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Abstract
Sequestered by the French State as an "enemy asset" in 1944, Kojiro Matsukata’s collection was used as a national showcase through exhibitions until 1958. Few catalogues were transparent as to the works’ provenance from the collection. When we map and visualize this historical information, a significant contrast appears between the “real” circulation of artworks, as recorded in governmental archives, and the "official" circulation listed in catalogues. This discrepancy points to a propaganda effort in such a way as to bolster an artistic narrative that was key to French national pride, and studying it can further explain why the French decided to retain certain artworks for their own public collections and to “gift” the others back to Japan.

Résumé
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In June 2019, Japan commemorated the 60th anniversary of the National Museum of Western Art in Tokyo with an exhibition entitled “The Matsukata Collection: A One-Hundred-Year Odyssey”.¹ The museum, which opened its doors in 1959, had indeed been conceived in order to welcome the large proportion of Kōjirō Matsukata’s collection that was “gifted” by France to Japan in that year, following its confiscation in 1944 as an enemy asset in the Second World War. A 1989 exhibition at the museum documented this restitution as a fairly straightforward process.² However, quantitative and cartographic analysis allows us to shed new light on the history of Matsukata’s collection and to reveal a rather more complex story.

The son of the Prime Minister of Japan, Matsukata was born in 1865. He was initiated into Western culture through studies in the United States and business trips to Europe, where his shipbuilding company delivered ships to Allied countries. According to historian Atsushi Miura, Matsukata was the first Japanese industrialist to build a genuine collection of Western modern art, a collection that he mainly acquired during two extended stays in London, between 1916 and 1918, and in Paris, between 1921 and 1922.³ Matsukata was advised during this time by the painter Frank Brangwyn, who he had met in London, and by the curator of the Musée du Luxembourg, Léonce Bénédite, who directed him towards contemporary artists such as Lucien Simon, Charles Cottet, Paul-Albert Besnard and Edmond Aman-Jean. Matsukata aspired to create a museum in Japan that would bring together the works of Western masters for Japanese artists unable to travel to Europe to study there.⁴ He subsequently invested very large sums in the purchase of sculptures by Auguste Rodin and works by Paul Gauguin, Gustave Moreau, Pierre-Auguste Renoir, Paul Cézanne, Vincent Van Gogh and Claude Monet. Matsukata also regularly met with French artists. For example, he was introduced to Monet by his niece, Takeko Kuroki, and her husband, both familiar with the artist.⁵

The exact number and nature of the artworks Matsukata owned remain unclear – but can be estimated at 10,000 pieces, including more than 2,000 works of Western art. This uncertainty is due to the geographical fragmentation of his collection. Indeed, until 1924 Matsukata regularly shipped pieces in his collection to Japan in order to save them for his future museum;⁶ beginning that year, however, the Japanese government imposed customs duties on luxury products⁷ up to 100% of the value of the works. To avoid paying customs duties, Matsukata decided to store the remaining works at the Pantechnicon in London and, thanks to the intervention of Léonce Bénédite, in the reserves of the Rodin Museum.⁸ As Matsukata kept no inventory of his works, it is impossible to know the exact composition of his collection, which was physically dispersed when part of the collection was sold at auction in Japan after Matsukata went bankrupt in 1927,⁹ and partially destroyed when the British stock was lost in a fire at the Pantechnicon in October 1939.¹⁰

As for the works that remained in France, which constitute the core of the present paper, they suffered an even more chaotic fate. In 1940,

⁸ Akiko Mabuchi,「The Kōjirō Matsukata Collection and the National Museum of Western Art in Tokyo」, in Japan’s Love for Impressionism. From Monet to Renoir, op. cit., 219-221.
¹⁰ Akiko Mabuchi,「The Kōjirō Matsukata Collection and the National Museum of Western Art in Tokyo」, art. cit., 221.
Matsukata, who had remained in Japan, asked his right-hand man Kosaburo Hioki to protect the Parisian collection from the threat of German occupation. However, the subsequent victory of the Allies at the end of the war did not give Matsukata the possibility to repatriate his collection to Japan: a government order passed by the French state and dated 5th October 1944 decreed the preventive seizure of all "enemy property". This measure meant in effect that the French state obtained immediate control of these assets, though it also committed to the signing of a future agreement with the states or parties concerned that would allow for the sale of the foreign assets or else for the French state to take full legal ownership of them. On 2nd November 1944, as per legal requirements, Hioki declared Matsukata’s works to the Administration des Domaines (the French administration in charge of public property). On 16th December 1944, the president of the Seine Civil Court duly seized the "enemy property" of "Mr. Matsukata Kojiro, Japanese subject", and the Domaines de la Seine took charge of the collection. An initial inventory listed 58 sculptures, kept at the Rodin Museum and at the Rudier foundry, and 336 paintings, watercolors and drawings, which were transferred to the reserves of the Museum of Modern Art. The French state thus took custody of a very important collection, though strictly speaking it did not own it. In the end, on 23rd January, 1959, the French officially handed over the bulk of Matsukata’s collection to the Japanese authorities. These works were to constitute the core of the National Museum of Western Art, built in Tokyo for this occasion. Nevertheless, twenty artworks remained in France, intended for the National Museums, and classified as part of the public property.

