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Many local communities around the world enjoy some degree of autonomy: a council, legislative and taxation power, local service delivery, and even local police. Some might not be affluent but have a tradition of local decision-making and local planning. Those are chartered villages or towns. Such traditions exist even where the central government has the ultimate power to ratify local master plans. Hawai`i communities do not have local autonomy, because they depend on the county and the state for many services, including planning. While local people do exert, at times, great leadership, they usually lack a much-needed localized planning capacity.

Community visioning, participatory assets mapping, local organization coalition building, stakeholders’ partnerships, and statutory participatory planning provisions, are all ways to rejuvenate planning at the local level and retake possession of the surrounding environment, thus improving management and equity. In this quest, the local university, community colleges, and schools can serve key functions in technical assistance helping task forces, locally based organizations, and community groups.

This article reviews examples of neighborhood and community projects in Hawai`i involving graduate students at the University of Hawai`i at Mānoa, faculty, and community-based organizations (CBOs). These projects, undertaken between the late 1970s and the early 1990s, include resident-based microzoning in Mō`ili`ili; proposed small-scale mixed land use and voluntary land readjustment in central Honolulu; proposed land swaps to protect rural Waimānalo; community-based assets and stressors mapping in Kahalu`u; neighborhood visioning in Kāne`ohe; and Hawaiian subsistence resource use and fishpond restoration on Moloka`i.

Cultural, religious, and subsistence rights justify more locally based planning. There are steps to restructure the Hawai`i economy in this direction. This is of interest, as Hawai`i faces globalization pressures; the examples provided are consistent with the alternative approaches of “globalization from below” (cf. Falk 1999). These bottom-up examples also show how communities engage in planning even if they lack the institutional capacity to do. This is significant because governments tend not to delegate planning to localities unless they demonstrate that they are able to handle it, and state and county bureaucracies perceive that their role could be more to focus on island-wide systems and external concerns related to a global sustainable economy, than matters such as local zoning.

Localism and Globalization

The literature on globalization provides elements of a framework to analyze local Hawai`i cases in light of their economic, cultural, and political linkages to globalization.

Globalization is a complex phenomena characterized by the increase and worldwide reach of the following dimensions: (a) widespread capitalistic economy; (b) cross-border trading; (c) globalization and liberalization of financial and consumer markets; (d) international mobility of people; (e) globalization of multinational corporations and deregulation; (f) global consciousness; (g) cross-
national social interdependence; and (h) global technological innovation in communications and transportation networks (Hamelink 1999:1-4). However, critics of globalization emphasize that these dimensions do not necessarily operate worldwide to the extent implied, and that they are not necessarily positive because there is concentration of wealth and power in few countries; geographic polarization; domination by few multinationals; and growing disparities and inequalities among rich and poor people (ibid.; Smeets 1999:10-14). Local community planning efforts can then be assessed in relation to the existence (or not) of these dimensions and people’s responses or adaptation at the local level.

The global economy is based on the homogenization of cultures and on the exercise of a “politics of difference,” according to Vandana Shiva (1999). The result is the domination by a few over the many, disparities of wealth, and marginalization by race, class, and gender. But Shiva adds that there are responses to the unjust, non-sustainable production of globalization. These constitute a “politics of diversity” where “diverse cultures, rooted in diverse ecosystems and supported through diverse livelihood,” thrive because of “the kinship between diverse people, the Earth and her species” (1999:29-30). Richard Falk defines a “second type of globalization,” that is, “a product of transnational forces” influencing the environment, human rights, and development promoted by a highly differentiated “global civic society.” This movement is people-oriented and constitutes a “globalization from below” in opposition to the neo-liberal “globalization from above” of the large private and public multinational organizations (Falk 1999:147). Michael Haas refers to “ecological epistemic communities” as networks of people who, sharing similar values and knowledge, push an international “green” agenda for ecological sustainable development (Hass 1999:121). Both Buck and Henderson use the term “global common” for the many international treaties dealing with worldwide environmental protection and ecological integrity adopted also because of pressures from environmental groups (Buck 1998; Henderson 1999:25).

