What can the world learn from the lifescape and urbanism in Tokyo?

Riichi MIYAKE
Darko RADOVIĆ

Naoto NAKAJIMA
Kenji FUJIWARA

Journal of Architecture and Building Science

November 2012
vol.127 no.1638

Architectural Institute of Japan

NAKAJIMA: Thank you for making time to be together, and I'm sorry for my absence. Today we would like to hold a discussion by the two most internationally active researchers of architecture and urbanism. The main topic of discussion is what can the world learn from the lifescape and urbanism in Tokyo?

I want to explain the objective of this special issue. 3.11 exposed that the Tokyo is facing a high risk from earthquakes and the overconcentration of people and functions. It's a very big problem. In the special issue, Tokyo Urbanism, we are discussing the future of this high-risk metropolitan city, Tokyo, in a historical perspective on places of daily life.

At the end of this special issue, I will organize three discussions about the present and the future of Tokyo urbanism, mainly lifescape. Lifescape means the everyday urban landscape. The discussion by Miyake-sensei and RadoviĆ-sensei will be the very last discussion of this issue. In the discussion we would like to hear your views and evaluations for the lifescape and urbanism of Tokyo.

As the chief editor, I am very interested in your work on Tokyo urbanism. RadoviĆ-sensei has recently edited Small Tokyo, which focused on smallness in Tokyo urbanism. You wrote that smallness is a critical ingredient for the sustainable future of the built environment in Japan. This is a very interesting phrase. And Miyake-sensei of course has written many books about Tokyo, for example ***Edo no Gaikoutoshi*** (江戸の外交都市) ***Akihabara Wa Ima*** (秋葉原は今), or ***Funoisan de Machi ga Yomigaeru*** (負の遺産で街がよみがえる). In particular, the last one, Funoisan de Machi Ga Yomigaeru, is very suggestive for the sustainable future of cities, maybe including Tokyo. In this book, Miyake-sensei insisted on the switch from flat thinking to heritage thinking.

I am very interesting in your view on Tokyo urbanism and lifescape with heritage thinking. Today, please discuss about these issues freely among yourselves.

At first, I'd like to know your own life histories, in particularly those in Tokyo. Please could you tell me your professional biography, your history? I would like to take maybe five or ten minutes for each of you. After that, let's talk about lifescape and urbanism of Tokyo.

MIYAKE: I was born in 1948 in Tokyo, but not in the heart of

Tokyo--I'm not an Edokko--but in Setagaya, Akazutsumi. It's where the Tamagawa line, the small tramway was running. My parents were of very different backgrounds.

My mother was connected closely to China, living in Shanghai, and my father's parents, father's family were connected very well to the United States. So I don't have deep roots in Tokyo at all. Most of the Miyakes in Japan came from the Okayama region, historically speaking. But in modern times my family, parents' families, both families, are not well connected to Okayama at all. They were more based in foreign countries.

Anyway, there was the war. They were obliged to return back. So my images of Tokyo were just after the war, the burned city. I had very sad experiences. The roads were not asphalted. There were still rice fields or fields over there in Tokyo. And bridges were broken. But my pleasure, or maybe that was my mother's pleasure, was to go to Shibuya by Tamagawa train. There was a Tokyu Toyoko department store there. Tokyu was already the center of urban life or entertainment in Tokyo.

But at the age of four I emigrated, I changed places to live, to Hokkaido. So most of my childhood I spent in a very cold place in Japan, the Nayoro area, the coldest part. Below ten is the most appropriate temperature for me, like Russians. I'm not able to stand, even now, the hot temperature and humidity of Tokyo and Kansai areas.

I experienced two different extremes of Japan, the 1940s and 50s. One was devastated Tokyo, but growing up in Hokkaido was another one. It's a really remote place, but at that time the fisheries and the mining industries were very active. From time to time I had to cross the channel of Seikan channel. It took thirty or forty hours by train from that place to Tokyo.

So the change of place or ***deplacement*** [displacement] was very very interesting even from the age of ten or twelve years old. When I always came back to Tokyo, Tokyo was growing. Limitless plains of houses, small houses of course. And at that moment people were very poor. I stayed in my aunt's apartment house, reinforced concrete, but according to actual standards it was a very small apartment house. Going to the city center like Nihonbashi or Shibuya was very fun. There were department stores or other types of entertainment, Takarazuka or things like that.

But once my parents took me to Kansai. Kansai was closer to the original place of my father's family. It's completely different. So my family's tomb was both in the countryside of Okayama and in Rokko. So I was quite impressed that Kobe was

much more urbanized or sophisticated than Tokyo or Setagaya-like Tokyo. Setagaya was still the countryside of Tokyo. Even now, I think it's like that.

In Tokyo it's very different to measure the depth of the civilization. Many people say that Tokyo life is Edo-oriented life, like the life of samurai who used to live in the heart of Tokyo or the downtown area of Tokyo. But my experience of Tokyo is not at all like that. I'm a foreigner in that place. Setagaya or maybe Meguro would be my home place, but I'm not so much interested in there.

I had one thing I have to confess is a very bad experience in Ibaraki. Because my father's job, I was obliged to stay only one semester in Ibaraki. But people were so rough over there. The kids. There was ***ijime***. In Tokyo, I wore shoes. In Hokkaido, it's cold. We need shoes. But they were barefoot in Ibaraki. Of course, in civilized life they wear shoes but for kids' life they were barefoot. But my feet were not tough enough to be barefoot, because I was trained to wear shoes. I was always wearing shoes. So I was ***ijimerareta*** [bullied] by these people, and with kids they would be just hiding in the bushes and suddenly they would beat me or take me around. It's typical ***inaka no gaki*** or gangs of small kids in the countryside like that.

