased in the ICNER Shōnin Sōbukai exhibition curated by Sharf in 2009; these objects and others are supplemented in the book by works in far-flung private and museum collections. Despite the impressive effort to "visualize" the period through various media, the volume is not so representative of the visual field as is Weisenfeld's study (it contains, for example, only one example of yōga or "Western painting" in oils, and hardly a typical one at that, from the National Museum of Modern Art in Tokyo). We might in part attribute the logic of certain exclusions and omissions to shifts in the Japanese art collecting habits of North American institutions, in response to the vagaries of the art market and the evolving tastes and pocketbooks of benefactors.

The 1950s were harrowing and heady times for Japan, punctuated as much by moments of crisis as of celebration, and The Brittle Decade captures something of their energy and anxiety. Amid worsening diplomatic relations, the country geared up for the Tokyo Olympics and International Exposition slated for 1940, only to see them canceled; this was against the backdrop of the simultaneous expansion of Japanese colonialism in Asia and tightening grip of totalitarian control at home. Japan's Fifteen-Year War commenced in 1931 with the Manchurian Incident, hastening the persecution of socialists and communists and precipitating the nation's withdrawal from the League of Nations; its undeclared war on China came six years later, followed in 1938 by total mobilization and in 1940 with the call for a New Order (shinritaisei) and the creation of a National Defense State. Pearl Harbor soon extended Japan's military engagement to the Pacific War. Dower's account of this volatile period makes sense of its contradictions. Noting that "nothing surpasses the visual legacy of the 1920s" for revealing what he calls the process of "becoming modern," he relates how modernity was associated at the time with, on the one hand, "technological progress, mass communications, rapid urbanization, consumerism, cosmopolitanism, self-indulgence, iconoclasm, diversity, and dissent." On the other hand, to its critics, modernity would come to signify "nuruliness, degeneracy, fragmentation and instability—a malaise" (p. 11) attributed to the Anglo-American liberalism, materialism, and individualism polluting modern Japan. Such reactionary thought fueled the ideological basis for war and undergirded ideologues' attempts to "overcome the modern" (mado to chōo) —that is, to oust the West from the center of geopolitical (and cultural) power with the creation of the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere (Daio kita kōryō)—a sometimes brutal imperial program packaged in high-minded rhetoric.

Atkins's survey of sashiko gata textiles, a genre of clothing rarely seen or studied, links the abstract ideology of empire with its symbols and domestic audience. These fashionable garments, which were worn by men, women, and children of all classes, featured
It is the latter subject—war and mobilization—to which Art and War in Japan and Its Empire is primarily devoted, and it is here that we can measure one of the most significant shifts in Japanese modern art scholarship. Until only recently, if you were to open just about any Japanese-language language book on the country's modern art, you would find a peculiar omission, one all the more striking for its utter consistency: the war was simply excised, leaving a blank, almost indiscernible gap between "prewar" and "postwar" periods. If an artwork from the war years was included, more often than not its pictorial reference to war, if any, was oblique, indirect, and opaque. The same was true for artists' biographies. Only in the treatment of those artists who were perceived as resisting the wartime status quo did the war enter the picture in any meaningful way. Moreover, few scholars writing in Western languages took up the subject, at least until the 1980s. Omnipresent yet invisible at one and the same time, the war cast an imperceptible shadow over Japanese modern art, as it has over postwar Japan more generally.

So it is with enormous gratitude and expectation that we receive Art and War in Japan, an anthology of writings compiled and edited by Atsuo Ikeda, Ayako Katsura, and Ming Tanfio. To be sure, it is not the first publication on wartime art. Four pioneering studies by Kawata Akishio, Matsuki Sander, Bert Winther-Tamaki, and Genni Weisenfeld dating from the mid- to late 1980s are, in fact, reprinted within; others exist as well. But the appearance of this book in 2013 marks an important and exciting moment in the evolution of the field, for if nothing else (and it does much else), Art and War demonstrates that enough significant critical work has been—and is being—done that a true conversation is taking place about this neglected chapter in the history of Japanese modern art. Furthermore, that conversation is happening among scholars of diverse backgrounds working in Japan, North America, and Europe. To the uninitiated, however, the temporality of that conversation is likely to be unclear, for the book indiscriminately mixes eight new texts with twelve others (some translated from the Japanese) that were previously published over an eighteen-year period. No anthology can be all things to all people, but there are some surprising omissions, especially in light of the dynamic intermedia nature of the period. While it delves into a handful of artistic mediums—most deeply, oils on canvas, but also, to a lesser degree, nikong, woodblock prints, sculpture, graphic design, and photography—it might profitably have included architecture, film, and craft objects such as mingei, on which significant work has been done. The book's three parts, entitled "Wartime Art Production," "War Art and Japan's Colonies," and "Postwar Reflections," are of uneven length and focus, and with only one essay on post-1945 art proper, the end date given in the title (1960) hardly seems justified. Yet its formidable power and certain impact should not be underestimated.

