ABSTRACT

Title of dissertation: COMPETING CONSTRUCTIVISMS: MODERN ARCHITECTURE AND DESIGN IN JAPAN AND KOREA, C. 1925-1940

Suzie Kim, Doctor of Philosophy, 2015

Dissertation directed by: Professor Steven A. Mansbach
Department of Art History and Archaeology

This dissertation focuses on a set of dynamic Japanese and Korean architects and artists who, during the interwar period, actively adopted and transformed the principles of Russian Constructivism, the Bauhaus, and International Architecture into their own artistic style: Japanese architects Yamaguchi Bunzō (1902-1978) and Yamawaki Iwao (1898-1987), Japanese furniture designer Kurata Chikatada (1895-1966), Korean architects Park Gil-ryong (1898-1943) and Park Dong-jin (1899-1981), and Korean artists Lee Sun-seok (1905-1986) and Yoo Youngkuk (1916-2002). This study provides the first comprehensive study of the multifaceted connections between Europe, Japan, and Korea to explore the richness of this relatively underrepresented, but decisive, modern aesthetic impulse.

Prior to and during the period of the activities of the two major architectural groups in Japan, Bunriha Kenchikukai (1920-1928) and the Sōusha (1923-1932), Yamaguchi Bunzō, the leader of the Sōusha, demonstrated a strong commitment to Marxism and promoted *gorishugi kenchiku* (rationalist architecture), which acted on his

vision of social transformation through a rationalist and functional approach to architectural design. In contrast, Yamawaki enjoyed a rather socially neutral perspective of Constructivism and searched for a synthesis between the principles of the Bauhaus style and traditional Japanese interior designs of private houses. Furniture designer Kurata Chikatada, the leader of Keiji Kōbō (1928-1940), employed the idea of standardization derived from the Bauhaus workshops, and tried to find a way to mass-produce handcrafts, and he designed standardized models that would meet the budget of Japanese middle-class housewives.

Whereas Yamaguchi, Yamawaki, and Kurata used Constructivism to open up a wide field of modernist opportunity and inventiveness, Korean architects and artists, who worked under constrained political and social circumstances, defined mostly by the colonial status of the nation, embraced the international movement only in a rather general, informative, and redemptive way—a "local" way to assert a suppressed national dynamism. The first generation of Korean architects, which included Park Gil-ryong and Park Dong-jin, suggested a way to incorporate the qualities of Constructivist style into Korean homes. Korean artists Lee Sun-seok and Yoo Youngkuk, who studied in Tokyo during the 1930s, adapted the Constructivist style to suit the local customs and artistic conventions of Korea after they returned to their homeland. This comparative study of competing Constructivisms in Japan and Korea will provide new insights into the history of modern architecture and design in Japan and Korea and a reassessment of the significance of these architects and designers who, from the mid-1920s, contributed to make Constructivism internationally recognized.

COMPETING CONSTRUCTIVISMS: MODERN ARCHITECTURE AND DESIGN IN JAPAN AND KOREA, C. 1925-1940

By

Suzie Kim

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park, in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
2015

Advisory Committee:
Professor Steven A. Mansbach, Chair
Professor Jason Kuo
Professor Marlene J. Mayo
Professor Abigail McEwen
Professor Alicia Volk

Acknowledgments

This dissertation would not have been possible without the endless encouragement and support of many people. I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my advisor, Steven A. Mansbach, for his care and interest during the long process of dissertation writing. I will remember the time I spent in his office asking innumerable questions and concerns as well as sharing my life events, big and small. I am thankful to proposal committee member Professor Dorothea Dietrich, who had wonderful suggestions and encouraged me to continue working on this topic. Special thanks go to dissertation defense committee members Professors Jason Kuo, Marlene Mayo, Abigail McEwin, and Alicia Volk. I am largely indebted to Professor Alicia Volk for sharing her expertise in modern Japanese art. I have benefited from the insightful advice from Professor Marlene Mayo who spent time with me in the library café discussing various topics on the history of modern Japan. Lastly, I am grateful to Professors Abigail McEwin and Jason Kuo, who devoted their time and energy to read my dissertation. Special thanks go to Professors Joshua M. Reynolds and Ken Tadashi Oshima, who provided me insightful comments and ideas about my topic.

Generous support came from a number of institutions and libraries in the United States, Korea, and Japan. I thank the art history department and the Graduate School at the University of Maryland for granting me the Art and Humanities Graduate Student Professional Development Fund that supported my research in Japan and Korea. I was especially fortunate to be appointed as a University of Maryland museum fellow at the Freer and Sackler Gallery. My advisor and senior associate

curator Ann Yonemura, curators James Ulak and Louis Cort, librarians Reiko Yoshimura and Yue Shu, and researcher Motoko Shimizu provided initial support and advice for my research. In Japan and Korea, my research greatly benefited from the assistance and advice of the following people: Professor Katayama Mabi, graduate students Hiroko Shikida and Jiyoung Kim from the Tokyo University of the Arts, librarian Miha Nakagawa from the architecture library at Kyoto University, librarian Takashi Koga at Tenri University, librarian Yuhei Kato at the National Diet Library, professor Woo Don-Son at Korean National University of Arts, professor Soohyun Mok at Seoul National University, independent scholar Kwon Heangga, and curator Jiyoung Oh at the Seoul History Museum. Director Yoo Gun at the Yoo Youngkuk foundation very kindly shared precious unpublished material about his father, Yoo Youngkuk.

I owe my heartfelt thanks to my fellow graduate students Lara Langer, Madeline Gent, Jingmin Zhang, and Sophia Lee, who, in constant, sincere friendship, encouraged me many times to keep working on my project. I should not forget Deborah Down, who was always there for a small chat and helped me so much with registration issues. I am indebted to Yukiko Furuya for help with translations of Japanese materials written in the 1930s. Special thanks goes to my study buddies, we who were better known as the “Fantastic Four,” Dr. Jongyun Kim, Dr. Jihyun Mandy Kim, and Hyojoon Chang. They spent so much time with me studying, discussing, chatting, and excercising on campus. We shared all our joyful and dark moments during our graduate student years. Finally, this dissertation is dedicated to my parents

and to my husband Hanju Lee, in appreciation for their endless love, support, and devotion. Thank you so much.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A Note on Transcription and Translation

In general, Japanese names and terms are transcribed according to the modified Hepburn system. The transcription of Korean names and terms follow the Revised Romanization of Korean (RR, also called South Korean or Ministry of Culture 2000) system. Exceptions include self-chosen names of modern Japanese and Korean scholars, as well as artists, names, and terms in titles of publications using different systems of transcription. Japanese and Korean names are cited in original form.

All Japanese and Korean names are listed surname first, followed by first name.

List of Figures

Fig. 11. Yuzuru Watanabe, Old Imperial Hotel, 1889-90. Illustration from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Imperial_Hotel,_Tokyo. Accessed on March 23, 2015.

Fig. 12. Frank Lloyd Wright, Final Perspective Drawing of the Imperial Hotel, Tokyo, 1920. Illustration from Kathryn Smith, "Frank Lloyd Wright and the Imperial Hotel: A Postscript," *The Art Bulletin* vol. 67, no. 2 (June 1985): 306.

Fig. 13. Frank Lloyd Wright, North Entrance of the Main Lobby, Imperial Hotel, Tokyo, 1913-23. Illustration from Joseph M. Siry, "The Architecture of Earthquake Resistance: Julius Kahn's Truscon Company and Frank Lloyd Wright's Imperial Hotel," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* vol. 67, no. 1 (March 2008): 89.

Fig. 14. Ishimoto Kikuji, *Crypt* (Elevation View), 1920. Illustration from *Kenchiku bunka* vol. 55, no. 639 (January 2000): 107.

Fig. 15. Takizawa Mayumi, *Model of Mountain House*, 1921. Illustration from Joshua M. Reynolds, *Maekawa Kunio and the Emergence of Japanese Modernist Architecture* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), 26.

Fig. 16. Hans Poelzig, Sulphuric Acid Factory, Luboń, Poland, 1911-12. Illustration from http://socks-studio.com/2013/11/26/hans-poelzigs-sulphuric-acid-factory-in-lubon-poland-1911-1912/. Accessed on March 23, 2015.

Fig. 17. Erich Mendelsohn, Einstein Tower, Potsdam, Germany, 1920. Illustration from http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_image.cfm?image_id=4196. Accessed on March 23, 2015.

Fig. 18. Yamada Mamoru, The Central Telegraph Office, Tokyo, 1925. Illustration from Eizō Inagaki, *Nihon no kindai kenchiku: sono seiritsu katei* [Modern Architecture of Japan: The Forming Process] (Tokyo: Kajima Shuppankai, 1979), 301.

Fig. 19. Hans Poelzig, Bank in Dresden, Germany, 1921. Illustration from Peter Eisenman, *Eisenman Inside Out: Selected Writings, 1963-1988* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), 94.

Fig. 20. Sōusha Members at their 8th Exhibition, 1930. Illustration from *Kenchikuka Yamaguchi Bunzō: Hito to sakuhin* [Yamaguchi Bunzō: Life and Work], RIA Kenchiku Sōgō Kenkyūjo, ed. Kondō Shōichi (Tokyo: Sagami Shobō, 1982), 208.

Fig. 21. Kurata Chikatada, "Kokusai zakki (7)" [International Miscellaneous News] *Kokusai kenchiku* 5 (July 1929): 1-5.

Fig. 22. Photograph of Yamaguchi Bunzō, date unknown. Illustration from *Kenchikuka Yamaguchi Bunzō: Hito to sakuhin* [Yamaguchi Bunzō: Life and Work], RIA Kenchiku Sōgō Kenkyūjo, ed. Kondō Shōichi (Tokyo: Sagami Shobō, 1982), 4.

Fig. 23. Yamaguchi Bunzō, *Music Hall,* 1923. Illustration from Yamaguchi Bunzō, "Sōusha to sono dai ichi kai ten" [The First Exhibition of the Sōusha], *Kenchiku shinchō* 5 (February 1924): 5.

Fig. 24. Yamaguchi Bunzō, *Memorial on the Hilltop,* 1923. Illustration from http://homepage2.nifty.com/datey/bunzo/bunzo-imeges/1924kinento.jpg. Accessed on March 23, 2015.

Fig. 25. Architectural Models Exhibited at the Fourth Exhibition of the Sōusha, 1926. Illustration from *Kenchiku Shinchō* 7 (December 1926): 165-166.

Fig. 26. Poster for the Fourth Exhibition of the Sōusha, 1926. Illustration from http://homepage2.nifty.com/datey/bunzo/bunzo-imeges/1923sousyaposter.jpg. Accessed on March 23, 2015.

Fig. 27. Poster for the First Exhibition of the Sōusha, 1923. http://homepage2.nifty.com/datey/bunzo/bunzo-imeges/1923sousyaposter.jpg. Accessed on March 23, 2015.

Fig. 28. Yamaguchi Bunzō at Walter Gropius's Atelier, 1931. Illustration from *Kenchikuka Yamaguchi Bunzō: Hito to sakuhin* [Yamaguchi Bunzō: Life and Work], RIA Kenchiku Sōgō Kenkyūjo, ed. Kondō Shōichi (Tokyo: Sagami Shobō, 1982), 219.

Fig. 29. Walter Gropius, Siedlung Törten, Dessau, 1927. Illustration from Reginald Isaacs, *Gropius: An Illustrated Biography of the Creator of the Bauhaus* (Boston and London: Gebr. Mann Verlag GmbH, 1983), 127.

Fig. 30. Weissenhof Siedlung, Stuttgart, 1927. Illustration from Richard Pommer and Christian F. Otto, *Weisenhof 1927 and the Modern Movement in Architecture* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1991), color plate nos. 1 & 2, and black and white plate no. 3.

Fig. 31. Yamaguchi Bunzō, Seiunsō (Apartment with Hospital), Tokyo, 1934. Illustration from *Gendai jūtaku, 1933-1940* [Contemporary Houses, 1933-1940], vol. 2 (Tokyo: Kokusai Kenchiku Kyōkai, 1941), 108-109.

Fig. 32. Yamaguchi Bunzō, Bancho shūgō jutaku [Bancho Siedlung], Tokyo, 1934. Illustration from *Gendai jūtaku, 1933-1940* [Contemporary Houses, 1933-1940], vol. 2 (Tokyo: Kokusai Kenchiku Kyōkai, 1941), 110-113.

Fig. 33. Yamaguchi Bunzō, Kurobegawa No. 2 Power Station, Kurobe, Toyama Prefecture, 1938. 1931. Illustration from *Kenchikuka Yamaguchi Bunzō: Hito to sakuhin* [Yamaguchi Bunzō: Life and Work], RIA Kenchiku Sōgō Kenkyūjo, ed. Kondō Shōichi (Tokyo: Sagami Shobō, 1982), 140-155.

Fig. 34. Yamaguchi Bunzō, Nihon Dental College, 1934. Illustration from *Kenchikuka Yamaguchi Bunzō: Hito to sakuhin* [Yamaguchi Bunzō: Life and Work], RIA Kenchiku Sōgō Kenkyūjo, ed. Kondō Shōichi (Tokyo: Sagami Shobō, 1982), 225.

Fig. 35. Yamaguchi Bunzō, Yamada House, Kita Kamakura, Kanagawa Prefecture, 1934. Illustration from David B. Stewart, *The Making of a Modern Japanese Architecture: 1868 to the Present* (Tokyo and New York: Kodansha International, 1987), 161.

Fig. 36. Richard Neutra, Lovell House, Los Angeles, 1927-29. Illustration from http://www.archdaily.com/104713/ad-classics-lovell-house-richard-neutra/lovell_wikiarquitectura/. Accessed on March 23, 2015.

Fig. 37. Le Corbusier, Villa Savoye, Poissy, France, 1928-31. Illustration from http://www.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/cas/fnart/Corbu.html. Accessed on March 23, 2015.

Fig. 38. Yoshida Kaoru, "Dessau houmonki" [Visit to the Dessau], *Kenchiku-shinchō* 11 (November, 1929): 191-194.

Fig. 39. Illustrations in the Special Issue of the Bauhaus, *Kenchiku-shinchō* 11 (November, 1929).

Fig. 40. Student Identity Cards of Yamawaki Michiko (left) and Yamawaki Iwao (right) at the Dessau Bauhaus. 1930. Illustration from Yamawaki Michiko, *Bauhausu to cha no yu* [The Bauhaus and the Tea Ceremony] (Tokyo: Shinchōsha, 1995), 36.

Fig. 41. Mizutani Takehiko at the Dessau Bauhaus (left) and his Works at the Dessau Bauhaus (right), 1927. Illustration from Izutsu Akio, *The Bauhaus: A Japanese Perspective and a Profile of Hans and Florence Schust Knoll* (Tokyo: Kajima Institute, 1992), 21, 28.

Fig. 42. Wassily Kandinsky, *Second Level of Analytical Drawing*, 1929. Illustration from Kandinsky: *Complete Writings on Art*, ed. Kenneth C. Lindsay and Peter Vergo (Boston: G.K. Hall, 1982), 729.

Fig. 43. Yamawaki Iwao, Study Drawings from the Class by Wassily Kandinsky, 1930. Illustration from *Bauhaus 1919-1933,* exh. cat. (Tokyo: Sezon Museum of Art, 1995), 330-331.

Fig. 44. Yamawaki Michiko, Study Drawings from the Class by Wassily Kandinsky, 1930-1932. Illustration from *Bauhaus 1919-1933,* exh. cat. (Tokyo: Sezon Museum of Art, 1995), 330-331.

Fig. 45. Study from the Preliminary Course by Joseph Albers, Yamawaki Michiko (left, 29 × 53 cm, 1930) and Yamawaki Iwao (right, 42 × 53.5 cm, 1932). Illustration from *Bauhaus 1919-1933,* exh. cat. (Tokyo: Sezon Museum of Art, 1995), 332.

Fig. 46. Mies van der Rohe, Barcelona Pavilion, Barcelona, Spain, 1929. Illustration from Philip C. Johnson, *Mies van der Rohe* (New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1947), 68-74.

Fig. 47. Mies van der Rohe, Farnsworth House, Plano, IL, 1951. Illustration from http://farnsworthhouse.org/gallery. Accessed on March 25, 2015.

Fig. 48. Yamawaki Iwao, Analytical Drawing Studies at the Architecture Department, 1931-1932. Illustration from *Bauhaus 1919-1933,* exh. cat. (Tokyo: Sezon Museum of Art, 1995), 337, 364.

Fig. 49. Yamawaki Iwao, *Bauhaus Building Dessau*, 1931. 22 × 16.5 cm. Illustration from *Bauhaus 1919-1933,* exh. cat. (Tokyo: Sezon Museum of Art, 1995), 338.

Fig. 50. Yamawki Iwao, *Untitled Photography Works*, 1932. Illustration from *Bauhaus 1919-1933,* exh. cat. (Tokyo: Sezon Museum of Art, 1995), 338-339.

Fig. 51. Kitazawa Rakuten, "The Japanese People's Double Life," *Jiji manga* 20 (June 26, 1921).

Fig. 52. Antonin Raymond, Antonin Raymond's House at Rainanzaka, Azabu, Tokyo, 1923-26. Illustration from David B. Stewart, *The Making of a Modern Japanese Architecture: 1868 to the Present* (Tokyo and New York: Kodansha International, 1987), 102-105.

Fig. 53. G.T. Rietveld, Schröder House, Utrecht, 1924. Illustration from http://centraalmuseum.nl/bezoeken/locaties/rietveld-schroederhuis/. Accessed on March 25, 2015.

Fig. 54. Yamawaki Iwao, Exterior View, Atelier of Artist Migishi Kotaro, Saginomiya, Tokyo, 1933. Illustration from *Nihon no zenei, 1900-1940* [Art into Life, 1900-1940]. Kyoto: Kyoto Kokuritsu Kindai Bijutsukan, 1999, 20-21.

Fig. 55. Walter Gropius, Houses for the Bauhaus Teachers, Dessau, 1925. Illustration from http://www.meisterhaeuser.de/en/house_Walter_Gropius.html. Accessed on March 25, 2015.

Fig. 56. Axonometric Plan of Yamawaki's Residence, Tokyo, 1935. Illustration from *Kokusai kenchiku* vol. 11 (January, 1935), color illustration page.

Fig. 57. Yamawaki Iwao, First Floor of Yamawaki's Residence, Tokyo, 1934. Illustration from *Gendai jūtaku, 1933-1940* [Contemporary Houses, 1933-1940], vol. 1 (Tokyo: Kokusai Kenchiku Kyōkai, 1941), 128-132.

Fig. 58. Photograph of Kurata Chikatada, date unknown. Illustration from *Kessei 80-shūnen: Modan dezain no senku Keiji Kōbō ten; Keiji-Kōbō* [80th Anniversary: The Predecessor of Modern Design: Keiji-Kōbō Exhibition, 1928-1938], ed. Mori Hitoshi (Matsudo-shi: Matsudo-shi Bunka Shinkō Zaidan, 2008), 9.

Fig. 59. Dōjunkai Apartment at Daikainyama, Shibuya, Tokyo. Date unknown. Illustration from *Kessei 80-shūnen: Modan dezain no senku Keiji Kōbō ten; Keiji-Kōbō* [80th Anniversary: The Predecessor of Modern Design: Keiji-Kōbō Exhibition, 1928-1938], ed. Mori Hitoshi (Matsudo-shi: Matsudo-shi Bunka Shinkō Zaidan, 2008), 4.

Fig. 60. Keiji Kōbō, Standardized Arm Chair (left) and Small Chair (right) with *tatamizuri*, date unknown. Illustration from *Bauhaus 1919-1933,* exh. cat. (Tokyo: Sezon Museum of Art, 1995), 365.

Fig. 61. Keiji Kōbō, Standardized Types of Furniture, date unknown. Illustration from Toyoguchi Katsuhei, *Keiji Kōbō kara: Toyoguchi Katsuhei to dezain no hanseiki* [From the Keiji Workshop: Toyoguchi Katsuhei and the Design over the Half-Century] (Tokyo: Bijutsu Shuppansha, 1987), 76,79, and 82.

Fig. 62. Kinokunia Bookstore, Tokyo, 1927. Illustration from http://www.kinokuniya.com/us/index.php/fho004. Accessed on April 1, 2015.

Fig. 63. Model for a Living Room, Keiji Kōbō's First Exhibition, Kinokunia Bookstore, 1928. Illustration from *Kessei 80-shūnen: Modan dezain no senku Keiji Kōbō ten; Keiji-Kōbō, 1928-1938,* ed. Mori Hitoshi Matsudo-shi, exh. cat. (Matsudo-shi Bunka Shinkō Zaidan, 2008), 12.

Fig. 64. Walter Gropius, Apartment Interior at the Törten Siedlung, Dessau, 1926. Chairs, Stools, and Table designed by Marcel Breuer. Illustration from Christopher Wilk, *Marcel Breuer: Furniture and Interiors*, exh. cat. (New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1981), 34.

Fig. 65. Keiji Kōbō, Standardized Small Chair with the Measurements, date unknown. Illustration from *Kessei 80-shūnen: Modan dezain no senku Keiji Kōbō ten; Keiji-Kōbō, 1928-1938,* ed. Mori Hitoshi Matsudo-shi, exh. cat. (Matsudo-shi Bunka Shinkō Zaidan, 2008), 14 and 28.

Fig. 66. Cover page of the *Keiji Raporto* 1-3, published by the Keiji Kōbō, 1933-1934.

Fig. 67. *Keiji Raporto* 1, published by the Keiji Kōbō, 1933-1934.

Fig. 68. Marcel Breuer, *Club Armchair for Wassily Kandinsky*, 1926. Illustration from http://www.moma.org/collection/object.php?object_id=2851. Accessed on April 1, 2015.

Fig. 69. Mart Stam, *Chair S 33*, 1926. Illustration from http://en.shop.thonet.de/classics/range-s-33?a=526. Accessed on April 1, 2015.

Fig. 70. Yamawaki Iwao, "Doitsu ni ogeru no kōtetsu kagu no keikō" [The Trend toward Steel Furniture from Germany], *Kokusai kenchiku*, vol. 9, no. 3 (March 1932): 143-151.

Fig. 71. Model of a Kitchen at the Third Exhibition of the Keiji Kōbō, 1934. Illustration from *Kessei 80-shūnen: Modan dezain no senku Keiji Kōbō ten; Keiji-Kōbō, 1928-1938,* ed. Mori Hitoshi Matsudo-shi, exh. cat. (Matsudo-shi Bunka Shinkō Zaidan, 2008), 19.

Fig. 72. Keiji Kōbō, Standardized Armchair with the Measurements, date unknown. Illustration from *Kessei 80-shūnen: Modan dezain no senku Keiji Kōbō ten; Keiji-Kōbō, 1928-1938,* ed. Mori Hitoshi Matsudo-shi, exh. cat. (Matsudo-shi Bunka Shinkō Zaidan, 2008), 29.

Fig. 73. Yamawaki Iwao, *Engeki Research Lab Constructed on Factory Fields*, 1926. Illustration from *Geidai korekushon ten: Tokyo bijutso gakko to bauhausu – kenchikuka, zuanka sotsugyō seisaku ten* [Tokyo School of Fine Arts Collection: The Tokyo School of Fine Arts and the Bauhaus], exh. cat. (Tokyo: Tokyo bijutsu daikagu, 2008).

Fig. 74. Hans Poelzig, Sulphuric Acid Factory, Luboń, Poland, 1911-12. Illustration from http://socks-studio.com/2013/11/26/hans-poelzigs-sulphuric-acid-factory-in-lubon-poland-1911-1912/. Accessed on March 23, 2015.

Fig. 75. Weissenhof *Siedlung*, Stuttgart, Germany, 1927. Illustration from Richard Pommer and Christian F. Otto, *Weisenhof 1927 and the Modern Movement in Architecture* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1991), black and white plate no.4.

Fig. 76. Oka Hyakuju and Yoshimura Junzō, *Jutaku-gun* (Housing Compounds), 1931. Illustration from *Geidai korekushon ten: Tokyo bijutso gakko to bauhausu – kenchikuka, zuanka sotsugyō seisaku ten* [Tokyo School of Fine Arts Collection: The Tokyo School of Fine Arts and the Bauhaus], exh. cat. (Tokyo: Tokyo bijutsu daikagu, 2008).

Fig. 76-1 Oka Hyakuju and Yoshimura Junzō, Details of *Jutaku-gun* (Housing Compounds), 1931. Illustration from *Geidai korekushon ten: Tokyo bijutso gakko to bauhausu – kenchikuka, zuanka sotsugyō seisaku ten* [Tokyo School of Fine Arts Collection: The Tokyo School of Fine Arts and the Bauhaus], exh. cat. (Tokyo: Tokyo bijutsu daikagu, 2008).

Fig. 77. Ikebe Yoshiatsu, *Modern Architectural Design*, 1927. Illustration from *Geidai korekushon ten: Tokyo bijutso gakko to bauhausu – kenchikuka, zuanka sotsugyō seisaku ten* [Tokyo School of Fine Arts Collection: The Tokyo School of Fine Arts and the Bauhaus], exh. cat. (Tokyo: Tokyo bijutsu daikagu, 2008).

Fig. 78. Hashimoto Kanichi, *Five Design Types for Bedroom*, 1930. Illustration from *Geidai korekushon ten: Tokyo bijutso gakko to bauhausu – kenchikuka, zuanka sotsugyō seisaku ten* [Tokyo School of Fine Arts Collection: The Tokyo School of Fine Arts and the Bauhaus], exh. cat. (Tokyo: Tokyo bijutsu daikagu, 2008).

Fig. 79. Moholy Nagy, *A 19*, 1927. Illustration from http://www.ipernity.com/doc/57114/album/193884. Accessed on April 1, 2015.

Fig. 80. Gyeongbok Palace. Gyeongseong, Korea, early 1930s. Photograph from the archive of the Seoul Museum of History, Seoul, Korea.

Fig. 81. Street View, Traditional Korean Districts, Gyeongseong, Korea, early 1930s. Illustration from *Ibangin ui sungan pochak Gyeongseong 1930* [Old Seoul through Foreign Eyes 1930], exh. cat. (Seoul: Cheong Gye Cheon Museum, 2011), 83.

Fig. 82. Street View, Bonjeong District, Gyeongseong, Korea, early 1930s. Photograph taken from the "View of Keijo" postcard collection in the archive of the Seoul Museum of History, Seoul, Korea.

Fig. 83. Street View, Namdaemun (south-gate) District. Gyeongseong, Korea, early 1930s. Illustration from *Ibangin ui sungan pochak Gyeongseong 1930* [Old Seoul through Foreign Eyes 1930], exh. cat. (Seoul: Cheong Gye Cheon Museum, 2011), 96.

Fig. 84. George De Lalande and Ichiro Nomura, The Government-General of Joseon Building, Gyeongseong, Korea, 1916-26. Photograph from the "View of the famous place, Keijo" postcard collection in the archive of the Seoul Museum of History, Seoul, Korea.

Fig. 85. Tatsuno Kingo, Busan Station, Gyeongseong, Korea, 1912. Illustration from http://www.jennyhouse.info/board/bbs/board.php?bo_table=busan&wr_id=1085. Accessed on April 1, 2015.

Fig. 86. Tatsuno Kingo, Bank of Joseon, Gyeongseong, Korea, 1912. Illustration from *Ibangin ui sungan pochak Gyeongseong 1930* [Old Seoul through Foreign Eyes 1930], exh. cat.(Seoul: Cheong Gye Cheon Museum, 2011), 161.

Fig. 87. Tsukamoto Yasushi, The Gyeongseong Station, Gyeongseong, Korea, 1923. Illustration from *Ibangin ui sungan pochak Gyeongseong 1930* [Old Seoul through Foreign Eyes 1930], exh. cat.(Seoul: Cheong Gye Cheon Museum, 2011), 123.

Fig. 88. The Namdaemun Station, Gyeongseong, Korea, 1910. Illustration from http://blog.daum.net/_blog/BlogTypeView.do?blogid=0ZP6c&articleno=719&categoryId=0. Accessed on April 1, 2015.

Fig. 89. Gyeongseong Station under Construction (completed 1925). Illustration from http://keatonkim.tistory.com/3. Accessed on April 1, 2015.

Fig. 90. P.J.H. Cuypers, Central Station, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, opened 1889. Illustration from http://www.holandiabeztajemnic.pl/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/Centraal-Station-van-Amsterdam.jpg. Accessed on April 1, 2015.

Fig. 91. Central Station, Luzern, Switzerland, 1896. Architect unknown. Illustration from https://loco2.com/blog/train-stations-then-and-now. Accessed on April 1, 2015.

Fig. 92. Exterior wall of the Gyeongseong (Seoul) Station. Illustration from http://blog.joins.com/media/folderlistslide.asp?uid=maxxum&folder=8&list_id=7290299. Accessed on April 1, 2015.

Fig. 93. William Burges, St. Michael and All Angel Church, Brighton, England, 1858-62. Illustration from http://www.mybrightonandhove.org.uk/page_id__7932_img__10931.aspx. Accessed on April 1, 2015.

Fig. 94. Waiting Room on the First Floor (upper) and the Cupola (bottom) of the Gyeongseong (Seoul) Station. Illustration from Kim Chung-dong. “Seoul Station Building Reborn as a Cultural Complex,” *Koreana* 26, issue 1 (Spring 2012): 56-57.

Fig. 95. *Sightseeing in Gyeongseong*. Envelope for a Set of Postcards, 1930s. Illustration from *Ibangin ui sungan pochak Gyeongseong 1930* [Old Seoul through Foreign Eyes 1930], exh. cat. (Seoul: Cheong Gye Cheon Museum, 2011), 228.

Fig. 96. Postcard Sets of *The Greatest Views of Gyeongseong*, 1930s. Envelopes for a set of Postcards, 1930s. Illustration from *Ibangin ui sungan pochak Gyeongseong 1930* [Old Seoul through Foreign Eyes 1930], exh. cat. (Seoul: Cheong Gye Cheon Museum, 2011), 230.

Fig. 97. Map of Gyeongsong showing the increasing districts in the Southern Portion, c. 1930s. Illustration from http://fantastique.tistory.com/16. Accessed on April 1, 2015.

Fig. 98. Illustration Section, First Issue of *Chosen to kenchiku*, vol. 1, no. 1 (January 1924). Published by Chosen Kenchiku-kai.

Fig. 99. Erich Mendelsohn's Einstein Tower, First Page of the Illustration Section, *Chosen to kenchiku*, vol. 3, no. 1 (January 1924). Published by Chosen Kenchiku-kai.

Fig. 100. A Dutch Residence, Illustration Section, *Chosen to kenchiku*, vol. 4, no. 10 (October 1924). Published by Chosen Kenchiku-kai.

Fig. 101. Fritz Höger's Chile House in Hamburg, Germany, Illustration Section, *Chosen to kenchiku*, vol. 5, no. 1 (January 1925). Published by Chosen Kenchiku-kai.

Fig. 102. Fujishima Gaijiro, "Russian Art During the Revoluationary Period." Illustration Section, *Chosen to kenchiku*, vol. 5, no. 1 (January 1925). Published by Chosen Kenchiku-kai.

Fig. 103. Fujishima Gaijiro, "Modern Architecture after [Otto] Wagner," Series of Gendai kenchiku no-to [A Note on Modern Architecture], *Chosen to kenchiku* no. 4, vol. 1 (January 1925): 19.

Fig. 104. Fujishima Gaijiro, "Walter Gropius," part of series *Gendai Kenchiku No-to (A Note on Modern Architecture)*, *Chosen to kenchiku* vol. 4, no. 2 (February, 1925): 5-11.

Fig. 105. Fujishima Gaijiro, "Hans Poelzig," Series of *Gendai Kenchiku No-to (A Note on Modern Architecture)*, *Chosen to kenchiku vol. 5, no. 1* (January 1926): 19.

Fig. 106. Hermann George Schaffauer, "The Work of Walter Gropius," *Architectural Review* 333 (August 1924), 51-55.

Fig. 107. Cover of Architectural Magazine *Chosen to kenchiku*, vol. 4, no. 1 (January 1925). Published by Chosen Kenchiku-kai.

Fig. 108. Cover of Architectural Magazine *Chosen to kenchiku*, vol. 7, no. 6 (June 1928). Published by Chosen Kenchiku-kai.

Fig. 109. Photograph of Park Dong-jin, date unknown. Illustration from *Hanguk Geonchuk 100-nyeon* [100 Years: Architecture of Korea], exh. cat. National Museum of Contemporary Art and '99 geonchuk munhwa ui hae jojik wiwonhoe eds. (Seoul: Pia, 1999), 88.

Fig. 110. Park Dong-jin, "On Our Residences," *Donga-ilbo* [Donga Daily] (March 17, 1931): 4.

Fig. 111. J. J. P. Oud's Worker's Housing in *Hoek van Holland* (Hook of Holland), Rotterdam, Netherlands, 1926-27. In Park Dong-jin, "New Architectural Trends in Germany—On Our Residences," *Donga-ilbo* [Donga Daily] (March 18, 1931): 4.

Fig. 112. Hans Scharoun's Design for a Small Residence, Weissenhof Siedlung, Stuttgart, 1927. In Park Dong-jin, "New Architectural Trends in Germany—On Our Residences," *Donga-ilbo* [Donga Daily] (March 18, 1931): 4.

Fig. 113. Park Dong-jin, "Russian Constructivism—On Our Residences," *Donga-ilbo* [Donga Daily] (March 19, 1931): 4.

Fig. 113. Park Dong-jin, "Russian Constructivism—On Our Residences," *Donga-ilbo* [Donga Daily] (March 19, 1931): 4.

Fig. 114. Le Corbusier, Villa Stein, Garches, France, 1927. In Park Dong-jin, "Russian Constructivism—On Our Residences," *Donga-ilbo* [Donga Daily] (March 19, 1931): 4.

Fig. 115. Yi Sang, Cover Design for January and February Issue, *Chosen to kenchiku* 1930.

Fig. 116. The Prefectural Industrial Promotion Hall, Gyeongseong, Korea, 1929. Designed by Ministry of Communications. Photograph taken from an untitled postcard collection in the archive of the Seoul Museum of History, Seoul, Korea.

Fig. 117. Wells Coates, *Lawn Road flats*, Hampstead, north London, completed in 1934. Illustration from http://designmuseum.org/design/wells-coates. Accessed on April 1, 2015.

Fig. 118. Modern Life on the *Bonjeong* District, Gyeongseong, Korea, c. 1930s. Illustration from http://koreancontent.kr/1671. Accessed on April 1, 2015.

Fig. 119. Moriyama Matsunosuke, Meiji Confectionary Store, *Bonjeong* District, Gyeongseong, Korea, 1931. Illustration from *Ibangin ui sungan pochak Gyeongseong 1930* [Old Seoul through Foreign Eyes 1930], exh. cat. (Seoul: Cheong Gye Cheon Museum, 2011), 72.

Fig. 120. Competition Entry by Maekawa Kunio, Meiji Confectionary Company, Ginza, Tokyo, 1931. Illusration from Joshua M. Reynolds, *Maekawa Kunio and the Emergence of Japanese Modernist Architecture* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), 102.

Fig. 121. The Mitsukoshi Department Store, Gyeongseong, Korea, 1930. Illustration from *Ibangin ui sungan pochak Gyeongseong 1930* [Old Seoul through Foreign Eyes 1930], exh. cat, (Seoul: Cheong Gye Cheon Museum, 2011), 159.

Fig. 122. Pamphlets (left) Advertising the Mitsukoshi Department Store and Interior Space (right). The Mitsukoshi Department Store, Gyeongseong, Korea, 1930. Illustration from *Ibangin ui sungan pochak Gyeongseong 1930* [Old Seoul through Foreign Eyes 1930], exh. cat. (Seoul: Cheong Gye Cheon Museum, 2011), 67.

Fig. 123. The Rooftop Garden and Café Area, Mitsukoshi Department Store, Gyeongseong, Korea, 1930. Illustration from http://newsplus.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2010/03/02/2010030200602.html. Accessed on April 1, 2015.

Fig. 124. Mitsukoshi Department Store, Nihonbashi, Chu-ku, Tokyo, 1927. Illustration from http://www.oldstratforduponavon.com/tokyo.html. Accessed on April 1, 2015.

Fig. 125. Current Shinsegae Department Store, Namdaemun, Seoul, Korea. Illustration from http://times.kaist.ac.kr/news/articleView.html?idxno=1868. Accessed on April 1, 2015.

Fig. 126. Danseong Movie Theater, Gyeongseong, 1934. Illustration from *Ibangin ui sungan pochak Gyeongseong 1930* [Old Seoul through Foreign Eyes 1930], exh. cat. (Seoul: Cheong Gye Cheon Museum, 2011), 71.

Fig. 127. Dongyang Theater, Gyeongseong, 1934. Illustration from http://blog.daum.net/_blog/BlogTypeView.do?blogid=0ChzV&articleno=18342573&categoryId=493852&regdt=20090106223927. Accessed on April 1, 2015.

Fig. 128. Fire Department, Iljeongmok District, Gyeongseong, Korea, 1936. Illustration from http://blog.donga.com/oldphoto/archives/7. Accessed on April 1, 2015.

Fig. 129. The Chōjiya Department Store, Gyeongseong, Korea, 1939. Illustration from *Hanguk Geonchuk 100-nyeon* [100 Years: Architecture of Korea], exh. cat. National Museum of Contemporary Art and '99 geonchuk munhwa ui hae jojik wiwonhoe eds. (Seoul: Pia, 1999), 63.

Fig. 130. Erich Mendelsohn, Kaufhaus Schocken, 1928. Illustration from http://www.stuttgarter-zeitung.de/inhalt.stuttgarter-kaufhaus-schocken-eine-fuenfzig-jahre-alte-suende.71d11515-605d-41a8-ac21-110472b3e1e7.html. Accessed on April 1, 2015.

Fig. 131. Ishimoto Kikuji, Shirokiya Department Store, Tokyo, 1931. Illustration from David B. Stewart, *The Making of a Modern Japanese Architecture: 1868 to the Present* (Tokyo and New York: Kodansha International, 1987), 120.

Fig. 132. Park Gil-ryong, Bohwagak (Current Gansong Museum), Gyeongseong, Korea, 1938. Illustration from http://kansong.org/founder/founder2_3.asp. Accessed on April 1, 2015.

Fig. 133. Gyeongseong Engineering College, Gyeongseong, Korea, 1916. Illustration from http://ko.wikipedia.org/wiki/경성고등공업학교. Accessed on April 1, 2015.

Fig. 134. Photograph of Park Gil-ryong, date unknown. Illustration from *Hanguk Geonchuk 100-nyeon* [100 Years: Architecture of Korea], exh. cat. National Museum of Contemporary Art and '99 geonchuk munhwa ui hae jojik wiwonhoe eds. (Seoul: Pia, 1999), 84.

Fig. 135. Korean Graduates from the Gyeongseong Engineering College Working at the Ministry of Communications, 1920. Illustration from http://emfvnf0425.egloos.com/m/776453. Accessed on April 2, 2015.

Fig. 136. Park Gil-ryong, Namdae-mun Branch Office Building of Dong-il Bank, Gyeongseong, Korea, 1931. Illustration from http://blog.daum.net/jevmd. Accessed on April 2, 2015.

Fig. 137. Park Gil-ryong Architecture Firm, Gwanhun-dong, Gyeongseong, Korea, 1932. Illustration from *Hanguk Geonchuk 100-nyeon* [100 Years: Architecture of Korea], exh. cat. National Museum of Contemporary Art and '99 geonchuk munhwa ui hae jojik wiwonhoe eds. (Seoul: Pia, 1999), 86.

Fig. 138. Park Gil-ryong, Hancheong Building, Jong-no District, Gyeongseong, Korea, 1934. Illustration from *Ibangin ui sungan pochak Gyeongseong 1930* [Old Seoul through Foreign Eyes 1930], exh. cat. (Seoul: Cheong Gye Cheon Museum, 2011), 68.

Fig. 139. Park Gil-ryong, Hwashin Department Store, Namdae-mun District, Gyeongseong, Koera, 1934. Illustration from *Ibangin ui sungan pochak Gyeongseong 1930* [Old Seoul through Foreign Eyes 1930], exh. cat. (Seoul: Cheong Gye Cheon Museum, 2011), 66.

Fig. 140. *Munhwa Jutaek* (Cultural Houses), early 1920s. Illustration from http://salgustory.tistory.com/entry/01 월호문화융성-시대에-돌아보는-문화주택. Accessed on April 2, 2015.

Fig. 141. *Urban hanok (Korean Traditional Houses)*, date unknown. Ilustration on the left from http://www.koreaherald.com/view.php?ud=20120413000877, Accessed on April 1, 201. Illustration on the right from Inha Jung, *Architecture and Urbanism in Modern Korea* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2013): 30.

Fig. 142. Park Gil-ryong, "Improving our Residential Housing," *Chosun-ilbo* [Chosun Daily] November 9 (left) and November 10 (right), 1926.

Fig. 143. From *Hanok* (left) to Western-style housing (right). Illustration on the left from Choi Sun-Ai, "Park Gil-ryong ui saengae wa geonchuk e gwanhan jeongu" [Study of Park Gil-ryong's Life and Architectural Works], masters thesis (Seoul: Hongik University, 1981), 129. Ilustration on the right from Inha Jung, *Architecture and Urbanism in Modern Korea* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2013): 33.

Fig. 144. Park Gil-ryong, Residence of Kim Yeon-su, Seongbuk-dong, Gyeongseong, 1929. Illustration from Huh Yoo-Jin and Woo Don-Son, "1930 nyeondae mal seoul ui yang-gwan e daehan yeongu—Hanin geonchuk-ga ga seolgye han 3 chae reul jungshimureo" [Western-Style Mansions in Seoul in the Late 1930s—Focusing on Three Mansions designed by Korean Architects], *Daehan geonchuk hakhoe jihoe yeonhap nonmunjib* vol. 29, no. 7 (July 2014): 182.

Fig. 144-1. Park Gil-ryong, Floorplan of the Residence of Kim Yeon-su, Seongbuk-dong, Gyeongseong, 1929. Illustration from Huh Yoo-Jin and Woo Don-Son, "1930 nyeondae mal seoul ui yang-gwan e daehan yeongu—Hanin geonchuk-ga ga seolgye han 3 chae reul jungshimureo" [Western-Style Mansions in Seoul in the Late 1930s—Focusing on Three Mansions designed by Korean Architects], *Daehan geonchuk hakhoe jihoe yeonhap nonmunjib* vol. 29, no. 7 (July 2014): 182.

Fig. 145. Frank Lloyd Wright, Harry Adams House, Oak Park, IL, 1913. Illustration from http://circaoldhouses.com/the-prairie-style/. Accessed on April 1, 2015.

Fig. 146. Park Dong-jin, Humanities Building, Korea University, Gyeongseong, Korea 1931. Illustration from http://blog.daum.net/lds3737/17588226. Accessed on April 2, 2015.

Fig. 147. Park Dong-jin, Main Building of Jungang High School, Gyeongseong, Korea, 1935-37. Illustration from http://wow.seoul.go.kr/photomap/photo_view.jsp?num=4002&route=map_search. Accessed on April 2, 2015.

Fig. 148. Park Dong-jin, Residence of Park Dong-jin, Myongryun-dong, Gyeonseong, Korea, 1943. Illustration from *Hanguk Geonchuk 100-nyeon* [100 Years: Architecture of Korea], exh. cat. National Museum of Contemporary Art and '99 geonchuk munhwa ui hae jojik wiwonhoe eds. (Seoul: Pia, 1999), 89.

Fig. 149. Photograph of Kim Whanki, date unknown. Illustration from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Whanki_Kim. Accessed on April 2, 2015.

Fig. 150. Photograph of Yoo Youngkuk, date unknown. Illustration from Illustration from *Yoo Youngkuk Journal* no. 1 (2004): 110.

