JAPANESE UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES AS DIALOGUING ENCLAVES: SIX EXAMPLES

Context of the Study: Japanese University Space Particularity

Recently, Architectural Institute of Japan published a collection of studies concerning the future of university campuses, whose programmatic title is Creating a Campus like a Town, while using the Town like a Campus.¹ The problem outlined there is the following: “Traditionally, university campuses, both because of their nature of sacred place of the knowing and of their physical environment, are something similar to [extraterritorial] concession both because of their nature of sacred place of the knowing and of their environmental enclosure”.² To understand such statement, it may be useful to introduce briefly the nature of Japanese university space and its differences with the West.

In Japan, the word campus describes a well-defined typology which is necessarily composed by a controlled-access site comprehending both facilities and open spaces, and it is subjected to many regulations. Despite the strictness of such definition, nearly any Japanese university possesses at least one proper campus. When the authors tried to build a database of all Japanese university spaces, they counted 681 campuses for 600 universities, a huge number compared to European countries.³ These are distributed in the Country as shown (FIG. 01).

Historical background

When Japan started creating western model-based universities after the Meiji Restoration (1868), government modelled university system after Germany’s one; university space model choice, instead, is the result of several influences through the centuries.⁴ Prototype of modern campuses are the first eight so-called national number schools, characterized by plural buildings disposed symmetrically within former samurai residences.⁵ Under the direction of the two chief architects of the Ministry of Education, Hanroku Yamaguchi and Kuru Masamichi, the model initially adopted was that of France’s grandes écoles, monumental and urban; and later, starting with the enormous Hokkaidō University campus of 1903, university
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space typology was gradually brought closer to USA’s campuses, more informal, green and peripheric. The Criteria for the institution of universities (1956) confirmed also in the Post-War period the status of the campus as the sole allowed typology, by setting the minimum land amount as 10 m² per student. The same law prescribed also that, besides classrooms, research rooms and library, a self-learning space and a leisure space had to be provided as minimum requirements. The following law Kōgyō-tō seigen limited the establishment of new universities within the more central areas of Tōkyō and Ōsaka from the end of the 1950s until 2002. This led to the post-war countryside typology, influenced by the contemporary England’s New Universities, reinterpreted in a more frugal and reduced scale. This historical movement of campuses from city centre to remote areas is now changing its direction: in fact, from 2002, with the abolition of Kōgyō-tō seigen, 66 out of 80 campus relocations or new constructions in the Tōkyō metropolitan area were directed into the central city zone.

Relation between campus architecture and university government type

Japanese universities are of three funding typologies: national public (previously depending on the central government, and, since 2003, on semi-autonomous national university corporations); local public (depending on municipal or prefectural government); and private. Even though each of the 47 Japanese prefectures houses at least one national university, their campuses assets and aspect show a clear uniformity, with a standardized spatial layout organized roughly in faculty zones, equipped with homogeneous buildings and in absence of a strong centre. This uniformity can be explained by the strong control conducted by the Ministry of Education (MEXT), hence obtaining stronger architectural images.

Since private universities are extremely numerous and variegate, there is not a specific characteristic that is capable of summarizing them. However, the aim of the institution often reflects clearly in their architectural shape. For example, women’s universities or religious universities are evidently more separated from the surroundings and centred around a plaza or court.

THE PROBLEM ADDRESSED IN THIS STUDY: THE ENCLAVE NATURE OF JAPANESE CAMPUSES IS CHANGING

Apart from their layout differences, the majority of the depicted campus types is characterized by the same physical separation from the surroundings: they are enclosed in material fences and are only accessible through punctual gates; furthermore, 35% of campuses stand on hillside sites. The ideal community embodied by USA campuses has always “preferred open and expansive schools that look confidentially outward to the world”. Instead, Japanese campuses are still rather separated from their context, causing critics of the status quo to refer to them as closed utopias or more commonly as ivory towers meant to train the tomorrow dominant class in absence of external influences. The post-war era of the utopianist campus described by Muthesius, remote and special enclaves where it was possible to live a sort of Anglo-Saxon collegiate life, is now coming to an end. Ministry of Education is now looking to
USA, and Japanese scholars are studying old European models of *centro universitario*, as Bologna, Salamanca, Sorbonne, drawing as a result that campuses must now open their boundaries and become public spaces which carry on the task of *contribution to society*.14 Already practiced strategies are: Satellite Campuses, which are single buildings placed in the most central urban areas; possibility of public use of campus facilities, parks and roads; university-industry collaborative research facilities. The ideal tendency appears to be that of mixing completely urban and academic environment.