Yuichiro Miyashita analyzed the numerous diplomatic negotiations with Japan related to the Matsukata collection in the period from 1945 to 1959, and so did Geneviève Lacambre. However, the French state’s reasons for choosing to retain these particular twenty artworks have been little explored. The French National Archives and the Diplomatic Archives of the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs can yield a better understanding of the shared destinies of the works, thanks to the information they contain on the temporary exhibitions organized between 1944 and 1959.

The French state did not hesitate to circulate the works from the confiscated Matsukata collection, even though it was not their official owner. In other words, a collection of Japanese origin served to vaunt France’s artistic and cultural “greatness” in the aftermath of the trauma of Second World War, both in France and abroad. The artworks’ circulation was not entirely transparent, since the exhibition catalogues did not systematically mention the origin of the artworks.

Did the French state seek to mask the origin of certain works, in line with its propagandistic ends? A cartographic, quantitative and geographical investigation of the collection’s circulation can help us better understand this story, and return to archival sources with renewed considerations. It reveals a discrepancy between the published, official circulations of the confiscated Matsukata collection on the one hand and the actual, unofficial ones on the other.

After retracing the history of the exhibitions which featured work from the Matsukata seizure prior to 1959, this article will explore the strategic ways in which the “Matsukata” provenance was revealed, or rather occluded, in exhibitions. Using quantitative evidence, we will then analyze the reasons why some works in the confiscated Matsukata collection were ultimately chosen by French national museums over others that were returned permanently to Japan. In addition to shedding new light upon the history of Franco-Japanese cultural relations, this research questions the scope of the visualization
methodologies that are increasingly used in art history. Maps are ideal tools for opening up new perspectives in sources, provided that the sources are complete and relevant; in this case, it is diplomatic issues that they reveal in particular.

**Tracing the Exhibitions**

Reconstructing the trajectory of a collection is a difficult task. However, in the case of the Matsukata collection, the presence of an exhaustive archive makes it possible to reconstruct and describe the circulation of works lent to exhibitions in France and abroad.

**Methodology.**

The French National Archives hold rich documentation on the seizure of the Matsukata collection, which notably includes inventories of the collection, a large volume of correspondence, ‘wish lists’ from museum curators detailing the works they intended to keep for their own institutional collections, and a sub-folder containing a list of the loans for exhibitions in France and abroad. This last folder contains loan authorizations from the Administration des Domaines which was the administration in charge of the Matsukata collection, as well as from Jean Cassou and Bernard Dorival, chief curator and assistant curator at the Musée national d’art moderne, who were in charge of the physical paintings, watercolors and drawings themselves. Delivery notes from the Paris-based company Express Transport Ltd. are also included, which record the safe reception of the works at the Musée national d’art moderne at the end of an exhibition; interestingly, these receipts also detail insurance values (Fig. 1).

To begin with, we transcribed the complete inventories of the Matsukata collection into a database that gives, for each work, the name of the artist, the title of the work, its dimensions and the number of the box in which it was located at the time of the first inventory, carried out by Bernard Dorival in 1945. These 424 works were entered into a spreadsheet, with one row for each, while the spreadsheet’s columns record the events related to each work, namely the successive loans to exhibitions, their insurance value, and their presence or absence from the wish lists that French curators drew up. The database, available online, allows users to filter each work of the seizure and to visualize its trajectory.

![Figure 1: Express Transport Ltd. delivery note, March 1, 1954, for Le Pont Saint-Michel by Albert Marquet, from Mainz to the Musée national d’art moderne. Archives nationales, 20150044/120, file 5 “Prêts”. Photograph: L. Saint-Raymond.](image)

The second step in our research was to consult exhibition catalogues, starting from the information contained in the "Loans" sub-folder of the National Archives. By studying the names of artists, titles, dimensions and reproductions, we were able to check which artworks from Matsukata’s confiscated collection had been displayed in which exhibitions (whether or not the...
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catalogues listed their provenance). The list of exhibition catalogues appears in the appendix to this paper, sorted by starting date; travelling exhibitions are grouped here with a single identifier, e.g. [1949a] for the exhibition *De Manet a nuestros días* which was presented in different cities in South America between 1949 and 1950. The appendix also mentions the catalogues that could not be found – [1950c], [1953e] and [1954].

