

THE FOLLOWING IS A ROUGH DRAFT. NOT FOR QUOTING OR USING AS
REFERENCE

**WALKING THE TIGHTROPE
POLITICS, ART AND CENSORSHIP IN NINETEENTH CENTURY JAPAN**

Brenda G. Jordan
Assistant Professor
Florida State University

[This is essentially a series of notes that provided the basic material from which I drew for paper entitled “Censorship and Reception: The Case of Kawanabe Kyôsei.”]

This research is concerned with the tensions—both perceived and real—between artists and the state in 19th c. Japan, and with the traditional social and cultural modes of thinking that could affect an artist’s relationship with both his patrons and his public as well as with those in positions of political power. In Japan of the 19th c., politics, art and culture interacted, affecting artists’ careers and even, most likely, the future evaluation and place of an artist in history.

This paper is concerned with censorship. Not just the kind of censorship that is legally imposed, but also the kind that occurs by virtue of negative opinions and views in government quarters. Both of these types of censorship can affect an artist and his career. This issue has been a topic of research in Japanese art history, but more has been published in this country on censorship in the fields of journalism and literature, and on the rise of the police state in 20th c. Japan. Censorship in Japan is an issue that speaks to scholars on both sides of the Pacific because of the implications that government involvement had for later years, particularly those years leading up to WWII.

Although artists had been censored earlier in Japan, I will confine this discussion to the period from the late 18th c. on through the 19th c. in Japan, with a special focus on the 1870s and 1880s. During this entire period, writers, artists, dramatists, etc. sometimes found themselves walking a tightrope, to so speak; that is, walking a fine line between

the interests and demands of their public and the concerns of government officials who sought to oversee the contents of artistic production.

I contend that Kawanabe Kyôσαι (1831-1889) both benefited and was a victim of government censorship.¹ At the height of his popularity and artistic powers in the 1870s and 80s, Kyôσαι was one of the most well-known contemporary painters and print designers in Japan (particularly in the Tokyo area). He was even popular in the western community in Japan, and constantly in demand by Japanese and western patrons alike. He had a broad following corresponding to his vast repertoire, with which he could satisfy the requests of almost any type of patron. Yet, in the 20th c., his name nearly disappeared from the history books. Was this because, as in the case of his contemporary, American landscape painter Frederick E. Church, tastes changed and he went out of fashion? Was it because Kyôσαι wasn't part of either of the two major artistic movements of the day—Nihonga and Yôga—that were to dominate the Japanese painting world into the next century? Was it because he did not found an influential school of painting, teach the next generation of painters or start a new artistic movement? All of these factors may have contributed to his rapid descent into near oblivion, but censorship also played its role.

Kyôσαι lived at a time of rapid change, when a young government was trying to assert its legitimacy, both inside and outside Japan, and the road to modernization was being created as they (the Japanese) went along, rather than adhering to anything like a definite, single plan. Within this era of constantly shifting political and cultural winds, artists often had to do some juggling to keep up with it all.

Kyôσαι's lifestyle, much of his art and his personality were all, in a word "politically incorrect", in a manner of speaking. A painter's lifestyle, character and art were interrelated in nineteenth century Japan because, in the Confucian sense, an painter's work was a revelation of his character. Those things that contributed to Kyôσαι's popularity with Westerners and Japanese alike rankled the Confucian morality of many government bureaucrats, and his kind of artist had no role to play in the marketing of Japan to the West as an up-and-coming industrialized modern nation. Kyôσαι's character and his art that did not fit the picture, that is, the image of Japan that the government wanted to represent. Thus, when Japanese began to write histories of Japan, both for themselves and for Westerners, Kyôσαι was often conveniently left out.

To back up a bit, during the Edo period the government was involved in attempting to have an effect on the moral fiber of the nation. The government passed numerous laws to restrict the activities of people or the information that might reach them. There was some concern with the content of art and literature or written information which reached the masses. Connected to this is the fact that literacy was rising; the merchant class was becoming better educated and financially powerful although politically powerless. There were government controls and regulations for almost every aspect of life. Circumventing regulations and restrictions was a challenge for anyone involved in the publication of wood block printed pictures and books.

