



透過培力建構社區復原力： 不同文化背景的社區營造

Building Community Resilience through Empowerment: Place-Making in Different Cultural Contexts



綠比卡・馬穆拉-席頓 博士暨紐西蘭席頓研究顧問公司負責人

Dr. Ljubica Mamula-Seadon

Director of Seadon Consulting & Research Ltd., New Zealand

Email: Ljubica@seadonconsulting.com

摘要

災害的影響在 20 世紀驟增，新的複雜性已經改變了以風險評估為基礎的防災政策與實務脈絡，並將注意力轉移到耐受力、彈性、與災後復原的概念，導入復原力的主張。社會復原力一般解釋為社區自我組織及能夠學習、創新與創造的能量，然而，調適能力與學習能力只會在體制架構提倡培力的脈絡下發生，這需要一個有機構們推動有意義的社會參與及強化社會資本的治理制度。日本早在 16 世紀就有一個社區自治的管理系統，稱為 machi-kumi，與現代的社區營造 (Machizukuri) 實務相似，社區營造代表公民及居民有都市規劃所有權的趨勢，並與政府積極合作。它已經變成東亞最受歡迎的社區規劃概念之一，遍及韓國 (Maeul-Mandeulgi) 和臺灣 (SheQu-

YingZao，社區營造)，影響這些國家規劃社區治理的範式轉變。紐西蘭採取地方分權及審議式的規劃與決策過程的民主制度，將風險管理整合入更廣泛的永續發展策略，最大的城市奧克蘭最近引進新的治理機制，透過社區營造來支持社區培力，本文分析這兩個社區營造取向的執行，及他們在建構社區復原力的成效。

關鍵字：復原力、社會資本、造町、社區營造、社區學習

Abstract

The impact of disasters has dramatically increased in the 20th century. New complexities have changed the context for policies and practices based on risk assessment and drew attention to the concepts of endurance, flexibility and rebound after a disaster, introducing the notion of resilience. Societal resilience is commonly interpreted as the community's capacity to be self-organising and capable of learning, innovation and creativity. However, adaptability and learning can occur only in the contexts where institutional frameworks promote empowerment. This necessitates a system of governance where institutions act as enablers of meaningful engagement and the strengthening of social capital. As early as the sixteenth century in Japan, there existed an autonomous community management system, machi-kumi, arguably reflected in the modern practice of place-making (Machi-zukuri). Machizukuri represents a trend whereby citizens and residents take the ownership of city planning, and work in active partnership with government. It has become one of the most popular planning-related concepts in contemporary East Asia as it spread to Korea (Maaeul-Mandeulgi) and Taiwan (SheQu-YingZao), influencing a paradigm shift in planning governance in those countries. New Zealand operates democratic systems with decentralised and deliberative planning and decision-making processes that integrate risk management into broader sustainable development strategies. Its largest city, Auckland, has recently introduced new governance mechanisms



to support community empowerment through place-making. This presentation analyses implementation of the two approaches to place-making and their effectiveness in community resilience building.

Keywords: resilience, social capital, Machizukiri, SheQu-YingZao, community learning

Introduction

The impact of disasters has dramatically increased in the 20th century. New complexities have changed the context for policies and practices based on risk assessment and drew attention to the concepts of endurance, flexibility and rebound after a disaster, introducing the notion of resilience. Societal resilience is commonly interpreted as the community's capacity to be self-organising and capable of learning, innovation and creativity. However, adaptability and learning can occur only in the contexts where institutional frameworks promote empowerment. This necessitates a system of governance where institutions act as enablers of meaningful engagement and the strengthening of social capital.

New Zealand operates democratic systems with decentralised and deliberative planning and decision-making processes that integrate risk management into broader sustainable development strategies. Its largest city, Auckland, has recently introduced new governance mechanisms to support community empowerment through place-making. This chapter analyses implementation of the two approaches to place-making and their effectiveness in community resilience building.

What is community resilience?

Resilience to disasters, as a new concept in risk management, came to international prominence following the introduction of the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005 – 2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters. Originally, one of the most common references to natural hazard disaster resilience related to the capacity of a society to “bounce back”, cope,

withstand, resist and recover quickly from the impacts of hazards (Mileti, 1999). Preparedness and self-reliance are other characteristics of resilience, as are diversity, redundancy and interconnectedness (Mileti, 1999; Paton & Johnston, 2006). These characteristics relate to a set of capacities that can be fostered through interventions and policies, which in turn help build and enhance a community's ability to respond to and recover from disasters (Cutter, 2010).

Rapid, unplanned urbanisation, environmental degradation, population concentration in disaster-prone areas and increasing disparities of wealth weakened community-wide capacities to resist and recover from disasters. Those uncertainties have changed the context for policies and practices based on risk reduction and drew attention to the concepts of endurance, flexibility and rebound after a disaster, introducing the notion of resilience. Thus, first decade of 21st century has seen rapid expansion of resilience related research and initiatives - the 'advent of resilience', with initiation of major international, globalised programmes of resilience building all over the world. Most recently, many of these developments in sustainability and resilience, related to natural hazards risk management, have been summarised in the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 (UNISDR, 2015).

The Sendai Framework represents a blueprint for disaster risk management that governments across the world have committed to. It reinforces the importance of people-centred, all-hazards approaches that strengthen societal resilience. The Framework also requires that disaster risk reduction and resilience building are addressed in the context of sustainable development (UNISDR, 2015). Strengthening of democratic risk governance, all-of-government, all-of-society, inclusive and empowering partnerships with all stakeholders are required for effective risk reduction and resilience building (UNISDR, 2015). This reflects a definition of resilience as the community's capacity to be self-organising and capable of learning, innovation and creativity, determined by interdependent resources including economic development, social capital, information and communication, and community competence (Paton et al., 2014). The definition resonates with Norris et al. (2008) who identify



adaptive capacity as a process enacted through linking social capital, economic development, information and communication, and community competence.

Resilience and governance

If societal resilience is characterised by community's adaptive capacity, that means building adaptive capacity requires institutional contexts which promote empowerment and sharing knowledge, as well as well-developed, strong social capital (Norris et al., 2008; Paton et al., 2014). In this context social capital is interpreted as networks of relationships among people in a society that enable societies and citizens to function effectively (ibid). The approach brings to prominence the role of governance, as inter-related sets of norms (such as laws and regulations, frameworks, standards), organisational and institutional arrangements, and practices designed to enable implementation of measures that reduce the impacts of disasters (Tierney, 2012).