Local community efforts can then be evaluated in terms of their kinship and linkages to similar endeavors by other like-minded people; the degree of exchange and communications existing among them; and planning efforts “from below.” Community projects should also be seen from a historical perspective and in a time context. Prakash and Hart (1999:4-5) suggest that globalization processes were initiated and encouraged by four factors: technological change, the market system, domestic politics, and inter-state rivalries. Globalization induces changes in governance institutions, and over time these changes impact the pace and extent of globalization. In other words, these authors see globalization affecting and being affected by governance.

What could be a community approach for Hawai‘i in an era of globalization? If globalization means viewing the world as one, trade across national boundaries, merchants operating in international settings, and international migration of labor, then Hawai‘i has already seen all these international activities with the geographical exploration of the European and American scientific expeditions in the Pacific in search of the Northwest Passage and the Antarctic continent, with the fur and the sandalwood traders, with the sugar cane plantations and their foreign indentured laborers, and more recently, with the presence of the military, international mass tourism, and resort development. Thus it is possible to tease out of the islands’ history the gradually developing policies toward globalization, institutional takeover, and economic change, on the one hand, and on the other, see how people cope with, adapt to, and resist the contemporary aspects of globalization.
Limited Local Autonomy and Government Centralization

The limited local autonomy and decision-making in Hawai‘i today is the legacy of external influences that supported a centralized form of government in the past. The unified Hawaiian Kingdom of 1810 was made possible by the relationship that King Kamehameha had with whites who reached the Hawaiian Islands after 1778 because of global exploration and world trade. These Westerners exerted their influence and helped the King defeat other chiefs with arms, technology, money, and administrative knowledge. Thus the international forces that spurred modern globalization already impacted the Hawaiian Islands two centuries ago.

Meller (1958) describes the centralization of government in Territorial Hawai‘i as rooted in the monarchy and the chiefly system of the Kingdom of Hawai‘i in 1800; the authoritarian pattern of influence by the protestant mission; and the authoritative private control of plantation managers in rural areas. These centripetal forces carried over into the Provisional Government of the annexationists that overthrew the Kingdom of Hawai‘i in 1893; into the Republic of Hawai‘i of 1894; and – after annexation to the US in 1898 – into the Territory of Hawai‘i. Centralization was pursued for converging reasons by a white oligarchy made up of missionaries who desired a new moral order, and plantation owners who sought world recognition for international treaties for marketing sugar, and to secure waves of plantation laborers from China, Japan, and the Philippines. The result was a centralized territorial government with appointed positions from the top, a government responsive to the Republican Party and the American corporate interests concentrated in the “Big Five” – the companies that controlled plantation, shipping, infrastructure, and finance in the Hawaiian Islands.

The Organic Act of 1900 spelled out the form of government for Hawai‘i with a governor appointed from Washington DC who controlled education, welfare, sanitation, health, highways, and public works. Counties had limited scope and a small degree of fiscal authority, with no school districts or special districts, no towns or townships, and no municipal government for Honolulu (Kamins 1952:6,97). Foreign-born Asians did not obtain voting rights until 1952 (Mention and Tamura 1991:128-31). While the expanding Democratic electorate pressured for more home rule, when the Democrats themselves came to power, they too retained a high degree of government centralization even after obtaining statehood in 1959 (Meller 1958:105).

Today, the counties have attained a greater level of autonomy in local planning in the urban district and joint authority with the state in the agricultural districts, but still there is no “home rule” below that level. Even if there are so called “community plans” on Maui, Community Councils in the County of Hawai‘i, and advisory “neighborhood boards” on O‘ahu, only the counties and the state can do regulatory planning.

Currently at the county level, appointed citizens have limited input on boards, commissions, and committees advisory to the mayor and the county councils in areas such as ethics, civil service, cost control, pensions, status of women, persons with disabilities, affirmative action, public safety, civil defense, police, fire, liquor licenses, planning, zoning, historic preservation, transportation, and water supply (Mau 2000).

In sum, from the 1880s, a centralized Hawai‘i government operated under the influence of an incipient world capitalist economy. Foreign investment and population growth (originating in immigration from the continental US and the Asia-Pacific region) were key components of the post-contact colonization of the
islands for the sugar economy then, and of the recent urbanization and development pressure for the tourism economy now (Minerbi 1996:190-93). It is within this history of external influences and centralized control at the state and county levels that the lack of resources and authority at the local level and efforts of bottom-up community planning can be understood in Hawai‘i.