The government banned pornography, references to the ruling Tokugawa family and current events as subjects of visual expression. Sexually explicit pictures were thought to be inappropriate for a morally superior society (Censorship, p. 3), although enforcement of that ban tended to be spotty and inefficient.² References to the ruling Tokugawa or to contemporary events or political situations could be veiled in some way, such as when contemporary events were represented in the guise of something occurring in the distant past. Until the mid 19th c., the very individuals who were responsible for policing the censorship laws were themselves members of the publishing and printing industries. (Censorship, p. 4) Thus, the producers of prints were often caught in a tug-of-war between the lure of financial gain and the laws of the land. Many times people simply obeyed the regulations; many more times they would work around them in clever ways—one could design a picture of a courtesan that suggestively erotic without revealing a great deal of flesh or showing explicit sex acts.

Sometimes, however, the designer or his publisher slipped on that tightrope. In 1805, Kitagawa Utamaro (1754-1806) was sentenced to three days in jail and fifty days of house arrest in handcuffs for the print triptych entitled “The Taikô Hideyoshi and His Five Wives on an Excursion to Rakutô.” This print triptych referred to a banned historical novel, the *Ehon Taikô ki*, which dealt with the sixteenth century warlord Toyotomi Hideyoshi (1537-98), whose heirs had been overthrown by the Tokugawa family. The actual names of the historical characters were recorded in small cartouches besides each figure on the triptych, a further breach of the law. The experience of this censorship and punishment is thought to have contributed to the decline of Utamaro’s health, and he died the following year.

The perception of the public regarding a work could have as much impact on the government censors as what the artist may have intended in the first place. In 1843, a woodblock print triptych by Utagawa Kuniyoshi entitled “Minamoto Raikô and the Earth Spider” was published. This work was released during the severe Tenpô Reforms of 1841-2, which had been instigated by the senior councillor to the shogun, Mizuno Tadakuni (1794-1851). Although the subject, on the surface, seemed to have to do with one of the legends surrounding Minamoto Yorimitsu (Raikô; 948-1021), Kuniyoshi’s contemporaries interpreted the triptych as a satire and associated the subject of Raikô with Mizuno Tadakuni, the senior councillor. Kuniyoshi and his publisher apparently escaped being punished, but the wood blocks were withdrawn and publication halted, although not in time to prevent editions circulating as far as Osaka and Kyoto. When variant versions of the theme appeared, the parties involved were punished.

These are just two of a number of examples of censorship in the 19th c. On the one hand there was an undercurrent in the Japanese art world, particularly the world of popular art, which pushed the limits of legality regarding censorship as far as possible. On the other hand, as Melinda Takeuchi has pointed out, it was clear “that a distinction was drawn between the probably wholesome ventilation of the kind of discontent considered endemic to the city-dweller’s lot, on the one hand, and protests leading to the undermining of the actual political system itself, on the other.”³

Which brings us to the issue of current events and political satire. These subjects were officially prohibited, but by the 1850s there seems to have been a breakdown in the efforts to censor forbidden topics. Long-standing restrictions began to be ignored. After the arrival of Admiral Perry, for example, informal and unpublished commentary, often bitterly critical, began to circulate. Albert A. Altman has noted that “lampoons commonly bunched together under the rubric of *rakugaki* or *rakusho*, usually unsigned, criticized officials and their policies in a manner by turns satirical, mocking, often insulting, and sometimes inflammatory.”⁴

However, there was a fine line that could not always be crossed safely. Signing or not signing your name to a print was one of these fine lines, where committing yourself to responsibility for the design of the print might create a problem for you as the print designer.