Finally, the exhibition catalogues were transcribed and entered into the Artlas database of exhibition catalogues, BasArt (see: https://artlas.humanum.fr/map/#/ ). It is thus possible to display the exhibited works from the Matsukata seizure in the form of a list, a graph or a map, as well as to visualize all the other lenders who contributed to the exhibitions in question. Thanks to this two-fold database – the whole of the confiscated Matsukata collection on the one hand, and all of the exhibitions in which it was featured on the other – the use of this seizure by the French state can be understood from a new and quite different perspective.

**The Varying Pace of Loans**

Between the time of its confiscation by the French state in 1944 and the return of a large part of artworks it contained to Japan in 1959, works in the Matsukata collection were lent to 23 exhibitions abroad and to 14 in France, for a total of 37 exhibitions. The pace of these loans varied, and can be divided into three main periods (Fig. 2).

Between 1944 and 1948, the seizure was used only very little, featuring in just one exhibition abroad...
per year. The first exhibition took place in Mainz and Baden-Baden in 1946, and displayed "modern French painting from Impressionism to the present day". In 1947, the Administration des Domaines lent works to another travelling exhibition retraicing "the origins of contemporary art" in Strasbourg, Besançon, and Nancy, and then to a second exhibition recounting the evolution of French art, "From David to Cézanne", at the Palais des Beaux-Arts in Brussels. In 1946 and 1947, French curators and politicians paid little heed to Matsukata's confiscated collection, with the exception of Jean Cassou and Bernard Dorival, who, in December 1946, compiled a list of paintings "likely to be acquired by the Museum of Modern Art". In November 1947, the Administration des Domaines indeed sold off 21 paintings from the Matsukata collection at auction. The works were chosen by Cassou and Dorival in order to raise a sum of one million francs for the conservation and storage costs of the seizure.

The 1948 Venice Biennale constituted a turning point. Ten works were lent to the exhibition "Gli impressionisti alla XXIV Biennale di Venezia". Around this time, art critic and editor of the New York journal *Art News* Alfred Frankfurter spoke with Jean Cassou and discovered the existence of the Matsukata collection. On April 13th, 1949, through the mediation of lawyers, Frankfurter sent a letter to Jacques Jaujard, Directeur Général des Arts et Lettres, on behalf of some "friends interested in buying several hundred thousand dollars of a number of impressionist paintings (Monet, Renoir, Van Gogh Manet, Gauguin, Cézanne)". Since the French government did not claim ownership over these paintings, France could consent to their sale and export to America, Frankfurter suggested. Jean Cassou denied having made such "inaccurate and fanciful" statements.

In July 1949, the Directeur des Musées de France Georges Salles echoed Cassou's response, and asked the Legal Service of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs "to study[...] by what means it might be possible that the Direction des musées de France could succeed in obtaining the attribution of all or part of this collection, which represents for our national collections the last chance to fill gaps that can never be filled again". From 1949 onwards, the Matsukata seizure garnered growing interest and, in parallel, was displayed in further exhibitions (Fig. 2). The loans of the artworks continued at a steady pace after the French state took ownership of the Matsukata collection following the signature of a peace treaty between the Allies and Japan on April 28th, 1952.

This period of significant lending slowed in 1954, however. The provenances of artworks listed in exhibition catalogues reflect this change (Fig. 3): the works from the Matsukata collection were no longer presented as belonging to some anonymous "private collector" but as part of the holdings of the Administration de Domaines, the Musée national d'art moderne or the French state. This shift corresponded to the moment when the restitution of the Matsukata collection to Japan became the subject of serious negotiations. These exchanges can be summarized as follows: the French Embassy in Japan, encouraged by the French Minister of Foreign Affairs Robert Schuman, negotiated a return of the collection to Japan in the form of a donation to Japan by the French state, on the condition that the works be held and exhibited in a new "French art" museum, and that the French state be allowed to retain certain pieces for its national collections. In 1957, no loans were granted, as a precautionary measure: according to the curator of paintings of the Musée du Louvre, Germain Bazin, "we [the French] risk finding ourselves in a difficult situation if we return works

---

20 Letter from Bernard Dorival to Georges Salles, December 31, 1946, AN, 20150044/120.
21 The list of these works is given by Léa Saint-Raymond, « The escrow of the Matsukata collection: inventories, lists and exhibitions (1945-1949) », *Art News*, vol. 12, no 2, Fall 1964, pp. 56-60, and Léa Saint-Raymond, « Présence culturelle de la France au Japon et la collection Matsukata », *Art News*, vol. 12, no 2, Fall 1964, pp. 56-60.
22 Letter from H. Compin to J. Odin, lawyer at the Court, April 13, 1949, AN, 20150044/120.
23 Idem.

