

Historical Heritage and its Utilization in Megalopolis -A Case Study of Osaka City-

Osaka City University

Professor Ph.D Towao Sakaehara

Explanations for the Power Point

- Naniwa-no-Miya Historical Park and Osaka Castle Park seen from air
Both Naniwa-no-Miya Historical Park and Osaka Castle Park further north are surrounded by urban area.
- Archaeological sites of Early and Later Naniwa-no-Miya
Both palaces were constructed on the same location, fifty years apart, in seventh and eighth centuries.
- Foundation of Later Daigokuden (imperial audience hall, restored), Osaka Museum of History and NHK
- Osaka Museum of History, NHK and Historical Park
- Current state of restoration at Naniwa-no-Miya Historical Park
- Naniwa-no-Miya Historical Park seen from Osaka Museum of History
- Daigokuden of Later Naniwa-no-Miya restored inside Osaka Museum of History
- Storehouses (restored) of fifth century with indication of their location
Remains are preserved underground with paved surface over it, and location of the remains is shown in different colors.
- Unification and Integration Plan of Osaka City
By February 2008, removal of buildings has almost completed, leaving just one more facility.
- Hanshin Expressway Higashi-Osaka Line
Only at Naniwa-no-Miya, the line runs on the ground and not overhead.
- Educational Center for Adolescents, current Central Youth Center
Part of the remains discovered here are preserved in this location
- Second Prosthetic School
Already relocated

Historical Heritage and its Utilization in Megalopolis -A Case Study of Osaka City-

Osaka City University

Professor Ph.D Towao Sakaehara

1. Foreword

In ancient Osaka, which was then called Naniwa, there existed a palace called Naniwa-no-Miya. At one point, I was involved in a movement for its conservation.¹ Based on this experience, I present in this paper my opinion concerning preservation, utilization and tourism based on a cultural heritage which is located in a megalopolis such as in the case of Osaka.

2. Megalopolis Osaka and ancient city

First, I would like to clarify the relation between the region of Naniwa and the palace.

In the year 645, there was a major political regime change in Japan called “Taika no Kaishin.” This is one of the great turbulences that occurred in East Asian countries that were directly exposed to the expanding pressure of the Tang Empire.

To overcome this difficult situation, three kingdoms of Koguryo, Paekche and Silla in Korean Peninsula all made reforms to centralize power in the middle of seventh century. In Koguryo, the power was concentrated in the central aristocracy, whereas in Paekche, it was in hand of the king and in Silla, it was the combination of the king and regional aristocracy. Thus, the content of reforms varied from one country to the other, depending on their respective situations. Japan aimed to create a centralized national system with the emperor at its center.

Political center before Taika no Kaishin was located in Asuka region, Nara Prefecture. After the regime change, however, it was moved to Naniwa and a palace called Naniwa-Nagara-Toyosaki-no-Miya (Toyosaki-no-Miya) was constructed. Construction of this great new capital finished in 651, but this region remained political center only for about ten years, during the construction period and a few years after its completion. Later, the imperial court moved back to Asuka. Although Toyosaki-no-Miya continued to exist thereafter, its political importance remains unclear. The palace totally burned down in 686 and Asuka became the sole political center.

In the 680s, a large palace called Fujiwara-kyo was constructed in the north of Asuka and was officially announced as capital in 694. In eighth century, another palace, called Heijo-kyo (Nara Prefecture), was constructed further north and became capital in 710. The ancient state of Japan enjoyed great prosperity in the period when Heijo-kyo was its capital.

Situation in Naniwa after the destruction of Toyosaki-no-Miya is unknown, but in the 720s when Shomu became emperor, he had a palace reconstructed in Naniwa. Afterwards, the palace of Naniwa prospered as the second capital, while Heijo-kyo remained the main capital. During a short period of time, Naniwa was even declared capital of Japan.

However, as capital moved from Heijo-kyo to Nagaoka-kyo (Kyoto Prefecture) and then to Heian-kyo (Kyoto Prefecture), thus moving further and further away from Naniwa region, its importance declined and in 793, Naniwa-no-Miya was abolished. Afterwards, Toyosaki-no-Miya and Naniwa-no-Miya got forgotten and even their exact locations became unknown.

