

The Clapping Club:
Postmodern Aesthetics, Japanese Avant-Garde Lineage,
and the Politics of Surprise

Gen Nakao and Junko Ishikawa

The Clapping Club:
Postmodern Aesthetics, Japanese Avant-Garde Lineage, and the Politics of Surprise
Gen Nakao and Junko Ishikawa

Otemon Business Management Review, Vol.32, No.1

The Clapping Club:

Postmodern Aesthetics, Japanese Avant-Garde Lineage, and the Politics of Surprise

Gen Nakao and Junko Ishikawa

Abstract

This paper examines the contemporary Japanese art practice known as the “Clapping Club” (クラッピングクラブ¹), in which participants suddenly begin clapping their hands in public urban spaces, generating surprise, uncertainty, and affective disturbance among bystanders. Situating the practice within both Western postmodern performance theory and the Japanese avant-garde lineage, this article argues that the Clapping Club represents a micro-political redistribution of perception in late-capitalist urban life. Drawing on Allan Kaprow’s *Happenings*, Nicolas Bourriaud’s relational aesthetics, Jacques Rancière’s politics of aesthetics, assemblage theory, Judith Butler’s performativity, and the critical theories of spectacle and simulation, alongside the practices of the Gutai Art Association and Hi-Red Center, this paper proposes that the Clapping Club exemplifies a distinctly postmodern and post-avant-garde intervention. Through minimal gesture and collective sound, it destabilizes ordinary perception and reveals the fragile constructedness of public reality.

Introduction

Since the mid-twentieth century, avant-garde and postmodern art have repeatedly attempted to dissolve the boundary between art and everyday life. Rather than producing autonomous objects for institutional display, artists increasingly turned toward events, gestures, and ephemeral situations. In contemporary Japan, an art practice referred to as the “Clapping Club” exemplifies this tendency. Both the Clapping Club and the Clapping Lecture (拍手レクチャー) are announced in advance and explicitly presented as part of the event program. Thus, participants gather in response to this announcement and begin clapping while walking through a museum, museum plaza, or

public street. For bystanders who are unaware of the event, there is no banner, no stage, and no explanatory frame. The surrounding public is left suspended in interpretive uncertainty.

The Clapping Club is organized by the following two members: Emi Ogura (小倉笑) and Kazuma Suga (菅一馬). A Clapping Club event typically consists of two sections. First, the organizers begin with what they call “clapping lectures,” during which participants take several multiple-choice quizzes about clapping. The quizzes include questions such as: (1) When did clapping begin in human history? and (2) For what purposes have people engaged in clapping? Because the historical origins and purposes of clapping are contested, the multiple-choice options

1 In Japanese usage, both クラッピングクラブ: *Kurappingu Kurabu* and 拍手クラブ: *Hakushu Kurabu* are used as the name.

are designed so that all answers can be considered correct. Notably, after the first question, participants begin to anticipate that “perhaps all of the answers are correct.” As a result, a willingness to engage with the questions emerges among them, and a safe space for responding is established, allowing participants to answer with a sense of ease. Furthermore, participants are encouraged to respond to the questions by clapping rather than by raising their hands. This shifts the mode of response from individual identification—such as who knows which answer—to an aggregated form, expressed as a proportion (or percentage) within the group. This mechanism, in turn, serves as a catalyst for the emergence of a small, temporary community. After these quizzes, participants engage in a clapping practice session. They are given instructions about the route along which they will walk while clapping and are advised to pay attention not to hurt their hands during the activity.

One example of a Clapping Club event was held at ROHM Theatre Kyoto, a theatre complex in Kyoto, Japan. On this occasion, in January 2026, the Clapping Club was presented as part of the theatre’s 10th anniversary event, titled “*Play! Theater for the 10th Anniversary*,” as a segment within “*KYOTO RECORDS*,” a program directed by Daisuke Yamashiro. Support was also provided by Twelve Inc. The Clapping Club’s segment was titled “*Omoide raruru, pachi-pachi-pachi*².”