Community Mapping, Visioning, and Participatory Planning

While in Hawai‘i local planning is mainly undertaken at the county level, in reality, private consultants, hired by foreign corporations or large landowners, end up doing most of the actual planning for resort and housing projects. These projects are often proposed in inappropriate locations, such as sensitive coastal sites and agricultural and conservation lands, and not in already-zoned urban lands – where they should be. The state and county then accommodate these private development proposals by approving *ad hoc* development plan and rezoning changes. This explains many community conflicts (Minerbi 1994a,b).

This system of centralized bureaucratic or privatized top-down planning is responsible for most of what is wrong with local land planning in Hawai‘i. However, things do not have to stay that way. What follow are precursors to recent efforts in participatory mapping, visioning, and community planning in the 1990s:

“Participatory mapping” encourages residents to plot by themselves, with the assistance of a planner, the important resources and assets, stressors, and issues of the area in which they live.

“Visioning” is a facilitated process for community members to state desirable goals and objectives that form a unified vision for their own community.

“Community planning” or participatory planning is the involvement of residents in planning their own community through the following steps of the planning process: involvement of leaders; local area assessment; identification of values and visions; development and selection of alternatives to achieve the vision; impact assessment of the selected alternatives; and plan documentation, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation (Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation 1985).

Community planning thus is a process within which participatory mapping and visioning of a preferred future take place. Participatory mapping can be undertaken in the three stages of data collection, visioning, and design of alternatives. These methods are described below in a number of examples of public policy in Hawai‘i from the last fifteen years.

The Urban Setting

*Microzoning at the Neighborhood Level in McCully-Mō‘ili‘ili, 1977-84*

McCully-Mō‘ili‘ili is an old, ethnic, working-class neighborhood that has experienced ethnic and class diversification due to high-rise construction and a moderate shift in neighborhood character from renter- to owner-occupied units. Through community meetings, residents helped generate a community-issues map in 1977-79 depicting both site-specific and neighborhood-wide issues and concerns. This map was useful to identify a neighborhood strategy for coalition building between residents and small businesses (Minerbi 1981).
The McCully-Mō‘ili‘ili map proved valuable in envisioning what would be a community-based zoning plan for the neighborhood: microzoning for a greater variety of mixed uses, and low-rise typology for moderate density. This is a departure from the County General Plan and the old Comprehensive Zone Code (now the Land Use Ordinance) of 1960, which simplistically, with a wide-brush, brown color, slated the entire neighborhood for high-rise, high-density redevelopment dictated by the City and County of Honolulu (C&C) and developers’ interests.

The neighborhood board circulated this community-based, microzoning map to all residents in the district in 1979 (McCully-Mō‘ili‘ili Neighborhood Board 1979), which helped residents solidify their zoning vision for the neighborhood. The development plan eventually adopted by the C&C for the area in the early 1980s was a compromise between this low-density microzoning proposed by the residents and the high-density zoning imposed by the C&C, but the community activists did not forget their community-based plan. When a developer proposed a high rise abutting the Mānoa stream across the Ala Wai Canal in 1984, opposition to the project came not only from the residents of the parcel and the city block affected, but from a much broader, neighborhood-resident constituency that spread city-wide. The result was that the Save Date Lā‘au initiative petition (citizen-initiated legislation) succeeded in stopping the project and required that the public be formally informed when developers want to change zoning (Save Date-Lā‘au Coalition 1984). The lesson here is that the planning officials should acknowledge the mental map that interprets a community’s vision, and community organizers should help residents visualize their visions and concerns using maps.

