

Bryn Mawr College

Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work at Bryn Mawr College

Growth and Structure of Cities Faculty Research
and Scholarship

Growth and Structure of Cities

2008

Machi: Neighborhood and Small Town—The Foundation for Urban Transformation in Japan

Carola Hein

Bryn Mawr College, chein@brynmawr.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://repository.brynmawr.edu/cities_pubs



Part of the [Architecture Commons](#), [History of Art, Architecture, and Archaeology Commons](#), and the [Urban Studies and Planning Commons](#)

[Let us know how access to this document benefits you.](#)

Citation

Hein, Carola. "Machi: Neighborhood and Small Town—The Foundation for Urban Transformation in Japan." *Journal of Urban History* 35 (2008): 75-107.

This paper is posted at Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work at Bryn Mawr College.

https://repository.brynmawr.edu/cities_pubs/22

For more information, please contact repository@brynmawr.edu.

Machi: Neighborhood and Small Town. The foundation for Urban Transformation in Japan

Carola Hein

In 1854, American navy ships under Commodore Matthew Perry appeared off the shores of Japan and pressured the formerly secluded nation into accepting a treaty that included opening some ports to American ships and the beginning of trading.ⁱ With this opening to outside influences, Japanese professionals began to study—among other subjects—modernizing European and American cities in search of models to implement at home.ⁱⁱ When they applied new principles, Japanese practitioners tweaked the original ideas to make them fit their own changing cultural backgrounds, local needs, experiences, and practice. I argue that one element in their particular reading of foreign form was and continues to be their understanding of urban space in terms of neighborhoods and small towns, both of which are called *machi* in Japanese. The word itself captures themes in national and local identity and different perspectives on urban living, density and transportation, and evokes—at least in some of its meanings—specific socio-economic structures and urban development. As *machi* appears to be a foundation of Japanese urban thought, a closer look at the term and its multiple meanings may well be useful to foreign observers and scholars interested in Japanese planning, urban form, and thought.

Indeed, without such an understanding, European and American scholars and practitioners have had a difficult time understanding the form and function of Japanese cities, leading to varied and complex views and changing interpretations over time. This history also dates to the mid-19th century: even as the Japanese investigated the outside world, the formerly closed East Asian nation opened to more wide-spread observation, and Japanese design, landscaping, architecture, and urban form attracted growing foreign attention. Some Western professionals traveled to Japan to explore, study traditional Japanese arts, or exchange knowledge, while others imported Japanese concepts and objects into new contexts. A first exhibit of Japanese objects in New York in 1853, followed by world's fairs in numerous centers, including London (1862), Vienna (1873), Philadelphia (1876), Paris (1878), or Chicago (1893), showcased Japanese architecture, art, and life styles.ⁱⁱⁱ (fig. 1) Rapidly, Japanese design made its mark on Western art and furniture, while landscape architects were excited to incorporate ideas from Japanese gardens.^{iv} (fig. 2) In the 1920s, Frank Lloyd Wright and other leading architects, bent on promoting functionalist concepts, demonstrated growing interest in the structural elements of Japanese traditional architecture.^v These Western observers went to Japan to learn, but also to find justification, support, and inspiration for local needs and debates. The elements they chose to observe often reflected discussions “back home.”

In the early years of contact with Japan, foreigners repeatedly criticized modernizing Japanese cities and planners for the apparent discontinuity of urban space, and lack of planning principles.^{vi} Western scholarly interest in the Japanese city and comparative studies grew in the 1960s with the translation into English of Japanese books. Of particular importance among these were the works of the sociologist Yazaki Takeo, who, while intent on comparison and classification, highlighted the need to keep in mind distinct patterns of change and continuity.^{vii} By the 1970s, Western scholarly discussion saw a number of

publications that celebrated a unique Japanese urban form—particularly visible in the capital Tokyo—based on continuities between the traditional and the modern city.^{viii} This shift over the last three decades, from criticizing the city to celebrating it, is visible in the changing metaphors which Japanese and foreigners have deployed in urban projects, architecture, and publications over the last three decades to describe and “re-script” Tokyo: as the British geographer Paul Waley puts it, in their views, Tokyo has gone “from ugly duckling to cool cat.”^{ix} The “most persistent cluster of metaphors,” Waley says, is the theme of “Tokyo, (...) as a city of villages,” or “Tokyo as something smaller than the sum of its parts.”^x Indeed, as Harry Smith has pointed out, the village metaphor has long been a theme in foreign writings about the city.^{xi}

The notion of a metropolis as a cluster of villages is not new or limited to Japanese cities. Over the last century, visitors and researchers have described many cities, including Berlin, London, Los Angeles, Toronto, and even New York as composed of unique units. In 1929, the American planner Clarence Arthur Perry stated, that “... every great city is a conglomeration of small communities. For example, Manhattan—New York’s oldest borough—contains sections like Chelsea, Kip’s Bay and Yorkville.”^{xii} It is thus not surprising that the distinctive patchwork character of small and imaginatively used units in Japanese cities has captured the imagination of foreign practitioners. Over the last three decades, these practitioners have looked to Japanese approaches for ideas about designing increasingly chaotic, albeit comprehensively planned, European, American, and Australian cities; they are intrigued by local initiatives that allow parts of the city to change flexibly according to different rhythms and varying principles.^{xiii}

In particular, the concepts of the neighborhood (*machi*) and community building (*machizukuri*) have evolved into a central concern for contemporary Japanese and foreign researchers and practitioners of urban and built form, as well as for those interested in social organization.^{xiv} In “Neighborhood Tokyo,” the American anthropologist Theodore Bestor points out that “Tokyo neighborhoods are geographically compact and spatially discrete, yet at times almost invisible to the casual observer. Socially they are well organized and cohesive, each containing a few hundred to a few thousand inhabitants.”^{xv} Inhabitants generally refer to the *machi* as a place of a particular lifestyle and a social community. The Japanese idea of neighborhood offers identity to its citizen to a larger extent than does the social concept of the city—much in contrast to the European concept of urban identity. Long-standing social practices, such as festivals (*matsuri*), help bring the community together at regular intervals in preparation and celebration, and temporarily transform the existing urban spaces.^{xvi} In form and function, these urban neighborhoods are heterogeneous, a reality that perhaps finds a source in land ownership patterns and urban laws. For example, there are neighborhoods in which a large landowner leases part of the land to families, who build both homes and rental apartments. Neighborhoods can thus host a diverse group of owners, leasers, and renters, all of whom have rights (for example) in the case of an urban renewal project.

If we abstract design and planning concepts, these traditional multi-functional Japanese neighborhoods provide a life-environment, with inspiring features in regard to sustainability, livability, and community planning.^{xvii} Tokyo, for example, is an easy-to-live-in metropolitan area of about 12.5 million inhabitants (as of 2005) inside its administrative

boundaries, and totaling about 35 million in the continuously built up area. It is composed of a multitude of high-density, multi-functional neighborhoods that offer a mixture of different residential types, from private houses to small apartments, integrating different social groups.

Following an investigation of historic and contemporary meanings of *machi*, and its particular spatial and socio-economic forms, this text argues that the Japanese tradition of *machi* has influenced the ways in which modernizing Japan picked up foreign concepts through the 19th and particularly in the 20th century. It is crucial for those looking at Japanese neighborhood organization, city life, and urban form today to understand *machi* as a key concept in their analysis of Japanese urban form and function.

***Machi* as neighborhood**

The term *machi* can be used to describe units inside a Japanese city, even various and often very diverse ones.^{xviii} Thus the term *shita-machi* describes the low-lying and usually working-class areas of Tokyo and other cities, as distinct from the *yamanote* areas, the wealthier highlands.^{xix} The map of the city of Edo (the name of Tokyo before the Meiji restoration), home to the shogun, and namesake of the Edo period, also highlights the socio-spatial division of the city into various units, de facto small towns, which were under the control of the military class, temples and shrines, or the townsmen, each with their own regulatory and even police powers. (fig. 3) Monofunctional districts for samurai and their retainers, or for merchants, but also the geisha district (for example: Kazue-machi, Kanazawa) or a shopping district, can be called *machi*, (with the Chinese character 町 sometimes pronounced *chô*). Craft communities originally settled into residential areas according to specialties, such as blacksmiths (*kajiya-machi*), dyers (*konya-machi*), or carpenters (*daiku-chô*).^{xx} Neighborhoods have taken different forms over time, with streets as boundaries between them. However, some *machi* called “*ryôgawa-chô*” were centered on the street and included buildings on both sides. These were typical for Kyoto and visible in the street plan of Edo in the seventeenth century, as the Japanese architectural and urban historian Tamai Tetsuo has shown.^{xxi} Geographic features, such as slopes or valleys, can shape the spatial dimensions of *machi* and building lots, as Jinnai Hidenobu shows in an analysis of neighborhoods and the residences of feudal lords (*daimyô*) in Tokyo.^{xxii}

Thus the form, size, and definition of urban *machi* have varied over the centuries. Different social classes—*samurai* (the military nobility), temple folks, and commoners—occupied distinct areas, but their governance structure was similar. In Edo, and similarly in other cities, each class was governed separately: by a city magistrate (*machi bugyô*) for the commoner areas (*machi-chi*); by a temple magistrate (*jisha-bugyô*) for the temple areas (*jisha-chi*); and directly by central authority (*Bakufu*) or local rulers (*daimyô*) for the samurai areas (*buke-chi*).^{xxiii} As a result, a large urban area, such as Edo, was ruled in bits and pieces by various authorities with certain degrees of local authority, but there was no single metropolitan governments.^{xxiv} Today, *machi* continue to be important administrative and planning units.^{xxv} The term still has multiple meanings in the Japanese city: It can be used to indicate a district that tries to revive the feel of an earlier era, such as *Showa no machi*; an urban unit of the postal system; or a residential area centered on a shopping street.

Although the term and urban form of *machi* have a long-standing history and

actuality, the Japanese city's post-modern and post-occidental order introduced a break with the past, as the French geographer Augustin Berque has argued. And as Bestor has also pointed out, there are no continuous links between contemporary urban neighborhoods and preexisting villages and their lifestyles; today's *machi* are not simply administrative units or the expression of bygone social structures and life styles.^{xxvi}

Nonetheless, I argue that the concept of neighborhood activity underlying the idea of *machi* has roots in earlier forms and continues to flourish today. The formal division of the city into units, for example, was partly derived from traditional China, where cities were divided into sections with strict social hierarchies and control structures.^{xxvii} Yazaki, writing about medieval Kyoto, calls these subdivisions "towns," and notes the importance of Kyoto local organizations:

"All subdivisions of Kyôto thus developed as towns. One block surrounded by larger streets consisted of five or six *chô* (townships), and several of such *chô* units formed *oyamachi*, or larger townships. The townspeople, *machishû*, were mainly merchants and their helpers, craftsmen and some deposed nobility. Money-lenders and *sake* brewers generally held dominant positions in the management of town affairs and security, which, in any case, the townspeople managed themselves. The townships were organized into larger autonomous bodies, *machigumi*, which, again were brought into even larger unions of the Kamikyô, Nakakyô, and Shimkyô (upper, middle, and lower sections of Kyôto)."^{xxviii}

These neighborhood organizations and other local groups reappear in the analysis by the German anthropologist Christoph Brumann of the conflict over the 1996 proposal by the Kyoto mayor to build a copy of the Parisian Pont des Arts footbridge over the Kamogawa River.^{xxix} Special neighborhood organizations, composed of local citizens (mostly land-owners and merchants), continue to administer many neighborhoods in Japan, which is to say that they are responsible for organizing neighborhood events and other activities, as well as establishing, for example, rules for waste disposal.^{xxx} They have long been the primary partners of local government. Even today, the local government may ask local institutions, such as traditional self-governing neighborhood organization, the *chônai*, or advice before deciding on controversial projects such as the construction of a new street or the implementation of urban renewal projects; it may request the *chônai* to find out about the needs and ideas of the inhabitants so as to be able to organize emergency services or to preempt opposition movements. Traditional neighborhood groups also head the organization of festivals. Though recent years have seen a concerning decline in the numbers of participating members and their relevance to community life, the practice of civic activity is still alive and the growth of new local groups gives hope for continued vitality of the neighborhood.