Hence, the region of Naniwa saw the construction of palaces twice, the first one being Naniwa-Nagara-Toyosaki-no-Miya between 651 and 686 and the second being Naniwa-no-Miya which was revived by Emperor Shomu around 730's and lasted until 793 (in this paper, these two palaces will collectively be called Naniwa-no-Miya). From some time before the completion of the first palace of Toyosaki-no-Miya, the political center was in Naniwa region and afterwards, it became capital for a few years. The second palace of Naniwa-no-Miya was planned from the beginning to be the second capital after Heijo-kyo.

In the following, I shortly present Naniwa region and Osaka in later periods.

Since ninth century, Heian-kyo was political and economic center of Japan. When warrior government was established in the end of twelfth century, Kamakura, its headquarter, became another political center. When Toyotomi Hideyoshi constructed Osaka Castle at the end of sixteenth century, economic importance of Naniwa region increased again. Naniwa came to be known as Osaka from around this period.

In the beginning of seventeenth century, when Tokugawa Family established another warrior government, Edo (present day Tokyo), its headquarter, became political and economic center. Tokugawa government designated both Edo and Osaka as centers of national economy, thus guaranteeing the economic importance of Osaka throughout Edo Period. But after the Meiji Restoration, Tokyo became the sole capital and Japan was increasingly centralized, while the importance of Osaka declined.

But there is no denying of the fact that Osaka City remains one of the most important cities of Japan. Population in the urban area counts 2,630,000, which is third largest number after 8,660,000 in Tokyo wards and 3,630,000 in Yokohama City (Kanagawa Prefecture). When we compare gross city production, Osaka City has 21,270,000,000,000 Yen (nominal for Fiscal Year 2004), which is second only to Tokyo wards with 94,330,000,000,000 Yen (Fiscal Year 2007)ⁱⁱ. If we convert this sum according to the rate at the end of January 2008 (1 USD = 106 Yen), it would amount to approximately 199,900,000,000 USD. Thailand's GDP in Fiscal Year 2006 was nominally 206,700,000,000 USDⁱⁱⁱ. It is impossible to make detailed comparison due to differences in fiscal years and exchange rates, but we can see that gross city production of Osaka City is only a little less than the GDP of Thailand.

Hence, there is no denying that Osaka City is a megalopolis. And the ruins of the ancient palace of Naniwa-no-Miya are located right at its center. Placing this site within the framework of a megalopolis and making best use of it is an important issue.

We need to remember that the site of Naniwa-no-Miya does not exist above surface level to be easily seen by everybody, as in the cases of Wat Arun and Royal Palace of Bangkok or Osaka Castle. It is hidden deep below the surface of urban district and has the status of Buried Cultural Property. Therefore we hardly know until where the site extends and what types of buildings there are. So we should verify its actual state through archaeological excavation. Yet it was precisely because of this resolution that so many problems occurred until now.

3. Archaeological excavation of Naniwa-no-Miya and conservation movement

As we have seen earlier, the exact location of Naniwa-no-Miya was lost through time. A few places were presented as possible candidates, such as Uemachi Plateau which extends from south to north passing through central Osaka City, or the lowland outside the Plateau. But they were all covered by urban constructions and there were hardly any indications pointing to specific location, except for the fact that in 1913, two rooftiles dating to Nara Period was discovered at the tip of Uemachi Plateau. Unfortunately, this place was at the time occupied by the army and thus impossible to investigate.

Survey of the site finally became possible after the army was dismantled, following Japan's defeat in the Second World War. Under the leadership of Tokutaro Yamane, former professor of Osaka City University, research was conducted for the first time in February 1954.

Patient archaeological investigations have continued ever since. In this time there also arose various conservation movements. By these investigations, Naniwa-no-Miya was located at the tip of Uemachi Plateau and it became known that there were two groups of palaces dating from different periods at the same location. They are called Early Naniwa-no-Miya and Later Naniwa-no-Miya, respectively. The former corresponds to Naniwa-Nagara-Toyosaki-no-Miya and the latter to Naniwa-no-Miya from the time of Shomu dynasty.

