

Ethnic Sources in Hawai'i: Social Process in Hawai'i, Volume 29

Introduction

We are delighted to offer this reprint of what has become a minor "classic" in the ethnic literature of Hawai'i, Volume 29 of *Social Process in Hawai'i: Ethnic Sources in Hawai'i*.^{*} *Social Process in Hawai'i* came into existence in 1935 as a journal "devoted primarily to the social situation in Hawaii" and was the product of the Sociology Club and its faculty advisor, Andrew Lind. Lind had been educated at the University of Chicago, and the sociology department at the University of Hawai'i at Manoa in those early days showed the influence of Robert Park and the Chicago School. Volume 29 continued in this tradition. Lind, then Emeritus Senior Professor, was joined in the editorial task by another distinguished Emeritus Professor of the Department of Sociology, Bernhard L. Hormann. Hormann had earned a BA at the University of Hawai'i (in 1927) and like Lind, he did his graduate work at Chicago.

For these distinguished sociologists, Hawai'i was an unusual "laboratory" for ethnic studies. Not only was there a "striking ethnic diversity" in these Islands, but the social process of their construction and reconstruction was recent and vivid. This gives the present volume a special importance. Lind and Hormann invited writers who were both knowledgeable and were participants in the communities they were asked to write about. But Lind and Hormann saw also that the process of ethnic construction was dynamic and that, accordingly, as Heraclitus had insisted, "nothing abides." The problem, of course, is endemic to the social sciences. It should not discourage us. The past is always present in some form, a legacy to be worked with by people acting in the present moment. Not only is there always continuity in change, but at least some changes are unequivocally for the good.

In this introduction, I make the effort to sketch some of these changes, concentrating, with apologies, on the largest populations. My brief remarks will inevitably be selective. As Hormann and Lind said of their writers, such efforts always reflect a perspective.

The Ethnic Distribution of Hawai'i

Lind's two essays, the first on immigration and the second on race and ethnic relations, are indispensable if we are to grasp the broad historical outlines of ethnic diversity of Hawai'i. In the first essay, Lind sketches the immigration history of the Hawaiian Islands. The second gives a wonderful overview, conceptual and historical, of the very special factors which explain the ethnic construction of Hawai'i. This essay remains of general theoretical interest and raises difficult and interesting questions about the future development of Hawai'i in terms of ethnic and race relations. Of special interest is his view that "a continuing trend toward the obliteration of the physical manifestations of race through outmarriage... appears to be irresistible under Hawaiian conditions," and that this will result neither in "Americanization as in most Mainland communities" nor "an aggregation of independent, semi-autonomous 'sub-societies' or 'sub-nations,' with different values and aspirations" (p. 126). Both claims, of course, raise many questions; taken

^{*} I am very much indebted to Herbert Barringer who produced all the census data for this essay. My thanks go also to Lloyd Kuniyoshi who reformatted the entire volume for this reprint.

together, it is not clear what Lind had in mind. One might hope, perhaps, for diversity and difference in a special kind of unity, instead of either a washed out homogeneity or a barricaded plurality.

Immigration policies have not significantly changed since the large shift in 1965 (below, p. 10), and as Lind discerned in 1982, some demographic tendencies have continued since. Let us begin, accordingly, with some numbers. Table 1 displays the 1990 Census numbers for Hawai'i.

Table I

1990 Census: Hawai'i

Total:	1,108,229
White:	369,616
Black:	27,195
American Indian, Eskimo and Aleut.	5,099
Asian and Pacific Islander Total	685,236
Chinese	68,804
Filipino	168,682
Japanese	247,486
Asian Indian	1,015
Korean	24,454
Vietnamese	5,468
Cambodian	119
Hmong	6
Laotian	1,677
Thai	1,220
OtherAsian	4,036
Pacific Islander Polynesian:	
Hawaiian	138,742
Samoan	15,034
Tongan	3,088
Other Polynesian	885
Micronesian: Guamanian	2,120
Other Micronesia.	1,848
Melanesian	291
Pacific Islander, not specified	261
Other Race	21,083

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Census of the Population: Social and Economic Characteristics Hawaii, 1990 CP-2-13*

There are, to be sure, all sorts of problems here, especially when the US Census approach is applied to Hawai'i (Hormann, pp. 22f.). Most critical, perhaps, is the fact that the census approach perpetuates misunderstanding of both "race" and "ethnicity" by reifying both categories and by obscuring mixtures. In the current jargon, it "essentializes" both race and ethnicity. We know that there is no biological meaning to race and that like ethnicity, "races" are thoroughgoing social constructions (Drechsel, 1991). This is not to say, of course, that they are "unreal" since social constructions once constructed have very real effects, in this case, most critically and tragically, racism. But because both ideas are fluid, self and other-identification can become problematic.

As Barringer (1994) notes, two questions are used by the census to establish ethnicity, "race" and "ancestry." For both, the person is given a list of nearly identical choices. e.g., Japanese, Samoan, etc. These are conventional but arbitrary. Thus, "Japanese" appears as both a race and as label for "national origins." Write-ins are allowed; but within the "race" coding, only the first race mentioned is coded. Accordingly, someone who wants to identify themselves as (say) "Chinese-Hawaiian" has to write in, but this response will coded as "Chinese." With ancestry *two* choices are coded, so that the same person will appear in the Census as both "Chinese" and "Hawaiian." There will be, on this criterion, a larger number of Hawaiians. The situation gets even more confusing if we take as preferable--as I do-- the Hawai'i State Health Surveillance Survey. It allows for the "race" of both father and mother and allows *three* choices of major "races" for *each*. This way, one of every six Hawaiian choices get coded as Hawaiian.