However, it is necessary to question whether this melting with the city is applicable or not to Japanese education, which has traditionally been characterised by a strong community identity of students and teachers. As Campos and Luceño observed, “the university community can see its limits dissolved, expanding its scope towards the urban fabric”.15 In fact, a sudden change in campus permeability in order to obtain a *cultural contamination* as in Bologna University, in Japan would necessarily bring a loss of such identity, in a similar way to the phenomenon of gentrification.16

For this reason, the aim of this study is to investigate how Japanese university campuses can reach the desired openness without giving up their *genius loci* and community identity. In order to do so, we will first briefly introduce various scholars’ positions regarding the concept and role of university community and its relationship with society. Then, we will display six chosen examples of campuses which we believe can provide a valid response to the above issues. This study is based on the authors’ previous research, on the analysis of the contemporary debate that is taking place in Japanese academia, and, in particular, on interviews with prizewinning architects Yamamoto Riken and Makishi Yoshikazu, who not only testified their design intentions, but also helped in understanding such debate from an original point of view.

**POSITIONS REGARDING ‘UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY’**

The heart of the problem referred to in the previous paragraph is the relation between university community and surrounding society. And, in other words, the conception of the campus as a private, public or common place. We here define university community as the positive relationship between one university’s students, teachers and personnel, who share the final purpose of education. In Japan, the places where this relationship happens are mainly: indoor or outdoor common spaces, *gakusei kaikan* (buildings for extracurricular activities), professor’s offices, research rooms, cafeteria, library, learning commons, sport facilities. Being students’ residences normally placed outside the campus boundaries, gates also naturally became the place for students’ morning gatherings, acquiring a symbolic value.

Japanese private universities put great emphasis on the importance of common spaces for students’ community. For example, according to Tanioka Fumiko, the characteristics of a student-centred campus are the central position of court and student services, and the possibility of student access to any of its parts: “Only [this kind of] student-centred type campus deserves the name of community”.17 Such a community idea is primarily defined by its inner relationship, rather than by its function.

On the other hand, national universities consider university communities as subordinated to a vaster purpose. For example, USA-educated architect and professor Kurata Naomiichi states: “Universities are one of the main communities that constitute the regional society”.18 In a similar way, the future strategies for higher education discussed by the Central Education Council in 2018 state that university must become “the core of regional society”.19 Those national guidelines admittedly inspired the adoption, in masterplan strategies of many public campuses, of newly designed industry-university collaboration research facilities, reorganization of campus boundaries, citizen free-access facilities, etc. On the other hand, it is noticeable that national university campuses often dedicate only the most hidden and narrow areas of their sites to students’ services facilities.20

As it can be noticed, Japanese *private* and national ideas of *university communities* and their aim appear to be different. Regarding this, architect and university rector Yamamoto Riken asserted: “Starting point of Japanese universities and European universities is different. In Japan, the actor who initially started to form universities was the state government. [...] Government developed super-elite universities as Tōkyō University, Kyōto University and so on; they trained the super-elite from all over Japan and those became the future bureaucrats. [...] For this reason, they are born as gated communities. This is why they have no relationship with their surroundings. Instead, those universities that trained a reality that wasn’t the super-elite, and tried to form people who are active into the society, were private universities, that were born later. [...] Their aim is different and so is their structure.”21

Regarding this, then why, on one hand, do Japanese private universities seem to consider campus as an enclosed *common-but-not-public* space, and, on the other hand, national universities, which are supposed to be built for the elite, are now putting more emphasis on the *contribution to society* role of the campus? According to Yamamoto, *contribution to society* is not being intended as a relationship between university and local community, but rather as a call to universities to participate in the effort towards national interests.22

From the reported opinions, it seems that there is an architectural dilemma: should we keep a protected and autonomous environment (university community separated from city community) or should we eliminate the barriers and differences between campus and surroundings (university community functional to regional society)?

Reasonably, there is a third option, that of strengthening commonality and community identity while opening to the outside (university community *in dialogue with city community*); it can be described by the following words of the Education scholar Šatô Manabu: “A good school architecture must have a strong concept, which is linked to the formation of a community. The keys of that are publicness and commonality”.23 The third option is the more responsive to the object of this study: in the following paragraphs, we will analyse six cases of campus planning which appear to embody it.