At the beginning of archaeological research, no notable achievement was made for some time and the existence itself of Naniwa-no-Miya remained under question. Remains of Daigokuden of Later Naniwa-no-Miya were finally discovered in 1961, proving to the academic world and to the world in general that this site really exists. Unfortunately, this didn't mean that the site of Naniwa-no-Miya was to be safely preserved for posterity. Construction plans arose one after another, which, if effectuated, could lead to the destruction of the site. But each time, conservation movement arose nationwide and the site was protected.

Immediately after the existence of the remains of Daigokuden was confirmed, however, it was announced in August 1962 that at the exact same spot, Kinki Local Financial Bureau of the Ministry of Finance was planning to construct a state building, namely a second joint government building. The City administration, City Council and Mayor of Osaka each urged the preservation of the remains and the relocation of the construction site. In October, a joint communiqué was issued by presidents of eight universities of Kansai region. This had a large impact. Also, "Committee for the Conservation of the Archaeological Site of Naniwa-no-Miya" was created and the conservation movement gained momentum nationwide. In the end, Osaka City prepared an alternative site. In March 1963, Cultural Properties Protection Committee submitted a report, recommending the designation of this site as Historic Site, which resulted in the registration of approximately 17,500 m² as National Historic Site in May 1964. This is how the first crisis was solved.

In March 1965, it became known that Osaka Prefecture was planning to construct second prosthetic school within the precincts of Japan Red Cross Hoenzaka Branch Hospital. During the emergency survey, remains of Early and Later Naniwa-no-Miya were discovered in the vast area under and around the planned construction site, giving rise to a new conservation movement. But this time, Osaka Prefecture refused to change the initial plan, prompting people to request for resident audit twice, first in October and then

in December 1966. They were both refused and rejected and the construction work was carried out.

In May 1968, there arose the issue of the construction project of education center for adolescents (currently Central Youth Center) by Osaka City Board of Education. By preliminary research, it was learned that there were remains of Naniwa-no-Miya below the construction site, in a good state of preservation. Requests for the conservation were made anew from the academic and related societies, but Osaka City did not back down. Resident audit request was submitted in September 1969 but was dismissed, so a lawsuit was filed against the local government in November. This was a landmark event for the conservation movement of cultural property.

In 1970, plan to construct an elevated road for Hanshin Expressway Higashi-Osaka Line was announced. Since this would run through and split the site of Naniwa-no-Miya into two, after a number of negotiations, the plan for a flat expressway was adopted. A survey of the land where the road was supposed to be built was made from 1975 to autumn 1977. Also, an environment improvement project for Naniwa-no-Miya Historic Site Park began from Fiscal Year 1971, to organize the entire region registered as National Historic Site into a decent historical park.

In February 1979, the lawsuit between residents and local government ended in reconciliation^{iv}. In March 1985, the Mayor of Osaka City Yasushi Oshima announced "Unification and Integration Plan"^v at the City Council. This plan intended (1) to organize Naniwa-no-Miya Historic Site Park by extending it northwards, (2) to create a historical park by unifying and integrating it with Osaka Castle Park, located further north, and (3) to equip them with an archaeological museum which would further enrich the Historical Park. This plan demonstrates the strong willingness of Osaka City to preserve and utilize the site of Naniwa-no-Miya and still constitutes the basic concept of Osaka today, twenty years after it was first announced.

But in order to realize this plan, a few important facilities standing at the north of the site of Naniwa-no-Miya needed to be removed. Therefore in May 1987, an agreement was made between Osaka City and NHK and accordingly, from July 1987 to May 1990, an archaeological excavation was carried out on a large scale in the area of Osaka Municipal Central Gymnasium, which was designated as NHK's new location. This place is located to the northwest of the heart of Naniwa-no-Miya. However, it became apparent that very important remains were buried here, such as large group of storehouses of fifth century, storehouses of Early Naniwa-no-Miya, remains related to Ishiyama-Honganji Temple and residences of the subjects of Osaka Castle's castellan from Edo Period. Therefore many academic societies and related organizations demanded their conservation and in July 1989, "Council for the preservation of Naniwa-no-Miya" was created, which became the leading force of conservation movement.

