

66 Akira Tamura: National Land Planning Trap, Shimin, No. 11, 《Citizen》 Editorial Board, Keiso Shobo, pp. 28-34, 1972.11

It was, of course, in socialist countries that planning at the national level was largely established as a general thing. Thereafter, there were various national plans such as the New Deal and the Nazi national land planning in Germany.

In postwar Japan, economic planning, social planning, and physical national land planning were introduced in place of each other. Up to now, economic plans alone have been issued every four or five years. Other plans include the Economic Independence Plan, the Medium-Term Plan, the Economic and Social Development Plan, and the New Comprehensive National Development Plan, etc., and few people seem to be able to answer correctly which one is related to which. I suspect that a major national land plan will be issued every two years or so, and I wonder why such plans keep appearing.

Objectively speaking, there are, indeed, some issues that need to be considered, such as resource allocation, land use, and major trunk line issues nationwide, for example, how to allocate water, apart from issues of a certain regional dimension. But, even with the new Comprehensive Plan, there is still a need to reexamine the plan in its seventh year, and I wonder if there is enough to change it every once in a while. I think that national-level plans should be based on a larger direction, and there is no need to come up with so many different plans in such a short period of time. In the new Zensho, on the one hand, there is talk of concentrating on large cities, and on the other hand, there is talk of large-scale industrial development. Then, suddenly, in the "Theory of the Remodeling of the Japanese Archipelago", while talking about large-scale industrial development, the idea of regionally-centered cities is introduced. They may seem similar, but they are slightly different. There are overlapping aspects, but the connection between them has not been explained, and they are being introduced one after the other. There is really no need for so many unrelated plans to appear one after another.

A handsome man, but money and power are not enough: the role of the Economic Planning Agency

The reason why so many plans are being made one after another is not because we are pursuing the proper allocation of resources, but because there is a political dimension to the problem. It means that land planning development projects have come to have a certain political meaning. If this is the case, the election for the House of Representatives is held every two or three years, and whether or not it coincides with the election, it is possible that some kind of plan will be revealed at a tempo comparable to the election. Of course, the change of

cabinet may have a great deal to do with this. In such a political dimension, the plan must play a slogan-like role. Rather, I think it is becoming impossible to keep up with the current situation unless we create illusion after illusion through our plans. In this sense, there is a possibility that plans will be created without limit, regardless of whether or not they are relevant to people's lives. Many of these plans are made by the Economic Planning Agency, but as you know, the Agency is not a business agency. However, as you know, the Economic Planning Agency is not a business agency, nor does it have the ability to completely oversee the work of each ministry. It merely handles "other matters that do not belong to each ministry" within the so-called stove-piped administration.

In the old days of the Planning Agency, some of them actually did quite a lot of work on basic drafts such as goods control. However, in the postwar period, the Economic Planning Agency, now the Economic Planning Agency, was one of the many ministries that dealt with current issues in a very realistic manner, and it seemed to me that it was taking a somewhat integrated role by dealing not only with current issues but also with future issues and major issues that the ministries could not deal with. In reality, however, control over the various ministries and agencies is actually a function of the government. In reality, however, it has little control over the various ministries. In other words, "A man of color has no money and no power. However, being a man of color does have a role to play. In order to put on a play, a rough and powerful man may be necessary, but a sexy man is also needed as a signboard. I feel that the Economic Planning Agency is forced to play such a role.

The Economic Planning Agency is planning based on this role, so there is no need for it to be a specific plan or administrative plan. The problem lies in the creation of an image, so the idea is to create an image, and if someone bites on the image, then we will attract that person. If they don't bite, they don't bite, but as long as it creates an image, that's all that matters. The bait is being spread out. If they are not biting, they are not biting, but as long as it creates an image, that's all that matters. Since politics today is not necessarily driven by leadership and cannot be led by strong leadership, we may have no choice but to follow those who bite into the bait.

I am a planner myself, and from my standpoint as a planner, I understand that the people at the Planning Agency, while on the one hand they are in agreement with this kind of movement, on the other hand, they want to find somewhere what the public is looking for. They do not have the power to lead. Therefore, while they may be hoping to realize their own ideas by launching observation balloons to gauge the trends of the people, they are actually being taken back to a higher political level and put to effective use.

The Aim of the "Japanese Islands Remodeling Theory

The "Japanese Islands Remodeling Theory" was not an administrative plan, nor was it clearly announced by the government. It is just a theory that Mr. Tanaka came up with as an individual before he became prime minister. It is a theory that was put forth by one individual before Mr. Tanaka became prime minister, and it remains somewhat ambiguous, and it may be said that the "reform theory" is very much in line with the Japanese people's naïve attitude. In the past, the scope of the bait was limited to very localized issues in economic planning, but recently it has become much broader, and since there are many different kinds of bait, ministries and agencies are competing to get a bite out of it. The bait has been very broad, and there are a variety of bait available, so ministries and agencies are competing with each other to get a bite out of it. The problem is that the bait is not being fed to the citizen or local government level, but is being consumed by corporations, real estate agents, and central government agencies with great vigor. Regional issues regarding what to do with the Japanese archipelago must now be seriously considered at the citizen level. I believe that this is why various citizen movements are taking place and innovative local governments are making progress. Even if it cannot be said that they are playing a sufficient role in each other, there is an objective background and trend that local problems must be considered by citizens themselves or at least at the level of local governments. However, the "theory of remodeling the Japanese archipelago" has ignored the objective background and trends, and has only cultivated fodder for the monsters that have already nested in the hands of big corporations, central government agencies, and the like. Of course, this may have been done in the hope that it would be profitable, but on the other hand, it also raises a big balloon and makes the public expect that something good will come out of it. This is extremely dangerous. There is no way that a truly comprehensive plan can be created if the current administrative structure is left as it is. All ministries and agencies are willing to bite into anything that they deem advantageous for expanding their own authority and interests. The people and local governments are the ones who will suffer the most if they fall into the trough of this feeding frenzy.

