摘要
文章首先从词源学的角度阐释了“全球本土化”概念的内涵，以及将之作为现实背景对社区营造展开研究的当代意义。文章指出，通过具体的微观情境来理解全球本土化概念，是社区营造研究中全面理解本土社会全球化进程最适宜的分析框架。基于此，文章从微观全球化视角出发，以日本的社区营造为例，考察了全球本土化进程对日本社会产生的影响。日本的社区营造除了具备西方社会倡导的“公众参与”所普遍具有的政治学和社会学因素外，还强调从文化的角度来理解日本传统空间意象的保护意义。文章选取东京神乐坂作为研究案例，通过剖析其在社区营造过程中话语实践的创新，来探究日本社会在全球本土化过程中表现出来的复杂性和驱动力。文章关注全球化体系中神乐坂的本土化社区在社会关系塑造中的作用，通过解析自下而上的营造与由上至下的规划之间产生的矛盾与耦合关系，重点论述日本社区营造当前面临的机遇和挑战，从而希望对中国正在推进的社区营造运动有所启示。
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ABSTRACT
This paper first explains the etymological connotation of Glocalization and interprets its authenticity and contemporary significance for studying community building. It argues that understanding Glocalization in specific contexts offers an ideal analysis framework to comprehend the globalization processes of local societies. This paper, by adopting a perspective of micro-globalization, studies the community building in Japan to manifest the influence of the process of Glocalization on Japanese societies. In addition to the political and sociological factors prevalent in the public engagement of community building advocated by western countries, Japanese practice is characterized for emphasizing the cultural significance of the traditional Japanese spatial image. Taking the community building case in Kagurazaka of Tokyo, it illustrates the creative discourse practice in the local community building to probe into the complexity and driving forces in Japan's Glocalization. In addition, this paper focuses on the role of the localized community in shaping the social relations in Kagurazaka under globalization. By analyzing the contradictions and associations between the bottom-up building and the top-down planning, it discusses the opportunities and challenges faced by the community building in Japan and hopes to offer inspirations for the current community-building movement in China.
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Among international academia, one of the increasing concerns on the accelerated globalization is that does globalization make countries or races more homogeneous, or otherwise, more diverse? One argues that the progress of globalization must be recognized in the form of “Glocalization”[1]—Etymologically, the term “Glocalization,” as a combination of globalization and localization, describes the negotiating interaction between global networks and local social forces, i.e. the mutual adaptive and interconnecting process between globality and locality[2]. Meanwhile, one probes into that the term “Glocalization” originally stems from “dochakuka” (a Japanese concept which refers to the adaptation of agricultural technology to local production conditions[3]) and was widely spread in the fields of Sociology, Economics, and Urban Studies since the late 20th century. On the Globalization and Indigenous Culture Conference in 1997, buzzword expert and sociologist Roland Robertson pointed out that “Glocalization means the simultaneity and the co-presence of both universalizing and particularizing tendencies”[4], which results in a unique universalization that explores universal values through individual case studies[5]. Implying the coordination, intension, and counterbalance between globalization and localization, this concept not only represents the adjustment and transformation of discourse practice (amidst the globalization, the discourse pattern of certain communities would be selectively redefined and adjusted to re-adapt the new local culture), but also embraces the integration and innovation of discourse practice (a territory’s proactive coordination and adjustment against the backdrop of globalization so as to dynamically select, interpret, and re-organize the discourse elements in various cultures or social communities)[1]. As a concept that can be examined, interpreted, and recognized from various perspectives, Glocalization is both a top-down process during which local communities get globalized with a nation’s powerful administrative means and a bottom-up process allowing local communities to intermingle with globalization under a unique counterbalance mechanism.