The venue is a two-story complex comprising three theatre halls, an outdoor theatre square, and a park plaza. Given the spaciousness of the site, the Clapping Club organizers provided detailed instructions regarding the route along which participants were to walk while clapping. Completing the designated route typically takes about 20-30 minutes. Participants usually walk together, with organizers positioned at both the front and the rear.

When the activity concludes, participants receive a Clapping Club sticker as a token of participation. Importantly, the meaning of clapping throughout the event depends largely on the reactions of the bystanders present. Responses vary depending on whether onlookers are individuals or groups. Sometimes an organizer calls out “Congrats!” while walking and clapping, but neither participants nor bystanders are required to respond positively.

Often, bystanders look around to see how others respond to the crowd of clapping participants. Some people appear puzzled, sometimes even frowning, seemingly bewildered by the apparent lack of a clear meaning behind the clapping. At times, organizers acknowledge this confusion, saying things such as, “No wonder you’re puzzled!” In this way, the sound and movement of the Clapping Club resemble the bustle of urban life itself.

When the authors asked what had prompted the clapping, Emi Ogura, one of the founders of the Clapping Club, explained that she had originally been involved in dance and conceived of the clapping as a means of cultivating a sense of collective consciousness. When the authors mentioned that it resembled a Happening, she responded tersely, “We can’t go back to those days.” The remark was both suggestive and thought-provoking.

This paper argues that the Clapping Club should be understood as a contemporary iteration of performative urban intervention. It inherits both Western Happening-based aesthetics and a distinctly Japanese avant-garde genealogy. More importantly, it operates as a subtle redistribution of the sensible—a temporary rupture in habitual perception that exposes the normative structures governing public behavior.

From Happenings to Event-Based Art

The Clapping Club resonates strongly with Allan

2 Further details are available on the event website: <https://rohmtheatrekyoto.jp/en/event/145526/>.

Kaprow's theory of the Happening. Kaprow (1966) argued that art should merge with life, replacing theatrical representation with participatory events. In later writings, he described "lifelike art" as a practice that heightens awareness of ordinary experience (Kaprow, 2003). The goal was not to stage illusion but to reconfigure attention.

Like Kaprow's Happenings, the Clapping Club produces an event rather than an object. Its meaning emerges through contingency: the reactions of bystanders, the acoustic qualities of the site, the timing of the interruption. The sudden eruption of clapping transforms an unnoticed urban space into an arena of inquiry. Pedestrians pause, scan their surroundings, and attempt to decode the scene. In doing so, they become participants rather than passive observers.

This situational orientation aligns with postmodern critiques of aesthetic autonomy. As Hal Foster (1996) notes, postmodern art foregrounds context and discursivity rather than medium purity. The Clapping Club cannot exist independently of its environment; it is constituted by the social field it disrupts.

A Neo-Avant-Garde Return

The Clapping Club can be productively understood through the theoretical framework articulated in *The Return of the Real*, particularly Foster's reconceptualization of the neo-avant-garde as a form of critical return rather than simple repetition (Foster, 1996). While the Clapping Club practice bears an affinity with Allan Kaprow's Happenings—especially in its emphasis on participation, contingency, and the dissolution of boundaries between art and everyday life—it should not be reduced to a revival of earlier performance strategies. Instead, following Foster, such practices are better understood as operating through a logic of deferred action, in which the meaning of earlier avant-garde forms is retroactively reconstituted within new historical and institutional conditions (Foster, 1996).

A Japanese Avant-Garde Genealogy

While the Clapping Club shares affinities with Western performance art, its deeper lineage lies within postwar Japanese avant-garde movements (for discussions of the context of Japanese art, see Tomii, 2007, 2009, 2016).

One major precursor is the Gutai Art Association, founded in 1954 by artists under the leadership of Jirō Yoshihara. Gutai artists emphasized bodily immediacy, interaction with materials, and the primacy of action over representation. Performances often took place outdoors, collapsing the boundary between artwork and environment (Munroe, 1994).

