Towards Street Oceanography

Ginza Street as a Case Study

Wanhong Huang
huangwanhong@serendip.ngo

Abstract

A companion paper proposes a field organised around the street understood as an open system: heterogeneous flows passing through a heterogeneous terrain, forced from outside on several timescales, altering what passes through and altered in turn. That proposal was made in the abstract, and a proposal for a field earns attention only where its questions have determinate content on an actual street and records adequate to answer them can be shown to exist. Supplying that demonstration is the role of this paper.

The case is Ginza, in central Tokyo, chosen for three properties the proposal requires of a case: unlike regimes of price, provenance and use within a few hundred metres; a documented arrangement altering the traversable configuration reversibly and on a schedule; and an observational and institutional record reaching back a century and more. The paper sets out that record, reads the district as an ordered sequence of layers laid down since the seventeenth century, and works the field's principal questions through the case in turn. Four findings are claimed. An imposed terrain of the 1870s was documented as initially rejected by its occupants, which is a recorded instance of flow and terrain moving against one another. The interruptions in the record arrive with their causes separately documented, which is the condition under which an absent interval becomes usable evidence. A rule governing the street was made to track daylight, exhibiting an institutional reading that follows a forcing the institution leaves untouched. And the persistence most likely to impress an observer proves the evidence least able to discriminate, since the standing null account produces the same appearance. The paper closes by specifying a first campaign of measurement in four pieces, ordered by what each requires of the others.

Keywords: street systems; case study; urban terrain; periodic intervention; observational baseline

---

Draft. This is a working paper circulated for comment, and every part of it is open to revision.

Licence. CC BY-NC 4.0.

Statement on assisted composition. Claude (Anthropic) and ChatGPT (OpenAI) were used in the preparation of this manuscript. All claims, all errors and all judgements are the author's.

Suggested citation. Huang, W. *Towards Street Oceanography: Ginza Street as a Case Study.* Working paper.

Discussion Paper Note

This paper is a preliminary discussion paper intended to share an evolving idea and invite further dialogue, criticism, revision, and independent development.

The author does not claim exclusive epistemic ownership over the viewpoints, concepts, or lines of reasoning presented here, nor does the author claim priority as their first originator. Similar or related ideas may have appeared previously in other intellectual, cultural, or disciplinary traditions. Any legal rights retained in this work are intended to support attribution, responsible use, and protection against exploitative or harmful appropriation, and not to restrict independent inquiry, criticism, revision, or further development.

The arguments in this paper should therefore be understood as provisional and historically situated rather than definitive. Readers are encouraged to question, revise, extend, reinterpret, or independently develop the ideas presented here. Where appropriate, acknowledgment of this paper as one point of encounter in the development of related ideas is appreciated, but such acknowledgment should not be understood as granting the author epistemic ownership over the ideas themselves.

Responsible Use and Rights Reservation

The author encourages good-faith discussion, criticism, independent development, and responsible use of the knowledge presented in this work. The author does not claim exclusive epistemic ownership over the ideas or viewpoints discussed herein, nor claim priority as their first originator.

However, the author expressly reserves all rights and remedies available under applicable law with respect to uses of this work or related materials that involve unlawful conduct, harmful or abusive exploitation, improper commercial appropriation, infringement of applicable intellectual property or other legal rights, or conduct contrary to applicable national, regional, or international law.

This reservation is intended to preserve the ability to respond to misuse and harmful appropriation. It should not be interpreted as restricting legitimate academic inquiry, criticism, independent reasoning, or the further development of related ideas.

1 Introduction

This section states what the paper does with the case it takes up, the order in which it proceeds, and the limits under which its account is offered.

A companion paper proposes a field of study whose object is the street understood as an open system. Heterogeneous flows pass through it; its terrain is heterogeneous in its own right and is physical, economic, institutional and symbolic together; it is forced from outside on several timescales at once; it responds selectively to what arrives; it accumulates a record of what has passed; and it returns what passes through it to the world in an altered state. That paper sets out nine domains of question, nine classes of instrument, and the findings that would defeat the proposal, and it leaves every actual street unexamined.

This paper examines one. Its purpose is threefold. It establishes that the questions of the proposal have determinate content when put to an actual street, in the sense that each admits an answer there and the answer is obtainable. It identifies the records that exist for that street and states what each can support. And it shows that the answers are not already supplied by the accounts under which the street is ordinarily described, which treat its form, its commerce, its sociability and its history separately.

The street is Ginza, a commercial district in central Tokyo occupying eight blocks along a single principal thoroughfare. Three properties recommend it and each corresponds to a requirement the proposal makes of a case. It holds unlike regimes of price, provenance and use within a few hundred metres. It is subject to a documented arrangement that alters its traversable configuration reversibly and on a schedule. And it carries an observational record reaching back a century, together with a documentary record of its physical and institutional form reaching back considerably further.

The argument proceeds as follows. Section 2 states what a single case can establish and what it cannot, and fixes the standing of every claim below. Section 3 delimits the object and draws its boundary. Section 4 sets out the documentary record and the kinds of evidence it contains. Section 5 reads the street as a sequence of layers, since the proposal holds that a street's present state is the product of accumulated passage. Sections 6 to 10 work the field's principal questions through the case in turn: what the flows carry, what the terrain consists of and how steeply it varies, what retains and on what rhythm, how the street converts what reaches it, and what it has kept. Section 11 sets out the identification design the case affords and gives the protocol it requires. Section 12 treats the documented governance record and states what it instances. Section 13 records what the case cannot establish and states what a first campaign of measurement would consist of.

