

Learning “Shared Experiences” of Industrialization: A Critical Review of Cross-Cultural Exhibitions and an Analysis of Museum Visitors’ Perceptions in Japan and the United States¹⁾

Fujita Kayoko

Introduction

Recent revisions in the field of global economic history emphasize the continuities between the early modern and modern periods. At the same time, Japanese economic historians also press the importance of indigenous industry and social structure formed in the peasant society of the Tokugawa period (1603–1867) as one of the key factors for Japan’s successful economic development and industrialization during the following Meiji period (1868–1912).²⁾

For those of us who live in today’s Japan that was once swept by the blizzard of high economic growth of the 1960s, however, it is hard to feel the legacy of the Tokugawa traditions in our daily material culture. In the classroom, too, the discontinuity between a feudal shogunate and a modern nation state is noticeable in the history textbooks, by accentuating the significance of the nation’s rapid industrialization and modernization *after* its full-scale opening in the mid-nineteenth century to the overwhelming power of the already developed Western economy.

The collection of Shibusawa Keizō (1896–1963) for the *Nihon Jitsugyōshi Hakubutsukan*, or literally the museum of Japanese industrial history, gives us a good starting point to overcome this gap in recognition. His efforts to build the museum were recently rewarded in the form of two exhibitions, first in the United States and then in Japan, after more than sixty years since he first envisioned in the 1930s a design for a museum dedicated to the study of the historical transformation of Japan’s economy and industry, and of the everyday practises of Japanese folks.³⁾ The exhibitions, “Different Lands/Shared Experiences: The Emergence of Modern Industrial Society in Japan and the United States” (「日米実業史競」 [*Nichi-bei Jitsugyōshi Kurabe*]), were organized by and held at the St. Louis Mercantile Library at the University of Missouri-St. Louis (St. Louis, Missouri, September 9–October 2, 2004) and at the Shibusawa Memorial Museum (Tokyo, October 2–November 27, 2005). It was the first project to take up the artifacts that Keizō had collected and preserved to commemorate the achievements of Shibusawa Eiichi (1840–1931), his grandfather, who is known as the “father of Japan’s capitalism.”

I was given the opportunity to document the preparation process of the exhibitions in Missouri and Tokyo in order to review how the curators and librarians organize exhibits to visualize the concept of the exhibition and how museum visitors from different cultural and educational backgrounds perceive the historical narratives constructed in the displays. The research was conducted through a) questionnaire

surveys of visitors at both exhibitions and b) individual oral interviews with the parties concerned in St. Louis and Tokyo.⁴⁾ In this article, I would like to focus mainly on the survey results, in order to analyse the ways in which museum visitors interpret the exhibits in relation to industrial developments in Japan and the United States from the nineteenth to the twentieth centuries. Stress will be upon the commonality and the difference of Japanese and American audiences' perceptions, in terms of the experiences of their nations in the tide of global industrialization, and of the meanings of historic conditions of each nation for modern technology transfer and industrial advancement.

Backgrounds of the Collections in Tokyo and St. Louis

It was fortunate that Keizō's collection survived World War II. However, the dissolution of the *zaibatsu* or pre-war conglomerates by the Occupation Forces and the following requisition of the buildings that Keizō intended to utilize as the residence for the museum derailed his plan of establishing a museum for the foreseeable future. In 1951, the Shibusawa Seien Memorial Foundation, to whom Keizō had entrusted the collection, deposited it in the Ministry of Education Archives, and in 1962 the collection was officially donated to the Archives, which is the current Department of Archival Studies of the National Institute of Japanese Literature. The collection, around 2,500 items in total, is comprised of the following items: (1) 982 prints, (2) 350 maps, (3) 257 *banzuke* or ranking lists, (4) the Takemori collection of 2,484 business-related books, (5) 7,573 paper notes, (6) approximately 5,000 items used in commercial operations approximately, (7)(8) approximately 5,300 documents and books approximately, (9) 350 advertisements, and (10) 2,450 photos.⁵⁾