Which brings us back to Kyôσαι; and to some background on him. Kyôσαι had for a brief period been a student of Kuniyoshi (whose prints were more than once considered to be political satire), and he remained a great admirer of the elder designer. But Kyôσαι was also of low level samurai rank and had trained and graduated from a high ranking academic Kano painting workshop, where his initial professional career had been as an painter for the Tokugawa bakufu. He had worked on commissions for daimyo and for the government for a time, before striking out on his own in 1857. However, because of his training and class status, there were certain patterns of behavior expected of him—Confucian sobriety and frugality, hard work, filial piety (which would include that to the government), and being a painter of elevated and serious, didactic subjects.

We know that these expectations persisted beyond Kyôσαι's lifetime. The scholar Iijima Kyoshin, himself the eldest son of a samurai and a biographer of Kyôσαι, took great pains to focus the reader's attention on Kyôσαι's Kano and samurai connections, and argued that Kyôσαι's venture into more "frivolous" art was not really what the painter wanted to do.⁵ Even today, that prestigious connection to the Kano school and to the samurai class is a point of pride with Kyôσαι's descendants.

The problem is that Kyôσαι's lifestyle, personality and much of his art does not fit into the mold of the sober samurai painter. Kyoshin wrote that Kyôσαι's study of popular ukiyoe was something he did in response to the trend of the time, not something he did out of true desire, but this was clearly not the case. Clearly Kyôσαι was proud of his Kano training and connections, and he painted "elevated" themes and styles that the Kano specialized in. However, he also produced *giga* (caricature sketches), *kyôga* (satirical sketches), and fantastic and crazy subjects far too often and for too many years for it to be something forced upon him. He also had a reputation of heavy drinking, telling tall tales and spontaneous eccentric acts that fly in the face of the sober image that was expected of him.

Kyôσαι was, in truth, a dedicated painter, a hard worker and a man with a passion for his art. He was also a lover of sake, a partier, a spender, and an eccentric. These different aspects of his personality, which were reflected in his art, both contributed to his popularity and caused him trouble. The "crazy," eccentric side of his personality came to overshadow his passionate, dedicated side. Of course, that an eccentric painter can also be a dedicated, serious painter was not a contradiction Japan. However, a man's art

and character were intertwined, one was revealed in the other. It was an ancient Chinese idea that a man of poor character could not produce high art. Further, in the case of 19th c. Japan, with the political and social upheaval and changes, a lack of conformity to Confucian morality was not what those in power wanted to see.

The biography Kyoshin was halfway right about one thing. It was the tenor of the times from the 1850s on that changed Kyôsai. But rather than it being the case that Kyôsai temporarily had to stoop to the production of vulgar public art in order to make a living, it was the case that Kyôsai's particular personality and talents encountered a wealth of wonderful material with which to work.

Now, to put the issue of censorship and Kyôsai together. As noted, there had been a breakdown in enforcement of the censorship laws by the 1850s, but that does not mean that one could get away with just anything. This was a time when the political situation was heating up. In the early 1860s, foreign ministers were pressing Japan for a successful negotiation of treaties that would open up further ports to foreign trade and commerce. The “revere the Emperor, expel the barbarian” movement was growing stronger. Terrorism was at a peak as anti-foreign elements of the Japanese military were attacking foreigners as well as the shogunate and court officials who supported opening Japan to further intercourse with the West. Several court officials resigned. Violence on a larger scale was just around the corner.

Kyôsai's production during this period demonstrates his tendency toward making commentary on contemporary events. In the 4th month of 1863, Kyôsai designed a surimono with a picture of foreigners and samurai. Kyôsai wrote on the print that he did this work by special request. The subject is a current one. Foreigners are facing off a group of samurai. The topic may relate to the tensions between Westerners and the government at this particular time. Edo was under threat of foreign bombardment if the shogunate did not pay compensation for the murder of the Englishman Richardson by samurai from Satsuma in the previous year (Clark, p. 117).⁶ Foreign warships assembling in Edo Bay provoked a mass exodus from the city, and were satirized in prints known as *awate-e* (panic pictures). (Clark, p. 117) Negotiations were underway in Kyoto between the Shogun and the court on how and when the “foreign barbarians” should be expelled from the country.