Fig. 151. Im Suk-jae, *Design for a Bookcase and decorative crafts,* 1928. Watercolor on paper, 70 × 102.3 cm. Illustration from Roh Unia, "Gundae dizain genyom gwa yansik ui suyeong: Dongyeong Misulhaggyo doangwa yuhakseng Im Sukjae reul jungsimuro" [Adoption of Modern Design Concept and Style: Sook-Jae Lim and his Works], masters thesis (Seoul: Seoul National University, 2009), plate 108.

Fig. 152. Kono Takashi, *Un Suicide*. 1929. Illustration from Felice Fisher, "*Japanese Design: From Meiji to Modern,*" in *Japanese Design: A Survey since 1950,* ed. Kathryn B. Hiesinger and Felice Fischer (Philadelphia: Philadelphia Museum Art, 1994), 12.

Fig.153. Lee Sun-seok at the Tokyo School of Fine Arts, Ueno, Tokyo. 1928. Illustration from *Hara Lee Sun-seok Jakpumjib* [The Artworks of Hara Lee Sun-seok], exh. cat. (Seoul: Seoul Daehakgyo Misuldaehak Silyongmisulhakgwa Dongmunhue, 1993),167.

Fig. 154. Lee Sun-seok (on the left of the heater in the middle), the only Korean student at the design division, Tokyo School of Fine Arts, Ueno, Tokyo. 1928. Illustration from *Hara Lee Sun-seok Jakpumjib* [The Artworks of Hara Lee Sun-seok], exh. cat. (Seoul: Seoul Daehakgyo Misuldaehak Silyongmisulhakgwa Dongmunhue, 1993), 167.

Fig. 155. Lee Sun-seok, Book Cover Design for *Insaenghak* (Life Story), 1931. Illustration from *Hara Lee Sun-seok Jakpumjib* [The Artworks of Hara Lee Sun-seok], exh. cat. (Seoul: Seoul Daehakgyo Misuldaehak Silyongmisulhakgwa Dongmunhue, 1993), 29.

Fig. 156. Lee Sun-seok, *Katolik* (Catholic), 1931. Illustration from *Hara Lee Sun-seok Jakpumjib* [The Artworks of Hara Lee Sun-seok], exh. cat. (Seoul: Seoul Daehakgyo Misuldaehak Silyongmisulhakgwa Dongmunhue, 1993), 31.

Fig. 157. Lee Sun-seok, *Scholastik*, 1931. Illustration from *Hara Lee Sun-seok Jakpumjib* [The Artworks of Hara Lee Sun-seok], exh. cat. (Seoul: Seoul Daehakgyo Misuldaehak Silyongmisulhakgwa Dongmunhue, 1993), 35.

Fig. 158. Lee Sun-seok, Untitled (Book cover for Color Study), 1928. Illustration from *Hara Lee Sun-seok Jakpumjib* [The Artworks of Hara Lee Sun-seok], exh. cat. (Seoul: Seoul Daehakgyo Misuldaehak Silyongmisulhakgwa Dongmunhue, 1993), 41.

Fig. 159. Lee Sun-seok, *Labor*, 1928. Illustration from *Hara Lee Sun-seok Jakpumjib* [The Artworks of Hara Lee Sun-seok], exh. cat. (Seoul: Seoul Daehakgyo Misuldaehak Silyongmisulhakgwa Dongmunhue, 1993), 41.

Fig. 160. Lee Sun-seok, *Joseon gajeong gwahak* (Family Science of Joseon), date unknown. Illustration from *Hara Lee Sun-seok Jakpumjib* [The Artworks of Hara

Introduction

We want to create a clear, organic architecture, whose inner logic will be radiant and naked, unencumbered by lying facades and trickeries; we want an architecture adapted to our world of machines, radios, and fast motor cars, an architecture whose function is clearly recognizable in the relation of its forms.

— Walter Gropius,1923[1]

During the interwar period, a new paradigm in architecture emerged from the idea that form should follow function, as described by German architect Walter Gropius (1883-1969). A movement of architects and designers who disparaged ornamentation and favored modern and industrial design concepts began at the German Werkbund (German Work Federation) and continued at the German Bauhaus Institute (1919-1933). This architectural impulse, which spread not only to other European countries and the United States but also internationally to the continent of East Asia, inspired a young generation of architects in Japan and Korea and those artists who came on the heels of their contemporaries in Europe and the United States. For this younger generation, the modern concepts of architecture developed by Walter Gropius at the German Bauhaus Institute (1919-1933) would become the primary source for a new architectural style to be applied principally in Tokyo and Gyeongseong (Keijō in Japanese, both being the name of Seoul during the Japanese occupation, 1910-1945) from the mid-1920s. Variants of International architecture and Constructivist design played an instrumental role in shaping the rapidly evolving course of modern architecture and design in Japan and Korea.

[1] Walter Gropius, "The Theory and Organization of the Bauhaus (1923)," in *Bauhaus 1919-1928*, ed. Herbert Bayer and Walter Gropius (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1975), 27.

This dissertation provides the first comprehensive study of a select number of dynamic Japanese and Korean architects and designers influenced directly and indirectly by Constructivism in the mid-1920s to the late 1930s. I focus on identifying the characteristics and conditions of Constructivist architecture and design movements in Japan and Korea, in order to explore the richness of this relatively underrepresented, but decisive, modern aesthetic impulse. I have selected a set of representative architects and artists who adopted and transformed the principles of European Constructivist movements into their own artistic style: Japanese architects Yamaguchi Bunzō (1902-1978) and Yamawaki Iwao (1898-1987), Japanese furniture designer Kurata Chikatada (1895-1966), Korean architects Park Gil-ryong (1898-1943) and Park Dong-jin (1899-1981), and Korean artists Lee Sun-seok (1905-1986) and Yoo Youngkuk (1916-2002). Whereas Constructivism afforded Japan's architects and designers the opportunity to practice and reinvent modernism, the embrace of this international movement by Korean architects and designers, who worked under constrained political and social circumstances, resulted in a rather general, informative, and redemptive brand of architecture—a "local" way to assert a suppressed national dynamism.

Background

Constructivism first emerged in Russia during the early 1920s among mostly largely Russian and Ukrainian artists who wished to reflect the goals, aspirations, and hopes of the Communist Revolution of 1917. The creators and followers of Constructivism in Central and Eastern Europe energetically, but rarely uniformly,

struggled to define the movement.[2] To communicate with the reality of life, Russian artists Naum Gabo (1890-1977) and Antoine Pevsner (Gabo's older brother, 1886-1962) in their *Realist Manifesto,* published in 1920, came up with the idea of making art based on a logical construction of two fundamental elements, space and time.[3] They emphasized tangible materials and quotidian artifacts from everyday life rather than traditional or exalted materials from an art studio. In essence and in practice, they rejected all experimental activity divorced from life itself.

The artists at the INKhUK (Institute of Artistic Culture) in Moscow had intensive discussions between 1922 and 1924. Electing Russian artist Wassily Kandinsky (1866-1944) as the first chairman, the First Group of Constructivists included the Russian artists Liubov Popova (1889-1924), Alexander Rodchenko (1891-1956), Varvara Stepanova (1894-1958), and the theorist Aleksei Gan (c. 1889-c. 1940). The Moscow Constructivists tried to promote art as primarily a mode of production rather than a means of expression—an altogether new formulation of the concept of the role of art and the responsibilities of the artist. This new outlook was especially evident in an art exhibition held in April 1921, when the artists launched a kind of second phase. They abandoned their inquiry into the definition of art as a mode of production and entered the realm of industrial production itself. They

---

[2] On Russian Constructivism, see Maria Gough, *The Artist as Producer: Russian Constructivism in Revolution* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005); Christina Lodder, "Art into Life: International Constructivisms in Central and Eastern Europe," in *Central European Avant-gardes: Exchange and Transformation, 1910-1930*, ed. Timothy O. Benson (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2002), 173-198; Briony Fer, "Metaphor and Modernity: Russian Constructivism," *Oxford Art Journal* 12 (1989): 14-30; Christina Lodder, *Russian Constructivism* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1983); and George Rickey, *Constructivism: Origins and Evolution* (London: G. Braziller, 1967).

[3] Martin Hammer and Christina Lodder, *Constructing Modernity: The Art and Career of Naum Gabo* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), 75, *Naum Gabo & Antoine Pevsner*, exh. cat., Museum of Modern Art (New York, 1948), 7-13.

insisted that the artist should commit himself to real, practical work in production. The Russian artists considered their theory about artistic expression as the definitive transposition of Constructivism.

As Constructivism spread beyond Eastern Europe, it developed new variants. At the German Bauhaus (1919-1933), under the tenure of its founding director, Walter Gropius (resigned in 1928), Constructivism became a complex, multifaceted cultural phenomenon. This variegation was accentuated by the changing identity and function of the Bauhaus, which between 1923 and 1933 underwent changes in location, pedagogy, directors, and teachers. The first phase of Bauhaus activity from 1919 to 1920 focused on arts and crafts with Expressionism prevailing as the dominant style. But teachers and students, including the Hungarian student association K.U.R.I., demanded a turn toward Constructivism, which they perceived as both more rational and more socially responsive.[4]

Walter Gropius responded by emphasizing practical applications in housing, domestic furnishings, and industry in the curriculum. This emphasis may also be understood as his response to the competing Constructivisms of contemporary Russia and, especially, Holland, where the Dutch had achieved international recognition for its variant of international Constructivism. His idea of changing the goal of the Bauhaus developed yet further during the first International Congress of Progressive Artists, held in Düsseldorf in May 1922. The idea of International Constructivism had been formed among the multi-national participants, including

[4] For more information about K.U.R.I, see Eva Bajkay-Rosch, "Die KURI-Gruppe," in *Wechsel Wirkungen: Ungarische Avantgarde in der Weimaren Republik*, exh. cat., Neue Galerie Kassel (Marburg, 1986), 260-266.

Van Doesburg (1883-1931), El Lissitzky (1890-1941), and Hans Richter (1888-1976). In a manifesto they wrote together, they dedicated themselves to the systematization of the means of expression to produce results that were universally comprehensible.[5]

Inspired by the ideas of these protagonists and responding to the demands of the Bauhaus teachers and students, Gropius changed the slogan for the first major exhibition at Weimar in the summer of 1923 from "Art and Crafts: A New Unity" to Constructivist-style "Art and Technology: A New Unity."[6] As Gropius explained in his 1923 publication, *Idee und Aufbau des Staatlichen Bauhauses Weimar* [The Theory and Organization of the Weimar Bauhaus], the aim of the school was, from that time forward, to create a center for experimentation through which to engage the contemporary challenges of domestic architecture so as to "combine the greatest possible standardization with the greatest possible variation of form."[7]

Bauhaus teachers and students postulated an amalgamation of fine arts and industrial design, intertwined with machine production and international communication.[8] They attempted to meld the methods of craft production with what they perceived as the rationality of modern manufacturing systems. Even though

---

[5] Petra Kayser, "Constructivism and the Machine Aesthetic," in *The Mad Square: Modernity in German Art 1910-37*, ed. Jacqueline Strecker (Sydney: Art Gallery of New South Wales, 2011), 163-164.
[6] John V. Maciuika, "The Politics of Art and Architecture at the Bauhaus, 1919-1933," in *Weimar Thought: A Contested Legacy*, ed. Peter Eli Gordon and John P. McCormick (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013), 305-306.
[7] Walter Gropius, "Idee und Aufbau des Staatlichen Bauhauses Weimar," in *Staatliches Bauhaus Weimar, 1919-1923*, ed. Walter Gropius (Weimar: Bauhausverlag, 1923), 7-18; Eng. transl. provided in *Bauhaus 1919-1928*, ed. Herbert Bayer, Walter Gropius, and Ise Gropius (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1938), 20-29.
[8] John V. Maciuika, "The Politics of Art and Architecture at the Bauhaus, 1919-1933," in *Weimar Thought: A Contested Legacy,* ed. Peter Eli Gordon and John P. McCormick (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013), 291-315.

Gropius's slogan would remain valid, the shift in directorship from Gropius to Hannes Meyer (1889-1954) and finally Ludwig Mies van der Rohe (1886-1969) brought yet more change in its curriculum and objectives—and specially the use and understandings of the term "Constructivism."[9] Nonetheless, and especially in the context of this dissertation, the term can best be correlated with the liberal—and often imprecise—usage of the Bauhaus. But because that institute underwent so many shifts, and in light of Gropius's own insistence that Bauhaus did not represent a "style" but rather a general worldview, it is advisable to be as flexible in using and understanding the term as were the Japanese and Korean architects, designers, artists, and critics who are the subject of this study.

Tokyo became both the site and the symbol of the newly emerging and vigorously modernizing empire during the Taisho (1912-1926) and the early Showa periods (1926-1937). Young Japanese architects, inspired by modern architectural trends from Europe through publications and by word of mouth, passionately discussed new possibilities for modern Japanese architecture after the great Kantō earthquake in September 1923. More specifically, the importation of the concepts developed at the Bauhaus Institute would become the principal source for a Japanese version of the Constructivist movement from the mid-1920s onward. Japanese architects from the early 1920s advocated Bauhaus ideals in two main phases. The first, introductory phase featured the role of print media and the influence of Japanese visitors to the Bauhaus in 1922. The growing interest of Japanese architects

[9] Upon the resignation of Walter Gropius in 1928, Hannes Mayer, a Surrealist architect with Communist sympathies, was appointed director. Mostly due to Meyer's political commitment, he was dismissed in 1930, to be succeeded as director by Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, an architect who remained director until the Bauhaus was closed by the Nazis in 1933.

in the Bauhaus accelerated with the publication of new architectural magazines, including *Kenchiku shinchō* [Architectural Current] (1924-1932), *Shinkenchiku* [New Architecture] (begun in 1925), and *Kokusai kenchiku* [International Architecture] (1925-40, 1940-67). The writers for these magazines were architects affiliated with two major architectural groups, Bunriha Kenchikukai (Japanese Secessionist Architectural Association, 1920-1928) and the Sōusha (Creation of the Universe Society, 1923-1932), both of which sought a new style or movement that could minimize the gap between their ideal for a modern Japan and the reality of a tradition-bound profession.

The second phase—the focus of this study—started in the early 1930s, when the proposed architectural plans in the annual exhibitions of the Bunriha Kenchikukai and the Sōusha began to be constructed in the districts of Tokyo. At this time, not only the construction of public facilities and residences but also furniture design, book cover design, and art education flowered in Tokyo under the label "Bauhaus." The intricacies and dynamics of the Japanese version of the Bauhaus were illustrated through the works of young architects and designers who directly or indirectly learned the key principles of the Bauhaus movement, people such as Bunriha members Horiguchi Sutemi (1895-1983), Yamada Mamoru (1894-1966), and Ishimoto Kikuji (1894-1963); the leader of the Sōusha, Yamaguchi Bunzō; and the foreign exchange students Mizutani Takehiko (1903-1969) and Yamawaki Michiko.

The political circumstances of Korea greatly differed from those of Imperial Japan during this same time period. Throughout the colonial period (1910 to 1945),

Korea was subject to foreign domination by the Japanese. Japan sought to legitimize and signify her imperial pan-Asian ambition and her coercion of Korea by constructing "modern" architectural landmarks in the Korean capital city of Gyeongseong. Various Western styles of architecture, including Constructivist, were idealized as symbols of modernity, an ambition Japan had been promoting at home since the Meiji restoration in the mid-nineteenth century. Japanese architects started to shape the modern urban environment in the main districts of Gyeongseong. While tightly controlled by Japanese working at the Ministry of Communications within the Government-General of Joseon (Korea), the first modern buildings in the city definitively reshaped architectural history in Korea.

Korean architects, who were not allowed to study abroad in Europe or America due to colonial policies, encountered Constructivism for the first time only by witnessing the Constructivist-style buildings erected by Japanese architects and through printed media, such as daily newspapers and architectural magazines. Despite the constraints imposed by colonial policies, architectural magazines from other countries, such as the Japanese magazines *Kenchiku zasshi* [Architecture Magazine] (1881-present) and *Kenchiku sekai* [Architectural World] (1910-1944), the American magazine *American Architect* (1876-1938), and the German magazine *Wasmuth Monats Hefte für Baukunst* (1914-1931) were available to Korean architects, who read them passionately.[10] The latest news on modern European architecture came mostly from the first architectural magazine published in Korea,

[10] Yoon In-seok, "Iljesidae geonchuk eseo ui modeonijeum" [Modernism in Architecture during the Colonial Period], *Geonchuk yeoksa hakhue* [Architectural History Conference] Inaugural Lecture, June, 1991.

Chosen to kenchiku [Joseon and Architecture] (1922-1945). The editors and authors for the magazine were principally Japanese architects affiliated with the Ministry of Communications, Government-General of Joseon, and the intended audiences were Japanese and Korean architects residing in Korea. Japanese architects were allowed to study abroad and thereby personally experienced and passionately advocated Constructivism as the new architectural impulse. But the first generation of Korean architects, who received limited training from the Japanese professors of architecture at the Gyeongseong Engineering College of Joseon, were not allowed to study abroad. They started their projects only after graduation, and then had but a limited chance to absorb the principles of Constructivism. Only a few of the buildings constructed by Koreans in Gyeongseong followed the Constructivist style. Park Gil-ryong and Park Dong-jin employed the principles of Constructivist architecture in their designs of Korean residences and they tried to correct structural problems in traditional Korean houses. The first Korean architect known to have engaged with Constructivism was Park Dong-jin, who introduced the International Style and Russian Constructivism to a Korean audience in a series of articles published in *Donga Daily*, 1931. In his essay, Park argued that the International architecture advocated in Germany fostered the idea that everything, including architecture, should be constructive to its society and to everyday life. He stressed that "International Architecture" has the will to create common elements that are in accordance with each country's national character.[11] Based on these ideas, Park Gil-ryong and Park Dong-jin developed the rationalist and functional quality of Bauhaus

[11] Park Dong-jin, "2. Dokil ui geonchuck gyeonghyang" [Architectural Trends in Germany], *Donga-ilbo* (Donga Daily) March 18, 1931.

architecture and International Style through urban housing projects they designed in Gyeongseong during the late 1930s.

Terminology

In architecture, Constructivism is literally translated to *koseishugi* (構成主義) in Japanese and *guseongjuui* (구성주의, 構成主義) in Korean, and International Architecture as *kokusai kenchiku* (國際建築) in Japanese and *gukjae geonchuk* (국제건축) in Korean. To minimize the confusion of the use of "Constructivism," "International Architecture," and "International Style" within the Japanese and Korean context, it is necessary to differentiate these terms from European usage. The term "International Architecture" was invented by Walter Gropius to describe common characteristics of the newest trends of Constructivist architecture in Germany, France, the Netherlands, and in Eastern Europe. This term was used for the first time in the title of his booklet *Internationale Architektur* [International Architecture] (1925, Fig. 1) and in German architect Ludwig Hilbersheimer's (1885-1967)'s booklet *Internationale Neue Baukunst* [New International Architecture] (1928).[12] Gropius's book, which was the first of a fourteen-volume Bauhaus book series, was an introductory survey with various illustrations of the modern art of building. Through the six pages of text, Gropius explains that the architectural works featured in the book share common features besides their individual and national

[12] Walter Gropius, *Internationale Architektur* (Munich: Albert Langen Verlag, 1925); Ludwig Hilbersheimer, *Internationale neue Baukunst* (Stuttgart: Verlag Julius Hoffmann, 1928).

characteristics. He criticizes recent architecture for being heavily ornamented and for not representing a living organism (*lebendiger Organismus*). He asserted that in modern architecture, the objectivization from individuality to nationality is clearly perceptible:

> Architecture is always going to be national, always individual, but of the three concentric circles—Individual, Nation, Mankind—the last is the greatest and encompasses both the others. Therefore the title:
>
> **INTERNATIONAL Architecture!**
>
> The economic utilization of time, space, material, and money in industry and commerce decisively determines the features of the appearance of all modern building organisms: precisely determined form, simplicity in diversity, articulation of all the elements of the building according to the functions of the structure, the streets and the means of transport, limitation to a typical form and its repetition in rows. There is a new will to create the buildings in our environment according to an inner logic, without lies or tricks, to make their meaning and purpose stand out by themselves, through functional organization and tension of their masses, to get rid of everything which is dispensable, which masks their absolute form.[13]

The idea of creating a uniform appearance to transcend national borders was shared by Hilberseimer. In a one-page introduction to a book published three years later, Hilberseimer argues that new architecture is not determined by its external

[13] English translation provided in Walter Gropius, "International Architecture," in *Images,* ed. Charlotte and Tim Benton (Milton Keynes, UK: The Open University Press, 1975), 3-4.

decoration but by the expression of the spiritual penetration of all elements. Although architecture is often differentiated by local and national peculiarities and the personality of the designer, the uniformity of its appearance will cross all national borders.[14] The book featured illustrations of the works by the seventeen architects who participated in the design competition for the Weissenhof Siedlung, Stuttgart, a building exhibition sponsored by the German Werkbund in 1927.

The term "International Style" was used for the first time in the exhibition "Modern Architecture—International Exhibition," held from February 9 to March 23, 1932 at the Museum of Modern Art in New York City. The exhibition employed the term "International Style" to indicate Constructivist architecture from Europe during the early twentieth century, but it avoided the term "Constructivism," most likely in order to downplay the sociopolitical aspects of architecture and to emphasize design and style only.[15]

Rather than defining or sharing the specific meanings, ideals, or debates of Russian Constructivists or its variants from Holland to Poland, Japanese and Korean architects and designers understood the principles of Constructivism and International Architecture in a rather general and informal way, but one that centered on the original redemptive mission of the style. Compared to Constructivists in Russia and the functionalists of the German Bauhaus (1919-1933), or other similar Western groups, such as Dutch *De Stijl* or the various Hungarian or Czech modernist

[14] Hilberseimer, *Internationale neue Baukunst*. Hilberseimer's article was first published in *Moderne Bauformen* 26 (1927): 325-64.

[15] Henry-Russell Hitchcock and Philip Johnson curated this exhibition. In the exhibition, the work of Le Corbusier, Oud, Gropius, Mies van der Rohe, and Wright occupied the main exhibition space. Henry-Russell Hitchcock and Philip Johnson, *The International Style* (New York: Norton, 1966).

formations,[16] Japanese and Korean architects understood "Constructivism" as a motivating movement through which they could challenge and transform existing national styles or customs in architecture and design. Japanese and Korean architects often used the terms "Constructivism" and "International Architecture" interchangably, adopting them both as a symbol of modernism and modernity in general. In Japan, the term "*kokusai kenchiku*" appeared in architectural journals to translate the title of Gropius's publication on International Architecture in 1925. Thereafter, the members of the Bunriha and the Sōusha used *kokusai kenchiku* to distinguish Bauhaus Constructivism from Russian, and this term was more frequently used than *koseishugi* to describe the movement as it developed in Germany. Similar interpretations happened in Korean architecture as well. Korean architects used *guseongjuui* in his writings to indicate Russian Constructivism, and *gukjae geonchuk* for German Constructivism and the International Style.

Questions

The projects of Japanese and Korean architects and designers should be examined in the context of the region's local characteristics. Japanese and Korean Constructivists refracted their movement through localized terminology, theories, and interpretations of modernism and modernity. In the case of Tokyo, the Japanese architects Yamaguchi, Yamawaki, and Kurata grew up witnessing their nation's

[16] See Timothy O. Benson, ed., Central European Avant-gardes: Exchange and Transformation, 1910-1930 (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2002) and Steven A. Mansbach, Modern Art in Eastern Europe: From the Baltic to the Balkans, ca. 1890-1939 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

transfiguration into a modern state, and were responsible in the 1930s for introducing their own version of modernity to break from former native traditions in architecture and furniture design. Nevertheless it is questionable if their "modernity" meant the same thing as was understood elsewhere, especially in Central or Eastern Europe during the same time. Was this stylistic or physical change toward modernity accompanied by a theoretical change? If so, what was the ultimate goal of each architect in embracing Constructivism? Did they also adopt a theoretical change? Can the ideal derived from Western Constructivism be applied to Imperial Japan? Since Japanese architects struggled between the new demands of Western-derived capitalism and their own conventional history and culture, it would be appropriate to interpret their "modernity" as "co-eval modernity," a term introduced by historian Harry Harootunian.[17] As Harootunian argues, modernity in Japan should not be understood as an alternative or recapitualization of Western modernity, but as "co-eval," a term that reflects both contemporaneity and cultural difference.

In the case of Gyeongseong, the work of Korean architects should not be considered a passive adoption of Euro-American and Japanese modernist ideas, since they advocated Korean modernism in their own authentic and innovative way, even though, due to political circumstances and limited educational opportunities, Korean architects were not able to generate an independent modern movement of their own. Instead of understanding the Constructivist and International Style buildings by Japanese architects in Gyeongseong as products of Japanese colonial ascendancy, which most former studies have done, this study tries to understand these buildings

[17] Harry Harootunian, *Overcome by Modernity: History, Culture, and Community in Interwar Japan* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), preface.

as playing the most significant role in providing visual experience to the first generation of Korean architects, who could not study or travel abroad and therefore did not have the chance to directly examine Constructivist buildings in Japan, Europe, or elsewhere in the world.

To address the complex situation of the Korean Constructivist movement, in which the impact comes not only from the West but also from the East (specifically from Japan), this study applies the theoretical framework of "colonial modernity," a term used and defined by historians Tani Barlow, Gi-wook Shin, and Michael Robinson.[18] In her book *Formations of Colonial Modernity in East Asia*, Barlow views colonialism and modernity as two inseparable concepts in the history of capitalism, and combines the issues of colonialism with the diverse discourses on modernity in East Asian studies. In *Colonial Modernity in Korea*, Shin and Robinson pay attention to the multifaceted and interactive relationships among colonialism, modernity, and nationalism. Considering the intertwining issues of Japanese colonial domination, Korea's experience of modernity and its response, and the construction of Korean nationalism and identity, Shin and Robinson point out that current nationalist narratives have discussed colonialism, modernity, and nationalism as separate variables and have not appreciated "the complex issues as to colonial modernity, cultural hegemony, and the formation of non-national identities."[19] Considering the interaction between the National, the Colonial, and the Modern

[18] Tani E. Barlow, "Introduction: On 'Colonial Modernity," in *Formations of Colonial Modernity in East Asia*, ed. Tani E. Barlow (Durham: Duke University Press, 1997), 1-11; Gi-Wook Shin and Michael Edson Robinson, eds., *Colonial Modernity in Korea* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999).
[19] Shin and Robinson, "Rethinking Colonial Korea," in *Colonial Modernity in Korea*, ed. Gi-Wook Shin and Michael Edson Robinson (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999), 4-6.

offers a perspective not seen in prior studies on Korea. Such an approach enhances our understanding of the efforts of the first generation of Korean architects and artists to find their own national identity within the complex relationship between the colonizer (Japan) and the colonized (Korea), as well as of how Euro-American avant-garde movements impacted them both.[20]

Literature Review

Although the embrace and development of Constructivism contributed to the modernization of the architectural landscape in Tokyo and Gyeongseong, the movement there has been relatively underrepresented in art-historical scholarship, both in the United States and in East Asia. My research, therefore, relies heavily upon Japanese and Korean architectural magazines published in the 1920s and 1930s and on secondary studies written by Japanese and Korean scholars.

The study of Japanese Constructivists Yamaguchi Bunzō, Yamawaki Iwao, and Kurata Chikatada in chapters one and two relies mostly on Japanese architectural magazines published during the 1920s and 1930s and on secondary sources in Japanese. The exceptional, yet essential, English sources on Japanese Constructivist architecture and the Japanese Bauhaus are Ken Tadashi Oshima's seminal *International Architecture in Interwar Japan: Constructing Kokusai Kenchiku* (2009), Joshua M. Reynolds's *Maekawa Kunio and the Emergence of Japanese*

[20] Barlow, "Introduction," 1. This study has also relied on *Refracted Modernity: Visual Culture and Identity in Colonial Taiwan*, ed. Yuko Kikuchi (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2007).

Modernist Architecture (2001), Izutsu Akio's *The Bauhaus: A Japanese Perspective and a Profile of Hans and Florence Schust Knoll* (1992), and David B. Stewart's *The Making of a Japanese Modern Architecture: 1868 to the Present* (1987).[21] Oshima's in-depth case study of three architects Yamada Mamoru (1894-1966), Horiguchi Sutemi, and Antonin Raymond (1888-1976), who were associated with the activities of the Bunriha Kenchikukai, has enriched the field with a diverse body of Japanese materials on modernism in Japanese architecture. He discusses the formation of the Japanese *Kokusai Kenchiku* (International Architecture) movement by analyzing the architectural projects of these three figures. Reynolds's study provided a comprehensive overview of the Japanese architectural societies; his brief, but detailed research on the Sōusha provides a foundation for the study of Yamaguchi Bunzō. Izutzu's *The Bauhaus: A Japanese Perspective and a Profile of Hans and Florence Schust Knoll* (1992) is the first significant English source introducing the richness of the activities of Japanese artists who studied at the Bauhaus during the 1930s. Stewart's survey of modern Japanese architecture, with its plentiful images from primary sources, illuminates most of the works by Japanese architects who constituted the International Architecture movement in Japan during the 1930s. In addition to this, Helena Čapková introduced in her recent article "Transnational Networkers—Iwao and Michiko Yamawaki and the Formation of Japanese

[21] Ken Tadashi Oshima, International Architecture in Interwar Japan: Constructing Kokusai Kenchiku (Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 2009); Joshua M. Reynolds, *Maekawa Kunio and the Emergence of Japanese Modernist Architecture* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001); Izutsu Akio, *The Bauhaus: A Japanese Perspective and a Profile of Hans and Florence Schust Knoll* (Tokyo: Kajima Institute, 1992); David B. Stewart, *The Making of a Modern Japanese Architecture: 1868 to the Present* (Tokyo and New York: Kodansha International, 1987).

Modernist Design" the life of Yamawaki Iwao and Michiko at the Bauhaus and included brief analyses of a couple of Yamawaki Iwao's architectural projects.[22]

A number of exhibition catalogues, both in English and Japanese, provide rich information about these three figures. The *Keiji Kōbō-ten* [Keiji Kōbō Exhibition] (2008) catalogue, which was the first exhibition about the Keiji Kōbō, provides plentiful images of the works of Kurata Chikatada and the other Keiji Kōbō members and their activities.[23] In *Berlin Tokyo, Tokyo Berlin: Die Kunst zweier Städte* (2006), the activities of Japanese constructivists in Europe are briefly introduced in German. The *Nihon no zenei (Avant-garde of Japan): Art into Life 1900-1940* catalogue (2000), written in German and Japanese, includes a section introducing the beginning of the Bauhaus education in Japan. The exhibition catalogue *Bauhausu (Bauhaus) 1919-1933* (1995), held at the Sezon Museum of Art in Tokyo, contains articles that deal for the first time with the close relationship between the Bauhaus and Japanese artists during the mid-1920s and 1930s.

Aside from that, some in-depth research of these three figures has appeared in Japanese scholarship. SatoYoshihiro's 2010 doctoral dissertation, "Tosho shakai ni okeru bunka katsudou o kenkyū - ryō taisen kanki no sōusha kenchikukai o chūshin ni" [A Study on Architects' Cultural Activities in Urban Society: Sōusha Kenchikukai in the Interwar Period] (Tokyo: Hitotsubashi University), conducts a

---

[22] Helena Čapková, "Transnational Networkers—Iwao and Michiko Yamawaki and the Formation of Japanese Modernist Design," *Journal of Design History* vol. 24, no. 4 (November 2014): 370-385.

[23] *Kessei 80-shūnen: Modan dezain no senku Keiji Kōbō ten; Keiji-Kōbō* [80th Anniversary: The Predecessor of Modern Design: Keiji-Kōbō Exhibition, 1928-1938], ed. Mori Hitoshi (Matsudo-shi: Matsudo-shi Bunka Shinkō Zaidan, 2008).
Ibangin ui sungan pochak Gyeongseong 1930 [Old Seoul through Foreign Eyes 1930], exh. cat., Cheong Gye Cheon Museum (Seoul, 2011).

profound analysis of the activities of the Sōusha from its formation until its dissolution. The author put more effort in analyzing the socialist aspects of their activities than in casting light on the architectural works of each member. *Kenchikuka Yamaguchi Bunzō: Hito to sakuhin* [Yamaguchi Bunzō: Life and Work] (1982) has an insightful analysis of some of Yamaguchi Bunzō's architectural projects and includes original texts written by Yamaguchi Bunzō. A very detailed biography of Yamaguchi helps to trace his activities while he was staying in Germany. In addition to this, Yamawaki Iwao's autobiography *Keyaki* [The Zelkova Tree] (1942), Yamawaki Michiko's autobiography *Bauhausu to cha no yu* [The Bauhaus and the Tea Ceremony] (1995), and Toyoguchi Katsuhei's *Keiji Kōbō kara: Toyoguchi Katsuhei to dezain no hanseiki* [From the Keiji Workshop: Toyoguchi Katsuhei and the Design over the Half-Century] (1987) provide rich documentary records on the activities of Yamaguchi Bunzō, the Yamawaki family, and Kurata Chikatada.[24]

Since the late 1980s, the literature on Korean modern architecture, primarily in Korean, has gradually increased. Architectural historians have recognized Korean architects Park Gil-ryong and Park Dong-jin as being at the vanguard of the pioneering generation of Korean Modernists and they have conducted insightful

[24] SatoYoshihiro, "Tosho shakai ni okeru bunka katsudou o kenkyū - ryō taisen kanki no sōusha kenchikukai o chūshin ni" [A Study on Architects' Cultural Activities in Urban Society: Sōusha Kenchikukai in the Interwar Period], Ph.D. diss. (Tokyo: Hitotsubashi University, 2010); *Kenchikuka Yamaguchi Bunzō: Hito to sakuhin* [Yamaguchi Bunzō: Life and Work], RIA Kenchiku Sōgō Kenkyūjo, ed. Kondō Shōichi (Tokyo: Sagami Shobō, 1982); Yamawaki Iwao, *Keyaki* (Tokyo: Atoriesha, 1942); Yamawaki Michiko, *Bauhausu to cha no yu* [The Bauhaus and the Tea Ceremony] (Tokyo: Shinchōsha, 1995); Toyoguchi Katsuhei, *Keiji Kōbō kara: Toyoguchi Katsuhei to dezain no hanseiki* [From the Keiji Workshop: Toyoguchi Katsuhei and the Design over the Half-Century] (Tokyo: Bijutsu Shuppansha, 1987).

research into their artwork and writings. Nonetheless, a comprehensive study on Constructivist architecture has not yet been conducted.[25] Close, visual analysis and careful research on buildings constructed in Constructivist style has been to date relatively rare, and research on Constructivist buildings erected by Japanese architects has been almost entirely overlooked.[26] The lack of study in this area can be explained by the fact that most modern buildings constructed by Japanese architects (other than government buildings) were destroyed during the war and after emancipation, and only a few of them were documented. The images used in this study were taken from the pages of the architectural magazine *Chosen to kenchiku* and from postcards produced in the 1930s by the Japanese government, or were found online.

Two major exhibitions have been held in Korea featuring the development of modern architecture during the 1920s and 1930s. These exhibitions constitute a significant part of the research on International Style architecture in Korea. The first exhibition was *Hanguk Geonchuk 100 nyeon jeon* [100 Years, Architecture of Korea]

---

[25] Only a brief mention of International Style buildings was adduced in the studies on *jeolchung yangsik* (eclectic style) architecture during the same time period. *Jeolchung yangsik* was a term created by Korean architects to define the architectural style of the public buildings and facilities designed by Korean architects during the late 1920s and 1930s. The term was used in a different context than the Western term "eclecticism." For Korea, the term suggests the introduction of a modernist style that combines the characteristics of Western Neo-Classicism and the International Style. The study on eclectic style in Korean modern architecture was conducted by Kim Seong-woo Kim and Song Seog-ki, "1920~30 nyeondae hanguk gundae geonchuk eso jeolchungjeok kyeonghyang ui jeongae" [The Beginning and Transformation of Eclectic Style in Korean Architecture, During the 1920-30s] *Daehan geonchuk sahakhue nonmunji gyehoekgye,* vol. 12, vo. 14 (December, 1998): 165-174.

[26] In Korean scholarship, colonialism is still a very sensitive issue, and it is a commonly thought that the Japanese occupation of Korea terminated Korea's effort to modernize itself. Barlow, "Introduction"; Gi-Wook Shin and Michael Edson Robinson eds., *Colonial Modernity in Korea* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999).

at the National Museum of Contemporary Art, from August to October 1999.[27] In this exhibition, the photos and documentation of approximately 350 works of Korean architects were displayed. The first section introduced the turmoil of the 1920s and 1930s, when modern Western and Japanese architecture was introduced to Korea. The second major exhibition, *Ibangin ui sungan pochak Gyeongseong 1930* [Old Seoul through Foreign Eyes 1930], was held at the Cheong Gye Chon Museum, Seoul in 2011. In this exhibition, approximately two hundred photos and postcards that rendered the main districts during the 1930s—items from the archive of the Seoul History Museum—were displayed for the first time.[28] The exhibition catalogue became an important source for my research, especially for its very detailed map indicating the location of each modern building and basic information about International Style buildings built by the Japanese.

Korean architectural historians Kim Chung-dong, Ahn Changmo, Song Seog-ki, and Kim Sung-woo have discussed modern Korean architecture during the 1920s and 1930s, and they have conducted a variety of research on the activities of the first generation of Korean architects during the Japanese colonial period. Their vast study has significantly documented the work of modern Korean architects such as Park Gil-ryong and Park Dong-jin. The work of Kim Chung-dong in the late 1980s took

[27] *Hanguk Geonchuk 100-nyeon* [100 Years: Architecture of Korea], exh. cat. National Museum of Contemporary Art and '99 geonchuk munhwa ui hae jojik wiwonhoe eds. (Seoul: Pia, 1999).
[28] *Ibangin ui sungan pochak Gyeongseong 1930* [Old Seoul through Foreign Eyes 1930], exh. cat., Cheong Gye Cheon Museum (Seoul, 2011).

the documentation of Korean modern architecture to a new height.[29] In his article "Hanguk gundae geonchuk ui jaejomyeong" [Study of the Modern Architecture of Seoul], Kim compiled a lengthy list of all modern architectural buildings in Gyeongseong based on in-depth archival research of the Japanese architectural magazine *Chosen to kenchiku*.[30] His valuable fact-filled research was the foundation for the next generation of architectural historians.

Using Kim's foundational studies, Ahn Changmo conducted an in-depth investigation into the writings on Park Dong-jin, who was the subject of his 1997 dissertation. Ahn asserts that Park Dong-jin tried to transform the concepts and aesthetic of European modern architecture into his own theory and that he employed his theory by using granite as a building material and by combining Korean architectural elements into his Neo-Gothic school buildings.[31] In Ahn's article on Korean railroad stations during the colonial period, he criticizes prior architectural

---

[29] Kim Chung-dong, "Geundae ihu seoul ui Jeongdong Dongyeok Byeoncheon-sa Yeongu" [Chung-dong Area in Seoul at the Enlightenment Period], *Seoulhak yeongu* no. 19 (2002): 161-225; Kim Chung-dong, "Hanguk geundae geonchuk i hyeondae geonchuk e jeoni duenun gwajeong e gwanhan yeongu" [A Study on the Process of Change From Korean Modern Architecture (1950-1955) to Contemporary Architecture], *Daehan geonchuk hakhoe nonmunjib* [Journal of the Architectural Institute of Korea] vol. 8, no. 3 (1992): 81-42; Kim Chung-dong, "Hanguk geundae geonchuk 206 pyeon ui chamgo munheon" [206 References on Korean Modern Architecture], *Geonchuk yeoksa yeongu* [Journal of Architectural History] vol. 1, no. 1 (1992): 351-361; Kim Chung-dong, "Seogu geonchuk i dong asia ro jeoni duenun gwajeong e gwanhan yeongu" [A Study on the Process of Change from Western Architecture to Eastern Modern Architecture], *Daehan geonchuk hakhoe nonmunjib* [Journal of the Architectural Institute of Korea] vol. 6, no. 6 (1990): 11-19. Kim Chung-dong, "Hanguk gundaegeonchuk e itseoso seoyang geonchuk ui jeoni wag u yeonghyang e gwanhan yeongu" [A Study on the Process of Transfer of Western Architecture to Korean Modern Architecture and Its Influence], Ph.D. Diss. (Seoul: Hongik University, 1990).

[30] "Hanguk gundae geonchuk ui jaejomyeong" [Study of the Modern Architecture of Seoul] was published in a series from May 1987 to February 1989 in the architectural magazine *Geonchuksa* [History of Architecture].

[31] Ahn Changmo, "Hanguk gundae geonchuk eso singminji gwangwang juui wa modeonijeum e gwanhan yeongu" [Colonial Tourism and Modernism in Korean Modern Architecture—Focused on Railroad Station during Japanese Ruling Era], *Geonchuk yeoksa yeongu* vol. 11, no. 2 (June 2002): 7-22.

studies, which have focused largely on establishing the roots of Korean modern and contemporary architecture though classifying each stage of modernization, and have devalued the impact of Japanese and Western modernism that prevented Korea from modernizing itself.[32] In his study, he focuses on the fact that the Korean traditional architectural style has never been used for public buildings or facilities, but was employed in a couple of train stations in the suburb of Korea, using traditional *kiwa* (Korean roof tiles) and conventional proportions. Ahn argued in this provocative study that the Japanese implemented the conventional Korean style for a couple of stations as part of their colonial tourism project. Yet, even though the train stations were built in what might be called a Constructivist style, Ahn did not closely search for the roots of the modern stations or compare them with other modernisms.

Song Seog-ki and Kim Sung-woo further investigated the architectural projects of Park Gil-ryong and have drawn attention to his contribution to the development of Korean modern architecture.[33] Song and Kim conducted a detailed analysis on the windows, entrance doors, and connections between spaces in the buildings and residences built by Park Gil-ryong. They conclude that Park Gil-ryong and other Korean architects, all trained at the Gyeongseong Engineering College in the late 1920s, were unable to create or employ their own architectural style in public buildings because of political circumstances. Nonetheless, Park Gil-ryong and Park Dong-jin did contribute significantly to the housing improvement projects in

[32] Ibid., 7.
[33] Song Seog-ki and Kim Sung-woo, "Park Gil-ryong geonchuk jakpum ui tukseong e gwanhan yeongu" [A Study on the Characteristics of Architectural Works of Park, Gil Yong], *Daehan geonchuk hakhoe haksul balpyo nonmunjib* vol. 13, no. 1 (April 24, 1993): 107-112; Song Seog-ki, "1930 nyeondae hangukin geonchukga ui hwaldong gwa gu seonggyeok" [The Significance of Korean Architect's Works, c. 1930s], *Daehan geonchuk hakhoe jihoe yeonhap nonmunjib* vol. 7, no. 3 (August 2005): 9-16.

Korea.[34] In 2005, Song Seog-ki conducted archival research on writings by Park Gil-ryong, Park Dong-jin, and other Korean architects, a project in which he criticized the inefficiency of Korean traditional architecture. Song has interpreted the architects' activity as an effort to reform and advance the style of Korean traditional housing by inventing new forms of housing to bring in rationality, economical efficiency, and functionality. Song concluded that the reason why Korean architects wrote only about non-residential buildings (such as public or commercial architecture) was because public buildings were mere imitations of the imported Western and Japanese styles. He also asserted that there was no chance to suggest or create any new architectural styles, whereas it was probably better to contribute to the improvement of residential houses in Gyeongseong. These several studies have emphasized the significance of the activities of those Korean architects who tried to introduce modernism into urban housing projects.

A few English-language publications dealing with modern architectural movements in Gyeongseong have appeared only recently. Youngna Kim included a broad but brief introduction to the emergence of Western architecture in Korea in her "Urban Space and Visual Culture: The Transformation of Seoul in the Twentieth Century," published in *A Companion to Asian Art and Architecture*, 2011. In 2013, Inha Jung's analysis of the urbanization process of Korea during the twentieth century garnered critical attention. Jung examined the urban housing projects of Park Gil-ryong and the use of new construction materials in the first two chapters of her

[34] Song Seog-ki and Kim Sung-woo, "Park Gil-ryong," 107-112.