The St. Louis Mercantile Library (SLML) shares the same vision of documenting the nation's transforming commerce and industries with Keizō's museum of Japanese industrial history collection. St. Louis, known as the "Gateway City," situated along the lower Mississippi River, functioned as an entrance to the American West throughout the nation's early days, and as you can see the Lewis and Clark expedition started from this city in 1804. In those years, civic leaders and philanthropists of the early American republic, such as bankers, entrepreneurs, and merchants made contributions to found libraries in numerous places in order to collect, preserve, and offer periodicals, manuscripts, rare books, and other intellectual resources for public use. As one of these institutions, the St. Louis Mercantile Library Association was founded in 1846 for the first time west of the Mississippi River, and the current Mercantile Library possesses a wide range of primary and secondary research collections on various American studies subjects, which consists of the core collection of more than two million books, and of various other collections and materials on specific themes like American railroads, waterways, and banking histories.⁶⁾

The Concept, Methodology, and Organization of the Exhibitions

The concept of the exhibition on which the two institutions had agreed was to "feature items to compare the historical course of developments in industry in Japan and the U.S. with particular emphasis on people who worked for and were influenced by industrial developments."⁷⁾ To accomplish this purpose, the curators organized the

exhibit into six themes: (1) “Development of the Frontiers of Japan and America” (under the new name of “The Opening of the Frontier” at Tokyo), (2) “Transportation (Railways, Ships and Postal Communication),” (3) “Transition from Crafts to Industrial Manufacturing,” (4) “Urban Development,” (5) “Daily Life,” and (6) “Japan and America Meet in 1904 at the St. Louis World’s Fair.” (This last section was replaced in Tokyo with a section entitled “The Modernization and Industrialization of Japan and the U.S. as Seen in Business Exchange,” contents of which were partly modified.) In six thematic sections, at Tokyo, a total of 275 items were exhibited; 131 items from the former Shibusawa Keizō collection at the National Institute of Japanese Literature in Tokyo, and 144 from the Mercantile Library and several other institutions in St. Louis. These items included two-dimensional objects such as *nishiki-e* woodblock prints, oil paintings and lithographs, photographs, maps, and books, as well as three-dimensional objects such as agricultural implements and industrial tools.⁸⁾ In addition, more than 300 projected images of photos and prints, which depict daily practises of Japanese commoners such as farmers, artisans, shop men, and factory workers, were shown through a projector at both exhibition sites.

As the goal of the exhibition was to “help the audience gain (a) deeper understanding of the age of industrialization and its meaning in contemporary and



Photo 1: A side-by-side display, effective to compare the historical courses of industrial development in Japan and America. Shibusawa Memorial Museum, Tokyo, October 1, 2005

future economic and social activities,”⁹⁾ a comparative perspective was applied to organize the exhibits. In each thematic section, the curators displayed Japanese and American artifacts dealing with similar topics or with the same usage side by side, so that visitors could easily consider the commonality and the difference in the two countries’ industrialization processes, which the objects represent. For example, at the section on the development of transportation, a multicolored *nishiki-e* woodblock print and an albumen photographic print of steam locomotives were placed together, which allowed exhibition visitors to reflect on how artisans of diverse cultural backgrounds depicted a scene of technological advancement, which simultaneously took place in each side of the Pacific, with different artistic techniques (**Photo 1**).

In the Section “Daily Life,” a square paper-covered lantern (*andon*) and a red-glassed lantern made for the St. Louis County Water Company were exhibited in a display case, which revealed the different natures of the material cultures of the countries. Timelines that show major events related to each nation’s economy and technological advancements were arranged side by side in the exhibition catalogues.

General Response to the Exhibitions from the Museum Visitors in Japan and America

The analysis in this section is based on the voluntary, anonymous, questionnaire-based surveys that were conducted during the courses of the exhibitions in St. Louis and Tokyo. The questionnaire was prepared by this writer, in consultation with Julie Dunn-Morton (Woodcock Curator of American Art for the St. Louis Mercantile Library) and Jay Rounds (E. Desmond Lee Professor of Museum Studies and Community History at the Department of History) at the University of Missouri-St. Louis, and with Kawakami Megumi (curator at the Shibusawa Memorial Museum).

