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Abstract

Culture and cultural heritage can be understood as powerful marketing tools that are increasingly used in urban development processes. Placemaking and the creation of a new place identity as an own brand accompanies such processes. In the case of the redevelopment of Kaka’ako, the culture and history of the neighborhood and of the islands of Hawai’i resonates in the discourse of the stakeholders. While landowners and developers claim to invite all residents and visitors to “discover the most desirable and sustainable urban place in Hawai’i to work, live, learn and play”, in reality not everyone is privileged to participate, and even more some histories are excluded in the process. This paper zooms in on the inclusion of more marketable cultural elements and lifestyles in the spatial fix of Kaka’ako during the past decades at the expense of other “histories”. Culture-led development means to find a balance between improving the place and respecting as many histories of this place as possible.
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Résumé
La culture et le patrimoine culturel peuvent être considérés comme de puissants outils de marketing qui sont de plus en plus utilisés dans les processus de développement urbain. Le placemaking (littéralement la « création d’espaces ») et la création d’une nouvelle identité de lieu en tant que marque propre accompagnent ces processus. Dans le cas du redéveloppement de Kaka‘ako, la culture et l’histoire du quartier et de l’ensemble des îles d’Hawa‘i résonnent dans le discours des parties prenantes. Si les propriétaires et les promoteurs prétendent inviter tous·te·s les résident·e·s et visiteur·euse·s à « découvrir l’endroit urbain le plus désirable et le plus durable d’Hawaï où travailler, vivre, apprendre et jouer », en réalité, tout le monde n’a pas le privilège de participer. Plus encore, certaines histoires sont exclues du processus. Cet article se penche sur l’inclusion d’éléments culturels et de modes de vie plus commercialisables dans le spatial fix de Kaka‘ako au cours des dernières décennies, au détriment d’autres « histoires ». Le développement axé sur la culture vise à trouver un équilibre entre l’amélioration du lieu et le respect du plus grand nombre possible d’histoires de ce lieu.

Mots-clés : développement axé sur la culture, gentrification, patrimoine, sens d’un lieu, (re)développement urbain
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Prologue
“This is my 3rd day in Honolulu, a city way different than my hometown Graz. I am walking down Cooke Street, passing warehouses with huge and beautiful murals. Some of them look like they want to teach you about Hawaiian history while others seem like carrying you off into a fairy-tale. I turn left and recognize a car repair shop. Of course, that’s what literature is talking about—the old industry that is still remaining in Kaka‘ako. Nice charm. And here is a hip brewery. I need to come back once during the evening. There are not many people on the streets. The few people I see are young, urban and in their early 20s to early 30s. I feel connected to them. They dress similar to me and I have the feeling that we even have more things in common. Like drinking fancy coffee. Ah, perfect there is a coffee shop. ‘One chai latte, please.’ Even if I read a
lot about the neighborhood of ‘Our Kaka’ako’ and especially their gathering place ‘SALT’, I now feel blinded by its offers. It is a district created for people like me—young, urban, intellectual, creative. I would fit in here perfectly. And it is so close to the waterfront. Ah, here is Waterfront Park. Let’s cross it to get a view on Kewalo Basin. I have a strange feeling now. Something tells me not to continue walking. My daydreaming of living in ‘Our Kaka’ako’ stops and reality hits me hard. There are tents scattered across the park. Many eyes are watching me. This is their park. People like me are not welcome. It is midday but I feel very uncomfortable. It is a situation I have never been to. I have never seen so many homeless people at once before. I feel afraid, sad and angry at the same time. Most people look Polynesian. Should it not be their island? Why do Native Hawaiians have to live in a tent in Waterfront Park while rich foreigners look down on them from a rooftop garden or the infinity pool of one of the new high-rises? I read that some of the condominiums are empty most of the year. It does not make sense. It makes me angry. How can young people enjoy their $5 coffee while many poor people are on the other side of Ala Moana Boulevard? How can a place that is famous for the ‘Aloha spirit’ be that unequal and exclusive?" (Astrid Holzinger, diary fragment of the fieldwork, Kaka’ako, 2017)