Importantly, in addition to enabling coordination and integration across the risk management and resilience building framework, governance can be interpreted as an institutional enabler of empowering societal networks and adaptive capacity settings and, thus, strengthening of community resilience (Paton et al., 2014). In other words, governance becomes an institutional enabler of meaningful engagement and strengthening of social capital (Paton et al., 2014), as well as the key instrument for implementation of the complex, integrated policy frameworks that underpin both sustainable development and resilience.

To link comprehensive environmental risk management, resilience and sustainability necessitates an appropriate framework flexible enough to incorporate the diverse aspects that constitute those terms. In fact, it can be argued that governance effectively brings together sustainability and resilience, in a shared policy and governance framework. Such a governance system involves multiple and democratic frameworks for negotiation among the various actors at different levels. Therefore, governance models for resilience and sustainability commonly introduce integrated, comprehensive and effects-based

(all-hazards) policy and planning. The approach presumes democratic systems with decentralised and deliberative planning and decision-making processes that integrate risk management into broader sustainable development strategies.

The governance model is tiered (i.e. central - regional - local government) where central government sets national direction and policies and local government is responsible for implementation. The supporting legislation, policies, guidelines and plans are commonly based upon sustainable development principles, favouring local empowerment and bottom-up approaches to management. The approach demands extensive coordination and cooperation among all levels of government, private sector, community groups and other stakeholders, with a particular emphasis on the inclusion of affected communities into decision-making (Mamula-Seadon & McLean, 2015).

The approach follows a trend of public participation in environmental decision making in general that had become gradually institutionalized at federal, state and local levels in the United States and Canada, Western Europe, Australia and New Zealand, as well as through the forums such as the United Nations and the World Bank (Depoe et al., 2004; Fraser-Molekati, 2012).

Cultural context and resilience: Japan and New Zealand

Japan: Machizukuri - a practice of place-making

It is easy to get lost in a Japanese city – just metres from the main arteries one enters a maze of narrow, winding streets flanked by tightly packed houses, with cyclists, bikers, cars and pedestrians sharing the space. Every now and then there is a small park, often covered with dirt and sand, where children play and their parents and elderly residents sit and talk. On weekends and public holidays there inevitably will be a local festival (matsuri), a sports event or some other communal activity. A newcomer to Japan might find it surprising that even large cities such as Tokyo and Osaka turn into quiet traditional neighbourhoods only less than a hundred meters away from their hectic centres - and there is always more than one city centre. Japanese cities come across as organic, sprawling



urban organisms, in difference to their more structured Western counterparts. This is commonly attributed to the historical emphasis on neighbourhoods as determined by social networks, rather than on neighbourhoods shaped by urban form and function as in European and American cities (Hein, 2001).

As early as the sixteenth century Japan, there existed an autonomous community management system known as *machi-kumi* that translates as “communities of place that protect and autonomously manage themselves” (Kusakabe, 2012). The practice involved capacity building and mutual support in small rural communities, later evolving to encompass management of natural resources such as rivers and forests, as well as local places of worships (Kusakabe, 2012). This traditional community management system was gradually formally replaced during the modernisation of Japan at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century. Under the influence of the western planning approach at that time, Japan introduced completely centralised planning through the City Planning Act 1919. However, reconstruction that followed WWII meant that a lot of rapid urban growth occurred rather uncontrolled, resulting in heavy reliance on land readjustment planning in 1950s and 1960s, mainly focused on infrastructure development in already ‘spontaneously’ urbanised areas (Watanabe, 2006, 2007). Reflecting developments in the planning discourse occurring in the West, strong central government powers were gradually delegated to local government in 1960 and 1970, as a result of the neoliberal economics thinking and strong national government's drive for development. Delegation of power and separation of governance into local, regional and national occurred in 1980s and 1990s. At the same time requirement for public consultation was introduced, again reflecting a general discourse in the West, calling for communicative and collaborative approaches to planning (Sorenson et al., 2009; Watanabe, 2007). The changes were encapsulated in the District Planning system introduced in 1980 and the amendments to the Planning Act in 1990s.

Simultaneously, in response to rapid growth and industrialisation and the related environmental deterioration, and perhaps drawing on those cultural

traits from earlier centuries, spontaneous citizen groups started forming with the purpose to actively influence development and planning. A few groups appeared in early 1950s and 1960s, but the movement gained momentum in 1980s and 1990s under the name of Machizukuri. The closest translation of the word Machizukuri would be place or city making, implying that it is done with care.

Whereas thousands of Machizukuri groups across the country display enormous diversity of activities involving all kinds of community interests, most authors agree that the main purpose is to participate, or attempt to participate, in urban planning, and particularly so since early 1990s (Sorenson & Funck, 2007; Watanabe, 2006, 2007; Kusakabe, 2012). Machizukuri has a connotation of residents building their own environment and reflecting their own values and lifestyles, as a radical departure from the conventional approach to planning that, at best, consults through a bureaucratic, tokenistic process (Sorensen & Funck, 2007; Heins, 2001).

Nowadays, Machizukuri represents a trend different from a period of social movement where citizens stood up to protest. It is seen as a process where citizens and residents are taking the ownership of city planning back into their own hands (Kusakabe, 2012). Machizukuri groups usually bring together communities of place, including local businesses, but also a significant number of experts and large businesses and companies from different areas (communities of interest) who volunteer their time and resources to specific causes. Moreover, Machizukuri has become one of the most popular planning-related keywords in the contemporary East Asia as it spread to Korea and Taiwan, particularly since 1980's. It is called 'Maeul-Mandeulgi' in Korea and 'SheQu-YingZao' in Taiwan (Watanabe, 2006). Today, Machizukuri is considered a very important phenomenon that is influencing a paradigm shift in planning governance in eastern Asia.