Then, in the fifth month of 1863, forces from the Chôshû han fired on an American merchant ship in the Shimonoseki straits. Attacks on French and Dutch vessels followed and the straits were closed to trade. The foreigners quickly retaliated, including an attack by British warships (in the seventh month) when they bombarded Kagoshima, capital of the Satsuma fief. At the end of the next month, a revolt against the shogunate failed. Uprisings and unrest were not over, however.

In the 8th month of 1863, a triptych designed by Kyôsai was issued, entitled “Repelling of the Mongol Pirate Ships.” Timothy Clark has pointed out that although the print supposedly depicts the destruction of invading Mongol forces in the late 13th c., it in fact shows a foreign (read Western) vessel destroyed by shelling, and others ablaze on the horizon. The raging waves in this print take on the sun and spreading rays symbolism of Japan.

In the 7th month of 1864, Kyôsai designed a triptych entitled “Elegant Picture of the Great Frog Battle”. In the autumn of 1863 and the spring of 1864 there were secret plans being laid within the shogunate for the punishment of Chôshû han, as the Chôshû were leading the anti-foreign movement that threatened to undermine the authority of the shogunate. Foreign powers were demanding that the Shimonoseki Straits be opened and Chôshû be punished. During the summer the shogunate stalled and foreign ships again gathered in Edo bay. In the next few months, extremists would attack Kyoto and be defeated, and foreign ships would proceed against Chôshû and bombard the coastal defenses in the Shimonoseki Straits.

Japanese scholars interpret this print entitled “Repelling of the Mongol Pirate Ships” as suggesting an open conflict with Chôshû and Tokugawa forces in which the Tokugawa forces prevail. It is also thought that this may be an early impression of a design that Kyoshin recorded as having been censored by the authorities for being a satire on contemporary events. Later impressions of this print are known; in those later impressions, the military crests on frogs’ shields and elsewhere in the design have been removed from the color blocks (and don’t appear in the published prints). Clark suggests therefore that it may be that this print was modified in later editions rather than altogether withdrawn from sale. (Clark, p. 150)

The examples above demonstrate that Kyôσαι was involved in satirical public works of art which made commentary on contemporary events in the 1860s, and it is thought that on one occasion that the print he produced may have been censored.

In 1868, there was a change of government and the dawn of a new era in Japan. The new government embarked on a vigorous campaign of modernization and westernization. The first few years were uncertain, however. Particularly in 1870, the young government was going through hard times. The process of extending control over all the various domains of Japan and creating a centralized government was creating a challenge. For this centralization to work, the backing of the powerful domains of Satsuma and Chôshû was needed. There was a rebellion in Chôshû in late 1869, and the failure of attempted talks in Tokyo with influential daimyo of Satsuma and Chôshû in early 1870.⁷

The central government was left at an impasse for the next year. Anti-foreign feelings were running high and foreigners came under attack. Assassinations continued, with the target being the new government leaders. Animosity existed between the leading domains. There were rumors of plots to overthrow the government. At the same time, the foreign powers were regarded as outside threats that compounded the problems of the dangers from within. In February of 1870 Sanjô Sanetomi wrote to Iwakura Tomomi:

Observing the situation in the east and west, I feel that the present is a truly difficult time. The outcome of the Restoration depends on the next three or four or five months. It is vital that officials exert themselves to the maximum. If we are fortunate enough to overcome the danger, then, just as the ground hardens after rain, a time of stability will arrive. But for a while the divine land will be at peril.⁸

Beginning in what corresponds to January of 1871, the impasse would be resolved, but for the remainder of 1870, the problems of the central government were clearly thought to be desperate. Coincidentally, the end of 1870 and the first two months of 1871 were a turning point in Kyôσαι's life as well.