Furthermore, the name "Gutai" is derived from the principle of "presenting the freedom of the spirit in a concrete manner," with *gutai-teki* denoting "concrete" in Japanese. Yoshihara's manifesto encouraged artists to create unprecedented forms of expression grounded in physical encounter. Accordingly, a key characteristic of this artistic practice is its capacity to elicit action from viewers—that is, its enactive quality. As articulated in the *Gutai Art Manifesto* (Yoshihara, 1956), this practice fosters fresh sensory experiences through diverse forms of expression.

The Clapping Club echoes Gutai's emphasis on gesture as event. The clap itself is materially simple, yet its resonance in space produces an experiential shift. Like Gutai's action-based works, the meaning lies not in symbolic representation but in the immediacy of embodied performance.

A second crucial precedent is the neo-dada collective Hi-Red Center, formed by artists Jirō Takamatsu, Genpei Akasegawa, and Natsuyuki Nakanishi. Hi-Red Center can be understood as a collective artistic practice that interrogates the boundaries between art and non-art, authenticity and inauthenticity, as well as reality and fiction. At the same time, it may also be interpreted as a form of absurd urban intervention that ambiguously oscillates between seriousness and

parody (for discussions of art in the context of postwar Japan, see Akasegawa, 1994; Chiba, 2021; Sawaragi, 2015).

Their 1964 cleaning event, officially titled “Be Clean! Campaign to Promote Cleanliness and Order in the Metropolitan Area,” involved the meticulous scrubbing of Tokyo’s sidewalks in anticipation of the Olympics—an action that simultaneously complied with and satirized state-driven modernization (Yamamoto, 2019). Passersby who encountered the performance were likely puzzled by what was happening, as the nature of the act—as an artistic practice—was deliberately left ambiguous. This ambiguity aligns with what Foster describes as a parallax structure, in which meaning does not reside in the act itself but emerges through the shifting positionality of observers (Foster, 1996). One possible interpretation is that such actions satirize beautification policies associated with excessive Olympic preparations; more fundamentally, however, they are provocative in that they encourage viewers to question what is ordinarily taken for granted.

The Clapping Club inherits this sense of provocative ambiguity. Its gesture resists stable classification. Is it celebratory? Satirical? Ritualistic? Political? This indeterminacy disrupts interpretive norms and exposes the theatricality of public order. In a society often characterized by tacit expectations of unobtrusive conduct, sudden collective clapping gently unsettles conformity without overt confrontation.

Thus, the Clapping Club extends a Japanese avant-garde tradition of subtle urban intervention—one that privileges ephemeral action over monumental declaration. Moreover, the Japanese avant-garde is not simply a historical backdrop to the Clapping Club but an active component of its conceptual structure. Through processes of deferred action and parallax, the Clapping Club reactivates and reconfigures this lineage, producing a form of neo-avant-garde practice that is both historically grounded and critically attuned to the contingencies of the present. Situated

within this dynamic field of temporal and perceptual displacement, the Clapping Club both inherits and transforms the experimental ethos of postwar Japanese art in a contemporary context.

Relational Aesthetics and Social Interstice

Nicolas Bourriaud (1998/2002) proposed “relational aesthetics” to describe art that takes social interaction as its medium. Rather than producing discrete objects, relational art creates temporary spaces of encounter.

The Clapping Club generates precisely such an interstice. Strangers share a moment of uncertainty. Some join in; others remain observers. The social field reorganizes around the ambiguous sound. In this brief interval, habitual anonymity is suspended.

Yet, as Claire Bishop (2004) argues, relational aesthetics remains a contested field and must be examined critically, particularly in relation to the question of artistic autonomy. The Clapping Club’s relationality is not purely convivial; rather, it tests the limits of public tolerance and social regulation, and its micro-political force lies in its subtle challenge to normative behavior. In this context, walking while clapping generates a certain degree of tension between participants and onlookers—what Bishop would describe as a moment of *relational antagonism*. At the same time, there are also moments—such as when participants assume the poses described below—in which this tension is temporarily dissolved.

