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Abstract

There is a conflict between native Hawaiians and the local tourism industry where tourism is pointed out as the cause of deterioration of the traditional Hawaiian culture. This definition of the conflict fails to connect fragmentation in today's society with the well-documented signs of disintegration that started already before tourism arrived. The Hawaiian cultural identity suffered under the eras of the sugar, pineapple, and defense industries as well as under tourism. This indicates that the underlying cause of deterioration is not industrial activity \textit{per se} but should rather be seen as the consequence of the societal fragmentation that is economic, political, as well as social in its nature. Although Hawaiians differ in what ideology they embrace in response to fragmentation and tourism, namely sustainable tourism, isolationism, or disengagement in cultural issues, each distinctive ideology can be explained in the context of the western world system subjugating the Hawaiian regional system, but not from tourism acting as a force in itself.
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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

1.1. Problem statement
There is a conflict between native Hawaiians and the local tourism industry about the impact of tourism on Hawaiian culture. Both counterparts agree that tourism has caused fragmentation in the past, but tourism representatives claim that this is changing with the emerging paradigm of “sustainable tourism” that is intended to support local cultural groups. Native activists, on the other hand, argue that “sustainability” is the political word of the day. To them, “sustainable tourism” is nothing but a new way to market Hawai’i to tourists, unrelated to preserving the Hawaiian culture, and instead they argue for isolationism by limiting tourism. The research problem here is to find out how the different ideologies related to this ongoing conflict were formed.

1.2. Purpose
The purpose of this Master Thesis is to analyze the current situation in Hawai’i from an anthropological perspective. Studying the greater systems within which the culturally contingent ideologies of sustainable tourism and isolationism are formed is key to understanding the influence of macro-structures on micro-level cultural practices and, hence, the conflict at hand. This means the clash per se is of secondary importance to revealing the dynamic forces that form relationships within and among the stakeholders.

With the arrival of the British in the late 1700s, the outer influences started altering the relationships between the Hawaiian subject and her contexts, causing fragmentation to occur in the subject’s reality and the loss of control over her society. Nonetheless, many local residents, today, look only at recent history and falsely perceive the changes in society, such as traffic congestion similar to Los Angeles, city sprawl, and the lack of access to land, as effects of the visitor industry (Schaefers, May 14, 2006.) The author objects to this widespread belief according to which the overall deterioration of traditional Hawaiian culture is caused by the increase in tourism. The inverse correlation of that idea is illustrated in model 1, where changes in the curve are based on historical descriptions, such as [1] by the 1970s, many regarded the Hawaiian identity more or less dissolved (Ekholm Friedman, 1998: 11) but [2] in 1975-1980 there was a “renaissance” where the natives started to identify themselves as a group again (Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism, DBEDT, 2005: A-6) and, [3] in the 1990s the paradigm of “sustainable tourism” emerged, raising awareness for cultural issues (Sharpley: 2000, 1.) The graph demonstrates the conflict as directly
related to tourist numbers and culture. (N.B. As culture cannot be assigned numerical values the graph cannot be treated as interpretation of raw data.) The flaw is that tourism is treated as if not acting in relation with other influences within a system (Sharpley, 2000; 1; Hunter, 2002.)

Although tourism adds to the various impacts of globalization, arguing that the industry is the sole source of problems for the Hawaiian people is to ignore the actual forces at play. The hypothesis is that the conflict is rooted in the collision between the western world system and the Hawaiian microcosmic system that took place as a result of the expansion of the West. Model 2 illustrates this hypothesis as an inverse correlation between the influence of globalization and relative culture. This relationship is similar to that of tourism and culture in model 1; the differences are, [1] that globalization is a larger system that contains tourism, and [2] that its influence on Hawaiians precedes tourism. This graph is based on the same historical records as model 1, but encompasses earlier historical documentation of non-tourism related developments, such as how, “from the late 1700s, Hawaiian society began to change rapidly as it responded to the growing world system of capital whose trade routes and markets crisscrossed the islands” (Vinton Kirch, & Sahlins, 1992).

The inverse relationship shows that the more globalization is emerged in the Hawaiian society through in-migration, tourism, and commercialism, the more fragmented the local culture becomes.
As far as the outline of the paper, part I defines the problems and parameters of the study. Part II establishes which the threats are to Hawaiian culture by studying the history of tourism on the islands and impacts of mass-tourism. Thereafter, part III analyzes the formation of ideologies among tourism and culture stakeholders.

1.3. Historical background of globalization in Hawai‘i
The West was introduced to the islands after Captain Cook anchored there for the first time in 1778. A few decades later, in 1810, the islands were united under one ruler, King Kamehameha I, Hawai‘i’s first monarch (1810-1819) (John M. Knox & Associates, Inc. (JMK), 2004: A-2.) The height of the Hawaiian civilization can be somewhat arbitrarily set at this time, as it is perhaps the most important milestone for Hawaiians ever since, and because the Hawaiian system started to decline immediately thereafter due Kamehameha’s openness to western manipulations (Kuykendall & Grove Day, 1961.) For example, missionaries were accepted in 1820 and influenced the islanders to cover their bodies (JMK, 2004: A-3.) Even today, the norm is for native women to bathe dressed.

King Kamehameha was also accepting of American businessmen investing in the land, which led to the establishment of the sugar industry in the 1830s; notably, in line with colonizing methods, the American influence dictated the development of an agricultural economy built to serve the American market, not to benefit the Hawaiians (Beechert, 1985: ix.) Linked to this, in 1848, the Law of Adverse Possession took advantage of native ignorance and provided forfeiture of communal land ownership by natives and title transfer to westerners (ibid.) This “transition from a society based on communal use to one based upon commodity exchange meant that the Hawaiian commoner now retained many of the obligations of the former relationship but few of its benefits” (ibid.: 17.) The heavy investment in the sugar industry intensified the drive among American investors for annexation because of the need for ties to international commerce through the USA (JMK, 2004: A-4.) Consequently, in January 1893, the sovereign monarchy was overthrown by a coup of plantation owners assisted by U.S. marines (Martin, 1993). This illegal act was protested by thousands of Hawaiians, but in vain, as in 1900 Hawai‘i was turned into a U.S. territory (ibid.) In 1922, the U.S. military emerged as a major industry, which also had a profound effect on land because of the occupation of large tracts of territory for the establishment of bases and control over all major inland waterways most notably Pearl Harbor (JMK, 2004: A-5.) Hawai‘i obtained statehood in 1959. Acknowledgment of the illegal annexation and occupation did not come until then-President Clinton signed an official apology into law in 1993 (State of Hawai‘i Senate, July 22, 1999.)
Summarizing these economic, political, and social changes, the state admits that the rapid rise in population caused by immigration and economic policies that favor growth have led to profound changes in the physical environment of the islands as well as in the economy, social structure, and lifestyle (JMK, 2004: A-4f.) More explicitly, it was globalization that turned Hawai‘i into a point of migration and an international market for investment. Hence, when trying to make sense of problems like homelessness, the failing education system, and the crystal-methamphetamine epidemic, the history of globalization cannot be ignored. Tourism alone cannot explain these phenomena; rather, they must be placed in the context of the Hawaiian cultural structure crumbling.