In the late fall of 1870, a *haikai* poet by the name of Kikakudô Ujaku held a painting and calligraphy meeting (*shogakai*) in Ueno. As a friend of the host, Kyôσαι was one of

those in attendance. As usual, the *sake* was flowing and Kyôσαι was partaking of it as he painted. In fact, Kyôσαι is said to have continued to drink and paint, and paint and drink until his face was the color of a red-paper lantern. The artist apparently worked himself into a nearly incoherent state. No one knows for sure what he actually painted during the party, but he is thought to have produced a number of *kyôga* (crazy or satirical pictures). These included an image of two men putting shoes on a man from the island of long-legged men, and another image of a person from the island of long-armed people pulling the nostril hairs of Daibutsu (the Great Buddha of Kamakura?). (People from these fantastic islands = imaginary foreigners.) Was he implicitly criticizing the events of his time, or was he merely a crazy painter out of control and thoroughly enjoying himself? It does not seem to have mattered, for a government official present at the party observed these goings-on and took offense. He caught Kyôσαι and arrested him.

Kyôσαι was reportedly detained and then interrogated in reference to the nature of the *kyôga* he had drawn. He was then detained further in the jail, the crowded and squalid conditions of which he illustrated for his autobiography, the *Kyôσαι gadan* (1887). The story recorded in this autobiography doesn't give us many details; it does say that Kyôσαι was in prison for a month and was extremely repentant of having been so drunk. Kyoshin, who had done a great deal of field research on Kyôσαι, wrote that Kyôσαι became ill while in prison, was released and put under house arrest until he recovered, then returned to prison, and, finally, punished with a public flogging consisting of 50 lashes. Kyôσαι thereafter changed his art name from one using a character that can be read as 'crazy' to a name in which the initial *kyô* reads 'dawn.'

According to Kyoshin, this incident made Kyôσαι's reputation. Afterwards, he was known as a *kijin* to people in Tokyo (an eccentric), and his career blossomed due to his popularity and notoriety for having been thrown in jail for satirical paintings. The problem is that no one has yet been able to corroborate this story with contemporary documents.

The lack of hard evidence is disconcerting, but there is a great deal of circumstantial evidence supporting the fact that something happened to Kyôσαι around the end of 1870 and the beginning of 1871. There are Kyôσαι's picture diaries that clearly show him as being ill and daily attended by a doctor. There is his own testimony to the fact that he

was arrested, although Kyôσαι's stories always have to be taken with a grain of salt. There is the extensive research by Kyoshin in the early 1890s; Kyoshin didn't seem to doubt at all that this incident had occurred. There are newspaper accounts at Kyôσαι's death in 1889 that recount this "slip-of-the-brush-incident" as scholars came to refer to it. There are westerners' accounts of the 1870s and 1880s, some wildly exaggerated, of Kyôσαι's run-in with the authorities and what the foreigners gleefully refer to as his anti-establishment and anti-authority attitude. It seems fairly clear, too, that Kyôσαι changed his art name just about at this time.

The time was ripe for such an incident to occur, given the political situation. Kyôσαι didn't have to go too far to offend a zealous official in 1870, and he apparently painted sketches that could be interpreted as a commentary on the government giving in to foreigners' demands, something that many Japanese resented. Kyôσαι touched the raw nerves of those in authority on one of the very subjects about which they were the most concerned.

In the end, however, it doesn't really matter what the details of the incident were. The point is that people thought it occurred, they believed it happened, and Kyôσαι was beloved by his public for having been censored; he was viewed as being anti-authority and admired for that. Japanese and Westerners in Japan admired this eccentric anti-establishment figure at a time when this type of personality was popular with Westerners (in an age of Whistler and Van Gogh) and Japanese (who were being pushed and pulled in all directions by those in power). And it had always been a part of the Edokko (child of Edo) sensibility to be anti-authority. To the officials in the Japanese government, however, Kyôσαι was, at the least, a figure on the fringe of acceptability. For this, there is good evidence.

Take the 1881 Second National Industrial Exposition, for example. Kyôσαι's ink painting of a crow entitled "Winter Crow on a Dead Branch" was one of four paintings he exhibited at this major exhibition. This painting won the highest prize given to paintings in its category. It also carried the enormous price of 100 yen, which Kyôσαι said he explained to a disgruntled official as not being the price of the crow, but the price for the many years and many hardships he had endured in order to learn to paint.