Three conventions govern the evidence below, and each fixes the kind of claim a passage may carry. Every quantitative statement in this paper is drawn from a documentary source and cited to it, so that the reader can trace each figure to the record that supplies it. Every sequence described in Section 5 is a sequence in the documentary record, and the causes standing behind it are left as a question for other work. And the evidential yield of the case is determinacy and availability in place of confirmation, for a reason given in full in Section 2: a case selected for its evident richness lies beyond the reach of discrimination, since every phenomenon the proposal describes will be found in it.

The paper's positive claim is that a street of this kind rewards the questions, that records adequate to several of them already exist, and that the remainder are answerable by work

specifiable now. Section 13 specifies that work as a campaign in four pieces, ordered by what each requires of the others.

2 The Standing of a Single Case

This section fixes what the paper's evidence can support. Its objective is to state in advance the uses of a single case that are legitimate, so that a reader encountering a documented fact about this street knows what is being asserted by it. The section states the uses available, then the use that is unavailable, then the treatment of the sources.

2.1 The Uses Available

Three uses of a single case are legitimate here, each corresponding to a claim the paper makes.

The first is demonstration of determinacy. A question is shown to have determinate content in a setting by exhibiting what an answer to it would look like there and what would count as obtaining one. This use proceeds without measurement and without comparison, and it is the paper's principal purpose.

The second use, demonstration of availability, is a matter of exhibiting sources: a record is shown to exist, to reach a stated period, and to resolve to a stated unit, by exhibiting it. The third use is the identification of a design, in which a setting is shown to permit a comparison of a stated form by exhibiting the arrangement permitting it; Section 11 makes this use and states the protocol the design requires.

2.2 The Use Lying Beyond the Case

Claim 2.1. (**The evidential yield of the case is determinacy in place of confirmation**). A case selected for the properties the proposal describes lies beyond the reach of discrimination between a world in which the proposal holds and one in which it fails, since the properties were the ground of the selection. A demonstration that this street exhibits compressed heterogeneity, selective response and a long record is therefore a demonstration about the selection, and its value lies in the three uses set out above.

What would test the proposal is a comparison including a street for which the proposal predicts nothing of interest, and no such street appears here. Section 13 places that comparison at the head of what remains to be done.

The claim has a consequence for how the sections below should be read. Where a section reports that the case supplies material for a question, the report concerns the material and not the answer. Where a section reports a pattern in the documentary record, the pattern is offered as a description of that record.

2.3 The Treatment of the Sources

The sources used are of four kinds and they differ in what they support.

Municipal and associational documents state rules, dates and the terms of arrangements. They are authoritative for what was decided and when, and they are interested parties in respect of why.

Archival and museum records state the occurrence and extent of events. They are used here for dates, magnitudes and physical descriptions.

A published survey states observations made at a time by a named method. It is used here for what it recorded and for the method it established.

Contemporary reporting states the occurrence of recent changes. It is used here where no documentary source was found and is identified as such.

Where sources disagree, the disagreement is reported in the text and every preference among sources is stated. Section 5 contains one such disagreement over a completion date, and it is stated there.

3 The Object and Its Boundary

This section delimits what the paper takes as its case. Its objective is to fix the extent of the object precisely enough that a later investigator could work on the same thing, and to state which terms are treated as external to it.

3.1 The Extent of the Object

The object is the length of Ginza Street running through the eight numbered blocks of the district, together with the frontages along it and the lanes giving off it. Its extent is fixed by an arrangement described below in Section 11, which closes approximately one kilometre of this thoroughfare to vehicles on stated days [Ginza Official, c], and the paper adopts that kilometre as its boundary in the along-street direction.

The working unit is the segment, meaning a length between intersections. The district's grid derives from a nineteenth-century reconstruction that fixed the principal street at fifteen *ken*, approximately twenty-seven metres, and laid out secondary streets of eight and five *ken* on the scale of the preceding blocks; that layout is the basis of the present block structure [Ginza Official, a]. The segment is therefore a unit with a documented origin in this case, beyond its use as an analytic convenience.

Across the street the object extends to the frontages and to the interiors reached directly from them. Vertically, the object reaches the upper floors of buildings only where their use bears on what occurs at the frontage, since the proposal's terrain is what acts on passage. The vertical cut carries a consequence worth recording: the rules treated in Section 12 regulate height, so the best-documented instrument acting on this street acts above the plane in which most of its flows move, and any account relating the two must cross that cut explicitly.

3.2 The Terms Treated as External

Four classes of term are treated as external, meaning that the paper takes their trajectory as given and asks how the street converts them.

Weather and daylight arrive without mediation and vary on scales from the hourly to the annual.

Calendars arrive through institutional readings and include more than one, since the district receives occasions dated by the domestic calendar and occasions dated elsewhere.

Economic conditions reaching the street from outside include the exchange rate, the cost

and availability of travel, and the disposable resources of the populations that reach it.