Table 2

Hawaiians	Hawai`i	United States
Census "race"	138,732	211,014
Census "ancestry"	156,812	256,081
State Health Survey	205,078	311,905

Source: Herbert Barringer and Nolan Liu, *The Demographic, Social and Economic Status of Native Hawaiians, 1990: A Report prepared for Alu Like, Inc., June 1994.*

The 1990 census figures in Table 1 coded for "race." Notice the large number of "whites"--a category that includes most "Hispanics" who do appear separately in the table.

But if we take the different approach of the State Health Survey, other significant differences appear. First the differences in the count for Hawaiians *and* whites is enormous. Moreover, by assembling the "mixed" ethnicities, we arrive at a new category, the "mixed, non-part Hawaiian."

Table 3
State Health Survey: Hawai`i

Race	Number	Percent
Caucasian	262,605	24.1
Japanese	222,014	20.4
Filipino	123,642	11.3
Chinese	51,294	4.7
Mixed (Part Hawaiian)	205,079	18.8
Mixed (Non-Hawaiian)	224,940	20.6

Source: Special run for *Alu Like* by David Johnson.

No doubt, many who get counted as "Caucasian" by the census appear as "mixed" in the State Health Survey. The resulting picture of ethnicity, it should be clear, is very different.

While today almost all Hawaiians are of mixed ancestry, it is important to emphasize that their numbers have continued to grow from a low of around 37,000 in 1900 to the present 211,014 or--if one chooses--311,905.¹

The bridegroom outmarriage rate for Hawaiians remains very high, 57.1% in 1980, and 54.1% in 1990 (Barringer, 1994, Table 2.4). Moreover, "*children* of mixed households are being defined as largely Native Hawaiians." Thus, "although about 50% of spouses are non-Hawaiians, 86.2% of the children are defined as `Hawaiian' in the Census questionnaire, with only 5.6% defined as `white'" (Barringer, 1994:37). Given that they are the youngest population of all the populations in Hawai`i (Barringer, 1994:5), we can expect their numbers to increase disproportionately. It is of some importance also to notice that not all Hawaiians live in Hawai`i. This provokes the question of why so many Hawaiians seem to leave Hawai`i, a point to which we return.

We should mention here that if we looked at "race/ethnicity" in the US in the way that the Hawai`i Health Survey does, the US census numbers might well look quite different also.² Indeed, as regards race and ethnicity, Hawai`i has much to teach others!

The Hawaiians

George Kanahale was legitimately optimistic in seeing among Hawaiians, "a new kind of awareness about themselves and their problems." The "Hawaiian Renaissance" in which Kanahale played a key role marked a stunning cultural renewal. This has not abated. Today, to give but a flavor: There are 177 pre-school children and 950 elementary students in immersion programs in the state; the Foreign Language in Elementary Schools program (FLES) had 998 students studying Hawaiian in 1993--the number has dropped because, sadly, positions were not renewed, Kamehameha Schools has 850 in grades 7 through 12 studying Hawaiian, and in the public high schools, there are some 1850 more. 2420 students are studying Hawaiian language in the UH system, some 920 at Manoa alone-- and there would be many more if there more resources. In 1984, there were 17 Hawaiian Studies majors: today [199], 119. Reflecting the quality of this

group, twenty-four were on the Dean's list in the Fall term of 1994. (Hawaiian Studies has a beautiful new building which will be completed soon, but it has one of the highest student/faculty ratios at Manoa and therefore inordinately large class sizes.)

Hawaiian hula, music, handicrafts and canoeing are anything but passing fads. They continue to attract sophisticated young people, Hawaiians and non-Hawaiians, who are thoroughly committed to the rejuvenation of Hawaiian culture. Perhaps even more important, sovereignty, not mentioned by Kanahale, has become the most critical item on the political agenda of Hawaiians. This is hardly the place to review either the background for this development.³ But there can be little doubt that the outcome of this movement will have critical bearing for both Hawaiians and for the all the people of this state. Much needs to be decided and settled, but one can share in Kanahale's view, supported by the evidence, demographic and cultural, that "the role Hawaiians are uniquely equipped to perform is that of helping all Island people become Hawaiians through a biological and spiritual fusion of the best qualities of all" (p. 21).

On the other hand, the grim picture of the situation of Hawaiians in their homeland painted by Kanahale sadly has not changed very much. Barringer's 1994 study shows that some 20% of Hawaiians continue to be below the poverty line, that Hawaiians are underrepresented in professions, administration, and management and are over represented in service and low-skilled labor. They remain over represented in correctional facilities: 37.6% in 1991 (OHA Data Book, 1994) and lowest in life expectancy: 63.5 years for men, 71.4 for women (Barringer, 1994, Table 1.10).

This cries out for an explanation. Several lines of thought may be suggested. First, as is very clear, the horrible de-population and consequent de-culturation has left a historical legacy of marginality.⁴ This resulted in an assault on the consciousness of Hawaiians and a negative stereotyping which was promoted by colonizers and reinforced by practices, including the apparent unwillingness of Hawaiians to be plantation workers (Trask, 1984/54; Blaisdell, 1989). Second, not only were Hawaiians a minority, but except for those relatively few who had become part of the Territorial establishment, political and economic, most Hawaiians were economically marginalized insofar as they were never deeply involved in the plantation economy, preferring to maintain as far as possible their traditional lifestyles in rural Hawai'i (Lind, 19). And in consequence, from their point of view, there was little to be gained by acquiring a generally not available *haole* education. There were, for example, *no* English Standard schools in the countryside of the Islands. Accordingly, it took considerable initiative to ride the no. 52 bus everyday from Laie to Roosevelt High School! When the plantation economy was replaced by tourism, "rural Native Hawaiian communities, already economically exploited, were besieged by rapid encroachment on remaining agricultural lands" (Blaisdell, 1989:50).