The practice of Machizukuri as we know it today was particularly championed and has deep roots in the port city of Kobe, West Japan. Machizukuri activities in Kobe started as early as 1960 and the Kobe suburb of Mano represents the best documented and the most famous case of community



led planning (Heins, 2001; Watanabe, 2006, 2007). In 1981, the city of Kôbe created an Ordinance (Bylaw) for Machizukuri Activities and Mano was recognized as the first Machizukuri council in 1982. At the time the earthquake occurred there were twelve Machizukuri Organisations in as many districts, authorised by the Kobe Machizukuri Ordinance. Kobe Machizukuri Ordinance wording stipulates that any Machizukuri organisation that is certified as a civic organisation by the municipality is entitled to make a proposal for community development to the Mayor and, if the community and the Mayor reach an agreement, they enter into a community development contract. This means that local government provides minor funding to each Machizukuri group to cover operational costs. More importantly, local government enters a collaborative decision making process on local urban planning matters with this group. Cost of development is born by property owners – local government, businesses and individuals alike.

Until the earthquake in 1995 Kobe City was one of the main ports in Japan, servicing its heavy industry and shipbuilding, as well as the regions' food, sake, fashion and tourist expansion. As one of the very few places open to foreign trade and foreign missions before WWII, Kobe developed specific culture and urban character. Planning practice in Kobe was known for its forward thinking and the master plan for the period between 1993 and 2025 had been in the initial stages of development when the earthquake occurred. The plan was intended to create a vibrant, creative city open to the world and in touch with its citizens, whilst focused on quality of living (Kobe City, 1997). Since 1960s the city had been carrying out land adjustment projects for redevelopment of urban infrastructure (e.g. roads and parks) and urban redevelopment (renewal) projects to rationalise land use while creating attractive public spaces. However, both approaches allowed for only limited participation by affected communities, through a fairly formal public consultation process.

Kobe earthquake recovery – the role of Machizukuri

The Great Hanshin earthquake, also known as the Kobe earthquake, occurred

on 17 January 1995. It was the worst earthquake that hit Japan in the twentieth century, apart from the Great Kanto (Tokyo) earthquake in 1923. The death toll stood at 6434, more than 150,000 buildings were destroyed, and 120 of 150 quays and 1km of the expressway collapsed. The recovery cost was about 100 billion USD, or 2.5% of Japan's GDP at the time. The overall number of damaged houses and structures reached more than 400,000, with central city areas, where more than 82,000 houses were lost, hit the hardest (Edgington, 2009).

After the earthquake, and partially in response to criticism of the slow initial response, the central government in Tokyo took a strong role in the early recovery, especially in providing the national-level funding for the prompt rebuilding of damaged infrastructure (Edgington, 2009). The funding was administered by local government, according to agreed criteria. This made prefectural and municipal governments the agencies directly responsible for managing the region's recovery on a day-to-day basis. The prefectural government, who had been working on the long term urban development plan prior to the earthquake, decided to take the opportunity and simultaneously launch the long term urban development and earthquake recovery plan, calling it the Phoenix Plan. The intention was to 'turn disaster to opportunity' and rejuvenate the whole region. Thus, besides coping with the aftermath of the destruction, a few months after the quake, local government (the city and the prefecture) announced a substantial 10-year urban renewal programme and related comprehensive reconstruction plans (Kobe City, 1997).

The speed that both the central and the local government adopted various reconstruction and planning initiatives meant that there was little opportunity to deliberate with citizens and incorporate local initiatives. Local communities felt disempowered and marginalised from the process and started organising into various community groups, mainly congregating around the pre-existing Machizukuri organisations, or promptly forming new ones. The local government recognised that they have to win back their community's trust.

At the same time, local urban planners found themselves disappointed by



the rigid approach to post-disaster redevelopment at the national level, and particularly so because the approach contributed to the frustrations experienced by residents and small business owners who felt especially vulnerable and disempowered (Edginton, 2009; Kobayashi, 2007). Some of the independent planners spearheaded the movement to involve local communities in urban planning and started setting up Machizukuri groups. The local government and their urban planners responded by partnering with those citizen groups and initiatives and supporting community led planning through machizukuri committees. On 27 January 1995, ten days after the earthquake, a “Restoration from Hanshin Disaster Supporters Network for Community Development Machizukuri” was formed to support citizens’ involvement in recovery and reconstruction planning (Kobayashi, 2007).

This was an initiative by independent planners who sprang into action immediately after the earthquake and contacted other planners, urban designers, disaster recovery specialists, businessmen, students, public figures and Machizukuri groups to bring them together to contribute to citizen-led action for recovery and renewal. The network initially started with about thirty volunteers from Kobe and nearby Osaka. The group immediately undertook initiatives to share information, bring different Machizukuri groups together through joint meetings and a newsletter, develop practical tools for engagement, advice on planning and community development matters, provide legal and other advice, fund seeking advice, organise local festivals (matsuri), fora and symposia (Kobayashi, 2007).

The group also undertook projects such as mapping of the damaged areas (Architectural Institute and Urban Planning Association), the ‘let flowers bloom’ early recovery community activity, promotion of a Collective Housing project, longitudinal studies of urban recovery and others (Kobayashi, 2007). The establishment of the group and development of activities was occurring at the same time local government was producing its grand renewal plan which encompassed, and built on, the pre-earthquake established urban readjustment and redevelopment projects. From the original twelve pre-earthquake

Machizukuri groups the number of districts with designated Machizukuri rose to over 100 in two years.

Most Machizukuri groups formed in earthquake affected areas where land redevelopment or readjustment were proposed, although some formed even in the heavily devastated areas where reconstruction was not possible (Kobayashi, 2007). Machizukuri groups were mainly composed of local land and property owners and residents, including small businesses. It is estimated that about 20% of the earthquake impacted area was included in Machizukuri activities, involving over 150,000 citizens (Kobe City, 1997).

Overall, local government held more than 30,000 meetings with affected communities during the initial few years of recovery. The citizens embarked on several recovery related activities including flower and rice planting to lift the spirit in those first weeks and months, but mainly focusing on redefining the streetscape, redesigning neighbourhood spaces, cooperative housing projects and introducing new design and housing types. Overall, local initiatives complemented spatial plans developed by local government (Kobayashi, 2007).

A few notable examples of Machizukuri based recovery during the first five years following the earthquake include Noda Hokubu and Matsumoto in West Kobe and Rokko in East Kobe. For planning purposes, at the time of the earthquake, those areas were respectively seen as the western (Noda Hokubu and Matsumoto) and eastern (Rokko) sub-centres of Kobe city, characterised by deteriorating living environment, aged population and stagnant industries.