Following the request to preserve important archaeological remains discovered around the area of Osaka Municipal Central Gymnasium, Osaka City Board of Education announced its first conservation plan in February 1991, but this was not put into effect due to the economic bubble burst. Then in September 1994, a second plan was announced, according to which remains in the southern half of the area, mainly storehouses of fifth century, would be preserved, while in the northern half, two buildings would be constructed, one exclusively for the use of NHK and the other for City Museum (moved from Osaka Castle) and Archaeological Information Center (later, the latter two were unified to become Osaka Museum of History). Since this still meant that some remains would be destroyed, conservation movement continued on, but the construction work took place nonetheless and in November 2001, the two facilities of Osaka Museum of History and NHK were inaugurated.

Thus, the site of Naniwa-no-Miya eventually made its appearance at the heart of the megalopolis of Osaka City, through multiple conservation movements and patient and persistent archaeological excavations. Its most important part is registered as national historic site and is protected by law. But it is clear that the site extends well beyond the

registered area, as has been attested by the important discovery of the main gate (Suzakumon) of Early Naniwa-no-Miya in 1993. Beyond the registered zone, however, it is everywhere urban district and covered by different buildings. Archaeological excavations can take place only when these buildings are renovated or reconstructed.

According to Japanese Law for the Protection of Cultural Properties, when an engineering work is planned within the zone of previously known archaeological site, the Board of Education should be informed beforehand. Once the notification is made, the person in charge of buried cultural property at the Board of Education makes a test excavation to verify whether or not a full-scale excavation is needed. In the case where it is deemed necessary, it will be carried out, although the research area would be limited to the proposed construction area. Even if important remains, which without doubt extend beyond this area, are discovered, it is basically impossible to expand the research area. All one can do is to wait for the next occasion to present itself, which nobody knows when. Outside the previously known archaeological site, even such emergent survey cannot be made.

Since Naniwa-no-Miya is an archaeological site buried under the urban region of a megalopolis, researchers have constantly been put under restriction for the choice of research area and been prevented from freely excavating academically important spots. Investigation of this site continued despite such difficulties and this is why I have expressed earlier as “patient and persistent excavation work.”

4. Historical heritage and economism

The site of Naniwa-no-Miya, which is a large tract of land in the center of a city, has been registered as national historic site and duly protected, thanks to numerous conservation movements and efforts of the administration. Its method of utilization, however, is a problematic issue.

Out of the whole site of Naniwa-no-Miya, approximately 11,000m² land has been registered as national historic site and organized as historical park. Posted land price in the surrounding area is about 500,000 Yen per m² (Heisei Fiscal Year 19), so the land price for the whole region would be about 5,500,000,000 Yen (1,620,000,000 Baht). Because of this elevated price and extremely good location, many construction plans presented themselves, aiming to utilize the place for other goals, but each time giving rise to conservation movement, as we have seen earlier.

In this situation, Kansai Keizai Doyukai (Kansai Association of Corporate Executives) issued a recommendation in January 2003, entitled "Suggestions for the utilization of resources to attract visitors, with the cooperation of the state and the people -Focusing on the revision of regulations and systems-."vi According to this, attracting visitors is the absolute requirement for the revitalization of Osaka and Kansai region. To achieve this goal, two "Specially designated zone for attracting visitors" should be set up, one around Osaka Castle and Naniwa-no-Miya, characterized by its historical heritage, and the other in the southern part of Midosuji Avenue, which inherits the culture of townspeople. In these regions, preexisting regulations and rules should be relaxed if necessary and the state and people should work together to attract more visitors. Osaka should also seek for the collective registration of Osaka Castle and Naniwa-no-Miya area as UNESCO World Heritage Site. Naniwa-no-Miya should be restored to become a tourist resource, and archaeological accuracy need not be overemphasized in this case. Cultural heritage should not only be protected but also be considered as a resource to make use of, and a flexible application of the Law for the Protection of Cultural Properties is requested.

Next, in December 2005, the City of Osaka formulated "Comprehensive Plan-Osaka begins-" (subsequently "Comprehensive Plan")^{vii}. This is the ongoing comprehensive plan, with target years from Fiscal Years 2006 to 2015. Based on this plan, "Work program 2006-2008" (subsequently "Work Program")^{viii}, was issued, targeting the first three years. Current basic strategy concerning historical heritage of Osaka is demonstrated here.