And when I watch movies like that, about the life of Japanese small kids, ***Nijyushi no Hitomi*** (二十四の瞳), etc, I have a very different type of inspiration. They are not as honest as is described in such movies. They have some kind of distance between Tokyo life or a foreigner's life and their own life. If I tell this story to my students or to my children, they don't believe me because Tokyo life is so different or Japanese life is so different. But if I told such a kind of story to Southeast Asians, they would understand because fifty years ago the Japanese countryside was still like that. That's my experience.

NAKAJIMA: Thank you very much.

RADOVIĆ: In my case, Nakajima-san, as you know, I'm definitely not an Edokko! But as you also know, I like to describe where I'm from now, unfortunately, more in terms of time than place. I was born in what used to be Yugoslavia 57 years ago. I was born in the place called Mostar, which was adorned by a famous, beautiful stone bridge that was destroyed in 1993, during the civil war. That is why I like to start from time; the place has changed enormously, the city was annihilated. We expect times to change, and places to stay relatively stable. But, in my case, that was not so.

I am mentioning that is because I think that the fact that the places of my past have been destroyed makes an important part of my research position, and of my life now. I am from the place which, like Atlantis, does not exist anymore. I am a traveler. Wherever I go I am, to various degrees, a foreigner. That essential foreignness has defined my existence over the last 20 years. I chose to be in Tokyo is because of that foreignness. Cultural distance of Tokyo inspires me. By using distance rather than proximity, I explore this culture and this city.

So, I used to live in what used to be Yugoslavia. I worked in Yugoslavia and, in the late 1980s, early 1990s, in the UK and Italy. When the war in Yugoslavia started, after understanding that any effort to fight the madness was futile, I decided to move to Australia. In 1993, I joined the University of Melbourne, which became my new intellectual home. But Yugoslavia and some neighboring countries, in particular Italy, remain my formative spaces, my years there were my formative years.

In those earliest years, I had an unusual first cultural contact with Japan. I remember that my first word in Japanese language (and I, unfortunately, never moved much further than that) was - "*kenzan*." My mother took some ikebana classes in the Japanese embassy in Belgrade. The first word that I remember was that for a strange, little thing for putting the flowers on.

Later I became interested in Japanese arts and, like many kids in my country in the sixties, in Japanese movies. "Far East" is term a much abused by terrible legacy of colonial powers, but from Europe geographically Japan is far indeed. In my culture, there was always fascination with that country which was so far away, so different and, from what was available to us, so beautiful.

When I moved with my family to Australia, suddenly that far East became not so far. I started working in several Asian countries, in particular in Thailand, Vietnam, and China. And then a long time after my *kenzan*, my platonic love became realized. I started visiting Japan. My first trip to Japan was to Kenchiku Kenkyuu-jo in Tsukuba. I was a visiting research fellow associated with Kodama Yuichiro-sensei. That was really a really interesting experience. My first visits to Tokyo date back to the late-1990s. After that, I was doing my best to visit Tokyo as often as I could. But, they were always short visits, except for a research fellowship at Osaka City University in 2003. And then, an unusual set of coincidences brought me to

Todai (where I met Nakajima-san). I was a visiting professor in the Center of Excellence, Center for Sustainable Urban regeneration, in charge of which was a very interesting group of people. I felt really welcome there.

I was puzzled by my first lived experience of Tokyo. I stayed there for almost two years and within those two years I developed a strange, schizophrenic experience, of simultaneously being distant, and being in. I wrote a small book that Todai and Ichii Shobou published on 2008, which I entitled *Another Tokyo*. For that book, I coined an improbable, impossible syntagm that defines my existence there: a *gaijin-vécu*, using 'gaijin,' of course, which is the reality of my distance, and that Lefebvrian, French *'vécu'*, which denotes my lived experiences. Making that, really improbable, language combination was an effort to just expose how ridiculous the position of simultaneous intimacy and distance can be.

That very much defines the rest. After spending most of 2007 and part of 2008 at Todai, I returned to the University of Melbourne. Then, a very interesting, irresistible invitation came to take over Kuma-san's laboratory at Keio, which I did. My son, who is also an architect, agreed. That decision was maybe brave, maybe it was crazy, but - definitely interesting. Since then I have been at Keio University. As you know, Keio does not have architecture explicitly as a separate department, but it offers a very interesting situation for thinking and doing architecture, which I am trying to both affect and fit in.

Over the last three years, together with two colleagues, Kazuyo Sejima and Hiroto Kobayashi, I established IKI - the International Keio Institute for Architecture and Urbanism, in which we are trying to advance architecture and urban design at Keio.

That would be the briefest cut through my *Curriculum* Vitae, describing where I am coming from and where I currently am. When people ask where I am from, I usually say - from Okurayama, just to spare them from this long introduction which needs to include complicated, but for me necessary, historic and geographic references.

NAKAJIMA: OK. Thank you very much for your personal history. Now let's talk about lifescape and urbanism of Tokyo. Tokyo includes, of course, Setagaya or the outskirts of Tokyo, the suburban areas like, for example, Tama New Town or others. I want to know, how do you evaluate the lifescape and urbanism of Tokyo? Please tell us your views, citing the essence of your work on Tokyo urbanism; Small Tokyo, or Funoisan or something. I wrote my questions on my sheet. If you can, please refer to

my questions during your discussion. Please discuss freely between Miyake-sensei and RadoviĆ-sensei from now.

MIYAKE: OK. May I add one more thing concerning my teaching experiences? I started teaching architecture at Shibaura Institute of Technology, Shibaura Kogyo Daigaku, from 1982. Before that, I lived in France, in Paris. I came back to Japan and I started teaching in the Shibaura area. That is beyond the Tamachi Station area, the same area as this Kenchiku Kaikan.

What was interesting was that Shibaura, at that moment, was an emerging place in Tokyo because of the bubble economy. So the Tokyo Metropolitan Government, as well as other institutions, are very eager to invest in many things on the coastal or seaside, waterfront area of Tokyo. Shibaura was one of the target areas. There was not national but lots of private sector investing. At the same time, Shibaura used to be a very industrialized area. There used to be an abattoir. So the image of Shibaura was very bad. Contrary to the mountainside, Tamachi station area was reclaimed land. It used to be the sea in the Edo period.

