

[Article]

## Characteristics of 'Shopping Districts' from the Perspective of Pre-war and Wartime Shopping District Organizations (part 1)

Mitsuhisa HAMA

Faculty of Commerce  
Nagoya Gakuin University

### Abstract

This study considers the relationship between shopping districts and machidukuri (community building), with particular focus from the perspective of shopping districts in the early Showa period. The recognition of policy in relation to shopping districts indicates there were proactive local movements that led to the revisions of the Merchants Association Law. Resource materials from the time have identified the type of presence that shopping districts had at such time.

**Keywords:** Shopping districts, machidukuri (community building), merchants association, shopping district activities

## 戦前－戦中期の商店街組織からみる「商店街」の特性（その1）

濱 満 久

名古屋学院大学商学部

### 要 旨

本稿は商店街とまちづくりにどのような関係があるのかを、特に昭和初期の商店街に焦点あてながら考察する。商店街が政策的に認識されていった背景には、現場での積極的な活動があったことを示し、それが商業組合法の改正にもつながったことを指摘する。そのような中で、商店街という存在がどのように存在したのかを、当時の資料から明らかにした。

**キーワード：**商店街，まちづくり，商業組合，商店街活動

---

発行日 2014年12月31日

## 1. Introduction

The decline of shopping districts is considered to be a major problem. This is because the decay of central urban areas is considered to be a problem not only for commerce but also for regions as a whole. However, first we need to consider why shopping districts are important for regions. In fact, while not being a criticism of such interpretation<sup>1)</sup>, promotion of commerce, particularly shopping districts, is undeniably an important aspect of machidukuri (community building).

In this report, we examine the reasons why shopping districts are currently putting effort into machidukuri by considering past periods when there were sudden rises in the prosperity of Japanese shopping district associations. Specifically, we focus on the activities of shopping districts in the early part of the Showa era. Concerns about the social problem of shopping districts were raised about the same time as the Merchants Association Law was enacted in the early part of the Showa era, so we expect that looking at shopping districts at the time will provide some suggestions for the current situation. In the following, we provide a simple review of past research to put this study in context.

Past research has considered the establishment of the law in the early part of the Showa era and the activities of shopping districts at the time (Ishihara, 1985; Yoshida, 1985; Kawano, 1995, 1992). Nevertheless, past analysis has all focused on the period from the enactment of the law up until wartime. That is, there has been virtually no analysis of the situation before the law was enacted and little analysis of the situation after entering the war in particular.

However, the activities of shopping districts did not suddenly appear with the establishment of 'shopping districts' under the law. Similarly, the 'shopping districts' themselves did not disappear just because there was a war. The special conditions during the war certainly may have caused transformation of shopping districts, but 'shopping districts' themselves did not disappear. The system under the Merchants Association Law certainly supported the activities of shopping districts, but it can also be said that such activities supported the system.

There are two aspects that we note as features of the aforementioned past research. One was that higher level of interest in the organization of shopping districts due to the system under the Merchants Association Law rather than the 'shopping districts' themselves. The other was the divide between the pre-war period and during the war. The constraints on materials due to the war and the fact that there were special circumstances at the time meant shopping districts suddenly seemed to cease to exist as an analysis subject as soon as the war began. The period analyzed in this study extends from before the law was enacted until the end of the war. The importance significance of this study is that we consider the period to be a series of events and examine the state of 'shopping districts' themselves.

Furthermore, two aspects can be noted in relation to past research that has focused on the shopping districts themselves. First, Ishihara (2004) analyzed the dynamics of the retail sector for about 100

years from the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. He also conducted detailed analysis of the arrangements for small retailer under the wartime regime. He noted that even if the original function of commerce itself was lost, 'merchants performed the role' of the distribution function to ensure that goods 'reached all citizens in as fair as way as possible' (p. 278). In other words, although the commercial function was dissolved, he clarified the existence of 'merchants' the types of behavior they adopted.