Although the overwhelming globalization may lead to the homogenization among different societies, the cultural disparity would not be erased by the globalization of goods, services, and ideas. People in different regions of the world are coping with the impact of globalization in their own ways[6], which exactly is the research interest of Micro-Globalization—Micro-Globalization examines the process of territorial societies’ changes in behavior, attitude, and concept under globalization by profiling individual community members. By arguing that “the local expression of globalization is situated in a historically concrete, rather than an
表征,使行动者“处于一种具体的历史背景之下”。从人类社会关系的视角出发,对任何社会结构动态和惯性的解释都必然是基于微观情境的,而微观层面的本土变迁则可以从社会的不同面向进行考察,譬如社区生活中的本土景观、消费模式、行为方式和价值取向的改变等,研究这些社会现象的分析路径通常可作为一种剖析微观全球化的方法。通过分析全球本土化和微观全球化各自的内涵,可以发现本土社会的变迁不仅表现为城市宏观发展模式的变化,还体现在嵌入微观情境中的个体价值与行为的聚集性变化。因此,通过具体的微观情境来理解全球本土化是把握和概括本土社会全球化进程最适宜的分析框架。

从20世纪90年代开始,全球范围内的城市规划和治理结构出现了重大变革。为了提高决策的效率与公正性,决策权逐渐从中央向地方转移。联合国于1992年颁布的《关于环境与发展的里约热内卢宣言》和《二十一世纪议程》提议各国地方政府动员广大市民参与制定21世纪的地方议题。根据倡导地方政府可持续发展国际理事会于2000年和2001年开展的调查,全球已有113个国家的6,416个地方政府参与了21世纪地方议题的制定,其中欧洲国家和日本的表现最为活跃。然而,这些在地实践究竟如何缔结为一场全球化运动?具体而言,即在地生活与全球化的互动是如何展开的?最终又将形成何种意义上的社会?对于这些问题的回答,有必要基于全球化的视角来审视地域社会参与全球化网络和微观情境下话语实践的整合创新——以日本的社区营造为例,其所展现的创新性话语实践是在全球化的单一思维模式下无法洞见的。这些本土经验有助于理解全球化背景下世界各地不平衡的发展格局,从而形成全新的社会协调发展理念。基于此,本文将从日本经验出发,重点检视在全球化背景下将社区营造作为城市化动力的意义,进而探究这一超越国界、文化、种族和政治的新社会动力对中国社区发展的当代意义。

2 社区营造:全球本土化进程中的地域再造

“社区营造”(community building)的概念是相较于具有权威性的城市规划系统而言的:社区营造是以地域社会现有资源为基础,通过

2 Community Building: Territorial Reconstruction in the Process of Glocalization

Compared with the conventional authoritative urban planning system, community building is a series of activities based on the existing resources of the territorial society to gradually improve
the living environment through diverse cooperation, so as to enhance the vitality of the community\textsuperscript{[11]}. This concept was first put forward by Masuda Shirou in 1952 to increase local residents’ environmental awareness\textsuperscript{[12][13]}, and then adopted by Japanese scholars and city managers as a methodological means on territorial governance to inspire new practice modes. At the end of the 20th century, grassroots strengths under the intensive urbanization started to seek a boost from civil society. With the expansion of the authority and power of local governments and other autonomous entities, the conceptual scope of community began to transcend the administrative boundaries of physical world and that of community building was no longer simply about physical construction\textsuperscript{[14]}. In such a context, the community building in Japan becomes a massive societal movement with great influence in spatial growth, cultural development, and policy making.

In addition to the political and sociological factors prevalent in the public engagement of community building advocated by western countries, Japanese practice is characterized for emphasizing the cultural significance of the traditional Japanese spatial image\textsuperscript{[15]}. In Japan, “machi” (町) is not only the physical unit of community building but also the entity unit of traditional blocks. In other words, Japanese community building is to measure the values and lifestyles recognized by territorial societies from an informal non-professional civil dimension\textsuperscript{[16]} by outlining a clear, culturally and socially collective ideological image for the residents within a neighborhood so as to promote machi-scale local protection\textsuperscript{[17]}. In Japan, early community building was mainly led by endogenous organizations such as neighborhood associations (chonaikai). Chonaikais—an analogy to the neighborhood committees in China—historically have had a good partnership with local governments in Japan and played an important role in local community building, resulting in, however, its political monopoly on associated decision-making that diminished the diversity of community programs and interests\textsuperscript{[18]}. In fact, chonaikais are often too conservative to defend or protect communities against existing unreasonable regulations, which triggered the emergence of independent organizations on community building. After Japan’s economic collapse in the 1990s, the central government empowered local authorities on certain management concerns, but the top-down bureaucracy still continued on the major issues such as urban planning and environmental governance\textsuperscript{[19]}. In addition, local governments do not have the independent decision-making right on urban development issues (which are determined by the central government) and are often financially limited—Japanese local governments might be the weakest administrative entities in
the world[20][21]. In the process of community building, Japanese central government has shaped a civil society framework favored by the authorities by means of regulatory control and administrative management.