The Keio area or the Kenchiku Kaikan area was a very established side. Keio University is based in Ehime-han's ***daimyo yashiki***. And Satsuma-han's ***shimoyashiki*** was there. But the Shibaura area--Shibaura means the Sea of Shiba area--was reclaimed, industrialized and, in short, for the working class sector. Only Shibaura Kogyo Daigaku had started at that moment, so the name comes from that area. So the Shibaura Institute was one of the hopes for this area, topographically concerned, or as far as the name of the place was concerned.

But thanks to the bubble economy, hidden nightspots or discotheques or bars suddenly appeared there. Many things happened. The area turned to be very internationalized. So when we had a chance to organize a series of lectures or research seminars, joint research with foreign institutions, it was not difficult to gather people. Once I was asked by the French embassy to take young architects to the hidden bars of Shibaura. When I said All right, the embassy people took Jean Nouvel and Dominique Perrault came to us and we took them to, there was a night place with a very strange name, Love & Sex, with extravagant atmosphere. So they were very content. This is at the end of the 1980s. In any metropolis such as New York, Paris, Tokyo, such new emerging places were appreciated. Shibaura became suddenly an international brand, a focusing point for those who sought unexpected.

Shibaura Institute is a technological institute.

Students are very shy and modest, but all around there were girls in up-to-date fashionable clothes and young boys gathered especially to catch them up. New cars, especially Italians, are all around the university. So there was a big difference between our university and the surroundings. One is very traditional, conservative and male-oriented, another very shabby places for these young girls.

Then I learned a lot of things. Tokyo is not at all an image of the total city. Even in my experience, the famous image of Tokyo is the Yamanote line. In Yodobashi Camera's advertisement, the Yamanote line and the Chuo line are the indicators of a city. We remember only Shinjuku or Shibuya or Shinagawa, that is, spots with station names, but not continuous image of districts. That is how people recognize Tokyo.

Tokyo is not a walking city. I used to live in France for seven years before Shibaura. Paris is completely a continuous walking city. Most European cities are like that. Walking around, maybe walking ten minutes, twenty minutes, so we can go all around one quarter like that. But in Tokyo, no one takes such kinds of experiences. They take the metro or tube, private railway or JR, etc. It's very punctual, point by point, so they don't have the image of network as a walking city.

I lived in Meguro-ku. Several times a year I tried to walk back home without a map. Even now I continue such kinds of experiences, even in Sapporo. Walking at midnight without any map is very exciting.

If I take the big Kanjyou-sen or big routes, we can go back home without any problem. But walking on very small, narrow streets is always zigzag within unknown districts and sometimes obliges stop at the end of cul-de-sac or river. Finding the way by myself in the heart of Tokyo is a very good experience. I'm more and more convinced that Tokyo is groups of independent small quarters, which are not so related each other.

RADOVIĆ: Thanks for leading me into this theme. Walks without map open the possibility of fantastic experiences for a foreigner, as well. I encourage my students to do what Guy Debord called ***dérive***: literally letting the streets take them somewhere, and to apply their knowledges to challenges of the unpredictable. We have done a project in Split (Croatia) based on ***dérive***, and the book ***The Splt Case***, edited by Kengo Kuma, Davisi Boontharm, a local academic Ana Grgić and myself is just out.

That accidental discovery is really fantastic because, especially in a city like Tokyo, in a city as big as Tokyo. I

believe that even people who were born here can be equally excited by discoveries, surprised over and over and over again how each trip can bring something new. Although this may sound like a stereotype, it really isn't.

I like to compare Tokyo with an archipelago, an archipelago of urbanities. Urbanity is my research obsession. That keyword, which is really a puzzle for which I don't have a good definition (and, probably, having a good definition would kill a significant part of the magic it possesses), hides the question: what makes cities - cities. My friends tell me that ***toshi-sei*** is the closest Japanese term, but ***toshi-sei*** is more like citiness, probably, than urbanity.

Anyway, to me that plural of urbanities is the most interesting aspect of Tokyo. You know how Michel de Certeau used to write about culture in the plural; ***culture au pluriel***. Tokyo is plural in that sense. I think that we absolutely agree on that, Miyake-sensei. To me as a foreigner, as well as for you as a Japanese, that mosaic structure, or the archipelago structure; whichever cut one takes through Tokyo, that cut is never homogenous. It's always heterogeneous. There is no equivalent of the Champs-Élysées, an experience which can takes you in and leads "forever".

My main vehicle during those my time at Todai was ***mama-chari***. I had a bicycle and, I must tell you, whole Tokyo is accessible on bicycle. That demands a little bit of effort but each hill, each ***zaka***, has the rewarding down-hill side. So there is always a reward for pumping the bicycle uphill. Those rides helped me strengthen my main impression of diversity, that Tokyo is - in plural. They brought various surprises, some of which link to the topic that we are going to come to later, which is smallness. The small urban grain of this city provides so many opportunities, so many corners, so many ***roji***, so many small things, and they all add up to its really a fantastic diversity.

MIYAKE: I have the hypothesis that for living in Setagaya or Meguro, the roads are not at all well regulated. There was a construction period for the railways in the 1920s and 30s, especially the private railways. But the infrastructure, especially the roads and streets, were not at all well planned. Maybe because of lack of funds, I think.

But private investment was so big that the private sector for housing was able to developed both small portions and sometimes big portions of lands or estates all around Tokyo, especially in the places which used to be farms or rice fields. Many of actual roads, and even small paths, originate from agricultural paths. The municipality was not rich enough to

transform them into wide and regulated street system. If I check old maps of Setagaya or Suginami, we may understand that the road system hasn't changed. Hidenobu Jinnai has done very good work on that subject.