Next, Furo (2009) took pre-war and wartime distribution not as an aspect of 'political history', but 'distribution' itself. That is, the history of distribution itself can be understood not by repeatedly asking about the political history of distribution, but about the 'distribution theory or historical distribution significance' of the arrangements the nation put in place for 'a full-fledged non-market distribution system' (Preface, pp. 1-3).

Nevertheless, the core themes of these two aspects were 'small retailer' and 'distribution' and there was no direct examination of 'shopping districts'. We consider that perspective in this study by examining 'shopping districts' in a series of pre-war and wartime events.

In the following, we first consider the change in perceptions of the policy targets in policies when looking at shopping districts. Merchants association were taken to be the targets for policies relating to shopping districts because it was recognized that local trends caused government response. We also discuss how shopping districts were the basis on which merchants association were founded. Lastly, we discuss shopping district organizations under the wartime regime and the form they took.

## 2. Change in the status of shopping districts in terms of policy

### 2.1 Pursuit of more rationalism with retail business policies

First, we provide a simple summary of the situation at the time. The socio-economic situation at the time was for successive panics following World War I and the Great Kanto Earthquake of 1923. The earthquake was the direct cause of the friction between department stores and small- and medium-sized retailers as the former began to appeal to the masses, creating the so-called small- and medium-sized retailer problem. Until that time, they had catered to different types of customers (Suzuki, 1980). Furthermore, the panic had a direct impact on rural areas and pushed populations into urban areas. While urban areas were mainly engaged in commercial and industrial activities, they were also affected by similar panics.

Therefore, the industrial sector was also unable to absorb the population inflow, but the need for provisions to live meant there was a large inflow of people into the easy-to-join retail sector. This led to severe competition among small- and medium-sized retailers (Taniguchi, 1936; Oshima, 1937a). There is a growing opposition movement to organizations likely to be a threat to the existence of small- and medium-sized retailers due to the developments in the aforementioned small- and medium-sized retail business problem. This is the opposition movement against department stores (Suzuki, 1980),

and evolved into the opposition movement against industrial associations in rural areas (Nakanishi, 1936). In the following, we consider the status that shopping districts had under such conditions in terms of policy.

First, it is not as though shopping districts themselves initially had status in terms of policy. There was initially not even clear status for small- and medium-sized retail businesses in terms of policy. Small retail businesses probably became an issue in terms of policy once the opposition movement against department stores made itself heard, because the wretched state of small- and medium-sized retail businesses came to be seen as a social problem. That is, there was direct reference made once there was awareness of the small- and medium-sized retail businesses problem.

So, why types of policy concerns were there? They were clearly evident in the “policies for improving the consumer economy” released by the third special committee of the government’s commerce panel one year after the committee was established in 1927. The report urged the government to organize middlemen to reduce the difference between wholesale prices and retail prices and encourage consumers to save.

At this stage, there were no measures that directly dealt with the wretched conditions of small- and medium-sized retail businesses, and the issue was to rationalize the distribution system through organization of middlemen (Edited by the Ministry of International Trade and Industry, 1980). That is, at this stage small- and medium-sized retail businesses were not subject to assistance in terms of policy. They were considered part of the rationalization process that was the basic policy direction at the time. In addition, the problem of rationalization had only been raised at this stage and there were no specific policy measures for improving the situation.

The following year, improvements for the retail system were once again entrusted to the same third special committee of the commerce panel to consider the aforementioned specific policy measures. The results of the meeting were released in December that year in the “policies for improving the retail system.” With the recognition of the existence of small- and medium-sized retail businesses as “the obvious need for small- and medium-sized retail businesses to exist alongside large retail sales organizations” (the Ministry of International Trade and Industry, ed. 1980, p. 171) in this report, rationalization did not refer to simply excluding traders from the distribution system. That is, as an “appropriate policy for improvement for the small- and medium-sized retail business system was established” (*Ibid.*, p. 171) and small- and medium-sized retail businesses themselves were finally given status at this stage. However, “it needs to be emphasized that this does not mean that large-scale retailers were suppressed; rather, this means that small- and medium-sized retailers that were lagging had to be promoted on equal footing with large scale retail businesses” (*Ibid.*). Therefore, the committee was merely pursuing rationalization and called for “small- and medium-sized retailers’ own self-defense” (*Ibid.*). A specific measure for this was the policy direction to create collaboration among small- and medium-sized retail businesses on grounds that “the combination of resources and capacity

would be most effective" (*Ibid.*, p. 172).

