

PREFACE

The idea for this collection of essays was conceived during a meeting of the three editors in Tokyo in September 2018. After the pioneering “Moderne Stadtgeschichtsforschung in Europa, USA und Japan. Ein Handbuch”, edited by Christian Engeli and Horst Matzerath and published by Kohlhammer, Stuttgart in 1989, it is only the second volume to address transnational connections in urban development between Japan and Europe. It built on some of the work that had been discussed during a workshop on “Japanese and European Urbanisation in Comparison” at the University of Regensburg in the previous month, in which some of the contributors had taken part. In the following year, in March 2019, another workshop, “Comparative Studies on the Development of the Modern City in Japan and Europe” under the auspices of the *Gesellschaft für Stadtgeschichte und Urbanisierungsforschung* at the Humboldt University Berlin, shaped the direction and structure of the volume further and added more contributors. Some of the contributions were discussed as work in progress in a panel discussion at the 90th Conference of the Socio-Economic History Society in Japan, University of Kōbe (conducted virtually) in May 2021. Finally, some of the finished papers were presented in a specialist session at the 15th International Conference of the European Association for Urban History at the University of Antwerp.

The editors wish to thank Maren Barton (Billericay, UK) for her painstaking language editing and Jan Wiemann from the Ruhr-Universität Bochum for his precise and prompt compilation of the print version of the manuscript. The editorial board of the “Beiträge zur Stadtgeschichte und Urbanisierungsforschung”, supported by an anonymous academic referee, has graciously agreed to incorporate our volume into its series at the Steiner Verlag, where Katharina Stüdemann has efficiently accompanied its production.

Generous financial support for language corrections and publication costs has been received from the Mitsubishi Foundation, the Leibniz Science Campus “Europe and America in the Modern World” at the University of Regensburg, the Chair of Japanese History at Ruhr-Universität Bochum and the Chair of European History at the University of Regensburg.

INTRODUCTION

Rainer Liedtke, Takahito Mori, Katja Schmidpott

“The city as social construct characterised the Middle Ages of European history and could be one of the most important features of Western history that shed light on differences with the Orient.”¹ The Japanese historian Masuda Shirō (1908–1997)² emphasised the role of urban history in comparative historical research with this phrase in his first article “Doitsu Hanza toshi Lübeck no hatten ni tsuite” (Study on the Development of the Hanseatic City Lübeck) published in 1935. Masuda has been known not only as a pioneer of the study of European urban history in Japan but as an opinion leader of the *post-war history school* (*sengo rekishigaku*) just after 1945. Its essential aim was to create a “narrative of the nation” for reconstructing Japan as liberal democratic society after the war by denying the totalitarian regime in the 1930s/40s and leading the people into establishing a “civil society” according to the model of the modern Western countries. Methodologically, *post-war history* was characterised as “scientific history” based mainly on Marxist historical materialism.³

Methodologically, the two books of Masuda, “Seiō shimin ishiki no keisei” (Development of the Bourgeois Ethos in Western Europe) in 1949 and “Toshi: Sono kontei ni aru mono” (A Essay on the City with Focus on its Historical Basis) in 1952, were somewhat different from other works of the *post-war history school*. They gained a wide readership not only among scholars but among the public at that time. What attracted attention to Masuda was his focus on the communal consciousness for the public good as one of the fundamental elements of modern European society. Based on Max Weber’s urban theory, he argued that the origin of communal consciousness stemmed from the bourgeois ethos, derived from the self-governed urban community in medieval Europe. Masuda contrasted these “settlements of individuals” to the Oriental cities ruled by the clan ethos.

1 *Masuda Shirō*, Doitsu Hanza toshi Lübeck no hatten ni tsuite [Study on the Development of the Hanseatic City Lübeck], in: Tōkyō Shōka Daigaku kenkyū nenpō keizaigaku kenkyū 4, 1935, pp. 141–217, here pp. 142 f.

2 On Masuda’s personal history and achievements as a historian mentioned below, cf. *Mori Takahito*, Tokushu Europateki naru mono kara chi’ikishugi e: Masuda Shirō no chi’ikishi kōsō [From focusing on the uniqueness of Europe as a historical entity to enlightening the importance of regionalism: Masuda’s concept of regional history], in: *Mori Takahito / Ishi’i Takashi* (eds.), Chi’iki to rekishigaku: Sono ninaite to jissen, Kyoto: Kōyō Shobō 2017, pp. 205–227.