Introduction

While urban development worldwide, in the wake of climate change and other challenges, is integrating more practices and principles of environmental sustainability, local translations manifest and change the existing environment in different ways. The departure point of this article is the importance of understanding the dynamic interactions of living culture (Toelken, 1996) on the current and historical narratives in the local translations of urban sustainability. In different parts of the world, international and local actors alike recognized Cultural Heritage (CH) and advocate for culture to be part of sustainable development indicators (Hassan and Lee, 2015), or even more for culture-led sustainable development (Hribar, David and Primož, 2015). Notwithstanding, the motivation behind sustainable initiatives with a focus on environmental adaptations and developments do not always include/integrate a social justice dimension. Sharon Zukin noted that cultural preservation is rather a marketing tool or lifestyle strategy of real estate companies to create an “authentic sense of place” (2011, p. 162) which attracts capital rich newcomers. Subsequently, it “challenges and sometimes displaces long term residents” (ibid.). In her literature research on the topic of making historic conservation sustainable, Erica Avrami (2016) noted that there are tensions between preservation and other sustainable development goals, like equality, but also that many cases and empirical data are missing. Some scholars have brought forward the argument that aesthetic value attracts potential (high-income) residents, but low supply of housing
due to restrictions on larger or higher density infill can drive up the price of residential buildings in the area (ibid.; Zukin, 1987). On the other hand, protecting “old” buildings would also be good in terms of environmental impacts. For instance, a material stock and flow study of redevelopment of Tiexi, an industrial site in China, over the span of a century, revealed that urban renewals, where cultural built heritage got demolished, has pernicious consequences on construction and demolition waste and material extraction (Guo, Fishman, Wang et al., 2021). The protection and promotion of CH can lead to local economic benefits, like job and income creation (Chong and Balasingam, 2019). In addition, cultural heritage transfers knowledge about the place, which can help in the design and adaptation of place-specific environmental challenges. Cultural heritage protection is not only a strategy of gentrification but could also serve sustainable development goals.

An analysis of the tactics in the mobilization of culture can reveal more about the different approaches to culture and heritage. Culture is fluid, which implies there is a whole array of “history” and cultural elements to choose from. In the 1960s, the small wave of private market capital investments in redevelopments in western cities aimed for vitality but was also characterized by a high degree of selectivity (Zukin, 1987). Even nowadays these choices of the past are shaping the presence. In addition, sometimes developers can “introduce” cultural practices or motives which do not feel authentic to local people or certain communities who are attached to another culture. This can happen through historical invention or manipulation of collective memory of cultural history (Said, 2000; Orlić, 2013). For instance, in Hawai‘i’s case, the concept of (‘auana) hula, which many non-Hawaiians and tourists perceive as an ancient indigenous hula, is a tradition invented by settlers. The traditional hula,kahiko, is not accompanied by guitar and ukulele sounds and becomes less seen even in Honolulu. Even more, local culture could be erased by the invasion of “alien” cultural elements. In other Asia-Pacific countries like Japan, cultural built heritage is threatened by the introduction of new lifestyle choices and cultural norms, which are mostly imported from the west (Wuyts, Miatto, Sedlitzky et al., 2019; Wuyts, Sedlitzky, Morita et al., 2020). Selection or introduction of cultural elements often means rejection or exclusion of other elements. Selecting or appropriating elements of culture could lead to conflicts between the place marketeers and local people and even lead to the eradication of this culture (Kearns and Philo, 1993; Hubbard, 1998). To illustrate this with the case of Hawai‘i, the precolonial culture is marketed in such a way that it appears less special and less unique (Harvey, 2012). Hence, as history and cultural identity are relevant for communities but there is also the need to generate income.

1. We want to show respect and honor the culture by writing “Hawai‘i” in Hawaiian. The Hawaiian apostrophe is called the ‘okina, and it’s actually an official consonant in the Hawaiian language.
The situation can become political, sensitive and complex and can lead to conflicts (Kearns and Philo, 1993; MacLeod and Carrier, 2010), especially as the production and consumption of culture, and the choice of cultural elements, are in control of relatively powerful stakeholders (ibid.).

While landowners and developers of this case study claim to invite all residents and visitors to “discover the most desirable and sustainable urban place in Hawai‘i to work, live, learn and play” (Kamehameha Schools, 2008, p. 2), in reality not everyone is privileged to participate. Even more, some histories are excluded in the process. Notwithstanding, Mateja Šmid Hribar, David Bole and Pipan Primož (2015) placed emphasis on the role of the local community as the main stakeholder and process in cultural heritage oriented local development and noted the added value of an institutional capacity and participatory approach. This paper zooms in on the inclusion of more marketable cultural elements and lifestyles (and the local communities represented by it) in the spatial fix of Kaka‘ako, a neighborhood in the heart of Honolulu, during the past decades, i.e., matching capital generation and environmental solutions for the (symptom) local problems (While, Jonas and Gibbs, 2004). This combination often leads to new spatial inequalities which are explored by several scholars (Curran and Hamilton, 2017). This manuscript reflects upon the creation of another spatial inequality, which—to our knowledge—has not been investigated. Environmental gentrification often happens at the expense of other “histories”. By that we mean narratives of local communities that have lived or still have been living in the margins of this place. To us, culture-led development does not mean appropriating cultural elements for aesthetic value in redevelopment oriented to newcomers, but it means to find a balance between improving the place and respecting as many histories of this place as possible.

