



The Japanese 1919 City Planning Act System in the World History of Planning: An Overview and Some Hypothetical Propositions on “Bureaucratic Professionalism”

Shunichi J. Watanabe *

* *Professor Emeritus, Tokyo University of Science, shun.watanabe@nifty.com*

The City Planning Act of 1919, established under the strong influence of Western modern planning, was the nation's first modern planning legislation. This paper is an attempt to position the planning system created by the 1919 Act within the framework of the world history of planning.

Unlike the Western countries, the Japanese system was created -- not by planning professionals -- by the bureaucrats of the central government, who eventually had a fairly high level of professional expertise. We name this situation "bureaucratic professionalism", which may be quite unique in contrast to the Western planning system.

The 1919 planning system was highly centralized in which small number of elite planning bureaucrats of the Home Ministry efficiently controlled the planning decisions all over the country. The Ministry prescribed the nation-wide, pre-established, uniform planning standards and asked the local government to follow. The Ministry created the City Planning Local Commission in all prefectures as its de facto branch offices and regularly dispatched its elite planning bureaucrats to the Commission's secretariat.

These bureaucrats consisted of general administrative officers and three kinds of specialist technical officials in civil engineering, architecture, and parks. They, as a group, seem to satisfy most of the elements of professionalism in general. But in reality, the group was a compound of administrators and three clearly separated specialists. It may be hard to say that these professional bureaucrats have established a city planning profession as a whole.

Keywords: City Planning Act of 1919, the 1919 planning system, Home Ministry, Western modern planning, City Planning Local Commission, Bureaucratic Professionalism

1. Introduction

The basic structure of the Japanese planning system was founded by the City Planning Act of 1919 (hereafter "the 1919 Act") which was enacted as the nation's first modern planning legislation 99 years ago. Since then, many features of the planning system have survived even the Act's drastic post-war amendment into the City Planning Act of 1968 which forms the basic core of Japan's current planning legislation. Analyzing the planning system put in place by the 1919 Act (hereafter "the 1919 (planning) system") is therefore an important research theme in understanding our past history as well as our current standing and our search for future perspectives on our current planning system.

The 1919 Act, as seen in the context of the world history of planning, was strongly influenced by the Western modern planning system, which was then being formed through the international exchange of ideas between Western Europe and North America in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Outside of these areas, Japan was an almost exceptional case as a nation that made contact with and learned from Western modern planning ideas based on its own initiative.

This paper is an attempt to position the Japanese 1919 planning system within the framework of the world history of planning. Here, however, we face problems right away. Historical facts show us that, while these Western countries enjoyed rich mutual exchange, Japanese contact with the West resulted only in a one-sided flow from the Western countries to Japan and ended with Japan hardly contributing to the formation of the modern planning system. Understanding how the Japanese contact with the West occurred as well as its results may be an important research theme for Japanese planning history but may not be an attractive or productive theme in the world history of planning as a whole.

Here, we propose a different approach. We try to discover and discuss features of the 1919 planning system which may have been unique in comparison to the Western planning system at the time and which may still be an attractive theme in relation to the basic nature of planning systems in general. We present here a concept that we have named "bureaucratic professionalism" which obviously requires some preliminary explanations.

In Western countries, urban planning as a social technology and institution was developed by a group of private and governmental "planning professionals".⁽¹⁾ In other words, the planning institution and its professionals grew in parallel with one another. In Japan, in contrast, planning was almost entirely developed by



bureaucrats in the central government's Home Ministry. These bureaucrats eventually came to have a fairly high level of professional expertise but they identified themselves basically as bureaucrats rather than as "planning professionals". We have named this situation "bureaucratic professionalism" and the people involved "professional bureaucrats".

Having said so, the next question is what "bureaucratic professionalism" and these "professional bureaucrats" meant within the actual context of Japanese history, and what new insights can come from these concepts regarding the 1919 planning system in the context of the world history of planning.

In order to answer these questions, this paper will take the following steps: After identifying precedent research relevant to this paper the theoretical framework of professionalism will be discussed, as this framework will be used to further detail the Home Ministry's bureaucratic professionalism near the end of this paper.