3 *Ninomiya Hiroyuki*, Sengo rekishigaku to shakaishi [Post-war history and social history], in: *Rekishigaku kenkyū* 729, 1999, pp. 21–27.

According to Masuda, it was urgently required to create a Japanese civil society through cultivating communal consciousness according to the model of European cities. Masuda's opinion was a product of the *post-war history* characterised by the dichotomy between the developed Western societies and the developing Japanese society.

What turned Masuda's attention toward the civil society and the city as its birthplace might be his experiences in Tokyo since he moved there in 1926 for entering academia. The 1920s belonged to the era of *Taishō Democracy* between the end of the Russo-Japanese War (1905) and the Japanese invasion of Manchuria (1931). The period was, in contrast to the atmospheres before and after, characterised by the birth of mass society, liberalisation and democratisation boosted by various social movements. These were aimed at reforming living and working conditions through social policy, creating a socialist society, advocating women's rights or at liberating discriminated minorities.⁴

The perception of Tokyo as a modern metropolis was well reflected in the volume of Greater Tokyo in the series "Nihon chiri taikai" (Compendium of the Geography of Japan) published in 1930, when the reconstruction of the city after the earthquake officially came to an end. In the introduction, the *Compendium* defined Tokyo as the capital of the "newly rising empire Japan", including Marunouchi, the business centre with many modern buildings, Ginza, the "privileged core of Japan's modern urbanity"⁵, with department store towers at its centre, and equipped with modern infrastructure such as electric streetlamps or brick sidewalks and various kinds of street-side trees.⁶

Marunouchi and Ginza were connected to Shinjuku and Shibuya by the Yamanote line, which, according to the *Compendium*, corresponded to the ring railway in Berlin. Shinjuku and Shibuya were also newly developed districts with terminal stations of several railways extending to the suburbs in the west. The western suburbs developed rapidly as the residential area of the new middle class, especially white collar workers, after the Great Kantō Earthquake (1923). They

- 4 For an overview on the social and intellectual trends in the era of the *Taishō Democracy*, cf. *Narita Ryūichi*, *Taishō demokurashī* [Taishō democracy], Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten 2007. Major works in English on the cultural history of the *long* Taishō period include: *Elise K. Tipton / John Clark* (eds.), *Being modern in Japan: Culture and Society from the 1910s to the 1930s*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press 2000; *Sharon A. Minichiello* (ed.), *Japan's competing modernities: Issues in Culture and Democracy 1900–1930*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press 1998. For an overview on the urban social history of the Taishō period in German, see: *Regine Mathias*, *Das Entstehen einer modernen städtischen Gesellschaft und Kultur, 1900/1905–1932*, in: *Josef Kreiner* (ed.), *Geschichte Japans*, Stuttgart: Reclam 2016, pp. 332–380.
- 5 *Yoshimi Shun'ya*, *Shikaku toshi no chiseigaku: Manazashi to shite no kindai* [Urban Geopolitics as the Study of Visual Representation with Focus on the Modern Gaze], Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten 2016, p. 69.
- 6 *Itabashi Tomoyuki*, *Ginza*, in: *Ishibashi Gorō / Imoto Nobuyuki / Tokuda Sadakazu / Katabira Jirō / Takahashi Jun'ichi / Tanaka Keiji / Tanaka Shūsaku / Endō Kanefusa / Shimomura Hikoichi* (eds.), *Nihon chiri taikai*. Daisankan. Daitōkyō hen [Compendium of the Geography of Japan. Vol. 3. Greater Tokyo Area], Tokyo: Kaizōsha 1930, pp. 386–396, here pp. 392 f.

were regarded as the “best residences for a rational lifestyle” which should liberate citizens from “traditional and conventional lifestyle.”⁷ In the western suburbs, the population grew so rapidly that the number of people boarding and alighting at Shinjuku station exceeded that at Tokyo Central Station by 1930.⁸ The suburbanization process had finally brought about the emergence of the administrative unit of Greater Tokyo through extensive incorporations of neighbouring and surrounding communities in 1932.

In addition, the *Compendium* introduced the various topographies, urban technologies and institutions that were considered *modern*, namely roads, bridges, parks, schools, universities, drinking water pipes, hospitals and so on. The perception of Tokyo as a *modern metropolis* in the *Compendium* was characterized by the fact that almost every object was compared to its counterpart in Western cities. It indicates not only that the development of Tokyo as a *modern metropolis* was influenced significantly by the model of Western cities, but that in the context of the rise of Japan as one of the great powers after the First World War, Tokyo was perceived as a global city that was not inferior to the Western cities.