**Terminology**

Having elaborated on the historical background, it is necessary to clarify some of the terminology. The wide usage of the term “culture” has lead to different definitions between scientists and laymen. Commoners often loosely describe culture as traditions and art. However, this is to commodify and reduce culture to static objects. As Clifford said, “cultures do not stand still while being portrayed” (1986: 11.) In anthropology, the definition of culture is, a “common set of meanings of a group of people, and as such it can neither be preserved, nor lost” (Christer Lindberg, personal communication, Sep 6, 2000.) Culture is the social framework, or eye-glasses, shared by a number of people, through which they observe the world and regenerate that understanding of the world. This means people are both the medium and product of their culture, resulting in regeneration and development of culture taking place sui generis (ibid.) In this sense, the Hawaiians are by no means losing their culture, however, they are taking on more western traits by each day, which is perceived as negative by many. Hence the verbatim in the government to want to “lure culture back;” in the tourism industry, the intention to “stimulate culture;” and among native Hawaiians, the talk of their culture as “gone” as if they were now culture-less.

Multiple uses also exist for the term “Hawaiian.” For simplicity, the term will be used in accordance with the definition of the U.S. Congress, about people of at least partial native Hawaiian descent (JMK, 2004: B-39.) Residents of Hawai‘i of unspecified ethnicity will be referred to as “locals” as is common practice in the islands.

**Methodology**

To limit the scope in time, the study focuses on the period following the shift in paradigm to “sustainable tourism,” in the 1990s (Sharpley: 2000, 1.) In terms of space, the study is limited to
Hawai’i, although informants are mainly residents of Oahu. The nature of the topic, conflict-generating macro-level structures, made it suitable to use a study approach based on review of literature and statistical reports, along with experience from the field. Collecting raw material directly from informants would have been unpractical and misleading, since the main focus is not on micro-level practices but the formation of ideologies. Informants are, however, used for comparison with statistics to map trends in economic, political, and social spheres.

The interaction with informants was carried out on Oahu, January 2003 through February 2007, and via email correspondence and phone conversations up until May 2007. Factual data comes from studies of literature and reports. Informants include natives from Waianae, activists from Waimanalo, politicians, environmentalists in Makaha and Hanauma Bay, tourism industry representatives in Honolulu and Kapolei, small-scale tourism entrepreneurs in Waikiki, first-generation international immigrants in Honolulu, and military staff in Mililani and Ewa Beach. (See appendix A: Map of the island of Oahu.)

As far as the people studied, the main interacting forces in the conflict between tourism and culture have been divided into three categories: [1] the government, [2] the tourism industry, and [3] native Hawaiians. Due to varying interests within the category of natives, the group is further divided into “elite Hawaiians,” “entrepreneurs,” whom have influence over tourism, “tourism workers,” whom work in hospitality but lack influence over it, and “tourism opponents,” such as activists.
1.4 Writer’s role

The Hawaiian state government currently encourages studies of sustainable tourism and research is conducted at all the major universities. The author’s experience with the subject comes from bachelor degrees in anthropology as well as in hospitality management, and from working with tourism and cultural heritage management in Hawai‘i. All of this provided valuable insight for a scientific analysis of the structures that formed the ideologies in tourism and native culture.

After being introduced to Hawaiian culture by Kajsa Ekholm Friedman at Lund University, I moved to Hawai‘i to learn more of it while studying travel industry management at Hawai‘i Pacific University. During these years, January 2003-February 2007, I lived in various social settings, varying from neighborhoods with drugs and violence in Kaneohe, tourist-traps in Waikiki, cosmopolitan city-life in Honolulu, military neighborhoods in Kunia, to western-integrated communities in Kapolei and Ewa Beach (see appendix A.). During the years 2003-2005, I volunteered and interned with the non-profit education program at the Hanauma Bay nature reserve, a threatened coral reef. There I was educated on the topic of sustainability and natural and cultural heritage management and spoke on the subject to over 16,000 visitors. I also learned more of the local socio-economic conditions when working with native Hawaiians there. Later, in January-June 2005, I worked with high-end tourists when interning with Dolphin Quest, a small company that provides dolphin and sea turtle encounter programs. Situated on the grounds of the luxurious Mandarin Oriental, with famous guests like U2 and Tiger Woods, my work setting allowed for observations of the hospitality industry and its effects on the local society, and how tourism companies differ in balancing profit-making with responsibility for the local culture. Through Hawai‘i Pacific University I got to visit natives in their taro patches and meet with kupuna (elders.) After graduation in January 2006, I was employed by Marriott’s Ko Olina Beach Club, April 2006-February 2007, as assistant manager for the activities department. Here, I got in closer contact with native Hawaiian workers, especially from the segregated Waianae, and learned how models of sustainable tourism can be implemented.

My most sincere gratitude to Professor Kajsa Ekholm Friedman at Lund University, Doctor Jerome Agrusa at Hawai‘i Pacific University, Jennifer Barrett at Hanauma Bay, Leah Carsrud at Dolphin Quest, and Nanilei del Prado at the Ko Olina Beach Club.
CHAPTER II: STUDY OF THE PROBLEM

2:1. Changes in the systemic macro-structure

How Hawai‘i could change from a society of indigenous people to the fragmented civilization it is today can be explained by the step-by-step integration of the western system. As demonstrated in Ekholm Friedman’s study of empires (2005,) globalization is processes of economical, political and social exchange.

In its widest geographical extension the global system ... [holds] together by mechanisms of international trade... [There are] three types of integration; social, political, and economic … (model 4), corresponding to society, empire, and trade (2005: 52.)

As a form of globalization, tourism is based on these three dimensions - it offers money in return for experiences that influence the social context of the host and political life of their society. Global travel is a communicator of globalization, often connected with commercialism as the initial reason for travel has often been trade (Ekholm Friedman, 2005.)

Tourism, as the combined form of these, is the “number one industry in many countries and the fastest-growing economic sector in terms of foreign exchange earnings and job creation” (UNWTO, n.d.) Especially in Hawai‘i the growth of the visitor industry has been remarkably strong.

In the collision between the two different macro-structures the West proved dominant over the Hawaiian micro-cosmic system, resulting in complete subjugation of the latter (see model 5.) Although undeniably significant, tourism is just one of the several factors in this globalization process against which Hawai‘i was not prepared to defend itself. All major changes that have arisen in the Hawaiian society since it was incorporated into the expanding world system of the British Empire, logically, must be analyzed as contextually linked to globalization as the influences that cause change now occur within a network that is global and not just local.
Model 5: Expansion of the western world system

Stage 1: West expanding toward smaller peripheral systems
Stage 2: Smaller systems are subjugated by the Western system

2.2. Fragmentation due to in-migration and tourism

Another feature in the collision of cultures is the crumbling effect within the subjugated system, as it is homogenized with the dominant system. In this case, the expansion of the West brought economic disintegration through commercialism, and political fragmentation as a result of the shift in power from the Hawaiian nobility to American businessmen; the latter were the ones that started the sugar industry and linked Hawai‘i to mainland USA through trade. Social division took place because of the in-migration of plantation workers for the sugar industry, whom came from America, China, Portugal, Japan, Korea, the Philippines, Samoa and more, many of which made Hawai‘i their permanent home (Kuykendall et al., 1961; Hawai‘i Tourism Authority, 2004: 3.) Between 1852 and 1946, approximately 400,000 people were brought to Hawai‘i for this purpose (HTA, 2004.: 3.) This constituted a significant increase in population considering that, in 1900, the Hawaiian islands only had 154,000 residents (DBEDT, 2005,) and had a fragmenting effect as the local people became a minority. Native Hawaiians are, today, outnumbered by other ethnicities. In 1990, there were ca 200,000 self-identified Kanaka Maoli (natives); 96% were of mixed ancestry, leaving only ca 8,000 full-blooded Hawaiians (Nov 16, 1997.) Their choices are to be integrated and homogenized in the American community or to protest but be dominated by the stronger system.