And I was very amazed to see that Tokyo did not evolve in that direction. The actual map for disaster mitigation by the Tokyo Metropolitan Government indicates that the most dangerous zones consist of such residential quarters. When I started teaching I came to be deeply interested in the real downtown of Tokyo. Just after the Hanshin earthquake of 1995, I was introduced to Kyojima District, which is in Sumida-ku. And urban structure of those areas was very controversial, Kyojima used to be the outskirt of old Edo, beyond Sumida River. Due to the great Kanto earthquake of 1923, major parts of downtown Tokyo. This produced countless number of evacuees.

They were obliged to live outside of this burnt area. Taking this chance, small investors and constructors developed instant type of housing estates in Kyojima. Cheap construction of Nagaya type with no special infrastructure appeared in this area. These people became the land owner. Those who bought the houses became owner of buildings. Then, these house were rented to ordinary people.

The relation between such private sector and public body was controversial. People demand municipality to improve or ameliorate infrastructure, but public authority was indifferent or they were not capable of doing this kind of infrastructure construction. So the road system is as it used to be, that is, following the shape of small rivers or small paths of agricultural lands. But, the life here is more exciting than downtown Tokyo.

This area was not burned down during the Second World War. It was saved by the inhabitants who extinguished the fire caused by bomb. By doing so, they were successful in keeping the old houses. Then after 1945 a lot of people who had lost houses immigrated here and lived together with the original people. So the density became, at the peak, 800 people per hectare. It's really, one of the highest densities in the world.

But this density promoted the intimacy of the people, and also the prosperity of the local commercial activity and the small industries, the manufacturers there. This tendency continued up to 1970s, making the spirit of people lively.

But again the problem of the aging society has been affecting the area since the 1980s. Although the location of Kyojima is the very center of Tokyo, quite near to the Ginza area by train, the housing did not advance well. Young boys and

girls, the second generation or third generation, don't want to live there. They moved to surrounding areas like Kanagawa-ken or Saitama-ken. Only their parents, many times women, they live alone over there. The ratio of vacancy is nearly 14%, it's a little bit more than the average of total Japan. So even in the heart of Tokyo, population decrease is outstanding.

NAKAJIMA: Thank you very much.

RADOVIĆ: I am very glad that Miyake-sensei links that density and quality of urban life. Density and overcrowding are two very different phenomena. Coming back to the keyword which I like, urbanity – urban culture is also critically linked to how many people can meet each other in the street. But, Miyake-sensei's elaboration was part of this discussion which I could mostly just listen and learn.

NAKAJIMA: Thank you. Density is very important. But I'd like to ask about buildings themselves, for Kyojima buildings are wooden buildings. Very very traditional Japanese buildings. But I think now all over central Tokyo concrete buildings, non-descript buildings, cover all over central Tokyo. On that point, Miyake-sensei, what do you think about non-descript buildings, post-war Japanese buildings? How do you think these buildings are the heritage, or how do you see them from heritage thinking?

MIYAKE: Yes. To answer this question, it is better to categorize such non-descriptive buildings by construction periods. The buildings after 1945 and until the 1950s, they belong to the reconstruction period and these buildings were with very low quality, so most of them have disappeared. But after that, from the end of the 1950s to 1970s there was another movement. Even what we call *mansions* started in the 1960s. At the initial stage, people, including specialists, architects and builders, were very anxious to make high quality buildings, *Danchi*, for instance. But once this sense of innovation came to be shared, and became very common, such a kind of innovative mind disappeared, or rather to say, automatized. This was followed by the decrease of skills among carpenters or builders. The workforce of such conventional sectors lost motivations although the training system was well established for young workers.

Still the cycle of building and demolishing in every 20-30 years continued until the end of 1990's. Most of the conventional buildings which we see everywhere are those constructed in 1970's to 1980's. It is rare to find older buildings in Tokyo. Frankly speaking, I'm not so much interested

in them. But my “petit tour” going back home without map, which takes two hours or three hours sometimes, is a very good experience to find out what kind of buildings are occupying the quarter. We can distinguish the construction period quite easily: style and taste, building technique, cliché such as Spanish windows and bow windows, and so on. Some buildings were very well-elaborated. At the peak one million houses per year were built all over Japan. High quality group must be quite limited, but enormous number of production.

Still there is a rule. Difference of gawa（ガワ）and anko （アンコ）, that is, the surrounding part along the street and inner area of the block. Along the big routem gawa consist of high reinforced buildings because of disaster mitigation measures. But in more conventional districts, gawa represents more outstanding appearance. Typology is the method to differentiate these buildings.

But I haven’t read a good report on the quality of such buildings that were constructed in the 1970s and 80s. This may be the task of your generation to define them. For instance, in the Tamachi area, because of the considerable growth of the economy of the Minato-ku area, all the buildings have been completely renovated. We have to know its mechanism.

RADOVIĆ: That is Miyake-sensei’s particular interest. To me, the non-descript buildings as such are not a problem. I remember how Robert Venturi used to speak, in positive terms, about ugly and ordinary architecture. Ugly and ordinary urban stock is very important. I do not know of any city with all its buildings glamorous and beautiful. That is, I think, not a point. What is interesting to me is that ordinary buildings are an important resource. They exist. At the pragmatic level, they embody energy. At the poetic level, they treasure embodied memories. They also constitute the city.

Today, when we have to think about sustainability, when we have to think about resources, the importance of such buildings should never be underestimated - even if they are non-descript, even if they are ugly. There is always “something” about urban environments, some quality which may be of immeasurable significance for the locals, for the people who live there, for those who have been born there, who lived and loved there. That brings us back, I think, back to the topic of this discussion, what you call lifescape. Lived experiences adds quality which is very difficult to recognize on the facade.

That would be my main point on this topic.