The questionnaire used at the SLML exhibition consisted of three sections and twenty-one questions in total; a Visitor Profile (three closed format questions), a Response to the Exhibition/Library (twelve main- and six sub-questions, ten of which were in open question format), and a not-required Demographics (six closed format questions).

At St. Louis, thirty-seven questionnaires in total were returned; seventeen were filled out by the invitation-based attendants of the Opening Ceremony and Lecture, including thirteen Japanese Studies or Museum Studies students (all from ages 18 to 34) and nine UMSL or other university faculty and staff, and Contributors to the Library (all over the age of 45). During the following three-week duration of the exhibition, twenty questionnaires were returned. Twenty-eight of the thirty-seven respondents were of United States nationality, one was Japanese, and eight gave no answer to that question. The male/female rate was nearly equal (thirteen of eighteen respondents to this question). In total, young graduate and post-graduate students formed the largest age groups, 18–24 (ten persons, 27%) and 25–34 (eight persons, 22%), and the age groups of 45–54 and 60–64 follow (four persons, respectively, 11% each). Six respondents made no answer to the age group question. The return rate on the Opening Day was about 10 percent. The return rate during the exhibition period is unknown because the total number of visitors is uncertain due to the nature of the exhibition venue in the main university library building, which attracts many

drop-ins, but probably it was around 10 percent. Although the return rate is low, I think that the comments from the respondents to open format questions contain useful information to show general visitors' perceptions of the American side.

At Tokyo, 107 questionnaires, thirty-three from the invitees on the opening day and seventy-four during the two-month exhibition period, were returned; seven invitees were American, seventy-six Japanese, and twenty-four gave no answer on their nationality. Sixty visitors (56%) were male, thirty-one female (29%), and sixteen unknown (14%). People aged 40–49 and 50–59 formed the largest (nineteen persons, 18%) and the second largest age groups (sixteen persons, 15%), with the age group of 18–29 in third place (fifteen persons, 14%). Twenty-four respondents gave no answer to the age group question. Company employee was the largest occupational group (twenty-six persons, 24%). University/college students was the second largest occupational group (ten persons, 9%), with teaching staff in third place (eight persons, 7%) and post-graduate students (five persons, 5%).

Generally, the respondents made a very favorable evaluation of the exhibitions.

Q1. Overall, how would you rate the exhibition “Different Lands/Shared Experience”?

	St. Louis	Tokyo
Excellent	22 (59%)	41 (38%)
Good	10 (27%)	39 (36%)
Average	5 (14%)	18 (17%)
Poor	0 (0%)	3 (3%)
Very Poor	0 (0%)	1 (1%)
Other	0 (0%)	5 (5%)
	37	107

I asked the visitors what aspect of the exhibition had the most influence on their rating. The following is the summary of their positive comments:

Q2. What about the exhibition had the most influence on your rating?

- a) The exhibits
 - the unique nature, high quality, and large quantity of exhibits
- b) The theme
 - the historical comparisons of America and Japan
- c) The layout
 - the side-by-side displays
- d) Other
 - the quality of explanatory panels and labels
 - the relevance to the exhibition venue

Above all, the uniqueness and the quality of the original materials that Keizō had collected appealed most to the audience both in Japan and the United States. In particular, colorful *nishiki-e* prints, including both originals and replicas, attracted many visitors of St. Louis.

The synergistic effect of the theme of the exhibitions and the comparative layouts of display also created positive responses among visitors; I think that the side-by-side displays, which the curators applied to visualize the similar and parallel historical courses that America and Japan had followed, proved to be effective and therefore the goal of the exhibition, which was to “help the audience gain deeper understanding of the age of industrialization,” was fully attained. Let me explain this further in the next section.

It is also important that visitors could have a feeling of attachment towards the topics and/or the objects which the exhibitions dealt with to achieve an educational effect. It was due to the relevance to the venue of the exhibition that the curators chose the St. Louis World’s Fair in 1904 as the last of six sections to close the SLML exhibition. As a result, the section has succeeded in making American visitors aware of the invaluable role of their home town in the history of the United States–Japanese relationships. This section won wide praise among American visitors also in another question, which asked what thematic sections the visitor found particularly interesting. At the same time, among many American visitors who mentioned Japanese objects, a St. Louis respondent cited American household articles and agricultural implements (sewing machine and sod plow), probably due to the familiarity with the recent past that the objects recalled.