After these preliminary discussions the topic will advance to the core historical discussions on the 1919 City Planning Act, the Home Ministry and the City Planning Local Commission. Based on these discussions an evaluation of the Home Ministry's bureaucratic professionalism will follow using the above framework, and finally the paper will close with some concluding remarks.

2. Precedent Research

As one of the most important elements in Japanese planning history, there has been plenty of research on and around the 1919 Act – the most famous being the general history textbook by Ishida⁽²⁾ and Watanabe's book detailing the formative process behind the 1919 Act.⁽³⁾ But when it comes to the subject of the 1919 planning system as a whole there have been relatively few results and practically none that discuss the 1919 system within the context of the world history of planning. Watanabe deals with the historical features of the Japanese planning system as a whole; identifying central bureaucracy and non-professionalism as key components.⁽⁴⁾ This paper more or less develops this earlier work, focusing more specifically upon the bureaucrats in the Home Ministry in charge of the actual technical planning around the 1910s and 1920s.

This type of research requires basic knowledge of the Home Ministry and its bureaucratic system in general and, in particular, of the City Planning Local Commission, which was where the actual planning work was carried out. The Home Ministry, as a very important research theme in the social sciences and history, has been much recorded and discussed in works such as the 4 volume book *The History of the Home Ministry*⁽⁵⁾ and recent books in social and political history.⁽⁶⁾ What we need is more works specializing in city planning. Nakamura provides a good discussion of the politics of the 1919 planning system including the City Planning Local Commission.⁽⁷⁾ This paper relies greatly on this work with, however, a slightly different view regarding planning expertise and professionalism.

Around the 1980s on, planning academics began their research and interviews with former planning bureaucrats who also began to record their memories.⁽⁸⁾ These records are another information source that this paper is based upon.

3. Professionalism

In Western countries and, in fact, much of the entire world, urban planning as a social technology is carried out by planning professionals — a fact that seems to form the fundamental basis of universal discourse on the world history of planning. The present author, however, believes that a more careful examination is necessary as far as the Japanese planning system is concerned.

In order to examine this issue theoretically, the word "professionalism" must first be defined. Let us rely upon that of Millerson, which is a rather old definition but is reliable for the purpose of our discussion.⁽⁹⁾ Millerson's definition of professionalism contains six aspects:

- (a) A profession involves a skill based on theoretical knowledge.
- (b) The skill requires training and education.
- (c) The professional must demonstrate competence by passing a test.
- (d) Integrity is maintained by adherence to a code of conduct.
- (e) The service is for the public good.
- (f) The profession is organized.

This definition gives us a fairly clear picture that planning professionals work with certain planning expertise which they obtain through training and education as well as a test, which bestows upon them a kind of status. Planning professionals also organize themselves into an identifiable group and maintain integrity through a code of conduct, working for public good.

This picture gives us the impression that the term may also be applicable to "bureaucratic professionals," because this definition allows planning professionals to work both in the private and governmental sectors. We will examine this point in depth later by using the 6 aspects mentioned above.



4. The City Planning Act of 1919

Systematic contact between Japan and Western modern planning ideas began with the "Town Planning Conference" organized by the Royal Institute of British Architects in London in 1910.⁽¹⁰⁾ At the time in Japan, there was no word for – and therefore no concept of – "town or city planning." And, more crucially, no one had the technical skills to carry it out. However, there did exist something that we can now consider the predecessor to "*toshi keikaku* (city planning)," a new term coined by Hajime Seki in 1913.⁽¹¹⁾ In this formative period of city planning, we should note both what kind of Japanese traditional soil the seeds of Western planning ideas fell onto, and, as a result, what kind of a new flower blossomed as the 1919 planning system.

The 1919 Act was born both from the influence of Western modern planning ideas and by 30 some years of experience gained through the urban program put in place by the Tokyo Urban Improvement Ordinance of 1888 (hereafter "Urban Improvement"). Urban Improvement was a program for planning and implementing a long-range construction plan for urban infrastructure, targeting the streets and parks in Tokyo's built-up areas. As for its planning system, three features should be noted as they were eventually inherited into the 1919 system.