While such associations are based in the neighborhood and build upon strong traditions of local self-governance and self-management, they are also part of strong vertical hierarchies, from neighborhood to district, ward, and prefecture, as the Canadian geographer André Sorensen has demonstrated.^{xxxi} As he convincingly argues, their structure can funnel demands and protests from citizens, as well as top-down directives and co-operation from above.^{xxxii} The close relationship between *chônai* and established institutions throughout

Japan contributed to the rise of new and diverse social, political, and design processes based in small areas rather than the larger scales of the entire city or region, referred to since the 1960s as *machizukuri* (literally, “making a neighborhood” or “making a community”). *Machizukuri* generally aims at improving livability, management of “shared spaces” as Sorensen calls them, and urban form.^{xxxiii} Such movements have made an appearance all over Japan over the last few decades, and local administrations have started integrating their activities into their frameworks. In the context of the present article, it is important to point out that these readings of *machizukuri* rely on the perception of urban units as small towns and as such build upon traditional elements of urban form.

***Machi*: The small town in Japan**

The term *machi* thus refers to an urban unit inside a city, but also to a small town.^{xxxiv} Japan traditionally has had a large network of small towns fulfilling different purposes.^{xxxv} Following periods of multiple fiefdoms lasting into the middle of the first millennium, the establishment of a centralized system and new capitals modeled after Korean and Chinese examples (such as Nara (founded as Heijōkyō in 710 A.D) and Kyoto (founded as Heiankyō in 794 AD)), a feudal system emerged after 1180. This system included urban settlements, labeled *machi* in conjunction with a special function and location, such as around temples (*tera-machi*), below fortresses (*jōka-machi*) or next to ports (*minato-machi*). The policy of mandatory alternate attendance at court for regional rulers in the Edo period (1603-1868), called *sankinkotai*, further increased the number of regional cities: people established post stations to offer accommodation to travelers along the old highway system, other businesses and houses settled next to them (*shukuba-machi*). Other examples are *hiroba-machi* (market towns) or *onzen-machi* (spa-towns). In contrast to European cities, where fortification surrounded the whole urban area, in Japan, walls only surrounded the actual castle, highlighting the town as an independent unit.

Centralization after the country’s opening, in 1854, led to a sharp decrease in the number of municipalities from more than 71.000 by 1883 to just over 14.000 in 1898. After a second municipal amalgamation in the 1950s and 60s their number was down to just over 3000.^{xxxvi} Later amalgamations have further reduced the number of municipalities with government aiming for the target number of around 1000, again for easier administration and stronger local governance.^{xxxvii} These sharp declines in the number of municipalities indicate a strong move towards centralization that seems to contrast the declared desire of the Japanese government to promote decentralization.^{xxxviii} Some scholars, such as A.J. Jacobs, have argued that the Japanese situation is more complex than the term “centralized” usually connotes, as some municipalities (notably the big cities) retain more power than others.^{xxxix} In their discussion of complexity and interdependence between central and local governments in terms of central control and local initiative, the American sociologists Richard Hill and Kuniko Fujita show that local power has grown despite a largely centralized national budget.^{xl} It is clear that the mega-cities (*seirei shitei toshi* 政令指定都市 or *seirei shi* 政令市), and especially Tokyo, have almost as much power as the prefectures, while the wards of Tokyo (its administrative units) each have as much power as an average city.^{xli} The decline of the traditional small towns and the emergence of large metropolises with developmental and planning needs different from those of traditional small towns also led to the introduction of a new term.

Toshi, a new term for the modernizing Japanese city

After the opening of Japan to the West and its ideas, Japanese practitioners needed a new word to introduce the ideas of European and American urban planners to Japan. They chose the word *toshi* to translate “city.”^{xlii} The very form of the word shows that it is an invented term, not a word or a concept integral to Japanese cultural identity: it combines the kanji of capital city (*miyako*) and that of market-place (*ichi*).^{xliii}

The spread of the new terms *toshi* and *daitoshi* (large city) is documented, for example, in the hundreds of books featuring it in their titles.^{xliiv} Though most were published after the Second World War (and the majority within the last three decades), texts from the 1920s and 30s used the terms to discuss foreign (European, American, Chinese) capitals and metropolises. Many of these early texts listed “the city government of Tokyo” as the main author/editor, possibly an indication of the degree to which city officials were considering their city within the context of large cities worldwide.^{xliv} Their use of the term *daitoshi* parallels the reduction in the number of municipalities and the desire of Japanese planner to study European and American models and implement them at home.

Similarly, other words related to modern city planning and the perception of the urban area as a whole, its methods and tools have entered Japan only during the last hundred years.^{xlvi} Throughout the Edo period, the dividing of land for building neighborhoods was called *machiwari*. Incorporating the word *machi*, its form indicates that planning the city as an entirety was not a dominant practice in Japan. Thus, just as planners had to invent the word for “city”, they had to find a new word for large-scale top-down urban planning resembling European or American planning practice. This time they came up with *toshi keikaku*, (city planning) a term first used in 1913 by the urban planner Hajime Seki.^{xlvii} Planners have used the term for interventions such as the planning of new towns on the outskirts of existing cities, the creation of man-made islands, and the construction of highways. While *toshi keikaku* seems diametrically opposed to *machizukuri*, concerned with a small area and local initiatives, these practices in fact coexist in the majority of Japanese cities.

Indeed, the idea and practice of *machi*, as a small city and as an urban unit, has resonated with the rapid transformation and modernization of Japanese cities since the Meiji restoration and has influenced the way in which the Japanese imported foreign concepts. Specifically, as Japanese planners projected comprehensive plans for large urban regions, they included the notion of small units composing a city. This attitude was in fact inevitable given the rapidity of Japan’s modernization, the scale of the urban areas, local opposition, and the lack of sufficient finances. Thus, planners found ways to co-exist with and adapt to longstanding traditions: of self-governing neighborhood groups, of small-scale land use and land ownership patterns, and of planning tools adapted to small areas. This approach also left room for forces other than planners that remodeled parts of the city often without reference to a larger plan.^{xlviii}

***Machi* and the import of foreign ideas**

As Japanese practitioners carefully examined foreign examples after 1854, their

cultural background influenced their selection of ideas.^{xlix} Concepts that dominated planners' thinking in many European countries, notably those revolving around aesthetic concepts, failed to excite their interest, as the case of the rebuilding after a major fire in 1872 shows. The Tokyo Governor decided that reconstruction in the Ginza area should set an example for fireproof residential construction. He retained the English engineer Thomas J. Waters, who designed the entire district along lines common in European cities at the time: with brick buildings, a unified streetscape, and the separation of traffic. (fig. 4) The plan also called for widening streets, and rearranging and replotting some blocks. (It largely maintained the urban layout of the area because modern planning tools were not yet established.) Nonetheless, Tokyoites perceived the buildings as expensive, damp, and not earthquake-proof. Many of the buildings remained empty for years, the project had no followers, and the 1923 Great Kanto Earthquake proved the critics right: it destroyed the brick district.¹

With many planners around the world, Japanese professionals and bureaucrats viewed attempts at deconcentrating the city, such as the garden city, with great interest. Here their understanding of cities as composed of specific urban units may have influenced their thinking.^{li} In 1918, Fukuda Shigeyoshi, a technical officer of the City of Tokyo, developed the visionary *New Tokyo Plan* for a deconcentration of Tokyo over the next fifty years. In the plan he limited the city's size to ten kilometers (a one-hour commute at the time) and proposed the development of sub-centers and satellite cities. (fig. 5) Fukuda's proposal resembled Howard's diagram no 5 of city growth, with open country nearby and rapid communication lines, but Fukuda used the idea for a large metropolis instead of a town of 55,000 inhabitants and proposed decentralizing commercial functions—rather than residential—to the rim of the existing city. (fig. 6)

Fukuda's plan remained only on paper until 1923, when the Great Kantô Earthquake of 1923 destroyed large parts of Tokyo and Yokohama and led to a major drop in the population of the city of Tokyo, as people fled to the suburbs and the countryside.^{lii} Gotô Shinpei, an important actor in Japanese urban planning who was mayor of Tokyo at the time, took up the deconcentration ideas of the *New Tokyo Plan*. But through the 1920s and 30s, unrestrained growth spread around Tokyo. The Kanto National Land Plan attempted in 1936 to create green belts, removing industrial functions from central areas into satellite towns—a move that was also supported by the 1937 Air Defense Law and the 1939 Tokyo Green Space Plan.^{liii} During this time, Japanese planners continued to monitor Western discussions and to consult with practitioners in Europe and America. Fukuda, for example, discussed the rebuilding plan for Tokyo after the Kantô earthquake in 1923 with the German planner Fritz Schumacher; and Ishikawa Hideaki (1893–1955), at that time an engineer in the Ministry of Home Affairs assigned to the town planning of Nagoya, consulted Raymond Unwin during his trip to Europe in 1923 to seek advice on his city's master plan.^{liv}

Ishikawa's writings and urban plans were a major conduit of planning ideas from the West to Japan. He reflected on Western planning ideas and influenced emerging practice through readings and interpretation of foreign planning examples including German principles from the 1920s and 30s, notably the works of the geographer Walter Christaller and professor of planning Gottfried Feder (1883–1941).^{lv} Japanese interest in British and American planning ideas was similar to that of other countries, but their interest in the two Germans, especially Feder, highlights a distinctively Japanese approach to the creation of small units that is comparable to the German attitude of solving the problem of big cities.