Art and War opens with Kawata's "War Art and Its Era," an ambitious and groundbreaking text that was originally published in Japanese in 1995. Kawata charts the development of senso-ga ("war painting") and its representational strategies in relation to the evolving ideological underpinnings of Japan's Fifteen-Year War. He locates a turning point in the advent of the Pacific War, when for the first time an enemy was clearly identified; this allowed for the graphic portrayal of death and dismemberment, as seen, for example, in the gruesome canvases painted by Fujita Taro in 1930. To win the war, he concludes, was the challenge for painting in an era of widespread press photography, and the ritual or religious function of painted canvases—have provided the touchstone and starting point for later considerations of the genre. He closes by remarking on the "indivisibility of art and audience" (p. 37), an instructive truism that runs like a leitmotif through many of the texts that follow.

Winther-Tamaki's "Embodiment/Disembodiment in Japanese Painting during the Fifteen-Year War" of 1997 deserves special mention, too, as it was the first English-language text to make sense on a grand scale of the complicated terrain of war painting. Informed by Kawata, Winther-Tamaki makes significant contributions of his own, especially as they relate to the body and embodiment (a subject to which he returned in 2012 with his Maximum Embodiment: Yoga, The Western Painting of Japan). Rather than map the transformation of senso-ga over time, as Kawata had, he identifies and analyzes examples from three categories of war paintings: canvases commissioned by the military, usually monumental oils depicting battle scenes by artists sent to the front (sakusen kiroku); pictures with patriotic themes that were not directly illustrative of the war, often nikong, and works by "internal emigres," who reacted the pressure to paint war art by introducing contemporary debates on the relative merits of nikong and yago to represent Japan's holy war to its domestic audience. Winther-Tamaki brilliantly relates the "themes of embodiment" to the "ideological significance of the technical and stylistic problems of the painterly definition of the figure as well as the relative power of different painting styles to embody a sceenography of war" (p. 113). His essay opened the door to further inquiry by a new generation of scholars writing in English, some of whom—Mayu Tsuruya, Mikiko
Hirayama, Ming Tampo, Maki Kaneko, Aya Louisa McDonald, and Asato Ikeda—are included in the present volume.

Michael Lucken, another war art veteran, presents a different kind of overview with his inquiry into the nature of Japanese totalitarianism—literally, “whole-body-ism” (zentai-shugō)—and the state’s centralization of the art world. Lucken’s discussion of collectivity differentiates totalitarianism in Japan from European variants by dint of its pursuit of an "absolute synthesis" (p. 79), an image of unity so total that there was "virtually no possibility of exile" (p. 81): all imperial subjects, as individuals, would come to constitute the "all-encompassing entity" (p. 85) of the nation. Singling out the Surrealist Kitabawko Noboru’s diagrammatic artwork as illustrative of this "cosmogony" (p. 86), Lucken’s text resonates with Winther-Tamaki’s exploration of the aesthetics of embodiment while implicitly offering a new perspective on the so-called internal émigré. The implications of his argument for the latter also sit in productive tension with Mark Sandler’s account of the dynamic governing the relationship between the individual (artist) and the collective (nation-state) in the early 1940s. In his 1996 treatment of the painter Matsumoto Shin-suke reprinted here, Sandler characterizes the “contest” between self-expression and cultural authority as the conflict between "egalitarian individualism and hierarchically ordered, group-based identity" (p. 155). One expects that these fundamental issues will become further nuanced as scholarship on war art as a whole progresses. Kaneko’s considered treatment of the artist Uchida Iwaso, for example, indicates that for many left-leaning artists the war years were characterized by an impotent and desperate "reform from within" (p. 203).