24 Letter from Jean Cassou to Georges Salles, July 2, 1949, AN, 20150044/120.
25 Letter from Georges Salles to the Director of Asia, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, July 30, 1949, AN, 20150044/120.
26 For more details, see Yuichiro Miyashita, « Présence culturelle de la France au Japon et la collection Matsukata », *Art News*, vol. 12, no 2, Fall 1964, pp. 56-60.
in poor condition and perhaps irreparably damaged to the Japanese government. We would thus lose the benefit of the diplomatic gesture that the French state proposed to make by handing over most of the Matsukata collection to Japan.”²⁷ Before the official restitution of the works on 23rd January, 1959, an exceptional final exhibition was organized in Rouen in 1958, featuring 12 works from the Matsukata collection, which were described in the catalogue as "belonging to the state": in reality, all the works displayed were part of the French donation that would be permanently conserved by the Tokyo Museum from the following year.

The frequency of exhibitions thus reflected the varying levels of attention paid to the Matsukata seizure and, above all, the progress of French negotiations with Japan. As the Rouen exhibition shows, the description of the works in the catalogues constituted a diplomatic issue, one which can indeed be made visible through cartography.

Mapping Loans, Mapping Omissions

The French National Archives and the Diplomatic Archives of the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs provide little explicit information as to the reasons and motivations for the circulation of Matsukata’s confiscated collection in exhibitions: the available sources are largely loan agreements and reports on the transport of the works and their possible restoration. Nevertheless, thanks to the mapping of exhibitions, we can better understand the French strategies for the circulation of this collection, and their diplomatic features.

---

²⁷ Letter from Germain Bazin to Georges Salles, March 14, 1957, AN, 20150044/120.
An opportunity for Showcasing “French” Art

The period during which France circulated Matsukata’s collection corresponded to the conclusion of the Second World War and, from 1947 through 1958, to the beginning of the Cold War and the establishment of the Western Bloc. The following maps display loans of works from the seizure, according to the number of exhibitions organized in cities outside of France (Fig. 4a) and according to the total number of artworks that circulated abroad (Fig. 4b).

In these maps, the absence of exhibitions in Asia is immediately striking. France was seemingly careful not to exhibit works from the Matsukata collection in Japan, nor anywhere else in Asia, until the situation of the seizure was officially resolved. Africa, Oceania and the Middle-East appear as three other neglected zones, either because no exhibitions were organized there requiring French loans, or because France decided not to circulate works from the Matsukata collection there.

As the maps show, the preferred destinations were the European and American continents (Fig. 4a and 4b). At a moment that marked the beginning of European integration, France’s closest neighbors were the major beneficiaries of loans from the seized collection, both in terms of the number of exhibitions held there and in terms of the quantity of artworks from Matsukata’s confiscated collection that travelled there: Belgium held three exhibitions in Brussels featuring work from the seizure for which it received a total of 19 loans [1947b] [1949d] [1953c], the Netherlands organized one exhibition in Amsterdam [1951b].
and a subsequent travelling exhibition in Amsterdam and Otterlo [1953d]. In Italy, the 1948 Venice Biennale featured ten artworks from Matsukata’s collection [1948a] and was followed by a travelling exhibition in Rome and Florence [1955c], while the United Kingdom hosted three exhibitions, all in London [1949g] [1951a] [1955d], and Switzerland hosted three exhibitions in Basel [1949e], La-Tour-de-Peilz [1950b] and Zürich [1952c]. In Germany, the Matsukata seizure served as a showcase in the French Occupied Zone in 1946, with an exhibition in Baden-Baden and Mainz [1946], and later in 1954 in Mainz, with an exhibition simply entitled “Paris” [1954]. Another exhibition of French modern painting was organized at the West Berlin Senate, but no catalogue was published for the occasion [1953d].

Two other cities in the Western European bloc hosted exhibitions with some artworks from Matsukata’s collection: Vienna [1949c] [1950c] and Copenhagen [1949f]. However, the number of loans there was not as consequential as those to Belgium, the Netherlands, Germany and Italy (Fig. 4b). France can thus be said to have targeted the core countries of the European Coal and Steel Community, established in 1951 by the Treaty of Paris.