The collaborative organization for small- and medium-sized retail businesses envisaged here was the cooperative department store, chain store, shopping district, buying-and-selling cooperative, and the retail market. Although shopping districts are referred to as a specific policy for improvements in small- and medium-sized retail business, there was no consideration given to the special nature of shopping districts, which are given the same status as other cooperatives. At this stage, although small-and medium-sized retail businesses were directly targeted, no thought had been given to the specific type of business that could develop with the "combination of resources and capacity." That is, there was merely emphasis given to the aspects of "collaboration" among small- and medium-sized retail businesses. Therefore, shopping districts were not given clear status.

Although there were various oppositions<sup>2)</sup> from former associations that were cooperatives of the same business type, the aforementioned policies were adopted, and the Merchants Association Law was promulgated in September 1932 following some fine-tuning. Consequently, the collaboration of small- and medium-sized retail businesses was proposed as a specific policy of rationalization to deal with the small- and medium-sized retail business problem. However, this was not extended to considering shopping districts as a specific form. This is because the focus of the specific rationalization policies envisaged with this law was scale merit through joint purchasing (Kawakami, 1936a). Therefore, there were difficulties such as the inability for shopping districts comprised of different types of business to pursue such merits (Shiraji, 1936; Iwasaki, 1937).

Because of this, it was envisaged that there would be associations by business type comprised of like-businesses, and this was clearly modeled on voluntary chains that were popular in the U.S. at the time (Takebayashi, 1937). The law had not at all envisaged cooperatives of different business types in shopping districts, and they were considered to be "an exception among exceptions." (Taniguchi, 1937a, p. 4). This is clearly because of the complete disregard in the policy for shopping districts.

## 2.2 Status in the principal form of a merchants association

The small- and medium-sized retail business problem showed no signs of being resolved following the enactment of the Merchants Association Law in October that year, and the government continued to deliberate on improvements to retail trade. This was undertaken by the Council to Study Improvements in the Retail Business Sector, established in 1934. That council was an organization that succeeded the aforementioned meeting of the commerce panel after it was dissolved in 1930 due to the increased social importance of the small- and medium-sized retail business problems.<sup>3)</sup>

That council conducted specific deliberation from the third general meeting of the Council to Study Improvements in the Retail Business Sector convened in October 1935. There were three main resolutions made at the meeting: "matters concerning cooperative organizations of retail businesses," "matters concerning assistance for retail business and supervisory institutions," and "matters

concerning the regulation of retail businesses” (Department of Commerce, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, 1936). Once reaching this stage, collaboration as a policy to improve small- and medium-sized retail businesses took hold as an effective policy. Furthermore, the principal form of collaboration was merchants associations and described this way: “within a cooperative of retail businesses, the merchants association system was the most appropriate for the situation in Japan” (*Ibid.*, p. 3). Then there was emphasis on the need to plan for “the widespread establishment of cooperatives” (*Ibid.*). That was not all. There were also references such as the following in relation to the assistance and supervisory institutions required for the spread of traders association: Action is required in each region to “require the regional authorities to establish and implement assistance and supervision plans for retail businesses in accordance with the circumstances in that region” (*Ibid.*, p. 8). Then, there is reference to the need for assistance and supervision of shopping districts with “the establishment and reorganization of certain plans concerning the assistance and supervision of shopping districts” (*Ibid.*, p. 9).

That is, the emphasis was on merchants association being the most effective way for collaboration as a policy to improve small- and medium-sized retail businesses. There was recognition that shopping districts were single cooperatives responsible for each region. At this stage, merchants association were taken to be the core policy for improvement of small- and medium-sized retail business, and shopping districts were finally recognized as a specific form. The number of shopping district merchants associations began to increase in 1937, and there is no doubt that shopping districts already had recognized status in terms of policy at that time.