In the period 1922-1959, the “Aloha spirit” became reputable as Hawaiians got accustomed to welcoming strangers, both plantation workers and tourists (JMK, 2004: A-5.) Beginning in the late 1800s, up until World War II, tourism was limited to the white American upper-class, whom visited for a month on average, to rest after “hunting in Africa” or other fancy escapades, and bringing everything to satisfy their needs of leisure including their luxury cars and servants (Didion, 1979/84:...
Although relatively stable before the war, with an annual average of 20,000 tourists in 1925-1940, the number of visitors was still significant compared to the local population of approximately 350,000 Hawaiian and immigrant residents (DBEDT, 2006a; U.S. Census Bureau, Dec 28, 2000). It was after the introduction of commercial jets in 1959, combined with statehood that same year, that Hawai‘i became an affordable and convenient destination for the masses (Seiden, 2001: 38.) As a result, in 1959, tourism replaced the plantation business as the number one industry (see model 6) (HTA, 2004: 3.)

In the period 1950-1970, the population grew significantly from 500,000 to 770,000 (U.S. Census Bureau, Dec 28, 2000: 1.) The number of tourists increased yet more drastically, from 47,000 to 1,700,000 in the same twenty-year-period (DBEDT, 2006a.) From 1970 to 1990, tourism increased by approximately a million every five years, reaching 6,700,000 in 1990 and having remained around 7,000,000 thereafter due to saturation of the market (ibid.) Not surprisingly, the local culture suffered from the massive growth and by the late 1970s the Hawaiian identity seemed to be destroyed (Ekholm Friedman, 1998: 11). In spite of the renaissance of Hawaiian culture and widespread activism in the late 1970s to early 1980s, the native protests against cultural domination had no impact on tourism growth rate as can be seen in the curve.

2.3 Fragmentation due to commodification

The demand for Hawai‘i tourism derived from the reputation as “paradise,” which reached the U.S. mainlander via the European-derived cultural imagery of Polynesia. What is wrong with this imagery is that it is not a Hawaiian self-representation but what outsiders determined should stand for the Hawaiian, an image that was then reproduced and spread to the West. The usage of the barefooted, sensual hula girl as the primary symbol for Hawai‘i reaches back two hundred years to the first
encounters of European voyagers. The many (mis-)representations of the culture came in the form of explorers’ reports and sailors’ sketches, statements by missionaries and anthropologists (Desmond, 1999: 11.) In each of them, the “European and Euro-American discourses of primitivism … respond to the sociopolitical needs of the societies that produce them, not to those they purport to describe” (ibid). Today, these discourses are manifested in wallpaper pictures, Aloha shirts, and music, like Blue Hawaii by Elvis, or mass media, such as the film Here to Eternity and more recently Pearl Harbor, the television shows Magnum and Hawai’i Five-0, many of which have been internationally broadcast and reached millions. All those non-Hawaiian representations assist in keeping the false imagery alive.

In its marketing campaigns, the visitor industry builds upon the broader web of associations with these tropical islands. From 1972-1992, the Hawaiian Visitors Bureau’s advertising campaigns summarizes the Hawaiian attributes as: “paradise, marginality, … femininity, and aloha. … The figure of the barefooted, grass-skirted hula dancer encapsulates all of these qualities and ties them to cultural distinctiveness” (ibid.: 12) Because of the worldwide familiarity with this image, it is extensively used in aggressive marketing campaigns that, in order to promote tourism, highlight the attributes of the hula girl, creating the impression that this is what Hawai’i supplies. For example, the 1993 brochure from the HVB tells how, “[t]he image that is most associated with Hawai’i is of a beautiful woman clad in a hula skirt. She offers a lei, plays the ukulele or dances hula” (ibid.: 10.) This is an incorrect depiction that forces the Hawaiian host to portray a static relationship to rituals that is not authentic culture. Since tourists expect hula it is provided as entertainment but is rarely a genuine cultural experience – the young woman that is dancing before me at breakfast, at Aston Waikiki Beach Hotel, is obviously forcing a smile when she dances, as the smile comes off immediately in every pause. This is how she makes a living, by supplying the demand, which has little to do with culture as framework for understanding the world.

This standardization of the cultural asset into cultural tourism makes abstract experiences concrete and possible for the tourist to consume. This process of commodification has been identified as one of the great threats to cultural facilities (McKercher & du Cros, 2002: 115.) Per definition, commodification changes culture for the purpose of consumption and generating money – the opposite of respecting the local host. Cultural theme parks, for example, are based on extensive commodification. According to McKercher et al. this type of business represents a:
practical and often desirable means of introducing visitors to local cultures, maximizing the economic returns of tourism, and also minimizing the socio-cultural impacts. Tourists know they are entering a tourist space. Performers know that they are providing a show for the visitor... (ibid.: 121.)

This statement would be false for most Hawaiian cultural theme parks as these lack authenticity. At the Polynesian Cultural Center, the demonstrations in how to climb a coconut tree to collect coconuts and open these with rocks is a way to reproduce the Euro-American imagery that is expected by visitors, where the scarcely clad Hawaiian (although the performer may not be Hawaiian) is portrayed as monkey - closer to nature, which is romanticized - but further from civilization. This imagery, reproduced through such performances, is based on the western racist model of linear evolution, where the West holds the top position. Still, McKercher et al. argue that

Far from denigrating places, the standardization, modification, and commodification of cultural assets plays a vital role in facilitating tourism consumption... In doing so, it adds value to the tourism industry, enabling products to be sold. Developing the asset around the tourists’ needs enables the asset managers to control the experience and to better impart the desired message. (My emphasis) (ibid.: 134.)

Whose desired message? Although commodification may be an essential and beneficial aspect of the tourism process as McKercher et al. argue, it is not necessarily as positive for the local host. Rather, this is the process of “reconstructed ethnicity” that is the maintenance of “ethnic forms for the persuasion or entertainment not of specific others … but of a ‘generalised other’ within a white cultural frame” (Desmond, 1999: 15.) More than anything, the production of misleading experiences, offered in order to supply the demand, highlight that the Hawaiian system is dependent upon western commercialism. Through the unequal exchange, in which the Hawaiians must give up cultural authenticity for economic benefits, the western world system can uphold its dominance over the local system.

As a result of mass-tourism, commodification and fragmentation accelerated. To extract more money from each customer the tourism market now offers travel packages that include flight, lodging, and rental car at a more affordable price than each service separately. Similarly, for the convenience of the visitor, although not necessarily affordable, hotels and resorts have increased their offerings of leisure activities, such as spa services, private luaus (dinner feasts), or even dolphin encounters at Hilton Waikaloa or the Kahala Resort – all to retain tourists on the site for as long as possible to maximize revenue-generating potential (McKercher et al., 2002: 116.) Hilton Village in Waikiki is a perfect example as it has all the features of mass-tourism and commodification; as Ekholm Friedman explains, the very name suggests that you can live your entire tourist life within its
boundaries (1998: 25f.) In the “Village” visitors have all they need; between the Hilton towers there are restaurants, spas, a miniature Chinatown, flamingos and penguins, jewelry boutiques, convenience stores, fitness centers, a man-made lagoon, beach services, and submarine tours... the list is endless. The missing feature is the genuine Hawaiian culture that has been completely removed by mass-tourism.

As for the burdens on the community, the local people were quicker to discover these than the industry was to admit them. Today, 58% of residents consider preservation of culture to be a problem in their community, and 32% of residents (40% of Hawaiians) feel tourism worsens the situation (Market Trends Pacific Inc. et al., Nov 2006). The industry, however, first acknowledged the problem when the cash cow, the visitor, threatened to stop delivering cash and argued that the same experience could be obtained elsewhere because of the Hawaiian culture having “disappeared.” Waikiki may have a charm of its own but it has no life and was created for the tourist, as a money-making machine, no different from other mass-tourist landscapes.