Of course, there always are buildings which need to be replaced. But I really think that fast replacement of building stock has become one of the myths of Tokyo. Like all myths, this one is grounded, of course. In Tokyo buildings do not last long. But, that is an unsustainable myth. I believe that buildings everywhere have to last longer, because they are environmentally expensive and, culturally, they make history. No one can persuade me that Tokyo would somehow lose its soul if some of its old, demolished buildings were still around.

MIYAKE: I would like to say actually more than 40% of the houses constructed per year are industrialized buildings. The building industry is very keen to ameliorate the quality of the buildings and achieve the goal of up-to-date notion of sustainability. As I told you, the building cycle was so short, little bit more than 20 year, but the economic and social situation has radically changed, people tend to maintain the existing buildings. In this context, ugliness doesn't matter. Making the best of old buildings, including recycle and reuse, is currently a new task for the experts.

RADOVIĆ: That is the resource approach I am speaking about.

MIYAKE: Exactly.

RADOVIĆ: Buildings are the resource. A cultural resource, not just a physical resource. Let me repeat that even in the ugliest of buildings imaginable, some significant events may have happened.

NAKAJIMA: I have a question. The professor Aoi, who is the chief editor of AI Journal Japan, he has one question for you. On behalf of him, I will tell you the question. Is that OK?

MIYAKE and RADOVIĆ: Yes.

NAKAJIMA: On this trick of small housing, Professor Aoi wrote that "We think that the structure of Tokyo has strongly affected the nature of the profession of architects." For instance, we have in Tokyo a number of architects who design only small detached houses. We call them *'jyutaku sakka.'* What are your observations of Tokyo architects and what is your expectation for the future of the role of Tokyo architects? I think this question is related to the discussion about small buildings or small alleys in Tokyo. Do you understand the question?

RADOVIĆ: Yes, we have it in writing.

NAKAJIMA: Tokyo architects.

MIYAKE: When I was a graduate student, there used to be magazines called *Toshi Jutaku* and SD. These magazines were provocative enough to introduce young architects' avant-garde individual houses. They started their careers with such a kind of very small buildings. When I was asked to organize an exhibition in France, "Le Japon des Avant-Gardes, I just focused on these architects: Tadao Ando, Toyo Ito in 1970's. They were very inventive and innovative, and they had even fighting spirits.

Thirty years ago, the society was not so tolerant and even the Architecture Society, *Kenchiku Gakkai*, AIJ, was occupied with conservatism. Among the jury for the grand prix of architecture, the annual prizes, they were not able to accept such attitude. But now, even the AIJ has changed quite a lot. They are for new and innovative ideas and also have strong tie with European and American partners. However, this tolerance may spoil young generation architects. They can do whatever they like but most of them are far behind the social context and no commitment for restructuring Tokyo.

Architects are often regarded only as those who make buildings on the designated sites with give budget, ant no further engagement in society building. They are the one who add another one with whatever type and style. What they have to do should be strategic idea for making human settlement based on their own analysis and conception of Tokyo or Japanese cities. That is my hope.

RADOVIĆ: To me, this is a very interesting question because I am an architect. I am an architect with an interest in, and with graduate qualifications in urbanism. I am, thus, a bit schizophrenic in terms of scales. I like urban scales and urban complexities. I am interested in Japan because of an undeniably high quality of its architecture. Japanese architecture is appreciated globally. That makes this topic particularly interesting to me.

As you know, we architects, historically, like to think about cities. But, history also shows how architects very rarely produced good urban theories and good cities. The reasons for that are, possibly, best described by Jane Jacobs, when she was defining urban design. She reminds us how design is the most exclusive field that one can imagine. I believe that my design is better than yours, of course; at the same time, you believe that your design is better than mine. We are subjective. On the other hand, *the urban* is the most inclusive of all phenomena. Everybody contributes to making of a city. The thrill and the problem for urban design is, thus, how ultimate inclusivity and

exclusivity come together to make an unbreakable unity. That is a very interesting question. There are many theories that follow the fashion of the day and design manifestos which claim to be theories. Recently popular positions of that kind are those which promote bottom-up approaches, which argue how aggregation of buildings, of good architecture, will eventually produce a good city.

I find that simplistic. Such views forget many key aspects of *the urban*, ranging from infrastructure to politics. Politics make cities. I always remind my students of the word 'polis.' Word 'politics' comes from 'polis,' which is the old Greek term for city. The word 'police' has the same root.

So, cities are political, and cities are places of many, many manifestations of the humankind. Those manifestations include architecture. Architecture (and, I repeat, that is my field) is an important ingredient of good cities, but it cannot on its own produce a good city. It is a much more complex game when exclusivity of good architecture enters in dialogue with generous inclusivity of *the urban* (where, as I said before, not only beautiful, but also ugly and ordinary has its place).

So cities are not only about fantastic architects like Ito and Ando, or after that Kuma and Sejima, or others. Those designers make fantastic contributions to city-making, but added together those contributions do not produce the city. This in itself is an excellent topic for discussion. We should never, never forget politics, economy, and infrastructure.

MIYAKE: Generally speaking, t understand a city, we have to distinguish its urban layers relating to the construction period like the case in European cities. A city, if it is historical, is well segmented in such a sense, from the central urban core of the medieval age, then surrounding areas one by one. Building types, styles and techniques differ according to the age. And Tokyo, unlike other Japanese cities, is exceptional because the speed of expansion after Meiji was too fast, and the repeated disasters have changed enormously its structure.

As RadoviĆ-sensei mentioned, Tokyo is a mosaic of groups or small urban units and sometimes rural units. Actually, the expansion period has gone and it has entered in shrinking process.

So what happened? High standard of building qualities is assured, but losing the population means losing necessity of buildings. There is no more big activity of human beings inside. We are required to find a completely different approach or strategy for how to reshape the buildings of Tokyo.