Small-scale, Mixed Land Use and Land Readjustment in Central Honolulu, 1979-85

In 1979, the C&C embarked on the preparation of new development plans for nine regions of the island of O‘ahu. This planning process included a people’s participation component so that three representatives of each neighborhood board would sit in an advisory group to the city for that development plan area. The Primary Urban Center East (PUC-East) included 27 representatives from nine neighborhood boards from Diamond Head to Kaka‘ako. A group of University of Hawai‘i (UH) graduate planning students acted as a technical assistance team by tackling the hottest issue hidden in the development plan: determining where the additional population assigned to the district should go. The C&C representative was not willing to address such a volatile topic, perhaps afraid that this might trigger opposition to the whole development plan process. The students instead addressed the question head-on by developing alternative distribution options, depicting these distributions on a map and providing information in a table to compare these population distribution alternatives using the following criteria: (a) neighborhood self-sufficiency; (b) impact on infrastructure costs; and (c) transit link possibility (Department of Architecture and Urban and Regional Planning Program 1979). The alternative design schemes were: (1) “Neighborhood Center” (locate the population in center of the neighborhood); (2) “Available Non-Residential Space” (locate the additional population in the Ala Wai Golf course and in Kaka‘ako); (3) “Infrastructural Spine” (locate the population in a linear way by filling the commercial space along the South King and Beretania Street corridors and along Ala Moana Boulevard); (4) “Laissez Faire” (allow the additional population to locate throughout the district by redeveloping older, single-family housing lots).
The members of the PUC-East, assembled by the students in small groups of five to six people, discussed this information and came up with their choice: a combination of alternative 1 and 3 in temporal sequence so that the initial population would be distributed equitably in the core of each neighborhood where some commercial use already existed, without encroaching on the established residential areas. In time, the additional population would locate along the two corridors, thereby linking the neighborhood and facilitating mass transit patronage.

In other words, the residents – in their wisdom – envisioned something quite new: a mixed-use approach (residential with commercial and businesses) to land-use intensification. The old Comprehensive Zone Code of the C&C did not provide for vertical mixed-use zoning (except in the Downtown area), but the 1985 Land Use Ordinance provided for it. This case demonstrates that neighborhood residents, when given the information and a chance, engage in good planning and arrive at innovative solutions by subordinating their own interest to the broader public interest.

Two UH planning students conducted a small-scale, mixed-use study for Young Street in Honolulu in 1982, demonstrating the possibilities of human-scale, pedestrian-oriented “high-density and low-rise” mixed use. This is an alternative to the corporate sector’s super-block “high-density and high-rise” mixed-use development of the Kaka’ako district (DURP 1982). This solution of a more human-scale mixed use, while still a possibility and sporadically implemented in the city, was stifled by the Japanese real-estate wave of corporate investment of the late 1980s and early 1990s in Honolulu. The unfortunate result was big developers’ redevelopment and residents and small business’ displacement (super block development), particularly in the districts of Kaka’ako, Waikiki and Ke’eaumoku.

In the 1980s, UH students and some faculty attempted to study legislation that would have provided an opportunity for small landowners and small developers to participate in the urban development planning process through the formation of voluntary associations as an alternative to the government’s initiated eminent domain. This would have achieved the objectives of limiting urban sprawl on O’ahu by fostering inner-city redevelopment in Honolulu and realizing a compact, human-scale urban form while avoiding mega-development. Interestingly, the missing tool would have been borrowed from the Japanese Kukaku Seiri, land-readjustment system. But the lack of a strong supporting coalition, and the lack of interest of the landed elite and the C&C government, lead to the costly and inefficient suburbanization of O’ahu we have today (Minerbi 1987; Urban and Regional Planning Program 1982; Minerbi et al. 1986).

The Rural and Suburban Setting

Land Swap to Keep “Waimānalo Waimānalo,” 1987

Another example of a local situation inspired by the Japanese land-readjustment system is Waimānalo. By listening to the Waimānalo community in the late 1980s, a group of UH graduate planning students managed to identify many land use issues such as the desire to keep “Waimānalo Waimānalo.” Residents desired to retain the rural character for the valley, while meeting modest growth needs. Some farmers wanted to subdivide their private land to build homes for themselves and their children, creating pressure for a conversion from agricultural to urban land use and scattered sprawl.
By mapping these community issues in Waimānalo against zoning information and ownership data in 1987, it became apparent to the students that a “land swap” between the private farmers and Department of Land and Natural Resources (DLNR) at the fringe of the town could achieve both objectives. DLNR could obtain good agricultural land for people who wanted to farm by extending the existing agricultural park. The farmers – in turn – could obtain house lots at the outskirts of the town on land owned by the state. The land swap could minimize infrastructure costs and retain a more compact, small-town pattern.