**CASE STUDIES**

The first three examples considered are designed by the previously cited architect Yamamoto Riken, born in 1945. Saitama Prefectural University campus has been completed in 1999, and Future University Hakodate campus in 2000. In 2019 Yamamoto has been appointed to be the new rector of Nagoya Zōkei University, and he is currently directing the construction of its new Nagoya campus, due to open in 2022 ([FIG. 03, NO. 1, 2, 3]). The fourth example is designed by Seike Kyoshi (1918-2005) and its colleague Okuyama Kenji. It is Sapporo City University Geijutsu no Mori campus, built from 1986 to 1991 ([FIG. 03, NO. 4]). The fifth and sixth examples are designed by Makishi Yoshikazu, an Okinawan architect born in 1943. They are Okinawa Christian University campus ([1985-87] and Okinawa University campus (buildings completed gradually in 1985, 1989, 1999 and 2010). ([FIG. 03, NO. 5, 6]).

To answer the question on why these six campuses could represent a possible solution to the above described *third option*, it is necessary to consider them according to the following common topics.
Campus site position and surroundings

Two of these campuses are sited in Japan’s extreme north, and two on its extreme south. Especially, since the northern ones, number 2 and 4, are local public universities, the ambitiousness of their architecture can be explained as a mean of the local government to attract the young generations’ university choice, in spite of their remoteness from the main metropolises.

The only two campuses which are completely surrounded by an established urban environment are number 3 and 6. Numbers 1, 2 and 4 stand in the border between urbanized and non-urbanized areas, which is an extremely common campus position in Japan. This allows planners to distinguish between a front (a more public zone, adjacent to the urban settlement), and a back (a more private and recollected zone). Number 6, Okinawa Christian University, instead, was established in what was, at the time, a solitary hill outside the city of Naha: “The surroundings were open fields.”

Campus scale

None of the six considered campuses overpass 170,000 m² of land area, which is the minimum amount of land that a normal national university campus possesses. Number 3, 5 and 6, which are private universities, are among the narrowest campuses in Japan. Local public universities can have access to local government’s terrain, hence to a greater availability of land than private ones; however, in number 1, 2 and 4, which are local public universities, buildings are grouped close to each other, causing most part of the land to be empty. Number 4, Sapporo City University campus, is characterized by a forest left to its natural state through the building arrangement. Therefore, a first consideration is that it is plausible that the following described characteristics were made possible by the limited scale, that, in some cases, was chosen on purpose.

Architectural configuration and balance between commonality and publicness

All of the three campuses designed by Yamamoto [number 1, 2, 3], are single megastructures “where there is always the consciousness of being under one roof, also in an abstract meaning”. As an architect, I feel the necessity of creating campuses where everybody shares the same space. Another issue is which kind of relationship between such space and the outside have to be built. [...] and I think that design of such relationship is a particularity of my architecture office. Basically, in the buildings that I design anybody is free to enter”.

Saitama Prefectural University campus is a single structure composed by two 4-storey longitudinal blocks which enclose an 80 meters wide single-storey Media Gallery, dotted by a labyrinth of small courts, giving the overall impression of a traditional campus’ negative image. On the deck floor above the Media Gallery is a garden which can be freely accessed by citizens; even so, “if you enter here, the space is totally different from the surroundings. [In this project] we chose a way to do which makes people say: ‘I entered in Saitama Prefectural University’, a place where the rules, the behaviour or attitudes are different from outside”.

The same design philosophy is brought also in number 2 and 3 campuses: in Future University Hakodate a single box-shaped building of 100 per 100 meters is adapted through section adjustments on a gentle slope, at the centre of a green site of 160,000 m², from which a scenic view of Hakodate city and its gulf is possible. The slope allows a staggered placement of labs and research rooms, in front of which a single giant-scale space consents the free choice of places for learning activities. All the surfaces directed to the campus entrance and the city, from room partitions to the exterior box façade, are transparent: “People from outside
can see what professors are teaching, and, if they are interested, they can enter to assist.\(^{32}\)

Nagoya Z\'eki University’s site is very near to the main monument of the city, Nagoya Castle. Since subway runs under its axis, construction in the central strip is limited; but the architect managed to take advantage of this limitation by creating there a public passage called Art Arena, the centrepiece of the new campus (FIG. 06).\(^{33}\) Art Arena is surrounded on the ground floor by the most public services, such as the library, the gym, shops, students’ galleries, the multipurpose hall. The squared upper floor covers the whole area and contains the learning sites, organized again in a single room space.