Outside Europe, twelve paintings from the seizure were shipped to South America (fig. 4b) for a major touring exhibition of French art in 1949 and 1950 which travelled from Buenos Aires to Rosario in Argentina, Sao Paolo and Rio de Janeiro in Brazil, Caracas in Venezuela, Lima in Peru, Santiago in
Chile and Montevideo in Uruguay. Finally, a watercolor by Cézanne depicting the mythical Montagne Sainte-Victoire was shown in two travelling exhibitions of French drawings (Fig. 4b) in the United States, which between 1952 and 1953 circulated between Washington D.C., Cleveland, St. Louis, Harvard University and New York [1952e], and in 1955 and 1956 between Chicago, Minneapolis, Detroit and San Francisco [1955a]. If some works of the Matsukata seizure were used as a French artistic showcase across the Western bloc, the maps (Fig. 4a and 4b) show one exception in the form of an exhibition of French paintings that travelled from Warsaw to Moscow and finally to Leningrad between June and December 1956 [1956b]. This major exhibition featured six paintings from the Matsukata seizure and 85 further works from French museums, including Delacroix’s *La Liberté guidant le peuple*, which left France for the first time, insured at 25 million francs by the Soviets and rolled in a 2.76m box that was transported on a Russian double-wheeled wagon.29 This "exceptional effort"30 on the part of the French sought to demonstrate, “through the presentation of the great masters of classicism, romanticism, realism and impressionism” that "since the nineteenth century, France has been exercising a dictatorship in art".31 The six Matsukata works that made the trip were amongst those destined to be returned to Japan in the near future: the French embassy in Tokyo thus consulted the Japanese authorities "as a matter of courtesy", who raised no objections but on the contrary were apparently "well aware of the fact that thanks to such an event, we [the French] were enhancing the status of the aforementioned collection".32 However, of the six works that travelled east, four suffered damage due to climatic conditions or transport, and had to be urgently restored upon their return to Paris, with canvas and varnish restoration and lining.33 This was the last foreign exhibition for which the Directeur des Domaines authorized for the loan of Matsukata’s collection.34

**Spreading the Word – or Not**

Beyond the geopolitical logics underlying the circulation of the seizure, the map of foreign exhibitions (Fig. 4a) also reflects the symbolic logics underpinning the way in which works were presented in catalogues. On our maps, the exhibition catalogues that mentioned Matsukata’s name when listing the provenance of the works are shown in green, while those that intentionally omitted it are shown in red. A clear opposition emerges between exhibition catalogues from Anglo-Saxon countries and Northern Europe which omit the name Matsukata, and catalogues from Switzerland, Italy, the USSR and South America, which acknowledge the provenance in the following terms: “formerly Matsukata collection”.35 By tracing and tabulating the same information for the 14 exhibitions organized in France, we see that only three catalogues there specified that the works shown had belonged to the Matsukata collection [1949b] [1950a] [1951c]. French exhibitions thus mentioned the Matsukata provenance significantly less often than foreign exhibitions.36 This assessment points to a methodological pitfall for art historians when it comes to the provenance of works: by relying solely on catalogues, we may miss significant information. Only by supplementing published sources with archival ones can circulations be accurately reconstructed; a distant, cartographic approach to the sources can also put the aforementioned frameworks in perspective.

---

29 The list of these cities is given in [1951a] and [1951e]. However, there are only four published and available exhibition catalogues, for Buenos Aires, Caracas, Santiago and Montevideo. We thank Victoria Márquez Feldman for giving us access to the Buenos Aires catalogue she owns.
30 *The Liberté guidant le peuple* was indeed conveyed: see « Rapport concernant le transfert de Varsovie à Moscou de l’exposition de peinture du 19e siècle français », Express Transport Ltd. Report, August 14, 1956, AMAE, 554 INVA 1375.
31 Letter from the Minister of Foreign Affairs to the Secretary of State for Arts and Letters, April 21, 1956, AMAE, 554 INVA 1375.
33 Letter from Daniel Lévi, Ambassador of France to Japan, to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Tokyo, December 22, 1955, AMAE, 554 INVA 1374. Initially, ten works from the Matsukata collection were to make the trip but: see the loan contract of April, 6, 1955, AMAE, 554 INVA 1374.
34 The four works in question are *La Vague*, by Courbet, *L’Allée à Éragny* by Pissarro. Letter from the Director of the Domaines de la Seine to Philipper Erlanger, February 13, 1957, AMAE, 554 INVA 1374.
35 *Letter from the Directeur des Domaines de la Seine to Bernard Dorival, January 22, 1957, AN, 20150044/120: “I have the honor to inform you that no loan of these works will be granted in the future.”*
36 In South America, the catalogues mentioned “Matsukata collection”, for the origin of the works, instead of “formerly Matsukata collection”.
37 The khi distribution equals 0.37, which means that the distribution is not due to chance, at 90%.
Figure 5: Network of the organizers of the exhibitions featuring artworks from Matsukata’s confiscated collection (1944-1958)
In order to understand the motivations behind the circulation of works from the seized collection on the one hand, and the decision to include or omit the Matsukata provenance in catalogues on the other, we propose in the following section to decrypt the logics at play in the exhibitions through archival analysis, before proceeding to a sociological analysis of the exhibitions' organizers that will draw on a distant computational reading of sources. The following network (Fig. 5) maps the organizing and patronage committees of the French and foreign exhibitions based on information available in the catalogues.