This idea remains a viable one even now to meet the need of Waimānalo residents to house themselves and retain the rural character of farming. This case illustrates that careful analysis of land-use options can lead to conflict minimization among residents by allowing diverse legitimate objectives to be met simultaneously – if the government takes a supportive role in implementing the residents’ suggestions (DURP 1987).

**Participatory Assets/Stressors Mapping in Kahaluʻu, 1992**

In Windward Oʻahu the neighborhood board and the Kahaluʻu Key Project, a social service agency, wanted to initiate community mapping and a survey. Without any funding, a class of UH graduate planning students linked up with community groups and earned their trust for interviewing, visiting farmers, working in the loʻi (taro pond fields), and adapting their class schedule to the community calendar by participating with a booth in the community hoʻolaulea (celebration, fair) at the Key Project. Students conducted a mini-survey and a “participatory mapping” exercise. The mini-survey, while not a substitute for a proper, random-sample telephone or mail survey of residents, was sufficient to show how to sense the pulse of the community and to learn what to ask regarding quality of life. The survey encompassed “rural” (read: local) lifestyle; “Hawaiian” (read: indigenous) lifestyle; population growth and density; shared community values and visions; basic needs (food and shelter, etc.); access to the mountains and to the sea; development and land use; transportation and traffic; security of residency and leases; and other concerns.

The one-page survey form asked respondents to describe “what is working well” and “what is not working well” for the above quality-of-life categories stressing people and places. Visitors to the fair were asked to identify on a map what they consider “assets” and “stressors” in the community. Visitors where also asked to identify the location of sites on the map. This map was then digitized into the state Geographic Information System (GIS), to make the point that bottom-up data from the community could very well be a consideration in state planning. A small-group mapping session with community leaders verified the information generated from the respondents. Assets were then tabulated with the quality of life indices, and major community concerns were ranked.

Even children participated in a cultural and environmental awareness game at the hoʻolaulea. One student typed the name and the description of cultural sites in the valley, attaching these paper strips to pins, and asking children to identify each place on the map by attaching the proper name to its locality. This was an opportunity to talk about legends, lore, and use of the area with the kids and their mothers. The respondents received small gifts, such as rulers to measure fish and posters of endangered species donated by DLNR. A cultural map depicting ancient sites was drawn up. The final report described in detail what residents of the area thought about the problems and opportunities to plan their own community.
This report generated interest within other neighborhood boards and service organizations on the Windward Coast and established the methodology for participatory community mapping and ethnographic quality of life studies used later in other communities. It was referred to by the State Department of Health and the US Environmental Protection Agency as a “cutting edge” example (DURP 1993a).

Community Visioning and Planning in Kāne‘ohe, 1994

Forming a group called “Vision 2020” in 1994, the Kāne‘ohe Neighborhood Board was probably the first to come up with a community-based consensus plan for the future of the district. The group started out by identifying landmarks throughout the area and planned a telephone survey that senior citizens would administer. The board sought to replicate the Kahaluu’u study in Kāne‘ohe. Thus, a UH graduate planning class assisted the Vision 2020 group in the following joint tasks: (a) community visioning and planning for a one-year-long timetable; (b) extending the “Landscape Landmarks” list with a participatory mapping exercise involving kūpuna (elders, old-timers) to designate cultural areas to protect; (c) linking up with the Kāne‘ohe Business Association to study their concerns regarding the viability of the central business district (CBD); (d) developing a bike plan and alternative traffic access improvement in the CBD; (e) studying historical, socioeconomic, land-use and environmental information as a basis for a neighborhood plan, (f) linking with the C&C planning department to access data sources and expertise; (g) participating in the Kāne‘ohe ho’olaulea to advertise the 2020 visioning process by involving visitors in participatory mapping exercises; and (h) setting up an exhibit at Windward Mall during Thanksgiving week to display all the maps generated by the project, to obtain additional input from residents, and to involve children in drawing visions of Kāne‘ohe.

The product was a report and an exhibit that are models for local community analysis and planning dealing with visioning, and participatory mapping leading to cultural resource planning, alternative transportation improvement, and intergenerational linkages (DURP 1994). The challenge then was for the Kāne‘ohe Vision 2020 group to expand its activities to involve business, residents, and service organizations in Kāne‘ohe and to find alternative technical assistance close to home through the Windward Community College and the local high schools to carry further what they and the UH students did in 1994. This report was a key resource for the American Institute of Architects’ participatory design exercise held the following year in Honolulu with C&C support and successfully involving architects, planners, and many Kāne‘ohe residents, including some of the students themselves.