The German idea of *Stadtlandschaft* (urban landscape), developed since the 19th century in conjunction with Anglo-American ideas, sought to transform existing cities by creating smaller neighborhoods separated by green areas. It seems to have resonated with Japanese planners who appropriated German ideas according to their own lights, requirements, and culture—and constraints, also given the fact that they had few legal tools to implement large-scale plans and they faced wide-spread opposition to any attempts at comprehensive planning. For all of these reasons, their preference was for small-scale, *machi* like patterns.^{lvi}

The works of Christaller (discredited later because of the use of his ideas by the Nazis) echoed the desire of the Japanese planners to make regional, metropolitan and urban plans. Christaller, whose writings were first introduced in Japan in the 1930s, analyzed urban services in regional context and pointed to a regularity in the distribution of specific functions that could be used in the location and planning of new cities.^{lvii} (fig. 7) Building upon this, as well as on Fukuda's and other earlier proposals for a deconcentration of functions in Tokyo, Ishikawa developed a visionary and all-encompassing plan for postwar Tokyo starting in October 1944. He took up British examples, notably the Greater London Plan of 1944, but also specifically recommended the creation of new specialized centers around the city, which would function as a regional network reminiscent of Christaller's work. With his first textbook on urban and regional planning, in 1941, Ishikawa had proposed his own regional planning ideas, and had laid them out more extensively in a section on planning for defense in his 1942 book, "War and City". His scheme had divided the city into multiple small units according to daily, weekly, and monthly needs and strongly influenced his proposal for the post-war reconstruction of Tokyo.^{lviii} (Fig. 8+9) A sketch from 1946 for the Kanto region highlights the specific connections he envisioned between Tokyo and satellite cities such as Ohta, Utsunoimiya, or Mito; he also translated this concept into a schematic drawing based on his regional planning concepts in 1963.^{lix} (Fig. 10+11)

Ishikawa was not the only one to consider Japanese cities in terms of their regions. The Japanese vision of day trips from the capital to any place in the country, which is virtually a reality today, inspired planners as early as the mid 20th century.^{lx} Nishiyama Uzô (1911-1994), another leading urban planner, considered the car and not the train as the main means of transport.^{lxi} Nishiyama proposed cities of between one and two hundred thousand inhabitants. Each of these cities would be the center of one of twelve central regions structuring the nation while also being connected to form a network. Some of these cities already existed; others had to be created. In an article published in 1946 in the journal *Shinkenchiku*, Nishiyama proposed a spindle-like system, given Japan's narrow, elongated form.^{lxii} His overall aim was to create a culturally and industrially balanced system. Nishiyama calculated distances between the different units in temporal and not spatial terms. In fact, distances of between one hundred and five hundred kilometers can be traveled by high speed trains and planes, which connect the big cities, whereas highways and tracks for high speed trains connect the smaller ones and cover distances of between thirty and fifty kilometers. Ordinary streets and trains lead to the villages, taking about an hour to travel twenty kilometers. Even the villages, however, should be at a maximum traveling time of three hours from the capital. (fig. 12a and b+13)

Both Ishikawa and Nishiyama also carefully examined the inner workings of a city, focusing on aspects of foreign planning that revolved around the idea of small cities and on urban units as the basis for metropolitan planning. They drew especially on works of

Clarence Perry and Thomas Adams, as their proposals for the creation of largely independent units are close to the division of Japanese cities into independent units.^{lxiii} (fig. 14) The degree to which Western planning influenced Japanese thought is well illustrated in the works of Takayama Eika, who in 1962 founded the first urban planning section in Japan at Tokyo University, for the Manchurian city Datong in 1939, where he modeled his neighborhood plans on Detroit designed in 1931.^{lxiv} (fig. 15, 16, 17) The Japanese were thus aware of worldwide discussions, but they appreciated another German planner, Gottfried Feder, whose work built upon historic and contemporary examples including Anglo-Saxon concepts, featuring among others a preliminary plan for Greenbelt-Maryland.^{lxv} It is possible that due to political and military context of the 1940s, German ideas received more Japanese interest than the proposals of other countries, but the post-war influence of Feder's ideas raises questions whether there was a specific reason for the sustained Japanese interest in this planner and the selective import of his work.

Since the 1940s, Japanese urban planning textbooks have given Feder's "New Town" a prominent place in a lineage that includes Howard and Perry, and Japanese planners often refer to it in interviews.^{lxvi} Ishikawa's 1941 textbook on urban and regional planning, illustrates his knowledge and interpretation of international planning examples, displaying—after Howard—images by the German planner Paul Wolf (mistakenly spelled Worf by Ishikawa) for the formation of a metropolis from 1919, the French architect Le Corbusier's city for three million inhabitants (1923) and Feder's "*The New Town*" proposal, a selection that Ishikawa maintained even in later editions (for example 1951, 1954, 1956, 1963), some of which are considerably revised. (fig. 18) In general, though, Japanese textbooks provide little detail about Feder's ideas. The planner, Akiyama Masayuki, for example, refers to "Gott Feder" and explains only the detail that he suggested multifunctional areas for daily living for about 20.000 inhabitants, separated from each other and from industrial and other areas by 100-500 meter wide green belts that incorporate small parks, footpaths, and sports facilities, as the basis for new town planning.^{lxvii} It is clear that a certain ignorance of the book's contents existed; meanwhile German and English language publications largely ignore the book.^{lxviii} In the political context of the 1940s, when Nishiyama wrote his article, such a genealogy might have been comprehensible, as the project was new and needed to be explained in detail. In regard to contemporary analysis of the history of town planning, this insistence on Feder may suggest that the book resonated with Japanese planners and planning principles as a technical introduction to urban planning rather than a politically motivated theory.

Nishiyama, educated as an architect between 1930 and 1933, and one of the rare Japanese planners whose proposals are based on a comprehensive and long-term concept of society, was a major instrument in importing Feder's ideas.^{lxix} In 1942, he was examining the problem of the big city as locale for a concentrated workforce, trying to find a new organizational form for the Japanese city. In this connection, he analyzed the major urban planning discussions in the west. He chose material to present without regard to the political context that engendered it, whether capitalist America, socialist Russia or fascist National-Socialist Germany. He compiled his findings and interpretations in an article entitled "The structure of life-units (or spheres)" (*Seikatsu kichi no kôshô*).^{lxx} In that text, first of all he refuted urban concepts featuring skyscrapers and higher density of population in the cities, as had been advocated by Le Corbusier or Hilberseimer, calling the first, a simple reorganization of the city without seeking solutions to the density problems and the second a

transposition of the capitalist American cities. He also rejected Beaux-Arts projects like the plan for Canberra as purely esthetic concepts. Although it is not mentioned in this particular article, Nishiyama further objected to the monumental National Socialist-urban design proposals by Albert Speer and others.^{lxxi}

Nishiyama was looking for a concept that could be applied both to new and also to existing cities, and in this regard he very much appreciated Feder's ideas outlined in his book *Die neue Stadt (The New Town)*, published in 1939.^{lxxii} Feder proposed urban units for twenty thousand inhabitants divided in nine autonomous units and surrounded by agricultural areas. Based on a lengthy survey of existing cities, he listed all institutions necessary for a small town, creating a kind of guidebook to city building. "The New Town" was published in January 1939. Six months later, on June 1 1939, it was already on the shelves of the administrative library of the city of Tokyo, demonstrating the interest given to the publication by the Japanese. It cannot be assumed that "The New Town" was read and understood by all planners, but it provoked enough interest to be partially translated by the Chamber of Industry and Commerce (*Shôkokaigisho*) by May 1942. At about the same time, several Japanese planners commented on the text in different articles. Itô Goro, officer at the building police section of the Metropolitan Police Board in Tokyo mentions it in his articles on Nazi-Germany.^{lxxiii} Ishikawa, refers to it in his article 1943 and Nishiyama discusses it in his study on the neighborhood.^{lxxiv}

Nishiyama's reference to Feder's book seems to have had a lasting influence on the Japanese interpretation and analysis of Western history of town planning. Most Japanese textbooks explain Feder's concept as a hierarchy of daily/weekly/monthly centers. These are the words first used by Nishiyama and which appear mainly in connection with a single illustration in "*The New Town*." This suggests that Japanese planners picked up Nishiyama's translation or that few authors returned to the original document.^{lxxv} The same is true for the choice of the illustration: In fact, apart from one book, the *Toshi keikaku kyôkasho* which is also the only one to correctly describe the contents of the Feder text, the design printed is always the same. It is the one chosen by Nishiyama, which refers to daily/weekly/monthly centers and which was in the original and not included in the translation As Nishiyama correctly mentions, this particular drawing, referred to in many books as the "Feder-plan," was actually created by Heinz Killius, one of Feder's students. (fig. 19) Feder had initiated a student project on the topic of a new town for 20.000 inhabitants, and included five student proposals in his book. While praising the Killius plan for its attempt to create an organic settlement, he also criticized it as too rigid. Among the other projects were proposals for satellite cities, one designed by Günther Hahn in Feder's seminar, the other created under the guidance of Professor A. Muesmann at the Technical University in Dresden. (fig. 20+21) Both proposals highlighted the possibility of applying Feder's ideas to new as well as existing towns, a possibility that Feder stressed in his book.

Feder considered this technical project to be connected with the art of city planning, as shown in the subtitle of his book, *Essay on the Creation of a New Art of City Planning, Based on the Social Structure of Its Inhabitants*. However, the esthetic part of this project and the reference to European medieval forms were not appropriate to Japan, and Japanese planners therefore largely ignored them. It appears that the notion of adjoining centers that catered to all daily needs, while being linked into a larger network of central places, appealed to the Japanese perception of *machi*-like urban units and the flows between them. Another

connection may exist between the Japanese and the German interpretation of urban units as small towns: the German word *Siedlung* (settlement) can apply to a newly established village or town, but has also been used notably since the 1920s for a residential district within the city. Ishikawa seems to have grasped this similarity, as he uses the term *Siedlung* when writing about Feder's new town project as well as when he refers to the apartment block complex Leipzig-Lößnig and others.^{lxxvi}

Nishiyama also developed several projects concerning the organization of the city in decentralized, self-governed neighborhoods (in the tradition of *machi*), which he called life spheres or life units. Just like his western counterparts, he opposed unnecessary traffic and suggested the creation of small urban units. However, he did not criticize the big city itself. On the contrary, and this is typical of Japanese planners, he tried to find a way to maintain the multifunctionality of big cities while making them more livable. He stressed the need for equilibrated growth and the existence of an appropriate number of workplaces, welfare facilities, and the like, in order to prevent sprawl.^{lxxvii} (fig. 22+23)

Japanese planners, such as Nishiyama and Ishikawa, thus appropriated Western idea—and particularly selected German concept—according to their own lights, and used them to develop concepts for the transformation and modernization of the Japanese cities. Their selection of foreign ideas appears to reconfirm their own understanding of the organization of cities in small units, of decentralization, and deconcentration, and made them highlight the development of cities as a conglomerate of neighborhoods

***Machi* as neighborhood and lessons for the West**

Newly introduced planning techniques added a new facet to Japanese urban form and planning concepts. They did not overtake and restructure Japanese cities, but rather contributed to and continued the patchwork character of Japanese cities.^{lxxviii} City characteristics, reflecting particular geographic contexts, national and local traditions of politics, economic development, and social interaction, traditions of land ownership and planning tools, urban form and architectural design continue to actively shape urban form and planning.

In turn, Japanese ideas about *machi* resonate with planning ideas from other countries. The idea of the neighborhood unit is a central idea of 20th century planning, intimately tied to the name of Clarence Perry. Residential neighborhood units, often organized around cul-de-sac streets, have been central planning features in many countries around the world, meant to allow child's play and community interaction. Many of these projects failed, however, and the result of modern neighborhood planning in the US and elsewhere (at the example of Levittown) have been residential subdivisions for single income-brackets that have rapidly degraded. Researchers widely analyzed the decay of the social interaction of traditional neighborhoods, and in the 1960s a new group of planners emerged in response to the writings of Jane Jacobs, defending community interaction, or New Urbanism. The current promoters of these ideas have once again taken up the topic of small-scale neighborhoods.

Thus today it is the patchwork character of Japanese cities, the multitude of local identities, of different perspectives of urban living and the strength of social networks in

traditional, non-planned, neighborhoods—some of the same characteristics that earlier observers condemned—that attracts foreign researchers. They seek inspiration in the densely-built, functionally- and socially-mixed residential areas with shopping streets, educational facilities and public transportation within walking distance, and feature narrow and irregular paths that require cars to drive carefully and allow room for neighborly talk and children's play. There is a special quality to the neighborhood, its social and functional diversity, and its meaning for the Japanese in terms of identity that is distinctive of the traditional *machi*, that have the feel of small towns and a certain feeling of local governance freedom. In fact, their interest tells us as much about Japanese cities as it does about the authors utilizing the metaphor, their home culture, and specific experience of urban space.