The certificate Kyôσαι received with the prize medal reads rather differently in tone from the certificates given to other painters at this exposition.

[He has] created instantly, in a stroke, a painting of a crow perched at the top of a decaying, bent branch, something extraordinary without wasteful embellishment, and has attained the divine quality of greatly resembling [nature], having removed himself from [his usual] custom of the crazy things that he does. We should therefore recognize his technical skill by awarding this prize.⁹

Thus the award was given, although not without a comment on Kyôσαι's character and painting. A further critique of the artist and his painting was offered by Fukuda Keigyô, a Tokyo-fu official who had been one of five judges headed by the chief of the Natural History Department; Fukuda's name appears first on Kyôσαι's award certificate. Fukuda had become the chief inspector of virtually the entire art section of the exhibition, and he presented a report on the exhibition in which he singled out the crow painting for the following remarks:

After Kyôσαι left the studio of Kano Tôhaku, he studied the painting styles of the Yuan and Ming, and claims to have become especially skilled at figure painting in the Northern style. Although he claims to be able to, in one breath, dash off one thousand paintings, there are many among those which please the popular eye, and few which understand the real meaning of the Northern style and should be recommended to the Hall of the Great Masters. However, the way the crow on the lone branch of this dead tree is done shows us, in some way, an understanding of the divine essence of the old method, and in the scant black ink of one crow on a single branch is contained a power of great weight. This one beauty conceals the one thousand uglinesses, and has washed off his hitherto associated reputation and changed it for the better. From now on, if he proceeds in this brush style and returns to the correct path, he will become someone who will have to be called an "Old Tiger" in the painting world.¹⁰ This is what Yamaguchi Seiichi characterizes as an "admonition of undisguised animosity." Yamaguchi has argued that this underlying attitude of animosity in regard to Kyôσαι was not an isolated incident on the part of only one official, but representative of a view of him held in common by (art) officials in the government at that time. Scholars of Kyôσαι have proposed three possibilities as to why this was the prevalent viewpoint on

Kyôσαι: (1) the various *giga* for which Kyôσαι was imprisoned in 1870; (2) a work by Kyôσαι entitled *Kiken au kômô keikan zu* (Sodomy of foreigners meeting Japanese dignitaries); and (3) another work entitled *Tôji no shôku o kifû shi tôtokiatari o bujoku shi tatematsureru* (Slander the Prime Minister and Insult the Emperor). Unfortunately, none of these suspect works are extant. However, as previously noted, there are a number of extant works that are considered to be *fûshiga* (satirical pictures). In any case, Kyôσαι irritated officialdom's sense of propriety, and Fukuda, for one, let him know about it.

There is other evidence of mutual dislike between Kyôσαι and those in official circles, of which the above quotes serve as among the better examples. On the other side of the coin, it is clear from contemporary accounts in newspapers of the 1870s and 80s, and lists of famous artists of Tokyo, that Kyôσαι was well regarded and highly ranked as a painter and print designer during his lifetime. Supporting contemporary documents are the painter's own picture diaries, that show a lifestyle so busy that the painter couldn't keep up with all the commissions.

Kyôσαι's activity during the 1870s and 1880s is broader than many scholars realize. He produced an autobiography/painting manual and many wood block printed books, some of which made their way to Europe within a year of their production. He continued to illustrate satirical works such as Kanagaki Robun's *Aguranabe*, and designed the pictures for widely distributed books such as *Aesop's Fables*. He produced his own satirical prints and paintings, and collaborated with Robun in publishing the satirical but short-lived *Eshinbun Nipponchi* (1874), one of his works in what might be called a pre-Manga style. He painted a major theatre curtain for the progressive Shintomiza, did social commentary, painted works that foreshadowed Nihonga, and produced paintings for a wide spectrum of patrons.