Data produced by Barringer (1994) establish that education surely pays in our modern economy, but he shows also that for some groups it pays much more than for other groups. As regards Hawaiians, this is especially distressing. The average difference in income for a Hawaiian male with a high-school diploma as against one lacking one is but \$1923. The comparison to whites is stunning. For them, a high school diploma is worth (on average) \$4968! The differences for holders of BA degrees parallels this. For Hawaiians, the increment is \$2451 against \$10142 for whites and, remarkably, \$15,590 for Japanese! Hawaiians begin to catch up with post-BA marginal increases: \$9288 for Hawaiians and \$11870 for whites. Japanese fall to \$5135 and Filipino males with advanced degrees earn a stunning increment of \$24,689! As might be expected the increments for females across all ethnicities is much less and flatter. This is probably explained as result of gender discrimination which determines the *kinds* of employment available

for females.

These numbers also suggest the validity of explanations of the sort offered by Ogbu (1978) and others. Minority young people "know" that advancement will be blocked by racism. Accordingly, they reject the idea that working hard in school will get them success. *This perception would be self-defeating even if it were not true.* But the data suggest that this perception is in not in any way far fetched.

We can, however, be encouraged. Not only has the rejuvenation of Hawaiian language and culture made an enormous difference as regards the consciousness of young Hawaiians, but as already noted, there is a turn-around in process as regards the education of young Hawaiians. Comparison of 1980 and 1990 census data shows small but significant gains in educational levels from kindergarten to the university (Barringer, 1994: 47). The gains at the university level are especially significant. In 1980, but 3% of the UHM student body was Hawaiian. This went to 6.7% in 1992 and was 12% in 1994.

One final worry is the question of whether Hawaiians who want to stay and raise their families will find the jobs that will allow this. As noted, there are some 72,282 or 188,614 Hawaiians, depending on how one counts, currently living on the US mainland. Surprisingly, perhaps, Barringer shows that there is no easy comparison between the Hawaiians in Hawai'i and on those the mainland. For example, while mainland Hawaiians are much better educated (on average) than local Hawaiians, individual incomes are slightly higher and household incomes are about the same and, oddly, mainland Hawaiians have a higher poverty rate than do local Hawaiians. Still, if we continue to have a service-oriented economy and if better educated Hawaiians (as others) believe that the structure of opportunity is better on the mainland, increasing the numbers of better educated Hawaiians could also increase out-migration.

The *Haoles*

Hormann's essay on the *haole* provides a first-rate review of the history of *haoles* in Hawai'i. He makes a number of useful distinctions and observations, emphasizing the critical role of what he calls the "old-time dominant *Haoles*"--the *kama`ina*, and recognizing, for example the importance of the military presence in the story of the *haole* in Hawai'i. He concludes his account with what was in 1982 a relatively recent phenomena: the presence in Hawai'i of what are best called "mainland *haoles*." It is this development which seems to me to be most critical as regards the past fifteen years.

Hormann noted that "upper-class *Haoles* had their own kind of ghetto" (p. 28) but that, perhaps like usual colonists who remain for several generations, they nevertheless "fit in." "Mainland *haoles*," by contrast, "with the best of intentions, have difficulty making the grade" (p. 30). Hormann suggested that they tended to associate only or mainly with other *haoles* and that locals, even local *haoles*, were reluctant to draw them in. "With the best of intentions, they...behave like 'obnoxious' *Haoles*. They act and talk as though, out of the wisdom of their Mainland experience, they had the answers for Island problems, for the discrimination which non-*Haoles* have experienced" (*ibid.*).

All of this is true, I think, but more can be said. First, we can note that when Hormann was writing, there had been a recent huge influx of *haoles* from the mainland. In 1970 there were some 178,531 who had been born on the mainland living in Hawai'i. Of these, 125,732 had lived on the mainland in 1965 or later. They tended to be young and they were well-educated. About 65.5% of these would be considered "high status" workers (Whittaker, 1986). This process has continued. According the 1990 census, almost 36% of all *haoles* in Hawai'i in 1990 did *not* live in Hawai'i

in 1985. (For comparison, only 3.5% of the Japanese did *not* live in Hawai'i in 1985). We are, accordingly, talking here about a relatively large and recent influx of *haoles* who, critically, have tended to take the better jobs in a state which, sadly, has appreciably fewer good jobs.

Second, since Hormann was writing, and surely in partial consequence of the foregoing, *haole* has increasingly become a term of insult--at least from the point of view of mainland *haoles*. Consider here the bruhaha created by Haunani-Kay Trask's innocent response in the *Ka Leo* to Joey Carter's charge in the same paper that he had been subject to racism in Hawai'i. He insisted that he should be treated as an individual. After offering a lesson in Hawaiian history, she wrote:

Mr. Carter is a privileged member of American society because he is a haole, whether he acknowledges his privilege or not...

If Mr. Carter does not like being called a *haole*, he can return to Louisiana. Hawaiians would surely benefit from one less *haole* in our land. In fact, United Airlines has dozens of flights to the U.S. continent every day, Mr. Carter. Why don't you take one?

Mainland *haoles* at the University instantly--and quite remarkably--called for her resignation.⁵ Fortunately cooler heads prevailed.

The issues are perhaps best explicated in terms of more recent accounts of race and class, including Elvi Whittaker's, *The Mainland Haole* (1986).

A number of writers (e.g., Wellman, 1993) have argued that white people in the US fail to acknowledge that *they* have a race. Worse, in part consequence of this, they fail to see that they do not need to be intentional or overt racists in order to benefit from being white. Often, these attitudes are shored up with an explicit liberal principle that individuals are each unique and that persons have a right to be treated as individuals. Of the mainland *haole*, Whittaker concludes: "The Caucasians seem to be saying through their objections that they dislike having ethnicity become their most identifying feature.... For the first time in their lives many of them face their own ethnicity. Previously it had been irrelevant. Now, however, ethnic recognition determines interaction' (Whittaker, 1986: 153). Moreover, in a stunning lack of understanding, they compare themselves to black Americans.⁶ Of course, as mainland *haoles*, they may well *experience* discrimination for the first time here in Hawai'i; but even if they do, they fail utterly to see that *unlike* black Americans, they are, as whites, privileged persons who gain enormous benefits at the expense of non-whites.