City planners were eager to revive these inner-city areas, promote risk reduction through urban design, supply good quality affordable housing, revitalise urban functions and connect with the centre of the ward, boosting commercial and industrial activities (Kobe City, 1997). Thus, two months after the earthquake, local government introduced Restorative Post-earthquake Urban Re-development Project, proposing major large scale development in those areas. The project was met with heavy criticism for its lack of citizen involvement. As a result, in collaboration with citizens through Machizukuri



movement, the project was significantly amended in February 1997 (Kobe City, 1997).

Some of the devastated areas were redeveloped as initially planned, although efforts were made to use the process to revitalise local communities and businesses. However, due to mass relocations that happened as the result of land clearing for construction, those efforts have generally been seen as not too successful at building sense of place and social capital. Bordering with these areas of 'top down' redevelopment were the areas of land readjustment where local communities led recovery planning through Machizukuri, such as those in Noda Hokubu and Matsumoto and, to a lesser degree, Rokko. The recovery/rebuild phase was finalised within five years after the earthquake. Some of the initiatives and achievements are illustrated below.

In the pursuit of improved urban design and amenity, Noda Hokubu community focused on streetscape and townscape. As a result, a number of innovations were introduced into planning rules. A new District Plan for the Guidance of Appearance of the Townscape was announced for Noda Hokubu in 1996, as the first in Japan. The intent of the Plan was to allow for widening of the streets whilst creating a convenient and comfortable neighbourhood. In order to achieve what the community wanted, the Plan eased the existing rules in relation to the road width and the area ratio of the dwelling, as well as the height-to-boundary rules. Whereas requiring widening of the streets and thus encroaching on privately owned space, the more relaxed rules on height-to-boundary infringements allowed for reconstruction of dwellings of the same size as those destroyed by the earthquake. The setback remained in private hands and the rules allowed for planting in that space. The government subsidised landscaping improvements. This has delivered on the desired low rise townscape with enlarged road space, as well as reduction of fire risk. The setback recreates the historic lifestyle where neighbours use to meet with each other. It also 'softens' the public-private delineation and contributes to creation of neighbouring ties.

A number of parks were created, both as amenity areas and risk reduction

and evacuation zones. Original design features, such as the Shigeru Ban's "emergency" church, were incorporated in the townscape, as well as a few poignant reminders of the disaster. Collaborative and experimental nature of planning can also be seen in attempts to achieve visual homogeneity of a cluster of private homes built near one of the small neighbourhood parks.

It is of interest that, in addition to the planning changes introduced in the District Plan for the Guidance of Appearance of the Townscape, a strong emphasis was put on quality of building. Regulations were introduced on June 20 1996 in the Procedure for the Improvement of the Neighbourhood Environment. All these innovations distinguished Noda Hokubu from other areas and established it as a model.

Moving on from 'hardware to software,' the Noda Hokubu Machizukuri group maintained a raft of community activities, bringing together multi-ethnic and different age groups through diverse projects such as street festivals (matsuri), partnerships with other town and city groups, promotion of eco-city, permanent earthquake exhibition, church based community initiatives, etc. Those activities attract not only local populations, but also many interested individuals and group from all over the country, from professionals who volunteer their services to disaster affected communities from other parts of the country and the world. The Machizukuri centre and related community groups are still as active as twenty years ago and many original activists still share their knowledge and experience with younger members. Noda Hokubu has transformed itself into a vibrant, successful community and a highly desirable area to live in.

Not far from Noda Hokubu is Matsumoto town, in the north-west Kobe city. Like Noda Hokubu it is known for innovative urban design solutions introduced by local communities. The community put particular emphasis on eco-design, risk reduction and preparedness for emergencies. Within the five years since the quake the area has transformed itself into a highly desirable place to live.

Terrified by fires that followed the earthquake Matsumoto Machizukuri planning initiatives focused on fire risk. Citizens decided they wanted to utilise



eco-design features in bringing their communities together and making them safer. As the first step, they rejected standard city planning rules for size of parks and requested a number of small parks scattered around the neighbourhood and easily inter-connected, rather than one large park for the whole area. City planners obliged and amended the rules. Next, the community focused on the main road that leads to the local school and designed it to 'feel good', provide safe passage for children and bring the community together. They introduced a small meandering stream along the main road, populated it with fish, including from the sister earthquake affected town in north-western Japan, and a variety of native plants. The stream gets its water from the local treatment pond a few kilometres away up the mountain. Water quality is stringently controlled. Local community is in charge of the stream maintenance and has been fulfilling this role for twenty years now. The community maintained its cohesion and involvement over the twenty years since the earthquake.

Rokkonichi is categorised as an easterner sub-centre of the Kobe City and was designated for massive redevelopment following the earthquake. What happened next is not so much an example of a quick recovery and reconstruction, but the strength of local community spirit, healing through collective action and memory sharing, innovation and perseverance. The area was devastated by the earthquake and identified as one of the high priority zones for massive redevelopment. Local communities staunchly opposed government plans and a period of intense negotiations ensued.

By February 1996 the recovery plan was somewhat modified, but the only real concession to the community was acceptance of development of a local park designed by residents. The Rokko Kazeno Sate park was hard fought for and finally approved in 1996 as a one hectare space amidst the major redevelopment areas. Whereas the reconstruction around it progressed fast, design of the park itself took seven years to develop. This is attributed to lively interest and many activities and groups that took part in the process.

The park was envisaged by the community as a place of respite and play, but also community activities and disaster risk education. The park addresses

the need for self-sufficiency in the immediate aftermath of a disaster – there is running water, pumps, edible trees and park benches that can be adapted as cooking pits or toilets. The pond is shaped as a fish, respecting local children's wishes. A community centre was erected at the edge of the park. It provides a range of activities, catering for a broad neighbourhood. It is still an active hub, just as it has been for the past twenty years. The centre attracts a plethora of community groups, including from areas outside Rokko.

The original leaders of the Machizukuri movement are still actively involved in the community and many professionals and sympathisers, as well as community groups, are affiliated with the community centre. This reflects the situation in other areas of earthquake related Machizukuri activities in Kobe – they are vibrant, highly desirable areas to live in, with engaged and lively communities. It is a common consensus that those areas have been much more successful in creating liveable environments, social networks and revitalised local economy than top-down, centralised approach elsewhere in the impacted zone (Mamula-Seadon et al., 2015).