It is also widely recognized in today’s Japanese urban history study that the prototype of the modern city in Japan, typically seen in the case of Tokyo, was formed during the period between the Russo-Japanese War and the Second World War, when against the background of accelerating urbanization the ideas of modernity, in terms of regularity, functionality and rationality, contributed to the establishment of mass culture and ultimately the social mobilisation for the *total war*. This applied to various fields such as urban planning, public hygiene, consumer culture and the culture of the body.⁹ These views correspond in some respects with those of European urban history where especially the period between the two world wars saw the transformation of urban space and lifestyles due to ideas of modernity in the sense mentioned above.¹⁰

Such a remarkable coincidence raises the question why the modern city had developed at the same time in Japan and Europe. Taking the today’s globalised historical studies into consideration, the question could be connected with the perspective of *multiple modernities* proposed by Shmuel Eisenstadt that sees patterns of modernisation as being “greatly influenced by specific cultural premises, tradi-

7 *Tanaka Keiji / Masuda Ichiji*, Chiriteki chi’iki: Jūtaku chiku [Geographical characters of the Residential Areas], in: *Ishibashi Gorō / Iimoto Nobuyuki / Tokuda Sadakazu / Katabira Jirō / Takahashi Jun’ichi / Tanaka Keiji / Tanaka Shūsaku / Endō Kanefusa / Shimomura Hikoichi* (eds.), *Nihon chiri taikai*. Daisankan. Daitōkyō hen [Compendium of the Geography of Japan. Vol. 3. Greater Tokyo Area], Tokyo: Kaizōsha 1930, pp. 356–369, here p. 362.

8 *Tanaka Keiji*, Tōkyō sōsetsu [General remarks on Tokyo], in: *Ishibashi Gorō / Iimoto Nobuyuki / Tokuda Sadakazu / Katabira Jirō / Takahashi Jun’ichi / Tanaka Keiji / Tanaka Shūsaku / Endō Kanefusa / Shimomura Hikoichi* (eds.), *Nihon chiri taikai*. Daisankan. Daitōkyō hen [Compendium of the Geography of Japan. Vol. 3. Greater Tokyo Area], Tokyo: Kaizōsha 1930, pp. 24–45, here p. 32.

9 For example, *Narita Ryūichi*, *Kindai toshi kūkan no bunka keiken* [Cultural Experiences in the Modern Urban Space], Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten 2003; *Yoshimi*, *Shikaku toshi* (cf. n. 5).

10 For example, *Friedrich Lenger*, *Metropolen der Moderne. Eine europäische Stadtgeschichte seit 1850*, München: C. H. Beck 2013.

tions, and historical experiences”.¹¹ As seen in the attempt of Christopher Bayly or Jürgen Osterhammel to write a global history or in that of Bo Stråth and Peter Wagner to rethink the historical sociological meaning of *European Modernity*, the theory of *multiple modernities* has made the basis for generalising the notion that the modernisation of the world did not entail the uniform spreading of Western *modernity* everywhere, although the globalization process since the 19th century had certainly led to an international integration of social and economic structures pushed by the initiative of Western countries.¹²

Moreover, according to Eisenstadt, Japan followed a unique path of modernisation among the non-Western societies owing to its “unusual combination of similarities and differences with Western societies”.¹³ Although the opinion was formed on the basis of his wide-ranging analyses on the history of Japan, he mentioned little about the city, in which the various aspects of the modernisation process could be found most clearly. Also, in international joint research programmes for the transnational history between Japan and European countries whose number has increased since 2000, the city has been seldom chosen as the main theme.¹⁴ It would therefore be meaningful to compare the development of the modern city in Europe with that in Japan and to include as many points of contact between the two as possible, in order to understand the historical significance of urban modernisation in a transnational context.

Starting from there, the research of historians of Japanese and European urban history from Japan and Germany presented here examines what influence the European and possibly North American experience of urbanization had on the development of the modern city in Japan and how the persistence of Japanese urban traditions could be reconciled with Western *role models*.