Museum Visitors’ Perceptions of Industrial Developments in Japan and America

I now would like to focus on the Japanese and American visitors’ perceptions of past industrial developments in the two countries. The two questions below intended to measure to what extent American visitors considered the theme of the exhibition (that is, the comparison of the industrialization process in the two nations) through watching the exhibits:

Q3. One goal of this exhibition is to compare Japanese and American artifacts from similar time periods. Did the exhibition make you feel that Japan and America were more alike or different than you have expected?

Very Alike	5	(14%)
Somewhat Alike	18	(49%)
Exactly Same	0	(0%)
Somewhat Different	4	(11%)
Very Different	0	(0%)
Other	1	(3%)
No Answer	9	(24%)
Total	37	(100%)

Q4. Why?

“Very Alike” or “Somewhat Alike”

- They were going through similar [courses]
- Both went through similar changes
- Most evident in prints: Especially in lumber/forestry–factories–

transportation

—Industrial rise

—They made me feel the differences were a bit less than I thought.

—When the two culture[s] met, things started moving in a parallel direction.

—Because you could tell they were “Americanized” in some pictures and yet still had a uniqueness of their own.

“Somewhat Different”

—Their concepts and use

—Connections weren’t always very clear

—The flow of influence and diffusion were apparent at times, but sometimes too much stuff made these comparisons tough to puzzle out

—This issue was not addressed satisfactorily—it seemed like objects were simply displayed together. Not enough analysis to meet this goal

The respondents are grouped into three categories based on their answers to the first question: twenty-three people in the first category answered “Very Alike” or “Somewhat Alike” to the question above, and all of them felt that America and Japan had followed a similar historical course simultaneously.

Four respondents who ticked “Somewhat Different” form the second group. Except one who felt that “[T]heir concepts and use [were somewhat different than he had expected],” they replied that the historical comparison, which was the objective of the exhibition, was not expressed well enough through the exhibits.¹⁰ In short, those who comprehended the curators’ intention through the exhibits recognized the similarity of the industrialization process in the two countries, and those who found the structure of exhibits disorganized tended to have difficulty in finding what the curators had intended to express.

The third category consists of ten people who answered “Other” with no additional comments, or made no answer to this question.

We should note that a surprisingly large number of respondents thought that America and Japan experienced more similar industrialization process at similar time periods than they expected. According to their comments, most respondents in the first category seem to have merely had an impression from the exhibits that the same kind of technological advancement (for example, development of the frontiers, the beginning of factory production, the laying of railways) occurred in America and Japan at around the same time. A response from a female UMSL student (age 18–24, American, Caucasian), however, indicates what aspect of the exhibition led them to conclude this way; she answered to the second question as “When the two culture[s] met, things started moving in a parallel direction” (**Photo 2**), highly probably associating the small exhibition on Commodore Mathew Perry and Japan’s “opening” to commemorate the 150 years of United States–Japan relations, at which western technologies such as a locomotive that Perry and his fleet brought were displayed, of which venue was facing to the entrance of the exhibition “Different Lands/Shared Experiences.” Thus we may assume that American visitors concluded it was the western impacts that had ignited the technological advancements and the social modernization of Japan in the mid-nineteenth century.¹¹



Photo 2: “When the two cultures met, things started moving in a parallel direction.” St. Louis Mercantile Library, St. Louis, Missouri, September 11, 2004