The case study is Kaka‘ako, a waterfront (re)development of a district in Honolulu. The district has a broad variety of stakeholders. The following map (figure 1) shows the composition of the private landowners and the land owned by the Hawai‘i Community Development Authority (HCDA). It visualizes the ongoing development. What distinguishes this case study from other studied waterfronts, mostly in North America, is the composition of the population and the integration of precolonial cultural symbols in the redevelopment of industrial sites as some sort of “culture washing” (Auclair, 2014). While the informal settlements are inhabited by a more Polynesian population, the new buildings not only attract the white upper and middle

---

2. “Spatial fix” is a term used to express thinking that a redevelopment can fix or cure all the symptoms (and it is arguable if the symptoms are really bad, or only perhaps only from the perspectives of the people in power or capitalist institutions).
class, but also wealthy investors from mainland US and Asia (Spencer, 2014; Loomis, 2018).

Before colonization, Kaka‘ako was a place of recreation for Native Hawaiians used for cleansing, fishing, canoe landings, and religious practices (Wu, 2007). Ironically, nowadays, this place is being appropriated to create recreational space for newcomers in order to generate capital accumulation opportunities. After the Great Mahele, a land division measure to introduce private property in 1848, landowners transformed this district into an industrial hub (Balderston, 2016), which translated into inequalities between the native and non-native locals (Grandinetti, 2019). Since industrial development in the late 19th century, Kaka‘ako has always been a neighborhood of the proletariat. In the early 20th century, Native Hawaiians, who were homeless as a result of privatization of land and access to the market, occupied a strip of wasteland in Kaka‘ako, but were evicted by the territorial government in the 1920s, only making space for the blue collars (Balderston, 2016). In the 1940s, this district was
designated for strictly industrial use, leading to a second wave of displacement (Johnson and Turnbull, 1991). In the 1980s, the community counted 2,300 residents and almost ten times as many workers (Steele, 1990). Until the recent development started, many people associated the area with criminality and thought of it as an industrial wasteland (Holzinger, 2018). Kaka’ako has undergone tremendous changes, transitioning from a fishing settlement to an area with an industrial and commercial focus and an ethnically diverse community, and then to the “mixed-use” neighborhood it is today.

Today’s challenges of Hawai’i and especially Honolulu are caused not only by the tourism sector, as the islands are seen as paradise on earth which led to mass tourism, but also by housing issues, due to the limited space of the island of O’ahu. After World War II, real estate investment and speculation have spurred population growth, especially with an influx of new residents from the US mainland and Asian countries (Spencer, 2014; Minerbi, 1994). Because of the city’s land mass and growing population, the high cost of living forces residents to either work two jobs or experience homelessness (Spencer, 2014). Affordable housing for low-income residents competes with luxury high-rises constructed for retired Californians, New Yorkers, Japanese, and other wealthy individuals looking to relocate. In 2015, the homeless population of Hawai’i (with the majority living in Honolulu) reached 7,620, making it the state with the highest homeless population per capita in the United States (Nagourney, 2016; Spencer, 2014; Minerbi, 1994; see figure 2).
Using Kaka’ako as a case study, this paper aims at addressing the potential loss of community outreach and involvement, and their cultural heritage in the redevelopment of the Hawaiian neighborhood, although redevelopment initiatives claim to celebrate the community’s cultural heritage of different times in their placemaking process. Zukin (1987) addressed already the use of historic preservation by classes, which cluster around collective lifestyle choices, to colonize urban spaces. However, we shift the focus to a place which has other cultural roots than traditional studied gentrification cases. The second section zooms in on the material and methods that this study is based on. The third section starts with the description of contemporary creative placemaking in Kaka’ako in order to present the contemporary community outreach and involvement in the redevelopment. While the first subsection of this part gives a background of the main landowners, the next one presents which cultural elements (of which history) are integrated in the current urban landscape of Kaka’ako. The next section discusses how developers and policy-makers could integrate culture in a deeper way in the (re)development of a neighborhood. The last one concludes with suggestions of what an alternative future for Kaka’ako could look like.
Material and methods

Based on arguments by Judith Rosendahl, Matheus A. Zanella, Stephan Rist et al. to make research more reflective, we feel it is pivotal to state our positionality, because “[...] knowledge claims are always socially situated. One’s social situation both enables and sets limits on what one can know” (2015, p. 19). This study is part of a master’s thesis at the Department of Geography, University of Graz, of one of us, with the purpose of understanding the environmental history, resources, and social networks of Kaka’ako (Holzinger, 2018). She resided in Hawai’i from July to November 2017, during which time she attended different public events and meetings as an active listener. She conducted fourteen expert interviews along with a semi-structured interview guide and six narrative interviews that did not follow the guided interview structure. The interviews lasted on average one hour. The shortest interview lasted approximately thirty minutes and the longest took one hour and thirty minutes. The interviews helped to understand the (emotional) history of the neighborhood, the link between actors, as well as the involvement of the community, the perception of the new development and the forecast of the future. Interview partners were executive leaders of all three main landowners, HCDA and the City and County of Honolulu, as well as university professors and residents of Kaka’ako. Further information was drawn from newspaper articles, blogs, neighborhood events and the authors’ personal network of locals. Secondary sources included previous academic research other case studies, and a limited number of records and statistics from administration units (projects, programs and policy documents), and maps, diagrams, photographs, and texts published on stakeholders’ website(s) or official social media channels. All procedures implemented, observed events, and contributions to this study were systematically documented in field diaries and photographs. The diversity of sources has helped to observe, document and analyze many perspectives of the neighborhood. It has provided the opportunity to question inconsistencies and injustices. From August 2017 onwards, we corresponded online: we traded long, analytical emails, have online self-reflective meetings and published blogs about our research. One could argue that we both can be considered as outsiders (Kerstetter, 2012; Staeheli and Lawson, 1995). However, we tried to be self-aware of our biases and blindness. Therefore, we decided to start and end this article with diary fragments where we acknowledge that we are privileged young professionals who benefit from high-end consumption of culture and even reinforce the placemaking dynamics.
Placemaking in Kaka‘ako