Architecture and Urbanism in Modern Korea.[35] Her analysis of the development of modern landscapes in Gyeongseong was precise and perceptive, but her focus was more on urban plans and projects rather than on specific styles in Korean modern architecture. Woo Don-Son's 2014 article "On Park Gil-ryong's Discovering, Understanding, and Designing of Korean Architecture," which will be the first English article on Park Gil-ryong, includes an in-depth examination of *hyun-gwan* (*genkan* in Japanese, meaning the Japanese entrance hall), which Park Gil-ryong's articles of the early 1930s introduced as a distinctive element in modern Korean houses.[36]

Although Korean architectural historians have studied a variety of modern Korean architecture, a close investigation of modern architecture built by Japanese, including Constructivist and the International Style buildings, was dismissed, or to say it more appropriately, intentionally avoided due to political issues.[37] For scholars, the Constructivist or International Style buildings were regarded as a loose interpretation of foreign concepts and therefore did not represent locality or any kinds of nativist authenticity. Moreover, the fact that only a couple of International Style buildings were built by Korean architects may have made this architectural

---

[35] Kim Youngna, "Urban Space and Visual Culture: The Transformation of Seoul in the Twentieth Century," in *A Companion to Asian Art and Architecture*, ed. Rebecca M. Brown and Deborah S. Hutton (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2011), 153-177; Inha Jung, *Architecture and Urbanism in Modern Korea* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2013), 23-48.

[36] Woo Don-son, "On Park Gil-ryong's Discovering, Understanding, and Designing of Korean Architecture," in *Constructing the Colonized Land: Entwined Perspectives of East Asia around WWII,* ed. Izumi Kurioshi (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2014), 193-214.

[37] *Geundae eseo mannan misulgwa dosi* [The Encounter of Art and the City during Modern Times], ed. Guksa pyeonchan wiwonhoe (Seoul: Sigong-sa, 1999); *Hanguk hyeondae yesulsa daegye I—Haebang gwa bundan gochak shigi* [A Companion to Korean Contemporary Art I—From Emancipation to Division Period], ed. Hanguk yesul yeonguso (Seoul: Sigong-sa, 1999).

movement appear less substantial than others. For instance, Park Dong-jin was the first Korean architect to discuss the principles of Constructivism (1931), but his Neo-Gothic style designs for schools and universities did not reveal his support for Constructivism and the International Style.[38] As a result, architectural historians pushed the apex of Constructivist or International Style movement to a point *after* the emancipation of Korea in 1945. Scholars argued that the *shingeonchuk* (New Architecture, a term alternatively used for Constructivist or the International Architecture) movement flourished after the colonial period ended, in 1945, when Korean architects had more freedom in publication and gained chances to study abroad not only in Japan but also in Europe or in the United States. Furthermore, the first Korean architectural journals appeared only after 1945. However, rather than date the development of Constructivism and International Style to after 1945, this study attempts to trace the Constructivist and International Style connections between Korea, Japan, Europe, and America from 1925.

The initiation of modern abstract painting in Korea has been a significant topic of research in Korean scholarship starting in the 1980s, and individual studies on the first generation of Korean modern abstract artists—Kim Whanki, Yoo Youngkuk, Yi Kyu-sang (1918-1964), and Chang Ucchin (1917-1990)—have emphasized their activities as touchstones for the Korean avant-garde movement from the mid-1940s. The Constructivist art practiced by these Korean artists during

[38] Ahn Chang-mo argues that Park Dong-jin's Neo-Gothic style architecture was intended to create a style combining both nationalism and universalism through the use of traditional material (granite) and Korean roof constructions. Chang-mo Ahn, "Geonchuk-ga Park Dongjin e gwanhan yeonggu" [Study on Architect Park Dongjin], Ph.D. diss. (Seoul: Seoul National University, 1997), 260-261.

their stay in Japan, especially Kim Hwanki and Yoo Youngkuk, were incorporated into a larger discourse on the notion of "abstraction" and "abstract painting." Of the various foundational studies on these artists from the 1990s, however, there was no comprehensive analysis until late in the first decade of the twenty-first century. Moreover, compared to the lively discussions on abstraction and abstract painting in the fine arts, a study embracing design and art together under the rubric of Constructivism, which I aim to explore in this chapter, has yet to be conducted. In Korean scholarship, prevailing art historical research has simply classified Lee Sun-seok and Yoo Youngkuk's earlier works, and only a few critics have offered a clear definition of which European '-ism' and to which artists their work are directly related.

Research on Lee Sun-seok apparently ceased after the late 1990s; there are no known publications on this artist from the last fifteen years. The first exhibition catalogue of his work was published only in 1993, providing bibliographical information and an interview with the artist. Immediately after the exhibition, publications by Korean art historians Gu Gyeong-wha, Choi Og-su, and Kim Minsoo appeared, making available foundational research about his earlier works at the Tokyo School of Fine Arts (Tokyo Bijutsu Gakkō) in Ueno, Tokyo.[39] Gu Gyeong-wha wrote a master thesis compiling facts on Lee Sun-seok's earlier activities as an art student in Japan and his career in Korea after his return to his homeland in the

[39] Gu Gyeong-wha, "Lee Sun-seok ui saengae wa jakpum jeongu" [Study of Lee Sun-seok's art and life], masters thesis (Seoul: Seoul National University), 6; Choi Og-su, "Lee Sun-seok ui gongye wa dizain gyoyuk e gwanhan yeongu" [Study of Crafts and Design Education by Lee Sun-seok], *Hanguk gongye nonchong* vol. 2, no. 2 (1999): 243-262; Kim Minsoo, "Hanguk hyeondae dijain gwa chusangseong ui balhyeon" [Contemporary Design of Korea and the Emergence of Abstraction], *Johyeong* vol. 18, no.1 (1995): 51-68.

early 1930s.[40] Choi Og-su researched his activities as an educator and as a founder of the first modern design division at Seoul National University, Seoul, Korea in 1947.[41] In his article, Choi proposed a new perspective on the relationship between the Bauhaus and Lee Sun-seok. After briefly discussing how the Bauhaus curriculum informed the design curriculum at the Tokyo School of Fine Arts and how this impact became obvious in Lee Sun-seok's earlier design work, the author provided substantial source material on the education system of the design and applied arts department at Seoul National University, where Lee Sun-seok (and Yoo Youngkuk) taught from 1947. Kim Minsoo, in his 1999 study, proposed a different perspective into the former's studies and attempted to place the artist within the context of the abstract design movement advanced by artists and designers studying in Japan from 1930 to 1945.[42]

In contrast, Yoo Youngkuk has been the subject of considerable art historical study. Research accelerated after his son Yoo Geon established the Yoo Youngkuk Foundation in 2003 and produced the first annual *Yoo Youngkuk Journal* in 2004. Before the journal was published, Kim Youngna's initial research on Korean students studying abroad in Japan during the 1930s provided extensive information about the early activities of Yoo.[43] Art historians Chung Yung Mok, Lee Inbum, and Rue Yeongah have departed from the previous monographic studies and started to

---

[40] Gu, "Lee Sun-seok," 6.
[41] Choi, "Lee Sun-seok."
[42] Kim, "Hanguk hyeondae."
[43] Kim Youngna, "1930 nyeondae donggyeong yuhagsaengdeul—jeonwi gurubjeon ui hwaldong eul jungsim euro" [Korean Students in Tokyo in the 1930s: The Avant-garde groups], in *Geundae hanguk misul nonchong*, ed. Lee Gyuyeol seonseng hoegabginyeom nonmunjib ganhaeng wiwonhoe (Seoul: Hakgojae, 1992), 273-319.

address the social implications in the earlier works of Yoo Youngkuk.[44] These more recent studies explore the process in which European avant-garde movements, including Constructivism, were adapted to the cultural and social needs of Korean artists studying abroad during the colonial period. Taking these studies as a starting point, I have called attention in chapter two to the Constructivist movement developed at the Tokyo School of Fine Arts, but I have not limited it to a specific division. Combining the research on Lee Sun-seok and Yoo Youngkuk (in chapter four) will provide an excellent case study for a rather unexplored approach to the initiation of Korean Constructivism, both in design and fine arts. Moreover, in conjunction with the Japanese Constructivist movement at the Tokyo School of Fine Arts, I have attempted to analyze the efforts of Lee Sun-seok and Yoo Youngkuk, after their return to Korea, to reconcile Euro-Japanese Constructivism with Korean nationalism and culture.

Introduction to Each Chapter

This dissertation consists of four chapters. Each chapter addresses the shifting concepts and understandings of Constructivism in the formation and development of western-style architecture and design in Japan and Korea, approximately 1925 to 1940. To evaluate Yamaguchi Bunzō, Yamawaki Iwao, and Kurata Chikatada's contribution to the development of the history of Japanese western style architecture

[44] Chung Young mok, "Yoo Younkuk ui chogi chusang, 1937-1949" [Early Abstraction of Yoo Youngkuk, 1937-1949], *Yoo Youngkuk Journal* no. 2 (2005): 41-52; Rue Yeongah, "Yoo Youngkuk ui chogi guseongjuui: <Rapsody>(1937) e natanan yutopianijeum" [Yoo Youngkuk's Early Constructivism: Utopianism in <Rapsody>(1937)], *Misul iron gwa hyeongjang* 8 (2010): 93-121.

and design more generally, I begin the first chapter with an introduction to the historical development of western architecture in Tokyo from the Meiji period and the activities of the modern architectural groups Bunriha and Sōusha. I assess the significance of Yamaguchi Bunzō (formerly Okamura Bunzō), who was one of the leading architects of Sōusha (1923-1931), in relation to his strong commitment to Marxism in his earlier career and promotion of gorishugi kenchiku (rationalist architecture) as an appropriate means to provide simple, hygienic, and economical working and living environments for the working class. He also acted on his vision of social transformation and his politics of social realism, because of which he fell subject to government control, by constructing public facilities, electric power stations, and housing for workers in the Constructivist style. The second chapter contains a detailed history of the Japanese visitors and students at the Bauhaus, with architect Yamawaki Iwao as the main subject. Unlike Yamaguchi, Yamawaki took a rather socially neutral perspective of Constructivism. Through his work, such as the studio of Migishi Kotaro (1933, Fig. 2) and his own residence in Tokyo (1935, Fig. 3), he searched for a synthesis between Constructivist style and the traditional Japanese interior designs of private houses. Another important figure who will be discussed in the second chapter is the Japanese furniture designer Kurata Chikatada, who conducted experimental research and analysis on modern furniture design to improve Japanese modern living styles. As a leader of the Keiji Kōbō (Keiji Workshop, 1928-1940), Kurata tried to realize a theoretical approach to solve the problems of Japanese modern furniture and interior design, and imported the furniture style developed at the German Bauhaus and combined it with traditional

Japanese material. Dissatisfied with the decorative and superficial quality of contemporary Japanese modern furniture design, the members of the workshop created a system for mass-produced modern furniture, which involved an extensive process of research, production, consumer education, and marketing, and led to the new furniture trend by manufacturing tubular metal chairs, simple wooden chairs, lamps, and bookcases for Tokyo customers. At the end of the second chapter, I examine the modernist curriculum of the design and architecture department at the Tokyo School of Fine Arts led by former Bauhaus student Mizutani Takehiko. It serves as the connection point to the Constructivist design movement of Korea, which was initiated by Lee Sun-seok, who graduated from the design department in 1930.

In chapter three, I present research on the historical formation of Korean western architecture, art, and design during the late colonial period (1930 to 1945). It includes an in-depth analysis of the architectural journal *Chosen to kenchiku* (Joseon and Architecture) and chronological research on Constructivist buildings built by Japanese architects during the late 1930s. These were significant formative influences on members of the first generation of Korean architects such as Park Gil-ryong and Park Dong-jin, who graduated from the Gyeongseong Engineering College of Joseon. I assert that even though Park Gil-ryong's architectural work does not stringently follow the Constructivist style, the implication of Constructivist ideals in his housing projects was significant. Park Gil-ryong suggested a way to incorporate the principles of Constructivist style housing and urban hanok (Korean traditional houses), which his colleague Park Dong-jin fully supported. We will

further examine their discussions of problems in Korean traditional architecture and their integration of Western and Japanese floor plans into Korean homes.

The fourth chapter traces the inauguration of Constructivist art and design in general Korea during the late colonial period. I focus on Korean artists Lee Sun-seok and Yoo Youngkuk, who experienced the Japanese version of Constructivism through their studies in Tokyo during the 1930s. I demonstrate how the earlier artwork of Lee Sun-seok and Yoo Youngkuk reflect their understanding of the essence of Constructivism and how the artists adapted the Constructivist style to suit the local customs and artistic conventions of Korea after their return to their homeland.

I hope this comparative study of competing Constructivisms in Japan and Korea will contribute to a better understanding of the history of modern architecture and design in Japan and Korea and will lead to a reassessment of the significance of these architects and designers who, from the mid-1920s, contributed to make Constructivism internationally recognized.

Chapter 1. Constructivism in Japanese Discourse: Yamaguchi Bunzō

1.1 The Rise of Modern Japanese Architecture

At the beginning of the Meiji Era (1868-1912), Japan—a nation with a monolithic culture, language, and history—experienced an enormous surge of modernizing. Over the course of the subsequent decades, the Meiji government carried out reforms in the political and educational systems in order to gain equality (sometimes only symbolic) with the rising Euro-American powers, especially the newly constituted German Empire (1870) and the United States. To promote Japan as a modern state, government officials traveled to America and Europe to look for specific Classical European architecture as a visual expression of supremacy and power. This broad-based effort to put Japan on the world stage, later termed the Meiji Restoration, affected every sphere of thought.

In the field of architecture, the Meiji government endeavored from 1868 to reconstruct the urban landscape of the capital city, Tokyo, to enable it to meet the needs of the nation-state. As an initial step, the Meiji regime discontinued building in native-style architecture and instead introduced architectural methods and forms from Europe to construct a new urban landscape that would demonstrate Tokyo's status as a city with modern facilities.[1] The Ministry of Public Works founded the first Technical College (Kōgakuryō) in 1871, which included for the first time training in Western architecture

[1] Jordan Sand, House and Home in Modern Japan: Architecture, Domestic Space, and Bourgeois Culture, 1880-1930 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003), 4.

and civil engineering.[2] Since the Western building techniques had yet to be developed, the government employed many foreign architects and specialists, which number peaked between 1873 and 1876.[3] Among these, German architects Wilhelm Böckmann (1832-1902) and Hermann Ende (1829-1907) were invited in 1866 and British architect Josiah Conder (1852-1920), in 1877. They played initial roles in supervising the construction of government and public buildings.[4] The Ministry of Justice (1895, Fig. 4) and the National Supreme Court (1896, Fig. 5) were constructed in Northern German style by the architectural firm Ende und Böckmann and the Department of Law and Literature (1884, Fig. 6) at the Tokyo Imperial University was designed in Neo-Gothic style by Conder, who was trained under the Gothic style revivalist William Burges (1827-1881). Conder was appointed as the first professor at the Technical College on the year of his arrival, and the first generation of Japanese architects, including Tatsuno Kingo (1854-1919) and Katayama Tokuma (1853-1917), were trained under his supervision.[5] These Japanese architects constructed a number of administrative buildings, schools, and museums in the revivals of Gothic and Renaissance architectural style from the mid-1880s until the end of the Meiji period in 1912. These structures included Tatsuno's Bank of Japan (1890-96,

[2] This college became a university in 1877 and was later incorporated into the engineering department of Tokyo Imperial University in 1886. For more information, see Ken Tadashi Oshima, "Constructed Natures of Modern Architecture in Japan 1920-1940: Yamada Mamoru, Horiguchi Sutemi, and Antonin Raymond," Ph.D. Diss. (New York: Colmubia University, 2003), 14.
[3] David B. Stewart, The Making of a Modern Japanese Architecture: 1868 to the Present (Tokyo: Kodansha International, 1987), 36.
[4] Botond Bognar, *Nikken Sekkei: Building Future Japan 1900-2000* (New York: Rizzoli International Publications, 2000), 34.
[5] The first students graduating from Conder's class were Tatsuno Kingo, Katayama Tokuma, Tatsuzo Sone (1852-1937), and Sadachi Shichijiro (1856-1922). For further information about the activities of the first generation of architects, see ibid., 34-35.

Fig. 7) and the Tokyo Station (1911-14, Fig. 8), and Katayama's Akasaka Detached Palace (1899-1909, Fig. 9).

New architectural trends, such as those evident in the new main building of the Imperial Hotel (1913-1923, demolished in 1968, Fig. 10) by American architect Frank Lloyd Wright (1867-1959)[6], signaled the end of Neo-Classical architecture during the Meiji period. In replacing the existing Imperial Hotel (1888-90, Fig. 11) designed by Japanese architect Yuzuru Watanabe (1809–1922),[7] Wright used reinforced concrete, stone, and brick in the new structures, making them impervious to earthquakes and fires. Counter to the dominant Neo-Gothic style of other Japanese government buildings, Wright's design incorporated two low, three-story wings running tangentially along either side of the central lobby. The wings enclosed an inner courtyard, giving the redesigned building an H-shaped floor plan (Fig. 12). Wright introduced cantilever principles to stress the verticality of the building. Cantilevered floor slabs serving as second-floor balconies adorned the north entrance of the main lobby (Fig. 13). White horizontal stone bands around the edge of the balconies decorated the exterior walls, providing a contrast to the tan brick of the overall structure.

Wright interspersed Japanese elements throughout the hotel. Its copper roofs referenced the Japanese temples in nearby Shiba Park, and the use of the light green *ōya*-stone, with its soft texture for easy carving, in the hotel's decorative elements exemplify

---

[6] For more information about the Imperial Hotel, see James Cary, *The Imperial Hotel: Frank Lloyd Wright and the Architecture of Unity* (Rutland, VT, 1968); Kathryn Smith, "Frank Lloyd Wright and the Imperial Hotel: A Postscript," *The Art Bulletin* vol. 67, no. 2 (June 1985): 296-301; Joseph M. Siry, "The Architecture of Earthquake Resistance: Julius Kahn's Truscon Company and Frank Lloyd Wright's Imperial Hotel," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* vol. 67, no. 1 (March 2008): 78-105.

[7] The original Imperial Hotel was a three-story structure made of wood, brick, and plaster, in the Second Empire style. It had sixty rooms and ten suites, a ballroom, dining room, billiard room, lounge, smoking room, and reading room. Smith, "Frank Lloyd Wright," 296.

these Japanese nuances.[8] The stylistic motifs of the Imperial Hotel, which would later be labeled Mayan Revival architectural style, were abandoned by Japanese architects with the emergence of new architectural movements during the Taisho period (1912-1926), which rejected the richly ornamented architecture of the previous era.

The urban population grew enormously during the Taisho period, leaping by 14.5 percent (approximately 421,900 residents) in 1917 alone. To explore new symbolic expressions and materials of modernity they thought appropriate for the growing metropolitan capital, Japanese architects paid attention to contemporary avant-garde architectural movements in Europe, not the Neo-Gothic style that had been flourishing in Tokyo in the previous decades. This tendency toward modern trends accelerated after the Great Kantō earthquake on September 1, 1923.[9] The earthquake destroyed almost two-thirds of the city's buildings, and 554,000 people out of 2.288 million lost their homes.[10] Immediately following the earthquake, from 1923 until 1931, Tokyo executed a recovery project in the urban architectural landscape. The members of new architectural societies, such as the Sōusha (founded right after the earthquake) recognized in this natural disaster a great opportunity to erect new types of buildings to transform the city into a world capital.[11] For the exterior, the architects looked for specific advanced styles that could be embraced not only artistically but also practically and industrially. Japanese architects, desiring modernization, both visual and material, traveled to and studied in Europe from

---

[8] Ōya stone is a rock created from lava and ash which was produced only in Ōya, Japan.
[9] For more information about the Kanto earthquake, see Gennifer S. Weisenfeld, *Imaging Disaster: Tokyo and the Visual Culture of Japan's Great Earthquake of 1923* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2012).
[10] Takafusa Nakamura, "Depression, Recovery, and War, 1920-1945," in *The Cambridge History of Japan,* vol. 6, *The Twentieth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 456.
[11] For more information, see Gennifer Weisenfeld, *Imaging Disaster: Tokyo and the Visual Culture of Japan's Great Earthquake of 1923* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2012).

the early 1920s, and witnessed the newest trends in architecture and design and introduced them to Japan upon returning from Europe. They published articles in architectural magazines and newspapers and soon participated in designing modern public facilities, school buildings, and private residences, following the new styles of architecture. Because buildings of non-reinforced brick and stone and wooden structures were not sufficient to withstand earthquakes, architects conducted research on reinforced concrete, not only because it was durable but also because it represented an opportunity to be part of the new impulse of urban construction dominant in the West.[12]

Most of the Japanese architects who were eagerly integrating architectural trends from Europe and the United States into Japanese modern residences and buildings were members of architectural societies, most notably the Bunriha Kenchikukai (1920-1928), the Sōusha (1923-1931), and the short-lived Nihon Intānashonaru Kenchikukai (1927-1933). These three architectural societies brought significant change to the history of Japanese architecture. The proposed architectural plans and newly constructed buildings by their members had common characteristics: None of them resembled the former Neo-Classical buildings dominating the middle of Tokyo, or any other conventional architectural forms of the past.

The first, the Bunriha, had as founding members Horiguchi Sutemi (1895-1983), Yamada Mamoru (1894-1966), and Ishimoto Kikuji (1894-1963), who were graduate students from the architecture department at Tokyo Imperial University. Takizawa Mayumi (1896-1983), Morita Keiichi (1895-1983), and Yada Shigeru (1896-1958) joined the group soon after its formation. The three members discussed in this dissertation—

[12] Ken Tadashi Oshima, *International Architecture in Interwar Japan: Constructing Kokusai Kenchiku* (Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 2009), 3-11, 85-110.

Yamaguchi Bunzō, Yamawaki Iwao, and Kurata Chikatada—and seven others joined the group later on. The group continued its activities until 1928 and held at department stores in Tokyo a total of seven exhibitions of their architectural work. Their manifesto, written in 1923, proclaimed their aspirations for a new architecture:

> We arise!
>
> To create a realm of new architecture that has true meaning, we secede from the realm of past architecture.
>
> We arise!
>
> In order to awaken all that lies dormant within the realm of past architecture and to rescue all that is in the process of drowning.
>
> We arise!
>
> In our start of jubilation, we dedicate all our efforts to realizing this ideal, and we wait expectantly until we collapse, until we die.
>
> We declare the aforementioned in unison, facing the world.[13]

A proclamation to create a realm of new architecture and to reject the past were reminiscent of the inspiring terminologies used in the manifestos written in the West a couple of years earlier, such as that of the group Die Brücke (1904-1913) in 1906. Their

[13] English Translation provided by Ken Tadashi Oshima, ibid., 40. Original text in *Bunriha kenchikukai sengen to sakuhin*, vol. 1 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shōten, 1920).

manifesto aimed to give hope to the new generation of young artists by freeing themselves from the old customs:

> With faith that a new generation of creative as well as perceptive people will develop, we call together all young people, and, as youth which carries the future in itself, we want to gain for ourselves the freedom of development and liberation from the old establishment. Everyone belongs to us who directly and undivergently tires to express that which impels them to create.

Or consider Walter Gropius's program of the Bauhaus in Weimar in April 1919.[14] That program proclaimed a break from the former class distinctions and expressed a desire to create a new structure with a new guild of craftsmen. It concluded:

> Let us then create a new guild of craftsmen without the class distinctions that raise an arrogant barrier between craftsmen and artist! Together let us desire, conceive, and create the new structure of the future, which will embrace architecture and sculpture and painting in one unity which will one day rise toward heaven from the hands of a million workers like the crystal symbol of a new faith.

The emphasis on refusing old practices or social conditions and giving hope to the new generation were common characteristics to all three manifestos. Nonetheless, a

[14] The program was originally published in German as *Programm des Staatlichen Bauhauses in Weimar* (Weimar: April 1919). Translated provided in *Between Worlds: A Sourcebook of Central European Avant-Gardes, 1910-1930*, ed. Timothy O. Benson and Eva Forgacs (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2002), 204.

socialist claim requiring a radical change of society was not present in the Bunriha manifesto, which dropped all political aspects.[15]

As architectural historian Ken Tadashi Oshima has perceptively deduced, the early members of this group were inspired by the ideals of German Expressionism, which was known mainly came through architectural magazines.[16] The architectural plans presented by the Bunriha members at the first two exhibitions preserved all the enthusiasm for new forms and innovative design combinations that had been evinced by German Expressionist architects, who tried to make architecture not only to partake of industrial technology but also to "become a constructive element of a new, living organism."[17] At the first Bunriha exhibition, Ishimoto Kikuji's architectural plan titled *Crypt* (1920, Fig. 14) and Takizawa Mayumi's (1896–1983) *Model of Mountain House* (1921, Fig. 15) conveyed Expressionist ideas. The curved surfaces and plain walls without any ornamentation were reminiscent of the Sulphuric Acid Factory (1911-1912, Luboń, Poland, Fig. 16) of German Expressionist architect Hans Poelzig (1869-1936) and the creative Einstein Tower (1920-21, Potsdam, Germany, Fig. 17) by Jewish German architect Erich Mendelsohn (1887- 1953). At the second Bunriha exhibition, architect Yamada Mamoru, working at the Ministry of Communications, exhibited a project for the Central Telegraph Office (Fig. 18), which was constructed in 1925. At the time, the Ministry of Communications needed new facilities for telephone and telegraph services, which had become an essential part of modern infrastructure. With a mast-capped

[15] According to art historian Ken Tadashi Oshima, the Bunriha's manifesto was an attack towards the structural faction and the design faction among the architects at the Tokyo Imperial University. Oshima, *International Architecture,* 40.
[16] Ibid., 39-41.
[17] James, Erich Mendelsohn, 43.

communication tower atop the entrance roof, the west side of the building comprised a five-story narrow range of bays decorated with barrel vaults and buttressing piers that divided the facade into a seven-part double-window array of soaring forms. A massive concrete stepped arch surrounded a towering glazed entrance at the corner. The curving arches and steep vertical lines gave this building a taste of German Expressionist architecture, recalling Hans Poelzig's towering bank building in Dresden (1921, Fig. 19).

As the trend in German architecture moved in the mid-1920s from Expressionism toward Constructivism, some of the Bunriha members were ready to follow suit. Following the visit to the Bauhaus by Bunriha member Ishimoto Kikuji in 1922 and Horiguchi Sutemi in 1924, the principles of Constructivist architecture advocated by Walter Gropius at the Bauhaus were soon embraced throughout the society and maintained until its dissolution, in 1928. They called their own work *kokusai kenchiku* [International Architecture], the members signaled their belief in a Japanese architecture based on how Gropius defined the term, i.e., a combination of art and science.[18]

The second architectural group, Sōusha, was formed by draftsmen and junior engineers in the Ministry of Communications in the immediate aftermath of the Great Kanto earthquake on September 1, 1923, only three years after the formation of the Bunriha, which had inspired its creation.[19] There were five initial members in total, all young, ranging from eighteen to twenty-one. Yamaguchi was the leader, joined by cofounders Sento Eiki, Ogawa Mitsuzō, Umeda Yuzuru, and Hiroki Kamekichi (Fig.

[18] Ibid., 40-44.
[19] For more information about the Kanto earthquake, see Gennifer S. Weisenfeld, *Imaging Disaster: Tokyo and the Visual Culture of Japan's Great Earthquake of 1923* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2012).

20).[20] Notably, none of the members had received any formal training in architecture. This was a major difference with the Bunriha, which was established by trained professionals who graduated from the elite Tokyo Imperial University. Nonetheless, the activities of the Sōusha were significant, since the senior architects and designers active in the Ministry of Communications strongly supported the group. The members were trained properly and gained the opportunity afterward to participate in dam and power station projects commissioned by the government.

The Nihon Intānashonaru Kenchikukai was founded in 1927 by six architects, including Ishimoto Kikuji, the leader of the Bunriha.[21] Their manifesto proclaimed the intent to create an International Architecture appropriate to new life, to join the progress of mankind, and to reject traditional forms of architecture. This group was formed on the idea of putting Japanese architecture onto the level enjoyed by other International Architecture movements in Europe. To promote the activities of this group, member Ueno Isaburō asked Walter Gropius and other architects for support.

According to Yamaguchi, both Gropius and Hilbersheimer's publication on International Architecture (see above, Introduction), was available in Japan in 1928, but it is unknown whether it was a Japanese publication or the original German version.[22] Regardless, common to all three groups was a preference to adopt the title of Gropius's work to use terminology that distinguished Bauhaus Constructivism from Russian. Rather

---

[20] Sato Yoshihiro, "Tosho shakai ni okeru bunka katsudou o kenkyū - ryō taisen kanki no sōusha kenchikukai o chūshin ni" [A Study on Architects' Cultural Activities in Urban Society: Sōusha Kenchikukai in the Interwar Period], Ph.D. diss. (Tokyo: Hitotsubashi University, 2010), 75.
[21] The six members were Motono Seigo, Ishimoto Kikuji, Itō Seibun, Ueno Isaburō, Shinmyō Kazuo, and Nakao Tamutsu.
[22] Yamaguchi Bunzō (as Okamura Bunzō), "Shin kenchiku ni okeru yuibutsu shikan" [Historical Materialism in New Architecture], *Atelier* (September 1929); Text available in *Kenchikuka Yamaguchi Bunzō: Hito to sakuhin*, Ed. Kondō Shōichi, RIA Kenchiku Sōgō Kenkyūjo (Tokyo: Sagami Shobō, 1982), 250-252.

than using the term *koseishugi* (Constructivism) that had been applied to the movement as it originated in Russia and spread to other central European countries, *kokusai kenchiku* (International architecture) was more frequently used by the members of the Bunriha, Sōusha, and the Nihon Intānashonaru Kenchikukai to describe the movement as it developed in Germany.

The full, mature Japanese appreciation for Constructivist architecture can be detected as early as 1929, when three articles were published in different major architectural magazines. Kurata Chikatada published a detailed review of the architectural work of Walter Gropius and Hans Poelzig in the July 1929 issue of *Kokusai kenchiku* (Fig. 21).[23] Explaining Walter Gropius as the leader of the International Architecture movement, Kurata included images of the Fagus Factury (1910), the Dessau Bauhaus (1925-26), and a model for the *Siedlung*. In the September 1929 issue of *Atelier*, Yamawaki published an account of the new architectural movements, which included a close analysis of the International Architecture being discussed in Europe. In the November issue of *Kenchiku shinjo*, Kawakita Renshichirō translated Gropius's "The Theory and Organization of the Bauhaus, Weimar" into Japanese and added commentaries on each paragraph in his forty-six page article 'An Overview of the Bauhaus.'[24]

1.2 Yamaguchi Bunzō and the Architectural Society Sōusha

[23] Kurata Chikatada, "Kokusai zakki (7)" [International Miscellaneous News], *Kokusai kenchiku* 5 (July 1929): 1-5. From page 6 to 9, a translation of Jean Badovici's *Le Constructiviste* (Title in Japanese: *Koseishugi*) was included.

[24] Walter Gropius's "Idee und Aufbau des Staatlichen Bauhauses, Weimar" [The Theory and Organization of the State School of Building, Weimar] was a 12-page article in which he explains the essence of the Bauhaus program he had developed between 1919 and 1923.

The Japanese were paying attention not only to the generalized concept of International Architecture. Its political context drew attention, particularly from Yamaguchi Bunzō, who explored its theoretical implications.

Born Yamaguchi Takizō at Asakusa, Tokyo, on January 10, 1902,[25] Yamaguchi Bunzō (Fig. 22) graduated from Tokyo Higher Technical School (now the Tokyo Institute of Technology) in 1918. He started his career in September 1920 as a draftsman at the Building and Repairs division of the Ministry of Communications.[26] The division, headed by Uchida Shiro as chief manager, was an exceptionally large organization. It was composed of six senior engineers, forty-seven junior engineers, and a large number of draftsmen. The distinction between the tasks, duties, and responsibilities of the high officials, architects, designers, and draftsmen was very strict, and a promotion from draftsmen to architect seemed nearly impossible. The Ministry of Communications was known for its progressive and innovative projects,[27] and so attracted young and ambitious architects like Yamada Mamoru (member of the Bunriha) and eminent architectural designers Iwamoto Roku (1893-1922) and Yoshida Tetsurō (1894-1956), all of whom joined the ministry in 1920.[28]

Because he had no prior education or training in architecture, Yamaguchi was never expected to become an architect. But unlike other draftsmen, Yamaguchi had the opportunity to participate in major construction projects of the Nishijin Telegraph Office and the Aoyama Telegraph Office, which proved to be the launching point of his later

[25] He called himself Okamura Bunzō while he was active as a member of the *Sōusha*, but changed his name afterward. To avoid confusion, Okamura Bunzō is used for his name in this dissertation.
[26] Kenchikuka Yamaguchi Bunzō: Hito to sakuhin, 43.
[27] Oshima, International Architecture, 48.
[28] Kenchikuka Yamaguchi Bunzō: Hito to sakuhin, 43.

career.[29] In 1922, after senior architects recognized his skills, he was promoted to junior engineer. With the permission of Yamada Mamoru, he was asked in the same year to design the *Kushiro* Post Office. Due to his close relationship with Yamada and other architects, Yamaguchi was invited to join the Bunriha in 1921. After two years, in fall 1923, he started his activities as a member and leader of the Sōusha group.

The Sōusha held its first exhibition in November 1923 at the Jujiya music shop in Ginza, only two months after the earthquake.[30] Each exhibition was mostly combined with a symposium or lecture. Their goals and objectives were articulated through the publication of their Expressionistic manifesto, which was based on a draft written by Umeda Yuzuru:

> Attaining a purity of heart like that of the ancients
>
> We are devoted to the spirit of creativity, and we attempt to remain
>
> Untainted by impure fads and fashion of imitation
>
> We carry with us a yearning for the Eternal Mother
>
> We will wait expectantly for the abandonment of current architecture, which is infected by the degenerate and the trite.
>
> The symphony of our lives—we exert ourselves persistently so that the beautiful, sacred mass of our souls might resound in the universe.[31]

---

[29] Ibid.
[30] Yamaguchi Bunzō, "Sōusha to sono dai ichi kai ten" [The First Exhibition of the Sōusha], *Kenchiku shinchō* 5 (February 1924): 4-5.
[31] Based on the English translation in Jonathan M. Reynolds, *Maekawa Kunio and the Emergence of Japanese Modernist Architecture* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), 30. Original text in Yamaguchi Bunzō, "Sōusha toso no dai ichi kai ten" [The First Exhibition of the Sōusha], *Kenchiku shinchō* 5 (February 1924): 5, and Fujimori Shōichiro and Yamaguchi Hiroshi, eds., *Nihon kenchiku sengen bunshū* (Tokyo: Shōkokusha, 1973), 164.

This extract shows how the members considered their architectural work to be a return to the Eternal Mother and to be a new hope for current architecture. The overall mystical tone and verbal intensity of the declaration shares aspects with other manifestos and statements of this time. A return to a spirit of creativity that belongs to the ancients was discussed in Central Europe by German expressionists. In 1907, Wilhelm Worringer claimed that the there was in antiquity a central driving force to pursue pure abstraction and spirituality in the life of an organism; it was to be contrasted with a naturalism that exhibit the needs for empathy. The former culminated in the art of ancient periods such as Egypt and the Gothic, whereas the ancient Greek cultures and the Renaissance were the prime examples of the latter.[32] Austrian Adolf Loos (1870-1933), a significant figure of the German Werkbund who was well known for his radical purism in aesthetics, developed Worringer's ideal of returning to the primordial past. In his essay *Ornament and Crime* (1908), Loos asserted that ornaments caused enormous damage and devastation in the aesthetic development of human culture and thus slowed down its evolution.[33] He heavily criticized the degeneracy of modern people surrounded by ornaments and he put forward the desire to go back to a time before the first ornament was created. The Sōusha manifesto holds a vision similar to those declared by these two Expressionists. It too criticizes current trends in architecture as degenerate and instead ploclaims a yearning for the Eternal Mother.

[32] Abstraktion und Einfuhlung: Ein Beitrag zur Stilpsychologie (Neuwied: Heuser, 1907).
[33] Adolf Loos' *Ornament and Crime* (German title: *Ornament and Verbrechen*), written in 1908, was announced in a lecture on 21 January 1910 in Vienna.

Yamaguchi's drawings *Outdoor Music Hall* (1923, Fig. 23), displayed in the first exhibition of the Sōusha, and *Memorial on the Hilltop* (1923, Fig. 24) presented at the second exhibition, represent his strong commitment to avoid ornamentalism and embrace Expressionistic and curvilinear forms. The latter is especially significant, since it was submitted to a competition for a monument for the great fire in Tokyo caused by the Kantō earthquake.[34] It reflects Yamaguchi's desire, seen in his address for the first Sōusha exhibition, that the architectural society was responsible for reconstructing Tokyo in the aftermath of this difficult period, to transform it into a beautiful artistic city. Yamaguchi asserted that the Sōusha members should awake their soul and feel the joyfulness of creation, and so help rebuild the city.[35]

The mystical tone of the Sōusha shifted toward a rational one beginning in the mid-1920s. Rather than searching for the "Eternal Mother," the members began to embrace realism and to search for rational ways to use new construction materials and design strategies that might minimize the loss of electricity and mitigate building costs. At the fourth exhibition of the Sōusha, held at the Shirokiya department store, Tokyo, in October 1926, the architectural models, including those by Yamaguchi (upper left model on the left page, Fig. 25), exhibit a rational rather than expressionistic character.[36] This rational aspect is asserted in the poster for that fourth exhibition (Fig. 26), which contrasts sharply with the poster for the first exhibition (Fig. 27). Sleek and sharp typography, geometric planes, dots, and lines emphasize clarity and practicality. In the

[34] Kenchikuka Yamaguchi Bunzō, 209.
[35] Yamaguchi Bunzō, "Sōusha to sono dai ichi kai ten" [The First Exhibition of the Sōusha], *Kenchiku shinchō* 5 (February 1924): 4-5.
[36] The photos of the architectural models submitted to the 4th exhibition of the Sōusha and its evaluation written by critics was published in *Kenchiku shinchō* 7 (December 1926): 165-166.

fourth exhibition, and the related seminar, the Sōusha strongly advocated an amalgamation of art and technology through the use of modern production methods, constructions, materials, and forms.[37] This dramatic change from the first exhibition in 1923 reflects the impulse to embrace the new movement of International Architecture taking place in Europe.

[37] Ibid., 10.

1.2 Principles of Yamaguchi's Rationalist Architecture: Socialism in Tangible Form

Yamaguchi played an especially crucial role in the adaptation of Constructivism to Japanese social conditions. Yamaguchi's vision of social transformation and his political adaptation of social realism show one of the subtle changes that Constructivism underwent as it moved across to Japan. Whereas the members of the Bunriha did not necessarily become fully committed Marxists or members of any left-wing party, Yamaguchi, together with the other Sōusha members, actively promoted his doctrine of rationalist architecture, expressing his aspiration toward the greatest possible social function within architecture and the integration of Constructivist characters for both the exterior form and the interior. The most decisive declaration of his theoretical approach to Constructivism was his article "Shin kenchiku ni okeru yuibutsu shikan" [The Materialist Conception of History in New Architecture], published in the September 1929 issue of *Atelier*, and his lecture from October 1929, "Gōrishugi hansei no kobo" [Demand of a Criticism of Rationalist Architecture], which closely repudiated previous architecture in which beauty was determined through exterior decorative elements. [38]

His article on the materialist conception of history in new architecture starts with a quotation from French Architect Le Corbusier that people would dwell from now on in houses that were "machines for living in."[39] According to him, the most advanced current theory is materialism, which requires judgments that are purely teleological (from Greek τέλος, end or goal). We are emancipated from the past realm of architecture, which

[38] Yamaguchi Bunzō, "Shin kenchiku ni okeru yuibutsu shikan" [Historical Materialism in New Architecture], *Atelier* (September 1929); Text available in *Kenchikuka Yamaguchi Bunzō: Hito to sakuhin*, Ed. Kondō Shōichi, RIA Kenchiku Sōgō Kenkyūjo (Tokyo: Sagami Shobō, 1982), 250-252.
[39] Yamaguchi Bunzō, "Shin kenchiku ni okeru yuibutsu shikan" [Historical Materialism in New Architecture], 250.

requires aesthetic judgments based on customs, emotions, and ideologies. We should now try to solve each kind of tasks by its purpose, which justifies the contemporary trend towards Rationalist architecture. Yamaguchi further argues that the older architecture considered how to make beautiful buildings, but the new architecture questions how to synthesize simple, pleasant, hygienic, practical, and economical features in a way that serves the building's teleology.[40] Yamaguchi's theory was based on the aesthetics of Immanuel Kant, who had made teleological judgment a centerpiece of his philosophical system. Yamaguchi emphasized, by using the term *mokutekiron kenchiku* (teleological architecture), that architectural planning should be driven by purpose and not be defined by conventional disciplines. He further argues that architecture does not mean only constructing residences, offices, or plants. Rather it is a synthetic expression of our scientific and spiritual demand. Yamaguchi says that this architectural theory has become a common concept worldwide among architects interested in the new movements, and that the development threatens the architects who have fallen into mannerism and remain in the past. After this bold claim, he lists representative architects evincing the new architectural movement in Europe and in Japan:

> Germany: Gropius, Hilberseimer, Duiker, Poelzig, Behrens, Taut Brothers, Mendelsohn
> France: Le Corbusier, Pierre Jeanneret, Lurçat, Perret brothers, Van Doesburg[41]
>
> Netherlands: Oud, Dudok

---

[40] Yamaguchi Bunzō (as Okamura Bunzō), "Shin kenchiku ni okeru yuibutsu shikan" [Historical Materialism in New Architecture], *Atelier* (September 1929); Text available in *Kenchikuka Yamaguchi Bunzō: Hito to sakuhin*, ed. Kondō Shōichi, RIA Kenchiku Sōgō Kenkyūjo (Tokyo: Sagami Shobō, 1982), 250-252.

[41] In the Japanese text, Yamaguchi listed Van Doesburg as French even though he was Dutch. Van Doesburg lived briefly in Paris in 1923, and Yamaguchi may have been thought he was French, or he made a mistake.

Belgium: Van de Velde, Bourgeois

Russia: Tatlin, Vesnin, El Lissitzky

Japan: Bunriha Kenchikukai, Sōusha Kenchikukai, Intānashionaru Kenchikukai[42]

Yamaguchi further states that the listed architects share the idea that architecture is a synthetic expression of both the scientific and spiritual needs of humankind. He quotes Gropius's and Hilbersheimer's theory of International Architecture and says it will be interesting to see how internationalization of style will progress when it needs to deal with national characteristics. He takes the Weissenhof Siedlung in Stuttgart as a good example of the new architectural movement. Yamaguchi says the architects who participated in this project shared both a sophisticated mechanics and a commitment to the ideal of simplified forms in architecture. He praised the common feature of each residence—the flat roofs, huge glass windows, and flat planes—as well as Gropius's invention of steel frame walls. He concludes his article with the statement that architecture will advance more scientifically and will develop with teleology at its center. The list not only indicates that Yamaguchi had extensive knowledge of the various architectural movements in (Central) Europe, but it also reveals Yamaguchi's desire to put the three Japanese architectural societies, including his own Sōusha, on the same level.[43]

Whereas the article was an introduction of rationalist architecture driven by teleological judgment without revealing heavy socialist or Marxist thoughts, he delivered

[42] Kenchikuka Yamaguchi Bunzō, 250.
[43] He praised Hans Poelzig's architectural project at the Weissenhof Siedlung in Stuttgart (1927), but said he had a suspicious feeling about Walter Gropius's architectural view due to the educational program at the Bauhaus.

a more left-leaning position in a symposium held a month after the appearance of the article.[44] In his lecture, Yamaguchi divided his talk into three parts—first, the dialectical perspective of nature in natural science and social science, second, a criticism of the mechanical materialism of new architecture, and third, a demand for a critique of rationalist architecture. According to him, natural science means science, and social science means Marxism. Overall, Yamaguchi criticizes new architectural theorists for hastily adjusting the standards of mechanical materialism and ignoring the political and social significance of the work. Therefore, through a construction of rationalist architecture, Yamaguchi strongly believed that positive social change could be made. He sought to provide for Japan a similarly sympathetic living environment for the working class and to validate a rationalist approach to architecture as the solution for a rapidly modernizing society. He explains that there are four steps needed to evaluate new architecture in the light of a socialist approach:

> First of all, examine the title of the architecture and figure out whether this plan was made for the proletariat or the bourgeoisie. Second, use a socialist approach and find out whether the architectural plan reflects the author's correct understanding of socialism. Third, please realistically consider the issues and find out if this plan can be realized. The last one will be an investigation of the possibilities. The last one is the most practical investigation, since you need to

[44] Yamaguchi Bunzō, "Gorishugi hansei no yōbō" [Demand of a Criticism of Rationalist Architecture], *Kokusai kenchiku* vol. 5, no.11 (November 1929): 15-22.

think about the building cost, maintenance, and many other political and economical aspects of your work.[45]

For a better understanding, Yamaguchi takes an example of a worker's apartment and a sanatorium for Japanese workers suffering from a tuberculosis disease and explains how to construct it according to the social conditions. With his strong commitment to the political and economical aspects of Constructivist architecture continues, Yamaguchi decided to visit Europe to learn and witness with his own eyes the current architectural tendency toward "new rationalist architecture" and practiced it after his return to Japan in 1932.