Seike and Okuyama’s Sapporo City University site is characterized by a harsh topography, with an upper and lower level dramatically divided by a long and narrow hill. Thus, designers “placed the library and the gym in the [lower] approach level, with the intention of realizing openness through setting facilities for citizens and their lifelong-learning”;\(^{34}\) in the upper level, instead, are all the educational facilities, the gakusei kaikan, and the administration. The latter ones are hence hidden by the hill, but a 150m long suspended passage called Skyway unites the two levels, inviting for sure visitors to reach the more hidden and private area through this scenic solution (FIG. 07). The more private facilities are not placed around an outdoor court or plaza because of the northern climate of Hokkaidō where the campus is located; however, the indoor common spaces «occupy 40.5% of the total area», while the average in high schools is 18.5% and in universities is 25%.\(^{35}\)

Makishi’s Okinawa Christian University concrete architecture appears as a fortress from the outside, with tall buildings which densely occupy the whole site; on the inner side, instead, buildings open towards a central circular grass plaza (FIG. 08). The sense of circularity and recollection around this void is enhanced by the external corridors that run all around it, gradually rising to the axially positioned chapel. Inspiration for this plaza are traditional Okinawan assembly rooms with their front court for people’s common prayers, gusuku castles, the court of the Shuri Castle and even San Pietro square.\(^{36}\) Despite the closed environment, the entire square and the access road from the east is designed in such a way as to give a glimpse of the curious interior and entice one to enter. Furthermore, “there is no gate and anyone can enter inside the court”.\(^{37}\)

Okinawa University campus is the result of many construction eras. The first campus built in 1956 was too narrow and the only three buildings were considered too small for the 3000 students;\(^{38}\) therefore, “the Ministry of Education ordered that the building and land area should be enlarged, otherwise the institution would have been dissolved”.\(^{39}\) Due to the limited budget, architect Makishi completed the substitution of the old facilities and the new constructions one by one, in a span of 25 years. Furthermore, due to the gradual and difficult purchase of new areas surrounding the original site, the current campus boundaries extend on the two sides of a public street, which, enriched by a grass plaza, became the central axis to which all the buildings face (FIG. 09). This has made necessary an open dialogue with the local community, which freely uses this crossing. Despite the confused construction history, the peculiarity of the façades provides the necessary awareness of spatial difference to the casual visitor. The plaza and the various semi-external spaces set at the ground floor of each building enable students’ gatherings and common activities: music/dance societies can practice there even in rainy days, and “of these spaces, the one nearest to the main approach has been used several times as public sit-in demonstration place”.\(^{40}\)

In summary, all of the six examples are designed to be different environments from the surroundings, and not to be melted with the city. They maintain their spatial identity through the single couverture (number 1, 2 and 3), the hidden or semi-hidden disposition of the facilities (number 4 and 5), or simply through the particularity of the architectural style (number 6). Within this recollected space, indoor or outdoor common spaces are central. Physical barriers still exist, but the access is not controlled in 5 of them (number 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6).

Visits from the exterior are encouraged by two main mechanisms: visual relationship (number 2, 4 and 5, which are those campuses which maintain a distance from the urbanized area) and incorporation of public roads, parks, public facilities or plazas (number 1, 3, 4 and 6, which are those campuses englobed in, or adjacent to, urbanized areas). Particularly, being number 1, 4 and 6 located in peripheral areas of Japan, where urban services are scarce and citizen dispose of few free-gathering places, campuses themselves compensate for this lack.

**Considerations on the environment for student community**

All of these campuses feature a place for students’ extracurricular activities (clubs); the smallest campuses (number 3, 5 and 6) had to renounce to outdoor sports facilities, but gym is maintained. Also, great emphasis is given to unspecific purpose common areas, as mentioned above. However, the main innovation consists in a characteristic that is
common to all of the displayed campuses, that is, the absence of division between different faculties members, or, in other words, the shared use of the totality of classrooms, research rooms and common facilities.

The clearest example is Saitama Prefectural University, which have curriculums in Nursing and Social Welfare. Because "teaching medical techniques and health care methods is of course important, but establishing a relationship between the health care and welfare system and everyday life is even more vital"., students and teachers of the two faculties are encouraged to use the above-mentioned Media Gallery.