The Hawai‘i Community Development Authority was formed in the year 1976 (Kamehameha Schools, 2008). Developers and the HCDA have a vision to mix contemporary culture and cultural tradition within a compact urban setting (ibid.). Besides encouraging a variety of housing opportunities with a provision of reserved, affordable housing units for mixed-income and mixed-age residents; permission for and integration of areas for industrial and commercial use; and the implementation of two train stations for Honolulu’s Transport Oriented Approach (TOD), a focus on the preservation of historic sites and culturally significant facilities, settings, or locations has also been observed (HCDA, 2015). Placemaking, from a marketing perspective, implies authenticity and quality (Steuteville, 2014). In the development of Kaka‘ako, one can find elements of strategic, creative and tactical placemaking. Places of Kaka‘ako receive a story from the landowners which attracts the people who want to belong to this story. “Our Kaka‘ako’s”—the area developed by Kamehameha Schools—story is the hip, rising, young professionals or artists. They combine old warehouses and car repair shops with coffee shops, breweries and gyms. “Ward Village’s” story by Howard Hughes is the (foreign) already professional with a “care” for sustainability and culture. Examples of that are the LEED certification and the South Shore Market as a shopping center with only local brands or the weekly farmers’ market. Regarding culture, many buildings were also given appropriate Hawaiian names in reference to the precolonial past.

The year before the establishment of the HCDA, the Pacific Urban Studies and Planning Program at the University of Hawai‘i published a study called “Kaka‘ako Solved?” (Campbell, 1975; Kamehameha Schools, 2008). While the research team agreed on the inevitability of a redevelopment of the district, it also tried to raise awareness for the protection of small businesses. Kaka‘ako Solved? included a district-wide 20% representative random sample survey of businesses, with a return rate of 48% (Minerbi, 1980). Even if the study announced many suggestions for the new development, especially in terms of spatial needs of businesses, locational dependencies and mixed-use compatibility, the publication was never used, and the university and community felt ignored (Holzinger, 2018). Voices from Kaka‘ako spoke out loudly after specific plans for the area’s redevelopment were announced. During the interviews conducted in July-September 2017 as part of the field work of this study, the common thread among interviewees was not an opinion, but a question: “for whom are they going to build the condominiums?” (ibid., p. 58)

One remarkable “story” of resistance that residents of Kaka‘ako are still talking about today was the Save Our Kaka‘ako March to the capitol on January 23, 2006, led
by Ron Iwami (Iwami, 2014). The rally resulted in a new law prohibiting the sale of public land and residential development in Kaka’ako Makai (ibid.). Iwami is not only a face of resistance for the community but also a voice recognized and respected by the landowners (Holzinger, 2018). His organization, Friends of Kewalos, was formed to “protect, preserve, and malama³ Kewalo Basin Park and the surrounding shoreline and ocean, to ensure that the recreational user will continue to have access and the ability to enjoy the area for future generations to come” (Iwami, 2014, p. 129). He represents surfers and people using the public parks in Kaka’ako (Holzinger, 2018).

**Lifestyle strategies of the main landowners**

In Kaka’ako, especially two urban concepts with respect to development are underway. The two biggest landowners, Kamehameha Schools and Howard Hughes, who, together own almost 40% of Kaka’ako, follow very different approaches (Lau, 2018). “Our Kaka’ako”, the area managed by Kamehameha Schools, focuses on young, urban, creative professionals with a hip lifestyle, while Howard Hughes addresses primarily upper socioeconomic classes and wealthy foreigners with interests in sustainability and culture with Ward Village (figure 3).

Figure 3: Ward Village, Anaha
© Holzinger, 2017

---

3. *Malama* means “to protect”, “to care for » in Hawaiian
It is noteworthy that Kamehameha Schools and the Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA), another landowner in Kaka’ako, are two powerful Native Hawaiian institutions that own land in Kaka’ako. While Tina Grandinetti argues that they are “part of the rush to capitalize on Kaka’ako’s rising land value” (2019, p. 11), one has to mention that Kamehameha Schools’ development process at “Our Kaka’ako” slowed down due to responses from the community. Kamehameha Schools claimed to make adaptations (e.g., changing a barber shop into a grocery store) because of the community’s input. They provide an information center at SALT to listen to the needs of the community (Holzinger, 2018). On the other hand, quotes such as “I don’t regulate the price, I incentivize the price”, which have been uttered by a member of Kamehameha Schools and documented during the interview, show the capitalist objectives of the institution.