[45] Ibid., 20-21.

1.3 Rationalist Architecture in Practice: Yamaguchi's Travels and Projects

Yamaguchi departed for Europe for the first time in December 1930 at the age of twenty-eight, returning to Japan in the summer of 1932.[46] Yamaguchi worked at Gropius's atelier as a designer in Berlin starting in July 1931 (Fig. 28), an experience that would shape the Japanese architect's large-scale public projects at home. Yamaguchi had been in continuous contact with German Marxist groups while he was in Japan.[47] And now, during his Berlin years, he was deeply involved with the socialist movement, but not many details are known. After his return from Europe, Yamaguchi discontinued his political activities, probably due to the arrest of the other Sōusha members who had joined the Communist Party, Umeda Yuzuru (1904-83) and Imaizumi Zen'ichi (1911-85), and the intense control over communists by the Japanese government. Only one example of his Constructivist style architecture—the Seiunsō (1936) commissioned by the Japanese labor union, which will be examined in this chapter—showed his commitment to Marxism.

At the atelier, Yamaguchi was the only Japanese working for Gropius. Yamaguchi was captivated by Gropius's architectural work not only because Gropius was the leading architect of the new movement in Germany, but because Gropius posited the intersection of new construction ideas with the legislative precepts advanced by the new political system of the Weimar Republic.[48]

---

[46] Ibid.
[47] Sasaki Hiroto, "Kenchikuka toshite no Yamaguchi Bunzō" [Architect Yamaguchi Bunzō], in *Kenchikuka Yamaguchi Bunzō*, 75.
[48] Ibid., 74.

While there, he assisted Gropius on two large projects. One was the design of the Karlsruhe Siedlung, and the other was the competition entry for the Palace of the Soviets. Not much is known about the working relationship between Yamaguchi and Gropius. In a response to a letter from Japanese scholars from Mrs. Ise Gropius in 1977 asking for reference material, Mrs. Gropius could recall only that she knew Yamaguchi as a very silent designer who always worked diligently to meet the date for the (Soviet palace) competition.[49] It is not known when exactly Yamaguchi left the atelier, but since his stay in Europe was twenty months, it seems that he worked for Gropius for approximately a year and half. He traveled to other countries in Central Europe before he returned to Japan in 1932.

Since he had made many social connections while in Europe, he was warmly welcomed back to Japan. Inspired by Gropius's Siedlung in Dessau-Törten (Fig. 29), and the Weissenhof Siedlung in Stuttgart (Fig. 30), both built in 1927, Yamaguchi transposed the key concepts of Bauhaus architecture and the International Style in most of his projects, such as the Seiunsō in Tokyo (apartment with hospital, completed May 1936, Fig. 31); his Bancho shūgō jutaku (Bancho Siedlung) project in Tokyo (completed August 1936, Fig. 32), built for the Japanese labor union and the worker's class; and the Kurobegawa No. 2 Power Station (completed 1938, Fig. 33), built for the Kansai Electric Power Corporation in Kurobe, Toyama Prefecture.

[49] Letter from Ise Gropius to Toshihiko Tanaka, August 28, 1997. In *Kenchikuka Yamaguchi Bunzō*, 80.

The first of these was one of his most significant. The commission came from the Japanese labor union (Fig. 31).[50] The completed building looked like a bare, cubic box. It had a flat roof, white walls, and three horizontal bands of windows on the north and south sides. Yamaguchi's in-depth research on the recent architectural projects of Walter Gropius in Germany and of Le Corbusier in France must have inspired him to consider a rational and plain architectural design that would reflect his earlier theories on rationalist architecture and worker housing. On the western façade of the building, which faced the road, Yamaguchi did not include any windows (upper left image, Fig. 31). He wrote that his intention was to minimize the noise from the street coming into the building and to prevent the strong sunshine coming from the west in the afternoon. Most of the units inside the buildings followed a north-south alignment, which mimicked the typical direction of rooms in Japan. The three uniform and narrow-shaped square holes in the middle of the west side served as small windows (with no glass) located right above the exit staircase hall of each floor (upper left image, Fig. 31). Atop the building, a small, white V-shaped awning above the flat roof prevented rainfall from entering the exit staircase hall. Yamaguchi initially planned to pattern half of the first-floor rooms in the hospital after the Western style, but he ended up designing all of the units in what he called the Japanese style. It is hard to discern what he meant by "Japanese-style," but he likely meant rooms furnished in tatami surrounded with white walls with slightly protruding columns. The second and third floors provided small living units (or flats) for workers. The floor plans resembled an assembly of even cubic grids of the same square footage. Yamaguchi designed six units on the north side and six on the south, separated

[50] *Gendai jūtaku, 1933-1940* [Contemporary Houses, 1933-1940], vol. 2 (Tokyo: Kokusai Kenchiku Kyōkai, 1941), 108-109.

by a corridor. He said that he felt this plan solved ventilation issues. The overall building looked like what the architects participating in the Weissenhof Siedlung project had aimed for: a building designed with industrially manufactured steel windows and segments of white, cement-based walls. The design ideas drew largely from the Siedlung projects in Germany (Fig. 29, 30), the housing complexes designed to create standard prototypes of housing, utilizing economical utilization of space, material, time, and money. The Japanese labor union funded the construction of Seiunsō to provide better living environments for workers by providing both medical care and a living space. Yamaguchi may have thought, therefore, that this project would realize his dream of a rationalist architecture to solve the social problems of the working class. The Seiunsō was carefully planned around the economical aspects and the social conditions of the Japanese workers, which were the key factors of rationalist architecture he mentioned in his 1929 lecture.[51] However, this project was unfortunately the only one which satisfied his dreams.

Yamaguchi's desire to create a large-scale housing complex in Japan—much as his teacher Gropius had done in Berlin, Dessau, and Frankfurt during the 1920s under the commission of the Weimar Republic—was finally realized with the construction of the Bancho Siedlung (Fig. 32). The basic concept was similar to the Seiunsō, but the residences were targeted to upper-class foreigners living in Japan. Following the key concepts of creating a uniform, standardized living space, he incorporated white walls and long, horizontal windows for the block-shaped unit housing. Thirteen family houses were constructed in three types. According to the floor plan, there were two A-type single houses, seven B-type row houses, and three C-type (the largest one) single houses

[51] Yamaguchi Bunzō, "Gorishugi hansei no yōbō" [Demand of a Criticism of Rationalist Architecture], *Kokusai kenchiku* vol. 5, no.11 (November 1929): 20-21.

(second image in the third row, Fig. 32). The C-type houses were constructed near the entrance of the complex, and A- and B-type houses were arranged in two rows. Although each type was different in size, each house, no matter the type, had on the first floor a kitchen and a combined living and dining area, a couple of bedrooms on the second floor, and a small garden in the backyard. The exterior of the A-type house resembled a miniature version of the Seiunsō. The west side of the house comprised a white wall with one long, narrow band of steel-framed window on the upper side of the first floor. The shape of the windows on the second floor of the southern part of the house looked again like a continuous façade. The B-type row houses were smaller than the A type, but shared the same exterior design. From a rooftop view from the roof of a block of four B-type row houses (right image in the second row, Fig. 32), one could easily see the contrast between the white walls and the dark steel window frames, lending a characteristic starkness similar to that of a geometrical abstract painting, with no emotional connotation.

The Kurobegawa No. 2 Power Station and the dam for the Kansai Electric Power Corporation in Kurobe, Toyama Prefecture (Fig. 33) was Yamaguchi's first government commission. He started this design before he left for Europe in 1930 and he continuously worked on it while in Berlin. The architectural plan of the station and the dam was completed in 1936, and the construction took two years.[52] The exterior of the buildings reflected his design for the Nihon Dental College (1934, Fig. 34) in Tokyo, the first project he started after his return from Germany.

With its size and appearance, it was the largest work of Constructivist style designed by Yamaguchi. The power station was asymmetrically arranged in three

[52] Yamaguchi wrote that he had visited the power station and dam in Karlsruhe to learn the advanced techniques. Sasato Hiroto, 89.

different-sized rectangular buildings (Fig. 33). The exterior of the four-story main office building was filled with glass windows. Each column of windows was divided with slightly protruding rectangular columns, which emphasized the vertical look of the structure. The white walls were covered with a continuous band of glass windows, which would bring maximum sunlight into the building and emphasize transparency. White steel muntin bars divided each window into nine equal squares, and the white color of the muntins matched the building's exterior. In the adjoining three-story building, three rows of square windows appeared on the front-right side. The use of clear cubic forms and a transparent façade of steel and glass elucidate Gropius' statement about International Architecture. The second and third floors of the main office building were cantilevered to meet the protruding flat roof of the three-story building, providing a more variable appearance to the overall structure. Only one picture of the interior remains, a view of a beautiful spiral staircase and horizontal steel beams used as balustrades. The red balustrades of the bridge rendered in expressionistic curvilinear forms were also Yamaguchi's design, yet it is not known if the color was originally painted red.[53]

Yamaguchi favored the cantilevered architectural style, evident in the main building of the Nihon Dental College (Fig. 34) and the Yamada House (1934, Fig. 35) built in Kita Kamakura, Kanagawa Prefecture. Like the main building of the dental college, in which the balcony of the fifth floor protrudes from the walls, Yamaguchi used a long cantilevered balcony on the second floor of the Yamada house, which emphasized the horizontal look of the house. The cantilevered design recalls that of Neutra and Le Corbusier. When in 1930 Neutra visited Japan Yamaguchi met him, and he had the

[53] Ibid.

chance to see Le Corbusier's work while he traveled in Germany. The design of Neutra's Lovell House in Los Angeles (1927-29, Fig. 36) and Le Corbusier's Villa Savoye in Poissy, France (1928-1931, Fig. 37) both innovatively use cantilevers and pillars to create an overall look that typifies the style of International Constructivism. However, there were no European electric generating stations in Constructivist style at this time, so Yamaguchi's design was new and pathbreaking. Yamaguchi approached the novel task with an overall concept that he should create a rational design that would match the natural surroundings. Yamaguchi writes:

> I have decided to put all of my efforts to express the characteristics of this modern building as natural and rational. Since it is inside a national park, all buildings need to be "nature friendly"…. you cannot say it is not acceptable to nature because it is made of steel. My concern is how to fully express the functional characteristic of this building inside nature.

For Yamaguchi, the new trend of architecture created by his fellow contemporaries, such as Walter Gropius and Le Corbusier, passionately stirred his social consciousness. Through his writings and architectural work, Yamaguchi's exclusive advocation of the sociopolitical and functional aspect of Rationalist architecture inspired further development of socialist architecture in Japan in the first half of the 1930s.

Chapter 2. A Japanese Bauhaus and the Emergence of Modern Living Styles in Tokyo

> *The Bauhaus that was driven from Weimar in 1925 because of the National Socialist Party, was now, after seven years, driven again from Dessau by the National Socialist Party. The Dessau Bauhaus has been completely trampled upon. But I think that the Bauhaus-like force that has been disseminated throughout the world will, in some form or other, rear its head once again in the world of plastic arts.*
>
> – Yamawaki Iwao[1]

With the continuous attack of the National Socialist Party, the city council of Dessau closed the Bauhaus in September 1932. After its closure, the Bauhaus was relegated to a Berlin telephone factory from late summer of 1932 until its final closure in 1933.[2] Even though the Bauhaus lasted less than 14 years, from 1919 to 1933, its extraordinary success not only in architecture but also in the crafts, furniture design, and education, made its name an icon of modernism. The functional, rational, and socialist aspects of its architectural style were thoroughly examined in Japan by Yamaguchi Bunzō and his counterparts (discussed in chapter 1) but the creative endeavor to transplant and transform Bauhaus principles into the fields of interior space, furniture, and pedagogy belonged to the next generation of architects and designers—the Yamawakis and Kurata Chikatada. These figures were largely indebted to the first generation of Japanese architects and critics, who brought back plentiful information about the Bauhaus and provided a ground to the Japanese

---

[1] English translation provided in Yamawaki Iwao, "Reminiscences of Dessau," *Design Issues* 2 (Autumn, 1985): 68.
[2] Margaret Kentgens-Craig, *The Bauhaus and America: The First Contacts, 1919-1936* (Cambridge, MA: 2001), 115.

Bauhaus movement. For the Yamawakis and Chikatada, the Bauhaus style was seen not just as an imported and imposed modernism from Europe but as a new way to develop creative consciousness that could be implemented into Japanese life and culture.

2.1 The First Japanese Visitors to the Bauhaus

Bauhaus principles first reached Tokyo via the first Japanese visitors to the Weimar Bauhaus. Records from 1922 and afterward document the first impressions of these visitors and prove how much they were captivated by the modern transformations in design and its pedagogy taking place there. In October 1922, art critic Nakada Sadanosuke (1888-1970) and architect Ishimoto Kikuji met Wassily Kandinsky and his wife at an exhibition held by Murayama Tomoyoshi at the Twardy art bookshop located in Berlin's Potsdamer Street. Kandinsky, who was then teaching at the Bauhaus, invited Nakada and Ishimoto to the Weimar Bauhaus the next month. Without having any prior information about the Bauhaus, Nakada later recalled:

> It was the first time that I heard about the National Bauhaus Institute in Weimar, the workplace of Kandinsky who was the founder of abstract painting and the father of New Art…. I did not have any preliminary

knowledge about the Bauhaus whatsoever. Kandinsky's talk at the Art Academy made me guess that it was some kind of art research institute.[3]

After the two returned to Japan in 1924, each published a number of articles in art magazines and newspapers sharing their knowledge about the Bauhaus. The first article by Ishimoto appeared in the Japanese architectural magazine *Kenchikuhu* in 1924.[4] It introduced Walter Gropius, the director of the Bauhaus, as one of the forerunners of modern architecture in Germany. Two years after Nakada and Ishimoto's visit, Japanese architects Ōuchi Shūichiro and Horiguchi Sutemi visited the Weimar Bauhaus in 1924 during their travels in Europe. With a letter of introduction from H. T. Wijdeveld, the editor of the art magazine *Wendingen* (1918-1932), they were able to schedule an appointment with Walter Gropius and with the Bauhaus master László Moholy-Nagy (1895-1946). Ōuchi's first impression of the waiting room at the Bauhaus shows his enthusiasm and excitement in encountering the Constructivist design for the first time:

The white doors located on the sidewalls were decorated with reliefs in constructivist design. The windows, placed in unexpected spots, were decorated with straight lines only. While sitting on the chairs in front of a

[3] Original text provided in Kawahata Naomichi, "Bauhausu no jitsujō: 1920-1930 nendai, nihonjin kenchikuka ni yoru bauhausu kenbunroku" [Realistic Images of the Bauhaus: 1920s-1930s, Memoirs of the Bauhaus by Japanese Architects], *Jutaku-kenchiku* 254 (May 1996): 19.

[4] Ishimoto wrote his personal impression about the new tendencies of European modern architecture, and highly praised Walter Gropius and the Weimar Bauhaus as one of the three principal agents (along with Bruno Taut and Hans Poelzig) behind major trends in German architecture. Naomichi, "Bauhausu no jitsujō," 19.

> huge desk, we were so amazed to see something which we had never seen before. The tubular light fixtures joined at a right angle resembled the shape of a box. The edges of the light were decorated with square wood painted in red, and even the electric cords were colored.[5]

Following their meeting with Gropius, they were guided through the rest of the school building. After viewing Walter Gropius's architectural work, they were excited to see on the wall reliefs by Oskar Schlemmer and photographs by Moholy-Nagy.[6] Like the earlier visitors Nakada and Ishimoto, Ōuchi published articles about Walter Gropius and the Bauhaus upon his return home, starting with the April 1925 issue of *Bunka no kisō* (The Fundamentals in Culture). His most significant publication was likely his translation of Gropius's thesis, "The Spiritual Development of Modern Architecture in Germany" in the architectural journal *Kenchiku shinchō*, 1925.[7] Another article from Horiguchi was published in *Kenchiku gahō* the following year. According to Horiguchi, he was impressed with the carefully orchestrated design of the director's office, which was a modern *Gesamtkunstwerk* painted in Kandinsky's color palette. The furniture—Constructivist tube lamps designed by Gropius, a tapestry designed by Johaness Itten, and the weaving workshop–made rug—highly impressed the Japanese architect. He

[5] Ōuchi Shūichiro, "Weimaru Bauhausu houmonki" [Visit to the Weimar Bauhaus], *Kenchiku jidai* 2 (1929) (special issue on the Bauhaus).
[6] Kawahata Naomichi, "Bauhausu no jitsujō," 19.
[7] In addition to these publications, an article about the Bauhaus director Walter Gropius was published with the title "About Walter Gropius" in the March issue of 1925 *Kenchiku-shinchō*. Furthermore, the article in the October issue of *Asahi Camera* (1926) was titled "The New Tendency of Photography—Recent Works of Moholy Nagy." Another article in the January issue *Kōgei jidai* (1927), titled "Talking about the Bauhaus," presented the Bauhaus in the form of a simple conversation.

paid special attention to Moholy-Nagy's photograms, which he felt showed an "Asian disposition" that originated, he thought, from the large Asian Mongol influence on Hungary, where Moholy-Nagy was born and educated.[8]

The experiences at the Weimar Bauhaus were published in detail by Japanese journals. Excited by the new institution and their activities, a couple of other Japanese architects traveled to visit the Bauhaus, which had moved to Dessau in 1925. The Japanese architects were especially interested in seeing the main building of the Dessau Bauhaus, which had been designed by Walter Gropius. The main building in a clear, cubic form, was covered with colossal glass windows that made the entire façade transparent. Construction of the building began in September 1925 and was completed in March 1926, which was right before Japanese architect Yoshida Kaoru visited the Bauhaus in Dessau. Yoshida met Gropius while he was pursuing his studies at the Institute of Technology in Dresden. After his return to Japan, Yoshida published an important photograph showing the Bauhaus school under construction in the November 1929 issue of *Kenchiku shinchō* (Fig. 38). He said of Walter Gropius:

> After waiting a little while, I was guided through the office of Mr. Walter Gropius, the leader of the new architecture movement…. He started to answer my questions with great warmth and patience. I could not understand him fully due to my limited language skills, but the main point of his argument was, "In the future, architecture needs to be more intimately

[8] Oshima, International Architecture in Interwar Japan, 59-60.

harmonized with technology," thus stressing the necessity of "standardization" in architecture.[9]

The November 1929 issue of *Kenchiku shinchō* was a special issue about the Bauhaus and so included not only Yoshida's impression about Walter Gropius, but also much other information.[10] In the illustration section (Fig. 39), two photos of the Dessau Bauhaus titled "New Architecture from the Bauhaus in Dessau (lower right of Fig. 39)" followed the image of the construction plan of a small store by Joseph Albers (lower left of Fig. 39). With twelve pages of illustrations, including images of architectural plans, stage design, theaters, and the Siedlung designed by Walter Gropius, this issue was the first complete overview of the Bauhaus for a Japanese audience. A forty-one-page article by Kawakita Renshichirō was the main feature in this issue.[11] In his essay, Kawakita designated Bauhaus as Western Constructivism (*koseishugi)* and said its ultimate goal was to be a *Gesamtkunstwerk*, a totalizing aesthetic unity through which all the arts were integrated for the benefit of humanity. The translation of Gropius's statement of International Architecture was included, and Kawakita thoroughly introduced and incisively analyzed for his Japanese audience the overall concept of the Bauhaus, its innovative curriculum, and the activities of its teachers and students.[12] Around 1928, the architect Makino Masami visited the Dessau Bauhaus and published an article titled "Bauhaus Dessau" in the

[9] Yoshida Kaoru, "Dessau houmonki" [Visit to Dessau], *Kenchiku-shinchō* 11 (November, 1929): 191.
[10] Ibid., 191-194.
[11] Kawakita Renshichirō, "Bauhausu kaikan" [Overview of the Bauhaus], *Kenchiku-shinchō* 11 (November 1929): 149-190.
[12] Ibid.

November 1929 issue of *Kenchiku Kigen*, a special edition dedicated to the Bauhaus.[13] Comprehensive treatment of Bauhaus and its principles were known through the media, which presented illustrations, articles, and architectural prints, and effectively educated Japanese modern architects about the Bauhaus, its methods, styles, and aspirations.

Kawakita Renshichirō was a good example of a Japanese architect who not only published about Constructivism, but depended upon publications, as well as visitors' reports, for what he knew of it. His work shows the symbiotic relationship between Japanese both abroad and home, and the role of publishing. A graduate of the architecture department of the former Tokyo Technical High School, Kawakita entered the profession and entered his work in exhibitions. In 1927, at the sixth exhibition of the Bunriha, Kawakita was awarded first prize for his work *Construction of a Music Chapel* whereupon he became a select active member of the Bunriha. In 1930, he won fourth place in an international competition held in Ukraine, known as highly competitive even among European architects.

As a member of the Bunriha, Kawakita knew Nakada Sadanosuke, who had been the first Japanese visitor at the Bauhaus and who familiarized him with the principles of Bauhaus education, through both anecdotes and books brought back from Germany. Another Bunriha member, Horiguchi Sutemi, who visited the Bauhaus after Nakada, provided Kawakita additional information about the Bauhaus.

[13] Unfortunately, the special issue of the Bauhuas in *Kenchiku kigen* was not available in the libraries in Tokyo. The image of the front page of the special issue has been published in several secondary sources.

Kawakita also kept a close relationship with Mizutani Takehiko, the first Japanese student enrolled at the Dessau Bauhaus.

When the journal *Kenchiku shinchō* was discontinued in August 1931, Kawakita launched a monthly architecture magazine called *Kenchiku Kōgei—I See All* [Architecture and Crafts—I See All]. Kawakita announced that he alone wrote, translated, edited, and revised this journal, and remarked about his editing policy:

> Apart from the previous architecture and crafts magazines, which had only prosaic articles in them, I thought about a way to make a contemporary organizational research environment in which the reader and journalist could work together. I would call this magazine a new type of lecture note rather than just an ordinary magazine. I wish teachers would use this at their schools.'[14]

Kawakita's journal took the form either of an architecture lecture or of documentation that functioned like reference material for the convenient use of entrepreneurs or students.[15] On the inside front cover, his manifesto could not be overlooked:

> "I See All: The Entrance Room"

---

[14] Kenichi Katsumura, "Bauhausu to Nihon to Dezain Kyōiku (7)" [Bauhaus, Japan, and Design Education], *Ōtsuki-tandai Ronshū* 10 (March 1979): 137-153.

[15] Muramatsu Teijirō praised this magazine in his book *Nihon Kenchiku San Myaku*: "*I see all* was a solo magazine by Kawakita, and the content was unique. Either way, the overwhelming energy was in there……In *I see all,* the sharp perception of a reformist was part of the distinctiveness of this magazine. The cleverness of drawing attention of people, specificity, and the usage of lots of visual and formative elements, and every important point of the theory came from the 'Spiritual Stylist' Kawakita." Cited in Katsumura, "Bauhausu to Nihon to Dezain Kyōiku (7)," 140.

- Today, all over the world, the age of technology has begun.
- We are striving hard to combine skillfully all of the arts and sciences.
- We encompass architecture and crafts, and must appeal to the common people with this new combination of the arts and sciences.
- In the instruction of new architecture and crafts, we take absolutely no notice of difficult and devious expressions and arithmetic equations; we pursue easy-to-understand diagrammatic methods. We have been completely liberated from the old shackles, and are as free as the open air.[16]

In tone and substance, this forthright manifesto kept with one Gropius created for the Weimar Bauhaus in 1923. Kawakita's version emcompasses a combination of architecture and crafts, and arts and sciences in the technological age, a synthesis that recalls Gropius's exhibition slogans "Art and Crafts: A New Unity (1919)," and "Art and Technology: A New Unity (1923)." Other Japanese architects and educators who visited the German Bauhaus or encountered publications about the Bauhaus movement were very passionate to learn, imitate, adjust, and advance the principles of the German Bauhaus into Japan. Furthermore, they provided a firm platform for the next generation—including Yamawaki Iwao and Kurata Chikatada—who would enthusiastically transform and localize the principles of Bauhaus design to challenge the traditional conventions of Japanese living spaces and furniture.

[16] English translation from Izutsu Akio, The Bauhaus: A Japanese Perspective and a Profile of Hans and Florence Schust Knoll (Tokyo: Kajima Institute, 1992), 28.

2.2 Japanese Students at the Bauhaus: Yamawaki Iwao and Yamawaki Michiko

Yamawaki Iwao (1898-1987, also known as Fujita Iwao) was born in Nagasaki in 1898. He studied architecture at the Tokyo School of Fine Arts from 1921 to 1926. After his graduation (Fig. 39), he joined the design department of Yokogawa Construction Company. The same year, he joined the avant-garde artist group *Tan'i sanka,*' where he met the art critic Nakada Sadanosuke (1888-1970). As mentioned earlier, Nakada was one of the first visitors to the Weimar Bauhaus, in 1922. He was also influential in motivating other members of the *Tan'i sanka* such as Yamaguchi Bunzō to visit Germany, and, instructing him in Bauhaus modernism, he encouraged Yamawaki Iwao also to make a visit. Yamawaki soon noted the discrepancy between the new architectural trends in Germany and the decorative construction style that was practiced at the Yokohama Construction Company. As a result, he began thinking seriously of studying abroad at the Bauhaus.[17] In 1928, Iwao married the eldest daughter of Yamawaki Zengorō, Yamawaki Michiko. This marriage was an arranged one, and Iwao became a son-in-law of the wealthy Yamawaki family through this marriage. As a condition of the marriage, Yamawaki suggested to Yamawaki Zengorō, his father-in-law, to support his wife and him for a study-abroad program at the Bauhaus after the wedding. As Michiko also was not against Iwao's idea, their departure to the Bauhaus was announced at their wedding reception. With the financial support of their family, Yamawaki Iwao and his wife Michiko departed Japan from Yokohama in May 1930 and arrived in Germany in

[17] Kawahata Naomichi, *Nihonjin no Bauhausler, Yamawaki Iwao·Michiko,* in *Bauhaus 1919-1933,* exh. cat. (Tokyo: Sezon Museum of Art, 1995), 328.

August.[18] They matriculated at the Dessau Bauhaus that October as the 469th and the 470th student (Fig. 40). Their matriculation was three years after that of Mizutani Takehiko, the first Japanese student to enrol at the Dessau Bauhaus in April 1927 (Fig. 41).[19] Since Mizutani graduated in April 1929, he and the Yamawakis did not meet each other.

When the Yamawakis arrived, the Dessau Bauhaus was undergoing a dramatic change in the directorship. Hannes Meyer had been driven from his position for political reasons, and Mies van der Rohe (1886-1969) was appointed the new director for a five-year term beginning August 5, 1930. The first encounter between Mies and the left-wing students is described as a disaster, and the police expelled twenty of the rebellious Bauhaus students.[20] Meyer had already initiated a process intended to make the Bauhaus an architectural school, and Mies had no choice other than to continue the policies of his predecessor, against whom he had had no strong feelings. Yamawaki expressed his sentiments in a letter written to a friend about the time when Meyer was forced to resign and Mies assumed his position:

> When the new director, Mr. Mies van der Rohe, was recently appointed, he provoked considerable criticism from the student body for calling each

---

[18] Michiko Yamawaki, *Bauhausu to cha no yu* [Bauhaus and the Tea Ceremony] (Tokyo: Shinchōsha, 1995), 15-30.

[19] Mizutani graduated from architecture department at the Tokyo School of Fine Arts in March 1921 and taught at the same school until his departure to Germany in 1926. He arrived in Berlin in July 1926. He studied first at the Reomann School of Art for six months. After visiting the Dessau Bauhaus for the first time in September 1926, he was impressed and applied to the Bauhaus in Februrary 1927. He was accepted and enrolled as the 150th student in April 1927. Petra Ruick, "Takehiko Mizutani's Years at the Bauhaus Dessau: Study on the Bauhaus and Takehiko Mizutani (1)," *Nihon kenchiku gakkai keikaku kei ronbunshū* 599 (January 2006): 158.

[20] Jean-Louis Cohen, *Ludwig Mies van der Rohe* (Basel: Birkhäuser Verlag AG, 2007), 85.

> student into his room and reciting his personal aspirations, instead of giving an official address. It seems to me that he took an extremely passive approach. Perhaps it was because, in conjunction with the resignation of Hannes Meyer, a number of students who had been ill-regarded had been removed by the city. Many were sympathetic toward them, and so for a time Mies was needlessly keeping the students at a distance. But even that disappeared as the days went by.[21]

Iwao had been admitted as a full-time student because he fulfilled the requirements of the institute through his impressive resume and a rich portfolio he had compiled while working at the Yokohama Construction Company. Michiko was admitted at the same time. However, her enrollment was only conditional since she had no experience in the fundamentals of plastic art and had not prepared any figurative artwork portfolios for submission, which was a requirement for all incoming students at the Bauhaus.[22]

During their stay in Dessau, the classes they took became significant sources of inspiration for their teaching career after they returned to Japan. They participated in classes such as "Material and Composition," and "Description of Material Quality" directed by Joseph Albers (1888-1976); "Fundamental Elements of Form" and "Analytical Drawing" taught by Wassily Kandinsky; "Rhetoric" instructed by Joost Schmidt (1893–1948), and 'Psychology' taught by Karlfried Graf Dürckheim (1896–

[21] Yamawaki Iwao, "Reminiscenes of Dessau," *Design Issues* 2 (Fall 1985): 62.
[22] Ibid., 57.

1988).[23] Among these teachers, Joseph Albers and Wassily Kandinsky taught the basic art courses offered at the Bauhaus. The preliminary course, which was a series of studies of nature and materials, including color and form theory, was taught by three teachers at the Bauhaus: Swiss painter Johaness Itten (1888-1967), German artist Joseph Albers, and Hungarian artist László Moholy-Nagy (1895-1946). Joseph Albers was a primary school teacher when he enrolled as a student at the Bauhaus in 1920. He took the preliminary course from Johaness Itten (1888-1967), a Swiss Expressionist painter and art teacher who created the initial curriculum for this course but who had left in 1925. Gropius appointed Albers to teach the prelimilary course along with Hungarian artist László Moholy-Nagy (1895-1946).[24] When Moholy-Nagy left the Bauhaus with Gropius in 1928, Albers became the official head of the preliminary course. Wassily Kandinsky was appointed as the teacher of the Bauhaus in 1922 and stayed until its closure. At the Weimar Bauhaus, he was the head of the wall-painting workshop and he taught the color theory classes as part of the preliminary course. At the Dessau Bauhaus, Kandinksy taught classes on analytical drawing, abstract form elements, and the colours class. Together with Paul Klee, he became from 1927 the head of a newly established series of free painting classes.

Yamawaki studied interior design and, informally, architecture, while also taking courses in photography from Walter Peterhans. He was especially interested

---

[23] Kawahata Naomichi, *Nihonjin no Bauhausler, Yamawaki Iwao·Michiko* [Japanese Bauhausler, Yamawaki Iwao and Michiko]*,* in *Bauhaus 1919-1933,* exh. cat. (Tokyo: Sezon Museum of Art, 1995), 328.

[24] Albers taught the class with László Moholy-Nagy until the latter left the Bauhaus in 1928. From 1928 until the closure of the Bauhaus, Albers continued teaching this class as the only head of the preliminary course.

in practicing photomontage along with his fellow student Kurt Kranz, whom Iwao invited to Japan after World War II.

Iwao was especially interested in Kandinsky's course "Analytical Drawing," and did not miss a single class. Michiko recalled in her autobiography, *Bauhausu to Chanoyū* [The Bauhaus and the Tea Ceremony], that after each class, Kandinsky was kind enough to deliver a short summary of his lecture in English to the two Japanese students, whose German was far from fluent. Her husband respected Kandinsky very much even before they took his class, and she was deeply impressed by Kandinsky's course.[25] Yamawaki Iwao kept a sketchbook with him on which Kandinsky himself drew a study illustration of tension.

In the analytical drawing class, Kandinsky's goal was to provide students with a presentation of the laws that govern the tensions (*Spannungen*) that can be discovered in given objects and of their logical construction—an exercise in clearly observing and reproducing relationships.[26] Kandinsky explained that the fundamentals of drawing and the plastic elements are in a constant relationship to each other, and this relationship is recognized in the tensions (*Spannungen*) that constitute the inner force of the elements.[27] During the course, Kandinsky trained the students to construct a still life not by depending on the outward appearance of the object but rather by depicting the tensions of forces in it.[28] Kandinsky described the analytical drawing process:

---

[25] Yamawaki Michiko, *Bauhausu to cha no yu*, 39-40.
[26] Wassily Kandinsky, "Analytical Drawing," in *Complete Writings on Art*, ed. Kenneth C. Lindsay and Peter Vergo (Boston: G.K. Hall, 1982), 729.
[27] Norbert M. Schmitz, "Teaching by Wassily Kandinsky and Paul Klee," in *Bauhaus,* ed. Jeanne Fiedler and Peter Feierabend (Potsdam: H.F. Fullmann, 2006), 382-391.
[28] Ibid., 436-437.

From the start the students themselves select their own still-lifes. The first tasks of analytical drawing are: 1. to subordinate the whole complex to one simple overall form, which, within the limits determined by the student himself, must be precisely drawn in. 2. to realize the formal characterization of individual parts of the still-life, regarded both in isolation and in relation to other parts 3. to represent the whole construction by means of the most concise possible schema.

Second-level exercise: 1. Making clear the tension discovered in the structure, which are to be represented by means of linear forms. 2. Emphasizing the principal tensions by means of broader lines, or, subsequently, colors. 3. Indicating the structural grid by means of starting or focal points (dotted lines). (Fig. 42)

Third level: 1. Objects are regarded exclusively in terms of tension between forces, and the construction limits itself to complexes of lines. 2. Variety of structural possibilities: clear and concealed construction. 3. Exercises in the utmost simplification of the overall complex and of the individual tensions—concise, exact expression.[29]

In Yamawaki Iwao's study drawing from Kandinsky's course (Fig. 43), he follows Kandinsky's instructions and simplifies the object into simple geometrical

[29] Ibid., 729.

forms while indicating the direction of tension between the lines and planes of the object through the use of small red arrows. Whether he was referencing a specific still life is impossible to ascertain as he did not write any title, and the forms themselves were simplified. Compared to the simple drawings of lines and planes by Yamawaki Iwao, Yamawaki Michiko laid out a more complex composition of objects than Iwao by showing objects, probably put onto a desk (Fig. 44). Michiko tried to reach the third level of Kandinsky's instructions and thereby draw the various directions of tension that are created between the linear forms of the objects.

Both Yamawakis took the preliminary course taught by Joseph Albers. By having his students explore the characteristics of contemporary materials, Albers compelled them to undergo sensory experiences of such everyday materials as paper, wood, glass, and metal. He wished to open the students up to economical and creative contact with the potential and the necessary flexibility of contemporary elements.[30] Yamawaki seemed not to be much impressed with this course, as he mentioned in one of his later interviews.[31] In that interview, he admitted that he was already an advanced architect when he entered the Bauhaus, and he did not feel much enthusiasm in going back to learn the fundamental principles and rediscover the quality of the materials. The reason for his dislike can be also inferred by looking at the political circumstances at the Bauhaus. When the Yamawakis took it, the leftist

[30] Norbert M. Schmitz, "The Preliminary Course under Josef Albers-Creativity School," in Fiedler and Feierabend, *Bauhaus,* 374-381.
[31] Kawahata, "Nihonjin no Bauhausler," 328.

radical students were demanding the abolition of the preliminary course by Kandinsky and Albers.[32]

Even though Yamawaki Iwao disliked the preliminary course, Yamawaki Michiko became keenly interested in Albers's class. In her later autobiography, Michiko addressed the fact that she found characteristics of the Bauhaus and of the Japanese tea ceremony comparable.[33]

For example, Albers was concerned throughout the class about training the students to produce designs that were suitable for practical tasks and displayed simplicity of form. Michiko found methods of learning the fundamental characteristics of each contemporary building material similar to the production of the ceramics and lacquer work found in the traditional Japanese tea ceremony, which she learned from her father before she married Yamawaki Iwao. Yamawaki Michiko recalled:

> I was born and educated in a tea-making culture. At the time I was making tea, I did not even know that I would eventually study at the Bauhaus. The learning at the Bauhaus compares with the procedure of boiling water for tea. It may not sound appropriate, but I think both are similar because they both value the fundamental characteristics of material. When I thought learning at

[32] The Communist students at the Dessau Bauhaus disparaged the elementary learning of materials as well as the treatment of drawing as "formalism," and they were unable to interpret it within the context of materialism. Therefore, the students sent a letter to the dean's office and demanded the abolition of the preliminary course and its replacement with a first-semester workshop. They also asked to establish a course in the theory of history developed on social and materialistic principles. The classes by Kandinsky and Albers were criticized in this way throughout the last years in Dessau. Wingler, *Bauhaus*, 172.
[33] Yamawaki, *Bauhausu to cha no yu*, 50-62.

the Bauhaus was similar to the tea making ceremony, I felt much encouraged.[34]

What I have learned from the Bauhaus was the "way of viewing objects." Through the studies of the materials, I was able to recognize the beauty of it. After you find out the characteristics and the composition of the material, you can think about for what purpose you want to use that material. Within this perspective, you will be able to view any kinds of objects, regardless of whether it is architecture, interior, sculpture, painting, utensil, or clothing. You need appreciation, theory, and skills to learn how to view objects. This way of viewing objects is applicable to the Japanese tea ceremony…

In the tea ceremony, you understand the materials through your hands when you prepare the clay or plait the bamboo to make the tools for the tea ceremony. This is similar to the lesson you learn from the Bauhaus—you understand the material by appreciating the object. In Kandinsky's and Alber's preliminary courses, you learn fundamental composition or color, which will lead you naturally to the master level. This rational curriculum resembles the procedure of boiling water for the tea ceremony.[35]

Yamawaki Michiko's ingenious connection between the Japanese tea ceremony and the process of apprectiating a modern object from Kandinsky's and Alber's preliminary courses is an excellent example of how Constructivism could be

[34] Ibid., 45.
[35] Ibid., 146-148.

combined with *Japonisme*. She would continue to intertwine elements of Japanese culture and Bauhaus modernism after she returned to Japan.

In March 1931, the Yamawakis presented the work they produced in the preliminary course at the end-of-the-semester exhibition (Fig. 45). Because of the caliber of their submissions, they received permission to continue their studies at the Bauhaus. Iwao was accepted in the architecture and interior design department and Michiko was finally admitted to the weaving workshop.[36] At the time of Michiko's admission, Gunta Stözl was the head of the weaving workshop, just before Lilly Reich took it over, in January 1932. Under the instructions of Ludwig Mies van der Rohe ("Mies"), each workshop was asked to produce models that could be mass-produced and ready to purchase, and the leaders of the growing industries began to collaborate with the Bauhaus designers. Following Mies's ideas, Stözl found a way to make the handmade weaving works suitable for mass production by securing a contract between the weaving workshop and the Polytextil Company Berlin in 1930. The contract stipulated that the company would produce and market fabrics from the weaving workshop designs under the label "Bauhaus Dessau." Through this business relationship, the students were pleased to get the opportunity to become involved in every stage of industrial production, and they were grateful to use the opportunity to secure positions after graduation. After the students presented their experimental works twice each month, the teachers selected the final samples for production.

[36] Kawahata, "Nihonjin no Bauhausler," 328.

Michiko was excited to see her designs manufactured, and she enthusiastically introduced this idea to Japan upon her return.[37]

The architecture and interior workshop, which was Iwao's department, was led by Mies. In the workshop, he required students to design courtyard houses and to complete their designs through a long succession of sketches. While working with Mies, they used the skills acquired in building technique and functional design as a platform for more abstract, ideal design tasks involving judgment of proportions, material combinations, and spatial relationships. Student projects served to introduce a system capable of uniting house and garden as a new way of living. In uniting house and garden, architecture and nature—combinations that can be seen in his Barcelona Pavilion (1929, Fig. 46) and in Farnsworth House in Plano, Illinois (1951, Fig. 47)—Mies sought to elevate technologies' domination of nature by designing spaces for human intellectual and spiritual life. Iwao echoed Mies's emphasis on uniting house and garden, and employed these ideas in his own architectural work later on.

During his final year, Yamawaki Iwao, as an advanced architect, disliked participation in the curriculum of the architecture department, since it was more focused on fundamental training rather than actual architectural planning. No drawings of his architectural work survive from this period of study except for a few analytical drawing studies (Fig. 48). His studies of spiral stairs, perspective, and furniture are extant, but none of his theoretical writings on major architectural designs remain. His disappointment with Mies's course in the Dessau Bauhaus

[37] Ibid.

soured his interest in architecture in general, and he turned his attention ever more toward photography and photomontage. He happily took the photography class taught by Walter Peterhans. Although he learned from Walter Peterhans, his photography better demonstrated Moholy-Nagy's concept of a "new way of seeing," reflecting an emphasis on light-and-dark contrast and unusual perspectives.[38] In Iwao's exemplary "Bauhaus Building Dessau" (Fig. 49) and additional photographs without titles (Fig. 50), buildings are seen from unconventional perspectives that heighten their diagonal, often geometric and almost abstractly constructed forms. Furthermore, when Iwao photographed his colleagues at the Bauhaus, he used minimal depth of focus, while emphasizing a stark contrast of dark shadow and light, and often portrayed his subjects with closed eyes or else looking into the distance.

During their stay at the Bauhaus, the Yamawakis made many trips to Berlin, Moscow, and Amsterdam, and Iwao took many pictures of significant modern architectural buildings with the likely intention of using them to illustrate his papers that would be published in Japanese architectural journals. The Yamawakis remained there until the institute was dissolved in January 1932 under political pressure from the Nazis. Afterward, they moved to London with some other Bauhaus teachers and students before they returned to Japan in June 1932.

Even though as an advanced architect Yamawaki Iwao did not like to attend the preliminary courses, he considered the Bauhaus teaching philosophy an ideal international educational model, and he endeavored to import it to Japan. When they returned to Tokyo in 1932, the art critic and educator Kawakita Renshichirō (see

[38] Katherine C. Ware, "Photography at the Bauhaus," in Fiedler and Feierabend, *Bauhaus* (Potsdam: H. Fullmann, 2009), 518-519.

chap. 2.1 above), who was one of those responsible for implementing Bauhaus education in the primary schools and architectural institutes in Japan, asked them to teach the preliminary courses at the newly founded Institute of New Architecture and Industrial Arts, Ginza (renamed Ginza New Architectural Arts Academy in May 1933). This academy settled on the third floor of the Mitsuki Building, Ginza. Kawakita became the head of the formative education department, and by inviting Yamawaki Iwao and Yamawaki Michiko to teach, he intended to instill courses modeled after the preliminary courses at the Bauhaus.