The community building in Japan has been the result of a conflicting negotiation on urban governance, revealing that community management interventions are highly political activities, because it would not only impact the existing management system but also associate with the municipal budget allocation. Eventually, it would form a management system that can be accepted by both the central authority and grassroots classes[22]. Due to the external pressure brought by the globalization, Japan’s localization is going through a long-time transition. The key of reconciling the contradictions between globalization and local development is not only to transcend territorial boundaries and erect collective consciousness, but also to strengthen the cognition of territorial uniqueness that is crucial to maintain the resilience of localization[23]. The analysis of localization in specific context helps understand the extent of residents’ autonomy through community building and recognize the global trend of economic restructure and decentralization. This paper examines Glocalization as a mutual interest between bottom-up movement and top-down administration by studying the community building case in Kagurazaka of Tokyo, Japan.

3 Micro Perspective of Glocalization: A Case Study of Community Building in Kagurazaka, Tokyo

3.1 The Cultural Identity of Roji System in Kagurazaka

Located in Shinjuku District of Tokyo, Kagurazaka covers an area of about 16 hm² and sits on the borders of Shinjuku, Bunkyo, and Chiyoda Districts, composed of six small blocks in the two stripes between the upper- and lower-Kagurazaka (Fig. 1) and accommodating more than 2,600 residents[24]. Situated at the middle of the lower-Kagurazaka, the Kagurazaka Street is the main road within this area (Fig. 2) and enjoys a traditional Japanese streetscape—the network of Roji (ろじ), a kind of alley of two or three meters in width with storefront shrines, inns, restaurants, and traditional handicraft shops (Fig. 3). As a representative of traditional Japanese cultural landscape, the Roji spaces in Kagurazaka include three types[25]: 1) alleys of red-light district, consisting of decorative Roji (しつらえの路地) and greeting Roji (もてなしの路地); 2) alleys of mom-and-pop-business; and 3) alleys of life scene, consisting of high-density small low-rise houses. Japanese architect, Yamashita Kaoru, described the spatial aesthetics of Roji network[26] as: one walks on the narrow and winding paths, as if wondering in a
mini Japanese tea house with an area of 3 or 4 tatamis\(^\circ\), where the spatial tension draws visitors from daily experience into a mystery, inspiring infinite fantasies about such spaces.

In the Edo period (1603-1867), Kagurazaka was the home to lower-class warriors and a centralized area to a great number of temples and shrines. Kagurazaka witnessed a historical prosperity from the end of Meiji period to the early Showa period (1868-1941), when plenty of ryoteis (a Japanese-style luxury restaurant) and taverns thrived with geisha performance of traditional Japanese dance and shamisen art (Japanese guitar)\(^[26]\). The existing literature on the Kagurazaka culture anchors in a two-fold spatial implication: One is the places of traditional cultural identities (including cultural activities occurred here), one example of which was the Lki Club of Stylish Community Building (a community building organization founded in 2003) that adopted “lki” (いき, a concept representing the traditional aesthetics of Edo) to narrate the local cultural spirit\(^[27]\); The other is the places for people’s daily life and the public
activities (Fig. 4) which greatly encourage people’s interaction and promote community development and a flexible use of space. In Kagurazaka, the residents live in a complex network interwoven by social, historic, and cultural factors, where daily life represents and records people’s existence, inheritance, and continuation in the world.

3.2 The History of Community Building in Kagurazaka

Community building in Kagurazaka began in 1972, when the Iidabori Moat (a river adjacent to Kagurazaka) was heavily polluted, compromised by the rapid growth of the postwar economy, and the Shinjuku Council determined to bury the river as a part of the Urban Redevelopment Program. In 1978, a local resident filed a lawsuit against the Shinjuku Council to defend his land replacement right. It triggered the establishment of Protection Association of Iidabori Moat by the local residents and merchants, as well as other social organizations, who believed that the Iidabori Moat should be protected not only as an Edo cultural landscape but also for the historic tradition of firework boating in the summer. Meanwhile, as a waterfront for nearby residents’ leisure life, cherry blossom trees were planted, attracting a great many visitors every spring. This event gave birth to the community building of Kagurazaka (Fig. 5).