In doing so, the chapters in this volume testify to transnational urban historians’ observation that many cities are, at least in part, products of transnational flows of concepts, institutions, practices, knowledge, technology, commodities, or people.¹⁵ In modern history, these flows were mostly initiated when the common

- 11 Shmuel N. Eisenstadt, *Multiple Modernities*, in: *Daedalus* 129, 1, 2009, pp. 10–29, here, p. 2.
- 12 Christopher A. Bayly, *The Birth of the Modern World 1780–1914*, Malden: Blackwell 2004; Jürgen Osterhammel, *Die Verwandlung der Welt. Eine Geschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts*, Munich: C. H. Beck 2009; Bo Stråth / Peter Wagner, *European Modernity*, London: Bloomsbury 2017.
- 13 Shmuel N. Eisenstadt, *Japanese Civilization. A Comparative View*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press 1995, p. 16.
- 14 As the works of such international joint research programmes, e. g. *Hosoya Chihiro / Ian H. Nish* (eds.), *Nichi-Ei kōryūshi 1600–2000* [History of the interactions between Japan and the UK 1600–2000], 5 Vols., Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai 2000/01; *Kudō Akira / Tajima Nobuo* (eds.), *Nichi-Doku kankeishi 1890–1945* [History of the relationship between Japan and Germany 1890–1945], 3 Vols., Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai 2008; *Sven Saaler / Kudō Akira / Tajima Nobuo* (eds.), *Mutual Perceptions and Images in Japanese-German Relations, 1860–2010*, Leiden: Brill 2017.
- 15 *Nicolas Kenny / Rebecca Madgin*, “Every Time I Describe a City”: Urban History as Comparative and Transnational Practice, in: idem. (eds.), *Cities Beyond Borders: Comparative and Transnational Approaches to Urban History*, London: Routledge, pp. 3–23, here p. 6.

experience of city growth in the wake of industrialisation brought about common issues such as housing, unemployment, or public health, which prompted city governments in different nations to observe and discuss each other's ideas and practices in their search for solutions.¹⁶ In Japan, too, the emergence of the modern city has been shaped by transnational flows, even before industrialisation and urbanisation led to large-scale social problems, as its urban development was affected by the import and adaptation of Western municipal government institutions, urban planning concepts or civil engineering technology as part of Japan's comprehensive modernisation process since the middle of the 19th century.

While key topics related to the modernisation of Japan's cities have been taken up by Japanese and – to a much lesser extent – by Western historians, many studies have been following the established narrative of modernisation as a one-way transfer from Western countries to Japan. In contrast, the field of transnational urban historiography which seeks to examine not only processes of unidirectional transfer and adaptation, but even more importantly connections and circulations, has a strong focus on North-West European and North American cities.¹⁷ It is only recently that other places have come into the picture, including understudied European regions¹⁸ and, finally, Non-Western cities¹⁹. It is the latter which has been acknowledged as particularly promising as it might bring forward discussions on urban theory which has been developed on the basis of Western experience and has yet to be tested against the historical experience of other world regions.²⁰ In this respect, taking the Japanese experience into account may be especially fruitful, as Japan has rightfully been described as “one of the world's most self-conscious transnational learners”²¹, thus promising to provide ample material for transnational research.

One influential model in transnational urban history concerns exchange processes on the level of municipal government. The pioneer of transnational urban history, Pierre-Yves Saunier has put forward the hypothesis that transnational knowledge transfer in modern history has developed in three gradually overlap-

16 *Pierre-Yves Saunier*, Introduction: Global City, Take 2: A View from Urban History, in: *Pierre-Yves Saunier / Shane Ewen* (eds.), *Another Global City: Historical Explorations into the Transnational Municipal Moment, 1850–2000*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan 2008, pp. 1–18, here p. 10.

17 *Shane Ewen*, *What is Urban History?*, Cambridge: Polity Press 2016, p. 115.

18 *Eszter Gantner / Heidi Hein-Kircher / Oliver Hochadel*, *Interurban Knowledge Exchange in Southern and Eastern Europe, 1870–1950*, London: Routledge 2021; *Martin Kohlrausch*, *Brokers of Modernity. East Central Europe and the Rise of Modernist Architects, 1910–1950*, Leuven: Leuven University Press 2019.

19 The edited volume “Making Cities Global: The transnational turn in urban history” (*A. K. Sandoval-Strausz / Nancy Kwak* (eds.)), Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press 2018) includes studies on cities in Western Europe, North and South America and South East and East Asia.

20 *Kenny/Madgin*, “Every Time I Describe a City” (cf. n. 15), p. 22.