Later, Yamawaki Iwao and Michiko promoted Bauhaus-derived theories through their lectures at other schools and universities, including *Jiyūugakuen* Industrial Arts Research Center, the Imperial Art School (today, the Musashino Art University), Tokyo Teachers Training College, Tokyo University of Education, and the Faculty of Arts at Nihon University.[39]

[39] Izutsu, *Bauhaus,* 33.

2.3 Modern Living Styles: Housing and Interior Design of Yamawaki Iwao

One of the challenges for Japanese architects and designers at the beginning of the 1920s was to design the interiors of newly built Japanese residences. The discussion about whether to accept the national style, a Western one, or both, had become an issue in everyday Japanese life. The interior and furnishings of public architectural buildings were constructed based on Western lifestyles with chairs and tables, and the adaptation brought no complications. The problems emerged with the construction of Western-style residences for middle-class citizens, since the majority of the houses in Tokyo utilized the Japanese traditional *tatami* flooring. A domestic lifestyle based on tables and chairs was not immediately accepted, despite other changes, such as the relatively quick adoption of Western-style clothing from the beginning of the Meiji period. An illustration by Kitazawa Rakuten included in the caption the lament "The Japanese People's Double Life: When the architecture is pure Japanese in construction only the master's clothing and the chair and table are Western style. No wonder there's confusion about whether to use Japanese or Western etiquette" (Fig. 51).[40] In a room with Japanese sliding doors and a Western-style carpet on the floor instead of *tatami* flooring, the woman is depicted wearing Japanese dress and greeting the host in a Japanese manner. The host, dressed in a Western suit, looks confused and tries to bow to the women while standing up from his Western chair.

The opportunities to synthesize both Japanese and Western culture in private residences became apparent among the members of the Bunriha from the mid-1920s.

[40] Kitazawa Rakuten, *Jiji manga* 20 (June 26, 1921).

For example, the Czech modernist architect Antonin Raymond (1888-1976), who was active in Japan from the early 1920s, designed his own house in Reinanzaka, Azabu, Tokyo (1923-26, Fig. 52) with exposed reinforced concrete walls and rectilinear silhouettes.[41] He used concrete for the three-level integral frame and wall structure and used oak for the floors instead of *tatami*.[42] The construction of an earthquake-proof structure with reinforced concrete throughout was sensational at this time, considering the fact that the G.T. Rietveld's Schroeder House (1924, Fig. 53) in Utrecht was made merely out of wood and plastered brick.[43] At the same time, Raymond integrated Japanese motifs by using Japanese folding screens to partition the living-dining room space and circular garden openings.[44]

Yamawaki proposed creative concepts of modern living designs for the Japanese that were reflected in their housing projects, interior design, and furniture design. In March 1932, almost a year after returning to Japan, Yamawaki established his own architectural firm, the Iwao Yamawaki Architecture Association, in Tokyo. Instead of competing for public plans commissioned by the government, as did the

---

[41] David B. Stewart, *The Making of a Modern Japanese Architecture: 1868 to the Present* (Tokyo: Kodansha International, 1987), 101.
[42] Ken Tadashi Oshima, "Constructed Natures of Modern Architecture in Japan 1920-1940: Yamada Mamoru, Horiguchi Sutemi, and Antonin Raymond," Ph.D. diss. (New York: Colmubia University, 2003), 169.
[43] Stewart, *Making,* 105.
[44] Oshima, "Constructed Natures," 166-170.

Bunriha architects Horiguchi Sutemi or Ishimoto Kikuji, Iwao founded his practice on the design of residential houses, ateliers, and furniture.[45]

Iwao's most significant architectural work was the atelier (Fig. 54) he planned and constructed for his close friend Migishi Kotaro, who was well known in Japan as a Surrealist artist. Immediately upon his return from Germany, Iwao renewed his old friendship with Migishi Kotaro, whom he ran into at an art exhibition at the Asahi newspaper gallery in Tokyo. At the art exhibition, Migishi told Yamawaki Iwao that he was planning to build a new studio-home and requested him to be its designer. According toYamawaki, the consultation about the construction of the atelier began in March 1934. In one of his later interviews, Migishi recalled:

> I am thinking of constructing an atelier on this free land. I was thinking about glass architecture, so I requested Yamawaki for the design. At the beginning, I planned to use reinforced concrete, which has the tensile strength like the bow to have durability to sustain the weight. But I stopped it because of the cost, but the construction began anyway. If we use the steel frames, they would match with the architecture, but they were unexpectedly heavy. The chrome plates of the steel pipe appear modern and intellectual."[46]

---

[45] Iwao's business conducted a number of other prestigious projects that drew from his Constructivist background. For the New York World's Fair held in 1939, he participated in the design of the Japanese pavilion. In this project, he used photomontage to decorate the walls. In 1950, he was able to pay tribute to the Bauhaus when he designed the Gropius and the Bauhaus exhibition in Tokyo, which was one of the first large-scale exhibitions ever held in Japan (see below, Conlusion). Iwao's architectural firm stayed in business until 1971.

[46] Takumi Hideo, *Migishi kōtarō: Shōwa yōgashi eno joshō* [Migishi Kotaro's Introduction to the History of Yoga Painting in the Showa Period] (Sapporo: Hokkaidōritsubijutsukan, 1968).

Migishi made some conceptual sketches for his atelier, which he dreamed of as a new "place for life and creation.[47]" He requested a spiral staircase so that he could see his own paintings while descending to the working place on the ground floor. Also, Migishi wished to have a small fountain in front of the glass walls so that the lotus flowers he cultivated would be reflected through the glass walls onto the white ceiling. Because Migishi's concept for his studies was frequently in flux, Iwao had to draw several blueprints to capture Migishi's ideas as well as to accommodate the limited budget. Migishi was deeply interested in Le Corbusier's avant-garde architectural theory, and he requested from Yamawaki a purist design for his atelier. His familiarity with Corbusier's work and his awareness of Bauhaus designs fostered a good aesthetic bond between patron and architect. It also resulted in a final design (Fig. 54) that was reminiscent of the housing complex designed by Walter Gropius for the Bauhaus teachers in Dessau in 1925 (Fig. 55), and of the glass walls of the Dessau Bauhaus school building. With the simplified geometrical block-shaped white walls, glass, gleaming metal, simple structures, and spiral stairs, it was indeed modeled in a cubic form, consistent with the styles of Mies van der Rohe and that of Le Corbusier. The flat-roofs, the geometric composition of forms, the straightforward structures, and the reinforced concrete express a loose interpretation of the Bauhaus Constructivist style. Iwao's general design principles were not simply European imports, for they drew on the long tradition of residential building

[47] *Migishi Kōtarō ten: Seitan 100-nen kinen* [Migishi Kotaro: The Centennial Anniversary of His Birth], exh. cat. (Tokyo: Tokyo Shinbun, 2003), 144.

practices in Japan. Whereas Gropius and other Bauhaus architects had oriented most of their dwellings (such as the houses for the teachers) east-west to bring morning sunlight to the bedroom and afternoon sun to the living rooms,[48] Iwao took into account customary living styles in Tokyo by orienting room openings to the south in order to maximize sun exposure during summer.

On July 1, 1934, just a couple of days before the framework raising ceremony, Migishi died from a worsening of a stomach ulcer while on a trip to Nagoya.[49] Migishi's atelier, which was completed in October 1934, still stands in Nakanoku, Tokyo.[50]

In an article published in *Jutaku*, 1936, titled "Kyoshitsu no saikin keikō" [Recent Trends of the Living Room], Iwao suggested to his Japanese audience that the living room should be understood not as an import of the Western tradition, but rather as a Japanese living space that allowed functionality, flexibility, and hygiene:

> A new living room should not be a room that simply follows the Western style. Even though it can be used for Japanese leisure, you are asked to use appropriate equipment and furniture for a modern type of living. The living room should be a big and flexible open space that allows functionality and hygiene. It should have multiple functions—it should be a resting room, a dining room, and also a living room at the same time. Instead of this type of

[48] Wingler, *Bauhaus,* 412.
[49] He was only 31 years old when he died, and a retrospective exhibition was held at the atelier in October 1934, commissioned by his wife Setsuko. *Migishi Kōtarō ten*, 144, 201.
[50] The full address of Migishi's studio is "Tokyo nakanoku saginomiya 5 chome 407 banchi (東京中野区鷺宮5丁目407番地)."

> living room, Japanese people gathered in a space in which the tea ceremony took place for a long time. The flexibility of this living room is critical. For example, if you want to use the living room as a reception room, you have to decorate a part of the living room as a reception room. If you want to use the living room both as a living room and a dining room, you have to consider the connection with the kitchen sink so that you won't encounter any major problems. As a living room, you need to make it a space where the family can rest, gather, and leave without having any difficulties.[51]

His concept of the open living space was established through his T-shaped ground floor plan in his personal residence (built in 1934 and located in Meguro-ku, Komaba-cho, Tokyo, exterior – Fig, 3. floor plan – Fig. 56). The ground floor of his house was an open space that functioned at once as living room, dining room, guest room, and kitchen (Fig. 57). The steel I-beams (Fig, 56 and bottom image, Fig. 57) and the foldable and removable furniture in the middle of the room, which served as partitions, created flexibility in the layout. By moving the partitions, the space could be used for other purposes. Like Migishi's studio, the floor-to-ceiling glass window (top image, Fig. 57) oriented toward the garden on the south opened up the living space into the garden. During summer, the center of the living room could be moved north to create shade, and during winter the center of the living room could be moved south. Even though the overall design concept derived from the West,

[51] Yamawaki Iwao, "Kyoshitsu no saikin keikō" [Recent Trends of the Living Room] *Jutaku* 21 (May 1936): 336-340.

Yamawaki accommodated the floor-seated culture of the Japanese people by lowering the height of the ceiling and the furniture.

Yamawaki's Constructivist designs for Migishi Kotaro and his own residence, which are only two examples of his extensive private housing projects, manifested the evolution of modern Japanese houses in Tokyo during the 1930s. Although he tended to follow the customary Japanese orientation of rooms and the floor-seated lifestyle, he nonetheless challenged the traditions of Japanese conventional living spaces, and incorporated new geometrical, hygienic, and rational elements, exemplified by the use of glass windows and geometrical block-shaped buildings and furniture. As a Japanese modernist, Iwao tried to make modernism a continuation of traditional architecture and design and not a break with the past. This position differed from the approach adopted by Yamaguchi Bunzō and the members of the Bunriha and the Sōusha, who much favored both the theoretical and physical changes offered by rationalist and functionalist features of modernism in order to break through and demolish the tradition-bound architecture of the past.

2.4 The Pioneers of Modern Furniture Design: The Keiji Kōbō

The Keiji Kōbō (1928-1940) was a furniture worshop that aimed to create a design that would exemplify rationalization of production through standard types of Western-style furniture. The members aimed to mass-produce for the Japanese marketplace furniture with a reasonable price, targeting Japanese middle-class workers, especially housewives, as customers. The group was formed among the teachers and graduates associated with the Tokyo High School of Industrial Arts (Tokyo Kōtō Kōgei Gakkō, now the Engineering and Industrial Design Department of Chiba University). Starting from spring 1928, when he was a teacher at the Tokyo High School of Industrial Arts, Kurata Chikatada (Fig. 58) organized a small group of students and a few architects and designers to meet regularly on Wednesdays in his small apartment built by the Dōjunkai Corporation at Daikanyama, Shibuya, Tokyo (Fig. 59).[52] Matsumoto Masao, a student who took the interior design course at the crafts and design department at the Tokyo High School of Industrial Arts, recalled that the majority of the members were originally students in his class. According to him, they gathered at Kurata's apartment after school to further discuss the possibilities of collaborating on new designs for products used in daily life or interior spaces. The activities of the Deutsche Werkbund (German Association of Craftsmen), which was an association founded in 1907 to raise the "standard of

[52] The people gathered in his apartment in spring 1927 were Okawa Kōzō (Mitsuzō), Ikebe Yoshiatsu, Suzuki Tarō, Moria Isao, Ikeda Sanshirō, Toyoguchi Kappei, and Matsumoto Masao. Among these people, Suzuki, Moria, Toyoguchi, and Matsumoto were students at the Tokyo High School of Industrial Arts. Toyoguchi Kappei, "Keiji Kōbō to sono kagu no dezain kenkyū" [The Keiji Kōbō and Their Furniture Design Research], *Kenkyū kiyō* 13 (Musashino daikagu, 1980): 25.

manufactured products by the joint [efforts] of art, industry and craftsmanship,"[53] and the Bauhaus were the main models for this group.[54] Since the regular meetings developed into a regular research group, they named the group Keiji Kōbō, which meant "Ideal Form Workshop." They launched their initial activities in 1928 with a total of nine members. Except Kurata, all others had recently graduated from the Tokyo High School of Fine Arts: Matsumoto Masao, Toyoguchi Kappei, Takahashi Minoru were graduates from the craft and design department, and Tezuka Keiō graduated from the metalwork department. The members Itō Ikujirō, Kobayashi Noboru, Nakajima Kenji, and Saito Shirō were graduates from the woodwork department.[55] The membership of Keiji Kōbō changed until it closed in 1940, but Kurata and Toyoguchi remained.

During their regular meetings, the Keiji Kōbō members were eager to conduct experimental research and analysis, and talk about their great ambitions for their group. In a pamphlet published in 1928, the purpose of the workshop was pronounced:

> The Keiji Kōbō is looking for architecture that incorporates daily life and craft products, and there is a sense of consciousness of our time period. In regards to the position of architects, draftsmen, and manufacturers, the

[53] S. Giedon, *Walter Gropius: Work and Teamwork* (New York, NY: Reinhold Publishing), 21.
[54] Toyoguchi, "Keiji Kōbō to sono kagu no dezain kenkyū," 25.
[55] These students learned from Moriya Nobuo, a furniture and interior designer who organized the design group Kinomesha in 1927. Kashiwagi Hiroshi, "On Rationalization and the National Lifestye: Japanese Design of the 1920s and 1930s," in *Being Modern in Japan: Culture and Science from the 1910s to the 1930s*, ed. Elise K. Tipton and John Clark (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2000), 63.

> rationalization of scientific, economic, and productive value must be realized. Thus, an interactive unification of divided technologies was the first reason why the Keiji Kōbō has been established. The Keiji Kōbō starts to work on interior crafts, and later on, will set mass-producible, non-decorative productions for the market place as a goal.[56]

In this program, the search for architecture and craft products that would encompass daily life and the ideal of finding a standardized type that would be mass-productive was reminiscent of the Bauhaus curriculum of Walter Gropius in 1922-1923, which emphasized architecture as the *Gesamtkunstwerk* and emphasized the preparation of prototypes for industrial manufacture of everyday objects in each workshop.[57] However, even though the main principles of the program were modeled after the workshops at the German Bauhaus, it is worth noting that the Keiji Kōbō members transformed these principles in light of their own social condition. They sought a way to enhance Japanese living conditions through their products.

The members focused on the improvement of Japanese residences and the possibility of introducing affordable Western-style furniture into the tatami-based Japanese home. The living conditions at the time for middle-class citizens of Tokyo became a critical issue for members. The late 1920s was a period of economic depression in Japan due to an overflow of unemployed and poor people coming in to

---

[56] Toyoguchi Kappei, *Keiji Kōbō kara: Toyoguchi Kappei to dezain no hanseiki* [From the Keiji Kōbō: Toyoguchi Kappei and the Half-Century of Design] (Tokyo: Bijutsu Shuppansha, 1987), 64.

[57] *Bauhaus: A Conceptual Model*, ed. Bauhaus Archiv-Berlin/Museum für Gestaltung, Stiftung Bauhaus Dessau, and Klassik Stiftung Weimar (Ostfildern: Hatje Cantz, 2009), 15.

Tokyo. The urban middle class of Tokyo could not afford to buy newly constructed western-style houses (called culture houses) or to purchase Western furniture.[58] The members discussed the price of furniture and its material. Even though the members designed simple, cheap, and functional furniture based on a Western lifestyle, questions emerged as to who would be able to purchase it and how customers could utilize such furniture in their conventional living spaces. As a solution, the Keiji Kōbō members used *tatamizuni* (leg guards to protect Japanese tatami mats) and Japanese wood for the material (Fig. 60). Moreover, they produced standardized types of Western-style furniture such as chairs, tea tables, desks, ottomans, and lamps that could be mass-produced**,** and at the same time, sold at an affordable price to middle-class customers (Fig. 61).

Their continuous research into standardized prototypes for the industrial manufacture of everyday objects was reflected in their four exhibitions, held in 1928, 1930, 1934, and 1937. The first one, conducted in fall 1928, was assisted by Tanabe Moichi, the young owner of the Kinokuniya Bookstore in the Shinjuku district of Tokyo (Fig. 62). The exhibition was held on the second floor, which had a small art gallery space. Kawakita Renshichirō gave a lecture in which he introduced and explained education at the German Bauhaus, the floor plans and designs for German residences, the new architectural styles in Germany, and the dissemination of the new theories on furniture.[59] Even though the first exhibition was successful with many architects, designers, and critics who were invited, Toyoguchi regretted that

---

[58] For more information about culture houses, see Jordan Sand, *House and Home in Modern Japan: Architecture, Domestic Space, and Bouregouis Culture 1880-1930* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003), 322-333.
[59] Toyoguchi, "Keiji Kōbō to sono kagu no dezain kenkyū," 39.

the furniture exhibited did not fully embrace the theories and thoughts developed during their earlier discussions:

> The works made for the first exhibition in 1928 did not correspond well to the theory, which I think happened similarly at the Bauhaus during their initial establishment. In most of the cases, the members were too focused on creating modern forms through the use of flat planes and straight lines. I was embarrassed to see the inappropriate use of materials that could not capture the form (of the furniture) in the exhibition: My face turned red when I looked at the seats of chairs covered with canvas and lamp shades made out of celluloid.[60]

The furniture was displayed in three types of living spaces – the study, the living room, and the bedroom. For the study, a desk, small chair, wardrobe, desk lamp, and Japanese bookshelf were exhibited. For the living room, a tea table, a small chair, an armed chair, a flower stand, a hanging lamp, and a rug were arranged (Fig. 63), and for the bedroom, a dressing table, an ottoman, a mirror, a built-in chest, and a floor stand were exhibited.[61]

In the photograph of the living room exhibit (Fig. 63), one wooden armchair and two wooden small chairs were displayed as a set, together with the wooden tea table. The simple and functional design, reflecting the Constructivist aesthetic, was central to the living room furniture: basic and simple forms and simple rectangular

[60] Ibid., 37.
[61] Ibid.

planes of wood were used for the chair. The box-like tea table had legs attached right to the edge of the table frame. The rug had geometrical patterns that matched the simplified furniture design. It is not known exactly what kind of wood was used. Toyoguchi recalled that the chairs and tables used in this exhibition were made of inexpensive material that could be used in daily life.[62]

Even though imperfections existed, the first works of the Keiji Kōbō members featured inexpensive material and a design that emphasized geometrical simplification. Their design concepts partially reflected the principles of the furniture workshop at the Bauhaus, in which Hungarian-born architect and furniture designer Marcel Breuer (1902-1981) became a leading figure starting in 1925.[63] Breuer advanced Gropius's idea of making workshops that would develop new standards for industrial production and he addressed the objectives of the furniture workshop in 1925:

> The furniture section of the Bauhaus has a double aim, through experimental work in its carpentry and joinery sections to arrive at clear solutions to the problems which are at the base of various furniture types, working out types and systems which make advanced production possible.[64]

---

[62] Ibid.
[63] Marcel Breuer started as an apprentice of the furniture workshop in 1920, and became a teacher of this workshop after he graduated. He taught at the Bauhaus from 1925 to 1928.
[64] Marcel Breuer's essay was published in *Fachblatt für Holzarbeiter* [Journal for Skilled Woodworkers] no. 20 (1925): 17. English translation provided in Andrea Gleininger, "Marcel Breuer," in *Bauhaus*, ed. Jeannine Fiedler and Peter Feierabend (Potsdam: H. F. Fullmann, 2006), 326.

Breuer further suggested less expensive woods, such as plywood, to make furniture suitable for mass-production and he created a couple of models to demonstrate.[65] However, he soon switched his main material from wood to tubular steel, which became the essence of flexibility, functionality, lightness, and economy.[66]

The canvas and wood used for the seats of the small chair and the armchair in the living room recalls the design of Marcel Breuer's wooden chairs covered with canvas, which were used for the apartment interior at the Törten Siedlung in Dessau designed by Gropius in 1926 (Fig. 64).[67] On top of these ideas, the Keiji Kōbō members added wooden rails, the *tatamizuri*, at the points of the legs so that it would not damages the tatami mats in Japanese homes. The tatamizuri were newly invented to make Western-style furniture usable for Japanese homes. The members also focused on the idea of 'standardization' and precisely recorded the dimensions of the small chair, and created a standardized design that could be produced any time in the factory (Fig. 65). The effort was unique; nowhere else, even in Europe, was this kind of experimentation taking place. Even though the exhibited works, aside from the *tatamizuri,* looked like loose interpretations of the Bauhaus furniture, it is worth noting that the members were not satisfied with their work after the exhibition and

[65] Christopher Wilk, *Marcel Breuer: Furniture and Interiors,* exh. cat. (New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1981), 31.
[66] Gleininger, "Marcel Breuer," 328.
[67] For this house, Gropius wanted to place inexpensive mass-produced furniture, and Marcel Breuer employed his earlier ideas of mass-producable furniture and used inexpensive wood and canvas. Christohper Wilk, *Marcel Breuer: Furniture and Interiors*, 34.

they realized that if they wished to further improve their design they needed to conduct a market survey and to study the living conditions of the Japanese.[68]

In the second exhibition, which was held in 1930 also at the Kinokuniya Bookstore, the members adjusted the material and design of the chair, table, desk, and drawer to improve the market value of the furniture, but not many visual materials remain. For this second exhibition, the members designed furniture that could be sold to customers, especially middle-class Japanese housewives. Keiji Kōbō signed a contract with Fujin no tomo-sha (Ladies's Companion Company), which was in charge of manufacturing the furniture and advertising it from 1930 to 1936. Advertisements of this furniture appeared in magazines such as the *Fujin koron* (Ladies Review, 1916- present).

In 1933, a year before their third exhibition, the Keiji Kōbō members published their magazine *Keiji Raporto* (Keiji Report, Fig. 66). The first issue was published as a part of the April 1933 issue of *Kokusai kenchiku* (bottom image, Fig. 66), but it was later that year released independently as a magazine with the title "Raporto."[69] The content of each of the three issues of *Raporto* indicates that their main interest centered on tubular steel furniture, chairs, and interior plans of apartments:

1933 *Raporto* 1, "Tubular Steel Furniture" (Tezuka, Matsumoto)

1933 *Raporto* 2, "Chair" (Kobajashi, Toyoguchi, Saitō)

1934 *Raporto* 3, "Interior and Mathematics of the Apartment" (Toyoguchi)

---

[68] Toyoguchi, "Keiji Kōbō to sono kagu no dezain kenkyū," 37.

[69] The first program was edited by Kurata's friend Kojama Showa. Kurata stated about the name 'Raporto' that "When they talked about compiling a big report and how to name it, they suggested calling it '*Raporto*,' which was in the Esperanto language.

It is worth noting that members included tubular steel furniture in their research theme in *Raporto 1,* showing how they planned to sell this novel type of furnishing in the market (Fig. 67). This built upon some years of study by others. Around 1925-1928, the steel tubular furniture made by Bauhaus architect and designers Mart Stam (1899-1986), Marcel Breuer, and Ludwig Mies van der Rohe was introduced in detail through the Bauhaus visitors reports that appeared in Japanese magazines and journals. Tubular steel furniture, such as Marcel Breuer's club armchair for Wassily Kandinsky (1926, Fig. 68) and Mart Stam's chair (1926, Fig. 69), carried modernistic characteristics such as simple forms, lightweight construction, and glossy surfaces. The forms made the chair seemed suspended in air, and featured repetitive curves. Adopting the ideas of tubular furniture at the Bauhaus, the members tried to apply a rationalistic, practical, and intellectual aesthetic to the structure of the steel pipe chairs. In 1932, Japanese designers and architects paid critical attention to the new invention of tubular steel furniture. Yamawaki Iwao introduced the tubular steel furniture in his article "The Trend Towards Tubular Steel Furniture from Germany" in the March 1932 issue of *Kokusai kenchiku*.[70] He started with a quote from Le Corbusier that "a chair is a machine for sitting," and explained that Breuer, Stam, and Mies all were fascinated by the characteristics of tubular steel.[71] He said that tubular steel was lighter than wood, easily handled, firm, and hygienic, and therefore a perfect material to make furniture. He asserted that it had a

[70] Yamawaki Iwao, "Doitsu ni ogeru no kōtetsu kagu no keikō" [The Trend toward Steel Furniture from Germany], *Kokusai kenchiku*, vol. 8, no. 3 (March 1932): 143-151.
[71] Ibid., 143.

better possibility of mass-production than did wooden furniture, which was more like a handcraft. After a very detailed explanation of the thirty standardized types of tubular steel furniture that were available in the German market (Fig. 70). Yamawaki expressed his concern that the initial idea of creating a product that is simple, lightweight, firm, hygienic, affordable, and mass-producible had been forgotten. Rather than appreciating the originally intended features of tubular steel, people considered it a masterpiece of the "machine age." Furthermore, people treated it as if it were a "craft" that would decorate the residences of only the rich. Yamawaki said that he was disappointed by not seeing a single tubular steel chair inside the many new Siedlungen in Germany.[72] He emphasized the fact that creating a standardized type of furniture for mass-production was the main reason for using steel tube. He recognized the increasing interest on tubular steel furniture in Japan, and he expressed a desire that the Japanese would produce affordable tubular steel furniture. He attached a price list of the tubular steel furniture in the German market.

In *Raporto 1*, the Keiji Kōbō conducted research on steel pipe furniture in Europe, and recorded the main characteristics of the material. Even though the steel pipes were small, they had high resistance. The members tried to figure out a fixed form of the pipe. By producing various forms of steel pipe furniture with degrees of flexibility and strength, they showed that such furniture needed no additional reinforcement or spring material, unlike previous chairs. The form of the steel pipe chair (back, seat, legs, and elbow) allowed easier alterations, which was not possible with wooden furniture.

[72] Ibid., 151.

Marcel Breuer's tubular steel chairs had been treated as artworks and could not be popularized in the market due to their high price. But the Japanese versions, even if not visually distinct from the European ones, were able to be standardized and produced cheaply enough to be sold widely to customers.

At the third exhibition in 1934, which opened at a salon in Takashimaya, Tokyo with the title "Interior Exhibition of the New Standardized l Living Room," the members expanded their coverage by introducing the modern Western kitchen to Japanese housewives. A model of a Western-style kitchen was displayed alongside a model living room and study (Fig. 71). Moreover, the armchair, small chair, and lamp had exhibited the members' mastery of technical standardization, evident from the exact measurements for each chair (Fig.72).

The last exhibition was held in 1937 at the Itōya store, Tokyo, under the title "*Fujin kōron* [Ladies' Review] Standardized Furniture and Children's Study Furniture." Targeting Japanese housewives, the exhibition focused on standardized furniture that could be adjusted to accommodate Japanese children.

Even though it was a relatively small workshop, the Keiji Kōbō members introduced a very plain, geometric, straightforward, and practical line of furniture. Their chairs, desks, bookshelves, and lamps, reached in Japan a level of standardization and marketing that was hoped for but never realized at the Bauhaus.

2.5 The Tokyo School of Fine Arts

As noted previously, interest in Constructivism and the Bauhaus arose when Japanese visitors to the Bauhaus in 1924 returned and published a number of articles sharing their knowledge. The reports were a critical motivation for teachers and students at the Tokyo School of Fine Arts, especially when Japanese Bauhausler Mizutani Takehiko was appointed as an assistant professor in 1930.

Originally named the Technical Art School (Kōbu Bijustsu Gakkō), established in 1876, the independent art institution was renamed the Tokyo School of Fine Arts (*Tokyo Bijutsu Gakkō* 東京美術學校) on October 5th, 1887 and from that point became the major national art academy. When the school was established, there were three divisions: *kaigaka* painting (Japanese-style painting), *kibori* (woodcraft), and the *chōkin* (metalwork). The *yōga* (Western-style painting) and the *zuan* (design) divisions were added in 1896.[73] Students at the Tokyo School of Fine Arts went through a five-year program. For the first two years, all students, regardless of their major, spent most of the time learning design principles. From the third year, students were separated into three curriculums—painting, sculpture, and design.

Before the Meiji period, there had been no distinction made between fine arts and applied arts in Japanese art. To classify the new fields of art coming from the West, new categories for the arts division at the Tokyo School of Fine Arts were

[73] The *yōga* division was under the supervision of the Japanese *yōga* artist Kuroda Seiki (1866-1924). For more information on the categorization of arts and the discussion on nihonga and yōga, see John Clark, "Okakura Tenshin and Aesthetic Nationalism," in *Since Meiji: Perspectives on the Japanese Visual Arts, 1868–2000*, ed. Thomas Rimer (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2012), 236, and Alicia Volk, *In Pursuit of Universalism: Yorozu Tetsugorō and Japanese Modern Art* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010), 19-24.

constituted. Western art and design was broadly divided into the fields of *bijutsu* (fine arts) and *kōgyō bijutsu* (industrial art), *sōshoku bijutsu* (decorative art), and *ōyō bijutsu* (applied art).[74] Beside these categories, *shōgyō bijutsu* (commercial art) and *kōgei* (crafts) were used to describe the other categories of art.[75] According to art historian Kendall H. Brown, *sōshoku* (decoration) was a newly defined word associated with the Western models, and had the opposite meaning of the older term *kazari* (ornament).[76] *Ōyō bijutsu* (applied art) included handmade crafts made with traditional Japanese techniques, and objects for daily use produced with new manufacturing processes.[77]

The design division at the Tokyo School of Fine Arts accepted these changing trends, and taught various types of design such as crafts, commercial art, and industrial design. In 1906, the curriculum was divided into two: one for the *kōgei zuan* (crafts design), and the other for *kenchiku sōshoku zuan* (decorative design for architecture), that is, architectural design.[78] In 1914, the design division separated into two subdivisions: one for design and the other for architecture.

From 1923, when architecture was separated from design to become its own full department, the design department went through a significant transition period.[79]

---

[74] *Tokyo geijutsu daigaku sōritsu 100-shūnen kinen ten [dezain, kenchiku]* [Special Exhibition Commemorating 100 years of Tokyo University of Fine Arts: Design, Architecture] (Tokyo: Asahi Shinbun Tokyo Honsha Kikaku Dai 1-bu, 1987), 57.
[75] For the discussion of these terms, see Satō Dōshin, *Modern Japanese Art and the Meiji State: The Politics of Beauty* (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2011), 66-72.
[76] Kendall H. Brown, "Japan and Art Deco," in *Deco Japan: Shaping Art and Culture 1920-1945,* ed. Kendall H. Brown (Alexandria, VA: Art Services International, 2012), 12.
[77] Felice Fisher, "*Japanese Design: From Meiji to Modern,*" in *Japanese Design: A Survey since 1950,* ed. Kathryn B. Hiesinger and Felice Fischer (Philadelphia: Philadelphia Museum Art, 1994), 9.
[78] Tokyo geijutsu, 57.
[79] Ibid., chronological table, 11-14.

This transition was the result of developments that began twenty years earlier. From 1901 onward, Professor Shimada Yoshinari (1870-1962), one of the leading professors, had been altering the curriculum in the design department. During the thirty years he spent at this school, he regularly taught 'Methods of Crafts Design,' which was very popular among students. In his lecture notes written in 1919, Shimada classified crafts design into two groups: one for art and the other for objects of daily use. He asserted that craft design for art should demonstrate the traditional Japanese style and target the intellectual class as the consumer, whereas craft design for daily objects should be trendy and be made with cheaper materials so that it could be manufactured in large quantities at a low price per unit.[80] However, Shimada mostly followed the conventional teaching style and focused on teaching design for traditional Japanese crafts rather than reflecting the changing trends in the West toward industrial and commercial design.

The other central factor behind the development of the design division was the Japanese Art Nouveau movement. Fukuchi Mataichi (or Fukuichi, 1862-1909) became the first senior professor of design at the Tokyo School of Fine Arts. Fukuchi was the founder of the Japan Design Association (1910) and the organizer of the first Japanese exhibition of Art Nouveau (1902). He sympathized with Art Nouveau during his visit to the Paris *Exposition Universelle* in 1900, where he was in charge of preparing a comprehensive history of Japanese art for the first retrospective

[80] Roh Unia, *Gundae dizain genyom gwa yansik ui suyeong: Dongyeong Misulhaggyo doangwa yuhakseng Im Sukjae reul jungsimuro* [Adoption of Modern Design Concept and Style: Sook-Jae Lim and his Works], masters thesis (Seoul: Seoul National University, 2009), 61-64.

exhibition.[81] On July 10, during his stay in Paris, he met Siegfried Bing (1838-1905), who was among the most important dealers and promoters of Art Nouveau.[82] The next day he visited his pavilion at the Exposition, together with Japanese *yōga* artist Asahi Chū (1856-1907).[83] After his return, he advocated the Art Nouveau style by organizing the first Japanese exhibition of Art Nouveau in 1902. The Art Nouveau style predominated in the ceramics division, the textiles division, and the design division for a number of years.

In 1919, two professors Kon Wajirō (1888-1973) and Sato Kazuo (1887-1955) were newly hired. Their task was to reform the curriculum of the design division according to the newest educational system in Europe. From August to November 1922, Sato Kazuo traveled to Europe and stayed mostly in Germany to investigate the educational system of the design divisions in a number of academies and specialized schools. After his return, Sato advocated the adoption by Japan of the advanced curriculum in Europe, which focused on fundamental design courses and accentuated industrial and commercial design. In his 1923 report, he recommended improving the curriculum by emphasizing drawing of nature (especially analytical drawing), constructive analysis, and linear analysis.[84] This transformation toward a modern design curriculum was accelerated through the hiring of professor Mizutani Takehiko, the first Japanese Bauhaus student. After a further reform in 1931,

---

[81] Ellen P. Conant, Challenging Past and Present: The Metamorphosis of Nineteenth-Century Japanese Art (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2006), 26, note 66.
[82] For more information about Siegfried Bing, see Gabriel Weisberg, *Art Nouveau Bing: Paris Style 1900* (New York: Abrams, 1986).
[83] Mori Hitoshi, "Paris and Kyoto—Asai Chu Making a Bridge onto the Art Nouveau from Japan," coupDefouet International Congress, Barcelona, 2013, http://artnouveau.eu/admin_ponencies/functions/upload/uploads/Hitoshi_Mori_Paper.pdf (accessed September 1, 2014).
[84] Ibid.

students were asked to complete a new version of the five-year program. They were required to earn more than 72 credits in fine arts, more than 52 credits in design, exactly 18 credits in sculpture, and more than 16 credits in crafts making.[85] The balance of credits indicates how artistic expressions in fine arts were stressed more than were crafts.

The move toward a modern curriculum was not limited to the design department. The *kenchikuka* (architecture division), which started as part of the design department, became an independent division in 1923.[86] Since its founding, the architecture division focused on artistic standpoints by hiring faculty specializing in fine arts. The emphasis on Constructivist design principles of the German Werkbund and the Bauhaus movement in Germany became visible through the graduation works of the students from the mid-1920s.

Yamawaki Iwao's 1926 graduation work *Engeki (Theatrical Arts) Research Lab constructed on Factory Fields* (Fig. 73) in 1926 shows a clean reference to Constructivist style.[87] The model for the theatrical research lab seems to be an amalgamation of photographs that were published in architectural journals during this period, showing current artistic trends in Europe. The tiers of the main six-story building and the factory on the right side, with Expressionistic overtones, bear

---

[85] *Tokyo bijutsu gakkō ichiran* [Tokyo School of Arts Catalogue], 1926-1927, 41-42.
[86] The term *zuan* was used as an alternative of the later used term *dezain* (Japanese transliteration of the English word 'design') and meant a design prototype to be applied on an object.
[87] At the time Yamawaki was still a student at the Tokyo School of Fine Arts, Mizutani taught architecture and draftsmanship as a lecturer. Petra Ruick, "Takehiko Mizutani's Years at the Bauhaus Dessau: Study on the Bauhaus and Takehiko Mizutani (1)," *Nihon kenchiku gakkai keikaku kei ronbunshū* 599 (January 2006): 158; Terao Kazuyuki, "Mizutani Takehiko ga shōkai shita Bauhaushu" [Bauhaus introduced by Mizutani Takehiko], *Nihon bijutsu kenkyū* 2 (2002): 33-44.

similarities to the Sulphuric Acid Factory (1911-1912, Luboń, Poland, Fig. 16, 74) of Hans Poelzig (1869-1936). However, by designing the buildings in the front and the grillroom on the second floor of the main building, Yamawaki took a decisive step beyond Expressionism. The flat roofs, the continuing bands of glass windows, and the prominent horizontal lines on the front of the building showed architectural elements that would appear a year later in the apartment buildings of the Weissenhof Siedlung in Stuttgart (1927, Fig. 30, 75). Yamawaki used the principles of the Central Telegraph Office in Tokyo, which was designed by Yamada Mamoru in 1925. The walls of the grillroom were beautifully decorated with colored geometrical patterns to create a playful mood, reminiscent of the theatre designs of Russian Constructivist artist Lyubo Popova.

The impact of the Bauhaus at the Tokyo School of Fine Arts became obvious after Mizutani Takehiko returned from his studies at the Bauhaus in 1930 (see above, chapter 2.2, Fig. 41), when he was appointed assistant professor. He taught the principles of composition in his class "*kōsei genri* (構成原理, Principles of Composition)." Students from other divisions could take this class, and Mizutani's teaching methods garnered special attention from all divisions, including architecture, design, and fine arts. For his courses Mizutani drew from the 1928 material course taught by Joseph Albers and the form theory class taught by Wassily Kandinsky and Paul Klee.[88]

[88] Mizutani entered the cabinetmaking workshop in the second semester. For information about the classes Mizutani took at the Bauhaus, see Ruick, "Takehiko Mizutani's Years," 157ff.

Mizutani's Dessau Bauhaus experience impacted his students Oka Hyakuju and Yoshimura Junzō, who, under the supervision of Mizutani, submitted their graduation project *Jutaku-gun* (Housing compounds, Fig. 76, 76-1) in 1931. In the blueprint, Oka and Yoshimura included prefabricated family houses and community facilities, such as a hospital, an auditorium, and a pool. In the axonometric drawing of a two-bedroom unit, they included foldable chairs and furniture that could be placed inside built-in wardrobes when not in use (upper right image, Fig. 76-1). By proposing standardized plans for each prefabricated house, white cubic forms and glass windows for the interior, and functional furniture, Oka and Yoshimura transposed into their project the key concepts of the Weissenhof Siedlung in Stuttgart and Walter Gropius's design for Bauhaus teacher houses.

The impact of the Bauhaus at the Tokyo School of Fine Arts aroused attention not only in the architecture division but also in the design division. The graduation works from the students, such as Ikebe Yoshiatsu's *Modern Architectural Design* (1927, Fig. 77[89]) and Hashimoto Kanichi's *Five Design Types for Bedroom* (1930, Fig. 78), carefully manipulate the elements of art (color, shape, line, form, and space) in their design. Ikebe carefully arranged the composition along the fundamental qualities of shape, color, line, and size, which recall Moholy Nagy's experimentation of color, size, and plane in works such as *A 19* (1927, Fig. 79). Hashimoto designed bedrooms by decorating the walls and the textile with richly colored abstract patterns (Fig. 78), which would have been frequently experimented

[89] Illustrations are from *Geidai korekushon ten: Tokyo bijutso gakko to bauhausu – kenchikuka, zuanka sotsugyō seisaku ten* [Tokyo School of Fine Arts Collection: The Tokyo School of Fine Arts and the Bauhaus], exh. cat. (Tokyo: Tokyo bijutsu daikagu, 2008).

with by the Bauhaus students working at the wall-painting workshop or the weaving workshop.[90]

The Bauhaus principles, which were introduced through Mizutani Takehiko's class and affected the graduation works of the students at the Tokyo School of Fine Arts, would soon achieve signal status through the book-cover designs of Korean artist Lee Sun Seok, who entered the design division at the Tokyo School of Fine Arts in 1926, and graduated in 1931. By then Constructivism was no longer just being imported. It had taken root and was growing in native Japanese soil.

[90] The wall-painting workshop at the Bauhaus was supervised by Kandinsky from 1922 until 1925. The production was consisted mainly of painting jobs in buildings and work for the cabinetmaking workshop. Hans Wingler, *The Bauhaus: Weimar, Dessau, Berlin, Chicago* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1969), 332.

Chapter 3: Colonial Modernism: Constructivism in Korean Modern Architecture, 1930-1945

The first generation of Korean architects who were trained by the Japanese emerged while Gyeongseong was rapidly changing into a city with new Western-style architecture, modern cafes, and splendid department stores, a transformation that would eventually match the cityscape of Tokyo. The new Korean architects struggled to find a way to express their national identity, which was almost impossible due to heavily control and censorship by the Japansese government. With limited higher-education opportunities, Park Gil-ryong, Park Dong-jin, and others undertook restricted training by Japanese professors at the Gyeongseong Engineering College, developed their career at the Ministry of Communication, and passionately devoted themselves to trying to employ the modernist impulse in Constructivism and International Architecture, both European and Japanese, as a way to fix the problematic floorplans of traditional Korean houses.

3.1 The Introduction of Western Style Architecture

During the colonial period, from 1910 to 1945, the Japanese government defined their task as increasing control over Korea and assimilating Koreans to Japanese culture by restructuring the education system and enforcing new cultural

policies.[1] As part of that assimilation policy, the Government-General of Joseon, the name of the Japanese government of Joseon, endeavored to shape the main districts of cities such as Gyeongseong in the likeness of Tokyo. From the 1920s, Japanese architects were in charge of designing various buildings with Western styles of architecture in the middle of the capital to transform the urban landscape. Gyeongseong earned its special status due to its long tradition and location. It had served as the main capital for numerous kingdoms on the Korean peninsula, starting with the kingdom of Baekje from 18 CE, and had been the main hub for travelers who passed between China and Japan via Korea. In Gyeongseong, the new buildings constructed by the Japanese architects sharply contrasted with the Gyeongbok palace (Fig. 80) and traditional Korean districts (Fig. 81) dating to the Joseon period (1392-1897) and earlier. The Western-style buildings were inserted as symbols of modernity, an ambition Japan had been promoting, initially at home beginning with the Meiji restoration in the mid-nineteenth century and then, starting with Taiwan, throughout their colonies.[2] Modern buildings erected in the colonial capitals were intended to show off Japan's modern achievements in architecture and to fortify control over its colonies.[3]

The Ministry of Communications, the department in charge of the construction projects, built government office buildings and new public facilities

[1] Mark E. Caprio, *Japanese Assimilation Policies in Colonial Korea* (Seattle, WA and London: University of Washingtong Press, 2009), 81-85.
[2] Taiwan was under Japanese rule between 1895 and 1945, and the Government-General built several governmental buildings, including the headquarters building, which started its construction in 1912 and was completed in 1919.
[3] For a discussion on colonial modernity and Japanese imperialist policies, see Se-mi Oh, "Consuming the Modern: The Everyday in Colonial Seoul, 1915-1937," Ph.D. diss. (Columbia University, 2008), 4-12.

in the Jongno district, the Honmachi street (Bonjeong, currently the Chungmuro-district located at the northern part of Nam Mountain, Fig. 82), and the Namdaemun (South Gate) district of Gyeongseong (Fig. 83).[4]

The main architectural landmark was the headquarters of the Government-General, for which planning started in 1914 under German architect George de Lalande (1872-1914). After de Lalande's untimely death, Japanese architect Ichiro Nomura, the architect of the Government-General building in Taiwan (1912-1919), took over the work and saw it to completion in October 1926 (Fig. 84).[5] This building was constructed in front of the Gyeongbok palace, the main palace of the longest-ruling and last dynasty, the Joseon (1392-1897). The intention in obstructing the view of the palace was to present the triumph of Imperial Japan at the expense of the Joseon. During the construction, part of the palace was destroyed and dismantled.[6]

Other major public facilities in colonial Korea were built by Japanese architects Tatsuno Kingo (1854-1919) and Tsukamoto Yasushi (1854-1937). The

---

[4] The Government-General reorganized the road system and demolished the city walls through the Gyeongseong Urban Reform Project in 1912 and completed the structural layout of the city center in 1919. Through the Gyeongseong Urban Plan in 1934, the Government-General extended the border lines of Gyeongseong and developed additional industrial and commercial zones, which was a result of the Government-General's imperial project to turn Gyeongseong as the gateway for Japanese expansion into Manchuria. Oh, "Consuming the Modern," 65-66.