The Office of Hawaiian Affairs owns land on the Makai (ocean) side of Kaka’ako. The residential zoning is not allowed (see Save our Kaka’ako march in chapter 3, Iwami, 2014). Although a master plan for a mix of commercial and retail exists, OHA is very quiet. There was not enough information gathered for a proper statement.

HCDA feels responsible for balancing the interests of developers and residents. Since the board of HCDA changed in 2015, the community and residents have felt more involved and heard. One big adjustment was the new mixture of board members. Thereupon members also represent residents and small businesses and not only politicians and developers. In September 2017, the board passed a policy lowering rules for affordable housing from 140% average median income (AMI) to 120% AMI. Still, this figure is higher than the average median income, and many people spend more than 30% of their income on housing even if they live in “affordable” units.

The place’s culture and history strongly influence the master plans of both large landowners, who not only integrate these factors into their designs but also organize events such as Kona Nui Nights, a free monthly event honoring Hawaiian language, music, and (non-ancient) hula arts. Kamehameha Schools, furthermore, collaborate with POW! WOW! Hawai‘i, a global network of street artists who paint temporary murals on walls throughout the neighborhood. While Hawaiian influences can be noticed in a few murals, they appear to be more a sign of gentrification than of cultural sensitivity. Supporting arts and culture, therefore, is seen as a part of supporting the community. As Gerry Kearns and Chris Philo (1993) would describe it, the developers celebrate certain cultural and historical objects and traditions that are appropriate for being represented, especially to attract outsiders and their capital as well as to legitimate the redevelopment for insiders (figure 4).

Choice of cultural elements

Built Cultural Heritage (CH) plays an important role in society and everyday life, because it connects people with certain values, beliefs, and practices from the past by allowing for identification with others of similar backgrounds and mindsets—in short, it enables people to understand where they come from. In some cases, it helps to heal from tragic history and sad memories. For instance, in the case of Gwangju in South Korea, different local actors contested and negotiated the removal of a site connected to the democratic uprising in the eighties; the resistance of locals who lost their children in this uprising reveals the power of mourning for the tragic history and sad memories (Shin and Stevens, 2013; Shin, 2016). Although local government officers and developers can have good intentions to heal or clean “a place” by applying politics of forgetting and amnesia, the removal of buildings can be considered an act of forgetting or even denying some parts of the past and culture; hence these politics can have an ambiguous role (Colombino and Vanolo, 2017; Brockmeier, 2002). Culture is something that changes. Culture is fluid and inherent to choices people make about what to remember and what to forget (Tengberg, Fredholm, Eliasson et al., 2012).
Places have plural heritages and traditions with their own practices (ibid.). However, the utilization of local and traditional knowledge and heritage can lead to conflicts. Some communities place high value on the maintenance or restoration of certain cultural practices and symbols, because of the aforementioned memories of sadness, or of joy, or because of beliefs and cultural ecosystem services, which can be in conflict with the practices and values by other communities that drive urban renewal. As Zukin (1987) noted, often the pregentrifiers attach to elements of their version of “history” and do not see the improvements that come with redevelopment. Several scholars have studied how place-marketing might find resistance among residents, and specific long-term residents (see Hubbard, 1998; Kearns and Philo, 1993), although non-opponent cases exist too (see Colombino, 2009).

In the case of Kaka‘ako, the “culture” or history was not profoundly present in the built environment but in the memories of the industrial past and precolonial past. Interviewees did not refer to a specific building or a landmark of industrial history. Their focus was on the community that worked in the former industries of Kaka‘ako. They had a strong connection: they dreamt of working hard and acquiring their own family house in the suburbs of Honolulu which was “the American dream” during that time. A big displacement is not observed, except for a few cases (e.g., Feeding Hawaii Together). Car repair shops and warehouses still remain in the area, but middle-class and high-class newcomers are also popping up in the neighborhood. For some long-time residents, it feels like an invasion by more and more wealthy people. Opponents of the development seem to protect the working population from displacement by retelling the stories of the old Kaka‘ako. One example is 88 block Walks by Adele Balderston. She is a storytelling voice that documents the changes of the district by offering walking tours. The stories and the (emotional) connection of the population motivate the opponents to keep the sense and the lifestyle of the former Kaka‘ako alive.