Machizukuri in present-day Japan

Nowadays, most local government across Japan routinely appoints Machizukuri planning units that work with local citizen groups on variety of issues. However, a systematic analysis of their effectiveness is not readily available. Apart from notable high profile examples, such as Setagaya ward in Tokyo or central Kyoto Machizukuri groups, literature on the subject is relatively scarce in English language.

Following the Great East Japan Earthquake 2011, the Japanese government introduced one of the most comprehensive national resilience strategies in the world. The Japanese National Resilience Programme chaired by the Prime Minister is the umbrella strategy for all government programmes of work, from infrastructure to community development, and requires that all central and local government strategies, plans and programmes align with its principles, outcomes and key indicators (Fujii, 2012). For its implementation, the National Resilience



Programme utilises the existing governance structures, with the tiered central, regional and local government framework.

The Programme is administered by a newly formed central Secretariat at the Cabinet level, separate from the country's emergency management structures. Its broad spectrum and emphasis on infrastructure, economy and sustainable development are reflective of the UN and various national resilience initiatives, albeit on a larger scale. Through its community outreach work, the programme supports some Machizukuri activities, such as in the town of Kuroshio on Shikoku, where the highest tsunami risk in Japan is identified.

When investigating recovery after the Great East Japan Earthquake and tsunami 2011, the author did not encounter many Machizukuri groups in 2015. However, a number of communities have engaged with Kobe Machizukuri centre since and it is expected that their activities will be supported through local government and their resilience building activities, as a concerted effort towards more resilient Japan.

New Zealand: deliberative democracy and collaborative planning

New Zealand is one of the first countries that introduced collaborative planning based on principles of deliberative democracy, with an integrated governance system for implementation of risk reduction and resilience initiatives. The framework, introduced in the 1990s, has a tiered governance system whereby the national government is responsible for policy and direction setting and local capability building with local government responsible for implementation and a requirement for coordination permeating through all levels. One of the key mechanisms for natural hazards risk reduction and resilience is land use planning at a local level, as a part of the broader sustainable development. Community based emergency management complements these development mechanisms (Mamula-Seadon, 2009).

Central to collaborative planning and risk reduction in New Zealand is legislation covering sustainable management of natural resources, the Resource

Management Act (RMA) 1991, and its suite of policy statements, regional and district plans and the land use consent process that, together, regulate matters at national, regional, local and individual levels. The framework operates across the four pillars of sustainability - the social, economic, built and natural environments. Of particular importance for land use planning is the Local Government Act 2002. This enabled growth strategies and various land use plans that were to be strongly connected through long term financial plans, all expected to be developed in partnership with local communities. The framework is underpinned with a complex web of legislation and other policy instruments designed to enable integration of policy, planning and service delivery, as well as meaningful engagement with local communities.

This framework was born out of the comprehensive reforms of the government system, with the main purpose to strengthen the role of local communities and local economies and replace the hitherto centralised regulatory environment with a more local community centred and empowering governance. Risk reduction is integrated with land use and development mechanisms. This approach reflects the core principle of shared responsibility and empowerment of local communities where it is essential to develop society's overall adaptive capacity or resilience. Partnership with communities and integration across all levels of government, together with integration across planning and operational systems and resources, are the cornerstones of the approach.

In the quarter century since the comprehensive, integrated framework has been introduced the issues with the complex, collaborative planning based approach have been well documented. Many of those issues pertain to capacity and capability for implementation and focus on process with no or little outcome (Mamula-Seadon & McLean, 2015). In addition, the national government often lacked resources to build local capacity and capability, the 'meaningful engagement' process with local communities was often perceived as a mere superficial consultation, and the legalistic nature of resource management allowed for lengthy and costly legal processes, riddled with poor or delayed outcomes (Mamula-Seadon & McLean, 2015).



Integration of policy, planning and resources was hampered by silos, culture, capacity and capability. Furthermore, whereas the framework assumed coordination and alignment, often adequate mechanisms for enforcement were lacking (Mamula-Seadon & McLean, 2015). It appears that, whilst New Zealand assumes an integrated model of planning and environmental risk management which requires interaction and cooperation across a spectrum of organizations and their various agendas and responsibilities, the reality is a huge variability in practice and application. In the integrated policy and planning regime, such as the New Zealand one, relevant competency of, and appropriate interrelationships among all stakeholder are of paramount importance. Crucial for achievement of desired outcomes is the type and effectiveness of governance that enables implementation. Strengths and weakness of the approach were particularly tested in the aftermath of the Canterbury earthquakes in 2010 and 2011. Recent developments in a number of cities, and particularly in Auckland, perhaps hold promise for the future.

Canterbury earthquakes 2010 – 2011: challenge to community led recovery

An earthquake sequence occurring between 2010 and 2012, originating along faults not considered in the city's urban planning, devastated central Christchurch on the New Zealand South Island. Over 14,000 continuing aftershocks hit the greater city area. The first, strong earthquake occurred on September 4, 2010 about 40 km from the Christchurch city centre. This earthquake did not directly cause loss of life, but damage to buildings and infrastructure, caused mainly by widespread liquefaction of sandy soils, was substantial. The quake was followed by thousands of aftershocks, some causing further damage to the city. On February 22, 2011, a magnitude 6.3 earthquake with an epicentre only 6 km from Christchurch CBD, and close to the surface, severely impacted Christchurch City. One hundred and eighty-five people died. The Government declared a state of National Emergency for the first time in New Zealand history. Further severe damage was caused by liquefaction, lateral spreading and rockfalls from steep

mountain slopes. Ensuing aftershocks caused additional damage, ground failures and building and infrastructure damage (Christchurch City Libraries, 2015).

The February 22, 2011 earthquake is the largest disaster New Zealand has experienced since the early twentieth century when a powerful earthquake in 1931 destroyed Napier City on the North Island's east coast. The Canterbury earthquakes prompted central government to introduce significant changes to the pre-existing national and local risk and emergency management arrangements. Those changes, accompanied by the rezoning of areas with unstable or liquefiable soils as no-development areas, had significant repercussions for land use planning.