This attitude, often characteristic of the better educated and best-intended of individuals, would go some way to explain the distress felt by mainland *haoles* to be called a *haole*, to be upset by what they take to be the extraordinary ease of local people to identify a person as, for example, "the Filipino who sits in the front of the room and who dates the Japanese," to be annoyed at having a local person served before them in a store, to be genuinely frightened by verbal hostility expressed by locals at a beachpark, to be outraged at tuition waiver being granted to Hawaiians "just because they are Hawaiian."⁷

Unfortunately, there are benefits and liabilities bequeathed on people just because of their race and ethnicity; those who suffer the liabilities are acutely aware of this. These liabilities are both structural and interactional: the quality of a neighborhood and its schools, the assumption made known that the person is not expected to be "smart" or ambitious, the contempt communicated to a pidgin speaker by a person who thinks that *he* does not have an accent.

This is hardly the place to offer remedies. Still, the beginning of wisdom, it seems, is to acknowledge reality as it is and to recognize that where race matters, protestations to color-

blindness may have the effect of reproducing the privileges of the powerful.⁸ This is something well appreciated by "locals," a potentially powerful idea to which I return.

The Japanese

A student in my class in the introduction to sociology began a paper with these remarks:

"What are you?"

"I'm Japanese"

All my life, I have been telling people this. I don't know why, I have been to Japan. I can barely speak, read and write the language, and I was born and raised here in Hawai'i. Yet I still identify myself as Japanese.

Chad (not his real name) is *Yonsei* in Hawai'i, and is not *really* Japanese--as he knows. He is, perhaps, a "symbolic ethnic," like so many assimilated Americans. That is, if asked, he clings to a genealogical story to identify himself; he surely appreciates Japanese culture and practices and is, rightly, annoyed by Japan-bashing. Unlike his grandfather, he *would* marry a non-Japanese. Indeed, one of the stunning changes within the Japanese community is the change in the bridegroom outmarriage rate. It was 7% in 1950, 13.6% in 1960, 25.3% in 1970, jumping to 43.7% in 1980. It stood at a remarkable 52.2% in 1990, only slightly lower than the rate for Hawaiians. We can refer to Chad as an "AJA" or "Asian-American," but he would not likely choose either term. He would, indeed, prefer "local," an idea already introduced in the foregoing and to which I return.

Chad is not as knowledgeable about the Japanese past in Hawai'i as I would like and he would profit from a close reading of George Yamamoto's lovely, if brief, essay. Chad knows that the Japanese came to work on plantations and that they did very well. He also believes that this is due to some very special cultural characteristic of Japanese--*Yamato damashi*: Japanese work hard, are patient and frugal, and parents do everything for "the sake of the children" --*kodomo no tame ni*.⁹ That the Japanese in Hawai'i have done well is undeniable; that Chad's explanation will suffice is doubtful.

As Yamamoto notes, a predominance of families over single men--in contrast to both earlier Chinese and later Filipinos--allowed the Japanese community to grow, to maintain much of its traditions, to "exercise effective social control over its members"--including its children, and, critically, to encourage its *second* generation to attend school and study hard. In contrast to Hawaiians, education was seen to be the way out of the plantation. Indeed, 43% of McKinley High's 1929 student body was of Japanese ancestry and most of its graduates--in marked contrast to Kamehameha--went on to graduate work: Of the 394 graduates of the class of 1928, 105 were at the University of Hawai'i, 83 more (mostly females) were in the Normal School (becoming Hawai'i's school teachers, 11 were at mainland Universities and one was at a University in Japan! McKinley was dominated, in those days, by *haoles* fired up with the progressive educational views of John Dewey.

This history has been reproducing itself. According to the 1990 census, Japanese outstrip even *haoles* in achieving College degrees: 49.8% of men and 29.5% of women against the *haole* rates of 24.5% and 18.6% respectively (Barringer, 1994: 50).

Yamamoto also rightly emphasizes the bombing of Pearl Harbor as a key event with respect to the Japanese in Hawai'i. Writing in 1943, Kimie Kawahara and Yukio Hatanaka summed it up: "Many Japanese, prior to the war, lived in a sort of tolerated marginal position, but this has necessitated the abandoning of this position of "sitting on the fence" between two cultures" (1994 [1943]: 90).

They were prophetic. The Naturalization Act (1949, 1950) gave nearly all the Japanese in Hawai'i the right to vote and in 1954 they exercised it. The veterans of the 100th Battalion and 442nd Regimental Combat team, fighting with distinction in Europe, returned to be lawyers and legislators, so that from 1960 to the present, Japanese have averaged 50% of the Hawai'i legislature and half the memberships on boards and commissions. We need to be reminded here that as compared to the Republican period, the big losers in government positions were the Hawaiians. But there was nothing conspiratorial about this. The Hawaiians had hitched themselves to what became the political party out of power (Stauffer, 1994).

Against this background, then, was the invasion of Japanese capital in the late 1980's. Between 1960 and 1990, Japanese nationals invested some \$11 billion in Hawai'i. They now own some 65% of the hotel rooms in Hawai'i, more than 50% of the office space in downtown Honolulu. They purchased, at outrageously inflated prices, some 5,900 of the better homes and condominiums. With land already in the control of a handful, the 11% owned by Japanese is significant (Okamura, 1994: 248).