There were two other respondents who not only noticed the American influence on Modern Japan, but also became aware of the native tradition that survived the turmoil of social and industrial transformation. When these respondents, one a female UMSL student and the other a male full-time worker (not university faculty/staff) from California¹²⁾ wrote, “The feelings behind Japanese modernization—to use western ideas to improve upon, rather than replace their traditional way of life,” and “Because you could tell they were ‘Americanized’ in some pictures and yet still had a uniqueness of their own,” they apparently showed an insightful understanding of the curators’—and thus Shibusawa Keizō’s—message. The curators carefully designed the displays, the explanatory panels, and the descriptions in the catalogues to visualize that the overwhelmingly in-pouring western technologies were mixed with pre-existing indigenous knowledge and industrial techniques from the Edo period, which resulted in the creation of a new material cultural system of Meiji Japan. Take Section 3, “Transition from Crafts to Industrial Manufacturing in Japan and America,” as an example; referring to a piece from the multicolor *nishiki-e* series, *Shokō shokugyō kurabe* (諸工職業競 or “Contest of Craftsmanship”), it is explained, “they used *chona*, a traditional Japanese carpenter’s tool, to build Western-style chairs. Making good use of their traditional techniques, they repaired ships at the dockyard, made shoes, and tailored Western-style clothes. In the end the Japanese transformed crafts into industrial manufacturing—they began a new tradition of craftsmanship.”¹³⁾

To measure more precisely how the exhibition affects Japanese museum visitors' perceptions of Japanese and American industrial progress, I modified the questionnaire form for the exhibition at the Shibusawa Museum after consultation with Curator Kawakami, by inserting a new question (Q6). As seen below, visitors were requested to answer three sub questions, in which they chose which aspect of Japanese and American society they thought was more industrially advanced during the nineteenth century before and after visiting the exhibition (Q6a and Q6b) and then described the reason why they regarded it so (Q6c):

- Q6. One goal of this exhibition is to compare American and Japanese artifacts from similar time periods (roughly from the early 19th to the early 20th centuries).
- 6a. Before visiting the exhibition, which society did you think was more industrially advanced during the time period concerned?
 America The two countries were at the same level Japan
 Other [Please specify: _____]
- 6b. After visiting the exhibition, which society do you think was more industrially advanced during the time period concerned?
 America The two countries were at the same level Japan
 Other [Please specify: _____]
- 6c. Why?

The following table is the cross-tabulation of answers to Q6a and b:

Q6a (Before) \ Q6b (After)	Japan	Same	America	Other	No answer	Total
Japan	3 (3%)					3 (3%)
Same	1 (1%)	11 (10%)	22 (21%)			34 (32%)
America		2 (2%)	49 (46%)			51 (48%)
Other			6 (6%)	3 (3%)		9 (8%)
No answer			4 (4%)	1 (1%)	5 (5%)	10 (9%)
	4 (4%)	13 (12%)	81 (76%)	4 (4%)	5 (5%)	107

The main point to observe in the table above is that the rate of visitors who thought that America was more industrially advanced declined from 76 percent to 48 percent; out of eighty-one respondents who ticked “America” to Q6a, 22 people chose “Same” to Q6b, six indicated “Other,” and there were 4 people who made no answer.

Thirty-eight respondents in total, eighteen who did not change their opinions before and after viewing the exhibition and twenty who changed, answered to the open-format question Q6c to explain the reason for their choices. Opinions are quite diverse, and there was no specific opinion that was prominently supported by a specific group of respondents to Q6c. However, there are several revisions of perception in common among the respondents who filled in Q6c, whether they changed their choices or not.

First is the awareness of the fact that America was not so technologically ahead of Japan as the visitors had anticipated, and the surprise and amazement to the rapid

industrialization and westernization of Japan. A couple of Japanese respondents also suggested, referring to rural areas depicted in visual images from St. Louis, that the progress of industrialization and urbanization was not uniform across North America, although in urban areas the level of the achievement is undeniable. I think that this renewal of recognition was due the unique concept of the exhibition as well as the weakness of Japan's history education. For one, the "Different Lands/Shared Experiences" exhibition focuses on the comparison of two *developing* countries' industrialization processes in the nineteenth century (that is, Japan and America), while history textbooks usually explain a course of industrialization by technological transfer from an advanced nation (that is, England) to less-developed countries (for example, Japan and America). For another, the Japanese people are more familiar with linear and national history narratives, a situation caused partly by the separation of Japanese history from world history in Japan's educational system, than with a cross-national overview. Thus, it may be said that the exhibition leads the ordinary Japanese public, with their preconception that America, as a Western power, was as highly an industrialized nation as England was in the nineteenth century, when Japan opened its door to the Western world, to a change in that previous perception.