As explained earlier, the approach to recovery (and planning in general) centred on the role and leadership by local government, with central government setting a direction and providing support and capability building. Governance model supporting the framework was intended to enable local initiative, integration of government and civil action and deliberative planning. It can be said that the earthquakes afforded an opportunity to implement and test the approach that, theoretically, had all characteristics of the systems designed to ensure effective community based recovery and long term resilience.

As discussed above, the weaknesses in implementation of the pre-earthquake framework had been known. Well before the earthquake sequence started in September 2010, the government had embarked on reforming the legislative framework, particularly the Resource Management Act 1991 and the Local Government Act 2002, the two instruments governing collaborative land use planning in the country. The scale of the disaster prompted central government to introduce sweeping legislative and governance changes affecting disaster recovery, including land use planning in the affected areas.

Requirements for quick recovery revealed a tension between central government obligations and the perceived need for coercion in policy making on the one hand, and local capacity building and deliberation of land use planning decisions on the other. The centralisation of power progressively increased,



enabled by introduction of new legislation, the Canterbury Earthquake Response and Recovery (CERR) Act 2010 and the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery (CER) Act 2011, and establishment of two corresponding recovery bodies – Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Commission (CERC) and Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority (CERA). From the role to effectively coordinate between central and local government that CERC had, to the sweeping powers the newly established central government department (CERA) had, a hitherto decentralised regime saw progressive increases in the centralisation of power.

Introduction of the new legislation (the CERR Act 2010 and the CER Act 2011) and establishment of both recovery bodies - CERC and CERA - was met with some criticism and concern, mainly for curtailing of public involvement in the legislative process, as well as the lack of provision for public involvement in decision-making mechanisms in both Acts (Johnson & Mamula-Seadon, 2014). As the recovery process unfolded, central government has been progressively taking over land use planning and, indeed, has dictated most of the decisions. However, those same decisions and solutions that were hailed for their expediency and quality of designed, have been criticised for the lack of community involvement in deliberation and interference into a local authority-led initiative (Dalziel, 2011; Saunders et al., 2014; Bennett, 2014a, b). Self-mobilisation of Christchurch communities, their energy and innovation following the September 2010 and February 2011 earthquakes are well documented (Seadon & Bach, 2015). Yet, that energy does not seem to have been harvested in the early recovery.

Analysing transformation of governance following the two main shocks in September 2010 and February 2011, in relation to societal resilience and building of social capital, Mamula-Seadon and McLean (2015) conclude that the issue of control of very high impact disasters - whether it should be 'forward' at the site of the event or centrally by the government, does not yet seem to have been addressed. Partnering with communities in recovery decision making, taking on board community led action and sustaining and building on the initial momentum that Christchurch communities so generously created seemed to have

fallen victim to the perceived need for ‘quick recovery’ (Mamula-Seadon & McLean, 2015). Whereas there have been many praiseworthy achievements in Christchurch recovery, meaningful engagement and, indeed, partnership with broader local communities, creation of locally preferred opportunities and solutions seems to have not been as robust as desired.

If the strength of local relationships as an essential ‘building block’ of social capital can be expressed as the degree of strong and sustained-over-time involvement of local individuals and communities in the recovery decision-making process, analysis of the early recovery in Christchurch suggests a top-heavy recovery structure of CERA may not have been well equipped to engage in deliberative planning at the community level, to harvest the energy of the groundswell of community initiatives and empower affected citizens.

Interestingly, recent disasters in the US (Hurricane Sandy 2012), Japan (Great East Japan earthquake and tsunami 2011), Australia (Queensland floods 2010 and Victorian bush fires 2009), as well as the New Zealand (Canterbury earthquakes 2010-2011) were all followed by changes to previously existing disaster management arrangements. To a different degree, all those countries introduced new arrangements aimed at strengthening the role of central government. Drawing parallels and understanding implication of these changes for democratic deliberation, community empowerment and social capital building requires better understanding at this stage. Perhaps looking for answers might involve understanding developments in major cities and juxtaposing those with central government policies?

Auckland Council community empowerment programme: community placemaking

Auckland is an economic hub and the biggest city in New Zealand, with a population of about 1.4 million. This means that 34% of New Zealanders call Auckland home. New Zealand is an ethnically diverse society and nowhere is that pronounced as in Auckland: more than 200 ethnicities live in Auckland,



with 39.1% born overseas. Demographic changes have been quite rapid in recent years and 27.5% of migrants are classified as 'racialised' with only 11.6% are considered 'non-racialised', i.e. of European settler heritage; the former group is growing whilst the latter is stagnant or decreasing (Gooder, 2017). Research has demonstrated that the challenge to social cohesion is exacerbated when demographic changes are quick (ibid).

Local government in Auckland is represented by one council, as a result of central government imposed amalgamation of the seven city councils in 2010. Cognisant of the risks that rapid demographic changes pose to social capital, and reflecting the principles deeply ingrained in New Zealand legislation, such as inclusion, anti-discrimination and human rights, the Council has developed a comprehensive approach to proactively building its communities. As one of those initiatives, the Council introduced a stream work, and set up a corresponding Community Empowerment unit in 2016, aiming at engaging local communities in place-making. Essentially not unlike Machizukuri units in Japanese local government, the unit was established to facilitate involvement by individuals, families and communities in city planning. This includes communities of place, interest and identity.

The initiative was spearheaded by the Community-led Placemaking Champions Group - a group of local board chairs and members who are committed to working in ways that empower communities to create great neighbourhoods and places for Aucklanders. Local community boards were introduced in the local government reforms in 1990s to allow for functions at the interface between councils and local communities. They came to prominence in Auckland after the amalgamation of region's councils into one body, replacing the role smaller councils had in more directly engaging with local communities. Local boards in Auckland have a significant and wide-ranging role that spans most local government services and activities. They provide important local input into region-wide strategies and plans, make decisions on local matters, facilitate local leadership and support strong local communities.

The rationale behind the Placemaking community empowerment initiative was that traditional local government approaches to placemaking are led by experts and have limited opportunities for community engagement and influence. Therefore, these approaches do not tend to be flexible or inclusive enough to accommodate fast changing communities, local intelligence, rapid new development and the uniqueness of neighbourhoods (Local Boards, 2015). In this context community placemaking refers to communities engaging in shaping the look, function and feel of the places in which they live, across a wide range of activities that improve the look and feel of places and build a sense of community, local pride, identity and connection (Local Boards, 2015).