First, Urban Improvement was defined as the central --- not local--- government's program, and was administered by the Home Ministry. Second, it institutionalized a unique system involving a "commission" with strong administrative powers. In fact, the Urban Improvement Ordinance prescribed the establishment of the Tokyo Urban Improvement Commission which was empowered to officially determine the Urban Improvement plan and report it to the Home Minister who would then receive the Cabinet's approval.⁽¹²⁾ Third, Urban Improvement, which was basically a construction program, was administered by non-technical bureaucrats with technical help from civil engineers.

The 1919 Act introduced new elements, mostly by learning from the Western modern planning model as follows:

- (1) Expanding the act's application from Tokyo to the six major cities in Japan and later to all cities;⁽¹³⁾
- (2) Establishing the City Planning Area to include areas outside the central city;
- (3) Providing new planning tools in the form of construction projects like land readjustment and land-use controls like zoning. Overall, however, construction was emphasized more than restriction. Land readjustment came to be widely used thereafter,⁽¹⁴⁾ but zoning was only accorded weaker powers and did not become a central tool in the entire planning system.

Looking back at the 1919 planning system within the background of Western planning developments at the time, we may be able to say that it was a fairly comparable system as a whole. The soil onto which the seeds of Western planning fell was rich in terms of bureaucracy but rather poor in terms of technical skills. So the next question is: how was city planning as a technical matter actually carried out in the 1919 planning system?

Before we go further, however, we must take a glance at the 1919 system's relationship to building controls. In Western countries, land-use controls occupy a central place in the planning system but not so in Japan, as discussed above. Zoning was only briefly prescribed in the 1919 Act and detailed regulations on zoning were contained in the Urban Building Act of 1919.⁽¹⁵⁾ This Act, enacted as a sister legislation to the City Planning Act, was formed to control the engineering aspects of individual buildings (materials, structure, hygiene, fire, etc.) and, at the same time, their urban aspects (use, shape, size, height, building lots, etc.). In this way, land-use controls were, in a sense, separated from the planning system.

It should be noted that, prior to the Building Act, building controls had been administered on an ad hoc basis by the prefectural police. After the Act, a new system was put in place in the prefectural government and a Building Inspector was established under the strict control of the Home Ministry. This, however, gave rise to the problem that the planning of land-use and the actual control of individual buildings were administered by different people which eventually led to a serious need for coordination.

5. The Home Ministry

5-1. The Bureaucratic System

The 1919 planning system was carried out by a variety of bureaucrats in the Home Ministry. It is therefore necessary to take a look at the central government's bureaucratic system in the prewar days.⁽¹⁶⁾

The bureaucratic system in those days was strictly designed with a focus on the elite, generalist administrative officials (*jimu-kan*). Those who had passed the special *kôbun* examination⁽¹⁷⁾ were appointed as higher officials (*kôtô-kan*). They were the top-ranking elite group of bureaucrats with 10 steps to climb during their career. The ranks of the higher officials were as follows (from high to low):

- (1) Higher officials, who were specially selected from (2) and appointed by the emperor (*shin'nin-kan*), like ministers.
- (2) Imperial appointees (*chokunin-kan*) who were bureaucrats in classes 1 and 2, like vice-ministers and bureau directors general
- (3) Senior higher officials (*sônin-kan*) who were bureaucrats in classes 3 to 10, like division directors.



Under these higher officials were (4); lower officials (*han'nin-kan*) who were the non-elite bureaucrats. Further down, there were (5); many employees who were not considered government bureaucrats.

In this system the higher officials were the true elite bureaucrats who were small in number but controlled the vast number of non-elite lower officials.⁽¹⁸⁾ They played a decisively leading role in forming national policies. City planning was no exception; the administrative officials who occupied the Ministry's central positions in city planning were all higher officials like Ikeda Hiroshi.⁽¹⁹⁾

It should be remembered that this system was basically designed for the generalist administrative officials and, in fact, most of the higher officials were graduates from the Faculty of Law at the Imperial Universities, especially Tokyo Imperial University. On the other hand, what was the system of technical officials (*gijutsu-kan*) like?

There were actually many technical officials who were employed as specialists in fields such as engineering, medicine and agriculture. There was no systematic system or examinations for them as with the administrative officials, but the above concept was roughly applied to them as well. In the Home Ministry, elite technical officials given the status of *gishi* (literally, engineer or technical teacher) were treated like higher officials (*kōtō-kan*); non-elite technical officials, or the so-called *gite* (or *gishu*, which literally means technical hand) were the equivalent of lower officials (*han'nin-kan*). In the city planning world, the *gishi* played a leading role with the help of the *gite*, which we will see in the section on the City Planning Local Commission.