A few interviewees referred to the ancient Hawaiian concept of ahupua‘a, the precolonial concept of land division. An ahupua‘a was a non-private and pie slice-shaped area running from the mountains to the sea while following the natural boundaries of the watershed. Therefore, each area had similar resources—from fish to vegetables and fruits in different altitudes. For the interviewees, the concept of ahupua‘a and sharing the resources within a community is a strong symbol for sustainability. Kaka‘ako United, a voluntary organization well known in Kaka‘ako, integrated the concept in their guidelines. However, no definite plans for the integration of this concept have been found.
Regarding the renaissance of the long-standing and precolonial culture, many projects were given appropriate Hawaiian names in reference to the precolonial past, but this seems more like a façade. Academic communities advocate for a “cultural renaissance movement” (Chirico and Farley, 2015, p. 17 et seq.), in particular of this past, and are studying processes developed by precolonized Hawaiians. In their academic view, these integrated the ecology of the local island into their everyday lives; these traditional practices could be resurrected through a valorization and reclamation of CH, since they lived within nature’s limits, not only to ensure long-term sustainability but also their survival (ibid.). However, as Grandinetti (2019) warned, that this might be a romanticized view of what is possible. She proposed an alternative urban justice vision, but she also did not get into detail what this exactly means for this neighborhood. However, we engage with her vision to not only retrieve aspects of this culture that could be revived while cleaning up the more recent industrial past.

The developers include the history into their story by picking and choosing symbols of certain historical events and heroes. A mural of Princess Kaʻiulani should remind of the monarchy while the brick stone of the house should simultaneously remind of the industrial past. A luxury glass tower with an infinity pool on top should celebrate Hawaiian culture, while precolonial Hawaiians never used the material of glass. A food festival (figure 5) presents aloha, diversity and joy. However, people visiting the festival park their cars right next to the homeless (figure 6). Moreover, the whole park is a landfill that used to be a fishing spot some decades ago.
SALT (figure 7), the gathering place of Kamehameha Schools’ neighborhood, is named after the old, precolonial salt ponds in the area. However, today it is a place to eat, shop and have fun and it has no connection to this time at all, although Kaka’ako, as ironically mentioned before, used to be a place of recreation in this time. The buildings of Ward Village have Hawaiian names such as Waiea (water of life), Anaha (reflection of light) or Ke Kilohana (gaze upward) and architects describe the influence of Hawaiian culture in the design. It manipulates those cultural and historical associations because the hypermodern condominiums with high gloss interior, air conditioners and non-publicly accessible rooftop pools appear to be what Kearns and Philo call “architecture of power” instead of “architecture of the people” (1993). Furthermore, the history of an ethnically diverse Kaka’ako in the 20th century is not considered in the storytelling of the developers.

These cases demonstrate how cultural heritage, or actually only the symbols, heroes and rituals are revitalized, but not the values of preservation and harmony with the environment and its carrying capacity. One could argue that the developers participate in culture washing, referring to green washing (Auclair, 2014), in order to attract market tourists and new relatively well off and well-educated workforce residents who can generate revenue through tax and tourism expenditures (Kearns and Philo, 1993).
While Balderston (2016) and Grandinetti (2019) note that the commodification of Hawaiian culture is an instrumentalization of colonizing indigenous places, we see the redevelopment in our case study as the clean-up of the memories of “dirty” industrial time of the last century. The culture of the past it seems can only stay if it serves the needs of the wealthy, healthy and happy (future) residents. This raises questions about the politics of forgetting and remembering of different stakeholders in urban renewal processes.

Call for a deeper culture-led development

Neighborhoods and their buildings are culturally rooted. Their lives are mediated through the people, their beliefs and values, as well as their preference for materials and knowledge, and the local context (Cox, 2015). However, culture can also be used as a tool in placemaking with social justice impacts. One of our research priorities was to challenge if the most visible voices of Kaka’ako are capitalist institutions, that uphold a highly destructive money-making machinery for an elite, based on structural inequality and exploitation. Although Grandinetti (2019) deciphered the process of gentrification and cultural erasure in this neighborhood, she
primarily used the lens of urban political economy, with a focus on the indigenous history. This paper is looking at the processes of redevelopment from a sustainable consumption perspective to a wider array of histories and cultures of this place in order to identify the missed and ongoing opportunities for in-depth (rather than shallow) cultural heritage-oriented development. The housing market on the islands of Hawai‘i and Honolulu in particular is vulnerable because of the high demand from citizens from the US and Asia. Although efforts of integrating “visible” cultural practices and the reservation of affordable housing units by the HCDA and the developers can be recognized, profit orientation seems to be the driver for the development and an incentive for the people in power. Hence, some unprivileged groups such as the homeless people in Kaka‘ako Waterfront Park and the working class which owns businesses such as car repair shops in the neighborhood are not taken enough into account. At the same time, some of these groups have valuable insights into the area before the development started that might disappear or be forgotten.