However, there was no specific indication of what “the establishment and reorganization of certain plans” meant for shopping districts provided at the third general meeting of the council. This was because shopping districts were considered exceptions and not the cooperative forms envisaged for merchants associations. That is why specific policies for reorganization were seriously considered after that stage.

A national survey of major shopping districts was conducted in December, two months after the third meeting of the council, through Chamber of Commerce offices as a specific measure to address this issue.<sup>4)</sup> There was already “considerable discussion about the need to target shopping districts for reorganization as part of a measure to rehabilitate small- and medium-sized businesses and retail businesses” (Inagawa, 1936a, 1, p. 35) during this period, with shopping districts starting to be given important status in the policy for reorganization of small retail businesses. In response to the resolution of the third general meeting of the council and the survey on shopping districts, the Ministry of Commerce and Industry announced the following basic policy in June 1936: “While traders associations in the past often comprised companies in the same sector, utmost effort will be put into the organization of shopping districts to prepare for the future attack from department stores, which will be devised through the formation of regional cooperatives” (the Ministry of International Trade

and Industry, ed. 1980, p. 193). The small- and medium-sized retail business problem at the time was a major issue and the core measure to deal with department stores was to promote the formation of merchants associations for shopping districts.

Finally in December that year “matters concerning improvements and enhancements to shopping districts” were raised as a major issue in the “resolution of the fourth general meeting of the Council to Study Improvements in the Retail Business Sector” (Department of Commerce, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, 1937). As noted in the “urgency of not ignoring the promotion or expectations for current retail traders in the plans for improvements and enhancements” for shopping districts (p. 4), the planned improvements of shopping districts at this stage was taken to be a core measure for dealing with the small- and medium-sized retail business problem. In addition, there was a specific resolution at the fourth general meeting of the council to promote the formation of merchants associations for shopping districts as a policy for reorganization of small- and medium-sized retail businesses. The resolution, concerning “the creation of shopping district associations,” identified the need to ease the difficulties of establishing shopping district merchants associations by “eliminating the need for legal approval by the sector with only a majority approval of all traders within a region required to establish a shopping district traders association” (p. 5).

The resolution of the fourth general meeting of the council put focus on policies to reorganize small- and medium-sized retail businesses by forming shopping district cooperatives and specifically indicated the need for cooperatives to become more widespread. At this stage, shopping district merchants associations ceased to be the exception and were treated as important merchants associations alongside cooperatives consisting of like-businesses. Then, the promotion of the establishment of shopping district merchants associations led to the need for legislative amendments (Inagawa, 1937). While not going into detail here, the Merchants Association Law was amended in 1938, and shopping districts were finally given firm status as a system at this stage.<sup>5)</sup>

As noted above, the status of shopping districts in terms of policy changed over time and peaked with the amendments in 1938. The core driver of the uninterrupted policies was rationalization. Initially, small retail businesses were not targeted for policy. Moreover, there was the idea of excluding retail business from the concept of commerce when enhancing the distribution organization to promote rationalization. Once the existence of small- and medium-sized retail business was recognized, rationalization was based on such existence. That was the reason for collaboration. The establishment of merchants association was specifically promoted. The resolution of the third general meeting of the council called for action by region, and shopping districts finally began to be recognized for policy purposes.

The resolution of the fourth general meeting of the council was to promote more widespread establishment of shopping district merchants associations, which ultimately led to systematic establishment through amendments in 1938. Therefore, the large increase in the number of shopping

district merchants associations from 1937 was clearly due to the promotion to establish shopping district merchants associations in accordance with resolutions from the third and fourth general meetings of the council from 1935 and 1936. This encouraged the establishment of shopping district merchants associations.

So, why did the status of shopping districts in terms of policy change to such an extent? In this study, we attribute it to trends at locations. That is, the amendments to the law were consequential to what was happening at the actual locations.

In the following, we focus on the perspective of the activities at actual locations to consider the formation and development of shopping district merchants associations. In the following section, we consider “commerce associations,” voluntary organizations that existed in shopping districts prior to the formation of cooperatives. These associations have hardly been discussed until now.