21 *Sheldon Garon*, On the Transnational Destruction of Cities: What Japan and the United States Learned from the Bombing of Britain and Germany in the Second World War, in: *Past & Present* 247, 1, 2020, pp. 235–271, here p. 237.

ping “intermunicipal circulatory regimes”²². According to his model, from the middle of the 19th century to the turn of the century transfer processes were mostly informal. They were often initiated by cosmopolitan mayors or urban politicians and carried out under the paradigm of “emulation to cope with current urban problems as a ‘modern metropolis’ should”. From the time around the First World War into the 1920s, exchange processes became more and more formalised and institutionalised. Intergovernmental organisations or philanthropic foundations emerged as major actors, and international organisations evolved that supported the professionalisation of discussions on urban development, involving experts such as social scientists or engineers. The third regime has only emerged in the 1970s, when transnational networks of cities with common economic structural features evolved which sought to develop collective strategies in order to improve their international economic competitiveness.²³

How would interwar urban Japan fit into this model? Japan’s rise as a world power after the First World War and its subsequent integration and engagement in international organisations, especially those related to the League of Nations, has been well examined on the level of national diplomacy and political relations.²⁴ Did Japanese representatives of city governments or experts likewise become part of the intermunicipal circulatory regimes that Saunier suggested, and how did this influence Japan’s urban development?

What is more, the case of Japan may illustrate that transnational flows were not always unidirectional from the Euro-American “core” to the “rest” of the world, as Japan gradually shifted from receiving and adapting Western knowledge to creating and exporting knowledge towards Western-dominated global scientific communities. This trend has been shown in the history of science, starting with seismology in the 1900s,²⁵ but was also reflected in Europeans and Americans observing and learning from the Japanese war effort after Japan’s victory over

22 Defined as “long-term patterns and relatively stable interactions between mutually identifiable protagonists in a given geopolitical and geographical framework” (*Saunier*, Introduction (cf. n. 16), p. 10).

23 *Saunier*, Introduction (cf. n. 16), pp. 16 f.

24 *Thomas W. Burkman*, Japan and the League of Nations: An Asian Power Encounters the “European Club”, in: *World Affairs* 158, 1, 1995, pp. 45–57; *Frederick R. Dickinson*, *World War I and the Triumph of a New Japan, 1919–1930*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2013; *Frederick R. Dickinson*, *Toward a Global Perspective of the Great War: Japan and the Foundations of a Twentieth-Century World*, in: *The American Historical Review* 119, 4, 2009 (“AHR Forum: Early-Twentieth-Century Japan in a Global Context”, ed. by Louise Young), pp. 1154–1183; *Tosh Minohara / Tze-ki Hon / Evan Dawley* (eds.), *The Decade of the Great War: Japan and the Wider World in the 1910s*, Leiden: Brill 2014; *Liang Pan*, *National Internationalism in Japan and China*, in: *Glenda Sluga / Patricia Clavin* (eds.), *Internationalisms: A Twentieth-Century History*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2016, pp. 170–190.

25 *Gregory Clancey*, *Earthquake Nation. The cultural politics of Japanese seismicity, 1868–1930*, Berkeley: University of California Press 2006; *Boumsoung Kim*, *Seismicity Within and Beyond the Empire: Japanese Seismological Investigation in Taiwan and its Global Deployment, 1895–1909*, in: *East Asian Science, Technology and Society* 1, 2, 2007, pp. 153–165.

Russia in 1905, which also inspired reformers in Asia and the Islamic world.²⁶ Even before the interwar period, Japan therefore began to emerge as a node of growing importance in the global circulation of knowledge. But does this observation also apply to urbanism related fields, such as governance and planning concepts, civil engineering technology, urban design ideas or architecture?

Apart from the prominent and often-quoted exception of the American urban progressive Charles Beard (1874–1948), who exchanged ideas about the future development of Tokyo with Gotō Shinpei (1857–1929), mayor of Tokyo from 1920 to 1923, around the time of the Great Kantō Earthquake, previous research suggests that exchange processes in the interwar period remained largely uni-directional.²⁷ However, some of the papers in this volume suggest to revise this view, by shedding light on examples of bi-directional exchange and transfer of concepts and knowledge between Japan and Europe.