Secondly, historical reality should not be oversimplified by terms like "modernization" and "industrialization," as around ten respondents noted in one way or another. By saying so, the respondents suggest that they became aware through the exhibition that the degree of penetration of alien influences varied greatly among sectors such as transportation and factory production, and daily life and culture. Some also commented that it is technically difficult to assess the degrees of industrialization of two countries with different historical backgrounds as a whole. For example, two visitors (both male, Japanese, in their fifties, a company employee and a teacher of engineering) who changed his opinion from "America" (on Q6a) to respectively "Same" and "Other" (on Q6b), mentioned that accumulated knowledge and techniques of the Edo civilization are the distinctive feature of Meiji Japan's industrialization .

The answers to Q6 in total reveal that for both American and Japanese exhibition visitors, the implication of pre-existing production techniques and style of living as a base layer for Japan's smooth industrial development and (partially relatively slow) transition in daily material culture (for example, clothing, housing, and furnishings) was hard to notice, while many were astonished by the speed of the creation of industrial society through transfers of Western technology.¹⁴⁾ This is explicable in the main by the conventional approach to the history of science and technology rooted among the public. Christian Daniels, who investigates the transfer of advanced technologies from China to East and Southeast Asian countries in the early modern period, points out the problem of the linear method to assess pre-modern technological advancement by referring to modern Western technology and science as the highest reaching point. Mere comparison of pre-modern inventions and discoveries with their modern Western counterparts is insufficient. Instead, Daniels argues, researchers need to consider how indigenous technology impinged upon the changes in politics, society and the economy in various periods in history.¹⁵⁾ His indication here should also be heeded in the general and museum education fields, for

the better understanding of students and everyone else of the history of material culture in non-Western states and areas.

Conclusion

In this study, the main stress falls on the visitor survey results at the exhibition “Different Lands/Shared Experiences” to examine the ways in which museum visitors interpreted the exhibits in relation to industrialization and modernization of Japan and the United States from the nineteenth century to the twentieth century.

In Missouri or Tokyo, a majority of respondents expressed their surprise at seeing that the two countries underwent considerable changes in their social and economic structures during the nineteenth century and the early twentieth century, and that these changes were less different than they expected before visiting the exhibition. Several observations have shown that the preconceived notions were due to the lack of recognition that a) America in the nineteenth century was still a developing country (although a step ahead of Asia) compared to the northeast part of Europe, and b) America was geo-economically and politically diversified at the time, and, one may say this for sure at least for the Japanese side, due to c) the emphasis on a nation-state framework in history teaching. Many respondents also commented on the necessity to carefully deal with complex concepts such as “industrialization” and “modernization,” as they tend to conceal the internal diversity and the unique historical experiences of each nation. Some, though not many, visitors showed the understanding that the accumulated knowledge and technological skills and social structure developed under the feudal system became a crucial pre-condition of industrialization of the nineteenth century in the case of Japan.

It can be concluded that the method of the exhibition, a comparison of the industrialization process in Japan and the United States, two societies which tend to be regarded as polar opposites in the East and the West, as well as the comparative method to organize the exhibits, are proven to be educationally effective; Twenty-nine people at St. Louis (78%) and seventy-eight at Tokyo (73%) answered “Yes” to the question “Did the exhibition stimulate you to want to learn more about the subject?”¹⁶⁾ It should be noted with some stress that, as Janet Hunter expressed in her comments to the preliminary survey results at the SLML exhibition, we need to be cautious about overemphasising the “similarity” and/or the “synchronicity” of industrialization processes in Japan and the United States. Each state had its own unique and individual historical background and heritage that would regulate the course of subsequent industrialization, and the empirical contents of the course were not negligibly diverse in state by state.