Hawaiian Fishponds and Subsistence on Moloka‘i, 1994

For many years, people on Moloka‘i wanted to restore the Hawaiian fishponds of the south shore and protect and restock hunting, fishing and gathering subsistence resources of that island. Moloka‘i residents recently succeeded in obtaining government attention by setting up two Governor’s task forces in 1993-94 for fishpond restoration and for subsistence protection. The Governor’s Task Force for Fishpond Restoration held a conference and produced a report making recommendations for fishpond restoration. Few fishponds were restored as demonstration projects. Many political, regulatory, and technical concerns
remain to be addressed to make the restoration of several fishponds a reality. One idea was to ignore government regulations and have Hawaiian groups go ahead and restore and use the fishponds in the name of Hawaiian sovereignty. Another idea was to work within the government and obtain a Master Conservation District Use Application (MCDUA) from the DLNR that would allow several fishponds to obtain conservation-use permits through one master permit application, because of the similarity of the restoration work. The MCDUA would simplify government approval. The first idea generated pressure for the second one.

A UH planning graduate practicum undertook the following: (a) collected field information; (b) obtained consent from the private owners of some fishponds to participate in the MCDUA; (c) conducted a community meeting to establish which fishponds should be part of the MCDUA application; and (d) documented this process in a report (DURP 1993b). The students surveyed the ponds and analyzed and ranked the fishponds in groups according to relative degrees of restoration feasibility and prepared posters for each pond illustrating its conditions and characteristics, all the while providing for people’s write-in input. Eventually DLNR approved the MCDUA, but many tasks remain: (a) to facilitate ‘ohana (family) group formation for the restoration of the fishponds within each ahupua‘a (ancient land division stretching from the mountain tops out into the sea, including the reef; Minerbi 1999); (b) to secure agreements with the landowners; and (c) to come up with a plan for each pond that deals with federal, state, county, and community concerns specific to the locality and to resolve technical restoration problems. Recent legislation is attempting to address some of these concerns.

Work for the Moloka‘i Subsistence Task Force was done by three UH faculty involved in a “multi-method” research and planning approach: (a) acting as staff to the Task Force in their meetings and deliberations; (b) conducting a telephone survey of Moloka‘i residents’ opinion about subsistence; (c) conducting focus group meetings with subsistence practitioners in each community on Moloka‘i and meeting with lā‘au lapa‘au (traditional medicine) practitioners and commercial fishermen; (d) conducting participatory mapping in the focus group meetings to identify the spatial location of fishing, hunting, ocean and forest gathering, gardening, and raising animals; (e) presenting these findings at a community meeting; and (f) writing a report for review and approval by the task force.

The faculty subcontracted a local community-based organization to assist in identifying subsistence practitioners, calling the focus groups, and hiring Moloka‘i college students for the telephone interviews. The task force’s recommendations were: to protect subsistence resources; to promote education, restoration, and restocking; to train people in proper traditional gathering and fishing practices; to establish ‘ohana-, kupuna-, and kapu-based (traditional laws) management practices; to decentralize at the local homestead level some DLNR conservation functions; to create a pilot sanctuary project at Mo‘omomi Bay; and to offer suggestions for traditional Hawaiian trail access on Moloka‘i Ranch lands (Matsuoka et al. 1994:72-88; 1998:40-41).

The Moloka‘i experiences inspired community groups on Maui and Hawai‘i to conduct similar studies and establish similar Hawaiian sanctuaries in their respective islands.

**Linkages to Globalization and to Recent Local Developments**
What are the linkages – if any – of these local, island, community-planning examples to the globalization phenomenon and to current community planning efforts? There is a somewhat paradoxical and contradictory answer, “some and a little,” depending on how globalization is defined and how local-global linkages are understood. The above examples have been in response to, and in solidarity with, neighborhood communities and local and Hawaiian people. The work facilitated the documentation of people’s voices, views, wisdom, and knowledge through surveys, participatory mapping, and elaborating solutions proposed by residents.