- Adams, Thomas. *The Design of Residential Areas*. Harvard: Cambridge University Press, 1934.
- Adams, Thomas, and Kojiro Kamei. *Jutakuchi no shintaisei genri to keikaku*. Tokyo: Nihon Denken Kabushiki Kaisha Shuppanbu, 1944.
- Akiyama, Masayuki. *Toshikeikaku*. Tokyo: Riko tosho, 1980, 1985, 1993.
- Ashkenazi, Michael. "Cultural Tensions as Factors in the Structure of a Festival Parade." *Asian Folklore Studies* 46, no. 1 (1987): 35-54.
- Befu, Harumi. "Nationalism and Nihonjinron." In *Cultural Nationalism in East Asia: representation and identity*, edited by Harumi Befu, 107-38. Berkeley (CA): Institute of East Asian Studies, University of Berkeley, 1993.
- Berque, Augustin. "La città giapponese. Uso di un'immagine." *Casabella* 53, no. 608-609 (1994): 10-13.
- . "Paroles sur la ville et expression urbaine. Tôkyô années quatre-vingts." In *La Qualité de la Ville. Urbanité française, urbanité nippone*, edited by Augustin Berque, 8-15. Tokyo: Publications de la Maison Franco-Japonaise, 1987.
- . "Tokyo as emblem of a postmodern paradigm." In *Relating architecture to landscape*, edited by Jan Birksted, 147-57. London, New York: E & FN Spon, 1999.
- Bestor, Theodore. *Neighborhood Tokyo*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1989.
- Brumann, Christoph. "Whose Kyoto? Competing models of local autonomy and the townscape in the old imperial capital." In *Cities, Autonomy and Decentralization in Japan*, edited by Carola Hein and Philippe Pelletier, 139-63. London, New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Bundesamt, Statistisches. *Statistisches Jahrbuch*. Wiesbaden: Statistisches Bundesamt, 2007.
- Carver, Norman F. Jr. *Form and Space of Japanese Architecture*. Tokyo: Shokokusha, 1955.
- Christaller, Walter. *Die zentralen Orte in Süddeutschland, Darmstadt*. Darmstadt (Jena), 1969 (1933).
- Christaller, Walter, and Joji Ezawa. *Toshi no ritchi to hatten*. Tokyo: Taimeido, 1969.
- Dahir, James. *The Neighborhood Unit Plan. Its Spread and Acceptance. A Selected Bibliography with Interpretative Comments*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1947.

- Daitoshi Chosa Tokei Kyogikai. *Daitoshi kokigyo hikaku chosa*. Tokyo: Daitoshi Chosa Tokei Kyogikai, 1930.
- Drexler, Arthur. *The Architecture of Japan*. New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1955.
- Durth, Werner, and Niels Gutschow. *Träume in Trümmern*. 2 vols. Braunschweig, Wiesbaden: Vieweg, 1988.
- Engberts, Sonia. "Le territoire pensé à travers la couleur au Japon." In *Le territoire pensé: géographie des représentations territoriales*, edited by Aline Lechaume Frédéric Lasserre, 135-58. Sainte-Foy: Presses de l'Université du Québec, 2003.
- Evans, Neil. "Machi-zukuri as a New Paradigm in Japanese Urban Planning: Reality or Myth?" *Japan Forum* 14, no. 3 (2002): 443-64.
- Feder, Gottfried. *Die neue Stadt, Versuch der Begründung einer neuen Stadtplanungskunst aus der sozialen Struktur der Bevölkerung*. Berlin: Julius Springer, 1939.
- Feder, Gottfried, and Fritz Rechenberg. "Shintoshi no kensetsu." *Tôkyô Shôkô kaigisho* 5 (1942).
- Fiévê, Nicolas, and Paul Waley. *Japanese Capitals in Historical Perspective*. London, New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 2003.
- Gropius, Walter, and Kenzo Tange. *Katsura: tradition and creation in Japanese architecture*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960.
- Hall, Peter. "Christaller for a Global Age: Redrawing the Urban Hierarchy." In *Stadt und Region: Dynamik von Lebenswelten, Tagungsbericht und wissenschaftliche Abhandlungen*, 53. *Deutscher Geographentag Leipzig, 29. September bis 5. Oktober 2001*, edited by Alois Mayr, Manfred Meurer and Joachim Vogt, 110-28. Leipzig: Deutsche Gesellschaft für Geographie, 2002.
- . *Cities of Tomorrow. An Intellectual History of Urban Planning and Design in the Twentieth Century (Updated Edition)*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1996.
- Hayakawa, Tokuji. *Daitoshi no kotsu kikan to chika tetsudo*. Tokyo: Teikokutetsudokyokai, 1926.
- Hein, Carola. "Land Development for the Modern Metropolis." Paper presented at the Symposium Architecture and Modern Japan, New York 2000.
- . "Nishiyama Uzô and the Spread of Western Concepts in Japan." *10+1*, no. 20 (2000): 143-48.
- . "Siedlung." In *Trésor des mots de la ville*, edited by Christian Topalov, Laurent Coudroy de Lille, Jean-Charles Depaule and Brigitte Marin. Paris: CNRS-Editions & Editions de la MSH, forthcoming.
- . "The Transformation of Planning Ideas in Japan and Its Colonies." In *Urbanism – Impored or Exported? Foreign Plans and Native Aspirations*, edited by Joe Nasr and Mercedes Volait, 51-82. Chichester: Wiley, 2003.
- . "Toshikeikaku and Machizukuri in Japanese Urban Planning - the Reconstruction of Inner City Neighborhoods in Kobe." *Japanstudien*, no. 13 (2001): 221-52.
- Hein, Carola, and Yorifusa Ishida. "Japanische Stadtplanung und ihre deutschen Wurzeln." *Die Alte Stadt* 25, no. 3 (1998): 189-211.
- . "Machi and toshi - cities' divisions in Japan." Paper presented at the City Words, Paris 1997.
- Hein, Carola, and Philippe Pelletier. *Cities, Autonomy and Decentralization in Japan*. London, New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Higasa, Tadashi. *Toshikeikaku*. Tokyo: Kyôritsushuppan, 1977, 1985, 1986, 1992, 1993, 1996.
- Hill, Richard Child, and Kuniko Fujita. "State restructuring and local power in Japan." *Urban*

- Studies* 37, no. 4 (2000): 673-90, p. 83.
- Hohn, Uta. *Stadtplanung in Japan: Geschichte - Recht - Praxis - Theorie [City planning in Japan: History - law - praxis - theory]*. Dortmund: Dortmunder Vertrieb für Bau- und Planungsliteratur, 2000.
- Howard, Ebenezer, Peter Hall, Dennis Hardy, and Colin Ward. *To-morrow: a peaceful path to real reform*. London; New York: Routledge, 2003 (original 1898).
- Howard, Ebenezer, and Frederic James Osborn. *Garden Cities of To-morrow*. Cambridge (Mass.): MIT Press, 1965 (originally published 1902).
- Ishida, Yorifusa. "Changing Urban Divisions and their Characteristics in Tokyo." In *Les divisions de la ville*, edited by Christian Topalov, 191-221. Paris: Editions UNESCO, 2002.
- . "Japanese Equivalents for French 'Quartier' in Professional and Popular Languages." *Kogakuin Daigaku Kenkyûjohô* no. 81 (1996): 213-20.
- . "Local Initiatives and the Decentralization of Planning Power in Japan." In *Cities, Autonomy, and Decentralization in Japan*, edited by Carola Hein and Philippe Pelletier, 25-54. London, New York: Routledge, 2006.
- . *Nihon kindai toshi keikaku no hyakunen (A hundred years of Japanese urban planning)*. Tokyo: Jichitai-kenkyûsha, 1987.
- Ishikawa, Hideaki. "100 nengo no toshi (The city in 100 years)." In *toshi no seitai*: Shunjûsha, 1943.
- . *Sensoo to toshi*. Tokyo: Tokyo: Nihon Denpo Tsushinsha Shuppanbu, 1942.
- . *(Shintei) Toshikeikaku oyobi kokudokeikaku*. Tokyo: Sangyotosho, 1963.
- . *(Shintei) Toshikeikaku oyobi kokudokeikaku*. Tokyo: Sangyotosho, 1951.
- . "Toshi fukko no genri to jissai (Principles and Reality of Urban Reconstruction)." In *Ishikawa Hideaki toshi keikaku ron shû (Papers on City Planning by Ishikawa Hideaki)*, edited by City Planning Institute of Japan, 588-649. Tokyo: Shôkokusha, 1993 (original 1946).
- . *Toshikeikaku oyobi kokudokeikaku: sono koso to gijutsu*. Tokyo: Kogyotosho, 1941.
- Itô, Goro. "Nachisu doitsu no toshikeikaku (City planning in Nazi-Germany) Part I." *Shinkenchiku*, no. 11 (1942): 835-41.
- . "Nachisu doitsu no toshikeikaku (City planning in Nazi-Germany) Part II." *Shinkenchiku* 1 (1943): 25-35.
- Iyori, Tsutomu. "Tradition et avenir de l'expression de la nature dans la ville de Kyoto. Mesure de l'espace et symbolisme de la nature." In *La maîtrise de la ville. Urbanité française, urbanité nippone*, edited by Augustin Berque, 75-124. Paris: Édition de l'École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, 1994.
- Jacobs, A. J. "Devolving Authority and Expanding Autonomy in Japanese Prefectures and Municipalities." *Governance* 16, no. 4 (2003): 61-623.
- . "Federations of Municipalities: A Practical Alternative to Local Government Consolidation in Japan." *Governance* 17, no. 2 (2004): 247-74.
- Jinnai, Hidenobu. *Tokyo. A Spatial Anthropology*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1995.
- Karan, P.P., and Kristin Stapleton, eds. *The Japanese City*. Kentucky: Kentucky University Press, 1998.
- Katsura, Hisao, Kazuo Adachi, and Hiroshi Zaino. *Toshikeikaku*. Tokyo: Morikita Shuppan, 1975, 1988.
- Kenkyujo, Tokyo-shi Denki. *Nyuyokushi no chika tetsudo: Obei daitoshi ni okeru kosokudo tetsudo*. Tokyo: Tokyoshidenkikenkyujo, 1927.