This can be observed, for example, in the highly calculated postures and poses adopted by the two members—who are in fact also dancers—during post-event photo sessions with participants following a Clapping Club performance. Instances such as the so-called Japanese “A-un (阿吽)” paired formation—where the open and closed positions of the clapping hands are presented as complementary opposites—suggest a moment in which participants align with a

kind of anticipated harmony, thereby reducing the underlying tension.

In this respect, the Clapping Club also intersects with broader debates on dialogue and autonomy in socially engaged art, as discussed by Grant H. Kester (2005, 2013) and in *Theory in Contemporary Art Since 1985* (Zoya Kocur & Simon Leung, 2005), which foreground the autonomous and communicative dimensions of artistic practice beyond mere interaction. As Bell (2017) observes, the debate between Bishop (2006, 2012) and Kester (2005, 2006, 2013) turns on how the aesthetic dimension of participatory art is to be understood: whether it should be grounded in antagonistic disruption, dissensus, and spectatorship (as Bishop argues), or in dialogical engagement, communicative collaboration, and shared meaning-making (as Kester proposes under the rubric of dialogical aesthetics).

In this regard, the Clapping Club appears to occupy an intermediate position, combining moments of shared interaction with subtle forms of perceptual disruption. This tension invites further analysis of how it is negotiated within the work's aesthetic structure, while also raising the more fundamental question of whether a work of art can be said to exist as a self-contained entity.

Spectacle, Simulation, and Ambiguity

Guy Debord (1967/1994) described modern society as dominated by spectacle, in which lived experience is replaced by mediated images. Public space becomes a site of commodified attention. Against this backdrop, the Clapping Club introduces a rupture. It does not advertise a product or promote a message; instead, it produces confusion.

However, in a hyper-mediated era, such events risk rapid incorporation into digital spectacle through smartphone recordings and online circulation. Baudrillard (1981/1994) might argue that even disruption becomes simulation. The Clapping Club oscillates

between authentic interruption and consumable content.

This oscillation produces an uncanny ambiguity. Clapping is ordinarily associated with applause or celebration. Detached from these contexts, it becomes estranging. Freud's (1919/1955) notion of the uncanny—something simultaneously familiar and strange—captures this effect. The ordinary gesture reveals its latent instability.

Redistribution of the Sensible

Jacques Rancière (2004) argues that politics emerges through shifts in the “distribution of the sensible”—the organization of what can be perceived. Artistic acts can reconfigure this distribution by introducing dissensus.

The Clapping Club operates precisely at this perceptual level. Urban soundscapes typically consist of traffic noise, announcements, and commercial signals. Seemingly purposeless—with its nature unclear at first glance—clapping introduces an anomalous acoustic pattern. Attention shifts. The invisible norms governing public comportment become perceptible through their violation.

The intervention is minimal, yet its perceptual effect is profound. It reveals that the ordinary order of things depends upon tacit agreement.

Assemblage Theory and the Clapping Club

An assemblage-theoretical approach to artistic practices such as the Clapping Club provides a productive framework for understanding collective consciousness. The Clapping Club is not simply an artwork but an eventful assemblage that produces its own conditions of perception. The Clapping Club can be further understood through the lens of assemblage theory as developed by Deleuze and Guattari (1987) and elaborated by DeLanda (2016) and Buchanan (2020, 2026). Rather than viewing the event

as a unified artistic performance, it is more productively conceptualized as a contingent assemblage composed of heterogeneous elements: bodies in motion, clapping sounds, the architectural space, bystanders' gazes, and shifting affective responses. These elements do not form a stable totality but are temporarily coordinated through the act of collective clapping. The meaning of the event is therefore not predetermined but arises relationally from the interactions among its components.

From this perspective, as Brian Massumi emphasizes, singular expressions are inherently collective in their potential. Even when emerging from localized or minimal gestures, they “envelop a potential collective” and open onto a “people to come” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 345; Massumi, 2002a). In the case of the Clapping Club, the coordinated yet ambiguous act of clapping generates precisely such a field: participants and bystanders are drawn into a shared but indeterminate situation, in which meaning is not given but emerges through mutual attunement.