These studies were done within the existing governmental planning system. They indicate that, with proper support, residents can engage in remarkably good planning. Decentralization and home rule is achievable when the community already engages in local planning, shows that it can do it, and legally obtains planning powers from the state and the county. As more decentralization takes place from the federal government to the states through “block grants,” it would be wise to reassign, with funding support, certain tasks from the state and from county to local communities.

Here the successful communities and neighborhood plans under study were few because local communities did not have the resources and the jurisdictional power to plan for themselves. But the above examples document constructive steps toward community-based visioning and planning.

All the urban and rural island examples presented here from Hawai‘i may have existed even if the modern globalization phenomenon had not taken off as it did in the 1970s. These examples deal with local issues, local involvement, local resources, and local solutions that can be seen as “de-linked” from globalization to an extent. In fact microzoning, small-scale mixed uses, land exchanges, land readjustment, participatory mapping, neighborhood visioning, Hawaiian fishpond restoration, and subsistence protection stand in their own right as local realities, concerns, and solutions. Yet one could say that these are responses to the development and population pressures of globalization. The pressures of population growth and distribution induced by a sustained national and international immigration in Hawai‘i are precisely the forces that the microzoning, small-scale mixed-use, and land-readjustment approaches tried to address in urban Honolulu (Minerbi 1994b:147-51).

It is possible to see the projects on Moloka‘i for fishpond restoration and Hawaiian subsistence protection as examples of local strategies to deal with globalization, because they are based on indigenous and local cultural practices and the protection of island ecology. Legislation was introduced and enacted to establish Mo’omomi as a pilot project for five years. It was touted as a model project by many, but the new state administration and legislature apparently did not extend the project.

These Hawai‘i examples, proposing human-scale, culturally compatible land uses, and sensitivity to the island ecology, may be part of the so-called second type of globalization. We can say so because these local initiatives have not been conceived in isolation, but are based on some exchange and networking with “epistemic communities” around the globe faced with similar concerns.

The 1994 visioning exercise in Kāne‘ohe must have reassured the C&C of the replicability and value of such participatory efforts, such that the C&C has embarked on in the 1999-2000 C&C of Honolulu Shared Vision for the Future. This innovative program gave the opportunities to nineteen neighborhood boards throughout the island of O‘ahu, through volunteer efforts and with the support by Mayor Harris, to engage in a visioning exercise to identify desirable community projects.
The Mayor’s promise was that up to $2 million of the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) money for the fiscal year 2000 would be set aside in each community to fund these selected and very reasonable projects. Yet criticism has been raised that this effort may have been guided – in some instances – by some C&C officials and volunteers bypassing the planning subcommittees made up by elected representatives of neighborhood boards. Regardless of the merit of this criticism, the admonition here is that volunteer visioning efforts be harmonized with the established decision-making process of the neighborhood boards.

The Kāne‘ohe and Kahalu‘u experiences indicate that their visions and goals and the proposed “Town Plan” are consistent with the 1994 Kāne‘ohe 2020 study. CIP appropriations have been made for further planning and design (Kāne‘ohe-Kahalu‘u Community Vision Team 1999:7,14).

In Waimānalo, the DLNR is the single largest landowner because it has inherited the “ceded lands” of the centralized governments of the Hawaiian Kingdom and the Territory of Hawai‘i. Land exchanges of the extent needed to protect agricultural land and promote compact rural town development are possible precisely when the government is a large landowner. The 1999 vision statement for Waimānalo reiterates the goal that Waimānalo should remain rural in character by stating that: “Although there is a need for Housing, development should not convert agricultural lots into large residential neighborhoods” (Waimānalo Community 1999).

The Vision Summary of Team 10 for Central Honolulu still supports the notion of “promoting appropriate mixed uses in neighborhoods,” somewhat similar to the mixed-use idea suggested in the 1970s and the 1980s (Team 10 1999:3). The 1999 C&C Draft Development Plan for the Primary Urban Center, ignoring the voluntary land readjustment proposal of the 1980s, introduced the country notion of creating a city development authority with condemnation power of private property for redevelopment. It was only because the concern, knowledge of alternative solutions, and opposition of neighborhood residents, that the C&C in March 2000 promised to drop altogether this idea from the plan (Department of Planning and Permitting 2000).