Of course, *local* Japanese are not Japanese. Indeed, some 238,780 in 1990 census were born in the US. But against the background of the immediate past, the perception that "Japanese" "control" Hawai'i has become worrisome. Noel Kent's remarks seem to be much closer to the reality:

The AJA elite has never *constituted a legitimate ruling class in Hawai'i*. Instead, they have skillfully performed a multitude of roles--front men, middle men, mediators, agents, and power brokers--in the service of an authentic ruling class, much of which does not reside in the islands and which prefers invisibility as one element of its power (1989:114).

Indeed, the highest occupational statuses in Hawai'i remain *haole*, with the Chinese, a much smaller population as second (Okamura, 1990:5). Local Japanese are, of course, highly visible in the DOE and state government, but most Japanese, contrary to popular misconception, are in blue-collar roles in Hawai'i (Kotani, 1985: 154). On the other hand, the majority of local Japanese do own their own homes, which in the 1980s had increased in value by an average of \$200,000.

The Filipinos

Bienvenido Junasa's essay rightly emphasizes some critical demographic facts about the Filipino community in Hawai'i. In 1920, there were 685 adult males to 100 females. The numbers had not changed much as late as 1960: 628 to 100. One critical consequence of this fact was the late start of Filipinos in rearing a second generation here in Hawai'i. A further consequence of the unstable character of the early Filipino community was that Filipino young men and women were not well educated. In 1930, only 24.2% attended school (as compared to the 54% of Japanese) and a Filipino male who graduated from High School was a rarity. In 1941, unlike the Japanese, having failed to develop a successful community life, nearly half of the Filipino population left the Territory, most returning to the Philippines.

In his interesting essay (below), Fred Soriano rightly insisted that too often writers take a "pathological perspective" in describing these outcomes, when instead, we should see behaviors as adaptive responses to concrete conditions (Gans, 1995). He shows that under the circumstances, returning as a *pensionado* was a highly successful adaptation strategy. In returning to their *barrios* of origin, "they were accorded high social and economic prestige" (p. 141). Stephen Griffiths's "Enrique" narrative (below) gives Soriano's account a flesh and blood concreteness. Similarly, in the absence of the more usual family arrangements, Filipinos employed a mechanism of

compadrinazgo (ritual kinship) which served well those that remained. After the war, the Filipino population began to grow, in part because those who had married, whether Filipinos or non-Filipinos, were having children. (The outmarriage rate for Filipino males was 51.5% in 1960; 50% in 1990.) By 1950 there were 27,000 American-born Filipinos in Hawai'i; most were still children. But just as they were coming of age, the character of the Hawaiian economy began its dramatic shift to tourism. Unlike the Japanese who had preceded them and who were in position to exploit the new economy, as Alegado writes: "thousands of Filipino workers were forced to look elsewhere for jobs in the tourism industry--in hotels, golf courses, restaurants, and construction sites" (1991: 102). Many of these, of course, were new immigrants, arriving after 1965. Many lacked English skills and a solid education. According to the 1990 census, some 82,640 Filipinos in Hawai'i, or nearly half of the total Filipino population, were born abroad.

Fortunately, as with the Hawaiians, we have definitely seen a turn around--at least for the second and third generation. At present, 14.8% of the UH System is now Filipino, closely approximately the Filipino portion of the population. A survey of the 1990 incoming Freshman class found that 60% of the Filipino group reported that their parents' desire that they attend college was "a very important" reason in this decision. This compares to 32.5% of whites, 42.2% of Chinese and 41.2% of Japanese, "even though the latter two ethnic groups are positively stereotyped as placing a very high value on education" (Okamura, 1992). Leonard Andaya, a Spreckelsville plantation-born Professor of History at UHM summarizes matters well:

The present situation of Filipino youth in Hawai'i is far more complex than in my day. The plantation environment has practically disappeared, and there has been a large influx of new migrants from the Philippines since 1965. The Filipino community has become far more diverse. There are second and third generation local Filipinos, along with the large number of newly-arrived Filipino immigrants. They are no longer exclusively Ilocano or Visayan, and with the disappearance of the plantation economy, many of the Filipinos now occupy the gamut of occupations from manual labor to higher education.

The Chinese and Portuguese

Since my aim is to sketch developments since 1982, I can be brief with both the Chinese and the Portuguese in Hawai'i. Because the Chinese and Portuguese populations came earliest and were smaller, it is fair to say, I think, that as regards both populations little has changed in the past decade and half. As Tin-Yuke Char and Wai Jan Char, and Genevieve Correa and Edgar Knowlton rightly point out, both groups made enormous contributions and both, for what are very different reasons, have been more or less successfully assimilated into local culture. As regards the Chinese in Hawai'i, one change of some potential significance is the increase in Chinese immigration. This could increase even more after 1997 with the incorporation of Hong Kong into China. Of the total Chinese population in Hawai'i in 1990, 89.5% were residents in 1985 or earlier; but 29% had been born overseas.

Fuchs summarized the early Chinese experience in Hawai'i: "The most common response to plantation life was neither protest nor riot; it was to leave the plantation just as quickly as possible" (Fuchs, 1961: 90). In 1882, the Chinese were 50% of plantation workers, 10% in 1902. They rapidly became the most urban group, creating markets where none had existed. They brought from Hong Kong cuttlefish, dried fish, oranges and nuts, they dominated restaurants, peddled produce, started noodle shops, introduced a host of culinary items and engaged in manufacturing. By 1939 fifty-six of the 275 small manufacturers in Hawai'i were Chinese (Fuchs: 101). Second-

and third-generation Chinese were a small but significant part of the Democratic Revolution of 1954.