Creative placemaking has the potential to engage residents in the development of a vernacular urban design. However, as Zukin (2011) and Paul Cloke, Martin Phillips and Nigel Thrift (1998) noted, culture preservation and creative placemaking can have negative side effects for certain communities, especially when culture is commodified in the function of lifestyle strategies. In Kaka‘ako, though HCDA might has good intentions to create a thriving place with healthy sustainable communities, the creative placemaking led to a perceived colonization of precolonial symbols and a perceived exclusion of the industrial past. In placemaking, certain narratives are selected, which implies the exclusion or rejection of other narratives (Brockmeier, 2002). Albeit the selected narratives might contribute to cultural heritage preservation, this might also challenge the communities that feel connected with the recent industrial past for example. The exclusion did not happen out of a need to right some wrong from the recent industrial past. However, the “invasion” of incomers and the introduction of new cultural symbols seems to mainly serve to tourism and can feel like a culture washing to show how “sustainable” the new buildings are.

As a last discussion note, we want to dream of a more inclusive way of creative placemaking in terms of gentrification and build further on the vision that Grandinetti started. We agree with her vision that “true urban justice in settler colonial societies must always have at its foundation a commitment to recognizing, supporting, and reestablishing Indigenous connections to urban land” (Grandinetti, 2019, p. 17). However, we also miss details about what this exactly means, what is possible and desirable. First of all, as aforementioned, powerful Native Hawaiian institutions also use the “land” for capital accumulation and not necessarily for creating a more resilient urban environment adapted to the limits of the island. Secondly, other histories and
cultural heritage representing other marginalized groups should be integrated. Although Grandinetti criticizes the settler-native binary, she reinforces the binary by focusing only on the precolonial past. However, we agree with her call to recognize and support connections of the communities to the urban area of Kaka‘ako, but for us this is only a first step in this complex placemaking process.

Although studies of the narratives of gentrification (Slater, 2006) seem to demonstrate injustice for certain communities, some cases give hope for the potential of coexistence of community and area businesses. Winifred Curran and Trina Hamilton examined the social impacts of industrial gentrification in Greenpoint, Brooklyn, and proposed the Just Green Approach, which calls developers and stakeholders to design green projects that are shaped by the desires, needs and problems of the community instead of being driven by the market (2017; Wolch, Byrne and Newell, 2014). Julie Sze and Elizabeth Yeampierre (2017) described the activities, approach and methods of the New York City-based UPROSE community. This organization focuses upon the strengths, perspectives and other local knowledge of the manufacturing zones and prioritizes practices of making and saving rather than high-end consumption. The Just Green Approach to placemaking is an answer to the creation of new sociospatial inequalities by the contemporary spatial fix we witness in urban areas (While, Jonas and Gibbs, 2004), but does not look at the sociospatial inequalities that urban developers and policy-makers create by selecting—or excluding—cultural elements in this urban greening process. We imagine a sort of Deep Culture-led development, where the Native Hawaiians are included, not as an inspiration to integrate ancient symbols and their knowledge (as Chirico and Farley, 2015 suggest), but to dig deep to the roots and to learn how their stories are evolved. And the same is valid for other marginalized groups, like the blue collars who were part of the industrial past. When we visit countries, we like to listen to local stories and connect in a deep way with the place. Being there, as temporary residents, we also weaved some threads of our story into the stories of this landscape and the landscape weaved some threads of its stories into our story. It’s an interchange, one we should be conscious about when we participate in studies or projects on creative placemaking. We believe it is important to keep stories about landscapes alive, which implies to be open for constant new influxes of as many communities as possible, of the Native Hawaiians, the communities who feel connected to the past, newcomers and temporary visitors, in order to keep the stories calibrated in the ever-changing culture.

However, this creates challenges as different stories embody different values and priorities. For instance, a few centuries ago, only local materials were used for the construction of housing on the islands and the location of the building was determined by environmental conditions such as wind, sun and the topography (Chiciro and Farley,
During the fieldwork in 2017, one of the interviewees (born and raised on the island of O‘ahu) mentioned that on the island there is always a fresh and pleasant breeze coming from the windward side. In the past, houses were constructed without air conditioning and the windows were adjusted so that this trade wind could flow through the whole house. We could not find out if the developers in Kaka‘ako took this into account. As an example, Ward Village received a LEED platinum certificate for neighborhood development. However, they did not get the credit for “historic resource preservation and adaptive use” or “community outreach and involvement” (USGBC, 2009). This demonstrates potential losses where more sustainable development goals could be addressed in the same practice, but also windows of opportunities for a deep culture-led development.

Concluding remarks

This study did not intend to solve these conflicts between stakeholders, but rather to present data and policy implications to the community (leaders), policy-makers and other researchers in order to support them in understanding and managing the tensions between different goals in sustainability, and especially cultural heritage, justice and environmental footprints. In Kaka‘ako, everyone has his or her own idea of what this urban space should look like; currently, there is no shared vision. According to the master plan, in the future, the area will be pedestrian-friendly, include public spaces, and promote a mix of commercial and residential usage. However, the integration of industrial zones in the community will be complicated, and the composition of residents will change. It is certain that a higher number of wealthy people will live in the area than before. Theoretically, the neighborhood should consist of mixed-income groups. Nevertheless, it will not be easy to prevent gentrification, the rise of foreign investment, and displacement of current residents and erasure of cultural history. Based on the aforementioned findings and discussion and by engaging with and deepening the aloha‘aina vision for urban justice by Grandinetti (2019) for this neighborhood, our recommendations for policy-makers, developers and community leaders are the following.