- . *Parishi no chika tetsudo: Obei daitoshi ni okeru kosokudo tetsudo*. Tokyo: Tokyoshidenkikenkyujo, 1928.
- Kenkyujo, Tokyoshi Denki. *Daiberurin no kosokudo tetsudomo keikaku: Obei daitoshi ni okeru kosokudo tetsudo*. Tokyo: Tokyoshi Denki Kenkyujo, 1926.
- Kirsch, Karin, ed. *Die neue Wohnung und das alte Japan: Architekten planen für sich selbst: Edward William Godwin, Frank Lloyd Wright, Charles Rennie Mackintosh, Walter Gropius, Egon Eiermann, Toyo Ito*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1996.
- Kishida, Hideto. *Nachisu doitsu no kenchiku (The Architecture of Nazi Germany)*. Tokyo: Sagamishobo, 1943.
- Kornhauser, David. *Urban Japan: Its Foundations and Growth*. London, New York: Longman, 1976.
- Kumagai, Hiroko. "Machi: The Story of Two Neighborhoods." Japan: Siglo, 1996.
- Lambourne, Lionel. *Japonisme. Cultural Crossings between Japan and the West*. London, New York: Phaidon, 2005.
- LU, DUANFANG. "Travelling urban form: the neighbourhood unit in China " *Planning Perspectives* 21 (2006): 369–92.
- Mabuchi, Masaru. 2001. Municipal Amalgamation in Japan. In, The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank, siteresources.worldbank.org/WBI/Resources/wbi37175.pdf. (accessed).
- Mattie, Eric. *World's fairs*. Princeton: Princeton Architectural Press, 1998.
- McClain, James L., and Osamu Wakita, eds. *Osaka: The Merchant's Capital of Early Modern Japan*. Ithaca (NY): Cornell University Press, 1999.
- Mochizuki, Tokurô, Taksuke Watanabe, and Akira Soshiroda. "Waga-kuni ni okeru yogo "toshi" no tôjô to teichaku-katei ni kansuru kenkyû [Research Relating to the Appearance of the Word "City" and the Process of Its Establishment]." *Nihon Toshikeikaku Gakkai gakujutsu kenkyûronbun shû* (1994).
- Moriarty, Elizabeth. "The Communitarian Aspect of Shinto Matsuri." *Asian Folklore Studies* 31, no. 2 (1972): 91-140.
- Mumford, Lewis. *The city in history: its origins, its transformations, and its prospects*. New York: Harcourt, Brace + World, 1961.
- Nakabayashi, Itsuki. "Concentration and Deconcentration in the Context of the Tokyo Capital Region Plan and Recent Cross-Border Networking Concepts." In *Cities, Autonomy and Decentralization in Japan*, edited by Carola Hein and Philippe Pelletier, 55-80. London, New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Nawata, Yoshihiko. "Chônaiikai in the citizen-participation in Japan." Presentation at the EAJIS- meeting in Budapest, 1997.
- . "Stadtteilvertretungen und Dezentralisierung der Verwaltungsfunktion in Japan." In *Lokale Demokratie auf dem Prüfstand*, edited by Michael Glotz-Richter, Thomas Krämer-Badoni and Werner Petrowsky, 112–25. Bremen: Edition Temmen, 1994.
- Nishiyama, Uzô. *Chiiki kûkan ron (Reflections on urban, regional and national space)*. Tokyo: Keiso shobo, 1968.
- . "Kokudo kôsei no ichi shiron (first published as Atarashiki Kokudô kensetsu, in: Shinkenchiiku 6/1946)." In *Chiiki kûkan ron (Reflections on urban, regional and national space)*, edited by Uzô Nishiyama, 225-66. Tokyo: Keiso shobo, 1968 (1946).
- . *Nihon no sumai*. 3 vols. Tokyo: Keiso shobo, 1975, 1976, 1980.
- . "Seikatsu no kôzô to seikatsu kichi (The structure of life units and the base of life)." *Kenchikugaku kenkyû (later included in his book Chiikikûkanron, Tokyo, Keisô shobô, 1968)*, no. 110+111 (1942).

- . *Toshikeikaku to machizukuri [Urban Planning and Community Design]*. Vol. 2. Tôkyô and Kyôto: Chôbunsha, 1971.
- Ogawa, Ichitaro. *Daitoshi*. Osaka: Shiminsoshokankokai, 1923.
- Okui, Fukutaro. *Gendai daitoshiron*. Tokyo: Yuhikaku, 1940.
- Osborn, Frederic J. *Green-Belt Cities*. London: Evelyn, Adams & Mackay, 1969 (1946).
- Pelletier, Philippe. "Les Villes Hautes." In *La maîtrise de la ville. Urbanité française, urbanité nippone*, edited by Augustin Berque, 393-412. Paris: Édition de l'École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, 1994.
- Perry, Clarence Arthur. "The Neighborhood Unit. A Scheme of Arrangement for the Family-Life Community." In *Regional Survey of New York and Its Environs, Vol VII*, edited by Regional Plan of New York and Its Environs, 20-140. New York: Arno Press, 1929 (1974).
- Rausch, Anthony. "The Heisei Dai Gappei: a case study for understanding the municipal mergers of the Heisei era." *Japan Forum* 18, no. 1 (2006): 133-56.
- Reischauer, Edwin O., and Albert M. Craig. *Japan. Tradition and Transformation*. Revised ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1989.
- Sadler, A. W. "Carrying the Mikoshi: Further Field Notes on the Shrine Festival in Modern Tokyo." *Asian Folklore Studies* 31, no. 1 (1970): 89-114.
- . "Folkdance and fairgrounds: More notes on neighborhood festivals in modern Tokyo." *Asian Folklore Studies* 34, no. 1 (1975): 1-20.
- . "The Form and Meaning of the Festival." *Asian Folklore Studies* 28, no. 1 (1969): 1-16.
- Schenk, Tilman A., and Ray Bromley. "Mass-Producing Traditional Small Cities: Gottfried Feder's Vision for a Greater Nazi Germany." *Journal of Planning History* 2, no. 2 (2003): 107-39.
- Schubert, Dirk. "Gottfried Feder und sein Beitrag zur Stadtplanungstheorie—Technokratische Richtwertplanung oder nationalsozialistische Stadtplanungsideologie?" *Die alte Stadt*, no. 13 (1986): 192-211.
- Shelton, Barrie. *Learning from the Japanese City. West Meets East in Urban Design*. London and New York: E and FN Spon, 1999.
- Shoji, Sumie. "The Life of Hideaki Ishikawa." *Toshikeikaku/City Planning Review (special issue)*, no. 182 (1993): 25-30.
- Smith, Henry D. "Mura (birejji) to shite no Tôkyô: henten suru kindai Nihon no shutuzô (Tokyo as a Village: The Changing Image of the Modern Japanese Capital)." In *Shirîzu toshi kenchiku rekishi 6: toshi bunken no seijuku (Series on the History of Urban Architecture Vol. 6: A Mature Urban Culture)*, edited by Hiroyuki Suzuki and ed.alt. Tokyo: Tôkyô Daigaku Shuppankai, 2006.
- Sorensen, Andre. "Changing Governance of Shared Spaces. Machizukuri as institutional innovation." In *Living Cities in Japan: Citizens' Movements, Machizukuri and Local Environments*, edited by Andre Sorensen and Carolin Funck, 56-90. London, New York: Routledge, 2007.
- Sorensen, André. *The Making of Urban Japan. Cities and planning from Edo to the 21st Century*. London: Routledge, 2002.
- . *The Making of Urban Japan. Cities and planning from Edo to the twenty-first century*. London and New York: Nissan Institute/Routledge Japan Studies Series, 2002.
- Sorensen, Andre, and Carolin Funck. *Living Cities in Japan: Citizens' Movements, Machizukuri and Local Environments*. London, New York: Nissan Institute Routledge

- Japanese Studies Series, 2007.
- Steiner, Kurt *Local Government in Japan* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1965.
- Stipe, Margo. "Wright and Japan." In *Frank Lloyd Wright, Europe and Beyond*, edited by Anthony Alofsin, 24-44. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1999.
- Sugimoto, Yoshio, and Ross E Mouer. *Constructs for understanding Japan*. London; New York: K. Paul International, 1989.
- Takei, Kôjiro. *Toshikeikaku*. Tokyo: Kyôritsushuppan, 1960, 1958.
- Tamai, Tetsuo. *Edo, ushinawareta toshikûkan wo yomu*. Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1986.
- Taut, Bruno. *Cities and People of Japan*. second edition ed. Tokyo: Sanseido Press, 1937/1958.
- Taylor, Robert R. *The Word in Stone. The Role of Architecture in the National Socialist Ideology*. Berkeley: University of California, 1974.
- Tokyo Shisei Chosakai. *Noson kyodo kumiai to daitoshi chuo oroshiuri shijo*. Tokyo: Tokyoshiseichosakai, 1928.
- Tokyo-shi. *Gaikoku daitoshi sozei seido. 002*. Tokyo: Tokyo-shi, 1936.
- . *Gaikoku ni okeru daitoshi seido. 4*. Tokyo: Tokyoshibunshoka, 1932.
- . *Kokuto oyobi daitoshi sei*. Tokyo: Tokyo-shi, 1924.
- Toshikeikaku kyôiku kenkyû kai. *Toshikeikakukyôkasho*. Tokyo: Shokokusha, 1987/1995/1996
- Union Central des Arts Décoratifs, ed. *Le livre des expositions universelles 1851-1989 (exhibition catalog)*. Paris: éditions des arts décoratifs-herscher, 1983.
- Urushima, Andrea Yuri Flores. "Genesis and culmination of Uzô Nishiyama's proposal of a 'model core of a future city' for the Expo 70 site (1960-73)." *Planning Perspectives* 22, no. 4 (2007): 391-416.
- Vogt, Silke. *Neue Wege der Stadtplanung in Japan, Partizipationsansätze auf der Mikroebene, dargestellt anhand ausgewählter Machizukuri-Projekte in Tôkyô [New methods of urban planning in Japan: Participatory approaches on the micro-level in selected machizukuri projects in Tokyo]*. Munich: Iudicium, 2001.
- Waley, Paul. "Re-scripting the city: Tokyo from ugly duckling to cool cat." *Japan Forum* 18, no. 3 (2006): 361-80.
- Watanabe, Shun'ichi. "Garden city Japanese style: the case of Den-en Toshi Company Ltd., 1918-28." In *Shaping an Urban World, Planning in the 20th Century*, edited by Gordon E. Cherry, 129-143 London: Mansell, 1980.
- . "Machizukuri in Japan: A Historical Perspective in Participatory Community-Building Initiatives." In *Cities, Autonomy and Decentralization in Japan*, edited by Carola Hein and Philippe Pelletier, 233-54. London: Routledge, 2006.
- . *Shimin sanko no machizukuri [Community Building with Citizen Participation]*. Kyoto: Gakukeishuppansha, 1999.
- . "Toshi keikaku vs machizukuri. Emerging paradigm of civil society in Japan, 1950-1980." In *Living Cities in Japan. Citizen's movements, machizukuri and local environments*, edited by Andre Sorensen and Carolin Funck, 39-55. London, New York: Routledge, 2007.
- . *Toshikeikaku no tanjo: kokusai hikaku kara mita Nihon kindai toshi keikaku [The Birth of Urban Planning: Japan's Urban Planning in International Comparison]*. Tokyo: Kashiwa Shobo, 1993.
- Watanabe, Shun'ichi J., and et al. "Yôgo 'machizukuri' ni kansuru bunkenteki kenkyu 1945-1959 [Bibliographical Survey on the Word "Machizukuri" 1945-1959]." *Papers on*

- City Planning*, no. 32 (1997): 43-48.
- Wheatley, Paul, and Thomas See. *From Court to Capital: A Tentative Interpretation of the Origins of the Japanese Urban Tradition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978.
- Wichmann, Siegfried. *Japonisme. The Japanese Influence on Western Art Since 1858*. New York: Thames&Hudson, 1999.
- Yazaki, Takeo. *Social Change and the City in Japan*. Tokyo: Japan Publications, 1968.
- . *The Japanese City. A Sociological Analysis*. Rutland (VT), Tokyo: Japan Publications Trading Company, 1963.

ⁱ For a general history of Japan see, for example: Edwin O. Reischauer and Albert M. Craig, *Japan. Tradition and Transformation*, Revised ed. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1989).

ⁱⁱ On the import of German planning principles see, for example: Carola Hein and Yorifusa Ishida, "Japanische Stadtplanung und ihre deutschen Wurzeln," *Die Alte Stadt* 25, no. 3 (1998).