By contrast, the Portuguese--the only group of Caucasians who were not *haole*--were committed to the plantation, "encouraged to believe that their role as *lunas* over the Orientals was permanent" (Fuchs, 59). It is plausible to argue that this became "an ethnic mobility trap." Geschwender and his colleagues argued:

Portuguese were encouraged to emulate *Haoles* by planters who provided access to craft and luna occupations and paid them more than Asian workers doing similar work. This apparent favoritism carried over to those Portuguese who left the plantations. Portuguese-Americans selected a strategy for advancement shaped by advantages believed to come from *Haole* favoritism...Initially, it appeared to pay off in collective advancement, but its continued success depended on the continuation of a plantation society dominated by *Haoles* (1988: 525).

Of course, this did not happen. In consequence, rural Portuguese, less educated, were faced with lower-status jobs. Geschwender and his colleagues mount considerable evidence in favor of this explanation. They conclude that "the current disadvantage of Portuguese-Americans relative to Hawaii-born *Haoles* is more a legacy of past circumstances and prior community decisions than it is a consequence of present discrimination" (1988: 521).

This is, of course, an issue of considerable general interest and could be raised with respect to any minority group which demonstrably is at a relative disadvantage. It is, for example, used by current critics of affirmative action. Unfortunately, the Portuguese in Hawai'i are hardly a good case for generalization. First, it is no longer clear that the Portuguese of Hawai'i are not *haoles* (Hormann, p. 30). Their odd status is a historical anomaly whatever the best explanation.¹⁰ As conditions have changed, especially in the past two decades, the "Portugee" has also assimilated. This takes us back to race, of course. Since even if the Portuguese in Hawai'i are not *haole*, they are still caucasian. African-Americans, Japanese and Chinese cannot, if they choose, so easily "pass."

African-Americans

The 1990 census showed some 27,000 African-Americans in Hawai'i, what would seem to be a considerable increase over the estimate provided by Randolph Chambliss (p. 95). But he likely did not include military in this estimate. Katherine Takara estimated that if we exclude military and their dependents, there are perhaps 4,000 black Americans in Hawai'i (1992). In 1990 there were, she writes, only 468 African-Americans in the UH system, 148 at Manoa, and many of these were athletes who were not residents.

Chambliss and Takara agree that although Black Americans do experience racism in Hawai'i, the situation is better here than it is at least in many places on the US mainland. As Takara writes, because there is no well-defined African-American community, *kama`aina* African-Americans "most often blended into the local community"--often outmarrying. There are a number of very prominent African-Americans scattered throughout the business community, in education and culture. On the other hand, African-Americans who are not long-time residents, like mainland *Haoles*, do have a difficult time "fitting in." Because there are so very few, *malahini* and non-resident African-Americans tend to maintain closer ties with a fewer selected friends and associates. African-Americans often point to the lack of social support here, which may also help

explain why so few reside in Hawai`i. One black athlete pointed out to me that it was in Hawai`i that he first felt like a minority: He had been reared in South Central Angeles and had gone to nearly all black schools!

One general point of considerable importance is the fact the black/white dichotomy currently characteristic of the mainland US simply does not obtain here in Hawai`i. This has misled a number of otherwise sound mainland accounts of race and ethnicity in Hawai`i.¹¹

Native Americans

A group of people that we would not expect to find any substantial numbers in the Islands are Native Americans. They are not discussed in the present volume but deserve mention. Representing perhaps some 80 different tribes, they number, according to the 1990 census, some 5,099.

Local Native Americans have had their own organizations (such as the American Indian Service Center) and special events (such as powpows organized for special occasions). Most current Native American residents came to the Islands with the armed forces during and after World War II. The most prominent of these were Navajo and other Indian code talkers using their native language as secret codes. Some never returned to the mainland, but intermingled with *kama`aina*, and married locally. Native Americans have little difficulty "fitting in." They have reported less discrimination in Hawai`i than on the mainland. Not incidentally, it is certain that the first Native Americans arrived in the Islands with the return of Hawaiian sailors, who sailing for the Hudson's Bay Company, had settled among Native Americans on the Northwest Coast in the early 19th century. But as Emanuel Drechsel points out, an ethnography and social history of Native Americans in the Hawaiian Islands remains to be written.

Koreans and Samoans

As with Hawaiians, the figures for Koreans in Hawai`i vary considerably, a consequence of high Korean outmarriage and thus of the ways that people classify themselves and get classified. And as with the Chinese, there is an increasing number of more recent immigrants. The 1990 census shows some 24,454, nearly twice the number shown by the State Health Survey. Similarly, the census reports that of this number, some 14,820 were born abroad. This would confirm the idea that there are two Korean communities in Hawai`i at present--a idea not considered by Sarah Lee Yang in her otherwise sensitive essay. As Wayne Patterson says:

...there are, in a sense, two Korean communities in Hawai`i, the descendents of the first immigrants who came at the turn of the century who are thoroughly acculturated to American society and a new first generation immigrant community. This more recent group possesses many of the same traits of settler mentality as did the first immigrants nearly a century earlier, raising the probability that this latter group will experience many of the same problems and prospects faced by those earlier pioneers of the twentieth century (Patterson, 1992).

Barringer notes that Patterson is only half-right here in that many of the more recent immigrants from Korea are urbanized and well educated.

Fay Alailima's very useful account of the Samoans in Hawai`i calls for little additional comment. Since she wrote, Samoans continue to arrive in Hawai`i. The 1990 census did allow

persons to identify themselves as Samoan. It recorded 15,034 Samoans, 3,088 Tongans and 885 "other Polynesians" (Table 1).

It would seem that most of the same problems confronted by Samoans remain. But we here must recall Soriano's cautions regarding perspective. As Alailima writes: "Like immigrants from other rural, tradition-bound areas, Samoans commonly lack industrial skills and commercial traditions. Capital is difficult to accumulate among a people whose culture encourages large church and kinship contributions" (p. 93). Samoans have had to struggle to adapt and like Hawaiians they have done so--sometimes with exceptional success.