[5] The Korean Government demolished this building in 1995-96 since it was a symbol of Japanese Imperialism and blocked the view from *Gwanghwamun* to the *Gyeongbok* palace. *Gundae wa mannan misul gwa dosi*, ed. Guksa pyeonchan wiwonhoe (Seoul: Dusan Donga, 2008), 269. Hong Seong-tae, "From Mount Beakak to the Han River: A Road to Colonial Modernization," in *Impacts of Modernities*, ed. Thomas Lamarre and Kang Nae-hui (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2004), 124.

[6] Youngna Kim, "Urban Space and Visual Culture: The Transformation of Seoul in the Twentieth Century," in *A Companion to Asian Art and Architecture*, ed. Rebecca M. Brown and Deborah S. Hutton (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011), 156.

distinguished Tatsuno had studied at the Imperial College of Engineering in 1879 under Josiah Conder. Tatsuno designed the Bank of Japan in Otemachi, Tokyo (1890-96, Fig. 7); Tokyo Station (1914, Fig. 8); and other pioneering architectural landmarks of Meiji Japan. His responsibilities for designing government buildings in colonial territory included Manchuria, as well as Korea. His most remarkable architectural design was the Busan Station in Busan (1910, Fig. 85) and the headquarters of the Bank of Joseon (1912, Fig. 86) in Gyeongseong. The latter was executed in Japanese Neo-Classical or Beaux-Art style, linking the design to the Bank of Japan.

Tsukamoto Yasushi, architecture professor at Tokyo Imperial University, designed the new Gyeongseong station (Fig. 87, now Seoul Station) in 1925, the main station in Gyeongseong through which Japanese visitors would arrive from the ten ports in Korea.[7]

The history of the Gyeongseong station starts with the construction of the Namdaemun (south gate) railway station under the Yeomchon Bridge on July 9, 1900 (Fig. 88).[8] The Namdaemun station, which was finished a year after the Seodaemun (West Gate) station in Jeongdong was completed, served as the final destination of the Gyeongin line, which connected Gyeongseong and the Incheon

[7] The ten ports were Busan (opened in 1877), Wonsan (1880), Incheon (1883), Mokpo (1897), Jinnampo (1897), Gunsan (1899), Seongjin (1899), Masan (1899), Yongampo (1904), and Cheongjin (1908). See Inha Jung, 4.
[8] Kim Chung-dong, "Seoul Station Building Reborn as a Cultural Complex," *Koreana* 26, issue 1 (Spring 2012): 54.

seaport.[9] During the early 1910s, the Government-General converted the building from a one-story wooden-barrack structure into a two-story brick building and renamed it Gyeongseong Station. In 1923, the Government-General started nearby the construction of a replacement station (Fig. 89), which was completed in 1925, when the Government-General took over from the South Manchuria Railway Company the management of the Korean railway system. The new station served as the central international connection point from Japan to China (and Manchuria from 1931), symbolizing the expansion of the Japanese Empire and the strength of its colonial reign. Japanese architect Tsukamoto, who learned architectural design from Tatsuno Kingo, implemented the Victorian and the Neo-Gothic–style principles of Tatsuno's Tokyo station on the Marunouchi side (1911-1914, Fig. 8), which was discussed in chapter 1.1.

Whereas Tatsuno's design of the Tokyo station was modeled after the design of the Central Station in Amsterdam by P.H.J. Cuypers (opened 1889, Fig, 90), Tsukamoto's design followed the principles of the old Luzern station (1896, Fig. 91), especially its distinctive cupola design. The exterior wall of the Gyeongseong station was built of red bricks with contrasting horizontal bands of white granite tiles and dressings of white keystones on the semicircular arch windows (Fig. 92). This design recalls the exterior of the Tokyo station (Fig. 8), the old Luzern station (Fig. 91), and the St. Michael and All Angels Church in Brighton, England (1858-62, Fig. 93) designed by English architect William

[9] The Gyeongseong-Incheon line opened in the late 1890. The first train from Incheon entered Gyeongeong when the *Hangang* Steel Bridge was completed on July 5, 1900. The opening ceremony of the Gyeongseong-Incheon line was held on November 12, 1899 at *Seodaemun* Station.

Burges (1827-1881).[10] Burges's Victorian-style design principles are evident in the church exterior walls. The waiting area on the first floor (Fig. 94) was decorated with barrel vault ceilings, colonnades with Ionic columns, and a huge domed ceiling supported with Byzantine-style pendentives. While the exterior was more gothic revival in design, the interior featured a Neo-Renaissance ambience, using columns, colonnades, and domes.

For the construction of these buildings, more than 50,000 Korean workers were recruited to bring marble from all over the country.[11] Most of the engineers came from Japan, since under colonial policy Koreans were not allowed to receive any technical training or higher education in architecture before 1915. These modern buildings were all executed in Japanese "colonial" style, a term Korean scholars have coined for the buildings in Japanese neo-Renaissance and Baroque style in Gyeongseong. These architectural landmarks were intended to serve as architectural monuments to Japanese domination and were designed in confluence with the main buildings in Tokyo to signify Japanese hegemony not only over Korea but over all of Asia.

The Government-General advertised within Japan the newly constructed government buildings, especially the main office building, to promote Gyeongseong as an attractive destination for Japanese tourists, whose number steadily increased from the 1920s, peaking with the annexation of Manchuria in

---

[10] While studying architecture in London, Tatsuno he worked at the office of English architect William Burges, who was a Gothic revivalist. Since the exterior walls of the Tokyo station and the Gyeongseong station

[11] Hyung Il Pai, Constructing "Korean" Origins: A Critical Review of Archaeology, Historiography, and Racial Myth in Korean State-Formation Theories (Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 2000), 238.

1931.[12] On the way to Manchuria, Japanese travelers visited Gyeongseong for an inspection tour of the colony rather than sightseeing.[13] According to a travel log written by Japanese tourists, a typical Japanese group's itinerary could be as follows:

> They visited the headquarters of the Government-General and the China embassy in Korea and afterward watched a movie introducing the Joseon administration policies. At night, the Japanese enjoyed the dances and musical performances of *kisaeng*.[14]

An idealized, typical night scene is preserved in an image on a envelope for a set of picture postcards that depicts the main sightseeing route of the Japanese groups (Fig. 95). A beautiful *kisaeng,* the Korean term for Korean female entertainers who served as comfort women, is standing beneath an electric streetlight in front of the lit headquarters of the government-general. This remarkable image illustrates the contrast between colonized modernity, symbolized by the new headquarters of the Japanese government, and the traditional culture of Korea, symbolized by the Koreans who would entertain the Japanese tourist groups—the *kisaeng.* These postcard sets, produced by Japanese companies, were sold at train stations, department stores, and souvenir shops on

[12] Kwon Hyeok-hui, "Iljae sigi gwangwang yeobseo wa gyeonseong ui sigak jeok jaehyeon" [Colonial-era Picture Postcards and Visual Representation of Gyeongseong], in *Ibangin ui sungan pochak Gyeongseong 1930* [Old Seoul through Foreign Eyes 1930], jxh. cat. (Seoul: Cheong Gye Cheon Museum, 2011), 224-227.
[13] Ibid.
[14] Ibid.

the streets.[15] These sets covered several themes, and were sold under titles such as the *Greatest Views of Keijo* (the Japanese name for Gyeongseong, Fig. 96). In the postcards, short descriptions in English and Japanese were added to the black-and-white photographs of monumental architecture of the city, including panoramic views of Korean palaces and modern buildings built by the Japanese, such as the main building of the Government-General of Joseon (Fig. 84).

From the mid-1930s, new districts were developed in the city to accommodate the growing number of Korean and Japanese residents in Gyeongseong. The urban population almost doubled to 40,000 from 25,000 in 1919, mostly due to the increasing number of Japanese residents in the Namchon district, the southern portion of the city (Fig. 97).[16] Construction of modern facilities, principally commercial buildings, schools, hospitals, and department stores, accelerated. Although the Ministry of Communications was in charge of constructing new government buildings at the beginning of the colonial period, private firms took over from the mid-1930s. This change explains the increasing number of private architectural firms, which multiplied from three in 1910 to twenty-four in the 1930s, and were almost all Japanese. Rather than perpetuating the Japanese Neo-Renaissance style that typified 1920s construction, these new Japanese architects started to design buildings in Constructivist style (soon to be

[15] Picture postcards dating to the 1920s were mainly printed by the local manufacturer Hinode shōkō (Hinode stationery store) and the ones dating to the 1930s were printed by the Taishō shashin kōgeisho (Taishō Publishing Company). Pai Hyung Il, "Staging 'Koreana' for the Tourist Gaze: Imperialist Nostalgia and the Circulation of Picture Postcards," *History of Photography*, vol. 38, no. 3 (August 2013): 301-303.

[16] According to Inha Jung, Japanese residents increased during the 1920s, and approximately one-third of the urban population were Japanese. Inha Jung, *Architecture and Urbanism in Modern Korea* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2013), 4.

labeled International Architecture), inspiring the spirit of the modern city. Korean architects, who were not allowed to study abroad in Europe or America due to colonial policies, encountered these avant-garde movements for the first time through these new buildings. They also encountered the new style through printed media, such as daily newspapers and any available architectural magazines from Japan and the West, which were passionately read.

3.2 Architectural Journal Chosen to kenchiku

The first architectural magazine published in Korea during the colonial period had the Japanese title *Chosen to kenchiku* [Joseon and Architecture].[17] It was launched June 25, 1922 and ceased publication in April 1945 with the end of World War II and the emancipation of Korea. A total of 265 volumes were published over twenty-four years.[18] The magazine was edited by the *Chosen Kenchiku-kai* (the Joseon Architecture Association) and written in Japanese. The editors and authors for the magazine were principally Japanese architects affiliated with the Ministry of Communications, Government-General, and the intended audiences were the Japanese architects residing in Korea who participated in various construction projects in Korea. Even though it was a journal for the Japanese architects, it was the first magazine that gave Koreans access to modern architectural movements in Europe and Japan and inspired them to create their own projects. Some of the first generation of Korean architects worked as members of the Ministry of Communications and later on published a couple of articles in this journal. The foreword of the magazine explains their purpose:

> Chosen Kenchiku-kai was established this spring to follow the marvelous trends of civilized modern cities, to develop the architecture of Joseon,

[17] The first architectural magazine published by Korean architects was *Joseon Geonchuk* (March 1947-).
[18] Kim Yong-Bum, "1920-30 nyeondae Gyeonseong ui gundae geonchuk hwaldong e gwanhan gicho yeongu: Joseon to Genchiku ui jabbo gisa rul junshimuro" [A Primary Study on the Architectural Activities of Seoul in Modern Times: The Miscellaneous News Section of Chosen to kenchiku], *Seoulhak yeongu* 42 (February 2011): 4-5.

> and to provide for residents homes that will help them adjust properly to their climate and improve their cultural life. Our organization will try to contribute to the development of society and its transportation by strengthening this land's unity with architectural technology. The objectives for this society are not easy to achieve. Nevertheless, if we discuss further, it will be possible to improve our social life. The publication of this journal *Chosen to kenchiku* is significant as part of our business plans for Chosen. On one hand, the news about our organization will be discussed, and on the other hand, building codes, residential problems, solutions for disagreement among members, fire resistant and cold protecting architecture, and many other concerns will be discussed. The aim of this journal is to advance this (Korean) society.[19]

The manifesto declares the intent to adopt new technologies and architectural trends from other advanced countries to transform colonial Gyeongseong into a modern city. Thus, the magazine prominently featured introductions to contemporary buildings from Europe and Japan, including ones in Constructivist style. Each volume had four sections: illustrations, articles, a bulletin, and miscellaneous news. The themes of the main articles varied, including essays on new construction materials and methods, city planning, and housing improvements.

The illustration section comprised photographs and blueprints of newly constructed architecture in Korea, Japan, Europe, and the United States. Korean

[19] "Foreword," *Chosen to kenchiku* vol. 1, no. 1 (June 1922): 1.

architecture, such as Buddhist temples, palaces, and *hanok* (traditional Korean houses) were included, and artifacts excavated from archaeological sites appeared from time to time. Photographs of modern architectural landmarks in Gyeongseong were sometimes accompanied by the names of the designer and construction company. It seems that there were no specific themes, rules, or restrictions for the illustration section. For instance, in the first issue in June 1922, photographs of the interior and the exterior of a Western modern home for upper middle-class citizens, a Korean pagoda, and the architectural model of the headquarters of the Government-General were all included (Fig. 98).[20] This section introduced to the Korean audience the German Expressionist and Constructivist styles for the first time. An image of Erich Mendelsohn's Einstein Tower decorated the first page of the illustration section in the January 1924 issue (Fig. 99), with a short explanation that this building, designed as a research institute, had been constructed in Potsdam to commemorate Albert Einstein. In the October 1924 issue, a photo of a Dutch residence in Constructivist style, taken by Naoki Shigeru during his tour in Europe, was included (Fig. 100). The name of the architect was not indicated. This block-type residence with clean, simple exterior walls without any ornamental elements, followed the Constructivist style. This remarkable photograph would be the first image of Constructivist style architecture published for a Korean audience.

[20] The architect for the modern home, depicted in Fig. 98, was not indicated, but the low, horizontal lines of the architecture, the shape of the roofs, and the interior of the dining room share similarities with Frank Lloyd Wright's prairie style modern homes constructed during the late 1900s. For instance, the house built by Frank Lloyd Wright for Darwin D. Martin in Buffalo, NY (1905) looks very similar to the image provided in the illustration section.

Fritz Höger's Chile House in Hamburg, Germany, a well-known example of German Expressionist architecture, finished in 1924, was introduced with a one-page description by Fujishima Gaijiro in the January 1925 issue (Fig. 101). The accentuated vertical elements of the ten-story office building and the curved façade, with a reinforced concrete structure that used bricks, was a remarkable accomplishment, impressive both in scale and material. It was sensational not only to the German audience but also to the Japanese and Korean.

Russian Constructivism first appeared in the April 1925 issue (Fig. 102). Titled "Russian Art during the Revolutionary Period," its author Fujishima Gaijiro explained first that his introduction was based on the stories he heard from his fellow Japanese architect Shigeru Kaoka, who had just came back from his tour to Europe. Gaijiro included four images: Vladimir Tatlin (1885-1953)'s *Monument to the Third International* (1919), Anton Lavinsky (1893-1968)'s drawings for a residential district, a city in the future, and a radio mast. Gaijiro described Tatlin's model as supporting the ideas of the Russian Revolutionists through its steel beams and glass. He praised the monument as the first truly constructive creation of industrial art.

The images in the illustration sections correspond to the articles included in the main section of the journal. In that section, travel logs of tours and travel diaries were included. Japanese architects coming back from their trips in Europe and the United States published small articles about their experiences in almost every issue in the 1920s. From time to time, research on traditional Korean architecture in cities throughout Korea appeared. Moreover, a subsection was

devoted to Japanese translations of articles written by European architects. The introductory essays on current mainstream architectural movements in Japan and the West, such as German Expressionism and Constructivism, also appeared.

A major series of articles on modern architectural trends in Europe began with the January 1925 issue. The author, Fujishima Gaijiro (1899-2001), was a graduate of the architecture department at the Tokyo Imperial University (class of 1923) and later, from 1924, an assistant professor at the Tokyo Imperial University in 1929. He was appointed assistant professor at Gyeongseong Engineering College in 1933. He wrote and translated documentaries in a monthly series of four articles on emerging architects from Europe, specifically Otto Wagner, Walter Gropius, Hans Poelzig, and the Große Festspielhaus, capped a year later by a final installment on Hans Poelzig. The titles for each article:

- *Modern Architecture after [Otto] Wagner* / *Introduction*
Chosen to kenchiku vol. 4, no. 1 (January 1925): 19-22

- *Modern Architecture by Walter Gropius* / *First Note*
Chosen to kenchiku vol. 4, no. 2 (February 1925): 5-11

- *Hans Poelzig* / *Second Note on Modern Architecture*
Chosen to kenchiku vol. 4, no. 3 (March 1925): 30-42

- *The Große Festspielhaus in Salzburg* / *Third Note on Contemporary Architecture*
Chosen to kenchiku vol. 4, no. 5 (April 1925): 1-10

- *Architectural View of Hans Poelzig* / *Note on Modern Architecture*
Chosen to kenchiku vol. 5, no. 1 (January 1926): 26-30

Fujishima did not indicate the original source in his first essay about modern architecture after Wagner, but he acknowledged at the end of the article on Walter

Gropius and Hans Poelzig that he had translated essays of Hermann George Shaffauer originally published in the *Architectural Review*.[21] This was true for all five articles, except the fourth, on the *Große Festspielhaus in Salzburg*, which was an abberivated compilation of translated essays from various European scholars.[22] Fujishima's captivation with German Expressionism was well known among the Korean students who took his survey class on Western architecture at the Gyeongseong Engineering College,[23] and the influence was reflected in this series, devoted mostly to German Expressionism.

The first article, "Modern Architecture after [Otto] Wagner," included a chart intended to make the development of modern German architecture more understandable to readers (Fig. 103). The chart begins with the Renaissance, which divides into Classicism, Romanticism, and Eclecticism. These three movements influenced the Secessionist movement of Otto Wagner. Wagner's Secessionist movement continues in German architecture, which divides into four secessions in German cities—Leipzig, Dresden, Berlin, and Darmstadt. The chart indicated that the political turmoil and social upheaval that followed the Russian

---

[21] Hermann George Shaffauer was a German-American writer, who published in total four articles about Bruno Taut, Erich Mendelsohn, Hans Poelzig, and Walter Gropius as a series in the American architectural magazine *Architectural Review* from December 1922 to August 1924. The information about the four articles by Shaffauer are as follows: Hermann George Shaffauer, "Bruno Taut: A Visionary in Practice," *Architectural Review* vol. 52, no. 313 (December 1924): 155-159; "Erich Mendelsohn," *Architectural Review* vol. 53, no. 318 (May 1923): 156-159; "Hans Poelzig," *Architectural Review* vol. 54, no. 323 (October 1923): 122-127; "The Work of Walter Gropius," *Architectural Review* vol. 56, no. 333 (August 1924): 50-54.

[22] Fujishima's article of Walter Gropius (Fig. 28) was a translation of Shaffauer's article on Walter Gropius in the August 1924 issue of *Architectural* Review (Fig. 29), even though some of the images were excluded. The third article of Hans Poelzig in the March 1925 issue was a translation of Shaffauer's article on Hans Poelzig in the October 1923 issue. This time, Fujishima translated the whole article and included all of the images.

[23] Ahn, "Geonchuk-ga Park Dongjin e gwanhan yeonggu," 110.

Revolution in 1917 and the German Revolution of 1919 facilitated the emergence of Constructivism and Functionalism as the two dominant architectural trends. According to the chart, Expressionism (*hyōgenshugi*) was a continuous movement after Constructivism, which would afterward spread to other countries, such as the Netherlands. Under Expressionism, architects were classified into one of two groups: "extreme" or "moderate." The moderate group included Max Pechstein (painting), Walter Gropius, Bruno Taut, and Hans Poelzig. Wassily Kandinsky (painting), Erich Mendelsohn, and Hans Poelzig were listed with the extreme group. The differences between these two forms of Expressionism may have depended on the style of each artist and architect.

This chart clearly shows how the term "Constructivism" was translated into Japanese and subsequently into Korean. Here, the Japanese term used for the translation of Constructivism—*kōseishugi*—must have meant Constructivist movements in Russia, and the Korean pronunciation of this word—*guseongjuui*—was used afterward by Korean artist Park Dong-jin to indicate Russian Constructivism. The term does not include the Constructivist movement cultivated at the Bauhaus, which explains why Japanese and Korean architects frequently termed the later constructivist movements in Germany "International Architecture" and not "Constructivism." Unfortunately, the movements after Expressionism, such as the Bauhaus, were not listed in Fujishima's chart, but his terminology for these later schools could be found in the second article, about Walter Gropius.

Through these five articles, Fujishima called attention to German Expressionist architecture and the beginning of German Constructivism by way of Walter Gropius. Rich illustrations were included. For instance, Walter Gropius's machine hall design for the German Werkbund exhibition in Cologne 1914 was presented in the first page of the second article (Fig. 104), and Hans Poelzig's competition design *Entwurf zu einem Hochhaus* [Design of a High-Rise Building] in Berlin (1921), near the Friedrichstrasse station, decorated the first page of the third (Fig. 105).

The detailed essay about Gropius published in February 1924 was the first introduction in Korea to the German Constructivist movement (Fig. 104). His comprehensive activity both before and at the Bauhaus was portrayed in seven black-and-white images of his recent architectural work—images of the machine hall, the Werkbund Pavilion, and an overall picture of the Werkbund exhibition in Cologne 1914, two images of the exterior and interior of the Sommerfeld House (Berlin, 1920-1921), and two images of the exterior and the interior of the Municipal Theater in Jena (1922).[24] Using the words of Schaffauer published in the August 1924 issue of *Architectural Review* with the title "The Work of Walter Gropius (Fig. 106)," Fujishima introduced Walter Gropius as the founder of the German Bauhaus and a leading figure of the creative *zōkei geijutsu* (plastic art) movement in European modern architecture. He presented the teachers at the Bauhaus—Wassily Kandinsky (1866-1944), Lyonel Feininger (1871-1956), Johannes Itten (1888-1967), and Adolf Meyer (1881-1929)—as the leading

[24] All of these works were co-designed with German architect Adolf Meyer (1881-1929).

figures of this new design movement. The Staatliche Bauhaus and its curriculum was thoroughly discussed, presenting architecture as the most innovative visual form among architecture, sculpture, and painting, even though it was not formally part of the curriculum until 1928.

This early introduction of the Bauhaus to Korea is significant, if we consider that the first Japanese visitors arrived at the Bauhaus in October 1922, and the first article by Ishimoto, praising Walter Gropius and his activities at the Weimar Bauhaus as one of the three major trends in German architecture (with Bruno Taut and Hanz Poelzig), appeared in the Japanese magazine *Kenchikuhu* only in 1924 (see chapter 2.1). The increasing number of articles about Walter Gropius published in Japanese architectural magazines and the full translation of Gropius's thesis "The Spiritual Development of Modern Architecture in Germany" in *Kenchiku shinchō* (1925) at this time stimulated Fujishima to include Walter Gropius in his introductory series for *Chosen to kenchiku*. He also was familiar with the activities of the Bunriha group since he was a colleague of Bunriha members who were also graduates from the Tokyo Imperial University.

Articles on modern architectural trends appeared continuously in *Chosen to kenchiku*, and a copious array of topics were published, such as the Functionalism of Sullivan and Frank Lloyd Wright (From June to September 1927), Le Corbusier (March 1928), and Contemporary Architecture in Russia (May 1929). The introduction of the activities of emerging Japanese architects in

Tokyo were also prominent, such as a discussion on the future of the work of Japanese architect Itō Chūta (1867-1954) in the April 1922 issue.[25]

The cover design reflected changing modern architectural trends in Europe and Japan. From 1925, Chosen Kenchiku-kai held annual cover contests, and the winner's design was published for a year. The cover of the January 1925 issue featured an architectural model that alluded to German Expressionism (Fig. 107). Later on, in the June 1928 issue, an image of a building combining geometric planes clearly demonstrated the Constructivist style (Fig. 108).

The format, style, and content of this magazine resembled the publication style of other architectural magazines in Japan, including *Kenchiku shinchō*, *Shinkenchiku*, and *Kokusai kenchiku* (see chapter 1.1). Like their counterparts in the Japanese journals, the authors of *Chosen to kenchiku* defined Constructivism to mean Russian Constructivism, not that of the Bauhaus, and the ideas and works of European Constructivist architects, such as Walter Gropius, were described broadly as "International Architecture Style" (*kokusai kenchiku yōshiki*) or "New Architecture" (*shin kenchiku*).

Park Dong-jin (Fig. 109), one of the first generation of Korean architects, introduced to a Korean audience for the first time through a series of articles published in the newspaper Donga Daily, 1931 competing European modernisms such as French Art-Nouveau, Viennese Secession, *The Stijl* movements in the Netherlands, German Expressionism, and Russian Constructivism (Fig. 110). Park

[25] Itō Chūta, "Nihon Kenchikukai shunbo no miraikan" [The Future of Japanese Architectural Societies], *Chosen to kenchiku* vol. 1, no. 4 (April 1922): 1-9.

Dong-jin used *guseongjuui* (Constructivism) in his writings to indicate Russian Constructivism, and *gukjae geonchuk* (International Architecture) for German Constructivism and the International Style. Park Dong-jin did not have an opportunity to study abroad since it was forbidden for a Korean to study in Europe or in Japan at this time. However, he, like the first generation of Korean architects, was exposed to a vast amount of information through *Chosen to kenchiku* and other imported Japanese and Western architectural journals. According to architectural historian Yoon In-Suk, not only *Chosen to kenchiku* but also architectural magazines from other countries—such as the Japanese magazine *Kenchiku zasshi* (1881-) and *Kenchiku sekai* (1910-1944), the American journal *American Architect* (1876-1938), and the German monthly *Wasmuth Monats Hefte fur Baukunst* (1914-1931)—were available to Korean architects.[26]

In his article "New Architectural Trends in Germany," published on March 18, 1931, Park Dong-jin addressed his thoughts about the emergence of International Architecture:

> The expressionists' architecture had diminished, and their efforts declined, due to the uncontrollable tendency to focus on incendiary and wild self-expression, as well as on rejection and abandonment of the core elements of architecture—structure and material.

[26] Yoon In-seok, "Iljesidae geonchuk eseo ui modeonijeum" [Modernism in Architecture during the Colonial Period], Geonchuk yeoksa hakhue [Architectural History Conference] inaugural lecture, June 1991.

> As a countermovement, a new architectural spirit arose in Germany and all other countries around the world, competing with each other's innovations. This is the *International Architecture*, advocated in Germany. The *International Architecture* fostered the idea that everything, including architecture, should be constructive to its society and everyday life as a whole. It demonstrated the will to create common elements that are in accordance with each country's national character. Thus, their established standards would determine the country's direction of development.[27]

In his articles, Park Dong-jin used the terms *gukjae-geonchuk* (International Architecture, 國際建築), and *guseong* (Construction, 構成) to describe German International Architectural style.[28] The term 'International Architecture' must have been derived from Walter Gropius's article 'International Architecture' (1925) which was introduced in Japanese magazines during the later 1920s. Park's "International Architecture" had a meaning different from the one given to the same term by the Americans at an influential show at the Museum of Modern Art in 1931. Nonetheless, his argument demonstrates his knowledge about the new trends in Europe and his understanding of the concept of "International Architecture" promoted by Walter Gropius in the mid-1920s. The two images included in this article, J. J. P. Oud's (Jacobus Johannes Pieter Oud, 1890-1963) workers housing in Hoek van Holland (Hook of Holland, Rotterdam,

[27] Translated by the author from Park Dong-jin, "2. Dokil ui geonchuck gyeonghyang [Architectural Trends in Germany]—On Our Residences," *Donga-ilbo* [Donga Daily], March 18, 1931.
[28] Ibid.

Netherlands, 1926-27, Fig. 111) and the small residences designed by Hans Scharoun (Benrhard Hans Henry Scharoun, 1893-1972, Fig. 112) in the Stuttgart Weissenhof Siedlung, 1927, demonstrated the concept of International Architecture quite well.[29] Following German architectural trends, Park's next article, on March 19, dealt with French architecture (featuring Le Corbusier) and Russian Constructivism (Fig. 113). He called the main Russian figures Constructivists (*guseong-pa*, 構成派), and described this movement as proclaiming the unity of art and technology. He said it put an emphasis on the use of concrete to create functionalist architecture.[30] Somewhat paradoxically, even though one image of Le Corbusier's Villa Stein, built in 1927 at Garches, France was included, but no image of Russian Constructivist architecture was (Fig. 114). Park Dong-jin's newspaper article series "On our Residences" illuminates the fact that the latest architectural movements in Europe and America, introduced mainly through the magazine *Chosen to kenchiku*, were shared not only among Japanese architects in Korea but also among Korean architects who graduated from the Gyeongseong Engineering College, and was known to Korean audiences in general through newspaper articles from 1931.

Another figure who paid attention to the Constructivist movement was the noted Korean writer and architect Yi Sang (1910-1937). He worked as a civil

---

[29] After the Korean emancipation from Japan, in 1945, the International Style was described as *shingeonchuk* (New Architecture), *heondaegeonchuk* (Contemporary Architecture), and *sinsaeng joseon geonchuk* (Newly Emerging Architecture of Joseon). Song Seog-ki, "1940 nyeondae huban hanguk geonchuk eseo singeonchuk gwallyeon nonuiui seonggyeok" [The Characteristics of the Discussion on "New Architecture" in Korea during the late 1940s], *Daehan geonchuk hakhoe nonmunjib gyehoekgye* no. 19 vol. 3 (March, 2003): 97.

[30] Park Dong-jin, "4. Constructivism in Russia—On Our Residences," *Donga Daily* [Donga Daily] March 19, 1931.

engineer for the interior department of the Government-General of Joseon after graduating from the Gyeongseong Engineering College, and he had a particular interest in Dadaism, German Expressionism, and the abstract movements from the West. In December 1929, Yi Sang won the first and third prizes in a design contest for his innovative abstract design for the cover of *Chosen to kenchiku*. His design was used for the covers published in 1930 (Fig 115). In those covers, Yi featured a typography and abstract design influenced by Constructivism. He employed a universalized abstract language through the use of simplified disks, squares, and a new, innovative type of Chinese typography. For the title, he used small dots for some of the short strokes of *hanja* (the Korean name for Chinese characters) to add a little variation to the design. Furthermore, he converted the sharp edges of the square-shaped strokes into the shape of barrel arches to give an overall smooth look. Geometrical lines and forms used for his design indicate his understanding of the avant-garde movements in Europe and Japan, and the fact that Constructivism had been introduced to Korea almost instantly. Yi's work shows that Korean architects had opportunities to express their innovative ideas during this time period, even though it was only through publishing.

3.3 Constructivist and International Style Buildings in Korea

Even though the generalized meanings and ideals of Russian and German Constructivism, and other variants from Holland, Eastern Europe, and Japan were known to Koreans, there were few new buildings from the late 1920s and 1930s designed in Constructivist / International Style. The majority of the handful known were designed by Japanese architects. In lists of modern architecture compiled by Korean architectural historians, only a couple of buildings fully embodied the specific characteristics of Constructivist style. Unfortunately, there is extant little detailed information about most of these International Style buildings, most of which were destroyed during the war. Known Constructivist buildings from this period in Korea are listed in Table 1.

Building name	**Date constructed**	**Designer**	**Construction Company**
Tokyo Hall, Joseon Fair	1929	unknown	unknown
The Prefectural Industrial Promotion Hall	October 1929	Ministry of Treasure	Ministry of Communications and Transportation, Bureau of Accounts
Meiji Confectionary Store, Gyeongseong Branch	September 30, 1931	Moriyama Matsunosuke Architecture Firm	Ōda Engineering Office
Mitsukoshi Department Store	March 1929-October 1930	Mitsukoshi Archictecture Firm	unknown
Danseong Theater	June 1934-December 1934	Tamada Architecture Firm	
Dongyang Theater	1934	unknown	unknown
Joseon Central Telegraph Office	June 1935	Building and Repair Section, Ministry of Communications and Transportation, Bureau of Accounts	Building and Repair Section, Ministry of Communications and Transportation, Bureau of Accounts
Gyeongseong Fire	December	unknown	unknown

Building name	Date constructed	Designer	Construction Company
Department	1936		
Chōjiya Department Store	1939	unknown	unknown

Table 1. Constructivist Buildings in Korea, c. 1929-1939.

The exploration of "new" symbolic expressions and modern materials began in the late 1920s. The buildings listed in Table 1 were made with reinforced concrete, glass windows, and rectilinear façades, instead of with brick and ornamentations typical of eclectic or Neo-Renaissance style buildings constructed during the early 1920s.

In November 1929, the Department of the Treasury commissioned the construction of the Prefectural Industrial Promotion hall adjacent to the Namdaemun (south gate), Namdaemun district (Fig. 116). The white-painted reinforced concrete walls, steel sash windows, and protruding cantilevered balconies created a great contrast with the other Neo-Gothic buildings nearby, such as the Bank of Joeseon, which stood across the street and was built with granite and stone. The continuous vertical and horizontal joints, the use of non-ornamented walls, and the prominence of glass typify the Constructivist style, and might be compared to the earlier version of Wells Coates' Lawn Road Flats apartment blocks built in London in 1934 (Fig. 117). The incorporation of vernacular elements, rejecting any type of Korean traditional materials or ornamentations is clear. It is, however, hard to discern whether this reflected Japan's assimilation policies, which strove to eliminate local elements from

architecture, or modernist principles that rejected any ornamentation and favored new materials and structures, emphasizing impersonal quality and rationalism.

Modern cafes, department stores, and bars flourished in the *Bonjeong* district of Gyeongseong from the early 1920s onward. The main street in this southern district was dominated by Japanese residences (Fig. 118). It was comparable to the Ginza streets in Tokyo, where new department stores and shopping streets were developed.[31] The Bonjeong district (today Chungmuro) was the area in which the Meiji confectionary store opened a branch on September 30, 1931 (Fig. 119). The designer Moriyama Matsunosuke (1869-1949) was a reknowned Japanese architect recognized for his designs for significant public buildings in Japanese-occupied Taiwan. He established the Moriyama Matsunosuke architecture firm in Gyeongseong during the late 1920s, but the exact date is unknown. Typically, the design of the Meiji Confectionery branch stores in Japan were decided after yearly design competitions. For example, the contest for the design for the Ginza branch store in 1931 was won by Japanese architect Maekawa Kunio (1905-1986) (Fig. 120), who used a modernist design.[32] Likewise, Moriyama's winning modernist design was implemented in the Gyeongseong branch store (Fig. 119). He designed the three-story (plus one underground) building to be made of wood, brick, and reinforced concrete. It took

[31] In the late 1930s, five department stores were running their business in this district: The Mitsukoshi, Chōjiya, Minakai, Hirata, and the Hwasin department store. Only the Hwashin department store was designed by Korean architect Park Gil-ryong.
[32] Jonathan Reynolds, *Maekawa Kunio and the Emergence of Japanese Modernist Architecture* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), 101.

five months for the Ōda Engineering Office to complete the construction.[33] The continuous horizontal bands around the exterior of each floor and square windows without any decorations were reminiscent of Maekawa's design for the Ginza branch store in 1931, even though the Gyeongseong store was much smaller and had two street fronts.

Construction on the Mitsukoshi Department Store, Gyeongseong branch (Fig. 121), called the Gyeongseong Samwol department store in Korea, was begun in March 1929 in the Bonjeong district.[34] The Mitsukoshi architecture firm (the designer's name is unknown) designed it as a four-story (plus basement) building using brick and steel-frame reinforced concrete, and featured granite and marble slabs on the exterior wall.[35] The opening of a modern department store in the Bonjeong district in 1930 was sensational. Pamphlets with the image of the architecture advertised the completion of the new store (Fig. 122). The café on the fourth floor and the botanical garden on the rooftop became trendy gathering places for youth (Fig. 123). The store lured people by displaying new Western products in show window, targeting upper-class citizens, both Japanese and

---

[33] *Ibangin ui sungan pochak Gyeongseong 1930* [Old Seoul through Foreign Eyes 1930], exh. cat. (Seoul: Cheong Gye Cheon Museum, 2011), 72. Image and plan taken from *Chosen to kenchiku* (November, 1930), 12.

[34] This store started as a clothing store in 1906 in Gyeongseong and opened its official branch in 1930, three years after the first main store opened in Chuo-ku, Tokyo.

[35] Mitsukoshi began as Echigoya, a dry-goods store founded in the Edo period by Mitsui Takatoshi (1622-1694). The present name was adopted in 1928. In 1914, architect Yokokawa Tamisuke designed a six-story building in Neo-Renaissance style in the Nihonbashi section of Tokyo, located in Chuō, Tokyo (nowadays Mistukishimae Station, Ginza Line, Tokyo). Watanabe Hiroshi, *The Architecture of Tokyo: An Architectural History in 571 Individual Presentations* (Stuttgart and London: Edition Axel Menges, 2001), 94.

Korean.[36] The glass windows and attached granite slabs resembled the Neo-Renaissance style of the original department store in Nihonbashi, Tokyo (Fig. 124), but the curved entrance and powerful horizontal bands of windows added to the functionalist character. A couple of remodelings later, the building today stands at the same location, still attracting customers as part of the Samsung-owned Shinsegae department store chain (Fig. 125).

Like department stores and cafes, theaters were for Japanese and Koreans during the early 1930s among the favorite places for recreation. Two major theaters were constructed as modern landmarks in 1934: the Danseong Movie Theater (Fig. 126) and the Dongyang Theater (Fig. 127). The Danseong Theater originally opened in 1907 and was later expanded with the construction of a new modern building that could accommodate 750 guests.[37] Rather than using horizontal-band-and-glass walls, the real inspiration was German Expressionism, which was the most dynamic force in German architecture at the beginning of the 1920s. The biomorphic forms created through fragmented lines, small roundel windows, and the use of steel frames, brick, and reinforced concrete retained the excitement of Expressionism that had sprung up more than a decade earlier in Germany, attested in such buildings as Erich Mendelsohn's Einstein Tower (1920-21), which was published in the January 1924 issue of *Chosen to kenchiku*

[36] The targeted consumers for each department store were different. Whereas Misukoshi targeted the upper-class citizens through selling top brands, the Chōjiya department store sold products targeting the middle-class, and 60% of the consumers were Korean. Kim In-ho, *Baekhwajom ui munhwasa: gundae ui Tansaeng gwa yokmang ui sigonggan* [The Cultural History of Department Stores: The Birth of Modernity and the Urban Space of Desire] (Seoul: Sallim, 2006).

[37] The first Korean sound film *Chunhyangjeon* was screened in this movie theater on October 4th, 1934.

(Fig. 99). Another structure that reflected the form of the Einstein Tower was the Gyeongseong Fire Department (December 1936, Fig. 128), which was built in the Taepyeongtong Iljeongmok district (presently Taepyeongno street). Replacing a structure constructed in 1924, the new building had a U-shaped observation tower that made it possible to observe fires within the four gates of Gyeonseong, a sensational innovation at the time. The construction is attributed to a Japanese architectural firm, but no identifying documentation remains. The building was photographed in the 1950s—a time when surrounding skyscrapers rendered this building unable to take advantage of its observation tower, and the building was demolished in 1978.[38] The building had been eight stories, including the six-story observation tower, probably then making it the tallest building in Gyeongseong. The elevated tower was reminiscent of Erich Mendelson's Einstein Tower. Neither the sophisticated ideas of Mendelsohn about the creation of a living organism nor German Expressionist precepts were employed, but the unique semicircular shape of the tower aroused a sense of organic simplicity, and the structure's functionalism indicate the significant influence of German Expressionism.[39]

The final building, the Chōjiya (Georgia) department store (1939, Fig. 129) featured non-ornamental surfaces, a continuous row of transparent glass windows, horizontal bands, and vertical elements. The design was impacted by Eric Mendelsohn's German department store designs (Fig. 130) and incorporated the

[38] Only a couple of black and white photographs could be found online.
[39] *Joseon to kenchiku*, February 1935.

design used in Japanese department stores, such as the Shirokiya Department Store built in Tokyo by Ishimoto Kikuji (1928, Fig. 131).

3.4 Korean Housing Projects: Korean architects Park Gil-ryong and Park Dong-jin

Most Constructivist or International Style structures built by Koreans date to after 1945, largely because of restrictive colonial policies that prohibited Koreans from studying abroad or receiving professional architecture training. The only building erected by Koreans before 1945 in which Constructivist principles were employed was the first Korean private museum, Bowhagak (now Gansong Museum, Fig. 132). Cultural properties collector Jeon Hyung-pil (1906-1962) requested Park Gil-ryong to build Bowhagak to house his collection of national treasures. The building was completed in 1938. Even though the first generation of Korean architects did not construct other public buildings in Constructivist style, they innovatively adopted the principles of functionality and rationalism from Constructivist architecture and used these concepts to avidly discuss how to provide affordable and simplified prefabricated housing for middle-class citizens.

Park Gil-ryong

The Gyeongseong Engineering College, a three-year college established by the Japanese Government-General of Joseon in 1916, accepted Koreans, but only to study draftsmanship and engineering (Fig. 133).[40] Park Gil-ryong and Lee Ki-in were the first Korean graduates from the architecture department at Gyeongseong Engineering College in 1919. Afterward, several students, including Park Dong-

[40] Ahn Chang-mo, "Iljeha Gyeongseong godung gongeophagyo wa geonchuk gyoyuk" [A Study on Kyungsung Institute of Engineering and Architectural Education], *Daehan geonchuk sahakhue nonmunji gyehoekgye* vol. 14, no. 6 (June, 1998): 35-46.

jin, graduated from the same program and started their careers as the first generation of modern Korean architects.[41]

After graduation, Park Gil-ryong (Fig. 134) worked as a junior engineer at the Ministry of Communications (Fig. 135), where he practiced his designing skills while assisting Japanese architects. He finally got the opportunity to design the *Namdaemun* branch office building of Dong-il bank in 1931, the first notable public structure designed by a Korean (Fig. 136). Park was promoted to Chief Engineer in 1932, and he opened his own architecture firm that same year (Fig. 137). As the first Korean architecture firm, most of the employees were Korean graduates from the Gyeongseong Engineering College.[42]

Park Gil-ryong actively participated in a number of architectural societies beginning in the mid-1930s. In 1934, Park was an active member of Joseon Jutaekdan [Joseon Residence Society]. In 1938, he became the first board member of the Joseon Geonchuk hue (Joseon Architectural Society). Park Gil-ryong was promoted to be Dean of the Joseon Geonchuk Gisa Hyeobhue (Joseon Architectural Engineer's Association) while he was the only Korean member. From the early 1930s until his death on April 27, 1943, he was a well-known architect and architectural theorist. Park Gil-ryong introduced new trends in Korean modern architecture through numerous articles published in magazines and newspapers such as *Chosun-ilbo* [Chosun Daily] and *Donga-ilbo* [Donga

[41] Kim Sae-yeon (graduated 1920), Jang Jeon-chae (graduated 1923), Kim Sun-ha (graduated 1925), Lee Gyun-Sang (graduated 1925), and Park Dong-jin were the students who graduated from the architecture department at Gyeongseong Industrial High School. Song Seog-ki, "1930 nyeondae hangukin geonchukga ui hwaldong gwa gu seonggyeok" [The Significance of Korean Architect's Works, about 1930s], *Daehan geonchuk hakhoe jihoe yeonhap nonmunjib* vol. 7, no. 3 (August 2005): 9.
[42] Ahn, "Iljeha Gyeongseong," 35.

Daily]. He was an editor for the science magazine *Gwahak-Joseon* [Science Joseon].[43] In 1941, he published by his own magazine *Kenchiku Joseon* [Architecture Joseon], which was the first architectural magazine published by a Korean architect.