5-2. The Home Ministry

The Home Ministry, established in 1873, had jurisdiction over the police (Police Affairs Bureau), local government (Local Affairs Bureau) and civil engineering (Civil Engineering Bureau) among other branches and was one of the strongest ministries in the central government.

The prefecture, which was the local government, was in many ways almost the local branch of the Home Ministry and the prefectural governor was appointed out of the Ministry's higher officials. Furthermore, the prefectural police department, which was responsible for building regulations, was controlled by the Ministry's Police Affairs Bureau. So it is crucially important to look at the relationship between the Ministry and the prefecture in order to understand how city planning was actually administered.

5-3. The City Planning Division

The City Planning Division was established in the Ministry's secretariat in 1918. Hiroshi Ikeda became the first director of the Division and began drafting the City Planning Bill. The following year, the Bill became the City Planning Act of 1919 which was enforced at the beginning of 1920.⁽²⁰⁾

Interestingly enough, the Division's successive directors were all administrative --- not technical --- officers. This situation may seem quite strange to Western planners but, as we shall discuss later, it is here that the secret nature of Japanese city planning can be found.

The City Planning Division, led by Director Ikeda, consisted of four units: general affairs, civil engineering, architecture and parks. Each was headed by a higher official of its own specialization. It should be noted here that the technical units were clearly separated into the units of civil engineering, architecture and parks. This separation, which can be traced back to the Urban Improvement days, was strictly enforced not only in the central government but also in the prefectural governments.

Hideki Sakurai, who started working in the Division after graduating from the Department of Civil Engineering at Tokyo Imperial University in 1922, witnessed everyday life in the Home Ministry as follows: "At the time, there was hardly any substantial city planning work and the newcomers like us spent much time studying and translating Western material."⁽²¹⁾

6. The City Planning Local Commission

The 1919 Act prescribed the establishment of the City Planning Commission.⁽²²⁾ There were, in fact, two kinds of commissions: central and local. The City Planning Central Commission was established in 1920 but did not function much and was abolished in 1941.

6-1. The City Planning Local Commission

In 1920, the City Planning Local Commission (hereafter "the (Local) Commission") was established first in the six major cities where the 1919 Act was applied and then in all the prefectures from 1922 on.⁽²³⁾ In terms of its status in the government structure, it was a prefectural organization but in terms of planning practice, it was a branch of the Home Ministry's City Planning Division. (Remember the prefectural government itself was a de facto branch of the Home Ministry). The Local Commission is our focus of interest as it was the place where the work of city planning was actually carried out.

The 1919 Act prescribed that all planning cases, including the designation of city plans and city planning projects, go through the following process. First, the City Planning Commission was to deliberate the



case; second, the Home Minister was to form a decision; ⁽²⁴⁾ and third, the Cabinet was to give its approval. This was a very centralized system in that even small local planning cases had to go through cabinet approval. The Home Ministry --- in other words the planning bureaucrats --- therefore wielded a great amount of power in the actual administration.

As mentioned above, the Act assigned the Minister the power to form the final decisions, however the planning bureaucrats used the Local Commission as their place to deliberate and determine planning cases. This was possible due to the fact that various interests, particularly that of the central government, were well represented within the Commission. In other words, as Nakamura points out, the Commission functioned for the planning bureaucrats to coordinate the interests of the central government's ministries. ⁽²⁵⁾

6-2. The Members

Membership in the Local Commission was prescribed in the Minister's orders. The meeting was chaired by the prefectural governor, or by the vice-minister in the case of Tokyo. The members included: the mayor of the city where city planning was to be applied, members of the city and prefectural assemblies, and, in Tokyo, the governor and superintendent general (*keishi sōkan*).

It should also be noted that the members also included higher officials from various ministries. This was the arrangement used to carry out the abovementioned process. The meeting was oftentimes attended by planning specialists from the Ministry's City Planning Division, including Director Ikeda, and this made it possible for the planning bureaucrats to assume leadership in the decision-making process in the Local Commission.