### 3. The formation and development of shopping district merchants associations

#### 3.1 Shopping district activities before becoming cooperatives

Initially, the Merchants Association Law did not envisage shopping districts as individual cooperatives. However, shopping districts already existed. Shopping districts themselves had a long history. For example, the loss of the distinction between “machiya” (merchant’s houses) and warrior houses from the Meiji era meant shops could be freely constructed, and shops congregated in locations convenient for traffic in the form of shopping districts (Japan Consulting Institute, 1983). Therefore, in terms of merchants association, there was a concept of some form of collaboration even before shopping districts were recognized. In the following, we consider the types of arrangements that were in place in shopping districts prior to the formation of cooperatives. This is because we believe that the systemic promotion of shopping district traders associations was a measure to respond to activities at the locations. If that is the case, there must have been a foundation needed to promote such a development even before cooperatives were formed in shopping districts.

In general, commerce associations had been created before shopping district traders were organized. These commerce associations originated from neighborhood associations (Japan Consulting Institute, 1983). In addition, commerce associations increased in number and became active as they sought to compete with department stores that began to appeal to the masses from the end of the Taisho era following the Great Kanto Earthquake to the beginning of the Showa era.<sup>6)</sup> Retailers shared lighting and shading through commerce associations. They also jointly watered store fronts to prevent dust and conducted bargain sales.<sup>7)</sup> While each case was different, some commerce associations were very active. For example, Chikusei Kai of the Takemachi Street Shopping District in what is currently Tokyo’s Taito-ku was very active (Seibundo Publishing, 1929). First in terms of joint bargain sales, lottery tickets were distributed to purchasers that spent a certain amount of money at a

participating shop. While the business operations themselves were not unusual for the time, Chikusei Kai emphasized unity and generated full participation by the businesses. The situation was such that customers would not support non-participating shops during the bargain sale period, which forced retailers to participate. Under usual circumstances, non-participating shops did not incur any costs and are able to reap the increase in flow of customers that have been enticed into the shopping district. There was a tendency for so-called free riding. Since this was considered beneficial in the short term, it demonstrated the strength of unity of Chikusei Kai. One contributing factor for this development was the proactive promotional committee that publicly recognized the retail traders that contributed to the commerce association. In addition, a board of governors was appointed to represent each sector within Chikusei Kai to conduct research such as business plans and surveys of services and prices of other shops. This was possible because of the unity of Chikusei Kai.

Another example of a typical commerce association was the Ningyo-Cho Shopping District Shosei Kai in what is now Chuo-ku, Tokyo (Seibundo Publishing, 1929). The merchants association was involved in business considered very advanced for its time. This was joint delivery, which was planned in 1929. The first to implement joint delivery was probably the Shinsaibashisuji Shotengai in Osaka, which commenced joint delivery in October 1929 (Japan Consulting Institute, 1983). However, the arrangements made by Shosei Kai were also very early. The specific details of the delivery business were for Shosei Kai to own one car and make deliveries twice a day for 10 sen (0.1 yen) per item. The cost of the business was 20 yen per day, so 200 items needed to be transported each day. However, what is noteworthy about Shosei Kai was that it considered any shortfall as an advertising expense for the shopping district. This type of thinking was quite advanced for the time. Furthermore, another advanced aspect of Shosei Kai was its efforts to issue common gift certificates. However, gift certificates were not legally recognized at the time, so the plan did not take place.<sup>8)</sup>

In addition, the most distinguishing business of Shosei Kai was the “hyakka service” (variety goods service) (Matsuura, 1936; Aichi Prefecture Shokokan, 1938; Shoko Chukin Bank, 1940). The hyakka service cooperative was founded in July 1932 and transformed into a joint-stock company with capitalization of 100,000 yen in May 1934. The cooperative specialized in selling on credit. As a general rule, it was membership-based business targeting salaried workers. About 10 members formed one unit, which was represented by one person. The participating shops were selected from prominent stores within the shopping district. In addition, as evident by the term “hyakka” (variety of goods), the principle was for the organization to be comprised of various types of businesses with one shop from each business type. Members were given certificates of a certain value, which allowed them to purchase goods at shops participating in the hyakka service. The member representatives collected the money and paid it to the hyakka service company. Then the participating shops received payment from that company after commissions were deducted. This business enticed consumers from far away, and by simply paying the commission the participating shops were able to automatically advertise their