The initial two contributions by Satoshi Baba and Katja Schmidt pott chart the development and current state of historiography on modern Japanese urbanisation with a particular view to Western influences. Baba's overview of Japanese research on the impact of Western ideas on the birth of town and regional planning in Japan highlights that historical research on town planning has been conducted mainly by scholars with a background in urban engineering, before social and economic historians and architectural historians began widening the area of research by including specific research subjects such as housing policies since the 1990s. Baba's paper traces Japan's urbanisation process and the development of town and regional planning in Britain, the US and Germany before describing the development of town and regional planning in Japan from the late 19th century until the interwar period. Based on historical comparison, certain key features of Japanese town and regional planning as they arose in relation to influences from Western countries have been described in the literature. In town planning, ideas of legislation and administrative systems as well as planning techniques were selectively collected from various countries and adapted to Japanese conditions. For instance, the Garden City concept was very influential as it was seen as a solution

26 *Sheldon Garon*, Transnational History and Japan's "Comparative Advantage", in: *Journal of Japanese Studies* 43, 1, 2017, pp. 65–92, here p. 69.

27 Writing on the reformist Osaka mayor Seki Hajime (1873–1935), Jeffrey Hanes has shown that in the 1920s, only very few experts from Europe or North America were available for discussions with their Japanese counterparts on common issues such as social problems caused by industrial capitalism or the question of municipal autonomy. *Jeffrey Hanes*, Pacific Crossings? Urban Progressivism in Modern Japan, in: *Pierre-Yves Saunier / Shane Ewen* (eds.), *Another Global City: Historical Explorations into the Transnational Municipal Moment, 1850–2000*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan 2008, pp. 51–68. See also: *Jeffrey E. Hanes*, Progressivism for the Pacific World: Urban social policymaking in modern Osaka, in: *City, Culture and Society* 3, 2012, pp. 79–85. In this article, he links the origins of Seki's innovative urban social policymaking in Osaka to his involvement with the transnational social reform movement of Progressivism. For his intellectual biography of Seki, who was one of the most influential thinkers of urban social reform in the interwar period, see: *Jeffrey E. Hanes*, *The City as Subject: Seki Hajime and the Reinvention of Modern Osaka*, Berkeley: University of California Press 2002.

to rapid city growth and its related problems, yet the garden cities that were built in Japan differed in many respects from the original concept. Two other important points in which Japan's planning system diverged from Western models was the absence of master plans and an ambiguous understanding of the concept of *regional planning*.

Schmidtrott's overview on German scholarship on Japan's urban history in the first half of the 20th century presents a field of research that is comparatively small, yet very diverse in terms of the disciplinary backgrounds of scholars and the variety of their approaches. While typical phenomena of urban modernity in the interwar period such as Western lifestyle and consumerism, media and entertainment culture, or changing gender roles have often been addressed in historiography on the Taishō period, urban development as such, i. e. the key actors, political processes or economic forces that have shaped it, have received much less scholarly attention. That being said, clusters of research on Japan's interwar urban history can be identified on the topics of architecture, planning, local communities and social problems, urban entertainment culture and representations of the modern city in literature. There is also a certain amount of comparative research on Tokyo and Berlin or Vienna, respectively. A growing interest in transnational historical research can be seen in the recent literature, especially in the fields of architecture and planning, where the interwar period marks the beginning of a shift from a uni-directional flow of concepts and knowledge from the West to Japan towards both sides sharing in a global urban modern.

As concerns urban planning, it seems that Japanese experts indeed became part of the Western-dominated urban planning community during the interwar period. As mentioned in Baba's paper, Japanese experts and bureaucrats were regular participants at international congresses since the very first international conference on town planning took place in London in 1910. In general, Japanese planners remained in close contact with European, particularly German planners or planning ideas, such as those formulated by geographer Walter Christaller (1893–1969) and professor of planning Gottfried Feder (1883–1941). American or Russian ideas were also discussed. As Western experts were rarely available to travel to Japan for a direct exchange of ideas with their Japanese counterparts, ideas were mostly transmitted to Japan via media such as books, journals, or master plans, which often resulted in planning ideas being adapted to local needs while ignoring the foreign context in which they originally evolved. Again, a prominent example is the idea of urban de-concentration in the form of the garden city concept which was adapted by the architect and planner Fukuda Shigeyoshi (1887–1971) in his planning for Tokyo in 1918, and later in the form of military planning for air defense when in the 1930s industries should be moved to satellite towns away from the centre of Tokyo and large greenbelts should be created.²⁸ Related to the topic of the garden city concept, Yūdai Deguchi mentions in his

28 *Carola Hein*, *Crossing Boundaries: The Global Exchange of Planning Ideas*, in: *A. K. Sandoval-Strausz / Nancy Kwak* (eds.), *Making cities global: The transnational turn in urban history*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press 2018, pp. 114–129, here pp. 126 ff.