Decisions taken above the district include national measures bearing on development, of which Section 12 describes one whose effect on this street was direct and documented.

3.3 The Difficulty This Delimitation Leaves

One difficulty is stated here openly. The district is contiguous with adjoining districts of unlike character, and the boundary drawn here cuts a continuous urban fabric at a line fixed by an administrative arrangement. A flow leaving the object at that line remains in the city, and the paper's treatment of departures in Section 6 inherits this limitation in full.

4 The Documentary Record Available for the Case

This section sets out what is on record for this street and what each record can support. Its objective is to establish availability in the sense of Section 2, since a case whose questions are determinate and whose records are absent would serve no purpose.

4.1 The Observational Record

A survey conducted over four days in May 1925 recorded the appearance, dress and comportment of those present along the principal street of this district, between Kyōbashi and Shimbashi, and reported its findings in proportions; among the women recorded, the share in Western dress was of the order of one in a hundred [Kon, 1925]. The method was subsequently set out as a programme for the systematic recording of contemporary manners, by explicit parallel with the recovery of past ones [Kon and Yoshida, 1930].

Two things follow. The instrument is shown feasible at the resolution the proposal requires, on this street, by execution. And a baseline exists in the composition of the flow at a date a century before any automated instrument, against which a survey conducted today on the same protocol would be directly comparable. Section 13 places the repetition of that survey at the head of the work to be done.

4.2 The Record of Physical Form

The reconstruction of the district after 1872 is documented in government records that state the street widths adopted, the separation of carriageway from footway, the materials specified, and the ordinance regulating the dimensions and quality of the brick to be used [National Archives of Japan]. The fire that occasioned it is recorded with its date, its area and the number of dwellings lost [National Archives of Japan, Tokyo Metropolitan Archives].

4.3 The Record of Rule

The rules governing building in the district are documented by the association that negotiated them and by the ward that enacted them. The record states the height limit adopted in 1998 and the streets to which it applies, the allowance for rooftop structures above it, the revision of 2006 removing the exception provisions, and the subsequent extension of the rules to further classes of use [Ginza Machizukuri Kaigi and Ginza Design Council, b,d]. The association's own account gives the dates of its establishment and of the review body it created [Ginza Machizukuri Kaigi and Ginza Design Council, c].

The arrangement closing the street to vehicles is documented in its terms and its conduct: the date of its introduction, the districts in which it was introduced together, the party at whose instance it was introduced, its hours in each half of the year, its extent, and the activities it prohibits [Ginza Official, b,c].

4.4 The Record of Occurrence

The first day of that arrangement is recorded by the ward with its date and an estimate of attendance [Chuo City], and its suspension is recorded in contemporary reporting [Tokyo Shimbun].

4.5 The Absences in the Record

Three things the proposal requires are absent from the record, and their absence is as informative as its contents.

What arrivals carry stands unrecorded. The composition of the flow is documented for four days in 1925, and comparable resolution is absent from every period since.

Departures stand unrecorded. The documentary record leaves what departs indistinguishable from what arrived, which is the quantity the proposal makes central.

A continuous series at segment resolution is absent for every quantity of interest. The rules and arrangements are dated, the events are dated, and the state of the street between them survives in photographs alone.

5 The Street Read as a Sequence of Layers

This section reads the case as an accumulation. Its objective is to exhibit the sequence of impositions and settlements that produced the present street, since the proposal holds that a street's state is the product of accumulated passage and that the accumulation is ordered. The section gives the sequence, then the properties of the sequence that bear on the proposal.

5.1 The Sequence

The district takes its name from an office of the shogunate for the minting of silver coin, moved to a site south of Kyōbashi in 1612; the office was removed to another quarter in 1801, and the name persisted as a common designation for the area thereafter [Ginza Official, a, Ginza Tenkuni]. The first layer is therefore a name outliving the institution that produced it.

The second layer arrived by destruction. A fire on 3 April 1872, beginning outside the district, destroyed the greater part of it; the area burned is recorded at some ninety-five hectares, with about four thousand eight hundred dwellings lost [National Archives of Japan, Wikipedia]. The government took the occasion to rebuild the district in fire-resistant construction, and the plan had two parts: a street layout widening the principal thoroughfare to fifteen *ken*, separating carriageway from footway, laying a brick footway, installing gas lighting and planting street trees; and the construction of brick buildings in a Western manner [Ginza Official, a, Tokyo Metropolitan Archives]. An ordinance of March 1872 specified the quality, dimensions, appearance and method of the brickwork [National Archives of Japan].

Completion of that reconstruction is the one point at which the sources part company: one municipal archive gives 1874, while the national archive and the district's own history give 1877 [Tokyo Metropolitan Archives, National Archives of Japan, Ginza Official, a]. The disagreement is reported here and left open.

The buildings so produced were sold to private hands, and their reception forms a layer of its own. The price was high, the brick proved poor in quality, the interiors were damp, goods stored in them spoiled, and the district's own history records that many stood empty at first [Ginza Official, a].