6-3. The Secretariat

The Ministry provided technical and administrative staff as the central government official to all the prefectural governments as a means of supporting their Local Commissions. In 1934 the numbers of officers stationed in the 47 prefectural governments were as follows according to rank: higher officials, consisting of 12 administrative bureaucrats (*kanji*) and 70 technical *gishi*, and lower officials, consisting of 73 administrative bureaucrats (*shoki*) and 163 technical *gite*. ⁽²⁶⁾ These officers were stationed in the prefectures' City Planning Divisions, ⁽²⁷⁾ which functioned as the secretariats of the Local Commission, together with the prefecture's own staff. The Ministry's staff members were on the prefecture's payroll but belonged to the Ministry and held themselves to be above the prefectural staff. The higher officials were appointed by the cabinet and the lower officials by each Local Commission.

In the major prefectures the City Planning Division consisted of one administration unit as well as three technical units specializing each in civil engineering, architecture and parks, with one or more *gishi* from each specialization. This clear division between the technical specializations was decisive and universal throughout the country. In short, the prefectural City Planning Divisions all over the country were exactly a miniature of the Home Ministry's City Planning Division.

The Division's director was an office assumed by an administrative --- not technical --- bureaucrat in the higher official rank. ⁽²⁸⁾ The director played a crucial role in coordinating the technical staff in the three specializations. The civil engineering staff were working in street planning, the architectural staff in land-use planning, and the park staff in park planning. In another words, the technical staff were devoted more to their own fields of specialization rather than to a comprehensive view of the city planning expertise. So the real core of comprehensive planning was in the hand of the administrative --- not technical --- staff who had rich administrative expertise but relatively poor technical planning expertise. This may explain why the entire city planning system of Japan has been heavily inclined to legal procedures rather than to planning ideas and technology as such.

6-4. The Actual Process

Finally, let us trace the actual processes taken in the Local Commission, which eventually led up to the official decision on the planning case. The first job was to prepare a draft to be submitted to the Commission. This was mainly done by the secretariat's higher official technical bureaucrats, often with the guidance of their counterparts in the same field of specialization within the Ministry. Sometimes the Ministry's planning bureaucrats took business trips to the local prefectures to teach their planning expertise to their local counterparts. ⁽²⁹⁾

At the Commission's meeting, the administrative *kanji*, who were often the Division's director, explained the purpose of the draft which was then deliberated by the Commission members. In that sense, the *kanji's* work formed the core of the Commission and, behind the curtain, he was technically supported by the technical staff in the three different specializations. As the other Commission members representing their own interests had little planning expertise, the draft was passed smoothly in most cases. The difference in knowledge in the specialized subjects allowed the secretariat to assume technical leadership.



The results of the meeting was then notified to the Ministry's City Planning Division which formed the official decision in the name of the Home Minister. The Division then obtained the Cabinet's approval and finally published the plan in the Official Gazette as the Home Ministry's Notification.

7. Concluding Remarks: "Bureaucratic Professionalism"

This paper has so far studied the activities of the Home Ministry bureaucrats who supported the 1919 planning system. Based on this, we would like to look at the characteristics of "bureaucratic professionalism" through the six elements (skill, training, competence, integrity, public good and organization) proposed by Millerson's definition on professionalism described above.

The urgent problems at the time were: how to promptly provide planning expertise to a large number of expanding cities throughout the country, and, in the absence of planning education and private professionals, how to utilize the existing central bureaucracy. The answer was the 1919 system, and the key to it was the development of professional bureaucrats.

These professional bureaucrats were adopted by the Ministry without any prior training in city planning. Afterwards, they were trained on the job in the Local Commission or by studying foreign literature on their own. They grew by demonstrating competence in their daily work and serving the public good with integrity and pride as higher official bureaucrats. They interacted well among themselves, beyond their differences in position – administrative or technical, working in the central or local workplace. They were organized in formally bureaucratic and informally personal ways. In these terms, within the framework and limitations of the bureaucracy, we can assume that they formed one city planning profession.

At the same time, we must also point out the problems with this system. It certainly looked like a single profession from the outside, but in reality, it was a compound of clearly separated elements: the administrative staff and three technical staff in the civil engineering, architecture and parks divisions. It is hard to say that a single unified city planning profession was actually formed. Another problem was the basic structure of the system in which the central bureaucrats made the decisions and the local staff followed. Although efficient, this system has left problems even up to this day.