In a similar way to Yamamoto Riken, Makishi Yoshikazu asserted during the interview: “What I especially cared about Okinawa Christian University campus plan is that there are two faculties, English and Pedagogy, and a Ministry of Education-style campus would be composed by a building for English faculty and one for Pedagogy faculty, connected by some corridor; however, I decided to act differently. I gave breath to this campus: the 800 students from both faculties can freely go around the [circular] corridor, and, while walking, they can look at the nature and talk to each other [...] FIG. 10. For example, if English students spend time only with other English students, they won’t get to know the world. Instead, if they are mixed with Pedagogy students, they would influence each other".

In addition, students’ community is inserted in the surrounding community, but in a different way from the official contribution to regional society concept, as Yamamoto Riken expressed with the following words: "I think that what matters in university is self-government. I think it is important to have self-government made by students and teachers, but nowadays, in Japan, administration by the state is very strong. Students who oppose the state are not brought up and this is stronger now than it used to be. What I tried to do in [Hotakubo] Housing was to bring inside a collective housing a sort of self-government [...], as in Italian comune. [...] And I think that the university of the future must become something that is united with its comune. In Vietnam or in Korea there are communities similar to comune too, and universities are made within those. Depending on the community, the method of making universities would be different".

CONCLUSIONS

It is evident that the above introduced campus examples could not represent the most exhaustive response to the need of better universities in Japan: their scale is rather small and the presence of a single designer is a fortunate condition, relatively rare in the richness of Japanese university space scenario. Also, the reported planners’ ideals have their material counterpart in the remote and depopulated Japanese areas need to stem the exodus of students towards larger cities; for this reason, geographic competition can also be interpreted as one of the motors of such conspicuous design investments. However, they are successful architectural planning which represent a concretization of the above-reported third option, that of a student community not elitist nor abstract, but well defined and still open, dialoguing with the larger society. Hence, we can draw the following conclusions.

The small scale was a favourable condition to the formation of the university community, mainly because it allows designers to individuate a strong and central common space, hierarchically dominant on the specific functions.

The location of the campus and the surrounding environment modify the mechanism of student-citizen dialogue: in urban areas, the mechanism works through making university spaces freely available to citizens; in rural areas, through visual connection and curiosity. In both cases, citizens are aware of entering a different environment, with a specific identity, that each designer concretized in three-dimensional solutions: Yamamoto’s one roof, Seike’s skyway, Makishi’s circular environment.

The shared use of all campus facilities by all students, irrespective of faculty affiliation, is not only a means of increasing awareness of community, but also an educational manifesto, aimed at the need for universality in human knowledge.
In synthesis, a peculiar or separated campus environment is not an objection to the “openness to the context” aspired by the global academia, which is already realized in the West, but still to be fully accomplished in Japan. This is because a specific and somehow delimited community represents the place of individual growth and, when dialogue with the context, it gives birth to the students’ sense of solidarity towards the nearest and furthest society. As the Italian educator Giovanni Riva wrote: “The dimension of “accompanyment” of education is a “sine qua non” of education itself. Only then does education bring to the forefront the problem of solidarity, telling us that it is in the self.”
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**FIG. 02.** Comparison between examples of different government type university campuses. Top left: national; top right: local public; bottom: private. © Vecchi Pietro, Suzuki Kenichi, 2021. Map data: © Geospatial Information Authority of Japan.

**FIG. 03.** Case study campuses planimetry and basic information. © Vecchi Pietro, Suzuki Kenichi, 2021. Map data: © Geospatial Information Authority of Japan.

**FIG. 04.** Saitama Prefectural University campus, aerial view. Image data: © Google, © 2008 ZENRIN, © Landsat/Copernicus.

**FIG. 05.** Future University Hakodate campus: sketch showing the view towards outside. The caption reads: "The studio is in the position with the best view. From everywhere Hakodate is visible. Coming friends are visible" (translation by the authors). © Riken Yamamoto Design Factory.

**FIG. 06.** Nagoya Zōkei University Nagoya campus: section sketch. © Riken Yamamoto Design Factory.

**FIG. 07.** Sapporo City Specialized College: view from the main access with the beginning of the 150m long Skyway. © Kaku Satoru, 2021.

**FIG. 08.** Okinawa Christian University campus, aerial view. Image data: © Google, © 2008 ZENRIN, © SIO, © NOAA, © U.S. Navy, © NGA, GEBCO.

**FIG. 09.** Okinawa University: aerial view. Image data: © Google, © 2008 ZENRIN, © Landsat/Copernicus.
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