The twentieth century deposited layers of rule and of record in alternation. A national building law of 1919 limited height to one hundred *shaku*, approximately thirty-one metres; the limit persisted after the war, and buildings of that height from the period remain on the street [Ginza Machizukuri Kaigi and Ginza Design Council, b]. Six years after the law, the survey of 1925 recorded the composition of those present [Kon, 1925], laying down the observational stratum treated in Section 4. Half a century later again, an arrangement introduced on 2 August 1970 closed the principal street to vehicles on stated days [Ginza Official, b], beginning the weekly alternation on which Section 11 rests.

A district plan enacted in 1998, after negotiation between the ward and an association of the district's occupants, set a maximum height of fifty-six metres on four named streets, with a further ten metres permitted for rooftop structures [Ginza Machizukuri Kaigi and Ginza Design Council, b,d]. A metropolitan ordinance on outdoor advertising prevents advertising above fifty-two metres, so that what stands above a building of the permitted height can be a structure and not a sign [Ginza Machizukuri Kaigi and Ginza Design Council, b].

In 2003 a redevelopment proposal was made for a building of nearly two hundred metres spanning two blocks, under exception provisions then available. An association was established in March 2004 in response; the plan was revised in 2006 to remove those provisions, and a review body was established in the same year [Ginza Machizukuri Kaigi and Ginza Design Council, c,b]. The rules were extended in 2019 to set standards for accommodation uses [Ginza Machizukuri Kaigi and Ginza Design Council, d], and a third edition of the district's design rules was issued in 2021 [Ginza Machizukuri Kaigi and Ginza Design Council, a].

5.2 The Properties of the Sequence

Four properties of this sequence bear on the proposal, and each corresponds to a mechanism the proposal names.

Observation 5.1. (**The layers are of unlike kinds and persist for unlike periods**). A name has outlasted its institution by more than two centuries. A street width imposed in the 1870s persists in the present block structure. A height limit was replaced after eighty years. A survey lasted four days and its record has lasted a century. The proposal's treatment of deposition requires media of differing durability, and the case exhibits them.

Observation 5.2. (**An imposed terrain was initially rejected by its occupants**). The brick buildings of the 1870s were built to specification, were of poor quality in use, and stood empty. The terrain was altered by decision and the flow declined to occupy it, which is a documented case of the proposal's two relations moving against one another.

Observation 5.3. (**The interruptions are as informative as the layers**). The record contains a fire, a war, a suspension in 2020, and the removal of an institution in 1801. The proposal treats an interval absent from a record as data, and the case supplies four such intervals, each with a documented cause.

Observation 5.4. (**The most recent layer is a rule about rules**). The sequence from 1998 to 2006 produced a limit, and alongside it a body that reviews proposals against agreed criteria. What was deposited in that period is a procedure, and Section 12 takes up what follows.

6 The Flows and the Composition They Carry

This section puts the proposal's first question to the case. Its objective is to state what would be asked of this street's flows, what the record supplies, and what an answer would require.

6.1 The Question Put to the Case

The proposal holds that a flow is characterised by what it carries and that a count is a summary that discards the property of interest. Put to this street, the question is what arrives, from where, carrying what, and in what altered state it departs.

The district receives arrivals of markedly unlike provenance, including residents of the metropolitan area, workers in the surrounding offices, domestic visitors from outside the region, and visitors from abroad. Provenance, however, is one dimension of a larger object. The composition the proposal asks after includes the language an arrival can transact in, the purpose of the visit, the time available for it, prior acquaintance with the street, and the capacity and willingness to spend, and each of these bears on what the terrain of Section 7 does to that arrival. The same arrivals reach the district at unlike times, and Section 8 takes up that variation.

6.2 The Contribution of the Existing Record

The record supplies one observation of composition and it is a century old. The 1925 survey recorded dress, comportment and activity by position along the street, and reported proportions [Kon, 1925]. Its headline proportion concerns a transition then in progress, and what makes it useful here is neither the proportion nor the transition but the fact that a composition was registered at all, at the resolution of the individual and the frontage.

For the present the record leaves composition unrecorded. Contemporary accounts describe the visible presence of visitors from abroad along the street on the days the vehicle-free arrangement is in force, and such accounts are reporting and not measurement [Ginza Official, c].

6.3 The Form an Answer Would Take

An answer requires the composition registered at entry and at departure on the same individuals, with a comparison population that did not traverse the street. The comparison population is what separates alteration from selection, since a district drawing arrivals unlike the wider population will present every appearance of having altered them.

An instrument of that description remains to be built. What the case does supply is the

1925 protocol, which registers composition at entry to the extent that composition is visible, at a resolution no automated instrument matches, and which can be repeated. A repetition would establish a comparison across a century on identical terms: the same positions, the same visible dimensions of composition, the same reporting in proportions. Set beside the 1925 result, a present survey would register a transition of the same order as the one the original caught in progress, with the direction of travel reversed, since the dress and comportment then arriving from abroad now constitute the local baseline against which visitors stand out. Departure would remain untouched by it.

Observation 6.1. (The case supplies an entry-side instrument alone). The oldest instrument available for this street resolves what the newest instruments leave aside, and the quantity the proposal makes central remains unregistered in either. The asymmetry is a property of the available instruments in place of this street.

7 The Terrain and Its Components

This section puts the proposal's second question to the case. Its objective is to exhibit the components of terrain on this street, to show that they resist combination into a single measure, and to state what the compression question would require.