The preponderance of war art was intended for an audience on the mainland (naitō)—that is, Japan proper—where monumental oils of battle scenes and serene views in mineral pigments of Mount Fuji, a sacred symbol of the nation, among other patriotic subjects, were received with great fanfare in record-breaking exhibitions. Woodblock prints, which were smaller in scale than yōga and, like nihonga, less apt to portray the war directly, also enjoyed an audience enanomed of renderings of the patriotic sites of the homeland, as Ken Brown reveals in an essay from 2001 that overturns canonical narratives of the medium’s wartime innocence. Previously existing bronze sculptures, however, were sacrificed to the cause, though with great reverence. According to Hirase Reita, bronzes melted for weapons were "drafTed" and sent off with a series of rituals and banzai cheers for their act of self-sacrifice to the holy war. A similar phenomenon of spiritualization—the "worship" of war art—is observed by Kawata and elaborated on by McDonald in her essay on Fujita. At least in the final stages of the war, McDonald suggests, the painted image, to which offerings were made by the viewing public, had become a "new public quasi-religious icon" (p. 183) and resting place for the spirits of the war dead.

The war clearly brought art and artists closer to the center of things. War artists were charged with multiple, far-reaching tasks: to galvanize public sentiment, express the essence of Japan’s kokutai, or national body, create a new aesthetic for the era ushered in by the nation’s victory, and, not least, commemorate for future posterity the heroes of the present historical, even revolutionary, moment. To this end, artists and critics debated the worthiness of various subjects, mediums, and styles of art, and Art and War gives ample evidence that the notion of realism was central to their spirited debates.

Hirayama’s essay focuses on a coterie of left-leaning critics who adapted their views on realism as the range of acceptable positions and styles increasingly narrowed. Through her findings are inconclusive, by introducing the notion of "fictionalized truth" and the variable meanings of the term "realism," her contribution sharpens our understanding of the mode as a method of capturing reality as well as of shaping its possibilities. Kawata’s brief comments regarding realism and idealism, in relation to painting’s efforts to record and commemorate the war (in “The Japanese Physique and the ‘Proper Body,’” his second contribution), offer further clarification on the problematic of realism. He and Winther-Tamaki raise, but do not fully develop, the question of painting’s vexed relation to photography, with its greater repertorial accuracy and indexical authority, a worthy topic that one hopes will be taken up more completely in the future. Tsuruya draws heavily on studies of Soviet socialist realism in a text that attempts to connect Japan’s socially oriented proletarian art, quashed in the early 1930s, with the propagandistic role of official war art. The comparison is suggestive because it allows us to begin to recapture a sense of the exhilarating revolutionary potential that the war represented, something that is generally missing from the volume. Weisenfeld’s essay, originally published in 2000, on the journal NIPPON throws into sharpest relief the complex relation between truth and verisimilitude in visual forms of propaganda.

Weisenfeld views NIPPON through the lens of tourism, and although she sees the journal’s touristic gaze as an invitation to its Western audience to "colonize" Japan visually, its modernist design aesthetic and graphic mix of photographs and text clearly worked hard to persuade a foreign (Western) audience of the legitimacy of Japan’s own colonial enterprise. NIPPON’s photo spreads exemplify what the critic Izumi Reijirō meant when he stated that photojournalism, as "an instrument" of national propaganda, "convey[s] the message, ‘It should be like this. We wish it were like this’" (p. 246). Idyllic photomontages of Manchukuo, Japan’s Manchurian puppet state, for example, construct a progressive (and fantastic) paradise of interracial harmony under the benevolent protection of Japanese imperialism.

The subject of imperialism, which is integral to any understanding of Japanese modern art, forms the most cohesive section of Art and War, though given the importance of the topic, one wishes that its treatment was more extensive. Kari Shepherdson-Scott excavates the meaning of a single photographic image reproduced in the pictorial magazine Menshū gurafu and in doing so opens up a vast terrain of competing interests on the Manchurian front. Arguing that the setting sun motif in Fuchikami Hakuryō’s Evening Sun, an evocative emblem of Manchuria, tied the history of Japanese lives lost in the 1897–98 Sino-Japanese and 1904–5 Russo-Japanese wars to the 1911 Manchurian Incident and the ongoing conflict with China, she demonstrates how the image denotes a shift toward the symbolic, rather than literal, representation of the advancing Manchurian battlefield. Kure Motoyuki compares two opposing tropes of Chinese ink painting—the "roaring tiger" and the "miserable refugee"—that circulated in the United States as a form of resistance to Japan’s aggressions in China; his study (like Weisenfeld’s) points to the triangulating role played by the West in the larger story of Japanese imperialism. Kim Hyeshin and Aída Yuen Wong, by contrast, show us how Japan exported art and art institutions to the colonies (gachī) as part of its program of "imperial subjectification" (kōmenkō). In an uncanny parallel to the role that art played in mobilizing the populace on the mainland, we see pro-Japanese artists in Korea collaborating with the military regime through fine art exhibitions and magazine and newspaper illustrations. Kim additionally describes how Korean artists reproduced Japanese wartime gender ideology with images of women on the (Korean) home front. Wong, through a penetrating study of a "compliant imperialist subject" (p. 318), the painter Lin Chih-chu, reveals how Taiwanese elites embraced and reinforced the Japanese status quo by adopting the fascist aesthetics of beauty that Wong locates in nihonga and specifically, the beautiful woman (bijin) genre.