Finally, we may say that the bureaucratic professionalism of Japan as described above is a quite different approach set in distinctly different social and historical conditions compared to the world history of planning. However, for the countries of East Asia including Japan, where there has been a weak tradition of civil society and a strong tradition of centralized bureaucracy, this system may have some degree of universality, a topic that merits further research.

Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Notes on contributor

Shun-ichi J. Watanabe is Professor Emeritus, Tokyo University of Science. He holds B.A. (Tokyo), MCP (Harvard) and PhD (Tokyo). He taught city planning at TUS for 24 years and at Michigan State, U. of Washington, National Taiwan U., and KRIHS, Korea. His publications (all in Japanese) include: *American Urban Planning and the Community Ideal* (1977), *Introduction to Comparative Urban Planning* (1985), *The Birth of 'City Planning': Japan's Modern Urban Planning in International Comparison* (1993), *Machizukuri by Citizen Participation* (ed. 1999), and *Practical Guide to Citizen-Made Machizukuri Plans* (ed. 2001). He has been an IPHS member since its establishment in 1993, serving as council member for a number of years, and is now Chair of its East Asia Planning History Prize Committee.

Endnotes

- 1 Peter Hall, *Cities of Tomorrow: An Intellectual History of Urban Planning and Design in the Twentieth Century*, Oxford, Blackwell, 3rd ed. 2002. Stephen Ward, *Planning the Twentieth-Century City: The Advanced Capitalist World*. John Wiley & Sons, 2002.
- 2 Yorifusa Ishida, *Nihon Kin-Gendai Toshi Keikaku no Tenkai (Historical Development of the Modern and Contemporary City Planning in Japan), 1868-2003*. Tokyo: Jichitai Kenkyū-sha, 2004; original version, 1982.
- 3 Shun-ichi J. Watanabe, "Toshi Keikaku" no Tanjō: *Kokusai Hikaku kara mita Nihon Kindai Toshi Keikaku (The Birth of "City Planning": Japan's Modern Urban Planning in International Comparison)*. Tokyo: Kashiwa Shobō, 1993.
- 4 Shun-ichi J. Watanabe, "A Historical and Comparative Analysis of the Basic Character of the Japanese Planning System: Toward a Drastic Reform for Decentralization and Participation," Paper presented at the 14th International Planning History Society Conference, Istanbul, 2010.
- 5 Editing Committee of the Home Ministry History, ed. *Naimushō Shi (History of the Home Ministry)*. Tokyo: Taika-kai, 1971. 4 vols.
- 6 Yoshiya Soeda, ed., *Naimushō no Shakai Shi (The Social History of the Home Ministry)*. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 2007. Ryō