businesses. There was also the merit of not having to worry about collecting the money themselves. In other words, the *hyakka* service could be referred to as a business that “combined the management of the organization on the distribution side and cooperative purchasing on the customer side” (Matsuura, 1936, p. 203).<sup>9)</sup> Even after *Shosei Kai* was reconstituted as a traders association in 1936, it acquired a *hyakka* service company and continued to develop this as a core business.

As noted above, individual shopping districts conducted collaborative arrangements at the local level to deal with the small- and medium-sized retail business problems such as the problem of department stores even before the enactment of the Merchants Association Law and at the very least even before shopping districts were recognized as single merchants associations in terms of policy. The proactive collaboration in the above example led to success. Therefore, there were perceptions of shopping districts as a single management structure and organization at the local level from an early stage. In fact, Nakamura (1936) notes “advocacy was made for the need to create a Merchants Association Law” in 1929 to make shopping districts cooperatives (p. 58). As noted in the previous section, shopping districts recognized that they were burdened by the small- and medium-sized retail business problems at the local level from a very early stage even though shopping districts were not considered a policy issue until the third general meeting in 1935. Based on there being collaborative arrangements within shopping districts before the establishment of merchants associations, it may have only been natural for there to be demand to create cooperatives to strengthen shopping districts as organizations in order to defend against the attack from department stores that were the core of the small retail business problem at the time.

The Merchants Association Law gave shopping districts that had the potential capacity to survive but needed support “the potentiality to develop by forming traders associations” (Nakamura, 1936, p. 54). That no doubt expanded the scope for activities that shopping districts could undertake as an organization. This also indicates how shopping district merchants associations were locally driven, and commerce associations can be referred to as one of the foundations leading to their establishment. In that context, “shopping district merchants associations were not simply an academic notion or something novel; they were merely an expansion and enhancement of existing shopping district organizations that were aware of the need to proactively attract customers” (Iwasaki, 1937, p. 44). According to Taniguchi (1937ab), shopping districts did not sense a need to become cooperatives as they had steadily organized themselves into commerce associations to achieve such purpose,<sup>10)</sup> and this was conversely an impediment to becoming a cooperative sometimes.<sup>11)</sup> Nevertheless, “organizations known as commerce associations had no rights or obligations. They enjoyed a completely simple realistic relationship and were not organizational entities” (Nakamura, 1937, p. 70). In addition, “the small- and medium-sized retail business problem in Osaka City was a problem of conflict between shopping districts and department stores. The pressure from department stores was felt much less severely by shopping districts than scattered small retail shops.” Consequently, “the measures for

small retail shops became measures to reorganize shopping districts” (Nakamura, 1936, p. 61). That is why there was demand for “organic unification” within shopping districts to deal with the situation. However, commerce associations without rights and obligations had their limitations in dealing with the deficiencies caused by the lack of planning and lack of systems at spontaneously occurring shopping districts. Therefore, organizations with clear rights and obligations were established by turning shopping districts into merchants associations, and overcame the limitations of commerce associations that emerged from neighborhood associations. In the following we consider how shopping district merchants associations expanded and took hold.

(To be continued into the second section)