In spite of the potential risk, with the appropriate help of a teacher or a museum guide and of explanatory labels and catalogues, visiting a museum exhibition will be a valuable opportunity to bridge the gap between pre-modern and modern economies and societies in textbooks and to overcome the inadequacy of history education bound in the nation-state frame. If properly guided, learners, from schools or higher education institutions, would be able to recognize the importance to horizontally overview, compare, and analyse the experiences of industrialization in the shared past, which the current educational system of Japan fails to teach, and to reconsider its

meanings in today's globalising societies they live in, which I believe was the intention of Shibusawa Keizō and his contemporaries.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude to the Shibusawa Ei'ichi Memorial Foundation and Museum, and the St. Louis Mercantile Library at the University of Missouri-St. Louis, for granting me permission to conduct the research at their institutions and to access their collections and the internal documents during the preparation process of the exhibitions. For their kind help during the research and in writing this article, I would like to thank the staff members at both institutions, especially Joel Glassman, John Hoover, Julie Dunn-Morton, Gregg Ames, Bette Gorden, Laura Diel, Jesse Nay'lor, Jay Rounds, Allan Bird, Richard H. Mitchell, Shibusawa Yoshiaki, Shibusawa Masahide, Kimura Masato, Inoue Jun, Koide Izumi, Sekine Hitoshi, and Kawakami Megumi. Finally, I am grateful to Kusumoto Wakako for her perceptive comments and suggestions on the earlier versions of this paper and for her encouragement through the course of my research. All limitations are, of course, my own.

Notes

- 1) This article is based on my research "A Passage to St. Louis: An Analysis of the Preparation Process of a Cross-Cultural Exhibition, 'Different Lands/Shared Experiences: The Emergence of Industrial Society in Japan and the United States,' and Museum Visitors' Perceptions," which is a part of a research project of the Research Department of the Shibusawa Ei'ichi Memorial Foundation.
- 2) There is an argument among economic historians to connect successful industrialization in modern East Asia and their peasant societies, with the large presence of small independent farmers whose economic incentives brought about the optimum allocation of resources, resulting in commercial agriculture and proto-industrialization. These developments in Japan paved the way for the smooth technological transfer and the successful industrialization since the mid-nineteenth century. See Miyajima Hiroshi, "The Emergence of Peasant Societies in East Asia," *International Journal of Asian Studies* vol. 2 no. 1, (2005); Hayami Akira, "Kinsei Nihon no keizai hatten to Industrious Revolution [Economic Development in Early Modern Japan and the Industrious Revolution]," in Hayami Akira, Saitō Osamu, and Sugiyama Shinya, eds., *Tokugawa shakai kara no tenbō: Hatten, kōzō, kokusai kankei* [A View from Tokugawa Society: Development, Structure, International Relations], (Tokyo: Dōbunkan, 1989), 19–32; and Hamashita Takeshi and Kawakatsu Heita, eds., *Ajia kōekiken to Nihon kōgyōka, 1500–1900* [The Asian Trading Sphere and Japan's Industrialization], (Tokyo: Riburo Pōto, 1991).
- 3) For the details of and an analysis of the conceptual framework and the plan of Shibusawa Keizō for the museum, see Aso Noriko's article in this issue.
- 4) The preliminary results of the questionnaire surveys at Missouri and at Tokyo were presented at the 11th Conference of the European Association for Japanese Studies in 2005 and the tenth Asian Studies Conference Japan in 2006, and I thank Janet Hunter and Alan Christy, the chairs and commentators of the sessions, for their valuable comments.
- 5) Yamada Tetsuyoshi, "Nihon Jitsugyōshi Hakubutsukan Jumbishitsu kyūzō shiryō [Former Collection of the Preparatory Office of the Museum of Japanese Industrial History]," in Kondō Masaki, ed., *Zusetsu Taishō Shōwa kurashi no hakubutsushi: Minzokugaku no chichi Shibusawa Keizō to Achikku Myūzēamu* [Catalogue for the Exhibition on Daily Lives in the Taishō and Shōwa Periods: The Father of Japanese Ethnology Shibusawa Keizō and the Attic Museum], (Kawade shobō shinsha, 2001), 139–141. Around 1,000 visual images of Keizō's collection for the museum of Japanese industrial history, most of which are the *kaika-e* or early Meiji *ukiyo-e* prints, are now stored in an online database and accessible at <http://archives2.nijl.ac.jp/jkdb-index.htm> (日本実業史博物館設立準備室旧蔵絵画データベース).
- 6) Based on my interview with John Hoover, Director of the St. Louis Mercantile Library at the University of Missouri-St. Louis, on August 30, 2004. The Mercantile Library moved from downtown St. Louis to the UMSL campus in 1998, which made its collections easily accessible to students and researchers, as you can see in this article. For more details of this institution, visit their website at <http://www.umsl.edu/mercantile/>.
- 7) "Outline: Exhibition in St. Louis, Missouri," St. Louis, Missouri, March 24, 2004, 1. This prospectus