7.1 The Components Present on This Street

The proposal treats terrain as everything at a location that acts on what passes it, with physical, economic, institutional and symbolic components held separately.

The physical component is documented from its imposition: a carriageway and footway separated in the 1870s, a principal street of approximately twenty-seven metres, and a grid of secondary streets on the earlier block scale [Ginza Official, a].

The institutional component is documented in the rules: a height limit applying to four named streets, an allowance above it for structures and not for signs, a review body assessing proposals against agreed criteria, and standards applying to particular classes of use [Ginza Machizukuri Kaigi and Ginza Design Council, b,d,c].

The economic component is present in the price level of what is offered along the frontage and in the terms on which occupancy is held. It is absent from every source used here.

The symbolic component is present in what the frontage displays and in what is said about the district elsewhere. The district's own materials are a source for the first and an interested party in respect of the second.

7.2 The Resistance of the Components to Combination

The case exhibits directly why these components cannot be summed. The height rule and the advertising ordinance interact in a manner that no single scale represents: a building may stand at fifty-six metres, and what may occupy the space above fifty-two metres is restricted by a separate instrument to structures without advertising content [Ginza Machizukuri Kaigi and Ginza Design Council, b]. The resulting terrain has a physical component, an institutional component and a symbolic component that act at different heights on different classes of party, and a scalar index of the street's terrain would have chosen a weighting among them.

The point generalises to those who traverse the street. A price threshold acts on some arrivals and passes others by; a language of service acts on some and passes others by; the standing of a name acts on those who recognise it. Two people at one position are traversing unlike landscapes, and the case makes this visible in a district whose frontages address markedly unlike populations within a few metres.

7.3 The Compression Question

The proposal asks how steeply the terrain varies over distance, and expresses the answer as a ratio between the distance over which the terrain changes appreciably and the distance an arrival traverses in a visit.

Put to this street the question is answerable in principle and unanswered in fact. The numerator requires a record of what arrivals actually walk, which the case awaits. The denominator requires the terrain field of the preceding subsection at frontage resolution, which the record supplies for the institutional component alone.

Observation 7.1. (**The institutional component of terrain is the best documented and the least often measured**). For this street, the rules governing frontage, height and use are recorded, dated and public, while price, language of service and standing stand unrecorded. Accounts of streets ordinarily proceed in the reverse order, treating the commercial character as evident and the rules as background.

8 Retention and the Rhythm of the Street

This section puts the proposal's questions about retention and about time to the case. Its objective is to state what the case makes measurable now, since more of this domain is within reach here than of any other.

8.1 The Question Put to the Case

The proposal holds that the distribution of the time arrivals spend in a segment carries more than its mean, that a transit shorter than the duration an exchange requires forecloses that exchange at any rate of arrival, and that a street holds several periodicities at once.

8.2 The Periodicities the Case Exhibits

The street exhibits periodicity at several scales and the sources document some of them directly.

At the daily scale the composition of those present turns over as premises open and close, and the declared hours of the frontages are public and revised by their occupants.

At the weekly scale the vehicle-free arrangement operates on Saturdays, Sundays and public holidays, beginning at noon [Ginza Official, c]. This is a periodicity imposed by rule, with a known phase and a known period, which is unusual and which Section 11 exploits.

At the seasonal scale the same arrangement changes its own duration, running to eighteen o'clock from April to September and to seventeen o'clock from October to March [Ginza Official, c]. The arrangement therefore carries an annual component in its duration as well as a weekly component in its occurrence.

At the annual scale the street receives dated occasions arriving on more than one calendar, since a district drawing visitors from abroad receives occasions fixed by calendars its own institutions do not set.

8.3 The Instrument the Case Makes Available

The proposal identifies declared opening hours as a direct registration of the effective terrain in time, on the ground that a holding remains open while the return exceeds the cost, so that its closing hour is a statement by the party best placed to make it.

For this street the declaration is public at the resolution of the holding, and the district contains frontages whose declared hours differ widely within a few hundred metres. The instrument is therefore available here now, at no cost beyond compilation, and it yields the effective terrain as a function of position and time.

Observation 8.1. (The seasonal adjustment of the arrangement is a rule that tracks daylight). The vehicle-free arrangement ends an hour later in the summer half of the year than in the winter half [Ginza Official, c]. A rule fixed by an institution has thereby been made to follow a physical periodicity that the institution does not control, and the case supplies a documented instance of an institutional reading tracking an unmediated forcing.

8.4 The Quantity Still Out of Reach

The distribution of transit times lies beyond every source used here. Its estimation requires paired observation at entry and exit, and Section 13 places it in the campaign to be designed.

9 Forcing and the Conversion the Street Performs

This section puts the proposal's question about external forcing to the case. Its objective is to identify the forcings this street receives, to exhibit one documented instance of a response becoming a structure, and to state what a response function would require.

9.1 The Forcings the Street Receives

Four classes of forcing reach this street and the record documents the arrival of each.

Physical forcing arrives unmediated. The vehicle-free arrangement is suspended in high wind and heavy snow [Ginza Official, c], so that a meteorological condition acts directly on the institutional configuration of the street.

Calendrical forcing arrives through institutional readings, and the district receives occasions on more than one calendar.

Economic forcing arrives through the conditions bearing on those who travel to the district.