Unsurprisingly, the people who were most decisive in these exhibitions were also those who held the most important positions in the French museum sphere and who by extension exerted the most direct control over Matsukata's confiscated collection. At the core of the network are Georges Salles, directeur des musées de France, and Jacques Jaujard, directeur général des Arts et des Lettres. They are joined by Germain Bazin, curator in the paintings and drawings department of the Musée du Louvre – later appointed chief curator in 1951 – and Jean Cassou, chief curator of the Musée national d’art moderne. It was these four personalities who were best placed to orchestrate loans of works in Matsukata’s confiscated collection, even if the official and administrative power lay solely with the Inspecteur Principal des Domaines de la Seine. The French National Archives further show that Bernard Dorival, assistant curator at the Musée national d’art moderne, was the Inspecteur Principal des Domaines de la Seine.

The network (Fig. 5) also reflects the active involvement of Louis Joxe, the Directeur Général des Relations Culturelles, and Philippe Erlanger, the Sous-Directeur des Échanges artistiques, who was in charge of foreign artistic exchanges and since 1944 had also been the director of the Association Française d’Action Artistique (AFAA). Founded in 1922, the AFAA was created in order to "methodically ensure the expansion and export of French art abroad and the warm welcome of foreign artists in France". To accomplish this, it could rely on its own endowment, on patronage from wealthy donors, and on subsidies from its two supervisory ministries, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Public Education and Fine Arts. The AFAA contributed to the circulation of the works of the Matsukata seizure by participating in the organization and financing of the following exhibitions (Fig. 4b): the three Brussels exhibitions [1947b] [1949d] [1953c], the Impressionists' exhibition at the Venice Biennale [1948a], the touring exhibition “De Manet à nos jours” in South America [1949a], the two travelling exhibitions of French drawings in the United States [1952e] [1955a], the "Landscape in French Art" exhibition in London [1949g], and further exhibitions in Copenhagen [1949f], Vienna [1950c], Amsterdam [1953d], Rome and Florence [1955c], Warsaw, Moscow and Leningrad [1956b]. The AFAA was not involved in the exhibitions in Switzerland (Fig. 4b); the fact that the Swiss catalogues systematically mention the name of Matsukata with regards to works’ provenance (Fig. 4a) may initially lead us to believe that the AFAA was unwilling to mention or uninterested in acknowledging this fact. However, on closer inspection, the exhibitions of Matsukata’s works in South America and Italy, which were sponsored by the AFAA, also cite the name of the Japanese collector. No cause-and-effect relationship can thus be inferred between the mention or omission of the name Matsukata in catalogues and in the involvement in the AFAA in the exhibitions.

Through its circulation as part of international exhibitions, the Matsukata collection clearly served to enhance France’s artistic influence in the context...
of the Cold War, increasing American soft power and, from 1951 onwards, nascent European integration. Indeed, the exhibition catalogues were unanimous: even if some did mention that works were “formerly [from the] Matsukata collection”, all of them were silent about the fact that this collection had been seized by French authorities.

**Keep or Return? A Choice Dictated by Exhibitions**

As works from the Matsukata seizure circulated in exhibitions abroad, museum curators – Jean Cassou, Bernard Dorival, Germain Bazin, and curator of drawings at the Louvre Jacqueline Bouchot-Saupique – and political decision-makers – Georges Salles, Jacques Jaujard, Minister of Foreign Affairs Robert Schuman, and successive French ambassadors in Japan – debated which artworks were “to be kept at all costs” for the French national collections and which artworks could be returned to Japan. From August 1947, Bernard Dorival was particularly active in drawing the attention of his colleagues to “the unique importance of this collection and the interest that France would have in keeping it for its museums”.

However, it seems that the decision whether or not to keep an artwork was not strictly correlated to its ostensible value. Interestingly, the final decision whether to keep or return an artwork correlated instead with its circulation.

**A Certain Idea of “French Artistic Glory”**

Matsukata’s collection was shown in two main types of exhibitions. On the one hand, the works were displayed in monographic exhibitions, or in exhibitions that commemorated important milestones in the cultural and artistic history of France: the centenary of the 1848 revolution [1948b], the centenary of Gauguin’s birth [1949b] [1949e], the fiftieth anniversary of the death of Toulouse-Lautrec [1951c] and Cézanne [1956a]. The second category could be called "progressive" exhibitions, ones which sought to construct a heroic and linear narrative of “French art” and which featured highly explicit titles: Modern French Painting from Impressionism to the Present [1946], The Origins of Contemporary Art: French Painting from Manet to Bonnard [1947a], From David to Cézanne [1947b], From Manet to Our Time [1949a], French Drawing from Fouquet to Cézanne [1949d], French Landscapes from Poussin to Cézanne [1951b], The Origins of Contemporary Art [1951d], French Painting from David to Cézanne [1956b]. Works were therefore called upon when they could contribute to the writing of a glorious and progressive history of France.