- of the UMSL exhibition was created after the meetings of personnel of the two institutions in St. Louis on March 22–23, 2004.
- 8) A separate catalogue was published in conjunction with each exhibition in Japan and America, under the common title of *Different Lands/Shared Experiences: The Emergence of Industrial Society in Japan and the United States* [Nichi-bei Jitsugyō-shi Kurabe].
 - 9) “Outline,” 1.
 - 10) At St. Louis, a few visitors made negative comments (in Q5a “What about the exhibition had the most influence on your rating?”) about the organization of the display and the quality of the explanatory labels. They appeared like “Interesting objects (photos, prints, not so much the 3-D stuff) *but* poor explanations” or “I had a hard time finding all the pieces of the exhibit, *but otherwise* it would have been excellent” [emphasis mine]. The largest hindrance factor for cooperation of the American and Japanese staff was, as I observed through interviews with the persons concerned, the difference in social conventions, particularly between the American style in which a person takes a strong initiative for the entire project and the Japanese style in which a negotiation process to build a consensus is highly respected. The difference in the training and trade practices of each curator and librarian (for example, history, art history, and book history) was also a problem to achieving consistency in the display. Those problems were caused, above all else, because it was the very first time for both institutions to cooperate with an overseas organization over an exhibition. Even so, in spite of numerous obstacles, I would like to emphasise that the atmosphere during the preparation was friendly and congenial from start to finish. The cross-cultural cooperation was, as I observed, much smoother at the second exhibition in Tokyo, which in the end resulted in the improvement of the quality of display.
 - 11) This exhibition on the arrival of Commodore Perry was prepared by the staff members of the Mercantile Library side, and according to the interviews with the staff of the Shibusawa Museum, the Japanese side was not aware of the exhibition until their visit to the exhibition site for the preparation. The survey results in St. Louis could have been very different if American visitors had not coincidentally visited the Perry exhibition right before their entering the “Different Lands/Shared Experiences” exhibition.
 - 12) Both belong to the age group 18–24 and were Caucasian. The demographic background of the latter may have some importance because he is rather different from other respondents, most of whom are from St. Louis or some other area of Missouri. Kusumoto Wakako at the Shibusawa Memorial Foundation has suggested to me that the entire survey results could have been very different if the survey was made in cities like New York and Los Angeles, which have more multi-ethnic populations and multi-cultural societies than does St. Louis and information on traditional Japan is relatively easily accessible in those cities.
 - 13) The Tokyo edition of the *Catalogue of the exhibition “Different Lands/Shared Experiences,”* 40.
 - 14) In connection with the comparison of the transition from crafts to industrial manufacturing in Japan and America (in Q10), we should also notice that no respondent at the SLML exhibition mentioned the preservation of craftsmanship in their country, America. It is most likely that American visitors tend to be more impressed by the fact that creating a new culture by mixing precedent traditional techniques and new western technologies was one of the key backgrounds that Japan, an Asian country, succeeded in the rapid industrialization and westernization process.
 - 15) Christian Daniels, “Gijutsushi ga okizari ni sareru sono wake [Why the History of Technology and Science are Excluded from World History Studies],” *Geppō: Iwanami kōza sekai rekishi* [Monthly Newsletter of the Iwanami World History Series] no. 11, (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1998), 3–5.
 - 16) Two individuals at St. Louis and fifteen at Tokyo answered “No” to the question. Six individuals and fourteen respectively made no answer or indicated that they could not answer to the question.