Decisions taken above the district arrive as changes in what may be built. The 2003 proposal was made under exception provisions available through a national measure, and the district's response was to seek the removal of those provisions from the plan governing it [Ginza Machizukuri Kaigi and Ginza Design Council, c,b].

9.2 A Documented Instance of a Response Becoming a Structure

The proposal holds that a response to a recurring forcing may cease to be a response and become a standing arrangement, and asks what marks the passage. The case supplies an instance in which the passage is dated.

The vehicle-free arrangement was introduced in 1970 in four districts of the city at the instance of the metropolitan governor, in response to conditions of the period, namely the growth of motor traffic and its consequences for congestion and air [Ginza Official, b]. It was a response to a forcing. It has since acquired hours that vary by season, a defined extent, a set of prohibited activities, a signal by which it begins, and a body that conducts it [Ginza Official, c]. It is now part of the street's terrain in the proposal's sense, and the forcing that occasioned it has changed.

Observation 9.1. (A response has outlasted its occasion and become terrain). The conditions that produced the arrangement in 1970 differ from those sustaining it now, and the arrangement is conducted with a regularity and an apparatus exceeding what a response requires. Of the four districts in which it was introduced together, few continue it [Ginza Official, c], so the passage from response to structure occurred in some settings and not in others under a common origin.

Observation 9.1 is the closest the case comes to a comparison, and it falls short of one. The districts differ in every respect, and the record used here leaves the reason for each discontinuation unstated.

9.3 The Form a Response Function Would Take

The proposal asks what accounts for the differing responses of streets to a common forcing, and expresses the answer as a property of the street.

For this case the required observations are a dated series of a street quantity and a dated series of the forcings. The second is available for calendrical and meteorological forcing without cost. The first lies beyond every source used here at a resolution finer than the annual, and Section 13 states what would supply it.

10 Deposition and the Retained State of the Street

This section puts the proposal's question about deposition to the case. Its objective is to identify the media in which this street has retained what passed through it, and to state the discrimination that any claim of retention here would have to make.

10.1 The Media of Retention

Section 5 exhibited the sequence of impositions and settlements; the present section reads the same material a second time, as a set of media differing in what they hold and for how long. The longest-lived medium in the case is a name, retained for four centuries and outlasting by two the minting office that produced it [Ginza Tenkuni, Ginza Official, a]. Built form comes next in durability: the street layout imposed in the 1870s persists in the present block structure and in the width of the principal thoroughfare [Ginza Official, a]. Rule occupies an intermediate position, since the height limit of 1919 was retained for eighty years before

its replacement, while the buildings erected under it remain standing on the street [Ginza Machizukuri Kaigi and Ginza Design Council, b]. Procedure is the youngest medium, the review apparatus of 2006 having been retained for two decades and extended twice [Ginza Machizukuri Kaigi and Ginza Design Council, d,a]. Alongside these stands a medium of a different kind, the observational record, of which the case holds a four-day specimen from 1925 preserved now for a century [Kon, 1925].

10.2 The Interruptions

The record contains intervals in which what was accumulating was removed. The fire of 1872 destroyed the greater part of the district's fabric [National Archives of Japan, Wikipedia]. The removal of the minting office in 1801 ended the institution while the name persisted [Ginza Tenkuni]. The suspension of the vehicle-free arrangement from the end of March 2020 interrupted a weekly regularity that had held for half a century [Tokyo Shimbun].

Observation 10.1. (**The interruptions here are documented with their causes, which is uncommon**). The proposal treats an absent interval as data and states that distinguishing a period of removal from a period without deposition is difficult. For this street the distinction is available for each interruption named, because the cause is separately recorded.

10.3 The Discrimination a Claim of Retention Requires

The proposal holds that a system driven by irregular disturbance and possessing weak damping exhibits slow variation and long apparent persistence without retaining anything, and that a claim of retention must be established against that account.

The material assembled above meets a weaker standard, and the section claims it at that strength. What it exhibits is a set of features that have persisted, which stands consistent with retention and equally consistent with the alternative. The observation that would separate them concerns whether the street's present response depends on the order in which its prior states occurred, at fixed present composition, and the sources used here leave it untouched.

Observation 10.2. (**Persistence of a feature is weaker evidence than it appears**). A street exhibiting a four-century name, a nineteenth-century street width and a twentieth-century weekly rhythm presents a strong impression of accumulated history. The proposal holds that this impression is exactly what the alternative account also produces, so the case is an instance in which the most suggestive evidence proves the least discriminating.

11 The Identification Design the Case Affords

This section sets out the comparison this street makes available and the protocol it requires. Its objective is to convert an arrangement made for other reasons into a design, since the proposal holds that a street is not run twice and that comparison must stand in place of repetition.

11.1 The Arrangement

An arrangement in force since 2 August 1970 closes approximately one kilometre of the principal street to vehicles on Saturdays, Sundays and public holidays. The closure begins at

noon on a signal, runs to eighteen o'clock between April and September and to seventeen o'clock between October and March, and is conducted by the police together with the district's associations, who install the barriers and place parasols and benches on the carriageway [Ginza Official, b,c].