The body, it should be apparent, is a theme that runs throughout the volume. Ikeda, like Kim and Wong, takes up the gendered body in her discussion of late 1930s nihonga paintings depicting the "modern girl." She links such depictions to a new ideal female type associated with the healthy athleticism and "disciplined national body" that was evoked by the Nazi-sponsored Berlin Olympics and the Takarazuka Revue’s synchronized dance routines alike. Ikeda claims that the "socially militant" mega of earlier years turned "militarist," as pictorially evidenced by the regimented spaces of what she labels "machine-inst paintings" (p. 94). Kawata,
in an essay dating to 2002, contributes a marvelously conceived treatment of the Japanese body in its modern historical and art historical contexts. He explains that given the pejorative images of the Japanese body generated by Western racism and the unshakable association between the imported tradition of oil painting and that tradition’s idealized and racially identifiable European body, Japanese war painters failed in their efforts to create an ‘individually conceived, absolute image of the Japanese body’ (p. 144). The symbolic motifs found in *nihonga* painting—cherry blossoms, the rising sun, and Mount Fuji—and written language in the form of calligraphy, he maintains, took the place of this “proper body.” Tampo continues the theme of the body in her treatment of the early postwar years, arguing in the final, postwar section of the volume that vanguard artists situated their work in the “autonomous body” (*shutaleku*) and the “carnal body” (*nikutai*) as a corrective to the wartime “national body” (*kokutai*). Her analysis of selected images and artists leads up to Shiraga Kuzuo’s 1955 *Challenging Mud* performance, for which the half-dressed artist forcibly wrestled with mud and earth. She reads the work, now known through photographic documentation, as an “attack on the wartime myth of the seamless collective of the *kokutai*” that stems from its “insistence on the power of dissent” and articulation of “a radical individualism” (p. 349).

If the body, as Tampo contends, was one tool for resisting fascism, then the museum, Laura Hein tells us in one of two concluding chapters, was another. In taking up the story of curator and scholar Hijikata Teichi and his leadership of Japan’s first museum of modern art, established in Kamakura in 1951, Hein explores how the museum’s exhibition and outreach programming served as a regional platform for critiquing “orthodox nationalism” and instilling a vigorous democratic aesthetic. To this end, Hijikata endeavored to present artworks to the public so as to argue for “diverse and dynamic modernities” (p. 354). Yet his efforts, we learn, were limited by a blind spot that ignored the modernity of those Asian peoples formerly under Japan’s colonial control. Hein’s consideration of the postwar art museum’s capacity to shape social and political values is carried forward in time by Julia Adeny Thomas in her closing contribution, a 2008 essay that rummages on the powers of art, artifacts, and curatorial vision to generate new modes of history and memory making. A historian of modern Japan like Hein, Thomas is concerned to understand Japan’s problematic relation with its wartime past; she observes a marked change between 1995, when an “official amnesia” suppressed historical awareness of Japanese aggressions, and 2004, when an “official collective memory” wallowing in “self-love, injured dignity, selected archives and ethnic pride” had been fostered by right-wing ideologues. She finds an alternative “mediation” between history and memory in the exhibition *Paradise Lost: The Politics of Landscape*, 1870–1954, an exhibition of paintings and photographs organized by the Yokohama Art Museum in 2004 that worked to subvert these official forms of historical remembering. Through the suggestive juxtaposition of images—of Japan’s Asian colonies alongside “the West” and “Japan,” for example, which served to destabilize the construct of “Japan and the West”—the exhibition effectively undermined the rigidity of identity and fostered a more open and fluid form of subjectivity. And by concentrating on the genre of landscape, Thomas explains, it “created a space where the vicissitudes of history and the nostalgia of memory could be shared across national boundaries” (p. 379).