More generally, I would hasten to add that continuing changes in the political economy of Hawai'i will enormously affect the opportunity structure for both the people of Hawai'i and for new immigrants.

The New Immigrants

This is, of course, critical also for the new populations who have arrived in Hawai'i since 1965: Vietnamese, Thais, Laotians, Cambodians, Asian Indians, and Latin Americans. The character of the present and future political economy and the resources that these groups have will determine their relative success in Hawai'i.

Of these, the "Hispanic" community is by far the largest and fastest growing--some 104,540--and perhaps best organized, this despite the fact that "Hispanic" (or "Latin American") assembles a very heterogeneous population which includes Mexicans, Guatemalans, Cubans, Nicaraguans and many others besides. The ethnic breakdown accounting to the 1990 census is surely confusing. The largest group define themselves as "Spanish" but it is doubtful that these all are from Spain. The smallest groups which can be identified are the Cubans, some 40, Domenicans, 280, and Puerto Ricans at 680, the only group discussed in this volume.

The number of Puerto Ricans reported is fascinating, given that Silva and Souza offer an estimate of 5,000 in 1950 (p. 67)! Where have all the Puerto Ricans gone? Perhaps they have become "Spanish" or through outmarriage have become Hawaiian--and there are, of course, other possibilities.

As regards organizations and culture, there are two newspapers, *The Hawai'i Hispanic News* and *Angulos Hispanos*, in Spanish. Both provide business and cultural news of interest to the community. There is as well a very active Hispanic Chamber of Commerce. Indeed, this year [1996] the eighteen month old Hawaii Chamber was rated in the top 3% in the United States, outscoring the fifty Hispanic chambers in California. As one of the six regional winners, it competed for the national title, won by the San Juan, Puerto Rico chapter. There are a host of Hispanic cultural events which are offered all year round and weekly Latin radio and television broadcasts in both Spanish and English. A number of Churches give services in Spanish. Indeed, as a recent editorial in the *Hawai'i Hispanic News* noted: "During the last three years a quiet revolution took place in Hawai'i. It was not a revolution that involved weapons, violence or anti-government marches. This revolution involved ethnic and cultural pride" (1995).

Locals/Non-Locals

I noted that in Hawai'i, the mainland bifurcation of white/black does not obtain. But the category of "local" suggests another, one of considerable potential significance. The problem is, with what does it contrast? We need to acknowledge here that like any social construction, "local" is dynamic and it changes, like other such categories, along with other changes in society.

It is not clear when the concept came into general use. Lind has speculated that it dates from the

Massie trial in 1931. Surely during World War II the presence of military and defense workers, who sometimes exceeded the total resident population, called for its use. You were "local" during this period if you were "born and raised" in Hawai`i. Ikeda (1951) put his hand on another of the crucial moves. Successful trans-ethnic unionization and the breakdown of paternalism on the plantations following World War II involved shifts in race relations, among workers, and between workers and owners. Up to this point, of course, ethnic cleavages could be exploited. With class consciousness, the respective ethnic identities became much less important. "Local" could and did serve as a marker for this new construction. It was likely at this point, also that the capacity to speak "pidgin" became a marker for a "local."¹² Since *haoles* were the owners and managers, "non-local" was beginning to get racialized.

This has remained ambiguous, and, I believe continues to be so. In 1974, Eric Yamamoto suggested three related defining criteria: Locals were those who "belong to Hawai`i-- however defined," who appreciated the "goodness of Hawai`i, the land, people and cultures of the place," and who wished to "regain control of Hawai`i and its future" (1994: 142). This criterion had a definite political meaning and was not racialized. Nor did it assume that "local" represented a "blending, sharing and mixing" of the heretofore distinct cultures (Ogawa, 1981: 246). If anything, it suggested a diversity which was wholly consistent with unity.

Yamamoto was surely reflecting on the changes that had occurred since Statehood--as his evidence documents. Critical among these was, as already noted, the expansion of tourism and even more important, I believe, the invasion of mainland *haoles*. Writing in 1982, Hormann could observe that for many prominent non-*haoles*, at least, a *haole* definitely could not be a local (p. 30).

By the end of the 70s "local" as a political category found expression in *Palaka* Power. Okamura writes: "Palaka power, or what might be termed local advocacy, sought especially to promote and protect the interests and values of local people during the 1978 Constitutional Convention; however, it never developed into an organized social movement" (Okamura, 1994). Why this was the case has not been thoroughly examined, but its failure, like the failed promises of the Revolution of 1954 surely raises hard questions about possibilities for the future.

Things have continued to change. Three developments need to be emphasized. First, there is the acceleration of the numbers of tourists in the Islands. Hormann noted that in 1977, there were perhaps 87,000 tourists present in Hawai`i on any given day. With the total visitor count now six times the total population, that number is safely doubled. Indeed, on any given day on Maui, 41% of the people are tourists! Second, there is the question of Hawaiian sovereignty and how this could refashion local politics. Third is the widely shared perception that "we" have lost control. Perhaps paradoxically, the more recent invasion of Japanese investors in Hawai`i makes it clear also that non-locals need not be *haole*! It is easy to be pessimistic, but there is, I think, ample space for optimism as well. Hawai`i has untapped resources in its people. Whether they are collectively capable of responding to the challenges remains to be seen.