11.2 The Design It Supplies

The arrangement alters the traversable configuration of the street while the fabric stands unchanged. On the days it operates, a carriageway of approximately twenty-seven metres becomes traversable and furnished; on other days it carries vehicles and the footways carry the flow.

The alternation gives many paired observations of one street under two terrains, with the occupants, the fabric, the season and the composition of arrivals held as nearly fixed as any field setting permits. Three properties make the design strong. The alternation recurs weekly, so a single occasion contributes one pair among many. The two configurations are separated by hours, so quantities that move slowly do not move between them. And the assignment is made by an authority for reasons unconnected with any investigation.

11.3 The Protocol

A campaign using this design requires four things.

Observation must be paired within a weekend, comparing a day on which the arrangement operates with an adjacent day on which it does not, so that weather and season are held.

Observation must be positioned, since the arrangement alters the carriageway and leaves the footway, and a measurement aggregated across the cross-section conflates a configuration that changed with one that did not.

Observation must register composition and not only rate, by the protocol of 1925 or a successor, since the proposal holds that the rate is a summary of the composition.

Observation must extend across seasons, since the arrangement's own duration varies annually and a campaign confined to one half of the year has sampled one of its two configurations.

11.4 The Limitations of the Design

Three limitations bound it and each is a property of this arrangement.

The assignment is deliberate. A district subject to such an arrangement differs systematically from the remainder, and Section 9 noted that few of the districts in which the arrangement began still conduct it.

The alternation is anticipated. Occupants provision and staff for the days it operates, so what is observed under either configuration includes preparation for the other, and the response measured is a response to the schedule.

Observation 11.1. (**The arrangement withholds at the moment it releases**)**.** Performances, the playing of instruments, the sale of goods and all vehicles including bicycles are prohibited within the arrangement by its own terms [Ginza Official, c]. The instrument that opens

the carriageway to those on foot simultaneously forbids the activities by which an opened space is ordinarily occupied. For the design this is a constraint on interpretation, since what is measured is the effect of an opening under restriction. For the proposal it is an instance in which a limit on conversion is written into the instrument, and Section 12 takes it up.

12 The Governance Record and Its Bearing on the Proposal

This section reads the documented governance of this district against the proposal's claims about what an authority can act upon. Its objective is to state which of those claims the case instances, and to state plainly that instancing a claim is not evidence for it.

12.1 The Episode

A district plan enacted in 1998, after negotiation between the ward and an association of the district's occupants, set a maximum height of fifty-six metres on four named streets, with a further ten metres permitted for rooftop structures [Ginza Machizukuri Kaigi and Ginza Design Council, b]. In 2003 a proposal was made for a building of nearly two hundred metres spanning two blocks, using exception provisions available under a national measure of the period. An association of the district's parties was established in March 2004; in 2006 the plan was revised to remove those provisions, retaining a narrow exception for large developments contributing to the maintenance of cultural functions in a designated area, and a review body was established to assess proposals against agreed criteria [Ginza Machizukuri Kaigi and Ginza Design Council, b,c]. The rules have since been extended, and a third edition of the district's design rules was issued in 2021 [Ginza Machizukuri Kaigi and Ginza Design Council, d,a].

12.2 The Claims the Episode Instances

Three claims of the proposal find an instance here.

The proposal holds that an authority acts on the conditions and the landscape and not on the outcome. What the episode produced is a height limit, a set of criteria and a procedure. A specification of what should occupy the district is absent from the record.

The proposal holds that the operable variable supplies no maximand. The instruments adopted here restrict, and the district's own account of them describes rules to be continued, detailed and updated [Ginza Machizukuri Kaigi and Ginza Design Council, a]. A programme of maximisation is absent from the record throughout.

The proposal holds that the last thing deposited may be a procedure in place of a state. The review body established in 2006 is an apparatus for deciding future cases, and Observation 5.4 recorded it as the most recent layer.

12.3 The Distributive Question the Episode Raises

The proposal holds that a condition set for a street is borne by identifiable parties and that an account reporting the instrument without its incidence has reported half of the matter.

The episode is a case in point and the record used here does not answer it. A height limit falls on whoever holds a site whose value would be realised by building above it, and it falls on parties who would occupy such a building. The benefit is diffuse and is described by the

district's own account in terms of the character of the street. The parties on the two sides are different parties, one identifiable and one not, and the record consulted for this paper states the rule and leaves its incidence unstated.

Observation 12.1. (**An instance falls short of evidence**)**.** That an episode is consistent with three claims of the proposal establishes that the claims have application. Their truth remains open, since an episode selected because it exhibits them was bound to exhibit them. What the case supplies here is the demonstration that the claims are about something.

12.4 The Reflexive Point the Case Makes Concrete

The proposal holds that an epistemology rendering a street measurable renders the people in it measurable, and that a report should state the uses its result makes available.

Section 11 above specifies a protocol for registering the composition of those present on a public street, at the resolution of the individual, on paired days. That protocol is the 1925 method with modern equipment, and it is an instrument of observation of persons whatever the purpose of the observer. Section 13 states what a proposal to run it would have to settle before it were run.

13 Limits and the First Campaign of Measurement

This section closes the paper. Its objective is to record what the case cannot establish and to specify the work that would follow from it.

13.1 The Limits of the Case's Evidence

Four limits are stated.