The 18th International Planning History Society Conference - Yokohama, July 2018

- Kurosawa, *Naimushô no Seiji Shi (The Political History of the Home Ministry)*. Tokyo: Fujiwara Shobô, 2013.
- 7 Akira Nakamura, "Taishô Hachi Nen Toshi Keikaku Hô Saikô: Toshi Keikaku Kuiki to Toshi Keikaku Chihô Inkai no Seijiteki Danmen (Reconsideration of the City Planning Act of 1919: The Political Aspects of the City Planning Area and the City Planning Local Commission)," *Seiji Keizai Kenkyûjo, Meiji University*, 1980, 59-99.
https://m-repo.lib.meiji.ac.jp/dspace/bitstream/10291/1690/1/seikeironso_49_1_59.pdf
- 8 City Planning Association of Japan, ed., *Toshi Keikaku no Pioneer no Ayumi (The Course of Pioneers of City Planning)*. Tokyo: CPAJ, 1986. "Tokushû: Naimushô Jidai no Toshi Keikaku: Toshi Keikaku Shi Kenkyû no Miryoku to Hôhō (Special Issue: City Planning in the Era of the Home Ministry: Interest and Method of Planning History Research)," *City Planning Review*, No. 144, 41987, 8-61.
- 9 G. Millerson, *The Qualifying Associations: A Study in Professionalization*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1998, p. 4; original version, 1964.
- 10 Watanabe (1993), 61-77.
- 11 Watanabe (1993), 90.
- 12 Article 2.
- 13 Three years later, an additional 25 cities fell under the Act, and the number went up to 49 in 1926. In 1933 the Act was applied to all the cities and some towns and villages. This means the 1919 planning system which was intended for large cities came to be applied to various sizes of cities all over the country.
- 14 The land readjustment tool was intensively used in the Capital Reconstruction Program after the Great Kanto Earthquake of 1923. In Tokyo, it treated over 3,000 hectare of burn down area, which can be seen as one of the greatest planning accomplishments in the world at that time.
- 15 The Urban Building Act of 1919 was enforced in December, 1920, or 11 months later than the enforcement of the City Planning Act.
- 16 Translations of the names of the governmental organization are as follows: bureau (*Kyoku*), department (*Bu*), division (*Ka, Shitsu*), office (*Shitsu, Sho*), section (*Han*), unit (*Kakari*); vice-minister (*Jimu-jikan*), director general (*Kyoku-chô*), director (*Ka-chô*), chief (*Kakari-chô*). <http://www.cas.go.jp/jp/seisaku/hourei/name.pdf>
- 17 This was the high-rank civil servant examination (*Kôtô-bunkan shiken*).
- 18 In 1942, higher officials and their equivalents numbered only 33,884, or 2.1%, of the 1,577,455 people working in all the central, local and other governmental organizations. See "Senzen no Kanryô Seido ni tsuite (Bureaucratic System in Prewar Japan)" Material 4, distributed at the Prime Minister's Administrative Reform Headquarters Meeting, September 7, 2007.
<https://www.gyokaku.go.jp/senmon/dai13/siryô4.pdf>
- 19 Hiroshi Ikeda (1881-1939) graduated from the Faculty of Law, Imperial Kyoto University and entered the Home Ministry in 1905. The next year he passed the *kôbun* examination and soon started his elite carrier as the higher official (class 7). When promoted to the director of the Road Division, Civil Engineering Bureau in 1915, Ikeda was in class 3. Then he was promoted to class 2 in 1918 as the director of the City Planning Division, and class 1 in 1923 as the director general of the Planning Bureau, Capital Reconstruction Agency. He left the ministry as the governor of Kanagawa prefecture in 1940. For his biography, see Shun-ichi J. Watanabe and Yasuhiro Sadayuki, "Ikeda Hiroshi Denki (The Biography of Hiroshi Ikeda) in *Toshi Keikaku no Pioneer no Ayumi (The Course of Pioneers of City Planning)*, Part 2, 139-228.
- 20 The Division was upgraded to the City Planning Bureau in 1922 but was assigned back to its position as a division in the Minister's Secretariat two years later. The City Planning Division was moved to the Planning Bureau in 1937 and to the Home Ministry's National Land Bureau in 1942.
- 21 "Sakurai Hideki Sensei ni Kiku (Interview with Mr. Hideki Sakurai)" in *Toshi Keikaku no Pioneer no Ayumi (The Course of Pioneers of City Planning)*, 1986, 37.
- 22 Article 4.
- 23 The Tokyo Commission was established in the Home Ministry, not in the prefecture. From 1922 onward, the Commission's name was changed from that of the city to the prefecture.
- 24 This decision, often called "city planning decision", made by the minister is one of the most important concepts in the 1919 planning system because it controls future land-use and construction projects in the name of the cabinet approval.
- 25 Nakamura, *op. cit.* p.82.
- 26 In 1938, these numbers increased each to: 23, 82, 106 and 264. Teizô Takeshige, "Toshi Keikaku Chihô Inkai no Jidai wo Omou (Remembering the Days of the City Planning Local Commission)," *Shin Toshi*, January, 1986, 47.
- 27 In Tokyo, they were stationed in the Home Ministry.
- 28 The technical *gishi* were not happy with the situation that they could not become the Division's director. But finally in the mid-1930s, the chance came in Kanagawa Prefecture, where Sukeyuki Nosaka, who, entering the Home Ministry in 1934, was a higher official civil engineering *gishi*, became the director for the first time in all prefectures. Takeshige, *loc. cit.*
- 29 Hideo Kimura, who became the higher official park bureaucrat of the Home Ministry in 1935, witnesses in: Hideo Kimura, "Naimushô Jidai no Toshi Keikaku: Honshô (City Planning in Home Ministry)" in *City Planning Review*, No. 144, 1987, 59.