## Notes

- 1) Typically, there are criticisms from a market economy perspective. For example, the idea that small- and medium-sized retail businesses typical of shopping districts should be protected because they are not only economically rational but also because they bring vitality of the local community and contribute to society has been criticized as unpersuasive (Takashima, 2002).
- 2) For example, participation to industry cooperatives was compulsory at the time. However, the draft of the Merchants Association Law in 1930 proposed that businesses be given the option of not participating or freely withdrawing from cooperatives. This proposal met strong resistance from those who argued that such a change would render the very existence of cooperatives meaningless. As a result, the proposal was deleted from the draft legislation. Details of the relationship between merchants associations and industry cooperatives are provided by Yoshida (1985); and Fujita (1985), among others.
- 3) The Council to Study Improvements in the Retail Business Sector was not formed immediately after the dissolution of the Commerce Association in 1930. Until then, the small- and medium-sized retail business problem was the responsibility of the sales management committee of the special industry council (the Ministry of International Trade and Industry, ed. 1980).
- 4) The national survey of shopping districts was conducted on December 10, 1935 and covered 86 main cities across Japan such as the six major cities. Refer to reviews of the results of the national survey reported in Kawakami (1937); and Kawakami (1937) “The status, form, length of shopping districts and the composition of the street” *Shogyo Kumiai* 3.4, pp. 52–84; Kawakami (1937) “Composition of businesses in shopping districts” *Shogyo Kumiai* 3.6, pp. 50–55. In addition, in terms of the 6 major cities there are survey documents in the form of the ‘survey of shopping districts within the city’ for each city (For example, the “Survey of shopping districts within Tokyo City,” etc.). Reports on other regions in East Japan appeared in the Japan Chamber of Commerce and Industry’s (1936) “Sangyo Gorika” Volume 19 and Volume 20.
- 5) However, the peak in the development of merchants associations, including shopping districts, in the pure essence of the term lasted until the first amendment. There was subsequently a change in meaning because of the emphasis of the role of merchants associations as national policy institutions when Japan entered a full-fledged war with China in 1937, (Kobe City Economic Bureau, 1942).

- 6) Due to the focus of this study, we do not directly discuss opposition to department stores. Details of opposition against and disputes with department stores can be referred to in examples such as Suzuki (1980); and Japan Consulting Institute (1983).
- 7) According to the 1935 national survey of shopping districts, many of the shopping districts in cities had formed commerce associations, and their businesses were those discussed in this report. For details, refer to reports such as the Tokyo Chamber of Commerce and Industry (1936) “Survey of shopping districts within Tokyo City” and the Department of Commerce, Ministry of Commerce and Industry (1936) “Survey of shopping districts within Osaka City” and surveys of shopping districts in Kyoto City, Nagoya City, Kobe City, and Yokohama City.
- 8) However, the issuance of gift certificates was not abandoned. It was approved under the first amendments to the Merchants Association Law in 1938. Certificates for mid-year business gift (o-chugen) and for prizes for summer (o-bon) campaigns were issued in June, a month after the issuance was approved. For details, see Shoko Chukin Bank Research (1940).
- 9) According to Matsuura (1936) there were many companies conducting similar businesses within Tokyo alone, such as Nippon Kyoei Kaisha, Tokyo Shoten Syndicate, Easy Payment, and Asakusa Hyakka Guide. In addition, there appeared to be developments even outside of Tokyo City, such as Sapporo, Osaka, Kobe and Hiroshima. Even Aichi Prefecture Shokokan (1938) provides details on a typical business model. Thus, it was obviously a comparatively popular business.
- 10) The most extreme example is the Ginza Shopping District’s Ginza Dori Rengo Kai. This is very evident in the comments from shopping district officials that “Ginza does not need relief measures and assistance. There are no shops within Ginza that are in trouble. A union for the purpose of commerce is not feasible in Ginza” (Seibundo Publishing, 1929, p. 24).
- 11) In that context, the pre-existence of organizations referred to as commerce associations could be one difficulty for shopping district merchants associations. However, this relies on the level of awareness of the cooperative system, which will be resolved as the awareness spreads (Taniguchi, 1937a). Therefore, in this report, rather than taking the stance that the pre-existence of organizations was a difficulty for shopping district merchants association, the collaborative intent is considered the basis for the establishment of shopping district merchants associations.

## Addendum

The references are attached to the latter section. The second half of this manuscript is published in vol. 51, No. 3 of *“THE NAGOYA GAKUIN DAIGAKU RONSHU, SOCIAL SCIENCES” (Journal of Nagoya Gakuin University)*.

This study is part of research undertaken with assistance from a JSPS grant for scientific research (25870807).