ⁱⁱⁱ Eric Mattie, *World's fairs* (Princeton: Princeton Architectural Press, 1998), Union Central des Arts Décoratifs, ed., *Le livre des expositions universelles 1851-1989 (exhibition catalog)* (Paris: éditions des arts décoratifs-herscher, 1983).

^{iv} See for example: Lionel Lambourne, *Japonisme. Cultural Crossings between Japan and the West* (London, New York: Phaidon, 2005), Siegfried Wichmann, *Japonisme. The Japanese Influence on Western Art Since 1858* (New York: Thames&Hudson, 1999).

^v See, for example: Norman F. Jr Carver, *Form and Space of Japanese Architecture* (Tokyo: Shokokusha, 1955), Arthur Drexler, *The Architecture of Japan* (New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1955), Walter Gropius and Kenzo Tange, *Katsura: tradition and creation in Japanese architecture* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960), Karin Kirsch, ed., *Die neue Wohnung und das alte Japan: Architekten planen für sich selbst: Edward William Godwin, Frank Lloyd Wright, Charles Rennie Mackintosh, Walter Gropius, Egon Eiermann, Toyo Ito* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1996), Margo Stipe, "Wright and Japan," in *Frank Lloyd Wright, Europe and Beyond*, ed. Anthony Alofsin (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1999).

^{vi} Bruno Taut, for example comments on the ugliness of modernizing Tokyo, see: Bruno Taut, *Cities and People of Japan*, second edition ed. (Tokyo: Sanseido Press, 1937/1958).

^{vii} Takeo Yazaki, *Social Change and the City in Japan* (Tokyo: Japan Publications, 1968), Takeo Yazaki, *The Japanese City. A Sociological Analysis* (Rutland (VT), Tokyo: Japan Publications Trading Company, 1963).

^{viii} This lecture of the city connects the current city to its historical roots rather than foreign influences. Known as *Tôkyôron* and related to *Edogaku*, it is part of a larger group of publications starting in the 1930s, the so-called *Nihonjinron*, arguing for a specific Japanese identity due to a special link between nature, space and Japanese society. For an examination of *Nihonjinron* and *Tôkyôron*, see, for example: Harumi Befu, "Nationalism and Nihonjinron," in *Cultural Nationalism in East Asia: representation and identity*, ed. Harumi Befu (Berkeley (CA): Institute of East Asian Studies, University of Berkeley, 1993), Augustin Berque, "La città giapponese. Uso di un'immagine," *Casabella* 53, no. 608-609 (1994), Augustin Berque, "Paroles sur la ville et expression urbaine. Tôkyô années quatre-

vingts," in *La Qualité de la Ville. Urbanité française, urbanité nippone*, ed. Augustin Berque (Tokyo: Publications de la Maison Franco-Japonaise, 1987), Augustin Berque, "Tokyo as emblem of a postmodern paradigm," in *Relating architecture to landscape*, ed. Jan Birksted (London, New York: E & FN Spon, 1999), Sonia Engberts, "Le territoire pensé à travers la couleur au Japon," in *Le territoire pensé: géographie des représentations territoriales*, ed. Aline Lechaume Frédéric Lasserre (Sainte-Foy: Presses de l'Université du Québec, 2003), Yoshio Sugimoto and Ross E Mouer, *Constructs for understanding Japan* (London; New York: K. Paul International, 1989).

^{ix} Paul Waley, "Re-scripting the city: Tokyo from ugly duckling to cool cat," *Japan Forum* 18, no. 3 (2006).

^x Ibid.: 367.

Waley also points to a historical examination by Henry Smith of Tokyo as a collection of villages: Henry D. Smith, "Mura (birejji) to shite no Tōkyō: henten suru kindai Nihon no shutuzō (Tokyo as a Village: The Changing Image of the Modern Japanese Capital)," in *Shirīzu toshi kenchiku rekishi 6: toshi bunken no seijuku (Series on the History of Urban Architecture Vol. 6: A Mature Urban Culture)*, ed. Hiroyuki Suzuki and ed.alt (Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai, 2006).

^{xi} Henry Smith lists and examines foreign references to Tokyo as a collection of villages starting from 1889 to 1998: Smith, "Mura (birejji) to shite no Tōkyō: henten suru kindai Nihon no shutuzō (Tokyo as a Village: The Changing Image of the Modern Japanese Capital)."

^{xii} See: Clarence Arthur Perry, "The Neighborhood Unit. A Scheme of Arrangement for the Family-Life Community," in *Regional Survey of New York and Its Environs, Vol VII*, ed. Regional Plan of New York and Its Environs (New York: Arno Press, 1929 (1974)), 22.

^{xiii} Barrie Shelton's book "Learning from the Japanese City" illustrates this approach: Barrie Shelton, *Learning from the Japanese City. West Meets East in Urban Design* (London and New York: E and FN Spon, 1999).

^{xiv} Recent English-language publications on the Japanese city and aspects of community development aspects include: Nicolas Fiévé and Paul Waley, *Japanese Capitals in Historical Perspective* (London, New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 2003), P.P. Karan and Kristin Stapleton, eds., *The Japanese City* (Kentucky: Kentucky University Press, 1998), André Sorensen, *The Making of Urban Japan. Cities and planning from Edo to the twenty-first century* (London and New York: Nissan Institute/Routledge Japan Studies Series, 2002), Andre Sorensen and Carolin Funck, *Living Cities in Japan: Citizens' Movements, Machizukuri and Local Environments* (London, New York: Nissan Institute Routledge Japanese Studies Series, 2007).

^{xv} Theodore Bestor, *Neighborhood Tokyo* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1989). p.1.

^{xvi} Note that community members are expected to participate in and/or pay for the organization of festivals. On festivals see, for example: Michael Ashkenazi, "Cultural Tensions as Factors in the Structure of a Festival Parade," *Asian Folklore Studies* 46, no. 1 (1987), Hiroko Kumagai, "Machi: The Story of Two Neighborhoods," (Japan: Siglo, 1996), Elizabeth Moriarty, "The Communitarian Aspect of Shinto Matsuri," *Asian Folklore Studies* 31, no. 2 (1972), A. W. Sadler, "Carrying the Mikoshi: Further Field Notes on the Shrine Festival in Modern Tokyo," *Asian Folklore Studies* 31, no. 1 (1970), A. W. Sadler, "Folkdance and fairgrounds: More notes on neighborhood festivals in modern Tokyo," *Asian*

Folklore Studies 34, no. 1 (1975), A. W. Sadler, "The Form and Meaning of the Festival," *Asian Folklore Studies* 28, no. 1 (1969).

^{xvii} See also the criteria of sustainability developed by Sorensen and Funck, *Living Cities in Japan: Citizens' Movements, Machizukuri and Local Environments*.

^{xviii} For an examination of Japanese terms meaning neighborhood, see also: Yorifusa Ishida, "Japanese Equivalents for French 'Quartier' in Professional and Popular Languages," *Kogakuin Daigaku Kenkyûjohô* no. 81 (1996).

^{xix} There are other words too used to describe sections of a town: *chiku* (district) and *kuiki* (district), for example. The neighborhood may be described as *kinjô* (vicinity), *chônai* (neighborhood), or with the imported word "community" written in katakana *komyûniti* to denote a social space without exact boundaries. Another word, *kaiwai* (neighborhood, vicinity) describes a small, active area or space distinguished from surrounding areas by its individuality and identity, see: Ibid. p. 214. See also: Carola Hein and Yorifusa Ishida, "Machi and toshi - cities' divisions in Japan" (paper presented at the City Words, Paris, 1997), Yorifusa Ishida, "Changing Urban Divisions and their Characteristics in Tokyo," in *Les divisions de la ville*, ed. Christian Topalov (Paris: Editions UNESCO, 2002). On yamanote areas, see also: Philippe Pelletier, "Les Villes Hautes," in *La maîtrise de la ville. Urbanité française, urbanité nippone*, ed. Augustin Berque (Paris: Édition de l'École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, 1994).

^{xx} See also: Yazaki, *Social Change and the City in Japan*, 155.

^{xxi} This organization may have developed in medieval Kyoto based on the needs of merchants and artisans; it may also have emerged independently in commercial districts of early modern cities, particularly in castle cities like Edo and its major predecessor as a castle town, Osaka. See also: Tetsuo Tamai, *Edo, ushinawareta toshikûkan wo yomu* (Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1986).

^{xxii} Hidenobu Jinnai, *Tokyo. A Spatial Anthropology* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1995).

^{xxiii} André Sorensen, *The Making of Urban Japan. Cities and planning from Edo to the 21st Century* (London: Routledge, 2002), 18.

^{xxiv} Osaka had a large commoner population and enjoyed greater self-governance as other cities, still the central government carefully ensured its authority. See: James L. McClain and Osamu Wakita, eds., *Osaka: The Merchant's Capital of Early Modern Japan* (Ithaca (NY): Cornell University Press, 1999), Sorensen, *The Making of Urban Japan*, 21. Sorensen has published a map highlighting the structure of Edo in 1859 based on an original map by Okata Junichiro drawn in 181 using the Bungan Edo Oezu published by Subaru Mohei Publishers in 1859 (Ansei 6), see: Sorensen, *The Making of Urban Japan*, 26.

^{xxv} Tsutomu Iyori, "Tradition et avenir de l'expression de la nature dans la ville de Kyoto. Mesure de l'espace et symbolisme de la nature," in *La maîtrise de la ville. Urbanité française, urbanité nippone*, ed. Augustin Berque (Paris: Édition de l'École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, 1994). p. 84

^{xxvi} Berque, "La città giapponese. Uso di un'immagine.", Bestor, *Neighborhood Tokyo*, 8-9.

^{xxvii} For a description of the Fujiwara capital, Heijôkyô (later Nara), and its construction partly on the model of Chinese capitals, see: Yazaki, *Social Change and the City in Japan*, 31-36.

^{xxviii} Ibid., 111-12.

^{xxix} Christoph Brumann, "Whose Kyoto? Competing models of local autonomy and the townscape in the old imperial capital," in *Cities, Autonomy and Decentralization in Japan*, ed. Carola Hein and Philippe Pelletier (London, New York: Routledge, 2006).

^{xxx} Yoshihiko Nawata, "Chônaikai in the citizen-participation in Japan," (Presentation at the EAJS- meeting in Budapest: 1997), Yoshihiko Nawata, "Stadtteilvertretungen und Dezentralisierung der Verwaltungsfunktion in Japan," in *Lokale Demokratie auf dem Prüfstand*, ed. Michael Glotz-Richter, Thomas Krämer-Badoni, and Werner Petrowsky (Bremen: Edition Temmen, 1994).

^{xxxi} Andre Sorensen, "Changing Governance of Shared Spaces. Machizukuri as institutional innovation," in *Living Cities in Japan: Citizens' Movements, Machizukuri and Local Environments*, ed. Andre Sorensen and Carolin Funck (London, New York: Routledge, 2007). For an overview of urban administration in Japan, see also: Sorensen, *The Making of Urban Japan*, 18-22.

^{xxxii} I wish to thank Andre Sorensen and Paul Waley for their reading of a draft of this article and for their comments on *machizukuri* in particular.