His first architectural project while working at the Ministry of Communications was the residence of Mr. Kim Yeong-su in Seongbuk-dong, Seoul. By the time he left the Ministry of Communications, his main works were

1929: Residence of Mr. Kim Yeong-su, Seongbuk-dong, Seoul

1930: Residence of Mr. Yoon, Sajik-dong, Seoul

1930: Residence of Mr. Kim Myeong-jin, Gahue-dong, Seoul

1930: Keijō Imperial University

1931: Donga Department Store

Dong-il Bank, *Namdaemun* branch

After establishing his architectural firm, his project list included:

1935: Hancheong Building

Chosun Daily Building, Hwashin Department store

1937: Gyeongseong Women's Commercial High School

1938: Bohwa-gak (Current Gansong Museum)

1940: The main school building of Pyongyang Daedong Gongjeon University

[43] *Gwahak-Joseon* was published by Balmyeong-hakhue [Invention Society] in June, 1933 and its publication ceased in January 1994. The main members of the editorial board were Kim Young-gwan, Park Kil-young, and Hyeon Deuk-young. Their objective was to provide scientific knowledge to inventors, students, and a general audience.

1943: Hyehwa College, main school building

1943: Imundang Building

Except for the Bohwa-gak building in 1938, most of his work did not fully embrace the Constructivist style. For instance, Park's design for the Hancheong Building (1934, Fig. 138) with its ground-floor shopping arcade giving way to a classicizing treatment, even though the use of reinforced concrete, the rhythmic curtain walls decorated with uniform windows, and the flat roof classify this building as part of non-decorative modernist architecture. Rather than considering the new architectural trends in Europe and Japan, he favored a more classical Western style, seen in the seven-floor reinforced concrete building of the Hwashin department (1934, Fig. 139).

Nevertheless, Park Gil-ryong's designs should not be viewed as simply European imports, but as a "mediated" type of colonial modernism, one that integrated native traditions and expectations with Japanese modernism. While Japanese architects did not employ or recognize local geography, language, or the people of Korea, Park Gil-ryong suggested a way to meld Western-style houses and urban *hanok* (Korean traditional houses).

From the early 1920s, bungalow-style houses, called cultural houses (*munhwa jutaek*), appeared in the suburbs of Gyeongseong as part of a housing improvement project in Korea. The cultural house was a copy of fourteen Japanese houses in Western style that had been presented at the Tokyo Peace Fair

in 1922 (Fig. 140).[44] These houses were thought to fully replace the "unclean" and "ineffective" building style of Korean *hanok* and to provide the upper class a modern, Western home.

Since the Western cultural houses were not appropriate for middle-class living, Park Gil-ryong tried to provide a more Korean-style floor plan for those who were used to living in Korean traditional houses, which typically had a central garden in the middle of the house and no corridors or hallways connecting the rooms (Fig. 141). In a series of articles, "Improving our residential housing," published in *Chosun-ilbo* [Chosun Daily], in November 1926 (Fig. 142), Park recommended adopting and utilizing the compact living plan of the Western houses to replace the inner garden area of *hanok*. However, Park still respected customary living styles in Korea by orienting room openings from north to south to maximize southern sun exposure during the summer and receive prevailing winds. Park's design also adopted the Japanese style entrance hall so that Koreans could easily take off their shoes in a separate space. He persuaded Koreans that to adopt Western floor plans was not to copy the Western tradition mindlessly, but rather to integrate its functionality, flexibility, and hygiene into an authentically Korean living space and kitchen (Fig. 143). Moreover, he insisted on using reinforced concrete and simple construction methods and on keeping the Korean *ondol* floor-heating system.

[44] Illustration was taken from http://salgustory.tistory.com/entry/01 월호문화융성-시대에-돌아보는-문화주택. Accessed on October 1, 2014.

The emphasis on functionality and rationalism was well expressed in Park Gil-ryong's writings on Korean residences. In a book titled *Structure, Material, and Composition,* Park insisted:

> The beauty of architecture should not be created intentionally. It will be naturally created if the composition is rational. Composition needs to be rational in terms of structure and material. The beauty of structure lies in its dynamics, and the beauty of material lies in its natural quality.[45]

The emphasis on rational composition, the dynamics in structure, and the natural quality of the material is well reflected in his design for the residence of Mr. Kim Yeon-su in Seongbuk-dong (1929, Fig. 144, 144-1). The house demonstrates his hybrid Korean-Western architectural approach, which soon became a compelling alternative to the conventional *hanok* and the cultural houses. The exterior of the residence, with its use of nearly flat roofs and bricks, and the overall long, horizontal look, reflected the features of Frank Lloyd Wright's Harry Adams House in Oak Park (1913, Fig. 145). Frank Lloyd Wright's architecture had been introduced in the June-September 1927 issue of *Chosen to kenchiku*, which was two years before the construction of this residence. Park Gil-ryong is known to have admired Wright, whose functionalist design may have influenced his work.

---

[45] Choi Sun-Ai. "Park Gil-ryong ui saengae wa geonchuk e gwanhan jeongu." [Study of Park Gil-ryong's Life and Architectural Works], masters thesis (Seoul: Hongik University, 1981), 91.

Park Gil-ryong used reinforced concrete and wood together in the construction of this residence, and the first-floor bedrooms featured an *ondol* heating system. The Japanese style entrance hall, called *hyun-gwan* in Korean, was a new element in Korean home design. In a 1933 essay, Park Gil-ryong stressed that the Japanese entrance hall, in which people can put on and take off shoes, would enhance the functionality of the modern Korean houses:

> The entrance hall is the gateway that connects the interior and exterior space of a house. Therefore it should provide the shortest distance between the main gate and each room; it should also be easily recognizable from the main gate. If the construction site is not large enough to accommodate the entrance hall and the main gate, the house should be placed adjacent to the road, so that people can access the house from the road through the front door.[46]

In the floor plan (Fig. 144-1), hallways emanated directly from the entrance hall to make the flow between rooms more natural. As a result, the connection between the entrance hall, kitchen, dining room, and living room became more functional and flexible. Park separated the living space from the space for eating by locating the dining room and kitchen in the northern side of

[46] Park Gil-ryong, *On Dwelling Reform of Traditional Housing* (Seoul: Park Gil-ryong, 1933), 9. English translation provided in Woo Dong-sun, "On Park Gil-ryong's Discovering, Understanding, and Designing of Korean Architecture," in *Constructing the Colonized Land: Entwined Perspectives of East Asia around WWII,* ed. Izumi Kurioshi (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2014), 204.

the residence – which would be the back of the house – and the master bedroom to the southern side. Park integrated the principles of this floor plan, which emphasized functionality and rationality, into the floor plans of traditional Korean houses built in the 1930s, such as the old house of Jeong Soon-ju (named Gaksimjae) and the house of Min Byeong-ok located in Insa-dong, Seoul.[47]

Park Dong-jin

Park Dong-jin, a contemporary of Park Gil-ryong, was another significant Korean architect who advocated the functionalistic and rationalistic characteristics of International Architecture and promulgated these features to improve the quality of Korean residences. After introducing the new architectural movements in Europe, which has been discussed in chapter 3-1, he developed his own thoughts about beauty in his article 'The Curvilinear Form and the Beauty of Architecture,' published in *Shin-Donga,* 1931:

> With having a scientific, realistic foundation, it is important to recognize the beauty within the physical laws and scientific accuracy. Beauty is undoubtedly equivalent to a scientific, realistic, or practical art in our daily life.[48]

[47] For a detailed analysis of these two residences, see ibid., 207-210.
[48] Translation by author. Park Dong-jin, "Gokseon gwa geonchukmi" [The Curvilinear Form and the Beauty of Architecture], *Shin-Donga*, 1931.

The emphasis on realism and functionalism continued in his other writings. Park Dong-jin argued that the beauty of architecture lies in "vast scale, tidiness, order, healthy, economic, rational, purposefulness, and refinement," a use of terminology that Constructivists in Eastern and Western Europe favored from the mid-1920s. After introducing the various architectural trends in Europe, Park Dong-jin discussed the problems in Korean traditional architecture in his article of March 20, 1931. He pointed out negative characteristics in Korean traditional *hanok*. For instance, he criticized the inefficiency of floor plans, the impermanence of construction material, and problems of hygiene in the kitchen and bathroom.[49] At the beginning of his article "*Hanguk jutaek gehyeok-ron* (Theory of the Improvement of Korean Res````idences)," published in the July 1941 issue of Korean magazine *Chunchu*, Park dong-jin quoted Le Corbusier, stating that houses were "machines for living in." He asserted that emphasizing function and form would lead Koreans toward internationalization and harshly criticized the impracticality of Korean house design:

> The exterior designs of current Korean houses are far too romantic. They entirely disregard the surrounding environment and natural settings. They lack practicality and functionality altogether. Architecture is dead. The circulation of blood has discontinued, and the heartbeat has stopped…. The same applies to the floor plan. It is important to make everything

[49] Park Dong-jin, "On Our Residences," *Donga-ilbo* [Donga Daily] March 20, 1931.

rational and more organic. Since there is no natural flow between rooms (in Korean houses), the organic relationship is not present.

To increase functionality and organic flow between rooms in Korean homes, he suggested adding the guestroom, entrance hall, living room, study, reception room, and terrace – all mainstays of Western and Japanese houses.

Unlike Park Gil-ryong, who actually realized his theories through integration of Western and Japanese floor plans in Korean dwellings, Park Dong-jin did not apply his research to actual constructions. He turned his interest to Gothic style buildings instead, and continuously designed granite-formed gothic school buildings (Fig. 146, 147). One exceptional example of this approach was his personal residence (Fig. 148) built in 1943, of which only blurry images exist. For this structure, he designed a functional and flexible living space by adding living rooms and hallways to the first and second floors. Although his architectural projects greatly deviated from his theories, it is noteworthy that Park Dong-Jin's writings strongly advocated the transformation of the Korean conventional living spaces by way of rational and functional architectural design.

Japanese architects actively introduced Constructivism, the International Style, and Japanese modern architecture into the main streets of Gyeongseong as part of the assimilation policies enforced by the Government-General in Colonial Korea. Nonetheless, the first generation of Korean architects, Park Gil-ryong and Park Dong-jin, endeavored to see modernism as a continuum of their traditional architecture rather than a break from the past. These architects reflected the

evolution of modern Korean architecture through their influence on Korean residential designs. The outcome was a "mediated" colonial modernism, one that integrated native traditions and expectations with Western and Japanese modernism.

Chapter 4: Constructivist Art and Design in Korea during the late Colonial Period, 1930-1945

After the annexation of Korea, the Government-General of Joseon intervened in industrial enterprises and halted the social development of Korea. The goal of the Japanese colonial policy in Korea was the complete integration of the two nations. Thus, Korean architects had very limited opportunities to receive any kind of higher education (see chap. 3). The same thing happened in the development of *zuan* (design) in Korea. The Government-General of Joseon banned *zuan* education because they felt it could give Koreans the opportunity to bring industrial development to Korea.[1] They excluded the design division, together with engineering and architecture, from the curriculum at the Gyeongseong Imperial University, founded in 1924. Prior to that, the Lee Wangjik Misulpum Jejakso (Lee Wangjik Arts and Crafts Institute), which opened in 1906, was the first and only Korean institute to design handicrafts for the royal family, but the Japanese took control of it in 1922. The first official department to teach modern design was established only after the emancipation (in 1946) at Seoul National University and Ewha Women's University.

Nonetheless, Constructivist design was introduced in Korea through routes other than the more conventional path of Constructivist architecture, which was available only in a limited form through architectural magazines and the activities of Japanese architects in Korea. Constructivist art and design, however, was spread through the activities of

[1] Kim Jong-gyun, *Hanguk dizainsa: seogu ui dijainsa reul baek beon deullyeoda boado ihae hal su eomneun uri dijain iyagi* [History of Design in Korea: A Look into Our Own Design Which Cannot be Understood by Looking at Western Design History One Hundred Times] (Seoul: Mijin-sa, 2008), 33.

Korean artists majoring in either design or fine arts while studying abroad in Japan during the late 1920s and 1930s. Access to Constructivism and other major European modern avant-garde movements was enabled through the second generation of Korean artists studying abroad in Tokyo during the mid- and late 1930s, such as Lee Sun-seok, Kim Whanki (1913-1974), Lee Kyu-sang (1918- 1967), and Yoo Youngkuk. Of these students, the first and last are noted for having left significant Constructivist works, made both during their studies in Japan and later, upon their return to Korea in the 1930s. This chapter examines the initial development of Korean Constructivism in art and design through a close analysis of works by Lee Sun-seok (1905-1986) and Yoo Youngkuk (1916-2002).

4.1 The Introduction of Modern Western Painting

Western-style painting had been introduced to Korea as early as the mid-1880s. A total of 886 Korean students departed to Japan for their studies, including painting, in 1909.[2] One of these students, Ko Huidong (1886-1965), matriculated in the Western-style painting division at the Tokyo School of Fine Arts in September 1909, and became the first Korean painter to apply Western oil painting techniques.[3] Ko Huidong, Kim Kwanho (1890-1959), Kim Chanyoung (1893-1960), and Na Hyeseok (1896-1946) also graduated from the Tokyo School of Fine Arts. All five constituted the first generation of Korean Western-style artists.[4] After they returned to Korea, the number of Korean *seoyangwha* (Western-style painting) artists steadily increased and soon exceeded the number of *dongyangwha* (Oriental painting, Korean ink painting) artists from the late 1920s. Since Korean artists were allowed to practice art only under the control of the Japanese government, and because travel to Europe or the United States was very limited, their practice was based mostly on the training they received while studying in Tokyo.

Indirect access to major European modern avant-garde movements was possible for the second generation of Korean artists, who studied abroad in Tokyo during the mid- and late 1930s. Abstract painting was introduced through Korean artists, including Kim Whanki (Fig. 149) and Yoo Youngkuk (Fig. 150), then studying in Tokyo. Kim Whanki started his study in the oil painting division at Nihon University in 1933, and Yoo Youngkuk learned abstract painting style at the Bunka Gakuin from 1935. Both artists

---

[2] Ko Hui-Dong graduated in graduated in March 1915. Kim Youngna, *20th Century Korean Art* (London: Lauren King Publishing Ltd.), 127.
[3] Ibid.
[4] Hong Seong-pyo, *Gabogaehyeok eseo haebang sigi kkaji: hanguk geundae misulsa* [From Gabo Reform to Emancipation: Modern Art History of Korea] (Seoul: Sigongart, 2009), 97.

became members of several artistic groups and exhibited at avant-garde exhibitions held in Tokyo. After their return, they inaugurated the Korean abstract art movement in the late 1930s. However, that movement soon ceased due to the outbreak of the Korean War (June 25 - July 27, 1950), a historical peculiarity that will be explored later. It was not until the late 1950s that these avant-garde artists began to be active within the increasingly capitalist culture of Korea. From that time on, artists found their artistic visions through abstraction.

The number of students who matriculated at the Tokyo School of Fine Arts increased to twenty in the 1920s, but only one of them was in the design division. Lee recalled in his essay "Nogyosu wa campus wa hakseng" [An Old Professor and the Campus and the Student], written during his final years as a professor at Seoul National University, that there were two reasons why Korean students did not apply for the design department. First, Koreans were not familiar with design or applied arts at that time and second, the Tokyo School of Fine Arts was hesitant to admit Korean students because the applied arts area might have a significant impact on industrial development in Korea, which the colonial authorities wished to curtail.[5] After Im Suk-jae and Lee Sun-seok graduated from the Tokyo School of Fine Arts, a couple of other Korean students enrolled in other design departments, but they were relatively few compared to the fine art students. Korean ceramic artist Kang Chang-won (1906-1977) graduated from the same department as Lee Sun-seok in 1933. Other Japanese institutes educated aspiring Korean artists. For example, the design department of the Japan Fine Arts Institute (*Nihon Bijutsu Gakkō*) graduated three Korean students—Lee Byung-hun (1934), Yoo

[5] Ibid.

Gang-ryeol (1944), and Kim Jeong-whan (1939).[6] Han Hong-taek (graduated in 1939) and Kim Jae-seok (graduated in 1940) graduated from the Imperial Art Institute (*Teikoku Bijutsu Gakkō)*.[7] According to art historian Kim Minsoo who traced the activities of all eight students,[8] Lee Sun-sek was the only one who adopted the Constructivist design from his experience as a student in Tokyo, even though he discontiunued pursuing this style after his return to Korea.

[6] Kim Minsoo, "Hanguk hyeondae dijain gwa chusangseongui balhyeon" [Contemporary Design of Korea and the Emergence of Abstraction], *Johyeong* [Form] vol. 18, no. 1 (1995): 53.
[7] For information about the Korean students in the design and crafts department at the Imperial Art College, see Shin Hee Kyung, "Hanguk e iseoseo ui geundae dijain suyong e gwanhan gochal: Jeguk misul hakgyo ui donan gongye gyoyukgwa joseonin yuhagseng (1920-1945) eul tonghayeo" [An Investigation about the Acceptance of the Modern Design in Korea—The Case of Design Education and Korean Students at Teikoku Art College 1920-1945], *Dijainhak Yeongu* [Journal of Korean Society of Design Science] vol. 18, no. 2 (2005): 48-58.
[8] Kim, "Hanguk hyeondae," 53.

4.2 Korean Students from the Design Division of the Tokyo School of Fine Arts

As mentioned above, the number of Korean students matriculated at the Tokyo School of Fine Arts reached as high as twenty in the 1920s, but only one of them was in the design division. In 1928, Im Suk-jae (1899-1937) was the first Korean to graduate from the design division at the Tokyo School of Fine Arts. Im Suk-jae matriculated in the *senka* (elect division), which was a division for students who passed a special entrance exam.[9] In Im's graduation project, one can detect the changing focus of the school. One of the four graduation projects by Im was the *Design for a Bookcase and Decorative Crafts* (1928, Fig. 151). Bamboo was used for the bookcase, and lacquer plates inlaid with mother-of-pearl was used for the flower patterns. The curvy lines of the gourd flower patterns show off the Art Nouveau style to great advantage. He applied the Art Nouveau style to traditional handcrafted objects, thereby following the craft design principles taught by Shimada Yoshinari and Mataichi Fukichi at the school.[10]

When Lee Sun-seok, the second and last Korean student to graduate from the design division during the 1930s, entered the school in 1926, it was in the process of changing the focus of their curriculum from crafts design to industrial and commercial design. From 1928, the graduation works of students responded to the introduction of varied European isms, including the Art Deco, the Viennese Secession, and Constructivist movements. For example, Kono Takashi (1909-1999) rendered a striking image for his graduation work *Movie Poster Design—Un Suicide* (1929, Fig. 152). The

[9] The *senka* students were not qualified for a teaching certificate, which *honka* students received after graduation. Kim Youngna, *20th Century Korean Art* (London: Lauren King Publishing Ltd.), 129.

[10] Yoshida Shizuko, *Kindai higashi ajia bijutsu ryūgakusei no kenkyū: Tōkyō Bijutsu Gakkō ryūgakusei shiryō* [A Study of the Modern Western Art Students from East Asia: Historical Records of Foreign Exchange Students at the Tokyo School of Fine Arts] (Tokyo: Yumani Shobō, 2009): 187-188.

simplified figures with a flat form, a divided picture plane, the collage-effect, the gothic font typography, the geometrical elements, and the use of vibrant colors show strong affinity of the artist with a medley of the Art Deco style, akin to contemporary European Art Deco movie posters published in the 1920s. At the Tokyo School of Fine Arts, students at the architecture or the design division focused on the new artistic trends and promoted variously Art Deco, Cubism, and Constructivism; this array of styles was evident within the fine arts division as well.

The modern design movement in Korea was initiated as early as 1931 through Lee Sun-seok. After graduating from the Tokyo School of Fine Arts, he went back to Korea and opened an independent design exhibition at the auditorium of the *Donga-ilbo* [Donga Daily] building, the first design exhibition ever held in Korea.[11] Lee Sun-seok went to Japan in 1925 and learned charcoal drawing at a private art institute before taking the entrance exam for the Tokyo School of Fine Arts. He matriculated at the design division in 1926 and learned both industrial design and crafts design (Fig. 153). Not much is known about his years at the Tokyo School of Fine Arts, but he recalls in his autobiography that he felt lonely since no other Korean students matriculated in the same department (Fig. 154).[12]

His graduation project, "The *sohtei zuan* [book cover design] for *Insaenghak* [Life Story]" (Fig. 155), is marked by stylistic diversity, and therefore exhibits a significant change in style and form than that of Im Sukjae. Nevertheless, there are striking similarities between them, including a tendency toward abstraction and an admiring

[11] Kim "Hanguk hyeondae," 55.
[12] Lee Sun-seok, "Nogyosu wa campus wa hakseng" [An Old Professor and the Campus and the Student], in *Hara Lee Sun-seok Jakpumjib* [The Artworks of Hara Lee Sun-seok], exh. cat. (Seoul: Seoul Daehakgyo Misuldaehak Silyongmisulhakgwa Dongmunhue, 1993), 191.

preference for Japanese, Korean, and Western elements. The highly stylized Japanese tie-dye patterns in yellow and purple on both the front and the back covers follow the conservative craft tradition at the Tokyo School of Fine Arts. Like Im's design for the bookcase (Fig. 151), the abstract but highly decorative and feminine patterns of the vegetation-like motifs reflected Art Nouveau aesthetics, yet it maintained authentic local Japanese form and colors. Other book designs such as *Katolik* (Catholic*,* 1931, Fig. 156) and *Scholastik* (1931, Fig. 157) belong to a period when he still favored the Art Nouveau style dominant at the Tokyo School of Fine Arts. Other works from this era but in a more Constructivist style include *Untitled* (1931, Fig. 158), *Labor* (1931, Fig. 159), and the book cover design for a Korean book titled *Joseon shin gajeong gwahak* (New Home Science in Joseon, date unknown), which was probably designed after 1931, when he was active in Korea (Fig. 160).[13] *Untitled* (Fig. 158) was designed for a book titled *saekchae ui yeongu* (Color Study). This was one of the first book designs made by a Korean artist showing complete abstraction. It is worth noting that it was designed the same year Korean architect Yi Sang's Constructivist design appeared on the cover of the architectural magazine *Chosen to kenchiku* (see chapter 3.2). The abstract elements, including the geometries of circles, planes, and horizontal and vertical lines, and the use of primary colors (yellow, red, and blue) are reminiscent of the abstract paintings and collages composed during the late 1920s by Bauhaus teachers Moholy-Nagy and Paul Klee (1879-1940), El Lissitzky, and especially the Czech polymath Karel Teige. Lee Sun-seok's book cover is composed by carefully considering shape, position, line, color, and rhythm—important elements mentioned by Moholy-Nagy as the basic means to build

[13] Gu Gyeong-wha*,* 10.

a completely new structure of vision.[14] Mohly Nagy's *Great Aluminum Painting* (1925, Fig. 161) conveys his idea that "color and light are the prime movers of abstract, nonobjective painting" and "symbolic values for a desirable social order." Lee accepted and experimented with this Constructivist style in his book designs, but did not mention in his writings why he was attracted to this specific movement during his stay in Japan.

At his first private exhibition, held in Korea in 1931, Lee exhibited thirty design works in commercial art, crafts design, and interior decoration. According to art historian Gu Gyeong-hwa, Lee exhibited the pottery he made while he was a student at the Tokyo School of Fine Arts along with a few posters, geometrical patterns for swimsuits, and drawings with Constructivist designs. None of his works remain, and it is unknown which ones he exhibited. In an interview, Lee recalled that the quality of his work were preliminary and similar to a work of an undergraduate, but it was the first design exhibition held in Korea, and many people came to see the exhibition.[15]

Around the time he held his first exhibition, he set out to emphasize the importance of design to a Korean audience, evident in the article that he published in the newspaper. The first article was a critique of the second *Dongmijeon* (Asian Art exhibition) and was published in *Donga-ilbo* [Donga Daily] on April 21, 1931 (fifth page, Fig. 162), only a month after Park Dong-jin published his series of introductory essays on the new avant-garde movements of Europe, including his article "New Architectural Trends in Germany" on May 19 in the same newspaper. The timing shows how Korean

[14] L. Moholy Nagy, "In Defense of Abstract Art," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 4, no. 4 (1945): 74-76. Reprinted in *Moholy Nagy*, ed. Richard Kostelanetz (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1970), 45.

[15] An interview with Lee Sun-seok and Jeon Shi-hwa in "The Significant Works of the Pioneering Sculptor Lee Sun-seom," *Ggumim* 11 (September, 1978). Quoted from Gu Gyeong-hwa, "Lee Sun-seok ui saengae wa jakpum jeongu" [Study of Lee Sun-seok's art and life], masters thesis (Seoul: Seoul National University), 12.

architects and designers were collectively trying to inform the Korean public of the newest trends from Europe.

In this article, Lee said that his Korean audience knew little about design, and he wished to change this trend. He argued that design affects our everyday life, which is an important difference from the fine arts. He emphasized the importance of understanding design and color, and noted:

> If you feel the necessity of color garments, which will look much better than the white garments Koreans used to wear, then you will probably feel the importance of design, which will enhance our daily life so much.[16]

Due to his exhibition, Lee Sun-seok was accepted at the design division of the Hwasin department store (Fig. 163).[17] He was in charge of advertisements and window displays at the store, but not much is known about his career during this time. Unfortunately, his interest in Constructivist design discontinued for more than fifteen years. In 1940, Lee quit his job as an artist to run a modern café, Parlour Nangnang (Fig. 164), a gathering place for artists and intellectuals in the middle of the Bonjeong district of Gyeongseong. In this café Nangnang ("joyful and sonorous"), cultural events and performances by foreign musicians, such as the *Wandervogel (*Wandering Bird) were frequently held (Fig. 165).

[16] Lee Sun-seok, "Jae 2-hue dongmisuljeon" [Second Asian Art Exhibition], *Donga-ilbo* [Donga Daily] (April 21, 1931): 5.
[17] Gu Gyeonghwa, 13.

After the emancipation in 1945 and the Korean War, he increasingly focused on design education, which can be recognized through his long-time role as an associate professor at Seoul National University from 1947 to the late 1970s. A member of the faculty of the design department (renamed "applied arts" in 1949) at Seoul National University, Lee Sun-seok mostly taught the practicum class. According to students who took his class in 1952, he taught them how to create modern designs for posters, book covers, cushions, and pillows.[18] He emphasized the design education methods of Japan, where students were asked to create simplified patterns following the Art Deco style. While he was teaching at this school, Yoo Youngkuk, to be discussed below, taught the 'composition' class together with Kim Whanki and Chang Ucchin.

His second personal exhibition was held in 1949 at Donga department store. Most of his works were decorative pattern designs for wallpapers, rugs, and screens, but none of these works remain. In his later years, rather than pursuing the Constructivist design, he put more effort into contributing to the development of Korean folk crafts and design, taking his interests in a direction rather retrograde to the one taken by design movements in Europe.

[18] Choi Og-su, "Lee Sun-seok ui gongye wa dizain gyoyuk e gwanhand yeongu" [A Study on Education of Modern Craft and Design by Lee Sun-seok at the Seoul National University], *Hanguk gongye nonchong* vol. 2, no. 2 (1999): 11.

4.3 The Art World of Yoo Youngkuk

The subject of my oeuvre is nature, which I have explored through non-figurative forms, that is, abstraction. It is nature not as particular subject but as lines, plans, or colors. Through these lines, planes, and colors, nature gets rendered as a non-figurative form.

- Yoo Youngkuk, 1989

Yoo Youngkuk was born in Uljin-gun, Gangwon-do in 1916. He moved from Uljin to Gyeongseong and entered the Second Keijo High School in 1931. In 1935, he decided to quit the program just before graduation and went to Japan, dreaming of becoming a navigator. He tried to enter the Yokohama Maritime School that same year, but was rejected since he did not have a high school degree.[19] He decided to become a painter immediately afterward and entered the Western oil painting division at the Tokyo Bunka Gakuin (Tokyo Art College) in 1935 at the age of twenty. During his study, he befriended Japanese abstract painter Murai Masanari (1905-1999) and other contemporary Korean artists Moon Haksoo (1916-1988), Kim Byunki (1916-1950), and Lee Joongseop (1916-1956). Yoo Geon, his son, remembered from an interview he conducted in summer 2013 that his father kept a close friendship with Murai Masanari and so assumed that some of the lost artworks of Yoo would remain in the archives of Murai. Murai was the cofounder of several associations, including the *Jiyū Bijutsuka Kyōkai*, in which Yoo was an active member.[20]

[19] Lee In-Bum, "'Rhapsody' of Spirit of Freedom and Nature," in *The Most Beloved Painter in Korea: Yoo Youngkuk 1916-2002,* exh. cat. (Seoul: Maronie Books, 2012), 259.
[20] Murai Masanari graduated from Bunka Gakuin in 1928 and departed to Paris the same year.

During his study in Tokyo, Yoo made a total of 109 works in total before the Korean War, of which only 45 remain.[21] While he was staying in Japan, Yoo actively participated in several artistic group exhibitions. He joined the Dokuritsu Bijutsu Kyōkai (the Independent Fine Arts Association), Jiyū Bijutsuka Kyōkai (the Free Artists Association), and the N.B.G. (Neo Beaux-Arts Group) in 1937, and the Bijutsu Sōsaku ka Kyōkai (Association of Creative Artists Association) in 1938. He submitted works at the exhibitions of these associations and groups until he went back to Korea in August 1943.

Yoo Youngkuk made his debut at the seventh *Dokuritsu-ten* in 1937 by presenting his work *Rhapsody* (Fig. 166). This work, which is known only from black and white postcards that survive, is reminiscent of Russian Constructivist artist Lyubov Popova's (1889-1924) three-dimensional wood set stage design for the 1922 performance of *The Magnanimous Cuckold* in (Fig. 167), a Constructivist play written by Belgian playwright Fernand Crommelyn. The performance was directed by the Russian theater director Vsevolod Emilevich Meyerhold (1874-1940). In Popopa's design, the windmill in the upper right of the construction was meant to remind the audience of the play's Flemish origins. The rolling stage set recalls Russian artist and architect Vladimir Tatlin's (1885-1953) model for *Monument for the Third International* (1920). The piece was a tribute to the strength and utopian nature of a post-Bolshevik Russia. Yoo Youngkuk's design recalls that of Popova, an image of which was published in an article about contemporary Constructivist stage design in the Japanese art magazine *Atelier* in 1936. Art historian Ruh Youngah interprets Yoo's artwork as expressing the Korean artist's nostalgic dream

[21] According to the family, he made 109 works during the 1930s and 1940s, but most of them were lost during the Korean War. Among the 45 works, there are 3 oil paintings, 26 photographs, 15 postcards, and 1 illustration. *Yoo Youngkuk Journal* 1 (2004): 12.

of utopia and argues that he recreated another stereotype of Arcadia with the clouds, horizon, and vast plains.[22] However, it might be safer to say that this seminal work represents Yoo's aesthetic attempt to master composition, material, and the path of abstraction. A series of painterly reliefs were submitted in other exhibitions in the same year. He submitted *Work B* at the first *Jiyū Bijutsuka Kyōkai-ten* and *Relief Objet* at the N.B.G. yoga-ten (Neo Beaux-Arts Group Exhibition of Western-style Painting). After his graduation from the Bunka Gakuen in March, 1938, he submitted *Work R2*, *Work R3* (Fig. 169), and *Work E1* at the second exhibition of the Bijutsu sōsaku ka Kyōkai-ten, for which only postcard images and reproductions remain. In June 1939, he submitted *Work 1* (L24-39.5) and *Work 2* for the Jiyū Bijutsuka Kyōkai Kansai-ten (Free Artists Association, Kansai Region Exhibition) and the series *Work 404-A~E* in May 1940. The other two exhibitions he participated in were the Bijutsu sōsaku ka Kyōkai-ten in May 1939 and October 1940.[23]

The Jiyū Bijutsuka Kyōkai, in which Yoo Youngkuk actively participated, was founded in 1937 by artists Hasegawa Saburō (1906-1957), Otsuda Masatoyo, Tsuda Seishū (1907-1952), Murai Masanari (1905-1999), Yamaguchi Kaoru (1907-1968), and Yabashi Rokurō (1905-1988). While the group produced many figurative works, its main interest was pure geometric abstraction. Unlike the other conventional groups, the Jiyū Bijutsuka Kyōkai divided its exhibition into seven genres: oil painting, watercolor, prints, sketches, collage, object, and photography.

---

[22] Ruh Yeongah, "Yoo Youngkuk ui chogi guseongjuui: <Rapsody>(1937) e natanan yutopianijeum" [Yoo Youngkuk's Early Constructivism: Utopianism in <Rapsody>(1937)], *Misul iron gwa hyeongjang* 8 (2010): 93-121.
[23] Yoo Youngkuk's biography, *Yoo Youngkuk Journal* 1 (2004): 110.

For the Jiyū-ten, Yoo submitted principally painterly reliefs. In the second Jiyū-ten, held from May 22 to 31, 1938 (Fig. 168), Yoo submitted the same *Work R3* (Fig. 169) that he submitted to the second exhibition of the Bijutsu Sōsakuka Kyōkai-ten, and he received the grand prize. Another work *LA-101* (1938, Fig. 170) was submitted to the N.B.G. Yoga-ten in 1937.

He experimented with new materials and techniques using plywood in collage. In one of his interviews, Yoo Youngkuk recalled that he went to art supply stores to find some construction materials, and the shop owner always offered him scrap construction material for free. By using wood pieces that he collected, he tried to express through a surface the deeper quality of the material. In *Untitled* (1937, Fig. 171), he placed some of the wood pieces on a black canvas and explored the basic geometric forms of the wood. The composition demonstrated similar aspects with a study on texture and surface from Bauhaus student Hilde Horn during her first semester at the Bauhaus in 1924 (Fig. 172). His many other works made with plywood, such as *Work 1 (L24-39.5)* (1939, Fig. 173) and *Work R3* (1938, Fig. 169) and showed his keen interest in exploring structure, materiality, and surface treatments, which Hungarian artist and Bauhaus teacher László Moholy-Nagy emphasized when he wrote about the possibilities of new materials in his book *The New Vision, from Material to Architecture* (1932) and exploited by the Polish Constructivist Władysław Strzemiński (1893-1952) to great effect.

The finest of Yoo's work were the geometrical abstract paintings composed of circles and squares of carved white reliefs made from plywood and synthetic board. In *Gyedo D* (Plan D, 1939, Fig. 174) he created a rhythmic mood using projecting rectangles of different sizes placed on the plane of the base. Shadows are created through

the play of recessed and projected arrays of rectangles, creating the illusory effect of a three-dimensional space. *Work 4* (L24-39.5) (1939, Fig. 175) is a complicated work, wherein a semicircle is hollowed out of the square, and only the remaining parts of the square are arrayed on the white background. These white reliefs made from plywood perhaps most closely resemble the series of white reliefs of British Constructivist Ben Nicholson (1894-1982) during the 1930s (Fig. 176). Yoo's reliefs, experimenting with the material reality of the elements of art, formed the bulk of his pure Constructivist work.

After returning to Korea in 1943, Yoo Youngkuk's educational pedigree and artistic favor for Constructivism contributed in the late 1950s to his own unique type of color field abstraction. He started to demonstrate national characters in his painting by depicting abstract elements from the rural landscapes of Korea and by using non-figurative forms and primary colors (Fig. 177)—this time not unlike the early works by Moholy-Nagy from roughly 1919 to 1921 and the works by Ben Nicholson. However, he soon discontinued working on art due to the exigencies of war. He stayed in his hometown, Uljin, for three years and only from 1947 did he actively begin painting again, participating in artist groups such as the New Realism group, the Neo-Realism group, and the 1950 Artists Association. These groups were the three leading artistic groups at the time and counted among their members Kim Whanki, Lee Kyusang (1918-1964), Chang Ucchin (1917-1990), Lee Joongseop (1916-1956), Paek Youngsu (1922-), and Yoo Youngkuk. Even though the Neo-Realism group was short-lived, with only three exhibitions held in 1948, 1949, and 1952, the members strongly supported the idea that "only a metaphysical, geometric language can lead to the meditation of humankind and

the world."[24] Their goal was to use abstraction to reveal the main quality of an object and they felt an object's nature should be based on nature. Around this time, Yoo discontinued his study of materials, which he had pursued in Japan. Instead, he began to depict things from nature, such as the moon, trees, and the mountains, all in a highly abstract form. His works are comparable to Kim Hwanki's work during the same time period.

However, another war soon broke out and once again he had to return to his hometown. After Yoo returned to Seoul in 1955, he started to render the rural environment in Korea, especially the mountains, in abstract forms. After becoming a member of the Modern Art Society in 1953, he started to use titles like "Mountain" and "Tree" for his work, which was a major shift from his previous work, which were untitled or titled merely "Work."

As Korean art historian Chung Yeong Mok points out, the artist's approach to objects derived from rural Korean landscapes should be understood as an attempt to convey nature through "rhythm, harmony, and balance."[25] After his return to Korea, Yoo continuously expressed Korean sentimentality and explored his national identity through a combination of local subjects and color with universal, abstract language derived from the West. His mountains do not seem to signify only a continuous subject, but rather to represent the souls of Korean heritage, and his faith in creating harmonious balance in life, art, and nature. His main subject, the mountain, can be interpreted as a concrete depiction of his fondness for expressing the traditional landscape and his preference for

---

[24] *Hanguk chuecho ui sunsu hwagdongin Sinsasilpa*, exh. cat., ed. Lee Inbum (Seoul: Yoo Youngkuk Art Foundation, 2008), 15.
[25] Chung Young Mok, "Yoo Younkuk ui chogi chusang, 1937-1949" [Early Abstraction of Yoo Youngkuk, 1937-1949], *Yoo Youngkuk Journal* no. 2 (2005): 41-52.

using geometric forms and lines, a technique he had pursued while staying in Japan. The reasons for his persistent focus on the mountain motif are alluded to in his 1989 manifesto:

> I chose mountains as a core subject of my paintings after I finished my art education and returned from Japan…. After my thoughts long dwelled on what the core subject of my works should be, I decided to take the path of painting the mountains…. Even without having to physically enter the mountain, I will pursue where my thoughts and imagination will take me—the boundless forms and interactions of colors are what I would like to pay my life-long devotion to. [26]

Yoo's devotion to mountains and the rural landscape can be interpreted as being part of the philosophical and religious attachment Koreans have to the mountains. Korea is well known for having some of the world's most beautiful crags and gorges, and an ancient tradition of respect, ritually acknowledging the "spirits" they embody. The mountain has been worshipped as a Shamanic demigod, and Korean mythology, the story of the Korean way of life, can be defined mostly through mountain worship, even to this day. Yoo Geon, the son of Yoo, recalled from a 2012 interview that his father made frequent trips to the mountains with his mother whenever he had a break from his work.

Yoo Youngkuk underwent some major shifts in style, and his work can be generally divided into five periods (Fig. 178). The first was an experimental period of abstraction, dating from 1937 to 1943. The second period was spent in composing images

[26] English translation provided in Oh Gwangsu, "Abstract Shape and Color Field Composition: The Art World of Yoo Youngkuk," in *Most Beloved Painter,* 20-25.

of nature, dating from 1948 to 1958. The third period, from 1958 to 1967, can be called the period of "abstract Expressionism." The fourth period was that of geometrical composition (from 1968 to 1972), and a final stage terminated by his death, was a return to his original departure point, abstraction.

The paintings painted during the late 1950s and early 1960s are characterized by contrasting color fields, thick material, and black-colored flexible lines that structure the composition of the painting (Fig. 179-80). In the painted work from 1960, the texture of the material exudes an affirmative mood. A slight stylistic change to a more Expressionistic atmosphere and reference can be understood through his close relationship with the Korean Art Informel group, formed around 1957 to challenge conventional artistic traditions. The leading artists of this group used thick layers of pigment or aggressive brush strokes, and examined the effect of dark and heavy calligraphic brush strokes that maintain a vertical and horizontal balance.

From 1960, the thick lines transform into compositions using sharper diagonal lines, but brighter, intense, and flexible color fields (Figs. 181-82). Yoo himself points out his intention in using color field abstraction:

> The basis of a painting is structure, and in that sense, an artist explores various formations as he composes. According to where one places a subject, new planes and lines are formulated. Every object consists of line, plane, and color, and

painting also accords with this. Therefore, simplification is to condense, and in the end, geometrical shape becomes the basis of everything.[27]

The flexible color fields turned into a more refined, rational, geometrical composition in the 1990s. The thick paint disappeared, and minimal forms of circle and triangles, mostly symbolizing the sun and the mountain, remained.

This chapter explored the beginning of Constructivism in Korean art and design during the late colonial period through the works of Lee Sun-seok and Yoo Youngkuk. Even though they departed from the Europe-derived Constructivism that they learned through their education at the Tokyo School of Fine Arts and through their Japanese fellow artists, they found a way to amalgamate Constructivism with their own tradition. Lee Sun-seok applied the Constructivist style into his book cover designs and focused on placing teaching methodologies derived from the Bauhaus in the Korean educational system. Yoo Youngkuk, on the other hand, embodied his fondness for expressing national identity by depicting rural Korean landscapes through nonfigurative forms and primary colors. Yoo sought to express the fundamental beauty and truth lying beneath nature's complicated forms and colors through abstract compositions and geometrical elements, and centered on the essential nature of his homeland, the mountains. To a considerable degree, Yoo's fascination with the modern principles of Constructivism was shaped by the very limited representation provided by Japanese journals and Japanese

[27] Yi Kyoung-sung, "The Master of Korean Abstract Painting: Yoo Youngkuk." In *Yoo Youngkuk,* exh. cat. (Seoul: Yu Jin, 1997), 16.

counterparts, but it landed safely in Korea and later developed into a firm abstract movement.

Conclusion

After their return to Japan, Mizutani Takehiko, Yamawaki Iwao, and Yamawaki Michiko organized various exhibitions related to the Bauhaus. Michiko brought back her weaving machine and opened an exhibition in Tokyo titled "The Bauhaus Textile Exhibition" in 1933. Eighteen years later Iwao, in conjunction with his wife and Mizutani, launched a comprehensive exhibition titled *Gropius to Bauhuausu* [Gropius and the Bauhaus], held at the Tokyo National Museum of Art, Tokyo, from June 12 to July 4, 1954. In the intervening years, Walter Gropius had watched with critical admiration the growth of Constructivism in Japan, so he took the invitation to visit in conjunction with the exhibition. He and his wife Ise arrived on May 18, 1954 in Tokyo and stayed until August 7.

In addition to materials from Gropius loaned from the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, images of the Bauhaus, pieces of furniture, and kitchen utensils were displayed. Most of the furniture belonged to the Yamawaki family, who had brought it back from Germany. Gropius delivered a speech at the opening of the exhibition. With watering eyes he said:

> This kind of exhibition would be totally impossible to hold today in America or any European country. I cannot help but wonder at how it has been possible to

> assemble such a detailed exhibition and at how so many Bauhaus products remain in Japan. It can only be because of the Japanese people's deep affection.[1]

Gropius said that the exhibition was rich in content and was well-organized, the like of which he had never seen in recent years. During his stay, he attended another exhibition sponsored by Tokyo University of Fine Arts, viewing works produced by the staff and students from the architecture, industrial arts, and the design departments. At this exhibition, he gave another speech:

> West Europeans have failed to maintain a balance between the spectacular progress in technology and the human mind, and this has led to great social problems. There is the question of the transition from manual arts and crafts to industrial production that has been carried out so far. It is necessary for schools to perform studies into how this transition can be implemented. The mistake made by the crafts movement of Ruskin and Morris in the early 19th century was that they rejected the use of machinery. It is hopeless to try and resist the passage of time. People must be the masters of machines.[2]

[1] Izutsu Akio, The Bauhaus: A Japanese Perspective and a Profile of Hans and Florence Schust Knoll (Tokyo: Kajima Institute, 1992), 52.
[2] Ibid., 54.