Fortunately enough, one priority of Tokyo is that the railway systems are quite well-organized, as they were implemented in the 1920s, 30s, before the motorization. Commuting by public transportation is highly appreciated.

RADOVIĆ: Everybody is envious of Tokyo's railway system. The whole world is aiming towards the famous TOD, transport oriented development, while somehow, since the early days of the Meiji era, Tokyo adopted the technological novelty and did the right thing. I mentioned infrastructure in my previous comment, but in this case we have a veritable infrastructural inheritance, one of the resources of Tokyo which is something that needs to be built upon. Even if the road structure is inefficient, in the times of scarcity we need to further discourage car. What is seen as a problem can become an advantage, rather than a disadvantage.

Nakajima-san, have we addressed properly the question of architecture?

NAKAJIMA: Yes. How do you feel the change of the lifescape and urbanism of Tokyo?

MIYAKE: The last twenty years?

NAKAJIMA: The twenty years after the collapse of the bubble economy and the coming of the global economic era.

MIYAKE: So, is it all right to restart the discussion?

NAKAJIMA: Yes.

MIYAKE: So during the last twenty years. Tokyo has experienced not a big change in a sense of the construction business. Up to the middle of the 1990s, the construction was a series of huge and hyper-scale buildings like the Metropolitan Government, Tokyo Forum and Tokyo Opera City. That was bubble economy, indeed, but after that, Tokyo has lost such a kind of propelling power for economized urban activities.

Kenchiku Gakkai has regularly organized international exhibitions every ten years. To conceive the last exhibition, which is still going around the world, maybe in Tehran, I has a role to play the role of curator together with the Japan Foundation. This exhibition concerns the buildings constructed from the middle of the 1990s to the middle of the 2000s. Tokyo Opera City, included in this period, is the last building of the bubbly Tokyo. After that, no significant buildings were constructed in Tokyo except some private sector buildings such as Marunouchi Building or Dentsu Headquarter. Epoch-making buildings of this period were constructed not in Tokyo, if I say, in the countryside, sometime with the financial assistance of the central government for social welfare

services. Lacking in the idea of grand design, Tokyo itself has been losing its interest.

In the meantime, lifestyle and the social goals of the nation have been changing in these years. Disasters have forced us to redirect the urban policy completely. Actually, those who are engage in urban management, mayors or leaders of NGO's are not so much interested in architecture. With the architectural issues, we are not able to change the situation. Architects, on the other hand, are not so much capable of committing is such problematic.

In the digitalized society, space does not matter. For instance, I live in Hokkaido, but such distance doesn't matter. Wherever I am, communication is assured and it is not any more necessary to live in the city center of a big city. SNS is giving more opportunities, facilitating us for meeting anytime and anywhere: discussions and chatting.

RADOVIĆ: That is a really interesting question. When it comes to Tokyo, I am very young, about twenty years old. My age in Tokyo coincides with the emergence of those issues behind your question, Nakajima-san. I have seen the end of that boom. I was coming to Japan when some of those big things were just finished.

I remember first time visiting Tokyo with an architecture guidebook, seeking some of those glamorous projects, and after that seeing how the situation changes. I like this place very much. I am in Tokyo not by birth, but by choice. If there is something to be critical about, that is about this period of the last twenty years. Besides technology which Miyake-sensei stressed, there is also a very strong sense of a single, dominant, ruling ideology in that.

French urban sociologist Henri Lefebvre used to say that the city is a spatial projection of society. Cities look the way their framing societies are. Each change in the city over a longer period of time reflects the forces governing that city. What is evident over the last 20 years in Tokyo is the power of an outdated economism, a strong neoliberal emphasis on spectacle rather than urbanity.

Over the period shorter than last twenty years, in which all these big, high rise building such as condominia are start to appear all around Tokyo. That is happening in all places where, in terms of ideology, a belated Thatcherism, or Reaganism rule. And Tokyo seems to be one of those places.

With my students I was doing a modest exploration on highrise developments in places such as Musashi-Kosugi, Toyosu and alike. We were trying to understand how those new typologies

affect urban fabric, how they affect patterns of movement, how they change that lifescape, which our discussion is about. They change the streetscape profoundly. They profoundly change the everyday life. Amidst solitaire typology, there is no contact in the street. It was interesting to me to see how real estate brochures for sale of those properties, for instance, promote latest surveillance systems. Tokyo, probably the safest big city in the world, does not need security cameras, but those buildings have high-tech 24-hour surveillance systems. Those systems are part of an imported model, from places like New York. That is one of the aspects of recent development of Tokyo where I have to be really critical. That is, I think, an irresponsible import. Those surveillance cameras may, in some strange reverse order, become necessary. If people disappear from the streets, if streets disappear from Tokyo, then the antiurban events will start to happen. That is the biggest change which I, as a foreigner see happening, and that is a dangerous change.

There are many nice evolutive changes In Tokyo. We already mentioned the small scale architecture, where new architectural styles seek diverse expressions within the grain of Tokyo. Those projects respect cultural nuances of individual streets, the culture of ***roji***. While those big buildings, big developments, hardly respect anything (if I may say as the only foreigner here), that I consider to be Japanese in this city. That would be my major observation in terms of trends. The sad loss of small and dangers associated with everything big and alien that comes in on the wings of an alien, outdated, unsustainable economic model. (I deliberately do not say foreign, but – alien.)

MIYAKE: The center of Tokyo and the outskirts are different. The extreme case is Akihabara. It used to be a quarter of very small shops for electric and electronic parts. They sold an astronomical amount whatever for the purpose of electronics. Then it has become of a center for computer. But the intervention of big real estate companies in the middle of 2000's has completely changed the aspect.

The fundamental is the urban policy of the metropolitan government. They are depending on the cutting in piece policy, that is, to sell the government's land to the private sector to make a balance sheet of government finance. I'm very critical about it. Tokyo has pursued this policy since the beginning of Meiji. Tokyo was covered by ***daimyo yashiki***. But, the new government formed by Satsuma-Choshu was financially very poor, so they were obliged to make money by selling those properties which were expropriated from Samurai lords. Not only Mitsubishi, but any other private real estate company had this benefit.