Bibliography

- City Planning Association of Japan, ed., *Toshi Keikaku no Pioneer no Ayumi (The Course of Pioneers of City Planning)*. Tokyo: CPAJ, 1986.
- Editing Committee of the Home Ministry History, ed. *Nainushô Shi (History of the Home Ministry)*. Tokyo: Taikakai, 1971. 4 vols.
- Hall, Peter, *Cities of Tomorrow: An Intellectual History of Urban Planning and Design in the Twentieth Century*, Oxford, Blackwell, 3rd ed. 2002.
- Ishida, Yorifusa, *Nihon Kin-Gendai Toshi Keikaku no Tenkai (Historical Development of the Modern and Contemporary City Planning in Japan), 1868-2003*. Tokyo: Jichitai Kenkyû-sha, 2004; original version, 1982.
- Kimura, Hideo, "Naimushô Jidai no Toshi Keikaku: Honshô (City Planning in Home Ministry)" in *City Planning Review*, No. 144, 1987, 59.
- Kurosawa, Ryô, *Naimushô no Seiji Shi (The Political History of the Home Ministry)*. Tokyo: Fujiwara Shobô, 2013.
- Millerson, G., *The Qualifying Associations: A Study in Professionalization*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul,



- 1998; original version, 1964.
- Nakamura, Akira, "Taishô Hachi Nen Toshi Keikaku Hô Saikô: Toshi Keikaku Kuiki to Toshi Keikaku Chihô Inkai no Seijiteki Danmen (Reconsideration of the City Planning Act of 1919: The Political Aspect of the City Planning Area and the City Planning Local Commission)," *Seiji Keizai Kenkyûjo, Meiji University*, 1980, 59-99. https://m-repo.lib.meiji.ac.jp/dspace/bitstream/10291/1690/1/seikeironso_49_1_59.pdf
- "Sakurai Hideki Sensei ni Kiku (Interview with Mr. Hideki Sakurai)" in *Toshi Keikaku no Pioneer no Ayumi (The Course of Pioneers of City Planning)*, 1986, 37.
- "Senzen no Kanryô Seido ni tsuite (Bureaucratic System in Prewar Japan)" Material 4, distributed at the Prime Minister's Administrative Reform Headquarters Meeting, September 7, 2007. <https://www.gyokaku.go.jp/senmon/dai13/siryô4.pdf>
- Soeda, Yoshiya, ed., *Naimushô no Shakai Shi (The Social History of the Home Ministry)*. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 2007.
- Takeshige, Teizô, "Toshi Keikaku Chihô Inkai no Jidai wo Omou (Remembering the Days of the City Planning Local Commission)," *Shin Toshi*, January, 1986, 43-47.
- Takeshige, Teizô, "Naimushô Jidai no Toshi Keikaku no Kaisô (Memories of City Planning in the Days of the Home Ministry)" in *City Planning Review*, No. 144, 1987, 49.
- "Tokushû: Naimushô Jidai no Toshi Keikaku: Toshi Keikaku Shi Kenkyû no Miryoku to Hôhō (Special Issue: City Planning in the Era of the Home Ministry: Interest and Method of Planning History Research)," *City Planning Review*, No. 144, 1987, 48-61.
- Ward, Stephen, *Planning the Twentieth-Century City: The Advanced Capitalist World*. John Wiley & Sons, 2002.
- Watanabe, Shun-ichi J., *"Toshi Keikaku" no Tanjô: Kokusai Hikaku kara mita Nihon Kindai Toshi Keikaku (The Birth of "City Planning": Japan's Modern Urban Planning in International Comparison)*. Tokyo: Kashiwa Shobô, 1993.
- Watanabe, Shun-ichi J., "A Historical and Comparative Analysis of the Basic Character of the Japanese Planning System: Toward a Drastic Reform for Decentralization and Participation," Paper presented at the 14th International Planning History Society Conference, Istanbul, 2010.
- Watanabe, Shun-ichi J. and Yasuhiro Sadayuki, "Ikeda Hiroshi Denki (The Biography of Hiroshi Ikeda) in *Toshi Keikaku no Pioneer no Ayumi (The Course of Pioneers of City Planning)*, 1986, Part 2, 139-228.