As explained by Rex Johnson, executive director of the Hawaii Tourism Authority, the change toward sustainable tourism was the result of the traveler base becoming increasingly sophisticated combined with the strains on the natural, physical, cultural assets and the people. The new demands are for “intimate and authentic experiences that allow visitors to see, feel, touch, taste and smell the uniqueness of these islands” (Arakawa, April 24, 2006; Schaefers, 2006: D4.) The tourist is striving for the feeling that comes with staying as a guest in a Hawaiian house or going fishing with Hawaiians when the latter are in their own element and not putting on a show. Consequently, the industry has understood that to save itself it must change its policies and practices. Meanwhile, some native Hawaiians find that this paradigm can be used to correct misinterpretations of their culture, strengthen micro-practices and thereby their macro-system. In Hawai‘i, “preserving” culture through sustainable tourism has become a project of high priority, and it is a key task for the government to develop a plan that suits the various stakeholders involved in the conflict.
CHAPTER III. REVIEW OF STAKEHOLDER PERSPECTIVES

3.1. Stakeholders in the conflict between culture and tourism

The choice of stakeholders studied, as generally defined groups, are linked to the different dimensions of globalization presented earlier. The tourism industry represents the economic integration of the western system; the government represents the political integration, and native Hawaiians the social. These three groups have different interests at stake and hence varying views on the usage of culture. For the hospitality industry, Hawaiian culture is the selling point used to compete with other sun-sand-surf destinations like Florida. For the Hawaiians, on the other hand, the culture is the framework for their existence; lastly, the government balances the interests of the two, responsible for the residents’ need for both income and culture.

Only broadly comparative analysis of systemic features is possible as there is no means of fairly measuring resident views on the topic, especially since individuals often overlap in different stakeholder categories. The Venn diagram in model 7 shows what standpoints the groups generally have taken in regards to tourism, with the government and native elite embracing sustainable tourism and native activists adhering to isolationism. As shown, natives overlap the most of the stakeholder groups in terms of what ideology they follow: sustainable tourism, no involvement, or isolationism.

Alternatively, modeling the spectrum of beliefs as a basic bell curve gives an idea of the relative proportions of the various stakeholder groups (see model 8.) One side is held by companies that make money off of culture. Net profit is primary but the trend is to have an agenda considerate of
the native culture. The ideal for the government, native elite, and pro-active hospitality companies is to stimulate sustainability in society, whereby, in the long-run, all industries will exist in symbiosis with culture. The government’s position in this is to lead and ensure fair coordination with native Hawaiian groups while simultaneously stimulating growth of gross state product (GSP.) The sustainable tourism model has intrinsic weaknesses, however. Sharpley (2000) warns that any long-term success is to be doubted because of the contradiction between preservation and development; a necessary feature in sustainability is isolation and limitation in scope, which is impossible in tourism and travel.

The middle of the bell curve consists of people that are not engaged in Hawaiian cultural issues. The natives in this category of residents are those that Ekholm Friedman refers to as integrated in the western system and that have lost their social world in the subjugation of their macro-structure (1998: 214.) Among these are native entrepreneurs and hospitality workers that are uninvolved in sustaining culture and reinforce Anglo-American cultural imagery, and whom thereby cause fragmentation of their own macro-system. Either they lack awareness of the result when objectifying culture, or they have no wish to prevent it.

On the other end, as activist Dennis Kanahele, 11th generation descendant of King Kamehameha, explains to me, there are isolationist Hawaiians that have taken a strong stance against westernization (Kanahele, personal communication, April 13, 2007.) Kanahele’s own response to the 1983 overthrow and “theft” of the land was to simply steal some land back. In 1987, with the help of 50 other activists, he took over a former coast guard station and the surrounding land, resulting in a physical confrontation with the police for which Kanahele was charged with felony. Later, the governor made the deal that if the group peacefully left the beach they would be granted land in the hills – which they accepted (Tizon, July 21, 2005.) In spite of his ambiguity, Kanahele’s efforts in carving out a Hawaiian enclave resulted in the governor hailing him “a leader in the Hawaiian community,” in 2002 (ibid.) Indeed, Kanahele emphasizes that his aim, to fend off westernization enough to maintain the Hawaiian lifestyle, is not a blow against tourism as much as it is a stipulation
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for it to adopt Hawaiian values. This is different from the radical activists that want to completely ban tourism and other western influences, such as the U.S. military, and in-migration.

3.2.1. Effects of the travel industry on culture

Survey results and informant perspectives presented in the remaining chapters will be analyzed to see how the conflict between the ideologies of isolationism, sustainable tourism, and disengagement are linked to globalization of the local macro-system.

First of all, what makes tourism indispensable to today’s community is the opportunity to earn an income in the otherwise isolated island economy. The industry is the chief generator of employment, providing one in every five jobs in the state through direct and indirect employment, and is also the primary source of revenue for the community through visitor expenditures and tourism-related capital investment (HTA, 2004: 4.) Simultaneously, the portion of residents feeling that, “tourism has been mostly good for themselves and their families,” is down from 60% in 1988, to 44% in 2006 (Market Trends Pacific Inc. et al., Nov, 2006.) In addition to this drop in positive inclination, the majority believes that tourism has negative impact on crime (58%) and cost of housing (54%) (ibid.) Because of the negative trends the last decades, the HTA warns the industry to address its threats, namely, “insufficient visitor-resident interaction … lack of stakeholder consensus … visitor expectations and misperceptions … anti-tourism sentiment, crime and drug use … [and] loss of identity differentiation…” (HTA, 2004: 5). It should be noted, however, that tourism having destructive features is not limited to today’s Hawai‘i; the negative effects of tourism on culture is a worldwide problem according to the UN World Tourism Organization (UNWTO, n.d.) Nor is there anything unique about Hawai‘i adopting sustainable tourism to stop the fragmentation. Successful township models have been implemented in, for example, Florence in Italy and in the Republic of Palau, and the Hawaiian government and tourism industry hope for similar success (JMK, 2004: 1-2.)

Nevertheless, even though many Hawaiian businesses are looking into becoming more culturally friendly, the western yearning for net profit constitutes a dilemma. Ramsey Taum at the University of Hawai‘i, School of Travel Industry Management, states that: “ultimately that’s going to be a deciding factor: whether they can make money on it” (Arakawa, Aug 7, 2005.) The attitude that all else can be sacrificed for money reveals that the underlying ideology is commercialism (Sunderland, 2003: 34.) It is commonly accepted that the imbalance between feel-good and profit is the result of the industry following the western business principle, “the customer is always right,” which values
the visitor more than the host and place. The HTA has defined that the three most critical cultural issues for tourism, which are a result of this business principle, are that a:

…[1] disconnect exists in the relationship between the visitor industry and Native Hawaiian community … [2] the Hawaiian culture is often inaccurately portrayed… [3] the Hawaiian culture needs to be respected and perpetuated (2004: 26.)

Because of the western model, the two elements “place” and “host,” which are highly valued by the Kanaka Maoli, are forced to continually change to accommodate the visitor. This is what creates homogenization within globalized tourism and disconnects the different parts involved (ibid.: 25.) Ironically, it was the homogenization that made tourists lose interest in Hawai‘i, and ultimately made the industry care for the native perspective - out of self-preservation - not philanthropy.