Even in the 1960s, around the Olympic Games and following Minobe Tosei have this cutting into pieces policy, especially, the waterfront line of *kashi*.

And now Ishihara government is deeply involved in this policy. The redevelopment of Akihabara started in such a situation as in Iidabashi or Marunouchi. The land of vegetable market was thus sold to the private sector. The governor is proud that the balance sheet is good, but the reality of urban life is going to another direction. Tokyo is losing the public spaces unlike European cities.

This neo-liberalistic policy has affected a lot, making a huge amount of commercial and business complex, not related to its original business character. Jimoto, that is local business people were always excluded.

RADOVIĆ: Yes, to me, that is of course--when we speak about, and that is an inevitable word, I think, to mention, globalization. We are led to believe that only one globalization is possible and that is this kind of globalization which leads towards sameness. And that is that unfortunate byproduct.

I like to show to my students photos of high rise buildings and say, which one is where? It is very difficult to recognize which building is in which part of the city because same kind of economy produces them, like that spatial projection of society. Same outcomes. And it is absolutely impossible for a global capital to produce local expression. Very very hard. Very difficult. So I think one of the aspects of Tokyo which is very important in this, what I find dissatisfactory, is competition. It is competition for the world class or the global city leadership, because that battle is being fought at the moment on the basis of a single bottom line, which is just economic, financial bottom line.

And since 2008, we see clearly that that bottom line is actually fairly dotty and fairly shaky. So I think that the next generation of world class has to have multiple bottom lines. It has to have an environmental bottom line, it has to have social sustainability, cultural sustainability, and I think cities which make a U-turn on time, towards going to multiple rather than single bottom lines are going to be future leaders in the world.

Unfortunately, that is what I don't see with these condominia. These condominia could be easily in Jakarta instead of Tokyo, in Hanoi instead of Tokyo, and then where is Tokyo? That followship, that followership I think is not good for any city. And this is now for me kind of generalizable situation,

because uniqueness is what we cherish. And Japanese culture does have that, probably because of geography, probably because of physical insularity. It has very well nurtured and developed specificity, and globalization as we are experiencing it at the moment goes against it. I like those philosophers who are speaking--I was speaking about Tokyo plural. I like those philosophers who speak about globalization plural. Not about toward a homogenized world but towards a heterogenized world, a world of differences.

I remember that Johann Wolfgang Goethe was the first one who mentioned the term 'world city.' But he was speaking about difference. Today, Florence in Europe doesn't qualify to be a world city. Kyoto doesn't quality to be a world city. Only places with strong financial centers qualify to be world cities and for me that is an absolutely unsatisfactory bottom line.

MIYAKE: Yeah, but from that bottom line Tokyo is really losing its position compared to Shanghai or Singapore for instance. The location of Tokyo is a bit far from the continent and the Southeast Asian countries. But at the same time this remoteness is one of the merits of Japanese life.

But still, I am very convinced that Tokyo should be divided and scattered, because it's too big. And spending two hours and forty minutes as average commuting time per day is really a waste of energy. A story about Keio SFC is like this: from the northern part of Tokyo it takes more than two and a half hours for one way. A student's father has to go to Seoul for a one-day trip while the daughter goes to SFC. The father returns back home earlier than his daughter.

Decentralization should be another goal of Tokyo. Based on the good infrastructure system, this kind of divisionism would work well: more compact size city with independent quarters.

RADOVIĆ: In that sense, an otherwise good railway system can also produce some negative outcomes. It is driven by an imperative of efficiency, rather than efficiency.

I like to juxtapose efficiency and sufficiency. The difference between growth (which is still a fetish today), and development. Since the energy crisis of the 1970s and Club of Rome report, we know that there are differentiated and non-differentiated growth. The last twenty years were very much the period of non-differentiated growth, the growth for the sake of growth. There were no mechanisms to differentiate between good and bad growth.

We have to go back to qualitative assessment of growth,

to value quality over quantity. At the moment, because the finances rule, more is more. More money is better than less money. But, what does that money translate into? That is another question. More money can translate into very unsustainable environments. Then, that is not good. That is an agenda that not only Tokyo struggles with, but I think that we all have to seek solutions, because we now know that we are going in a wrong direction.

MIYAKE: After thirty years, the population of Tokyo will be two thirds of what it is now. Still we are affected by a myth of growth but if we watch carefully the actual situation is so serious. Ee have to really conceive an alternative plan for the next generations. What is the most appropriate sphere for living? Most appropriate type of communication? In Hokkaido where I am working, there are some villages that are really shrinking. One village which is near to Sapporo, there used to be 1000 people living there but now only 20 people. That's really happening all over Japan. Such is the case in Tohoku, even in Kyojima in the center of Tokyo. For me Tokyo with less population and a more efficient network may be another goal.

RADOVIĆ: In that context, I would like to mention Thomas Kuhn's notion of paradigm shift. The most fascination message of his book "The Structure of Scientific Revolutions" is that sometimes the questions we are answering are the wrong questions. It seems that in this era, t exactly that kind of inertia rules. We are dealing with questions which may be the questions from the 20th century, not the questions posed by the epoch we are living now.

In September, I am going to attend a conference on degrowth. That is a very interesting concept, which can be related directly to shrinking populations, shrinking cities, shrinking trust in current system and a growing awareness that we have to redefine our ways of thinking and living. Does development need to seen as bad if it is not exponential? What about qualitative difference. For instance, at Keio University Onishi-sensei starts a very interesting project which is about "supermature" society. And I like that euphemism. Not aging but maturity, not old, but mature society. Putting old people in institutions may be seen(if I need to be banal) as 20yh century solution. We should aim towards enabling them to live normal and dignified lives for as long time as possible. A good city for old people is a good city for everybody.