First, a shared vision toward a sustainable neighborhood is essential for spatial justice. This implies a stronger cooperation between all the stakeholders and their investments of time. The status quo shows that stakeholders of Kaka‘ako are focusing on their own projects instead of viewing the big picture, because they have different political agendas. A next step is the establishment of a back casting or a similar method; where after the agreement upon a vision of Kaka‘ako in 2030, the steps can be identified from the current status to the future status. It is important that a
recognition of and sensitivity to cultural diversity should not be forgotten under any circumstances in the next formulation of this vision for 2030. For instance, providing more public space (e.g., buildings, streets, parks), and more free access, can accommodate the different intangible cultural practices and make the cultural diversity of this neighborhood more visible, in contrast to the clean-up or areas which favors only “marketable” cultural practices. Concerning buildings, it is important to find a balance between investing in new eco-friendly houses with local durable materials and certification that are adaptable to changing cultural and family norms and lifestyles and investing in maintenance and repair of cultural heritage buildings. Houses should represent different histories of the place, including the “dirty industrial past”. For instance, a reutilization of vacant buildings is an alternative way of decreasing the environmental footprint (Avrami, 2016; Wuyts, Sedlitzky, Morita et al., 2020), in contrast to building new construction which embeds marketable symbols of previous histories, but do not represent, and rather eradicate, the diversity of the past. Kamehameha Schools include buildings from the “dirty industrial past” but rebrand them in order to accumulate capital. Although their intervention might be interpreted as capitalist, there is not much evidence on Kaka’ako or other cases that these measures directly lead to land price increase (Avrami, 2016).

Another important note is to engage marginalized groups, including non-leading Native Hawaiians to the non-white immigrants in this transition process, not only as consumers, but also as cocreators (Kenis, Bono and Mathijs, 2016). This means to take care that the basic needs are met, in order for them to be able to participate with full mental capability, which implies access to affordable and healthy housing, food and other services. Marginalized people are not able to design a future for their neighborhood as long as their main concern is to survive on a day-to-day basis. However, buildings and spaces need to be protected against speculation and foreign investments in temporary housing which requires a stronger governmental regulation. Researchers could help by looking into the impacts of different policy scenarios. Two scenarios could be to examine the effects of the implementation of Vienna’s social housing model or the Thai model where land can only be bought by residents. However, in the case of Hawai’i, many temporary residents are national (US) citizens, which leads to the question of who can be considered to be a local and who has the right to Kaka’ako (Grandinetti, 2019). We cannot answer this, only conclude with an epilogue.
Epilogue

“While walking through the neighborhood of Howard Hughes, Ward Village, I could not resist daydreaming of my own future. I looked toward Anaha building and saw a person swimming in the infinity pool. ‘Can I afford this lifestyle in thirty years, too? Do I want to experience this way of life?’ I visited South Shore Market, a shopping center of Ward Village which takes care to promote local artists, crafts and fashion. I found a beautiful necklace I would like to call my own. I took a look at the price which I could afford but it would have blown a huge hole in my budget. Living in Honolulu isn’t cheap in general, so I weighed up more than usual whether I really wanted it. I decide not to buy it. The two landowners understand very well how to tell a story with their neighborhood projects. Everything is in its place, just as it was planned. And they warmly welcome residents and visitors to take part in their story. Some people fit into the storyline of how a princess fits into a fairy tale. Others will never have the chance to take part in the story and become just characters in other people’s fairy tales. A question which lingers in my head, even today, after having left Honolulu … how to make a place this way that everyone can be his/her own hero in his/her own tale?” (Astrid Holzinger, diary fragment of the fieldwork, Kaka’ako, 2017)

Acknowledgements

This research was supported by the MEXT scholarship of the Government of Japan; the KUWI scholarship of the University of Graz, Austria; and a scholarship from the Faculty of Environmental, Regional and Educational Sciences of the University of Graz, Austria. The authors like to thank the editor (Gerald Aiken), two anonymous reviewers and Raphael Sedlitzky for their comments and guidance on the earlier drafts.

To quote this article

References


Chirico Jennifer, Farley Gregory S., Thinking Like an Island: Navigating a Sustainable Future in Hawai‘i, Honolulu, University of Hawai‘i Press, 2015.


Hribar Mateja Šmid, David Bole, Primož Pipan, “Sustainable heritage management: social, economic and other potentials of culture in local development”, *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 188, 2015, p. 103-110.


Toelken Barre, Dynamics of folklore, Louisville, University Press of Colorado, 1996.