This perspective aligns with the broader claim that social reality is not simply communicated but enacted through events that exceed representation. The Clapping Club, as an expressive assemblage, produces a temporary reconfiguration of perception and collectivity. It demonstrates how minimal, non-representational actions can generate emergent social formations, not by conveying information, but by activating affective and perceptual relations that precede interpretation.

In this sense, the Clapping Club operates as an open system in which social, spatial, and affective dimensions continuously reconfigure one another. This perspective also highlights the micropolitical dimension of the practice: by deterritorializing the conventional function of clapping and reterritorializing it within an ambiguous urban context, the assemblage disrupts habitual patterns of perception and social expectation. The Clapping Club thus exemplifies how minimal gestures can activate complex assemblages that

rearticulate the sensible order of public space.

Performativity and Norm Disruption

Judith Butler (1990) conceptualizes social reality as constituted through repeated performative acts. Public behavior is stabilized through repetition. The Clapping Club interrupts this repetition.

The collective dimension is essential. A solitary individual clapping might be dismissed as eccentric; synchronized clapping produces legitimacy through number. The act demonstrates how coordinated repetition constructs social meaning. Temporarily, the norm of silence is replaced by the sound of clapping. This substitution reveals that norms are neither natural nor fixed. They are performatively sustained and therefore alterable.

Affect and Collective Resonance

Beyond symbolic interpretation, the Clapping Club operates affectively. Massumi (2002b) emphasizes that affect precedes cognition. The sudden sound of clapping triggers bodily responses before rational analysis.

The synchronization of clapping generates fleeting solidarity, echoing Durkheim's (1912/1995) concept of collective effervescence. Yet unlike traditional ritual, the Clapping Club lacks sacred narrative or institutional grounding. It produces secular effervescence without transcendental referent—an aestheticized intensity characteristic of postmodern culture.

Liotard (1979/1984) describes postmodernity as skepticism toward grand narratives. The Clapping Club embodies this skepticism. It offers no overarching meaning, only a momentary intensification of presence.

Collective Illusion and the Clapping Club

This emergent synchronization also gives rise to a

form of collective illusion. The Clapping Club may be understood as producing a form of collective illusion, in which participants and bystanders orient themselves toward a shared but unstable interpretive frame (Berger & Luckmann, 1966; Goffman, 1974; Rose, 2022). Collective illusion does not imply a simple false belief; rather, it refers to a socially sustained ambiguity in which individuals orient themselves in relation to others without fully grasping the meaning of the situation. In the case of the Clapping Club, the synchronized act of clapping produces the appearance of coherence and intentionality, even as its purpose remains indeterminate. Observers, encountering a coordinated group action, may assume that the event has a legitimate or institutional basis, thereby momentarily accepting its implicit logic. This dynamic reveals how social reality is often maintained not by clear understanding but by mutual attunement to perceived expectations. Individuals look to others for cues, and in doing so, participate in the stabilization of an otherwise ambiguous event. The clapping thus generates a provisional consensus—a fragile alignment of perception that can dissolve as quickly as it forms. In this sense, the Clapping Club operates as a micro-sociological experiment in the production of collective illusion, demonstrating how easily shared realities can emerge from minimal coordination.

At the same time, the illusion remains visibly incomplete. Unlike fully institutionalized rituals, the Clapping Club lacks a stable symbolic framework to anchor interpretation. This incompleteness produces a tension between belief and doubt: participants act “as if” the clapping is meaningful, while bystanders oscillate between acceptance and skepticism. The event thereby exposes the contingency of social norms, re-

vealing that what appears coherent and natural in public space may, in fact, rest upon fragile and continuously negotiated perceptual agreements³.

Ephemerality and Dematerialization

Lucy Lippard (1973) famously described the dematerialization of the art object in conceptual art. The Clapping Club exemplifies this dematerialization. Nothing remains once the clapping ceases. The artwork exists only in time.

Such ephemerality resists commodification and institutional capture. Although documentation may circulate digitally, the essence of the event lies in its immediacy. The silence before and after the clapping frames the action, producing what might be understood in Japanese aesthetic terms as *Ma* (間)—the meaningful interval.