My only criticism of the analysis of the western business model is that is assumed to be practised mostly in hospitality. It would be more logical to associate the model with commercialism in general as the western business principles came as part of the package with the expansion of the system. Therefore, I go further than arguing the model practised in tourism is the cause of the cultural fragmentation – rather, the decline in importance of the host in relation to economic profit is the result of the introduction of the western value-system. This means it was the western cultural structure that brought the Hawaiian society out of balance, not just the travel business but other economic, political, and social forces as well.

3.2.2. The sustainable tourism model

Requested by the state government, a plan on how to carry out sustainable tourism, “Hawai‘i Tourism Strategic Plan: 2005-2015,” was composed with the help of the Native Hawaiian Hospitality Association (NaHAA,) Hawaiian leader, politician and former activist, Peter Apo, and previously mentioned Kanahele, and approved by the state government. The model is adjusted to the local culture and context and based on the Hawaiian value of ho‘okipa (greeting and welcoming strangers,) which honors the place, dignifies the host and eventually satisfies the needs of the visitor. The idea is that the celebration of the culture will preserve the goodwill of the host, and thereby uphold the market value of the destination by maintaining its cultural uniqueness (ibid.) The contradiction in adopting a plan that derives from a globalized paradigm lies in that the western system, in doing so, exerts external influence to stimulate Hawaiianess, as opposed to change being generated from within. In Hawaiian sustainable tourism, the situation between the industry and the local culture is not necessarily one of symbiosis but of the western-style companies to some degree exploiting
natives for egoistic goals, and the only difference from before is that now the Hawaiians can reap some of the benefits. Admittedly, sustainable tourism may be the best option available for Hawaiians like Kanahele, who believes the strategic plan will bring about a win-win situation for both the industry and the culture (Kanahele, personal communication, April 13, 2007.) Yet, it cannot be completely concealed that the ideology ruling current development is western and not Hawaiian.

The vision statement of the strategic plan has five goals, that by 2015, tourism will: honor Hawai‘i’s people and heritage; value and perpetuate Hawai‘i's natural and cultural resources; engender mutual respect among all stakeholders; support a vital and sustainable economy; and provide a unique, memorable and enriching visitor experience (HTA, 2004: 6.) Certainly, the promotion of the ho‘okipa model along with the increase in demand for more intimate cultural experiences marks a shift away from reproduction of mass-tourism’s artificial cultural imagery, and has resulted in an increase in supply of tourist activities at most resorts. Examples are classes in hula, orchid lei making, poi making, coral conservation, Hawaiian language, lauhala mat weaving, ukulele playing, botanical walks, Hawaiian story telling, private luau, tide-pool walks, and much more. In the eyes of tourism industry representatives, this promotion of culture allows native Hawaiians to proudly share their traditions and also makes it possible for more artisans, dancers, musicians and others to make a living off their talents and so keep more cultural micro-practices alive. It can certainly be argued that the celebration of the local, such as exhibits of brown rays and small white tip reef sharks at the Marriott International Ihilani, as opposed to the imported penguins and flamingoes at Hilton Hawaiian Village, is a way to uphold the Hawaiian structure and fend off the western system. Yet, tourists cannot share the deeper meanings connected to the Hawaiian activities when these are demonstrated by facilitators that lack insight into the culture (JMK, 2004, II-6.) This is why the ho’okipa plan emphasizes the importance to use the native host as source of experiences for the message to be authentic.

Some major corporations and organizations that have turned to Hawaiians when planning and implementation the ho’okipa program at corporate and operational level are: Marriott's Ko Olina Beach Club, Ritz Carlton Kapalua hotel, the Hawai‘i Convention Center, and Ka‘anapali Beach Hotel (Ruel, Sep 26, 2003.) Their strategic plans include educating employees in concepts like “ohana,” to treat others as family - associates and guests alike. For example, at Marriott's Ko Olina Beach Club the ho’okipa standards are discussed, rehearsed, and practiced from operational to executive level on a daily basis. When conducting training, manager Nanilei del Prado points out to
associates that if they fulfill these standards they have learned all there is to know and, hence, incorporating those behaviors is what they should focus on (Nanilei del Prado, personal communication, Aug 23, 2006.) Interestingly, the Marriott International concern belongs to the 100 most popular of companies to work for among large publicly traded companies in the U.S. and this is linked to employees feeling well taken-care-of (CNNMoney, 2007.) However, it is not a coincidence that in the concern of over 2,000 properties, Ko Olina stands out as one of the stars. According to industry indexes it was one of the friendliest resorts in the U.S. in 2005 and 2006, which the company itself explains as the result of adopting the ho’okipa standards (Chris Fry, Marriott’s Vacation Club International, April 16, 2006.)

In regards to sustainable tourism, possible outcomes are that it will: [1] strengthen the Hawaiian macro-system by stimulating micro-practices; or [2] fail to strengthen the Hawaiian system; or [3] strengthen the western system more than the Hawaiian system. In case number 2 and 3 the Hawaiian structure will be weakened by the new business model. Indeed, Peter Apo explains that, “[t]here is a segment of the industry that is just not interested, and they tend to continue to perpetuate what I call the colonizing model” (my cursive; Arakawa, Aug 7, 2005.) Evaluations of this kind indicate that outcome number 1 is infeasible. Besides, in the light of inconsistency in implementation, it may be difficult for micro-practices to get sufficiently rooted in the society to strengthen the macro-system. Further, the fact that interest in sustaining culture appeared first when needed by the visitor industry shows that the western system is the primary actor in the emergence of the new business model. Therefore, it is a logical assumption that the western system has the most to gain from tourism developing in this direction and, thus, will stay dominant.

3.3. The government’s perception of culture

From the government’s perspective, sustainable tourism is the most logical option at the current time to deal with fragmentation. The economy depends on tourism - for example, for 2007, DBEDT estimates that the industry will account for $13 billion in spending, which will generate directly and indirectly, 22% of total jobs in the state. In addition, it is estimated that tourism will produce 17% of the GSP and 26% of total tax revenues (HTA, 2004: 4). The back side is that a great majority of residents (78%) feel that the economy is too reliant on tourism (Market Trends Pacific, Nov 2006.)

As illustrated in the pie chart in model 9, no other industry is nearly as significant as tourism, which a reason for the widespread belief that the culture is currently deteriorating solely because of tourism.
This is to ignore that the industries of sugar, pineapple, and defense are or have been essential to the economy even before tourism was developed in the islands. The West has upheld its dominance in the economic domain through different industries that have replaced each other over time. The sugar and pineapple industries dominated before 1959. After that, the military and visitor industries have been the most significant ones with the defense generating 10% and hospitality 22% of GSP in 2004 (DBEDT, 2006b: 13.01, 13.03.) Cultural fragmentation has taken place under each of the different industrial phases, which shows that type of economic activity is not the deciding factor in cultural deterioration.

As with tourism, the defense industry was handed down on the Hawaiians in a controversial manner and not started as a native initiative. Evidently, in the early 1900s, the newly established American state government welcomed the military but the natives did not. The time 1920-1950 marked resentment between natives and troops, expressed in racist crimes. For example, in 1931, the wife of a navy officer, Thalia Massie, was raped by “some locals.” All the defendants were freed in court, whereby Massie’s mother, husband, and two others murdered a Hawaiian defendant. The remarkable part is that although the members of the avenging group were proven guilty and sentenced to ten years in prison, they ended up serving only one hour of it - having cocktails with the governor at the Iolani Palace (Wright, 1966/1990: 271, in Ekholm Friedman, 1998: 47.) The discrimination by the western political regime bred disillusionment and bitterness in Hawaiians. Further, there have been numerous protests about the military occupying Hawaiian land, although to no effect as it still holds 30% of it (Martin, 1993.) Still today, the relationship between troops and Hawaiians can be quite uneasy and the two groups generally stay segregated.