That is a sort of change in thinking which is necessary and which I would like to help happen --Nakajima-san's question

was about the last two decades, but we started projecting into the next two decades.

One of my works which I enjoyed doing was ***eco-urbanity***. It brings together environmental and cultural sensibilities and responsibilities. I strongly believe that the measure of our success or failure will be the quality of everyday life. Not the quality of exceptional buildings and spaces, but of everyday life. The best bad example, a total opposite to what I am arguing for, is the residence of one of the richest Indian billionaires in Mumbai. It has the top rating as a sustainable building, while placed next to the slum! That is absolutely unsustainable and should be unacceptable. The quality of life in that slum should be used to measure the level of civilization of that society, not the quality of life of its richest person. Such distortions, I think, need to be addressed forcefully. Maybe, if we project the needs arising from the problems caused by the last 25 years towards the next 20 years, those should include radical improvement of everyday lifescape, the general conditions of life. That would be some success.

MIYAKE: We lost Nakajima-san.

NAKAJIMA: I heard your discussion. I think time is almost up? I think I've already got the answer for the final question, the message for the world from Tokyo. Mainly for Asian cities and African cities.

MIYAKE: Maybe that's related with the last question.

NAKAJIMA: Yes.

MIYAKE: An alternative for future Tokyo is not the metropolis like other Asian cities. I'm a bit skeptical whether Tokyo should always compete with other growing Asian cities. Tokyo has various components. There is Ekoda, Kyojima, Jiyugaoka and Shibaura. Different types of activities. I feel it is like a federation of different districts. Federated Tokyo could be one of the models for me. It could be something related to ***Edo-jidai***, Edo samurai lifestyle. Tokyo should not be the huge agglomeration.

But my hope or my idea would be to diversify the districts or the quarters or making use of the old stocks, the buildings and other properties. Those which are not needed should be cleared. That's my idea. We need more green space or vacant spaces. I prefer living in a much wider space. Tokyo is actually a very overwhelmingly dense type of a city. If I go to the port area or the waterfront area, I'm very relaxed. I'm thinking that we have to make some kind of relaxation space in between these quarters.

RADOVIĆ: Well, a couple of comments. I like Miyake-sensei's idea of a federated model, if it relates to governance. That is about recognizing the true identity of Tokyo, saying - yes Tokyo is diverse and finding ways to acknowledge and empower that local diversity. In what direction would such Tokyo develop is hard to predict, because that diversity would guide the outcomes. What I also find important, what I am really interested in, is the resilience of local cultures. For instance - *matsuri*. I like those events which are proving to be stronger than the buildings of Tokyo. Buildings get demolished, but nothing can uproot the resilience of culture. That is, I think, is another important thing to be preserved – not conserved. Energies that generate difference needs to be supported and nourished.

I do not like, as said before, when Tokyo follows other cities, especially the cities as distant (not only geographically but also culturally) as New York. The only thing which may link New York and Tokyo is that there is a lot of money in both. That is not enough. Edo did not follow. Much of what we like in Tokyo today refer back to the authenticity of Edo. That interesting period of *sakoku*, when Tokyo was on its own in a way, was the time when it had a higher level of literacy than London or Paris. Uniqueness, recognizing, cherishing and sustaining (without idolizing) own uniqueness, is of critical importance.

The second important thing to stress is the need to distinguish between loss caused by natural disasters, such as earthquakes and tsunamis and those caused by human ideologies. Disastrous human ideologies. We have a fresh, tragic example of Fukushima. An earthquake is unavoidable, and is thus bearable. The same is about tsunami. But, nuclear disaster is unbearable. It was caused by the humans, by a wrong decision to put the nuclear plant there. Those are, I think, very important issues and they should be carefully dealt with. This part of the world is vulnerable, and some nuances of its cultural beauty come from that very vulnerability. But, the of Japan vulnerability should not be increased by wrong decisions based on a single bottom line.

My last point maybe links to Miyake-sensei's notion of federated model. In Lefebvre's thinking, I like to stress the concept of the right to the city. Each inhabitant has the right to his or her city. Each citizen owns the city. With development model which I mentioned before, those ubiquitous condominia and more and more of privatized open space, that right to the city

is impossible. There are no ***rojis***, there is no permeability, there is no access to places which are not owned by the citizens.

Any city should be the place of all people. Understanding that diversity and smallness are in the nature of this city and finding mechanisms to let that diversity and smallness produce new creativities is the way to go.

Bottom up creativity can not be imposed. It can only be let go. How to let those bottom up creativities flourish, that is the key question. That includes, of course, resource approach to architecture, with which we have opened this discussion. A tremendous amount of resources were constructed by the humans. How to use those resources, how to reuse them, how to provide a responsible husbandry model to that resource is the question for 21st century.

MIYAKE: One thing still missing is the existence of the Imperial Palace in the center of Tokyo. Because it's a very big space and it's as big as the old imperial palace of Beijing. No one speaks about it nor touches it, but still it exists. This mythic area has a function to unite all the surrounding areas. So once this was opened like in China or, if I say, democratized, Tokyo's integral power would be lost. Roland Barthes described it as empty void. Without it, Tokyo would become Osaka or whatever else. The invisible role of Mikado is obvious.

RADOVIĆ: That is a powerful statement by Roland Barthes. "Tokyo is a city with an empty center." It is not for a ***gaijin*** to judge, but that space, the overall spatial organization of Tokyo, is an interesting and unique phenomenon. Some cities have it in different forms. New York, Central Park is that sort of equivalent green, but it does not have the equivalent symbolic power.

MIYAKE: Symbolism and mysticism as well as ecological concern. There are no such cities in any advanced countries like Tokyo. The imperial palace and also the imperial tomb have not yet allowed to be researched scientifically. Tokyo is still a hidden pat of Japan…