The evidential yield of the case is determinacy in place of confirmation, for the reason given in Claim 2.1. What the proposal requires is a comparison including a street for which it predicts nothing of interest, and Section 13 places that comparison first below for that reason.

The case is documented unevenly. Its institutional terrain is recorded, dated and public; its economic and symbolic terrain is absent from every source consulted here; and its flows are recorded once, in 1925.

The case is particular in its arrangements. A district with an association capable of negotiating a district plan, and with a weekly closure conducted by its own bodies, stands apart from the ordinary street, and the transfer of anything found here to streets governed otherwise is untested.

The case supports description of sequence and leaves causation to other work. Every sequence in Section 5 is a sequence in the documentary record, and whether an earlier item produced a later one remains a question for the comparative work named below.

13.2 The Campaign the Case Makes Possible

Four pieces of work follow, in an order determined by what each requires of the others.

The first is the compilation of declared opening hours across the district's holdings, repeated at intervals. It proceeds without instrumentation, access or consent, it yields the

effective terrain in time at the resolution of the holding, and it begins the dated series that Section 9 found absent. It should be extended at once to a set of streets selected to vary the properties the proposal names, including a residential street for which the proposal predicts nothing of interest.

The second is the repetition of the 1925 survey on its own protocol, at the same positions along the same street, reported in the same form. It establishes a comparison across a century on identical terms, and its cost is the observer's time. Section 12 states what it raises.

The third is the paired-day campaign of Section 11, which requires the second to have fixed a protocol for registering composition, and which should begin in one season and extend across the year.

The fourth is the estimation of the distribution of transit times, which requires paired observation at entry and exit and is the most demanding of the four. It is placed last because the first three produce the record against which its results would be read.

13.3 The Conditions the Second and Third Pieces Require

The second and third pieces of work involve the observation of persons on a public street, at the resolution of the individual, recorded and retained.

A proposal to conduct them should state who holds the record, what is retained and for how long, under what conditions it is released, and what is done with material identifying particular persons. The 1925 survey was conducted and published without such a statement, and that absence stands as history in place of precedent. A proposal that specifies the measurement and leaves the holding unspecified has specified the easy part.

13.4 The Question the Case Leaves Open

One question arises from the case that the companion proposal did not anticipate.

The arrangement described in Section 11 opens a carriageway and simultaneously forbids performance, music and sale within it. It has been conducted for more than half a century, while the same arrangement introduced on the same day in three other districts has largely lapsed. Whether the restriction is a condition of the durability remains undetermined here. What would bear on it is a comparison across arrangements of both kinds, including those that were discontinued, and the record of the discontinued cases awaits consultation.

References

Chuo City. Ginza: The district then and now. `https://www.city.chuo.lg.jp/miryoku/imamukashi/ginza.html`. Accessed 2026.

Ginza Machizukuri Kaigi and Ginza Design Council. The rules of the district. `https://www.ginza-machidukuri.jp/design/rule_ginza.php`, a. Third edition of the district design rules issued 1 February 2021; accessed 2026.

Ginza Machizukuri Kaigi and Ginza Design Council. On the height of buildings in the district. `https://www.ginza-machidukuri.jp/column/32/`, b. Accessed 2026.

Ginza Machizukuri Kaigi and Ginza Design Council. Ginza machizukuri kaigi: Establishment and purpose. https://www.ginza-machidukuri.jp/about/, c. Accessed 2026.

Ginza Machizukuri Kaigi and Ginza Design Council. The rules of the ward. https://www.ginza-machidukuri.jp/design/rule_chuoku.php, d. Accessed 2026.

Ginza Official. History of the ginza district. https://www.ginza.jp/history, a. Accessed 2026.

Ginza Official. The vehicle-free arrangement on ginza street. https://www.ginza.jp/townguide/pedestrian-zone, b. Accessed 2026.

Ginza Official. Conduct of the vehicle-free arrangement. https://www.ginza.jp/qa/vol-06, c. Accessed 2026.

Ginza Tenkuni. The history of ginza. https://www.tenkuni.com/column02/. Origin of the district name in the silver mint office moved in 1612 and removed in 1801; accessed 2026.

Wajiro Kon. Record of ginza street customs. *Fujin Kōron*, 1925. Survey conducted in Ginza, Tokyo, over four days in May 1925; published July 1925.

Wajiro Kon and Kenkichi Yoshida. *Modernologio*. Shun'yōdō, Tokyo, 1930.

National Archives of Japan. Learning from disaster: From meiji to the present. https://www.archives.go.jp/exhibition/digital/saigai/contents/02_040.html. Fire of 26 February 1872 by the old calendar; ordinance of March 1872 on brick construction; accessed 2026.

Tokyo Metropolitan Archives. Documents concerning the ginza brick district. https://www.soumu.metro.tokyo.lg.jp/01soumu-archives/07edo_tokyo/0701syoko_kara02. Accessed 2026.

Tokyo Shimbun. The ginza vehicle-free arrangement fifty years on. https://www.tokyo-np.co.jp/article/46568. Accessed 2026.

Wikipedia. Ginza taika. https://ja.wikipedia.org/wiki/%E9%8A%80%E5%BA%A7%E5%A4%A7%E7%81%AB. Used only for the recorded area and number of dwellings lost; accessed 2026.