A comparison of tourism with the military and plantation industries shows that it is not the visitor industry alone that causes fragmentation in the Hawaiian macro-system but the western value system, imposed from outside via the seven million tourists per year, military occupation of the land, and in-migration, among other things. When it comes to the major, society-wide problems in the
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state, such as increases in cost of living, poverty and homelessness, crime, failure in the education system and spread of methamphetamine epidemic, there is no direct link to tourism. The majority, 62%, feels that the state is run for tourists and not for the local people (Market Trends Pacific Inc. et al., Nov, 2006.) However, the question is misleading as it does not put tourism in the right context. A more correct depiction of the circumstances would have involved globalization, for example phrasing the question as to what degree residents agree that Hawai‘i is westernized at the expense of native interests. Holding a particular industry responsible for societal problems is to not look at the situation in its entirety. In fact, these phenomena appeared as the Hawaiian society started to crumble and are hence linked to identity loss rather than the effects of any particular industry.

Senate President Colleen Hanabusa, who is forth generation from the poverty-stricken Waianae, has argued for holistic sustainability efforts in the community that are not limited to any particular industry. The indication that sustainable tourism is only part of the solution is a reminder that tourism alone is not the cause of the problem. Hanabusa’s major goal in the government is to address those needs that exist in all ethnic groups but are alarming in areas where Hawaiians are in majority, such as Waianae and Waimanalo (Honolulu Advertiser, Jan 17, 2007.) For example, she explains that although the state has the lowest unemployment rate in the nation, at 2%, one in ten holds multiple jobs. This is something I have observed among friends and colleagues, many of which work seven days a week or have two full-time jobs! Even so, many Hawaiians do not make enough to support their families – 50% have incomes below 30% of the family median income and 49% have housing problems (Ingham, Sep 14, 2005.) Further, homelessness has doubled since 1999 and the Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA) estimates that 60-70% of the homeless people are native Hawaiians (Honolulu Advertiser staff, Jan 17, 2007; OHA, Aug 8, 2006.) (See appendix A.) When it comes to crime, although “Hawaiians and other Pacific Islanders” make up merely 9% of the state population, they constituted 40% of the sentenced felon population in 2002, with 2,300 Hawaiians (U.S. Census Bureau, n.d.; OHA, Aug 8, 2006.) According to the State Department for Public Safety, in 2000, 44% of all incarcerated women were Hawaiian (Omandam, June 28, 2002.)

Moreover, Kekuni Blaisdell, professor of medicine at University of Hawai‘i, points to surveys proving that the health plight of the Kanaka Maoli is the worst of all ethnic groups in Hawai‘i, and argues that this is essentially the result of the subjugation of the culture. Hawaiians have a 5-10-year shorter life expectancy than the state average (74 vs. 79 years, 1990 figure,) the prevalence for obesity is 69% (1997,) 39% have diabetes (1997,) 20% have an acute drinking problem (1997,) 31% have a
prevalence to smoking (1997,) and Hawaiians stand for 49% of teen pregnancies (1998) (Blaisdell, Nov 16, 1997; Ingham, Sep 14, 2005.) What different community leaders like Apo, Hanabusa, and Blaisdell have in common is the realization that the socio-economic, political, and cultural problems derive from the loss of identity over the last two centuries, and not from the more recent tourism. That the various societal problems hit Hawaiians harder than others is contextual and due to that the foundation for their culture eroded under the western expansion.

3.4. Native Hawaiian perceptions of culture
What is most striking about the stakeholder category of native people is their diversity of ideological responses to the same situation. Whether being pro sustainable tourism, isolationism, or the freedom not to care, it will be shown here that people within the same ethnic group vary widely in their actions vis-à-vis globalization.

3.4.1. Lack of participation in the Hawaiian movement
A reason for the continued subjugation is that the Kanaka Maoli are not organized in any large cohesive group. Both the Hawaiian elite and government representatives are urging natives to get involved in issues for the ethnic group to further their interests. Apo says about native activists that, “[t]hey have every right to be mad about tourism and development in Hawai’i, but the … hardest part is trying to engage a large segment of the Hawaiian population … If you don’t like how the visitor industry operates, then you have to help us change it” (Bolante, 2004: 16.) Apo, himself, started out as native activist protesting against the presence of tourism on the islands but, at one point, decided to work “within the system” to reshape tourism. Since then, he has served as Waianae’s state representative for 12 years, as special assistant to the governor, and as head of the Office of Waikiki Development to develop Hawai’i’s primary tourism site (ibid.) He is a Hawaiian community leader, but due to his closeness to the white and non-Hawaiian elite in politics and the tourism industry a distance to other native Hawaiians is formed.

There are minor organized movements, such as the Ka Lahui Nation, formed in 1987, the Aloha Aina party, formed in 2000, and the Hawaiian Sovereignty Movement, which is a consolidation of over 40 different groups (Tizon, 21 July, 2005.) All of these are linked to the sovereignty movement formed in 1900, aimed at reversing the annexation of Hawai’i, as well as to the renaissance period in the 1970s-1980s. The latter was the result of a number of coinciding events. It may have been primarily the protests against the bombing of the island Kaho’olawe by the military (see map 1) that
constituted the first sign of a viable activist political insurgency by native Hawaiians, which led to increased support for Hawaiian issues (Kamehameha Schools, 1979; JMK, 2004: A-6.) The renaissance that followed was expressed through increased interest for Hawaiian music, language, ancient hula and Polynesian voyaging (Theroux, December 2002; Kamehameha Schools, 1979.) The movements have raised awareness for Hawaiian issues and produced tangible results, such as the 1988 U.S. Congress Native Hawaiian Health Initiative, which started to address health needs (Blaisdell, Nov, 1997,) or demonstrations against the illegal overthrow of the monarchy in 1893, such as one in January 1993 with 16,000 demonstrators (Ekholm Friedman, 1998: 25.) One of the most important achievements, though, may be the Akaka bill, named after its chief sponsor and the first Kanaka Maoli in the Congress. If the bill falls through, native Hawaiians will be federally recognized as indigenous people the same way American Indians are (Tizon, 21 July, 2005.) Nevertheless, the Hawaiian movement lacks cohesion and supporters, and has but limited power in upholding a native structure.

A major reason for the lack of commitment is ignorance. My observations on this are similar to those of Ekholm Friedman, that there are two types of Hawaiians:

...one is the type that are relatively successful in the American society and that in this process (of assimilation) have lost their own social world and therefore want to recreate it [i.e. the integrated]. And then the others, where Miloli’i is the most obvious example, where people appear more or less as failures in the eyes of the white and Asians, but that have a social world of their own and therefore don’t really have any burning interest in recreating the way the movement urges them to [i.e. the segregated]. (Ekholm Friedman, 1998: 214, free translation from Swedish)

This also goes in line with what Julia in Miloli’i told Ekholm Friedman, that “to us, to enjoy life sometimes is much more important than sustaining life, whichever way that may be” (ibid.) What she means is that, in the Hawaiian culture, carelessly relaxing and playing has priority over worrying about making money or advancing in society through education or a career. This cultural feature is expressed in jokes and bumper stickers like: “slow down, you are not on the mainland,” or “I am not late, I am on Hawaiian time,” and is a reason why tourists cherish Hawai’i – it is the place to slow down from a fast-paced life.