The promotion of the community building of Kagurazaka demonstrates a valuable perspective for coordinative development of territorial societies under globalization. The problems brought by globalization force people to re-examine their living environment, rethink their local lifestyles, and emphasize the survival and development of traditional communities with daily measures. This development mode makes local residents form a strong topophilia. With the growing public pressure, Shinjuku district government designated Kagurazaka in 1988 as a demonstration for community building. However, the continuous downturn of Japan’s economy struck the high-end geisha business industry—only four kiosks left now in Kagurazaka with about 20 geisha artists. As a response, in 1991 local residents and retailers established the Kagurazaka Community Building Association, and published the Guidebook of Kagurazaka to spread the unique Roji culture of Kagurazaka. In 1994, the association launched the Charter of Community Building, which later became the highest-level convention to guide local community building. In 1997, the association, together with the Kagurazaka Business Association, took a street improvement initiative to regulate streetscape construction between the Chome One to Chome Five of Kagurazaka. The initiative proposes that to limit the height of buildings, to define the construction boundaries on both sides of street, and to make aesthetic requirements on building style and features and street beautification.
Research on local communities contributes to the social discourse of globalization. Because the progress of globalization and its influence on local communities are reflected not only in the usage of social resources, the development of economic activities, and the social integration—especially the diverse interactions that coordinate and maintain the social ties between community members—but also in the social values formed in these processes. In 1999, a developer acquired several pieces of land in Kagurazaka (about 4,500 m² in total), and planned to accommodate a 31-storey modern-style building. Local residents and retailers temporarily established the Consultation of Countermeasures against High-Rise Building in Kagurazaka to resist the proposal since it would seriously damage the historic landscape of Kagurazaka[31]. However, the proposal did not violate any planning policy or regulation at that time. Finally, the Urban Design Laboratory at the University of Tokyo put forward a compromised proposal that attempted to both ensure the interests of developers and protect the overall historic identity by cutting the floors down to 26. Unfortunately, the building still caused a heavy loss of Kagurazaka’s historic value[32]. This failure forced the local residents and retailers to re-examine and re-understand the cultural identity of the local Roji system. They started to employ planning means for a greater community conservation.

The spreading globalization enables information and material exchanges across regions, which, however, results in the increasing homogenization of place making worldwide—at both macro- and micro-level. In the consideration of this duality, local governments need to critically think about current context before taking action[23]. In 2004, the Renaissance Association of Kagurazaka Community Building, a special organization of district planning, was founded by local residents and retailers to restrict the construction height of redevelopment projects in the area. At the same time, the Kagurazaka Community Building Association held many cultural conservation activities in forms of workshop, Roji-themed forum, traditional performance, guide tour, etc., which attracted wide public attention[33]. The community building of Kagurazaka seized such opportunities by turning the challenges into boost for the promotion of the cultural identity of Kagurazaka. In 2009, the Kagurazaka Community Building Project by the Kagurazaka Community Building Association was listed in the Heritage for the Future Project by the National Federation of UNESCO Association of Japan (NFUAJ)—The project gathered 50 submissions across the nation and only selected 10 finalists, and the Kagurazaka Community Building Project was the only project in the Kanto Region (besides Tokyo). Later, six workshops were jointly held by different community building organizations in Kagurazaka, and a notable fruition was the publishing of the Landscape Conservation Rules for Communities in Kagurazaka and the Street Conservation
Planning for the Territorial Alley System\textsuperscript{[19]}. It evidences that the community of Kagurazaka has proactively participated, rather than passively involved, in the process of globalization by activating its existing public resources, enhancing its capacity to participate in globalization, and increasing awareness that it is necessary and possible to maintain its ownership and uniqueness midst the global movement. In other words, the community of Kagurazaka has constantly rethought their own history and culture in globalization and realized self-identity and cultural consciousness, so as to avoid homogenization and objectification.