In these plan and program, the following points are recommended to improve the charm of Osaka sightseeing: (1) improvement of the allure of Osaka Castle and Naniwa-no-Miya; (2) Making Osaka Castle and Naniwa-no-Miya zone the stronghold for attracting visitors, by means of appropriate regulations and promotions to create attractive landscape; (3) tangible and intangible historical and cultural resources such as historic sites, historical monuments, traditional art, regional history, language and food should be rediscovered and preserved; (4) museums, citizens and NPO should work together to enable the visitors to experience for themselves the charm of the region. Also in the Work Program, it is stated that (5) Osaka Castle and Naniwa-no-Miya zone should be made the stronghold for attracting visitors and the whole place should be organized and promoted in order to increase tourist consumption.

It is notable that in Comprehensive Plan, historical heritage is understood in a broad sense of word, as is seen in (3), and cooperation with the citizens and NPO has been suggested for its utilization, as in (4). On the other hand, Osaka Castle and Naniwa-no-Miya are considered more as tourist resources (1, 2, 5), in accordance with the recommendation given by Keizai Doyukai. This is even more clearly shown in the Work Program.

Hence, economic principle has been introduced into the preservation and utilization of cultural property. This is a new tendency which aims to utilize historical heritage as a tourist resource, as a means to recover from economic recession after the economic bubble burst. It was regarded as an important aspect, that needed to be marked clearly in the recommendation given by Keizai Doyukai and in Comprehensive Plan. We need to consider the historical heritage based on these facts.

5. Preservation and utilization of historical heritage

Sadao Watanabe made useful suggestions concerning the preservation and utilization of historical heritage: (1) even if a region possesses rich history, it would not always be correctly understood and appreciated by the people, if no effort has been made to that end. They would accept it as an important regional resource to be passed on to the posterity, only if historical facts are scientifically proved to be true and explained with clarity; (2) there are unfortunately a few cases where historical heritage, which ought to be protected, became primarily a tourist facility and was unexpectedly destroyed as a result of too high economic expectations. Increasing the attraction of historical heritage is not the same thing as transforming it into a tourist facility^{ix}.

From this opinion, we can point out the following. First, it is important to academically demonstrate the value and worth of each historical heritage. To achieve this goal, we need to make further research archaeologically, historically and by employing interdisciplinary methods on known and unknown historical heritage.

Secondly, we should decide how to preserve and utilize historical heritage, based on these research results. Since it is the role of contemporary people to decide whether historical heritage should be preserved and utilized or destroyed, we should promote these academic achievements to general public and also explain their duty to pass historical heritage on to the posterity. Explanation should be made clearly, specifically and as widely as possible.

Thirdly, if there is general consensus that a historical heritage should be preserved and utilized, it should be organized in a way to demonstrate its worth. Emphasis should be put

onto its historical importance. Although revitalization of regional economy, improvement of amenity etc. and the construction of tourist facilities are also important and worthy issues, we should not overemphasize them and thereby distort historical facts or destroy the site.

These are my basic ideas concerning historical heritage, based on Watanabe's opinion. Now I would like to examine the case of Naniwa-no-Miya along these lines.

Firstly, although there are many facts which became known through fifty years of research, there are still many unsolved or newly arisen issues, for example the geographic extent of Naniwa-no-Miya and the structures of Dairi, Kanga (administrative district) and Kyo-iki (city area). We should therefore continue research to solve these problems, employing archaeological, historical and interdisciplinary methods, and assess the historical importance of Early and Later Naniwa-no-Miya.

Secondly, we should inform the research results to the general public at different occasions, using different means, e.g. excavation reports, academic papers, conferences and public lectures. In this respect, Osaka Museum of History as an on-site museum has a major role to play. Until now, not only the museum, but also many researchers and related groups and societies have made efforts in this direction and it should be continued. Thirdly, only insufficient appeal to local residents has been made during conservation movements of Naniwa-no-Miya in the past, therefore we need to increase our effort in this respect. Considering the importance of the site, maybe we need to extend the notion of 'local residents' to the people of Osaka City, Osaka Prefecture or even of whole Japan or whole world^x.

Fourthly, by promoting research results, we need to obtain people's approval to preserve the site of Naniwa-no-Miya. Without contemporary people's approval, it is impossible to preserve this site, which occupies a great surface at the center of Osaka City. But the entire site extends well beyond the designated area that is under legal protection. Whether or not the remains that will be newly discovered from outside the designated area would be preserved, depends entirely on people's support, especially that of local residents.