Placemaking can take various forms, such as: physical placemaking involving activities that improve the physical look of a place, e.g. clean ups, gardening and planting, public art and street furniture; events, markets and ‘pop up activities’ designed to bring people together, have fun and feel part of a local community; various engagement activities, designed to support community leadership and involvement in placemaking, such as community dinners, Youth Panels and Children's Panels and ‘on the street’ ways to share ideas for a place, such as chalk boards; incentives and assistance for placemaking through a range of activities designed to encourage residents and community groups to lead or take part in placemaking efforts, such as matching funds, provision of equipment such as barbeques and making it easy to run small local events (Local Boards, 2015).

Only recently the Council called for applications for funding to support community led placemaking initiatives. The criteria for winning the grant are designed to foster social cohesion and social capital and include requirements to increase diverse community participation, build community capacity to do things for themselves, develop and support other community led placemaking initiatives and respond to Maori (indigenous New Zealanders') aspirations in practical and effective ways (Auckland Council, 2017). Whereas it is still early to evaluate success of this particular programme, other cities, and particularly Christchurch and Wellington, are already taking some of the practice on board.



Governance for empowerment

In the first decade of this century the ‘advent of resilience’ has seen numerous international, globalised programmes of resilience building enacted by governments and various groups all over the world. The UN sponsored World Disaster Reduction Campaign “Making Cities Resilient – My City is Getting Ready!” launched in May 2010 and by 2015 almost 3000 cities worldwide committed to the initiative. This initiative aligns with other global UN resilience and risk reduction actions, such as UN-Habitat ‘City Resilience Profiling Programme’ (CRPP) and the Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 (UNISDR, 2015). In 2013 the privately funded Rockefeller Foundation launched the 100 Resilient Cities Challenge, with an intent to enable 100 cities around the world to better address the increasing shocks and stresses of the 21st century. Nearly 400 cities across six continents applied to be among the first cities selected to receive technical support and resources to improve their urban resilience over three years (100 Resilient cities, 2013). The 100 Resilient Cities aims not only to help individual cities become more resilient, but strives to facilitate building of a global practice of resilience among governments, NGOs, the private sector, and individual citizens.

Likewise, the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 reinforces the importance of people-centred, all-hazards approaches that strengthen societal resilience (UNISDR, 2015). Meanwhile, governments of many nations became aware that community resilience involves a philosophical shift in relations between the state and civil society that changes the parameters of how the government engages with citizenry, how local communities organize and act and what form and function governance has in enabling this to happen (Bach et al., 2015). This strategic shift involves policies for societal resilience that focus on and even rely upon identifying and strengthening the processes and institutions that work in a community under normal conditions, before an emergency.

Focus on strengthening social networks and social capital provides a common

framework for local institutions and groups to participate in preparing and responding to a wide variety of risks. The strategic foundation of all hazards resilience, therefore, involves engagement and partnering between government, central and local, and those with private organisations and businesses, neighbourhood associations, schools, faith-based community groups, trade groups, fraternal organizations, ethnic centres, and other civic organizations that have routine, direct ties to local communities. In this way local collective action, by, with and for the individuals who live in local areas, becomes the leading edge of efforts to protect and sustain the nation (Bach et al., 2015). Supporting these initiatives through effective governance has been a major challenge for the integrated and comprehensive democratic risk management practice.

Recent disasters in the US (Hurricane Sandy 2012), Japan (Great East Japan earthquake and tsunami 2011), Australia (Queensland floods 2010 and Victorian bush fires 2009) and New Zealand (Canterbury earthquakes 2010-2011) were followed by changes to previously existing disaster management arrangements, based on the principles for participatory, sustainable, integrated, bottom-up approaches. To a different degree, all those countries introduced new arrangements aimed at strengthening the role of national government. Whereas designed mainly to strengthen the role of national government in disaster recovery, it is important to understand the implications of those policy adjustments for broader resilience building, particularly for the national - local government and local empowerment perspective.

In this context, it is particularly important to highlight the role of governance as the enabler of integration and democratic deliberation in social capital and resilience building, against the implications rapid changes in governance structures driven by the perceived need for 'quick recovery' may have for comprehensive and democratic risk management. It might be pertinent to note that the term governance is also synonymous with collaborative governance and collaborative public management, brought together for delivering public-good with shared decision-making directed towards shaping public policy (Kapucu, 2011).



Further challenges to governance for resilience have been posed in recent years by views of resilience as a construct formed through the interdependencies that evolve from established societal patterns rather than a replica of institutional, group or programme arrangements. This suggests that the consideration of risk governance structures has to understand and address the state – civil society relationships in culturally specific contexts (Bach et al., 2015). This involves understanding how different forms of governance, including authority and power, influence the degree of decentralisation and accountability and reflect on partnering with communities, and sustaining that involvement. Inherent in these considerations is a potential challenge to bureaucratic structures and the nature of service delivery based central government agency culture, as is, indeed, the role of government itself (ibid). Furthermore, if resilience building governance is, indeed, about local empowerment and partnering between government and civic society, it is reasonable to assume that governance structures have to be culturally appropriate for a local environment, while delivering on more universal principles.

The practice of placemaking bears a promise it could deliver on a number of the above identified requirements for social capital building and state-civil society engagement. The practice appears to have deep cultural roots in Japan. Similarly, democratic deliberation is a long standing tradition in New Zealand. In comparing success stories of disaster recovery it becomes evident that the pockets of exemplary success can be found in communities with strong, pre-existing social capital where external intervention by the state has not interfered with the social fabric, but worked alongside and in support of it. It is of particular interest to compare a role of the state versus a role of the city and the implications it has for future governance models. It would certainly be interesting to explore the implication of different roles central and local government assume in emergencies, in the light of the most recent apparent political dichotomy between the state and the city.

In regards to the practice of placemaking, perhaps the near future will see closer collaboration between cities across the globe, where realities on

the ground might afford synergies that are not readily obvious at the level of national policies.