^{xxxiii} See André Sorensen for an analysis of machizukuri as the governance of shared spaces: Sorensen, "Changing Governance of Shared Spaces." The Japanese planner and urban historian Shun'ichi Watanabe states that *machi* underscores the viewpoint of local resident. He defines *machi* as a small area, its physical space or social system. As Watanabe also points out, to highlight the specific, physical or social meaning of the term, authors often use different Chinese characters for the same word, thus *machi* 町 (meaning town) is more concerned with the non-physical, and *machi* 街 (meaning street) with the physical meaning of the term, whereas *machi* まち (written in hiragana) implies both meanings. See: Shun'ichi Watanabe, "Toshi keikaku vs machizukuri. Emerging paradigm of civil society in Japan, 1950-1980," in *Living Cities in Japan. Citizen's movements, machizukuri and local environments*, ed. Andre Sorensen and Carolin Funck (London, New York: Routledge, 2007). For an analysis of the term, history and practice of *machizukuri* see also: Neil Evans, "Machizukuri as a New Paradigm in Japanese Urban Planning: Reality or Myth?," *Japan Forum* 14, no. 3 (2002), Carola Hein, "Toshikeikaku and Machizukuri in Japanese Urban Planning - the Reconstruction of Inner City Neighborhoods in Kobe," *Japanstudien*, no. 13 (2001), Carola Hein and Philippe Pelletier, *Cities, Autonomy and Decentralization in Japan* (London, New York: Routledge, 2006), Uta Hohn, *Stadtplanung in Japan: Geschichte - Recht - Praxis - Theorie [City planning in Japan: History - law - praxis - theory]* (Dortmund: Dortmunder Vertrieb für Bau- und Planungsliteratur, 2000), Sorensen and Funck, *Living Cities in Japan: Citizens' Movements, Machizukuri and Local Environments*, Silke Vogt, *Neue Wege der Stadtplanung in Japan, Partizipationsansätze auf der Mikroebene, dargestellt anhand ausgewählter Machizukuri-Projekte in Tôkyô [New methods of urban planning in Japan: Participatory approaches on the micro-level in selected machizukuri projects in Tokyo]* (Munich: Iudicium, 2001), Shun'ichi Watanabe, "Machizukuri in Japan: A Historical Perspective in Participatory Community-Building Initiatives," in *Cities, Autonomy and Decentralization in Japan*, ed. Carola Hein and Philippe Pelletier (London: Routledge, 2006), Shun'ichi Watanabe, *Shimin sanko no machizukuri [Community Building with Citizen Participation]* (Kyoto: Gakukeishuppansha, 1999), Shun'ichi J. Watanabe and et al., "Yôgo 'machizukuri' ni kansuru bunkenteki kenkyu 1945-1959 [Bibliographical Survey on the Word 'Machizukuri' 1945-1959]," *Papers on City Planning*, no. 32 (1997).

^{xxxiv} Different ways of reading a Chinese character reveal further variations in meaning. Read

as *chô* 町, *machi*, can be a classifier for a town, distinguishing it in legal terms from other forms of municipal government often summarized as *shichôsonku* (市町村区) or city, town, village and ward (in Tokyo), as well as from the territorial entities *todôfuken* (都道府県), the metropolis of Tokyo, the political entity of Hokkaidô, and the urban prefectures like Osaka and Kyoto. The identifiers are added in official documents as well as colloquially on to the locale's name: Fukaura-machi (Aomori Prefecture) or Nasu-machi (Tochigi).

^{xxxv} On the urban history of Japan see, for example: David Kornhauser, *Urban Japan: Its Foundations and Growth* (London, New York: Longman, 1976), Sorensen, *The Making of Urban Japan*, Paul Wheatley and Thomas See, *From Court to Capital: A Tentative Interpretation of the Origins of the Japanese Urban Tradition* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978), Yazaki, *Social Change and the City in Japan*.

^{xxxvi} Masaru Mabuchi, *Municipal Amalgamation in Japan* (The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank, 2001); available from siteresources.worldbank.org/WBI/Resources/wbi37175.pdf.

On the Great Heisei Amalgamation (Heisei Daigappei), see also: Anthony Rausch, "The Heisei Dai Gappei: a case study for understanding the municipal mergers of the Heisei era," *Japan Forum* 18, no. 1 (2006).

^{xxxvii} Presently, cities have to have more than 50.000 inhabitants to be recognized by the Prefectural government as cities (when the Municipal Government Act was promulgated in 1888 the number was 25.000). Some cities are still smaller than 50.000 today. For example, as coal mining activity decreased, Utashinai in Hokkaidô, saw a rapid decline in population over the last five decades from 46.000 in 1948 to 5042 inhabitants in 2007 (<http://www.city.utashinai.hokkaido.jp/> last accessed December 13.2007). Meanwhile, some towns have population numbers that almost qualify them as cities. For example, Otofuke, Hokkaidô claims 44206 inhabitants (<http://www.town.otofuke.hokkaido.jp/index2.html> last accessed December 13. 2007). At times, the development of towns into city is visible in names such as Haramachi-shi in Fukushima, Tokamachi-shi in Niigata, or Omachi-shi in Nagano, which combine both terms for town and city.

Check also: A. J. Jacobs, "Federations of Municipalities: A Practical Alternative to Local Government Consolidation in Japan," *Governance* 17, no. 2 (2004).

^{xxxviii} The overall number of Japanese municipalities today is much lower than in the European Union with close to 90.000 municipalities, most of which are in France (some 36.000) and Germany (approximately 12500) as of 2007. On the number of communes in Europe and France, see:

http://www.colloc.minefi.gouv.fr/colo_otherfiles_fina_loca/presentations/pres_comm.html (last accessed December 12, 2007) and for the number of municipalities in Germany see also: Statistisches Bundesamt, *Statistisches Jahrbuch* (Wiesbaden: Statistisches Bundesamt, 2007). On opposing movements of centralization and decentralization from the 19th to the 21st century see also: Yorifusa Ishida, "Local Initiatives and the Decentralization of Planning Power in Japan," in *Cities, Autonomy, and Decentralization in Japan*, ed. Carola Hein and Philippe Pelletier (London, New York: Routledge, 2006).

^{xxxix} A. J. Jacobs, "Devolving Authority and Expanding Autonomy in Japanese Prefectures and Municipalities," *Governance* 16, no. 4 (2003).

On issues of decentralization, autonomy, and local government in Japan, see also: Hein and Pelletier, *Cities, Autonomy and Decentralization in Japan*, Kurt Steiner, *Local Government in Japan* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1965).

^{xl} Richard Child Hill and Kuniko Fujita, "State restructuring and local power in Japan," *Urban Studies* 37, no. 4 (2000). p. 679

^{xli} Itsuki Nakabayashi, "Concentration and Deconcentration in the Context of the Tokyo Capital Region Plan and Recent Cross-Border Networking Concepts," in *Cities, Autonomy and Decentralization in Japan*, ed. Carola Hein and Philippe Pelletier (London, New York: Routledge, 2006).

^{xlii} See: Tokurô Mochizuki, Taksuke Watanabe, and Akira Soshiroda, "Waga-kuni ni okeru yogo "toshi" no tōjō to teichaku-katei ni kansuru kenkyū [Research Relating to the Appearance of the Word "City" and the Process of Its Establishment]," *Nihon Toshikeikaku Gakkai gakujutsu kenkyūronbun shū* (1994).

^{xliii} Though many European cities did indeed develop out of market places, in Japan, this was rare. Conceptual and functional differences between European and Japanese cities can be seen even more clearly by comparing the ideas behind capital cities. The kanji for *miyako*, used to write *toshi*, the Japanese word for city, can be understood as meaning a capital city, but in Japan it was traditionally used only for Kyoto. *Miyako* did not apply to regional or specialized centers in the same way as the word "capital" did in Europe. A literal translation of the English word "capital" is *shuto* or "head city." While this term has been used repeatedly in recent years in the context of a possible transfer of government institutions to a new capital city site, it is usually not applied to other forms of capital cities. Instead, regional or prefectural capitals are referred to as the "seat of prefectural government" [*kenchō shōzaichi*] while regional cities are called *chihō toshi*. These terms do not carry the same symbolic meaning as the notion of a "capital city" in Europe.

^{xliv} See for example the electronic reference tool WorldCat, a global catalog of library collections, which reveals hundreds of titles that include the term *daitoshi* (www.worldcat.org).

^{xliv} On *daitoshi* see, for example: Daitoshi Chosa Tokei Kyogikai, *Daitoshi kokigyo hikaku chosa* (Tokyo: Daitoshi Chosa Tokei Kyogikai, 1930), Tokuji Hayakawa, *Daitoshi no kotsu kikan to chika tetsudo* (Tokyo: Teikokutetsudokyokai, 1926), Tokyo-shi Denki Kenkyujo, *Nyuyokushi no chika tetsudo: Obei daitoshi ni okeru kosokudo tetsudo* (Tokyo: Tokyoshidenkikenkyujo, 1927), Tokyo-shi Denki Kenkyujo, *Parishi no chika tetsudo: Obei daitoshi ni okeru kosokudo tetsudo* (Tokyo: Tokyoshidenkikenkyujo, 1928), Tokyoshi Denki Kenkyujo, *Daiberurin no kosokudo tetsudomo keikaku: Obei daitoshi ni okeru kosokudo tetsudo* (Tokyo: Tokyoshi Denki Kenkyujo, 1926), Ichitaro Ogawa, *Daitoshi* (Osaka: Shiminsoshokankokai, 1923), Fukutaro Okui, *Gendai daitoshiron* (Tokyo: Yuhikaku, 1940), Tokyo Shisei Chosakai, *Noson kyodo kumiai to daitoshi chuo oroshiuri shijo* (Tokyo: Tokyoshiseichosakai, 1928), Tokyo-shi, *Gaikoku daitoshi sozei seido. 002* (Tokyo: Tokyo-shi, 1936), Tokyo-shi, *Gaikoku ni okeru daitoshi seido. 4* (Tokyo: Tokyoshibunshoka, 1932), Tokyo-shi, *Kokuto oyobi daitoshi sei* (Tokyo: Tokyo-shi, 1924).

^{xlvi} Hein and Ishida, "Machi and toshi - cities' divisions in Japan".

^{xlvi} Shun'ichi Watanabe, *Toshikeikaku no tanjo: kokusai hikaku kara mita Nihon kindai toshi keikaku [The Birth of Urban Planning: Japan's Urban Planning in International Comparison]* (Tokyo: Kashiwa Shobo, 1993).

^{xlvi} On the planning tools used to transform Japanese cities and on specific examples from Tokyo see also: Carola Hein, "Land Development for the Modern Metropolis" (paper presented at the Symposium Architecture and Modern Japan, New York, 2000).

^{xlix} On the import of foreign planning ideas see also: Carola Hein, "The Transformation of Planning Ideas in Japan and Its Colonies," in *Urbanism – Imported or Exported? Foreign Plans and Native Aspirations*, ed. Joe Nasr and Mercedes Volait (Chichester: Wiley, 2003), Hein and Ishida, "Japanische Stadtplanung."

ⁱ See also: Ishizuka Hiromichi, Ishida Yorifusa eds., *Tokyo: Urban Growth and Planning 1868-1988*, (Tokyo: Center for Urban Studies, Tokyo Metropolitan University, 1988).

^{li} For leading theories on garden cities, see: Ebenezer Howard et al., *To-morrow: a peaceful path to real reform* (London; New York: Routledge, 2003 (original 1898)), Ebenezer Howard and Frederic James Osborn, *Garden Cities of To-morrow* (Cambridge (Mass.): MIT Press, 1965 (originally published 1902)). On a Japanese garden city see also: Shun'ichi Watanabe, "Garden city Japanese style: the case of Den-en Toshi Company Ltd., 1918-28," in *Shaping an Urban World, Planning in the 20th Century*, ed. Gordon E. Cherry (London: Mansell, 1980).