The enormous interest on the Bauhaus continued unabated into the 1970s, when the second major exhibition on the Bauhaus was held on February 1971 to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of the Bauhaus movement in Japan.[3]

This study followed the initial attempts and efforts of seven pioneering figures who instrumentally placed Constructivism into the discourse of modern Japanese and Korean architecture and design during their early careers. The result is an account of the migration, transformation, and the localization of Constructivism in Japan and Korea during the mid-1920s through 1940s. As seen through the work of Japanese Yamaguchi Bunzō, Yamawaki Iwao, Kurata Chikatada and Koreans Park Gil-ryong, Park Dong-jin, Lee Sun-seok, and Yoo Young-guk, the full social and political ambitions informing the original Constructivisms in Central and Eastern Europe could not be fully transposed to these two East Asian countries. However, the seven architects and artists working on their projects within the different national, cultural, and historical circumstances of Japan and Korea seized upon several of the characteristics of Constructivism from Europe to transform the social conditions and living style in their country.

Unlike the Bunriha members, who were interested in constructing high-end residences for upper-class citizens, Yamaguchi Bunzō in his later career during the early 1930s emphasized socialist aspects of architecture—features intended to improve the living and working environments of the working class. He suggested architectural models that featured simple, pleasant, hygienic, practical, and economic characteristics. A

[3] The 1971 exhibition was realized through close communication between Yamawaki Iwao and Hans M. Wingler, the director of the Bauhaus Archive in Darmstadt. Yamawaki Iwao, *Zoku*. (Tokyo: Nihondaigaku geijutsu gaku-bu bijutsu gakkaken kyūshitsu), 1973.

rationalist and functionalist approach toward architecture was seen as the solution to the rapidly modernizing city and the increasing number of middle-class citizens. Yamaguchi addressed his vision of social transformation through his design, especially that of the Seiunsō and the Bancho Siedlung, which drew from the idea of creating standard prototypes of housing to economically utilize space, material, time, and building cost. In contrast, a rather socially neutral perspective of Constructivism was advocated by Yamawaki Iwao. After returning from his study at the Bauhaus, he challenged the traditions of conventional Japanese living spaces, and introduced new geometrical, rational elements of interior design. This impulse was exemplified by his use of glass ribbon windows, movable partitions, and tubular steel furniture. He tried to entwine the principles of Japanese conventional living space with Constructivist principles that promoted functionality and flexibility. As a Japanese modernist, Iwao made an effort to make modernism a continuation of traditional architecture rather than a break with the past.

Kurata Chikatada, on the other hand, employed the idea of standardization derived from the Bauahus workshops, and tried to find a way to mass-produce handcrafts, and he designed standardized models that would meet the budget of Japanese middle-class housewives. All three architects and designers saw that the idea and praxis of Constructivist principles could be embedded into the traditional mindset of daily Japanese life, and so aimed to construct new living spaces within the rapidly changing Japanese urban environment during the interwar period.

Whereas Yamaguchi, Yamawaki, and Kurata encountered little difficulty in accepting and learning about Constructivism in Europe and had no restrictions in

practicing their work in a comparatively more liberal environment, the political situation of colonial Korea prevented Korean architects from examining firsthand new artistic trends covered by journals such as *Chosen to kenchiku*. During the late 1930s most Constructivist style buildings were built by Japanese architectural firms. Korean architects such as Park Gil-ryong and his contemporary Park Dong-jin deployed the functionalist principles of Constructivism in the interior space of the urban *hanok* plans. Lee Sun-seok and Yoo Youngkuk learned about Constructivism by studying in Japan—the first generation of Korean artists to do so. The earlier artworks of these two artists demonstrate that they were deeply impressed by Constructivism during their studies. Lee Sun-seok's discovery and embrace of the style through his Japanese student days likely led him to give up the style once his nation was freed from colonial rule. On the contrary, Yoo Youngkuk consistently and inventively continued to entwine the geometric elements and abstract forms into the artistic conventions of Korea even after the Korean War.

This study is the first to comprehensively explore the various modes of Constructivisms in Japan and Korea through a select number of Japanese and Korean architects and designers for whom Constructivism was instrumentally formative. This dissertation also contributes to scholarship by bringing to light unknown sources such as the architectural magazine *Joseon to kenchiku*. The Constructivism that emerged in Japan was at once as vigorous and factional as its Russian version. This vitality is to be credited to architects such as Yamaguchi Bunzō, who dedicated himself to producing designs in the service of social and political revolution. Others, such as the Yamawakis, strongly advocated the universal language of the German Bauhaus without policital commitments and thereby fostered the international aspect of Constructivism. On the other hand, the

Korean version of Constructivism pursued the possibilities of Constructivist style as much as was possible under political restrictions.

The introduction of Constructivism to East Asia was simple and swift, but its transformation into an artistic movement was complex and various, since the new style brought significant challenges to conventional lifestyles and living environments of Japan and Korea.

Figures

Bibliography

Ahn Chang-mo. “Geonchuk-ga Park Dongjin e gwanhan yeonggu” [Study on Architect Park Dongjin]. PhD diss., Seoul National University, 1997.

Ahn Chang-mo. “Iljeha Gyeongseong godung gongeob hagyo wa geonchuk gyoyuk” [A Study on Gyeongseong Engineering College of Joseon and Architectural Education]. *Daehan geonchuk hakhue nonmunjib gyehoekgye* vol. 14, no. 6 (June 1998): 35-46.

Alofsin, Anthony. *The Struggle for Modernism*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2002.

Andō Novio. “Bauhausu to watashitachi no aida” [In between the Bauhaus and Us]. *Sansai* 271 (April 1971): 49-55.

Avantgarde im Dialog: Bauhaus, Dada, und Expressionismus in Japan. Berlin: Bauhaus Archiv Berlin, 2000.

Barlow, Tani E. “Introduction: On ‘Colonial Modernity.” In *Formations of Colonial Modernity in East Asia*, edited by Tani E. Barlow, 1-11. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1997.

Bauhaus 1919-1933: Workshops for Modernity. Edited by Bergdoll Barry and Leah Dickermann. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 2009. Exhibition catalog.

Bauhaus: A Conceptual Model. Edited by Bauhaus-Archiv Berlin/Museum für Gestaltung, Stiftung Bauhaus Dessau, and Klassik Stiftung Weimar. New York: Hatje Cantz, 2009. Exhibition catalog.

Benson, Timothy O., ed. *Central European Avant-gardes: Exchange and Transformation, 1910-1930*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2002.

————. “Exchange and Transformation: The Internationalization of the Avant-gardes in Central Europe.” In *Central European Avant-gardes: Exchange and Transformation, 1910-1930*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2002.

———— and Éva Forgács, eds. *Between Worlds: A Sourcebook of Central European Avant-gardes, 1910-1930*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2002.

Berlin Tokyo, Tokyo Berlin: Die Kunst zweier Städte. Berlin: Nationalgalerie Staatliche Museen Berlin, 2006.

Blau, Eve and Monika Platzer, eds. *Shaping the Great City: Modern Architecture in Central Europe, 1890-1937*. Munich and New York: Prestel, 1999.

Bognar, Botond. *Nikken Sekkei: Building Future Japan 1900-2000*. New York: Rizzoli International Publications, 2000.

Brandt, Kim. *Kingdom of Beauty: Mingei and the Politics of Folk Art in Imperial Japan*. Durham, NC: Duke Uniersity Press, 2007.

Briony Fer. "The Language of Construction." In *Realism, Rationalism, Surrealism: Art Between the Wars*, edited by Briony Fer, David Bachelor, and Paul Wood, 87-167. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1993.

Brown, Kendall H., ed. *Deco Japan: Shaping Art & Culture.* Alexandria, VA: Art Services International, 2012. Exhibition catalog.

Calichman, Richard F. *Overcoming Modernity: Cultural Identity in Wartime Japan*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2008.

Čapková, Helena. "Transnational Networkers—Iwao and Michiko Yamawaki and the Formation of Japanese Modernist Design," *Journal of Design History* vol. 24, no. 4 (November 2014): 370-385.

Caprio, Mark E. *Japanese Assimilation Policies in Colonial Korea, 1910-1945*. Seattle and London: University of Washingtong Press, 2009.

Chizuko Yoshida. *Kindai higashi ajia bijutsu ryūgakusei no kenkyū: Tōkyō Bijutsu Gakkō ryūgakusei shiryō*. Tokyo: Yumani Shobō, 2009.

Choi Jungmoo. "This Discourse of Decolonization and Popular Memory: South Korea." *Positions* 1, no. 1 (Spring 1993): 77-102.

Choi Og-su. "Lee Sun-seok ui gonje wa dizain gyoyuk e gwanhan yeongu." *Hanguk gonye nonchong* vol. 2, no. 2 (1999): 243-262.

Chung Young mok. "Yoo Younkuk ui chogi chusang 1937-1949" [Early Abstraction of Yoo Youngkuk, 1937-1949]. *Yoo Youngkuk Journal* no. 2 (2005): 41-52.

Choi Seon. “1930 nyeondae joseon misulgye ui umjigim” [Artistic Trends in Joseon during the 1930s]. In *20 segi hanguk misul yeongusa* [Artistic Movements in Korea in the Twentieth Century], 35-64. Seoul: Seoul Hyeondae Misul Yeonguso ICAS, 2010.

Choi Sun-Ai. “Park Gil-ryong ui saengae wa geonchuk e gwanhan jeongu.” [Study of Park Gil-ryong’s Life and Architectural Works]. Masters thesis, Seoul: Hongik University, 1981.

Clark, John. *Modernities of Japanese Art*. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

————. “Okakura Tenshin and Aesthetic Nationalism.” In *Since Meiji: Perspectives on the Japanese Visual Arts, 1868-2000*, edited by J. Thomas Rimer, 212-256. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2012.

————. “Artistic Subjectivity in the Taisho and Early Showa Avant-garde.” In *Japanese Art after 1945: Scream Against the Sky*, edited by Alexandra Monroe, 41-53. New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1996.

Coke, Van Deren. *Avant-garde Photography in Germany 1919-1939*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1982.

Cohen, Jean-Louis. *Ludwig Mies van der Rohe*. Basel: Birkhäuser Verlag AG, 2007.

Conant, Ellen P. *Challenging Past and Present: The Metamorphosis of Nineteenth-Century Japanese Art*. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2006.

Crawcour, E. Sydney. “Industrialization and Technological Change, 1885-1920.” In *The Cambridge History of Japan*, volume 6, *The Twentieth Century*, edited by Peter Duus, 385-450. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Dada in Japan: Japanische Avantgarde 1920-1970: Eine Photodokumentation. Düsseldorf: Düsseldorf Kunstmuseum, 1983.

Dudden, Alexi. *Japan’s Colonization of Korea.* Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2005.

Edwards, Steve. “Profane Illumination: Photography and Photomontage in the USSR and Germany.” In *Art of the Avant-Gardes*, edited by Steve Edwards and Paul Wood, 395-425. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2004.

Eisenman, Peter. *Eisenman Inside Out: Selected Writings, 1963-1988*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004.

Eizō, Inagaki. Nihon no kindai kenchiku: sono seiritsu katei [Modern Architecture of Japan:The Forming Process]. Tokyo: Kajima Shuppankai, 1979.

Fairbank, John K., and Albert Feuerwerker, eds. *The Cambridge History of China,* volume 13, *Republican China 1912-1949, Part 2*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Fiedler, Jeannine. *Bauhaus*. Cologne: Könemann, 2008.

———— and Peter Feierabend. *Bauhaus*. Potsdam: H.F. Fullmann, 2006.

Fischer, Felice. "Japanese Design: From Meiji to Modern." In *Japanese Design: A Survey since 1950,* edited by Kathryn B. Hiesinger and Felice Fischer, 8-13. Philadelphia, PA: Philadelphia Museum Art, 1994. Exhibition Catalog.

Forgács, Eva. *The Bauhaus Idea and Bauhaus Politics*. Budapest: Central European University Press, 1995.

Franciscono, Marcel. *Walter Gropius and the Creation of Bauhaus in Weimar: The Ideals and Artistic Theories of its Founding Years*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1971.

Fraser, James, Steven Heller and Seymour Chwast. *Japanese Modern: Graphic Design Between the Wars.* San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 1996.

Fujimori Shōichiro and Yamaguchi Hiroshi, eds. *Nihon kenchiku sengen bunshū*. Tokyo: Shōkokusha, 1973.

Fujimori Terunobu. "Die Beziehungen zwischen Deutscher und Japanischer Architektur im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert." In *Berlin Tokyo, Tokyo Berlin: Die Kunst zweier Städte*, 20-25. Berlin: Nationalgalerie Staatliche Museen Berlin, 2006.

Geidai korekushon ten: Tokyo bijutso gakko to bauhausu – kenchikuka, zuanka sotsugyō seisaku ten [Tokyo School of Fine Arts Collection: The Tokyo School of Fine Arts and the Bauhaus]. Tokyo: Tokyo bijutsu daikagu, 2008. Exhibition catalog.

Gendai jūtaku, 1933-1940 [Contemporary Houses, 1933-1940]. Tokyo: Kokusai Kenchiku Kyōkai, 1941.

German Photography 1900-1970: Power of a Medium. Edited by Klaus Honnef, Rolf Sachsse, and Karin Thomas. Cologne: DuMont Buchverlag, 1997. Exhibition catalog.

Gough, Maria. *The Artist as Producer: Russian Constructivism in Revolution*. London: University of California Press, 2005.

Greenberg, Alan C. *Artists and Revolution: Dada and the Bauhaus, 1917-1925*. Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1979.

Gu Gyeong-wha. "Lee Sun-seok ui saengae wa jakpum jeongu." [Study of Lee Sun-seok's art and life]. Masters thesis, Seoul: Seoul National University, 1999.

Gundae wa mannan misul gwa dosi [Art and City in the Modern Period]. Edited by Guksa pyeonchan wiwonhoe. Seoul: Dusan Donga, 2008.

Hanguk Geonchuk 100-nyeon [100 Years: Architecture of Korea]. Edited by National Museum of Contemporary Art and '99 geonchuk munhwa ui hae jojik wiwonhoe. Seoul: Pia, 1999. Exhibition catalog.

Hara Lee Sun-seok jakpumjib [The Artworks of Hara Lee Sun-seok]. Seoul: Seoul Daehakgyo Misuldaehak Silyongmisulhakgwa Dongmunhue [Department of Applied Arts Alumni, Seoul National University], 1993. Exhibition catalog.

Harootunian, H.D. *Overcome by Modernity: History, Culture, and Community in Interwar Japan*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2000.

———— and Masao Miyoshi. *Postmodernism and Japan*. Durham, NC, and London: Duke University Press, 1989.

Helfrich, Kurt G. F., and William Whitaker, eds. *Crafting a Modern World: The Architecture and Design of Antonin and Noémi Raymond.* New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2006.

Hiesinger, Kathryn B., and Felice Fischer. *Japanese Design: A Survey since 1950*. Philadelphia: Philadelphia Museum Art, 1994. Exhibition catalog.

Hitchcock, Henry-Russel and Philip Johnson. *The International Style*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1932.

Hochman, Elaine S. *Architects of Fortune: Mies van der Rohe and the Third Reich.* New York: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1989.

Hong Sun-Pyo. *Gabogaehyeok eseo haebang sigi kkaji: Hanguk geundae misulsa* [From Gabo Reform to Emancipation: Modern Art History of Korea]. Seoul: Sigong art, 2009.

Hong Seong-tae. "From Mount *Beakak* to the *Han* River: A Road to Colonial Modernization." In *Impacts of Modernities*, edited by Thomas Lamarre and Kang Nae-hui, 121-135. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2004.

Huh Yoo-Jin and Woo Don-Son. "1930 nyeondae mal seoul ui yang-gwan e daehan yeongu—Hanin geonchuk-ga ga seolgye han 3 chae reul jungshimureo" [Western-Style Mansions in Seoul in the Late 1930s—Focusing on Three Mansions designed by Korean Architects]. *Daehan geonchuk hakhoe jihoe yeonhap nonmunjib* vol. 29, no. 7 (July 2014): 181-188.

Ibangin ui sungan pochak Gyeongseong 1930 [Old Seoul through Foreign Eyes 1930]. Seoul: Cheong Gye Cheon Museum, 2011. Exhibition catalog.

Isaacs, Reginald. *Gropius: An Illustrated Biography of the Creator of the Bauhaus*. Boston, MA and London: Gebr. Mann Verlag GmbH, 1983.

Izutsu Akio. *The Bauhaus: A Japanese Perspective and a Profile of Hans and Florence Schust Knoll.* Tokyo: Kajima Institute, 1992.

James, Kathleen. *Erich Mendelsohn and the Architecture of German Modernism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

James-Chakraborty, Kathleen, ed. *Bauhaus Culture: From Weimar to the Cold War*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2006.

Jencks, Charles. *Le Cobursier and the Continual Revolution in Architecture*. New York: Monacelli Press, Inc., 2000.

Jung Inha. *Architecture and Urbanism in Modern Korea*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2013.

Kandinsky, Wassily. *Complete Writings on Art*. Edited by Kenneth C. Lindsay and Peter Vergo. Boston: G.K. Hall & Co., 1982.

Kang Byung-Sun, ed. *Hanguk ui gundae geonchuk* [Modern Architecture of Korea]. Paju: Munhak Tongnae, 2011

Kashiwagi Hiroshi. "On Rationalization and the National Lifestyle: Japanese Design in the 1920s and 1930s." In *Being Modern in Japan: Culture and Society from the 1910s to the 1930s*, edited by Elise K. Tipton and John Clark, 61-74. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2000.

Katsumura Kenichi. "Bauhausu to nihon no dezain kyōiku (8)" [Bauhaus and Japanese Design Education]. *Ōtsuki-tandai Ronshū* 11 (March 1980): 111-120.

————. "Bauhausu to nihon no dezain kyōiku (7)" [Bauhaus and Japanese Design Education]. *Ōtsuki-tandai Ronshū* 10 (March, 1979): 137-155.

Kawahata Naomichi. *Nihonjin no Bauhausler, Yamawaki Iwao·Michiko.* In *Bauhaus 1919-1933,* 328-329. Tokyo: Sezon Museum of Art, 1995. Exhibition catalog.

Kayser, Petra. "Constructivism and the Machine Aesthetic." In *The Mad Square: Modernity in German Art 1910-37*, edited by Jacqueline Strecker, 163-164. Sydney: Art Gallery of New South Wales, 2011.

Kee, Joan. *Contemporary Korean Art: Tansaekhwa and the Urgency of Method*. Minneapolis, MN, and London: University of Minnesota Press, 2013.

Kentgens-Craig, Margaret. *The Bauhaus in America: First Contacts 1919-1936*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2001.

Kenchikuka Yamaguchi Bunzō: Hito to sakuhin [Architect Yamaguchi Bunzō: Life and Work]. Edited by RIA Kenchiku Sōgō Kenkyūjo, Kondō Shōichi. Tokyo: Sagami Shobō, 1982.

Kessei 80-shūnen: Modan dezain no senku Keiji Kōbō ten; Keiji-Kōbō, 1928-1938 [80th Anniversary: The Predecessor of Modern Design: Keiji-Kōbō Exhibition, 1928-1938]. Edited by Mori Hitoshi. Matsudo-shi: Matsudo-shi Bunka Shinkō Zaidan, 2008. Exhibition catalog.

Kim Chung-dong. "Seoul Station Building Reborn as a Cultural Complex," *Koreana* 26, issue 1 (Spring 2012): 52-57.

Kim Chung-dong. “Geundae ihu seoul ui jeongdong dongyeok byeoncheon-sa yeongu” [Chung-dong Area in Seoul at the Enlightenment Period]. *Seoulhak yeongu* 19 (2002): 161-225.

————. *Kim Chung-dong gyosu ui geundae geonchuk gihaeng* [A Guide to Modern Architecture with Professor Kim Chung-dong]. Seoul: Pureun yeoksa 1999.

————. “Hanguk geundae geonchuk i hyeondae geonchuk e jeoni duenun gwajeong e gwanhan yeongu” [A Study on the Process of Change From Korean Modern Architecture (1950-1955) to Contemporary Architecture]. *Daehan geonchuk hakhoe nonmunjib* [Journal of the Architectural Institute of Korea] vol. 8, no. 3 (1992): 81-42.

————. “Hanguk geundae geonchuk 206 pyeon ui chamgo munheon” [206 References on Korean Modern Architecture]. *Geonchuk Yeoksa Yeongu* [Journal of Architectural History] vol. 1, no. 1 (1992): 351-361.

————. “Seogu geonchuk i dong asia ro jeoni duenun gwajeong e gwanhan yeongu” [A Study on the Process of Change from Western Architecture to Eastern Modern Architecture]. *Daehan geonchuk hakhoe nonmunjib* [Journal of the Architectural Institute of Korea] vol. 6, no. 6 (1990): 11-19.

————. “Hanguk gundaegeonchuk e itseoso seoyang geonchuk ui jeoni wag u yeonghyang e gwanhan yeongu” [A Study on the Process of Transfer of Western Architecture to Korean Modern Architecture and Its Influence]. Ph.D. diss. Seoul: Hongik University, 1990.

Kim Yong-Bum. “1920-30 nyeondae gyeonseong ui gundae geonchuk hwaldong e gwanhan gicho yeongu: Joseon to genchiku ui jabbo gisa rul junshimuro” [A Primary Study on the Architectural Activities of Seoul in Modern Times: The Miscellaneous New Section of *Chosen to kenchiku*]. *Seoulhak yeongu* 42 (February 2011): 1-46.

Kim Jong-Gyun. *Hanguk dizainsa: seogu ui dijainsa reul baek beon deullyeoda boado ihae hal su eomneun uri dijain iyagi* [History of Design in Korea: A Look into Our Own Design, Which Cannot Be Understood by Looking at Western Design History One Hundred Times]. Seoul: Mijin-sa, 2008.

Kim Minsoo. “Hanguk hyeondae dijain gwa chusangseong ui balhyeon” [Contemporary Design of Korea and the Emergence of Abstraction]. *Johyeong* vol. 18, no. 1 (1995): 51-68.

Kim Youngna. “Urban Space and Visual Culture: The Transformation of Seoul in the Twentieth Century.” In *A Companion to Asian Art and Architecture*, edited by Rebecca A. Brown and Deborah S. Hutton, 153-177. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011.

———. “The Achievements and Limitations of Ko Yu-seop, a Luminary in Korean Art History.” *Archives of Asian Art* 60 (2010): 79-87

———. *20th Century Korean Art*. London: Lauren King Publishing Ltd., 2005.

———, ed. *Hanguk geundae misul gwa sigak munhwa* [Modern Korean Art and Visual Culture]. Seoul: Johyeong gyoyuk, 2002.

———. “1930 nyeondae donggyeong yuhagsaengdeul – jeonwi gurubjeon ui hwaldong eul jungsim euro” [Korean Students in Tokyo in the 1930s: The Avant-garde Groups]. In *Geundae hanguk misul nonchong*, edited by Lee Gyuyeol Association, 273-319. Seoul: Hakgojae, 1992.

Kobayashi, Hiroshi. “Keiji Kōbō no hitotachi” [Members of Keiji Workshop]. *Dezain gaku kenkyū tokushū gō* 6 (1998) 43-48.

Koike, Shinji. *Japan’s New Architecture*. Tokyo: Shokokusha Publishing Co., 1956.

———. *Contemporary Architecture of Japan*. Tokyo: Shokokusha Publishing, 1954.

Kon, Wajirō, and Maeda Kenjirō, eds. *Ginza modan to toshi ishō* [Ginza Modern and City Design]. Tokyo: Shiseido Gallery, 1993.

Kuroiwa Tomoko. “Japan und das Bauhaus.” In *Berlin Tokyo, Tokyo Berlin: Die Kunst zweier Städte*, 176-185. Berlin: Nationalgalerie Staatliche Museen Berlin, 2006.

Kwon, Haeng-ga, et al. *Shidae ui nun: Hanguk geunhyeondae misulga-ron* [Eye of the Century: Discussions of Modern and Contemporary Art Historians]. Seoul: Hakkojae, 2011.

Kyokuto Roshia no modanizumu 1919-1928 [Modernism in the Russian Far East and Japan 1918-1928]. Tokyo: Tokyo Shinbun, 2002.

Le Corbusier: Architect of the Century. Edited by Michael Raeburn and Victoria Wilson. London: Hayward Gallery, with the Art Council of Great Britain, 1987. Exhibition catalog.

Lee Hong Yung, Ha Yong Chool, and Clark W. Sorensen, eds. *Colonial Rule and Social Change in Korea, 1910-1945.* Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2013.

Lee Inbum. *Hanguk choecho ui cunsu hwaga dongin: Sinsasilpa* [The First Association of Korean Purist Artists: The New Realism Group]. Seoul: Yoo Youngkuk Art Foundation, 2008.

———, ed. *Hanguk chuecho ui sunsu hwagdongin Sinsasilpa.* Seoul: Yoo Youngkuk Art Foundation, 2008. Exhibition catalog.

Lee, Peter, ed. *Sourcebook of Korean Civilization,* volume 2, *From the Seventeenth Century to the Modern Period*. New York, NY: Columbia University, 1993.

Leśnikowski, Wojciech, ed. *East European Modernism: Architecture in Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland Between the Wars, 1919-1939*. New York: Rizzoli International Publications, 1996.

Lindsay, Kenneth C. and Peter Vergo, eds. *Kandinsky: Complete Writings on Art*. Boston: G.K. Hall, 1982.

Lodder, Christina. "Soviet Constructivism." In *Art of the Avant-Gardes*, edited by Steve Edwards and Paul Wood, 359-393. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2004.

———. *Russian Constructivism*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1983.

Lost Vanguard Found: A Synthesis of Architecture and Art in Russia 1915-1935. Thessaloniki: State Museum of Contemporary Art, 2008. Exhibition catalog.

Maciuika, John V. *Before the Bauhaus: Architecture, Politics, and the German State, 1890-1920*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

———. "The Politics of Art and Architecture at the Bauhaus, 1919-1933." In *Weimar Thought: A Contested Legacy*, edited by Peter Eli Gordon and John P. McCormick, 291-315. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013.

Mansbach, Steven A. *Visions of Totality: Laszlo Moholy-Nagy, Theo Van Doesburg, and El Lissitzky*. Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1978–80.

Margolin, Victor. *The Struggle for Utopia: Rodchenko, Lissitzky, Moholy-Nagy: 1817-1946*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1997.

März, Roland. "Begegnungen mit Japan: Kunst in Berlin 1900-1945." In *Berlin Tokyo, Tokyo Berlin: Die Kunst zweier Städte*, 54-61. Berlin: Nationalgalerie Staatliche Museen Berlin, 2006.

Matsudo-shi Kyōiku linkai, Matsudo-shi Bunka Shinkō Zaidan, and Matsudo Shiritsu Hakubutsukan. *Dezain no yurikago jidai ten* [Formative Years of Japanese Modern Design]. Matsudo-shi: Madsudo-shi Kyōiku linkai: 1996.

McNeil, Peter. "Myths of Modernism: Japanese Architecture, Interior Design and the West, c. 1920-1940." *Journal of Design History* 5 (1992): 281-294.

Menzies, Jackie, ed. *Modern Boy, Modern Girl: Modernity in Japanese Art, 1910-1935*. Sydney: Art Gallery of New South Wales, 1998. Exhibition catalog.

Migishi Kōtarō ten: Seitan 100-nen kinen [Migishi Kotaro: The Centennial Anniversary of his Birth]. Hokkaido: Migishi Kotaro Museum of Art. Tokyo: Tokyo Shinbun, 2003. Exhibition catalog.

Milner, John. *Kazimir Malevich and the Art of Geometry*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1996.

Minick, Scott. *Chinese Graphic Design in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1994.

Munroe, Alexandra. *Japanese Art after 1945: Scream against the Sky*. New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1994.

Munsterberg, Hugo. *From the Meiji Restoration to the Meiji Centennial, 1868-1968*. New York: Hacker Art Books, 1978.

Muramatsu Teijirō. "Ventures into Western Architecture." In *Dialogue in Art: Japan and the West*, edited by Yamada Chisaburoh, 125-149. Tokyo: Kodansha International, 1976.

Neumann, Eckhard. *Bauhaus and Bauhaus People.* New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1993.

Nicolai, Bernd. *Architektur und Exil: Kulturtransfer und architektonische Emigration von 1930 bis 1955*. Trier: Porta Alba Verlag, 2003.

Nihon kōgei no seishunki 1920s-1945 [Craft Movements in Japan, 1920s-1945]. Tokyo: Bijutsukan Renraku Kyōgikai, 1996. Exhibition catalog.

Nihon no zenei, 1900-1940 [Art into Life, 1900-1940]. Kyoto: Kyoto Kokuritsu Kindai Bijutsukan, 1999.

Oh Gwangsu. "Abstract Shape and Color Field Composition: The Art World of Yoo Youngkuk." In *The Most Beloved Painter in Korea: Yoo Youngkuk 1916-2002.* Seoul: Maronie Books, 2012. Exhibition catalog.

————. *Iyagi hanguk hyeondae misul hanguk hyeondaemisul iyagi* [The Story of Korean Contemporary Art, Korean Contemporary Art Story]. Seoul: Jeong-woo sa, 1998.

Oh Se-mi. "Consuming the Modern: The Everyday in Colonial Seoul, 1915-1937." Ph.D. diss. Columbia University, 2008.

Omuka Toshiharu. "Dadaismus in Japan: Tomoyoshi Murayama, Tokyo und Berlin." In *Berlin Tokyo, Tokyo Berlin: Die Kunst zweier Städte,* 120-133. Berlin: Nationalgalerie Staatliche Museen Berlin, 2006.

Oshima Ken Tadashi. *International Architecture in Interwar Japan: Constructing Kokusai Kenchiku*. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 2009.

Pai Hyung Il. "Staging 'Koreana' for the Tourist Gaze: Imperialist Nostalgia and the Circulation of Picture Postcards." *History of Photography*, vol. 38, no. 3 (August 2013): 3

————. *Constructing "Korean" Origins: A Critical Review of Archaeology, Historiography, and Racial Myth in Korean State-Formation Theories*. Cambridge, MA, and London: Harvard University Press, 2000.

Pehnt, Wolfgang. "Gropius the Romantic." *The Art Bulletin* 53 (September 1971): 379-392.

Pommer, Richard and Christian F. Otto, *Weisenhof 1927 and the Modern Movement in Architecture*. Chicago, IL and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1991.

Posener, Julius. *Hans Poelzig: Reflections on His Life and Work*. New York: The Architectural History Foundation, 1992.

Rave, Rolf. *Modern Architecture in Berlin: 466 Examples from 1900 to the Present Day.* Stuttgard and London: Edition Axel Menges, 2009.

Reuter, Helmut, and Birgit Schulte, eds. *Mies and Modern Living: Interiors, Furniture, and Photography.* Ostfildern: Hatje Cantz Verlag, 2008.

Reynolds, Jonathan M. *Maekawa Kunio and the Emergence of Japanese Modernist Architecture*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001.

————. "The Bunriha and the Problem of 'Tradition' for Modernist Architecture in Japan, 1920-1928." In *Japan's Competing Modenities: Issues in Culture and Democracy, 1900-1930*, edited by Sharon A. Minichiello, 228-246. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1998.

Rickey, George. *Constructivism: Origins and Evolution*. New York: George Braziller, 1967.

Rimer, Thomas, ed. *Since Meiji: Perspectives on the Japanese Visual Arts, 1868-2000*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2012.

*Rue Yeongah. "*Yoo Youngkuk ui chogi guseongjuui: <Rapsody>(1937) e natanan yutopianijeum" [Yoo Youngkuk's Early Constructivism: Utopianism in <Rapsody>(1937)]. *Misul iron gwa hyeongjang* 8 (2010): 93-121.

Ruick, Petra. "Takehiko Mizutani's Years at the Bauhaus Dessau: Study on the Bauhaus and Takehiko Mizutani (1)." *Nihon kenchiku gakkai keikaku kei ronbunshū* 599 (January 2006): 157-163.

Sand, Jordan. *House and Home in Modern Japan: Architecture, Domestic Space, and Bourgeois Culture, 1880-1930*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003.

Satō Dōshin. *Modern Japanese Art and the Meiji State: The Politics of Beauty*. Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2011.

Shaarschmidt-Richter, ed. *Japanese Modern Art: Painting from 1910 to 1970*. Zurich: Edition Stemmle, 2000.

Schulze, Franz. "The Bauhaus Architects and the Rise of Modernism in the United States." In *Exiles+Emigrés: The Flight of European Artists from Hitler*, edited by Stephanie Barron, 255-234. Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1997.

Shin, Gi-Wook, and Michael Edson Robinson, eds. *Colonial Modernity in Korea*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999.

Schwartz, Frederic J. *The Werkbund: Design Theory and Mass Culture before the First World War*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996.

Schwarz, Ullrich. *New German Architecture: A Reflexive Modernism*. Ostfildern-Ruit: Hatje Cantz, 2002.

Shin Heekyoung. "Ilbon eso ui bauhausu-sik gicho gyoyuk ui kyeseung gwa baljeon e gwanhan yeongu – Yamawaki Iwao wa ilbon daehak dizain hakgwa ibchae gicho gyoyuk eul tonghayeo" [A Study of Succession and Development of Bauhaus Basic Design in Japan: Based on Yamawaki Iwao and the Cubic Foundation Program of Japan University's Division of Design]. *Gicho Johyeonghak Yeongu* vol. 9, no. 5 (2008): 277-283.

————. "Hanguk e iseoseo ui geundae dijain suyong e gwanhan gochal: Jeguk misul hakgyo ui donan gongye gyoyukgwa joseonin yuhagseng (1920-1945) eul tonghayeo" [An Investigation about the Acceptance of the Modern Design in Korea – The Case of Design Education and Korean Students at Teikoku Art College 1920-1945]. *Dijainhak Yeongu* vol. 18, no. 2 (2005): 48-58.

Smith, Kathryn. "Frank Lloyd Wright and the Imperial Hotel: A Postscript," *The Art Bulletin* vol. 67, no. 2 (June 1985): 296-301.

Song Seok-Ki. "1930 nyeondae hangukin geonchukga ui hwaldong gwa gu seonggyeok" [The Significance of Korean Architects' Works, c. 1930s]. *Daehan geonchuk hakhoe jihoe yeonhap nonmunjib* vol. 7, no. 3 (August 2005): 9-16.

Song Seok-Ki and Kim Sung-woo. "1920~30 nyeondae hanguk gundae geonchuk eso jeolchungjeok kyeonghyang ui jeongae" [The Beginning and Transformation

of Eclectic Style in Korean Architecture, During 1920-30s]. *Daehan geonchuk sahakhue nonmunji gyehoekgye* vol. 14, no. 12 (December, 1998): 165-174.

———. "Park Gil-ryong geonchuk jakpum ui tukseong e gwanhan yeongu" [A Study on the Characteristics of Architectural Works of Park Gil Yong], *Daehan geonchuk hakhoe haksul balpyo nonmunjib* vol. 13, no. 1 (April 24, 1993): 107-112.

Spaeth, David. *Ludwig Karl Hilbersheimer: An Annotated Bibliography and Chronology*. New York: Garland Publishing, 1981.

Stewart, David B. *The Making of a Modern Japanese Architecture: 1868 to the Present*. Tokyo and New York: Kodansha International, 1987.

Takahashi Naoko and Miyazaki Kiyoshi. "Nihon no kinda dezain ni okeru josei deain naa ni kansuru kisoteki kenkyū—Yamawaki Michiko ni tsuite" [Female Designer in Japanese Modern Design—Yamawaki Michiko as a Case Study]. *Nihon dezain gakkai dezain gaku kenkyū* 51 (2004): 178-179.

Takeba Joe. "The Age of Modernism: From Visualization to Socialization." In *The History of Japanese Photography*, 142-183. Huston: Museum of Fine Arts, Huston, 2003.

Takeuchi Yukie. "Kōkoku no kindaika to 'Tanka' shi dezain no kōryū" [The Modernization of Advertising and the Prosperity of 'Tanka' Style Design]. *Dezain Riron* 47 (2005): 33-50.

Taut, Bruno. *Houses and People of Japan*. Tokyo: Sanseido Co., 1958.

Terao, Kazuyuki. "Mizutani Takehiko ga shōkai shita Bauhaushu" [Bauhaus introduced by Mizutani Takehiko]. *Nihon bijutsu kenkyū* 2 (2002): 33-44.

Terence, Riley. *Mies in Berlin*. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 2001.

The History of Japanese Photography. Houston: Museum of Fine Arts, Houston, 2003.

The Most Beloved Painter in Korea: Yoo Youngkuk 1916-2002. Seoul: Maronie Books, 2012. Exhibition catalog.

Tsunemi, Mikiko. “Kuwazawa Yōko to shin kenchiku kōgei gakuin no kōsei kyōikū.” *Kiso kōsei* 10 (2001): 43-50.

Tupitsyn, Margarita. *Rodchenko & Popova: Defining Constructivism*. London: Tate, 2009.

Tokyo bijutsu gakkō ichiran [Tokyo School of Arts Catalogue], 1926-1927.

Toyoguchi Kappei, *Keiji Kōbō kara: Toyoguchi Kappei to dezain no hanseiki* (From the Keiji Kōbō: Toyoguchi Kappei and the Half-Century of Design). Tokyo: Bijutsu Shuppansha, 1987.

Ueda Makoto. “Mobo moga tachino iezukuri” [Houses Made by the Modern Boy and Modern Girl]. *Tokyo Jin* 152 (April 2000): 74-83.

Umemiya Hiromitsu. “Kawakita Renshichirō no tenpo sekkei ni okeru gōri shugi shisō” [Kawakita Renshichirō: Rationalism in Shop Design]. *Nihon kenchiku gakkai taikai gakujutsu kōen kōgai shū* (September 1997): 57-58.

Volk, Alicia. *In Pursuit of Universalism: Yorozu Tetsugorō and Japanese Modern Art.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010.

Watanabe, Hiroshi. *The Architecture of Tokyo: An Architectural History in 571 Individual Presentations*. Stuttgart and London: Edition Axel Menges, 2001.

Weber, Nicholas Fox. *The Bauhaus Group: Six Masters of Modernism*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2009.

Weimar Thought: A Contested Legacy, edited by Peter Eli Gordon and John P McCormick. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013.

Weisberg, Gabriel. *Art Nouveau Bing: Paris Style 1900.* New York: Abrams, 1986.

Weisenfeld, Gennifer. *Imaging Disaster: Tokyo and the Visual Culture of Japan’s Great Earthquake of 1923*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012.

————. Mavo: *Japanese Artists and the Avant-Garde, 1905-1931*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001.

————. “Japanese Modernism and Consumerism: Forging the New Artistic Field of “Shōgyō Bijutsu (Commercial Art).” In *Being Modern in Japan: Culture*

and Society from the 1910s to the 1930s, edited by Elise K. Tipton and John Clark, 75-98. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2000.

————. "Touring Japan-as-Museum: NIPPON and Other Japanese Imperialist Travelogues." *Positions* 8 (Winter 2000): 749-793.

————. "Murayama, MAVO, and Modernity: Constructions of the Modern in Taishō Avant-Garde Art." Ph.D. diss. Princeton: Princeton University, 1997.

Weston, Victoria. *Japanese Painting and National Identity: Okakura Tenshin and His Circle*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan, 2004.

Wick, Rainer K. *Teaching at the Bauhaus*. Ostfildern-Ruit: Hatje Cantz Verlag, 2000.

Wilk, Christohper. *Marcel Breuer: Furniture and Interiors*. New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1981. Exhibition catalog.

Wingler, Hans M. The *Bauhaus*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1969.

Witkovsky, Matthew S. *Foto: Modernity in Central Europe, 1918-1945*. Washington, DC: National Gallery of Art in association with Thames and Hudson, 2007.

Wolfe, Tomas. *From Bauhaus to Our House.* New York: Farrar Straus Girox, 1981.

Woo Don-son, "On Park Gil-ryong's Discovering, Understanding, and Designing of Korean Architecture." In *Constructing the Colonized Land: Entwined Perspectives of East Asia around WWII,* edited by Izumi Kurioshi, 193-214. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2014.

Wood, Paul."The Idea of an Abstract Art." In *Art of the Avant-Gardes*, edited by Steve Edwards and Paul Wood, 229-272. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2004.

Yagi Atsushi, "Nihon no modanizumo no 'mizuaki annai hito'" [The Pilot of Japanese Modernism]. *Kenchiku bunka* 55 (January 2000): 124-127.

Yamaguchi Bunzō. "Shin kenchiku ni okeru yuibutsu shikan" [Historical Materialism in New Architecture], *Atelier* (September 1929); Text available in *Kenchikuka Yamaguchi Bunzō: Hito to sakuhin*, edited by Kondō Shōichi, RIA Kenchiku Sōgō Kenkyūjo (Tokyo: Sagami Shobō, 1982), 250-252.

————. “Gorishugi hansei no yōbō” [Demand of a Criticism of Rationalist Architecture]. *Kokusai kenchiku* vol. 5, no.11 (November 1929): 15-22.

————. “Sōusha to sono dai ichi kai ten” [The First Exhibition of the Sōusha], *Kenchiku shinchō* 5 (February 1924): 4-5.

Yamawaki Iwao. “Reminiscenes of Dessau.” *Design Issues* 2 (Fall 1985): 56-68.

————. *Zoku*. Tokyo: Nihondaigaku geijutsu gaku-bu bijutsu gakkaken kyūshitsu, 1973.

————. *Japanese Houses Today*. Tokyo, Asahi Shimbun Press, 1958.

————. *Bauhausu no hitobito* [People of the Bauhaus]. Tokyo: Shōkokusha, 1954.

————. *Keyaki* [The Zelkova Tree]. Tokyo: Atoriesha, 1942.

————. “Kyoshitsu no saikin keikō” [Recent Trends of the Living Room]. *Jutaku* 21 (May 1936): 336-340.

————. “Doitsu ni ogeru no kōtetsu kagu no keikō.” [The Trend toward Steel Furniture from Germany]. *Kokusai kenchiku*, vol. 8, no. 3 (March 1932): 143-151.

Yamawaki Michiko. *Bauhausu to cha no yu* [Bauhaus and the Tea Ceremony]. Tokyo: Shinchōsha, 1995.

Yi Kyoung-sung. “The Master of Korean Abstract Painting: Yoo Youngkuk.” In Yoo Youngkuk. Seoul: Yu Jin, 1997. Exhibition catalog.

Yim Chang-Bok. “Ilhae shidea hangukin geonchukga e uihan jugeo gundaehwa e gwanhan yeongu” [A Study on House Modernization Efforts by Korean Architects during 1910-1945]. *Daehan geonchuk hakhoe jihoe yeonhap nonmunjib* vol. 7, no. 5 (October 1991): 135-146.

Yoo Youngkuk Journal. Edited by Lee In-bum. Seoul: Yoo Youngkuk Art Foundation, 2004-current.

Yoo Youngkuk: Hanguk chusangmisul haesok ui jaengjeom: jeungin mit daedam [Yoo Youngkuk: Issues of Interpreting Korean Abstract Art—Witnesses and Discussion]. Script of a scholarly discussion meeting led by Lee Inbum, 2008.

Yoo Youngkuk, *Yoo Youngkuk*. Seoul: Hongjin Press, 1997. Exhibition catalog.

Yoshida Kaoru. "*Dessau Houmonki* (Visit to Dessau)," *Kenchiku-shinchō* 11 (November, 1929): 191-194.

Periodicals

Donga-ilbo (東亞日報, 동아일보, Donga Daily). Seoul: 1920 – current.

Chosun-ilbo (朝鮮日報, 조선일보, Chosun Daily). Seoul: 1920 – current.

Chosen to kenchiku (朝鮮と建築, 조선과 건축, Joseon and Architecture). *Seoul: 1925-1940.* Access available through the digital library database, National Library of Korea, Seoul, Korea.

Kenchiku shinchō (建築新潮, Architectural Current, 1924-1932)

Kokusai kenchiku (國祭建築, International Architecture, 1925-40, 1940-67)

Shinkenchiku (新建築, New Architecture, 1925-)