The Future of the "Japanese Archipelago Remodeling Theory"

It is no longer possible to draw up a fixed plan and then reach that plan from two points of view.

The first is from the standpoint of a proper planner's methodology. That is, the master-planning approach, which is based on the idea of planning on a fixed, overall scale, may not work as a methodology in times of drastic change such as the present. It is necessary to develop a planning theory that is more adaptable to the changing times. Since the early modern period, there has been a lot of talk about the ideal city, and pictures of ideal cities have been drawn in

various ways, which are not without meaning. The administrative level, too, took the method of saying, "This is the way to go, and the government will guide us toward it. However, even if the system is good, the world has not improved at all since then. So, fixedly, we are beginning to reflect on whether or not it is good to first and only draw a picture as a serious planning theory. It has become almost impossible to draw an abstract or at least physical picture of the future as a philosophical vision of reality. Therefore, we are forced to have some kind of elasticity in our planning theory. Serious planners are always struggling to figure out what to do about it.

The other problem is that, on a political level, the problems of serious planners today (and there are some such people in the Planning Agency) are strangely coextensive with the "whatever, just get it out there" talk. This is a very troubling story.

At any rate, no matter which way you look at it, I think that a lot of things are going to come out of the woodwork in the future without being fixed in any sense of the word. There is no political system that can take on that much responsibility, and even from a purely planning perspective, it is becoming difficult to say, "This is it," especially in a place like the Japanese archipelago.

Therefore, even if the "Theory of Japanese Islands Remodeling" is quite confident in its assertion that this is the right thing to do, it is impossible to believe it as it is. The "Theory of Reorganization" not only affirms the large-scale industrial development proposed by the New Zenso, even though it is too large, but also seeks to go beyond it. I believe that those who are actually considering the plan know that even so, it will not come to that, and that they will have to proceed while considering harmony with various other things.

I think that large-scale industrial development itself is becoming impossible. The government is trying to force us to spend more and more money by imposing some kind of tax to drive out factories or something, and then telling us to go somewhere else and build a better place, but we are no longer living in a world where anything is possible as long as you have money.

But we no longer live in a world where anything is possible as long as you have money. After a few years, I am sure that a new plan will emerge. It is very dangerous for the Japanese archipelago, which is irreplaceable at the end of the day, to be told to "make decisions and do things," and for ministries to start work without knowing what decisions will be made and what will be done. In terms of planning, and in terms of the political dimension, we have to be more careful.

We should start by examining the methodology.

There is a debate about whether or not to create a counter-proposal to the "Japanese Islands Remodeling Theory," but under the current circumstances, there is no point in trying to create

a plan that will be subject to frequent upheavals.

The first and foremost premise in this process is what the local people think about their community. In this sense, the "Japanese Islands Remodeling Theory" is very abstract. That is an abstraction, an argument from my student days. In reality, things that already exist have their own meaning, deeply intertwined with the local community, so it is not that simple. It is often said that "32% of the population lives in 1% of the country," but this is not true only in Japan. However, the question is how to organically relate such concentrated areas to other areas and what to do about the environment of the concentrated areas. Population is not easily dispersed. The basic problem lies in the fact that you start your argument from such a point of view as "32% of the population lives in 1% of the land.

In my opinion, it is the method of planning that is the problem, and I think that local communities should be encouraged to think more about what they are going to do with their own areas. I think we should let the local communities think about what they are going to do in their own areas. It may be said that there is no end to the number of questions we can ask, but we should try to ask each region what they are really thinking at least once or twice. In the case of Shibushi Bay and Mutsu Ogawara, I wonder if it is good or bad to just drop them in the water like that. I think we should listen more to the opinions of local residents before unloading. I am against the idea of first raising the balloons and then seeing how they react later.

Also, the argument that the factory should be removed and taken somewhere else is too abstract. The things that have already taken root are rooted for a variety of reasons and have a variety of relationships with the local community. The relationship between factories and citizens in today's overcrowded areas is one in which the residents have gradually driven companies that have done good things and bad things to a certain point. If the dispersal of factories is based on the idea that it will be easier for the trapped companies to escape and go elsewhere, the balance with the local community will be upset in the future. I think we should consider what has been achieved in the factories that have become a part of the local community.

However, even if we say that a factory should not be located in a community, it is the same if the factory leaves and becomes part of the community. If it is better to separate them, then they should be separated. In such a case, there will be a discussion on what to put in its place, and the rules for how it should fit in with the new community must also be fully considered.

Another thing that can be said about methodology is that there is still much to increase when considering the future of the Japanese archipelago. Therefore, we should focus more on how to deal with the new additions than on how to deal with the existing ones. It is not as simple as saying that we should increase oil refining and steel production because it is better looking

than the new total, but rather, we should give full consideration to the areas that need to be increased, both in terms of quantity and quality. We need to consider the areas where we can increase production, both quantitatively and qualitatively. What we have now, in its own way, has its roots somewhere in reality, with some meaning. If we have reached a certain point where we should no longer increase the number of these things, and we have reached a certain level of stability, it would be fine if we could balance the overall situation by removing this part of the population. However, the Japanese archipelago has an overwhelmingly large portion of growth. If you are saying that we are kicking out factories in order to control the growth and obtain appropriate financial resources, that is a bit of a lie. It is not just a question of eviction. How can we settle the situation in a new place without fully examining the issue of how to settle the situation and how to settle it properly? In the end, we will just repeat what we have done in the past.

(Akira Tamura, Director, Planning and Coordination Office, City of Yokohama)