paper in this volume that it had already been introduced to Japan in 1907, only five years after the publication of Ebenezer Howard's book "Garden Cities of To-morrow". Using a case study from the city of Amagasaki in the Kansai region near Osaka, Deguchi shows how a modified concept of the garden city was used in the construction of suburbs in interwar Japan.²⁹

Looking at the field of civil engineering, Shūichi Takashima's paper underlines that by the interwar period, Japanese experts had reached a similar level of expertise compared to their Western counterparts. He focusses on the German civil engineer Rudolf Briske (1884–1967) who was hired as an expert when Tokyo's first subway line was to be constructed which opened its service as the first subway in Asia in 1927. What seems to be a familiar story at first, reminiscent of the hiring of Western experts (so-called *oyatoi gaikokujin* or *contract foreigners*) in Meiji period technology transfer to Japan, turns out to be a very different case in several respects. To begin with, technology transfer did not start from scratch. By the 1920s, a considerable group of well-educated and experienced engineers had emerged in Japan and railway construction was no longer in need of foreign assistance. Rather, Tokyo's public transport system shared common issues with other major cities in Europe and America, and Japanese engineers in their search for solutions that were suited best to local conditions consulted with Briske on a similarly high level of expertise over certain technical problems, deciding which part of his advice they found useful and which not. What is more, Briske also benefited from this exchange, as he gathered data from Japanese scientific literature which he later put to use in his doctoral dissertation on the earthquake resilience of buildings. Rather than transfer, this is an example of a symmetrical exchange of knowledge and ideas based on expertise on both sides, which supported the creation of Japan-specific ways of urban development in terms of public transport systems.

In Mariko Jacoby's paper, discussions about and the implementation of fire-proofing Japanese cities are described as a process of import and adaptation of Western knowledge in combination with local traditions plus a further development of urban planning and construction technology in order to create a Japan-specific, modern fire regime. Similarly to railway construction, Japanese engineers occupied with earthquake engineering using reinforced concrete construction had reached an international level by the 1930s. While they continued to read Western publications, especially from Germany³⁰, Japanese civil engineers further

29 On the influence of the transnational Garden City Movement, including the reception of the garden city concept and its actual implementation in a comparative perspective in 1910s Japan and Britain, see: *Susan C. Townsend*, *The Great War and Urban Crisis: Conceptualizing the Industrial Metropolis in Japan and Britain in the 1910s*, in: *Tosh Minohara / Tze-ki Hon / Evan Dawley* (eds.), *The Decade of the Great War: Japan and the Wider World in the 1910s*, Leiden: Brill 2014, pp. 301–322.

30 Related to the topic of fire-proofing, Sheldon Garon has shown that when conceptualising the protection of Japanese cities against fire-bombing, Japanese urban planners still travelled to Germany as late as during the war to study the damage caused by air raids on German cities

refined relevant technologies and gradually began considering their work as world-leading, although local conditions did not allow them to put their ideas and findings about disaster-proof building and planning into practice until the post-war period.

Takahito Mori's paper in this volume on organised leisure as a form of urban social policy in Japan and Germany reveals a vivid, bi-directional exchange between the two regimes as they were heading towards total war at the end of the 1930s. Prompted by the 14th International Labour Conference of the ILO in 1930 and the 1st World Recreation Congress in Los Angeles 1932, the German leisure organisation *Kraft durch Freude* was established in 1933. In 1936, Isomura Ei'ichi (1903–1997), a municipal official of the city of Tokyo, inspected the Olympic Games in Berlin and surveyed the 2nd World Recreational Congress in Hamburg held by the KdF. When the Japanese Recreation Campaign (*Kōsei Undō*) was launched two years later, it was inspired by the German model. Japanese delegates of the Japan Recreation Association attended both the national congress of the KdF in Germany and the 3rd World Recreational Congress in Rome in 1938. Conversely, a delegation of the KdF attended the International Recreation Congress for Asian Development (*Kōa Kōsei Taikai*) held by the Japanese Recreation Campaign in Osaka in 1940. Although modeled after the KdF, the Japanese campaign was adapted to Japanese society and politics in terms of its organisational form and activities. In the local case of Osaka, where a high-ranking public health official who had studied social policy in Western cities was the leader of the campaign, its origins can partly be traced back to an earlier campaign to reform daily life in Japan.