These reflections on history and memory remind us of the multiple issues at stake in the writing of our own art histories—the responsibility, Thomas writes, of “crafting a meaning” (p. 375). The three books under review represent a staggering amount of research, reflection, and labor on the part of a small group of individuals, and they speak to the current vibrancy, energy, and momentum of Japanese modern art studies. With their focus on images made primarily for domestic audiences, they reveal the primacy of visual culture to the creation of the Japanese public sphere and just how profoundly art has mattered to Japan and the Japanese in the twentieth century. These are not the images foreign visitors to Japan once expected to encounter, nor the art objects that most North American museums have shown us. Thanks to these probing studies, we are able to grasp how Japanese art and visual culture participated in shaping the horizons of their world; it remains to be seen how their introduction to art history will shape and refine ours.

**ALICIA VOLK** is associate professor of Japanese art at the University of Maryland (Department of Art History and Archaeology, University of Maryland, 4210 Art-Sociology Building, College Park, Md. 20742).

**WARREN CARTER, BARNABY HARAN, AND FREDERIC J. SCHWARTZ, EDS.** *Renew Marxart Art History* London: Art/Books, 2013. 520 pp.; 106 b/w ill. $65.00

One of the most striking scenes in the television series Med Men is when adman Don Draper pitches his advertising concept for Kodak corporation’s new circular slide tray—“the carousel.” Clicking through homey photographs of his own family, Draper tells Kodak representatives that the deepest bond with a product is “nostalgia,” a term that in Greek “literally means the pain from an old wound; it’s a twinge in your heart far more powerful than memory alone.” Kodak’s carousel is “a time machine”: “it goes backwards . . . forwards . . . takes us to a place where we ache to go again.” He likens the power of this emotional longing to a child’s desire for the security and love of the family. Buy a carousel slide projector and you can revisit that sentiment, over and over again.

*Renew Marxart Art History* projects a similarly nostalgic evocation in the guise of its inside endpapers, “Liubov Popova Untitled Textile Design on William Morris Garden Tulip Wallpaper for Historical Materialism” by David Mabb, and frontispiece, “Under Wraps (Bust of Lenin)” by Carol Duncan. This collection is a *Festschrift* honoring British art historian Andrew Hemingway, emeritus professor at University College, London, former editor of the *Oxford Art Journal* and author of numerous publications, notably, *Landscape Imagery and Urban Culture in Early Nineteenth-Century Britain* (1992), *Artists on the Left: American Artists and the Communist Movement, 1926–1956* (2002), and *The Mysticism of Money: Precisionist Painting and Machine Age America* (2013). In their preface, the editors (Warren Carter, Barnaby Haran, and Frederic J. Schwartz) praise Hemingway’s dedication to promoting an “art history that can be considered properly Marxist” (p. 6), presumably one that has no problem with Vladimir Lenin’s Marxism, nor its legacy. By way of contrast I was reminded of T. J. Clark and Donald Nicholson-Smith’s (“Why Art Can’t Kill the Situationist International”) choice of illustrations for their own political reckoning with Leninism: “Moscow, 1917. Toppled Alexander III”; “Budapest, October 23, 1956. Toppled Stalin”; “Vilnius, August 30, 1991. Toppled Lenin”; “Moscow, KGB headquarters, August 22, 1991. Toppled Dzerzhinsky.” Then there is David Craven’s critique. Reviewing Hemingway’s edited volume *Marxism and the History of Art: From William Morris to the New Left* (2008), which the editors of *Renew Marxart Art History* single out as his codifying statement (p. 6), Craven called attention to his “Comintern” style of “fractions sectarianism,” which leads him to dismiss “almost any other variants of New Left art history that employ Marx in ways divergent from his.” The crux of the matter is Hemingway’s belief that Marxism is a totalizing theory of society encompassing every aspect of human endeavor; hence, like his Communist predecessors, he treats art history as one sphere of inquiry in a system of knowledge akin to metaphysics. On this basis, “competing” traditions in the Marxist canon are “enemies,” and those who question Marxism’s hegemony as such, even more so. Thus, championing “liberal pluralism” (that is, “bourgeois” values), the “art historical academy” may aspire to integrate Marxist art history into its “great smorgasbord”—“formalist art history, queer art history, feminist art history, post-colonial art history”—but Hemingway is having none of that. “Marxist art history,” he writes, “is a contradiction in terms, in that Marxism as a