However, Matsukata’s confiscated collection was not solicited in its entirety. Out of the 80 artists present, some 60 were wholly excluded from this glorious national artistic narrative and from the “progressive” exhibitions, and did not circulate: artists such as Charles Cottet, Lucien Simon, or Edmond Aman-Jean. Their works were precisely the ones that were later returned to Japan. This meant that the works of a select group of just 20 artists were chosen from those represented in the seized collection to circulate in France and abroad (Fig. 6).

Framed as heroes of France’s glorious narrative, these 20 artists were heavily solicited for the exhibitions, first and foremost the impressionists, Gauguin, Courbet, Cézanne, Toulouse-Lautrec and Van Gogh.

If we look to the individual artworks, a similarly stark contrast emerges between 54 works which were exhibited at least once, and 340 others which remained in the reserves of the Musée national d’art moderne or, in the case of sculptures, in the Musée Rodin (Fig. 7). Among the most frequently requested and most prominently featured artworks (Fig. 7) was Édouard Manet’s *La Serveuse de bocks (The Waitress)*. The painting was reproduced on

---

33 Letter from Bernard Dorival to Georges Salles, August 1, 1947, AN, 20150044/120.

40 Letter from Bernard Dorival [to Jean Chauvel], November 3, AN, 20150044/120.
the cover of the catalogues of two travelling exhibitions, one in Germany and the other South America (Fig. 8).

For the German exhibition, this choice was particularly significant. The exhibition was to travel through the French Occupied Zone. Manet’s painting depicts a waitress at the Reichshoffen café-concert, an establishment located on the boulevard Rochechouart in Paris; it pictures a waitress serving beers to male customers. It was this scene, reminiscent of the interior of a German brewery, that was chosen for the catalogue cover, as if to underscore in visual terms a strong cultural proximity between France and Germany. Not surprisingly, Bernard Dorival included La Serveuse de bocks in the list of “works to be to be kept at all costs” that he drew up in August 1947.42

However, not all of the works that enjoyed the most extensive circulation in the service of a national narrative were eventually included in the desiderata of the French curators. To understand their choices, we need to analyze the “needs” of French museums in the 1940s and 1950s.

---

41 This exhibition was placed under the high patronage of Army General Koenig, French Commander-in-Chief in Germany.

42 Letter from Bernard Dorival to Georges Salles, August 1, 1947, AN, 20150044/120. Later, in 1952, this painting by Manet was coveted because it belonged to the artist’s clear period, a period missing from the French national museums (Letter from Germain Bazin to Georges Salles, August 13, 1952, AN, 20150044/120).
Figure 7: Exhibited artworks from Matsukata’s confiscated collection sorted by the total number of exhibitions (1944-1958).
Turning Need into Choice

It is difficult to define the "needs" of museums, and harder still to measure them. At best, an approximation can be given. To better understand why the curators eventually chose to keep one work from the seizure over another for the national collections, it is possible to offer a measure of the extent to which museums “needed” to use a given seized work to present an artist in a given exhibition. The following graph (Fig. 9) presents this one possible measure of "need": for each artist, the number artworks drawn from the Matsukata collection and circulated in exhibitions (in France and abroad) is divided by the total number of circulated artworks by that artist (i.e. works from national collections as well as those from the Matsukata collection). The closer this ratio is to 100%, the more French curators can be said to have relied upon the seized collection for artworks with which to represent the artist in question, as opposed to their existing national collections.

In addition to this first measure of "internal" need, a second measure can be computed, that of "comparative" needs. For each artist, the graphs Fig.10a and Fig.10b show the respective percentage of works from French national collections, from foreign national collections, and from the Matsukata seizure featured in French exhibitions and exhibitions abroad, excluding loans from private collectors and dealers.

All these measures of internal and external needs can then be compared with the curators’ eventual selection of works to retain for the national collections (Fig. 11). This graph shows both the most frequently exhibited works and the various choices of the curators. In dark purple are the works chosen in the first official list of "works from the Matsukata seizure that the national museums wish to preserve for their collections", drawn up...
Figure 9: % of artworks from Matsukata’s confiscated collection, over the total number artworks lent by the French museums.

Figure 10a: Loans from French and foreign museums in exhibitions held in France featuring artworks from Matsukata’s confiscated collection (1944-1958).
After the signature of the peace treaty with Japan on 8th September 1951, and its entry into force on 28th April 1952, France officially became the owner of the seized collection.