On the back side, in the working world this lackadaisical quality is viewed as particularly negative. Allan Hong, manager for the City and County staff at Hanauma Bay, has to hire new security guards on a monthly basis as crew members consistently fail to show up in the morning, and, although there is a steady stream of applicants it is hard to find someone to hire because few pass the drug
screening (Allan Hong, personal communication, Nov 20, 2004;) Rafi Talias, a 27-year-old, who works with gardening in Manoa valley, commonly has to wake up his Hawaiian employer when reporting to his house in the morning (Rafi Talias, personal communication, May 6, 2005;) Natalie Blake, a military wife, who works as a teacher at a high-school in Waianae, cannot get her students to care about their grades and pass their math tests even if she gives them the correct answers in advance.

They don’t even care if they need to retake a year. They behave like it is cool to be dumb and laugh at themselves like it’s funny. These kids have no future. If I were to let them pass the class I wouldn’t do them a favor. Not a single kid I teach will be able to go to college (Natalie Blake, personal communication, Jan 20, 2007.)

The examples show, that the freedom the Hawaiians cherish is a double-edged sword as many choose not to care about their future. This means the elite and politicians that try to stimulate participation in Hawaiian issues are facing a tough challenge. To counter globalization and build a strong macro-system the Kanaka Maoli must first care about making a change.

In addition to ignorance, there is also active resistance to the West among radicals that follow the ideology to oppose tourism and outsiders in general. In Waianae, Waimanalo, or Miloli’i, expressions of protectionism, like: “Haole, go home!” and ‘variations of whites-aren’t-welcome’ are … shouted from front porches as a reminder that this is not Waikiki. It’s a different world” (Tizon, July 21, 2005.) This is their resentful response to the western system, based on the ideology that native culture can only be preserved through isolationism. These individuals do not necessarily try to further Hawaiian causes on a political arena. Yet, the issue becomes political when social conditions in isolationist areas degenerate due to lack of business enterprises, employment opportunities, good education, the prevalence of drug abuse, and increased crime rate, which, counter-effective of the goal, causes fragmentation. Although Ekholm Friedman argues that these people, “have a social world of their own and therefore don’t really have any burning interest in recreating the way the movement urges them to” (Ekholm Friedman, 1998: 214,) it is a fact that the segregated community is quickly eroding. For example, Waianae, and Waimanalo suffer fragmentation due to drug and alcohol abuse, poor housing conditions, lack of medical insurance and more (see appendix B.) The conclusion is that the isolationism that is intended to preserve a few native Hawaiian enclaves simultaneously gives rise to deterioration because of socio-economic and political problems, and lack of self-esteem vis-à-vis the western system.
Reasons for resistance are founded on feelings of resentment, which are ignited every time Hawaiians have to give up what they see as a cultural right. In 2005, natives were upset as the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that the century-old admission policy of Kamehameha School to accept only students of at least $\frac{1}{64}$ Hawaiian blood is “unlawful race discrimination.” In this case, activists decided to take out their anger with the U.S. judicial system on the tourism industry to strike where it hurts the state the most.

Native Hawaiian activist Keali‘i Gora has said he and others are going to go into Waikiki and ‘hit the economic situation, we’re going to hit them hard and we’re going to … tell the tourists to leave. Because we’re not pleased with what’s going on’ (Arakawa, Aug 7, 2005.)

As the visitor industry has nothing to do with court rulings, this is an illustrative example of how what often appears to be a conflict between native Hawaiians and tourism is, in fact, a conflict with the broader framework of the western world-system.

On the opposite of people acting against globalization, including tourism, those that work with sustainability in mind are hoping that stimulating micro-practices will bring cohesion and strengthen the Hawaiian cultural structure. In this group, you find members of the native elite, well-read activists, entrepreneurs, hospitality workers and supporters that are non-Hawaiian. For example, Greg Montgomery, a white resident that is co-owner of Tiki’s Bar and Grill, a successful Hawaiian-style restaurant in Waikiki, wants to bring “back” authentic Hawaiianess to Waikiki and by pulling his straw to the stack he hopes others will do the same (Greg Montgomery, personal communication, Oct 17, 2005.) Every aspect of his business stems from Hawaiian culture and the application procedure is highly selective as the staff must embrace the ho‘okipa values. The owners, managers and staff alike take courses taught by natives for the business to stay genuinely Hawaiian. Naturally, the restaurant serves Hawaiian foods like taro rolls, features live music every night with Hawaiian musicians, and further, participates actively in charity events for the local community. The tropical décor and the Hawaiian courses are not culture in themselves. However, by using them correctly, in combination with the staff upholding Hawaiian values, Montgomery is trying to make a correction to the image of the culture that the visitor has learned through western-style marketing and therefore expect to see.

The entrepreneurial idea behind Tiki’s illuminates the contradictory state of the native culture today - how to uphold micro-practices in an increasingly westernized Hawai‘i, without practices losing their function as contexts change. One the one hand, it can be argued that Montgomery’s perpetuation of
culture cannot be genuine as he is not native Hawaiian; on the other hand, he appears to be as emerged in Hawaiian values as a non-Hawaiian can be. For example, he studies old spiritual legends and meditates at sacred Kaena point to, in his own words, “connect with the Hawaiian spirits before they, according to the legends, dive into the sea” (Greg Montgomery, personal communication, Oct 17, 2005.) All in all, Montgomery makes an effort to represent the culture as correctly as can be done in a restaurant. As a result, his business is a celebrated example among government officials, the native elite, and businesses working with sustainable tourism. The idea is that even non-Hawaiians, by adopting native values and micro-practices, can strengthen the Hawaiian macro-system.

3.4.2. Voices from Waianae

As far as hospitality workers, many people take employment where they can, without being deeply concerned with ideology. Alben, a humble Hawaiian from Waianae that works as bartender at Ko Olina says he thoroughly enjoys being a host for tourists but emphasizes that he does not put on a show to please visitors but “remains himself.” When discussing the social problems in Waianae and Makaha, Alben laughs mockingly and shares the secret that, “Waianae is where you find the real luaus (Hawaiian feast), and where people have real aloha. (as opposed to Waikiki.) I wouldn’t live anywhere else!” (Alben, personal communication, Nov 1, 2006.) However, suddenly Alben’s behavior changes, perhaps as he sees that I do not find myself superior due to being white or having a degree; from moving around and acting cocky, he stops and stares, and reveals a heart-felt concern;

There is too much poverty there though (on the West side). People don’t have decent jobs, and there’s too much drugs … It’s really sad. The government needs to do more locally. There’s not enough hope for the young ones (ibid.)

Alben’s statement shows that there is a vibrant culture in the segregated areas, but also severe social problems that are worsening with each generation. The segregation he is used to can, as described, even be seen in his behavior and body language. A parallel can be drawn to Natalie’s pregnant 14-year-old students in Waianae. The young teacher explains that,

When the girls get pregnant the families are thrilled and throw her a great baby-shower. They don’t care that she most likely won’t pursue her education… It’s like going to college would be to break away from the family, like you’re better than them … but having a baby makes sure you won’t leave, so that’s okay (Natalie Blake, personal communication, Dec 3, 2006.)