So why is someone like this virtually ignored in the history books, or only mentioned in passing as an ukiyoe or late Kano painter? Perhaps it is because his agenda and the government's agenda were in conflict. The Meiji government was heavily involved in the art world. Government officials encouraged writers and playwrights to produce uplifting and moralistic materials that would be fit for family audiences and westerners. The government sponsored and was involved in national art exhibitions and the formation of national schools of art. Government officials continued in many ways the

policies of the previous Tokugawa shogunate by censoring artists and writers when they stepped over the edge. There was much greater freedom, granted, than in the previous three hundred years, but there wasn't a quick turnaround to "civilization and enlightenment" in the sense that one could lampoon and criticize current events in any way that one wished.

Traditional ways of thinking did not die out, and they impacted the writing of histories in the twentieth century. This combination of traditional ways of thinking and a new agenda, however, predisposed government officials for favor certain kinds of art and artists over others. That sponsorship or support of certain artists eventually had some impact on the writing of art histories. Those histories have to be read with the understanding that they ultimately are informed by the views of one kind of audience, and may not, in fact, present us with a balanced historical picture. The case of Kyôσαι is classic—widely popular in his time with some audiences, disapproved by others, written out of the histories after his death, and resurrected in an era when we seek to understand art within the context of its cultural milieu. What do we learn from Kyôσαι's case? We learn, for one, that his audience was a diverse group of people, emblematic of the diversity of the Meiji period itself. Some censured him and his work, resulting in long-term damage to his posthumous reputation. Others extolled his personality and his art, and not always for the same reasons. Had he lived longer, their voices may have prevailed in the end, for there is some speculation that he was being considered for a teaching position at the new Tokyo School of Fine Arts when he died. I think that his individualistic streak would have always prevailed, however. He was an example of the Meiji individualist, someone whose life and work cannot be categorized neatly. In this respect, he rises to importance historically, because he represented the *Zeitgeist* of his age.

¹ The most thorough treatment of Kyôσαι to date is Brenda G. Jordan, *Strange Fancies and Fresh Conceptions: Kyôσαι in an Age of Conflict*. Ph.D. diss. Lawrence: University of Kansas, 1993.

² For more information on censorship in wood block printing, see Thompson, Sarah E. and H. D. Harootunian. *Undercurrents in the Floating World: Censorship and Japanese Prints*, exhibition catalogue. New York: The Asia Society Galleries, 1991.

³ Melinda Takeuchi, “Kuniyoshi’s *Minamoto Raikō and the Earth Spider*: Demons and Protest in Late Tokugawa Japan,” *Ars Orientalis*, 17 (1987), 16.

⁴ Albert A. Altman, “The Press” in Jansen and Rozman, ed., *Japan in Transition from Tokugawa to Meiji*, p. 233. (Jansen, Marius B. and Gilbert Rozman, ed. *Japan in Transition from Tokugawa to Meiji*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988.)

⁵For more, see Iijima, Kyoshin. *Kawanabe Kyōsai ō den*. Publication of original manuscript from the late 1890s. Tokyo: Perikansha, 1984.

⁶ For more, see Timothy Clark, *Demon of Painting, The Art of Kawanabe Kyōsai*, exhibition catalogue (London: The British Museum, 1993).

⁷ For information on the problems of the central government during these years, I have relied heavily on Albert M. Craig, Chapter Two, “The Central Government,” in Jansen and Rozman, ed., *Japan in Transition from Tokugawa to Meiji*, pp. 36-67.

⁸ From Takematsu Ōtsuka, ed., *Iwakura Tomomi kankei monjo*, vol. 4 (Tokyo: Nihon shiseki kyōkai, 1930), pp. 36-47, quoted in Craig, p. 55.

⁹ Original text reproduced in Yamaguchi, “Kawanabe Kyōsai and Art Exhibitions in His Day,” *Kyōsai*, No. 26 (July 1985), p. 34.

¹⁰ . Original text reproduced in Yamaguchi, “Kawanabe Kyōsai and Art Exhibitions in His Day,” p. 35.