Fifthly, in order to obtain contemporary and 'local' people's support for the preservation, we need to organize the site so that the research results can be shown adequately. Although the site of Naniwa-no-Miya is currently being developed as a historic site park, when we consider its location in the middle of urban area in Osaka City, we should make our own specific suggestions for its preservation and utilization in connection with landscape plan, lifelong learning plan, land utilization plan (park and green zone plan) and disaster prevention plan. In this respect, "Osaka Acropolis Plan," suggested by Yoshiharu Nakao, who has conducted archaeological research for long time, would serve as a good reference^{xi}.

Sixthly, we appreciate the fact that the organization of the site of Naniwa-no-Miya is based on Unification and Integration Plan. However, in Comprehensive Plan, Work Program and the recommendation given by Keizai Doyukai, Osaka Castle and Naniwa-no-Miya are regarded as tourist resources. Although we should not categorically reject this point of view, we also should not overemphasize the importance of economic principle and neglect archaeological accuracy. The site should be preserved and utilized based on its own historical value.

6. Conclusion

In this paper I have examined the issue of preservation and utilization of historical heritage, using the site of Naniwa-no-Miya, an important archaeological site situated in the center of megalopolis Osaka, as an example. Here I briefly summarize my opinion about the matter.

(1) We have a duty to academically demonstrate the value of historical heritage. (2) Based on our research results, we must promote to the general public the importance of

preserving historical heritage and transferring them to next generation. (3) To reach that goal, we need to organize historical heritage in the way that its value is widely understood. (4) Historical heritage should not become simple means to attract tourists, but the historical value itself should rather attract people. Further effort is needed to promote its importance. (5) We should devise means to realize tourism that allows people to understand the value of historical heritage.

ⁱ Towao Sakaehara, "Naniwa-no-Miya and Naniwa-no-Miya Conservation Movement" in: National Council for the Preservation of Cultural Property (ed.), *Cultural Property for the Future*, Vol. 51, January 2004.

ⁱⁱ Osaka City accounting (Fiscal year 2004, Planning and coordination bureau, Osaka City), renewed on 24th January 2008.

<http://www.city.osaka.jp/keikakuchousei/toukei/E000/Ea00/Ea00html>

ⁱⁱⁱ JETRO basic economic indicator, http://www.jetro.go.jp/biz/world/asia/th/stat_01/

^{iv} For the background and terms of reconciliation, see Committee for the Preservation of Records of the Lawsuit on Site of Naniwa-no-Miya (ed.), *Preservation of the Site of Naniwa-no-Miya and Lawsuit*, Daiichi hoki shuppan kabushiki gaisha, February 1980.

^v Research and Public Relations Department, Secretariat to the Osaka City Council, *Bulletin of Osaka City Council* 74, June 1985; *id.* 79, June 1986; *id.* 83, June 1987.

^{vi} Kansai Keizai Doyukai (Kansai Association of Corporate Executives) Kansai Committee for the Promotion and Attraction of Visitors, "Suggestions for the utilization of resources to attract visitors, with the cooperation of the state and the people -Focusing on the revision of regulations and systems-."

<http://www.kansaidoyukai.or.jp/teigen-iken/2000/shukyaku/shuhyu.html>

^{vii} Osaka City, *Comprehensive Plan -Osaka begins-* (December 2005).

http://www.city.osaka.jp/keikakuchousei/n_sougou/pdf/kihon_2006/all.pdf

^{viii} Planning and coordination bureau, Osaka City, *Osaka City Work Program 2006-2008* (March 2006)

http://www.city.osaka.jp/keikakuchousei/n_sougou/juten/index.html

^{ix} Sadao Watanabe, "Historical Cultural Heritage and Urban Planning" in: Hiroshi Nakano (ed.) *Historic Sites of Japan -Protection System and Administration-*, Meicho kanko-kai, September 2004.

^x *Op. cit.* no.1.

^{xi} Yoshiharu Nakao, "Osaka Acropolis Plan-Preservation and Utilization of the site of Naniwa-no-Miya-" in: *Studies on Naniwa-no-Miya*, Yoshikawa Kobun-kan, March 1995.