These two informant observations show that, on the one hand, there is closeness in the segregated neighborhood, but on the other hand, there is a lack of responsibility, which forbears more fragmentation of the culture they claim to protect through isolationism.
A last example of the fragile and contradictory happiness of the Hawaiians is Roly, a twenty-year-old from Waianae with a life story that is fairly common in the islands. Roly was hired as my associate when I worked at the Ko Olina Beach Club and I got to train him as activity facilitator. He had a pleasant character, enjoyed working, and was proud to represent his culture by teaching children the traditions that he grew up with, like lawn bowling, or ti-leaf lei making. The surface, however, concealed a troublesome past: he used to be addicted to methamphetamine, he dropped out of high-school, his father is in prison for drug-related crimes, and at the age of sixteen, Roly found his mother in bed with one of his young friends, and he would have shot the man dead had his younger sister not disposed of his revolver the week before. However, he tells me, cordially, “[y]ou know… I am a different person now. I’m trying to become a Jehovah’s Witness [another feature of western expansion], I wanna buy my own place, and get married to my girlfriend” (Richard, “Roly,” Pelen, personal communication, Jan 12, 2007.) What I see though, is that Roly changes often, and drastically, which may threaten his progress. Three months before our discussion about his past, his one goal in life was to become a professional boxer. Now, on the other hand, he tells me he has stopped boxing, “because God doesn’t like violence” (ibid., Oct 4, 2006; Jan 12, 2007.) More than anything, the environment that shaped Roly did not just form the pleasant ways that make tourist kids send him postcards, but it also the drastic behaviors that may cost him both his job and freedom. As such, he is a textbook example of the culture’s dangerous balance between relaxed friendliness and social degeneration.

3.4.3. Disconnection from the aina (land)

The last cause of subjugation to be brought up in this analysis is loss of access to the land for the native people. The Hawaiians regarded the aina much like a relative, or elderly sibling, and not like a mere resource, and the land was a core feature of the culture (University of Hawaii, June 2001.) Still today, when Hawaiians speak of the “aina,” the reference is to more than just physical land, it has a spiritual connotation that shows humbleness and respect. The disconnect came with the manahele – land division – implemented in 1848 as a result of western influence. This was the beginning of the individual ownership discussed in chapter 1.3., and lead to that the land was quickly bought up by westerners - as much as 90% by 1893 (ibid.)

The lackadaisical behavior, loss of identity, and resentment of globalization demonstrated in Hawaiians can all be linked to this separation from the land (JMK, 2004: I-4.) Micro-practices, such as fishing, growing taro, and performing outdoor religious ceremonies have been largely removed
from their lives. What sustainable tourism can do, in this case, is to support those practices that remain, which may ultimately strengthen the Hawaiian system. There is the risk, however, that an emphasis on certain cultural practices may be as harmful as commodification if it puts a strain on resources. The tendency to do so is already evident in outdoor tourism where sustainable, ecological, and adventure tourism often fall under the same umbrella because of their overlapping features and due to that they are marketed to the same demographics. On the one hand, sharing the Hawaiian connection to nature with visitors has the positive effect of increased funding and raised awareness about the Hawaiian way of life. One the other hand, there is the destruction caused by the increase in cruise trips, nature excursions, whale tours, and snorkeling boats. In each case, the land and marine environment, and essentially the culture, are affected: cruise ships dump their waste at sea (Kubota, March 8, 2003), whale and dolphin tours add stress to marine life, nature excursions cause erosion, and snorkeling tours cause mechanical and chemical damage to coral reefs (United Nation’s Environment Programme, n.d.) In the light of this extensive destruction, Hawaiians are caught in the dilemma whether or not to continue using a cultural resource, even if they “love it to death.”

Ironically, while the Hawaiians cherish their land as culture, there is widespread resistance against efforts of managing cultural or environmental assets as these are viewed as attempts to limit native freedom. One such example is the general tendency among Hawaiians to boycott the state park of Hanauma Bay after restricted access was implemented. The limitations were set up by the government to preserve the fragile eco-system as there used to be up to 10,000 visitors a day, averaging 3 million per year. Today, the numbers are down to a maximum of 4,000 visitors a day and averaging 1 million per year. Further, only positive effects can be seen on the flora and fauna: “fish here grow older and larger than anywhere on the island, which means that the limitation has its desired effect” (Shawn Carrier, marine biologist, personal communication, February 7, 2005.) Still, of the few Hawaiians I have met at the park, some welcome the management of the cultural asset as caring for the aina, while others are offended or feel violated by that their visits are controlled.

As sustainability and cultural heritage management is controversial, the dilemma has appeared whether natives should accept non-Hawaiian ideological attempts to address the problems that globalization brought, or if isolationism would better serve their cause. Bottom-line is that the West caused the separation from the land, which strongly contributed to the cultural fragmentation. Meanwhile, a large segment of the population remains uninvolved, whether because globalization broke their spirit or due to innate carelessness.
CHAPTER IV. FINAL DISCUSSION

The ideology of mass-tourism that initially drove the western hospitality industry to conquer Hawai‘i stems from the combination of commercialism and global travel. The replacing paradigm of sustainable tourism is similarly a western product, although created in response to the homogenization from commodification and strain on resources from its predecessor. The underlying reasons for the western macro-system to uphold this ideology are economic, political and social in nature, including commercial and military interests.

The government, as representative of the people, embraces sustainable tourism in order to preserve resources, including culture, while not giving up the tourist dollar that is necessary for the state economy and, hence, rules much of the political arena. The ideology also finds supporters among those native Hawaiians that perceive it as the best solution available. Their argument is that removing globalization is impossible and therefore Hawaiians must work with the other stakeholders to preserve the culture. The natives that, on the other hand, practise isolationism or activism against globalization follow a rationale to preserve Hawaiianess by removing the Other, first from their segregated communities and thereafter from Hawai‘i as a whole. This group has not lost hope that this can be done and are therefore perceived as radical or unrealistic. That a great part of the population is not engaged in Hawaiian issues needs to also be seen as a contextual product of globalization. It may be that the lackadaisical way of life is a cultural feature that predates the arrival of the West, resulting in lack of resistance. Equally logic, however, is that the behavior is caused by the circumstances. At the time of discovery, the natives practised communal land ownership and division of duties within the community. Consequently, the Hawaiians were ill-prepared for the pragmatic ways with which the westerners established sole proprietorship and individual land rights. The defeat that came in the form of economic, political and social domination by the West caused a loss of identity in Hawaiians, expressed in all aspects of life for this cultural group.

It may be that, today, the imbalance between Hawaiians and the West is illustrated most clearly as a love-hate relationship with the largest industry, tourism, which causes the most influx of strangers and does more to uphold the unequal exchange than any other aspect of the economy. However, discontent with other aspects of the western system is also evident in the constant collision between Hawaiians and the state or various industries due to differences in the value-system.
When it comes to the major, society-wide problems in Hawai‘i, there is no direct link to tourism. Thus, holding a particular industry responsible for societal problems is too limited in scope to provide a full explanation. The West has upheld its dominance in the economy even through industries have replaced each other over time. The explanation is that the western business model, which causes unequal exchange to take place by diminishing the importance of the native people, is entrenched in all types of commerce in the state. What this shows is that the expansion of the West brought a value-system, foreign to the Hawaiian culture that is expressed in, not just the economic integration of the West, but the political and social as well. How this affected the Hawaiians is demonstrated by their ideological responses to the loss of land, commercialism, marginalization, overthrow of the monarchy, discrimination, commodification, and environmental problems. The ultimate result is that both integrated and segregated Hawaiians are at a loss trying to keep a healthy identity in a society characterized by hybridity, western domination, and partially incompatible cultural structures.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A:

MAP OF THE ISLAND OF OAHU

(Encarta, n.d.)
APPENDIX B: WHERE NATIVE HAWAI`IANS LIVE

Where Native Hawaiians, Pacific Islanders live

The dense populations of Native Hawaiians in the state continue to be in the poorest areas, new census data indicates, even though the Islands are growing more diverse.
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The largest population is on the Wa`ianae Coast. From Nānākuli to Mākaha Valley, 11,728 Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders live in neighborhoods that average half the median household income of Hawai`i Kai on the other side of O`ahu.

(Bricking, April 30, 2001).