3.3 The Significance of the Community Building of Kagurazaka

The history of the community building of Kagurazaka reveals that community fostering is essential to community building. It not only emphasizes the ownership of local residents but also reshapes the residents’ lifestyle by encouraging independent building activities for livable and vibrant living spaces. In the Kagurazaka case, the Roji system is undoubtedly a cultural landscape of traditional Japanese street aesthetics, but these narrow alleys are only two or three meters in width that are not up to the standards of Japanese modern urban planning system—For the requirements of fire protection, the width of urban streets cannot be less than 4 meters; in addition, the wooden structures of traditional Japanese buildings in the Roji system are concerned with high fire hazards, which now require security improvements through urban renewals. To in line with such urban construction standards, Japan’s Roji spaces have been replaced with widened urban roads in a large number. Fortunately, the community building cases in Kagurazaka and other communities stand out against such a context, making the local societies start to reconsider the cultural value of Roji systems, and spurring a broader academic discussion on associated topics, and “it can be said that the re-recognition of the cultural and spatial value of the territorial alley system in Japan is a reverse appeal of the Japanese people to the dehumanized modern urban planning system after the second world war”\textsuperscript{[24]}. However, the impact of globalization cannot be coped with individual efforts. The National Communication Council of the Alley-Based Community, founded in 2004, has organized annual summits to explore solutions for Roji conservation and associated cultural-value enhancement through urban renewals. Kagurazaka case’s success has greatly propelled the nationwide community building practice—Roji neighborhoods now become a special type of neighborhoods in Japan.

3.4 The Reflection on the Community Building of Kagurazaka

Although community building has, somehow, resolved social conflicts in a more elastic way, the community of Kagurazaka still faces other development problems. One of them is that all buildings
3.5 神乐坂社区营造的影响

在法规层面，2004年，《景观法》的出台使日本各级政府可以制定符合当地实际情况的景观基准。新宿区政府亦于2009年制定了针对该区的景观条例，将神乐坂列为区内需要实施特别景观基准的6个风貌区之一。这些景观基准包括对路地石材、院墙色彩，以及建筑风貌的规定，鼓励新的开发建设尊重区域内的原有风貌。然而，这些要求均以建议的形式出现，并不具备法律效力：即使开发商的建设规划不符合景观条例的要求，在技术操作层面上他们仍有可能获得开发许可。因此，即便神乐坂开发建设过程缺乏有效的法律保护，社区营造组织在路地系统保护中仍然发挥着不可磨灭的作用。

3.5 The Influence of the Community Building of Kagurazaka

Features of most historical districts in cities have been somehow damaged during urbanization and by disasters—architectural structures have remained though—This is a common problem faced by many Asian cities, and the Kagurazaka case undoubtedly offers a paradigm for localized practices by demonstrating that the participation of local communities is critical in the area were rebuilt after the World War II, which are excluded by the current policies on historic building protection. This means that in the future Kagurazaka may face uncertainties brought by new urban developments. However, vibrant Roji systems with unique cultural and spatial values will be formed when these reconstructed traditional-style buildings are seen as a whole—especially most of these buildings are traditional geisha places which form a distinctive pattern of alleys and streets, making a prominent cultural identity among various communities across the city. Therefore, how to evaluate the historical and cultural values of such reconstructed neighborhood poses a new challenge for the community of Kagurazaka. Because local governments in Japan have not issued any policies on historic street or Roji neighborhood protection, which has been promoted by many cities around the world though. The new development problems under globalization often stem from the internal systems of local communities, and in turn define the future development of communities. Therefore, these problems are definitely culturally significant that should not be ignored. The agenda of Roji neighborhood protection would not only determine the Roji projection of Kagurazaka, but also help avoid redevelopments that merge small plots in historic areas in the future. At present, scholars have begun to highlight the value of the Roji system and the geisha industry in Kagurazaka as a cultural landscape, so as to promote the protection of Roji neighborhoods.