^{lii} See: Nakabayashi, "Concentration and Deconcentration." P. 55.

^{liii} On the deconcentration of Tokyo see also: Yorifusa Ishida, *Nihon kindai toshi keikaku no hyakunen (A hundred years of Japanese urban planning)* (Tokyo: Jichitai-kenkyûsha, 1987), Nakabayashi, "Concentration and Deconcentration."

^{liv} On Ishikawa see: Sumie Shoji, "The Life of Hideaki Ishikawa," *Toshikeikaku/City Planning Review (special issue)*, no. 182 (1993).

^{lv} Feder had been an early member of the Nazi party. He was Reich's commissioner of settlement before being pushed out in 1934 and appointed at the Technical university of Berlin to a chair in urban and regional planning. See also: Tilman A. Schenk and Ray Bromley, "Mass-Producing Traditional Small Cities: Gottfried Feder's Vision for a Greater Nazi Germany," *Journal of Planning History* 2, no. 2 (2003).

^{lvi} "Die Ortsgruppe als Siedlungszelle" see also: Werner Durth and Niels Gutschow, *Träume in Trümmern*, 2 vols. (Braunschweig, Wiesbaden: Vieweg, 1988). On greenbelt cities see: Frederic J. Osborn, *Green-Belt Cities* (London: Evelyn, Adams & Mackay, 1969 (1946)).

^{lvii} See: Walter Christaller, *Die zentralen Orte in Süddeutschland, Darmstadt* (Darmstadt (Jena): 1969 (1933)). Japanese articles referring to Christaller appear in the 1930s, to my knowledge, the first full translation of the book was published in 1969: Walter Christaller and Joji Ezawa, *Toshi no ritchi to hatten* (Tokyo: Taimeido, 1969).

^{lviii} Hideaki Ishikawa, *Sensoo to toshi* (Tokyo: Tokyo: Nihon Denpo Tsushinsha Shuppanbu, 1942), Hideaki Ishikawa, *Toshikeikaku oyobi kokudokeikaku: sono koso to gijutsu* (Tokyo: Kogyotosho, 1941).

^{lix} See: Nakabayashi, "Concentration and Deconcentration," 60. and Hideaki Ishikawa, "Toshi fukko no genri to jissai (Principles and Reality of Urban Reconstruction)," in *Ishikawa Hideaki toshi keikaku ron shû (Papers on City Planning by Ishikawa Hideaki)*, ed. City Planning Institute of Japan (Tokyo: Shôkokusha, 1993 (original 1946)). p. 596 See also: Hideaki Ishikawa, (*Shintei*) *Toshikeikaku oyobi kokudokeikaku* (Tokyo: Sangyotosho, 1963), 41.

^{lx} Christaller's ideas are still relevant today even though they need revision as Peter Hall's analysis shows: Peter Hall, "Christaller for a Global Age: Redrawing the Urban Hierarchy," in *Stadt und Region: Dynamik von Lebenswelten, Tagungsbericht und wissenschaftliche Abhandlungen, 53. Deutscher Geographentag Leipzig, 29. September bis 5. Oktober 2001*, ed. Alois Mayr, Manfred Meurer, and Joachim Vogt (Leipzig: Deutsche Gesellschaft für Geographie, 2002).

^{lxi} On Nishiyama see also: Carola Hein, "Nishiyama Uzô and the Spread of Western Concepts in Japan," *IO+I*, no. 20 (2000), Andrea Yuri Flores Urushima, "Genesis and culmination of Uzô Nishiyama's proposal of a 'model core of a future city' for the Expo 70 site (1960-73)," *Planning Perspectives* 22, no. 4 (2007).

Nishiyama has published extensively, but there are still few publications examining his life and work.

^{lxii} Uzô Nishiyama, "Kokudo kôsei no ichi shiron (first published as Atarashiki Kokudô kensetsu, in: Shinkenichiku 6/1946)," in *Chiiki kûkan ron (Reflections on urban, regional and national space)*, ed. Uzô Nishiyama (Tokyo: Keiso shobo, 1968 (1946)).

^{lxiii} Thomas Adams, *The Design of Residential Areas* (Harvard: Cambridge University Press, 1934), Thomas Adams and Kojiro Kamei, *Jutakuchi no shintaisei genri to keikaku* (Tokyo: Nihon Denken Kabushiki Kaisha Shuppanbu, 1944), James Dahir, *The Neighborhood Unit Plan. Its Spread and Acceptance. A Selected Bibliography with Interpretative Comments* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1947), Perry, "The Neighborhood Unit."

^{lxiv} On Takayama Eika's work in Datong see: Hein, "The Transformation of Planning Ideas in Japan and Its Colonies." On the adoption of the neighborhood concept in China see: DUANFANG LU, "Travelling urban form: the neighbourhood unit in China " *Planning Perspectives* 21 (2006).

^{lxv} Gottfried Feder, *Die neue Stadt, Versuch der Begründung einer neuen Stadtplanungskunst aus der sozialen Struktur der Bevölkerung* (Berlin: Julius Springer, 1939), 440-41.

^{lxvi} A correct and independent reading of Feder is given in: Toshikeikaku kyôiku kenkyû kai, *Toshikeikakukyôkasho* (Tokyo: Shokokusha, 1987/1995/1996).

For the most common analysis of Feder's plan see: Masayuki Akiyama, *Toshikeikaku* (Tokyo: Riko tosho, 1980, 1985, 1993), Tadashi Higasa, *Toshikeikaku* (Tokyo: Kyôritsushuppan, 1977, 1985, 1986, 1992, 1993, 1996), Hideaki Ishikawa, *(Shintei) Toshikeikaku oyobi kokudokeikaku* (Tokyo: Sangyotosho, 1951), Hisao Katsura, Kazuo Adachi, and Hiroshi Zaino, *Toshikeikaku* (Tokyo: Morikita Shuppan, 1975, 1988), Kôjiro Takei, *Toshikeikaku* (Tokyo: Kyôritsushuppan, 1960, 1958).

^{lxvii} Akiyama, *Toshikeikaku*, 38. (1993 version)

^{lxviii} While it is not incorrect to place Feder in this context, no English or German language publication would give his work such a prominent place. In the postwar period, German practitioners did not refer to Feder, because of his political convictions. On Feder and his urban planning as technocratic or politically motivated, see also: Dirk Schubert, "Gottfried Feder und sein Beitrag zur Stadtplanungstheorie—Technokratische Richtwertplanung oder nationalsozialistische Stadtplanungsideologie?," *Die alte Stadt*, no. 13 (1986). In English-language publications, scholars don't see it as a noteworthy planning book in its own right, and refer to it in a footnote (Mumford), or as part of the National Socialist ideology (Taylor, Hall), see: Peter Hall, *Cities of Tomorrow. An Intellectual History of Urban Planning and Design in the Twentieth Century (Updated Edition)* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1996), 198, Lewis Mumford, *The city in history: its origins, its transformations, and its prospects* (New York: Harcourt, Brace + World, 1961), 594, Robert R Taylor, *The Word in Stone. The Role of Architecture in the National Socialist Ideology* (Berkeley: University of California, 1974).

^{lxix} Uzô Nishiyama, *Nihon no sumai*, 3 vols. (Tokyo: Keiso shobo, 1975, 1976, 1980).

^{lxx} Uzô Nishiyama, *Chiiki kûkan ron (Reflections on urban, regional and national space)* (Tokyo: Keiso shobo, 1968).

^{lxxi} He was not the only one doing so. The architect Kishida Hideto published a book on Nazi architecture, but prefaced it with discussion of modernist architecture. See: Hideto Kishida, *Nachisu doitsu no kenchiku (The Architecture of Nazi Germany)* (Tokyo: Sagamishobo, 1943).

^{lxxii} Feder himself insisted that the data given for an ideal new town can be used for the creation of new towns as well as for the creation of neighborhoods inside existing cities, for renewal as much as for rebuilding. This part of his writing was not clear to all his Japanese commentators, as becomes obvious in an article written by Ishikawa in 1943 who criticized the ideas of Feder for not being applicable to existing cities and instead develops his own concept of dividing cities. Ishikawa confused the first and last name and speaks of "Professor Gottfried." In regard to the theory, he spoke of the day/week/month center. Hideaki Ishikawa, "100 nengo no toshi (The city in 100 years)," in *toshi no seitai* (Shunjûsha, 1943). See also: Feder, *Die neue Stadt, Versuch der Begründung einer neuen Stadtplanungskunst aus der sozialen Struktur der Bevölkerung*.

^{lxxiii} Goro Itô, "Nachisu doitsu no toshikeikaku (City planning in Nazi-Germany) Part I," *Shinkenchiku*, no. 11 (1942), Goro Itô, "Nachisu doitsu no toshikeikaku (City planning in Nazi-Germany) Part II," *Shinkenchiku* 1 (1943).

^{lxxiv} Ishikawa, "100 nengo no toshi (The city in 100 years).", Uzô Nishiyama, "Seikatsu no kôzô to seikatsu kichi (The structure of life units and the base of life)," *Kenchikugaku kenkyû* (later included in his book *Chiikikûkanron, Tokyo, Keisô shobô, 1968*), no. 110+111 (1942).

^{lxxv} Nishiyama probably understood German well enough to make his own translation for his analysis. The terms he uses when writing about "The New Town" differ from those given by the translator of the Chamber of Industry and Commerce. They are more precise and better anchored in the Japanese planning context. For example, "Die neue Stadt" in the version of the Chamber of Industry and Commerce translates as "Shintoshi no kensetsu". Gottfried Feder and Fritz Rechenberg, "Shintoshi no kensetsu," *Tôkyô Shôkô kaigisho* 5 (1942). Nishiyama uses "Atarashiki toshi," which is a term that characterizes new city concepts. Furthermore, Feder's central argument, which concerns "organic" town-planning, is referred to by Nishiyama as "yûkiteki" (organic, a term used also by another famous urban planner, Ikeda Hiroshi earlier, whereas the other translator uses "soshikiteki", which has more the meaning of organizational. The hierarchy of centers established by Feder is explained by Nishiyama with daily/weekly/monthly centers within the city, using a term which well explains Feder's ideas but which is rarely used by the author, who uses *Kern* (nucleus). In fact, it appears primarily in the context of the illustration Nishiyama chooses to accompany his article. The version by the Chamber of Industry and Commerce uses the direct translation "kaku" for nucleus.

^{lxxvi} Ishikawa, *Toshikeikaku oyobi kokudokeikaku: sono koso to gijutsu. 1941, 1951, 1963.* (1941 edition: *Siedlung as characterization for the Feder plan on p. 41 and as residential district referring to Siedlung "Leipsic-Lössnig" p. 482*) On the German concept of Siedlung, see also: Carola Hein, "Siedlung," in *Trésor des mots de la ville*, ed. Christian Topalov, et al. (Paris: CNRS-Editions & Editions de la MSH, forthcoming).

^{lxxvii} See also: Uzô Nishiyama, *Toshikeikaku to machizukuri [Urban Planning and Community Design]*, vol. 2 (Tôkyô and Kyôto: Chôbunsha, 1971).

^{lxxviii} Private investors, including major players such as the Mitsubishi company, refashioned neighborhoods according to their own premises; some areas changed through the local use of planning tools that had partial roots in Japanese culture and could be applied on a small scale,

notably land readjustment, characterized by a reduction in lot sizes in order to create public land, and to widen and straighten out streets, plots, and blocks. Still others developed according to the combined interests and needs of individual landowners. Hein, "Land Development for the Modern Metropolis".