Conclusion

The Clapping Club demonstrates how a minimal collective gesture such as clapping can reconfigure the perception of public space and social norms in contemporary urban life. The Clapping Club stands at the intersection of postmodern performance theory and Japanese avant-garde history. From Kaprow’s *Happenings* to Gutai’s embodied immediacy and Hi-Red Center’s ironic urban interventions, it inherits a lineage of art that dissolves into life. Through a minimal gesture—hands meeting to produce sound—it destabilizes habitual perception, redistributes attention, and exposes the fragile performativity of public norms. Its power lies not in spectacle but in surprise. For a brief moment, everyday reality trembles. In that tremor, art fulfills one of its most enduring avant

3 Shuji Terayama, particularly in relation to the possibilities of theater, suggested that “reality is overturned by illusion. When reality becomes established as another illusion, yet another reality collides with it, and thus reality and illusion continue to struggle against each other endlessly” (Terayama, 1982). From the perspective that reality is subverted by a shared illusion, which in turn becomes another form of reality—and given that this process unfolds in an immediate, real-time manner—this notion appears to resonate with the Clapping Club within the context of *Happenings*. A more detailed discussion, however, will be left for a future paper.

-garde aspirations: to make the ordinary visible again.

The interpretations and analyses of the Clapping Club presented in this paper are solely those of the authors⁴. Clarifying the perspectives and viewpoints of the founder of the Clapping Club and its participants remains a task for future research.

References

- Akasegawa, G. (1994). *Tokyo mixer keikaku: Hi-Red Center chokusetsu kōdō no kiroku* [Tokyo Mixer Plan: A Record of Hi-Red Center's Direct Actions]. Chikuma Shobō.
- Baudrillard, J. (1994). *Simulacra and simulation* (S. F. Glaser, Trans.). University of Michigan Press. (Original work published 1981)
- Bell, D. M. (2017). The politics of participatory art. *Political Studies Review*, 15(1), 73-83.
- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality*. Anchor Books.
- Bishop, C. (2004). Antagonism and relational aesthetics. *October*, 110, 51-79.
- Bishop, C. (2006). The social turn: Collaboration and its discontents. *Artforum*, 44(6), 178-183.
- Bishop, C. (2012). *Artificial hells: Participatory art and the politics of spectatorship*. Verso.
- Bourriaud, N. (2002). *Relational aesthetics* (S. Pleasance & F. Woods, Trans.). Les Presses du Réel. (Original work published 1998)
- Buchanan, I. (2020). *Assemblage theory and method*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Buchanan, I. (2026). *Assemblage theory and affect*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble*. Routledge.
- Chiba, S. (2021). *Zōho gendai bijutsu itsudatsushi: 1945-1985* [Supplemented edition: A history of deviations in contemporary art, 1945-1985]. Chikuma Shobō.
- Debord, G. (1994). *The society of the spectacle* (D. Nicholson-Smith, Trans.). Zone Books. (Original work published 1967)
- DeLanda, M. (2016). *Assemblage theory*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia* (B. Massumi, Trans.). University of Minnesota Press.
- Durkheim, E. (1995). *The elementary forms of religious life* (K. E. Fields, Trans.). Free Press. (Original work published 1912)
- Foster, H. (1996). *The return of the real: The avant-garde at the end of the century*. MIT Press.
- Freud, S. (1955). The uncanny. In J. Strachey (Ed. & Trans.), *The standard edition* (Vol. 17). Hogarth Press. (Original work published 1919)
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. Harvard University Press.
- Kaprow, A. (1966). *Assemblages, environments & happenings*. Abrams.
- Kaprow, A. (2003). *Essays on the blurring of art and life*. University of California Press.
- Kester, G. H. (2005). Conversation pieces: The role of dialogue in socially engaged art. In Z. Kocur & S. Leung (Eds.), *Theory in contemporary art since 1985* (pp. 153-165). Blackwell Publishing.
- Kester, G. H. (2006). Another turn: A response to Claire Bishop. *Artforum*, 44(9), 22-23.
- Kester, G. H. (2013). *Conversation pieces: Community and communication in modern art*. Updated edition with a new preface. University of California Press.
- Kocur, Z., & Leung, S. (Eds.). (2005). *Theory in contemporary art since 1985*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Lippard, L. (1973). *Six years: The dematerialization of the art object*. Praeger.
- Lyotard, J.-F. (1984). *The postmodern condition* (G. Bennington & B. Massumi, Trans.). University of Minnesota Press. (Original work published 1979)
- Massumi, B. (Ed.). (2002a). *A shock to thought: Expression after Deleuze and Guattari*. Routledge.
- Massumi, B. (2002b). *Parables for the virtual*. Duke University Press.
- Munroe, A. (1994). *Gutai: Splendid playground*. Guggen-