According to the Landscape Law, issued in 2004, Japanese governments at all levels are allowed to formulate landscape benchmarks upon specific localities. The government of Shinjuku District also issued its landscape ordinances in 2009, and listed Kagurazaka as one of the six landscape areas with special landscape benchmarks—ranging from requirements on pavement stones, the color of courtyard walls, and architectural style to measures that encourage historical protection during new urban development. However, such landscape benchmarks are not mandatory; technically, even if an urban construction project does not meet these requirements, it still can get consented anyway. Therefore, in the face of the lack of legal guarantee, community building organizations play an indelible role in the protection of Roji system during the urban development of Kagurazaka.
in the improvement of living environment, during which community building, as a catalyst for regional revitalization, activates local residents to exploit the cultural value of the whole area. Besides, the participation and coordination of higher-level authorities leads to the success or failure of community building activities. In 2010, the Journal of Kagurazaka summarized up the core spirit of community building of Kagurazaka into a propaganda that “the creation of a landscape takes a decade, a century for a scenery, and hundreds of years for a tradition.”[27] This points out that the local community building in Japan is not a single political movement or social event that finishes with certain achievements; it essentially illuminates people to strive for their rights for a better life through community building, which is to build cities into comfortable homes—In this sense, community building is a fight to protect homeland through generations’ efforts. In terms of Glocalization, research on community development is not only to identify the commonness or difference between different cultures, but to explore the trend from cultural commonness towards cultural variability. Because only when the desire for power, as well as economic principles, give way to people's living demands, urban planning begins to transit towards a decentralized planning mode in democracy, modernity, and humanity. At present, by reviewing the issues on community development globally, three trends can be identified: 1) scale changes: with a shift from macro-planning on physical environment to micro-planning on development and governance, community governance has become a political agenda; 2) emphasis on process: with an emphasis shift from planning outcomes to democratic planning process, transparent decision-making mechanism, and associated institutional construction, planners and architects are also expected to act as advocates and promoters in the process of public participation; and 3) continuous decentralization: with the promotion of public engagement the fairness and inclusiveness of the city will be enhanced, and communities would play a greater role in the control and influence on environmental development, taking a larger responsibility and duty as well.

4 Conclusion: A New Global Landscape—The Contemporary Implications of Community Building

In Japanese, the word “building” (づくり) also means rice cultivation or talent training.[39] This implies that community building is inherently different from goods production or manufacture; it is a long-time process that needs careful planning and fostering. In this sense, the purpose of community building in Japan is not to create something new, but to revitalize or rebirth the existing by sophisticated planning and design. It also suggests that, instead of an activity that can get immediate results, community
building requires long-term, continuous, and sustainable efforts upon localities, so as to stimulate local vitality and contribute to the sustainability and health of community economy—Of course, it also depends on the understanding and patience of local governments, investors, local residents, community planners, and volunteers on community building itself.

At present, the tension between globalization and localization complicates the diversified social contexts. The understanding of globalization cannot be shaped with conventional conclusive definitions, but need to methodically study the influence of specific places and regional cultures on urban communities. In practice, regional traditions cannot be fabricated, or completely denied or discarded under globalization. On the contrary, Glocalization requires a more profound examination on the inevitable hybridity midst contemporary cultures, by rethinking of the existing historical and traditional elements and making full use of all kinds of living conveniences brought by Globalization. Glocalization expert Gili S. Drori believes that[1] Glocalization, as well as the mutual penetration and interaction between globalization and localization, can be explored from three dimensions: 1) the trade-off relation between the strengths of globality and locality; 2) the boundary-crossing and integration of global cultures and local cultures among different sectors and fields; and 3) the spread and adaptation of global cultures and local cultures in different ages or regions (Fig. 6). Under the influence of both globalization and localization, community building itself is a complex of contradictions: intertwined by nations’ macro-scale reforms and individuals’ micro-scale needs,
communities now become places witnessing urban social changes, interest conflicts, and neighborhood-level struggles\[40\].

Today, being a social and economic transformation, China has given up massive construction of new towns under an extensive economic growth and embraced the redevelopment of existing resources towards a mature and sustainable micro globalization. Japan’s urban regeneration experience initiated 50 years ago through community building can still offer references for enriching the regeneration strategies and objectives to China’s current inventory planning and participatory design. Philosopher Zhao Tingyang holds that all problems in life are common problems; if we narrate our life like profiling an object’s physical movement, all meanings and values of life would be diminished, so as the notion of happiness since no happiness exists upon individual things—happiness is a thing upon collective states\[41\]. Thus, contemporary community building under Glocalization is to form a new global landscape related to happiness. LAF
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