While Western discourses on urbanism were widely received in Japan, and urban planning concepts, architecture or engineering technology were put to use – mostly in adapted forms – in creating modern cities, Beate Löffler's paper examines the opposite side of Japan's relationship with the West. Her analysis of accounts of the Japanese city by German-speaking observers, including experts in architecture and urban planning, shows that even after almost 60 years of modernisation, a trajectory that saw not only Japan's rise as an industrial nation and as hegemonic power in East Asia, but also the reconstruction of Tokyo as a modern imperial capital after the Great Kantō Earthquake of 1923, they preferred to ignore, or to condemn the modernisation of Japan's cities. Even those who had visited Japan and seen Tokyo first hand, preferred to imagine Japanese cities as pre-modern, perpetuating stereotypical images of Japan that were circulating in Europe since the emergence of *Japonism* in the 1870s and 1880s.

It was only after 1945, beginning with the presentation of Tange Kenzō's Hiroshima Peace Park and Tokyo Bay projects to primarily Euro-American audiences, and later with the Metabolists in the 1960s, that the flow of planning or urban design and architecture ideas between Japan and Euro-America began to

and Germany's civil defense system. *Garon*, On the Transnational Destruction of Cities (cf. n. 21).

change direction.³¹ And it was still later, in the 1980s, that Western urbanists started to see positive features in Japan's seemingly unordered, chaotic cities. In his influential book "Learning from the Japanese city: Looking East in Urban Design" (1999), the Australian urbanist Barrie Shelton understood Japanese cities in their own right, referring to Japanese cultural traditions and architectural works, free from Western perceptions about how a city should be according to Euro-American urban design theory paradigms.³²

In sum, the papers in this volume indicate that in Japan's urban history, the interwar period may be characterised by a shift from a uni-directional, wholesale import and adaptation of Western concepts, knowledge and technology as practiced throughout the preceding Meiji period towards a beginning bi-directional exchange based on common issues and on an equal level of expertise in municipal administration, planning, architecture and civil engineering. However, it was still a long time until conversely, aspects of Japanese urbanism were discussed as models for the West and actually influenced Western urban development.

Much is left to be done in research on Japan's urban history in the interwar period, especially when taking its transnational dimension into account. The role of individual administrators, politicians, urban planners, civil engineers or architects as agents of transnational exchange, including their participation in international networks, institutions or organisations, has not been sufficiently studied yet. Also, Western research is still overwhelmingly focused on Tokyo, with some exceptions on Osaka. Only a few recent works have examined the emergence of urban modernity in other cities, including regional cities (*chihō toshi*). As was the case with Tokyo, their modernisation was likewise based on the introduction of concepts and practices developed in the West, but also influenced by local traditions and adapted to specific economic or topographical conditions.³³

Finally, it should be noted that due to the specialisations of the authors the papers in this volume examine connections between Japan and Europe, while leaving out Japan's formal and informal empire in Asia (1895–1945). It should not go unmentioned, though, that Japanese planners and architects not only engaged with Western concepts and practices in city planning and architecture with the aim of creating modern cities within Japan proper, they also transferred, adapted and implemented them to prominent places in Japan's overseas territories.

31 *Carola Hein*, Editorial: Japanese Cities in Global Context, in: *Journal of Urban History* 42, 3, 2016, pp. 463–476, here p. 470.

32 *Hein*, Editorial (cf. n. 31), p. 464. That Japanese historians may sometimes be more critical of certain aspects of Japanese urban development than Western researchers, reveals the review of André Sorensen's seminal book *The Making of Urban Japan: Cities and Planning from Edo to the Twenty-First Century*. London: Nissan Institute/Routledge Japanese Studies Series, 2002 by *Natsuki Nataka* in: *Social Science Japan Journal* 8, 2, 2005, pp. 303–305.

33 On Sapporo, Okayama, Niigata and Kanazawa: *Louise Young*, *Beyond the Metropolis. Second Cities and Modern Life in Interwar Japan*, Berkeley: University of California Press 2013; on Nagoya in comparison to Birmingham: *Simon Gunn / Susan Townsend*, *Automobility and the City in Twentieth-Century Britain and Japan*, London: Bloomsbury 2019, ch. 1: "Planning the Automotive City, c. 1920–1960", pp. 17–42.

Considering these points, our contributions to the transnational urban history of Japan and Europe can only be called a beginning. We hope to motivate the readership to rethink the historical characteristics of European and Japanese cities in a global context, which is what the study of urban history in this century should first and foremost promote.