4 The authors would like to express their gratitude to Ms. Emi Ogura for granting permission to publish this paper on the Clapping Club and for her assistance with various confirmations. We also thank the staff of ROHM Theatre Kyoto and Mr. Daisuke Yamashiro for reviewing and confirming the credits related to the art activities. However, responsibility for the content of this paper rests solely with the authors.

- heim Museum.
- Rancière, J. (2004). *The politics of aesthetics: The distribution of the sensible* (G. Rockhill, Trans.). Continuum.
- Rose, T. (2022). *Collective illusions: Conformity, complicity, and the science of why we make bad decisions*. Hachette Books.
- Sawaragi, N. (2015). *Nihon gendai bijutsu* [Japan, Contemporary, Art]. Chikuma Shobō.
- Terayama, S. (1982). *Terayama Shuji at Plan-B (1982) – 1 to 4 [Whole]* [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Nk8CMcwhqjg>
- Tomii, R. (2007). After the “descent to the everyday”: Japanese collectivism from Hi Red Center to The Play, 1964-1973. In B. Stimson & G. Sholette (Eds.), *Collectivism after modernism: The art of social imagination after 1945* (pp.44-75). University of Minnesota Press.
- Tomii, R. (2009). “International contemporaneity” in the 1960s: Discoursing on art in Japan and beyond. *Japan Review*, 21, 123-147.
- Tomii, R. (2016). *Radicalism in the wilderness: International contemporaneity and 1960s art in Japan*. MIT Press.
- Yamamoto, H. (2019). *Gendai bijutsushi: Ōbei, Nihon, to-ransunashonaru* [History of contemporary art: Europe and the United States, Japan, and the transnational]. Chuokoron-Shinsha.
- Yoshihara, J. (1956). Gutai bijutsu sengen [Gutai art manifesto] (R. Tomii, Trans.). *Geijutsu Shinchō*, 7(12), 202-204. (Source: Guggenheim Museum website <http://web.guggenheim.org/exhibitions/gutai/data/manifesto.html>)

Authors’ Bio:

Gen Nakao, Ph.D., is a Japanese psychologist who currently works as an Associate Professor at the Faculty of Management, Otomon Gakuin University, in Osaka, Japan. He obtained his BA in Intercultural Education from Sophia University, his MEd in Mental Health Counseling from Fordham University in New York, and his PhD in Social/Cultural Psychology from Kyoto University. During his graduate studies in New York, he completed a clinical internship at Albert Einstein College of Medicine. Nakao’s research interests center on acculturation, intercultural competence, marginalization, mental health, and quantitative and qualitative research methods. His cross-cultural studies

also examine socially engaged art (SEA) and the development of a sense of community. For more information about his work, please visit: <https://sites.google.com/view/gen-nakao/home>. For inquiries, please contact the author at [gen-nakao\[at\]otomon.ac.jp](mailto:gen-nakao[at]otomon.ac.jp).

Junko Ishikawa holds an MA in Applied Theatre from the City University of New York (2013). She previously served as a Teaching Associate in the Japanese language program in the Department of East Asian Languages and Cultures at Columbia University. Her current work engages with diverse forms of artistic practice, in collaboration with her child, through which she explores the intersections of everyday life, creativity, and embodied experience, as well as the evolving possibilities of participatory and practice-based inquiry.