As a consequence, the French decided to "gift" a certain number of the works to Japan, provided they would be curated in a new "museum of French art". Taking advantage of the fact that the state was now the official owner of the works, in 1952 the French museums bolstered their wish list: in addition to the first list, the graph (Fig.11) shows in light purple a further selection of works requested by the national museums in a second official list of 6th August 1952. When considering these additions, Robert Schuman, the French Minister of Foreign Affairs asked Georges Salles to review these choices, in order "to ensure the greatest possible reach of our artistic influence in the world". In the end, after internal debates, a third list was agreed on 30th April 1953, corresponding to the works that the French national museums ultimately kept for their own collections: in Fig. 11, these works are marked with an asterisk.

A comparison between Fig. 9 and Fig. 11 allows us to better understand the choices of the French curators. Firstly, the works that the French authorities chose for circulation in exhibitions were very likely to be amongst those they requested. One exception here is the *Bourgeois de Calais*, by Rodin, a monumental bronze sculpture whose weight prevented it from travelling altogether. However, not all of the works that circulated were ultimately requested for the national collections. Depending on internal and external needs, four categories can be distinguished amongst the works requested for the national collections:

---

43 All the lists are reported by Léa Saint-Raymond, *The escrow of the Matsukata collection: inventories, lists and exhibitions (1945-1949)*, art. cit.

44 Letter from Robert Schuman to Georges Salles, October 13, 1952, AN, 20150044/120.
Figure 11: Exhibited artworks from Matsukata’s confiscated collection, sorted by the total number of exhibitions (1944-1958) and French desiderata.
- Works by artists who were not well represented in French national collections. When it came to these artists, the Matsukata collection had been a windfall for curators. Examples of this category were François Bonvin’s three panels for the decoration of a dining room and, above all, the *Bedroom in Arles* by Vincent Van Gogh. These were requested as a priority and were not given to Japan.

- Works of artists who were essential to the French national narrative, who had been much more in demand in exhibitions than the previous group, and who were poorly represented in French museums particularly when compared to foreign museums. The works of these artists - Paul Cézanne, Paul Gauguin and, to a certain extent, Pablo Picasso - were requested as a priority by French museums and entered, for the most part, into the French national collections. In the case of Gauguin, this need was explicit: “the most beautiful Gauguins of the following periods are now held in the collections of Swiss or American museums; these five Gauguins would represent a value of about one hundred million that we could never spend”.

- The works of artists who were essential to the French national narrative but who were relatively better represented in the existing national collections. This category included the impressionist works of Claude Monet, Camille Pissarro, Pierre Auguste Renoir and Edgar Degas. Since they were already present in French collections, the internal and external need for these artists was less acute. However, French curators chose to circulate works by these artists from the Matsukata collection to represent them abroad, rather than risk damaging works that belonged to the national collections.

- A final and less common category pertained to works by artists who were well represented in the existing national collections, but whose workmanship, originality or significance in the artist’s career made them particularly desirable. These works circulated widely and were finally preserved by France, and included Manet’s *Serveuse de Bocks*, “the only painting of the clear period of this artist that the Louvre would possess”.

- Of the eight Gauguin paintings in the Matsukata collection, four were given to Japan. France kept three of Cézanne’s watercolors out of the seven in the Matsukata collection.

In 1959, most of the works from the Matsukata collection were "gifted" by France to the Japanese State, and were sent with great pomp to the National Museum of Western Art, built for the occasion in Tokyo by Swiss architect Le Corbusier. Fifty years later, in 2019, the same museum organized an exhibition commemorating the event, entitled “The Matsukata Collection: a One-Hundred-Year Odyssey”, for which the Musée d’Orsay and the Musée national d’art moderne lent works from the former Matsukata collection. The loop was closed and the word “odyssey” thus a very fitting one. The history of cultural and diplomatic relations is inscribed in the official and unofficial circulations of these artworks, and it is only through cartography that this odyssey can be made visible – a cartography that looks behind the curtain of the official history, that of the exhibition catalogues, and looks to the unofficial one, that of the archives.

---

45 Of the eight Gauguin paintings in the Matsukata collection, four were given to Japan. France kept three of Cézanne’s watercolors out of the seven in the Matsukata collection.

46 Letter from Germain Bazin to Georges Salles, August 13, 1952, AN, 20150044/120.


Source: File “Loans”, 20150044/120, Archives nationales,


[1950b] *Courbet 1819-1877, La Tour de Peilz, Salle des Remparts*, from July 8 to October 3, 1950, Vevey: Klausfelder, 1950 [no list of artworks].


[1953e] Exposition de peinture française contemporaine, Berlin, Senate of West Berlin. The exhibition catalogue is unavailable.