References

- Auckland Council. (2017). Regional Community Development Grants Programme. Retrieved from <http://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/EN/newsevents/culture/communityfundingsupport>
- Bach, R., Kaufman, D., Settle, K., & Duckworth, M. (2015). Policy leadership challenges in supporting community resilience. In R. Bach (Ed.), *Strategies for supporting community resilience: Multinational experiences* (pp. 15-52). Stockholm, Sweden: The Swedish Defense University Press.
- Bennett, B. (2014a). A guide to Christchurch rebuild for the rest of NZ. Retrieved from <http://www.projectfreerange.com/a-guide-to-christchurch-rebuild-for-the-rest-of-nz/>
- Bennett, B. (2014b). Design and democracy. In *once in a lifetime: City-building after disaster in Christchurch*, Freerange Press. Retrieved from <https://medium.com/@mrbarnabyb/design-and-democracy-339fa4688d70>
- Christchurch City Libraries. (2015). Canterbury earthquakes. Retrieved from <http://my.christchurchcitylibraries.com/christchurch-and-canterbury-earthquakes>
- Cutter, S. L., Burton, C. G., & Emrich, C. T. (2010). Disaster resilience indicators for benchmarking baseline conditions. *Journal of Homeland Security and Emergency Management*, 7(1), Article 51.
- Dalziel, L. (2011). Turning disasters into opportunity. Keynote Address presented at the Australian and New Zealand Institute of Insurance and Finance Conference, 30 November 2011, Auckland NZ. Retrieved from <http://www.scoop.co.nz/stories/PA1111/S00521/dalziel-turningdisaster-into-opportunity.htm>



- Depoe, S. P., Delicath, J., & Aepli Elsenbeer, M. F. (Eds.) (2004). *Communication and public participation in environmental decision making*. New York, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Edington, D. (2009). *Reconstructing Kobe: The geography of crisis and opportunity*. Vancouver, Canada: UBC Press.
- Fraser-Molekati, G. J. (2012). Democratic governance at times of crisis: Rebuilding our communities and building on our citizens. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 78, 191–208.
- Satoshi, F. (Ed.). (2012). *Kyojinka : Building national resilience against disasters in Japan, Asia, and the world*. Tokyo, Japan: TOA Institution.
- Gooder, C. (2017). *Immigration, ethnic diversity and cities: A literature review for Auckland Council for Auckland Council*. Auckland Council Technical Report 2017/008.
- Hein, C. (2001). Toshikeikaku and Machizukuri in Japanese urban planning: Reconstruction of inner city neighbourhoods in Kobe. *Jahrbuch des DIJ* (Deutsches Institut für Japanstudien), 13, 221–52.
- Johnson, L. A. & Mamula-Seadon, L. (2014). Transforming governance: How national policies and organizations for managing disaster recovery evolved following the 4 September 2010 and 22 February 2011 Canterbury Earthquakes. *Earthquake Spectra*, 30(1), 577–605.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1193/032513EQS078M>
- Kapucu, N. (2011). Disaster and emergency management systems in urban areas. *Cities*, 29, 41–S49.
- Kobayashi, I. (2007). Machizukuri (community development) for recovery whose leading role citizens play. *Journal of Disaster Research*, 2 (5), 358–371.
- Kôbe City. (1997). *Restorative Post-Earthquake Urban Redevelopment Projects*.

- Kusakabe, E. (2012). Advancing sustainable development at the local level: The case of machizukuri in Japanese cities. *Progress in Planning*, 80, 1–65.
- Local Boards. (2015). *Communities shaping their places: A good practice resource*. Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland Council.
- Mamula-Seadon, L. (2009). CDEM, integrated planning and resilience: What is the connection? TEPHRA 22, Community resilience: Research, planning and civil defence emergency management. MCDEM, (July), 3–8.
- Mamula-Seadon, L. & McLean, I. (2015). Response and early recovery following 4 September 2010 and 22 February 2011 Canterbury earthquakes: Societal resilience and the role of governance. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2015.01.005>
- Mamula-Seadon, L., Kobayashi, I., & Maki, N. (2015). Place-making after a disaster: Japanese practice of Machizukuri. *Planning Quarterly*, 199.
- Mileti, D. (1999). *Disaster by design: A reassessment of natural hazards in the United States*. Washington, DC: Joseph Henry Press.
- Norris, F. H., Stevens, S. P., Pfefferbaum, B., Wyche, K. F., & Pfefferbaum, R. L. (2008). Community resilience as a metaphor, theory, set of capacities, and strategy for disaster readiness. *Am. J. Commun. Psychol.* 41(1–2), 127–150.
- Paton, D., Johnston, D., Mamula-Seadon, L., & Kenney, C. M. (2014). Recovery and development: Perspectives from New Zealand and Australia. In *Disaster and Development* (pp. 255–272). Springer International Publishing.
- Paton, D. & Johnston, D. (Eds.). (2006). *Disaster resilience: An integrated approach*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Seadon, L. & Bach, R. (2015). New Zealand: Renewing communities and local governance. In R. Bach (Ed.). *Strategies for supporting community resilience* (pp. 119–151). Stockholm, Sweden: Swedish Defense University Press.



- Sorensen, A., Koizumi, H., & Miyamoto, A. (2008). Machizukuri, civil society, and community space in Japan. In A. Daniere & M. Douglass (Eds.). *The politics of civic space in Asia: Building urban communities* (pp. 33- 50). London: Routledge.
- Sorensen, A. & Funck, C. (Eds.). (2007). *Living cities in Japan: Citizens' movements, Machizukuri and local environments*. London: Routledge.
- Sounders, W., Vallance, S., & Mamula-Seadon, L. (2014). Land use planning following an earthquake disaster. *Encyclopedia of Earthquake Engineering*. (DOI 10.1007/978-3-642-36197-5_358-1). Berlin: Springer.
- Tierney, K. (2012). Disaster governance: Social, political, and economic dimensions. *The Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 37, 341–63.
- United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR). (2015). *Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015–2030*. New York: UNISDR.
- 100 Resilient cities. (2013). 100 Resilient cities. Retrieved from <http://www.100resilientcities.org>
- Watanabe, S. J. (2007). Toshi keikaku vs. Machizukuri: Emerging paradigm of civil society in Japan 1950-1980. In A. Sorensen & C. Funck (Eds.). *Living cities in Japan: Citizens' movements, machizukuri and local environments* (pp. 39-55). London: Routledge.
- Watanabe, S. J. (2006). Machizukuri in Japan: A historical perspective on participatory community building initiatives. In C. Hein & P. Pelletier (Eds.). *Cities, autonomy and decentralization in Japan* (pp. 128-139). London: Routledge.