To make headway, Hawai‘i centralized government bureaucracies and multinational landed elite could give up some of their excessive control of resources by decentralizing planning and management responsibility and entering into partnerships with local communities.

One opportunity to foster a search for a better community understanding of globalization and localism is the recent use of distance-education course and the initiative by local groups to engage in the educational skills building workshop “Countering Globalization” initiated in September 2000 to respond to the Hawai‘i government’s official decision to host the Asian Development Bank’s (ADB) annual meeting in May 2001 in Honolulu (Kahea 2000). The agenda explores how ADB “aid projects increase poverty, strengthen multinational corporations, desecrate the environment, suppress human rights, undermine indigenous rights and weaken local governments.” In particular, the effort by local groups is to better understand how globalization affects island people and the fragile island environment, and what can be done to ameliorate its negative effects.

In conclusion, while the examples presented may emerge autonomously from local needs, they are also a response to outside forces that stem from the global economy. They have a meaning not only in addressing local concerns, but also in a quest for a more sustainable and more human global economy to the extent that they are advocated and shared by other communities outside Hawai‘i, and vice versa. These community efforts can be sustained through
education across generations, as sometime positive results are achieved only in the long term.

Notes

1. An earlier version of this paper entitled “Community Visioning, Participatory Mapping and Neighborhood Planning in Hawai‘i” was presented at the May 20-21, 1995 Ethnic Studies Community Conference on “Community Politics and Socioeconomic Issues in Hawai‘i,” Ethnic Studies Program, University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, Honolulu, Hawai‘i. Thank you to the two anonymous reviewers and the editor for their comments to the latest version of this paper.

2. Successful examples of citizens’ coalitions and “community visioning” have been recognized at national planning conventions in the 1990s, generating interest and, in turn, greater acceptance by metropolitan jurisdictions (Jones 1990).

3. “Community mapping” is not a new endeavor. The famous map of cultivated fields, stonewalls, pathways, and streams carved three to four thousand years ago at Bedolina in the Valcamonica Valley of the Italian Alps is a powerful and enduring image of ancient people consciously charting their planned environment (Anati 1982). We can only speculate on the real purpose of this petroglyph map: it is on a very large, flat rock located on a ridge panoramically overlooking the valley below that even now has cultivated fields. Conceivably, one could point to a field in the valley, and at the same time locate its representation on the rock. Neolithic or Bronze Age people could ritualize, discuss, identify, locate, and assign tasks to families tending their fields. The map was an information tool linking people to their surrounding resources and places. The metaphor of the Bedolina map is that communities have carved their visions and plans since the midst of time. We can do that today. In fact, the Mō‘ili‘ili issue map was inspired by the Bedolina map.

4. “Visioning” – we believe imprecisely – sometimes is used to describe the overall planning effort at the community level, rather than one of its steps (Oregon Vision Project 1993). “Visioning” is a concept that Native Hawaiian elderly and cultural practitioners associate with dreams and visions such as akakū (vision), hihi‘o (dream), ‘ūlāleo (supernatural voices or sounds) (Pukui et al. 1972:11-22). Thus with Hawaiians, the term “goals and objective setting” would be preferable.

5. The project funded in fiscal year 2000 can be grouped in the following categories of neighborhood betterment: community master planning, design and construction studies; infrastructure and traffic improvement and beautification (including streets, roads, drainage and flood control); sidewalks, bikeways, trails, and access; community facilities and furniture improvements in parks; recreation; landscaping and signage; cultural centers; anti-crime measures; ambulance stations; clinics; land and easement acquisition; open markets; utilities relocation and undergrounding of overhead utilities; lighting improvements; bus stops and transportation assistance.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSIONS OF GLOBALIZATION</th>
<th>ACTIONS/EVENTS</th>
<th>IMPACTS</th>
<th>LOCAL RESPONSES</th>
<th>HAWAI‘I CASES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPITALISTIC</td>
<td>expansion of consumers’ and producers’ markets</td>
<td>displacement of local people</td>
<td>propose voluntary land re-adjustment for small lot owners</td>
<td>Central Honolulu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. It may be instructive to explore possible linkages between local planning and globalization by analyzing selected dimensions of globalization and the general actions or events they can generate. These actions or events may have direct or indirect impacts on local people and on the local environment. Local planning initiatives may be a response to challenges and opportunities of globalization.