Endnotes

1. Barringer notes that if present tendencies continue (perhaps a big "if"), then it seems likely that Hawaiian, Filipino and *haole* populations will be the largest with the Japanese, formerly the largest, continuing to shrink relatively.
2. The census, of course, assumes the now conventional "one drop of blood" idea as regards blacks. This, of course, dates from slavery where for economic and political reasons, the progeny of slaves and non-slave were considered to be black, and thus slaves. This has not been the case everywhere, for example, in Cuba. Martinez-Alier writes of that country: "Legal color shows that the basic criterion of social classification was social origin and not physical appearance" (p. 137). This had the effect of making physical appearance secondary to class: Status did not depend upon how one looked! See Verena Martinez-Alier, *Marriage, Class and Colour in Nineteenth Century Cuba* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974) and Orlando Patterson, *Slavery and Social Death* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982).
3. See Trask, *From a Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawai'i* (Monroe, Maine: Common Courage, 1993, *He Alo A He Alo (Face to Face): Hawaiian Voices on Sovereignty* (Hawai'i Area Office: American Friends Service Committee, 1993).
It is remarkable that the people of Hawai'i seem not to realize that only in Hawai'i is it the case that the 1934 Restoration Act has not been applied. It orders a free, fair and representative plebiscite, to be followed by the writing of Constitution. The Alaskan indigenous nations sued and in 1994, they received sovereignty by court order. Bob Stauffer has commented: "Hawai'i ... is being treated like a second-class state. That is, the most important native law in the U.S. today is in force and doing good in all the States except ours. Citizens of the Hawaiian nation are simply being grossly abused." The State's process, promised for next year, contravenes the Federal Act insofar as it is connected--if not controlled--the state.
4. Kanahele (p. 13) gives a very conservative estimate of 300,000 Hawaiians. David Stannard (1991) has argued that it may have approached one million. On de-culturation, see Trask (1984/5).
5. The text quoted is conveniently reprinted in Majid Tehranian (ed.), *Restructuring for Ethnic Peace* (Honolulu: Spark Matsunaga Institute for Peace, 1991). This volume contains some much of the debate. I said that the calls for Professor Trask's resignation were quite remarkable because her essay, like Carter's letter, were opinion pieces in *Ka Leo*, the student newspaper. The idea that Professor Trask had somehow overstepped boundaries of both the First Amendment and of Academic Freedom and had somehow created "a hostile environment" for a student was quite stunning.
6. See Reverend Al Miles, "Racism in Hawai'i," *Honolulu Magazine* (July 1995).
7. It goes some way to explain as well the recent attacks on affirmative action and the interpretation placed on the verdict and outcomes in the black and white communities in the O.J. Simpson trial. Affirmative action threatens taken for granted privilege; the jury system worked exactly as it should have--in contrast to the way it usually works with black Americans. The sentiments expressed by many black American were expressed exactly because every black American has immediate experience of racism--often from otherwise "innocent" whites.
8. It is not my aim to reduce class to race. Surely there are many unprivileged whites in the US, although there are fewer here in Hawai'i. Rather, the point is to acknowledge the continuing pertinence of race.
9. But see Cindy Kobayashi's dissertation, "Out of Rebellion: The Politics of Identify and the Japanese in Hawai'i," University of Hawai'i., and the responses to a brief paraphrase of some of her views in the *Hawai'i*

Herald, Vol. 16, no. 11 and the issues following.

10. For criticism of the explanation offered by Geschwender and his colleagues, see Michael G. Weinstein, Peter T. Manicas and Joseph J. Leon, "The Portuguese and Haoles of Hawaii: Comment on Geschwender, Carroll-Sequin, and Brill," *American Sociological Review*, 55: 2 (April, 1990).

11. For example, see Beth Bailey and David Farber, *First Strange Place: Race and Sex in World War II Hawai'i* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1994).

12. Recent important discoveries show that the usual story regarding the nature of pidgin in Hawai'i requires serious revision. It has long been assumed (as by Hormann) that pidgin developed from efforts to communicate in English and that, accordingly, throughout the nineteenth century an English-lexified pidgin was in use. But Roberts has demonstrated that a pidgin based on the Hawaiian language preceded this and was in use throughout the nineteenth century. It was displaced by an Hawaiian-English mixture after the Overthrow and thus after Hawaiian was suppressed by the Territorial Government. See Julian M. Roberts, "Pidgin Hawaiian: A Sociohistorical Study," *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages*, Vol. 10, forthcoming.

References

Alegado, Dean (1991), "The Filipino Community in Hawai'i," reprinted in Manicas, *Social Process: A Reader*. All quotations of essays which are reprinted are from the reprinted essay.

Andaya, Leonard (1994), "From American-Filipino to Filipino American," *Filipine Culture*, UHM Summer Session.

Barringer, Herbert and Nolan Liu (1994), *The Demographic, Social and Economic Status of Native Hawaiians, 1990: A Report prepared for Alu Like, Inc.*, June.

Blaisdell, Kekuni (1989), "Historical and Cultural Aspects of Native Hawaiian Health," reprinted in Manicas, *Social Process: A Reader*.

Drechsel, Emanuel (1991), "The Invalidity of the Concept of 'Race,'" in M. Tehranian (ed.), *Restructuring for Ethnic Peace* (Spark M. Matsunaga Institute for Peace, University of Hawai'i).

Fuchs, Lawrence H. (1961), *Hawai'i Pono: A Social History* (New York: Harcourt Brace and World).

Gans, Herbert (1995), *The War Against the Poor* (New York: Basic Books).

Geschwender, J., Carol Sequin and Brill (1988), "The Portuguese and Haoles of Hawaii: Implications for the Origin of Ethnicity," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 53 (April).

Hawaii Hispanic News, Vol 1, No. 6, 1995.

Ikeda, Kiyoshi (1951), "Unionization and the Plantation," reprinted in Manicas, *Social Process: A Reader*.

Kawahara, Kimie, and Hatanaka, Yuriko (1943), "The Impact of War on an Immigrant Culture," reprinted in Manicas, *Social Process: A Reader*.

Kent, Noel (1989), "Myth of the Golden Men: Ethnic Elites and Dependent Development in the 50th State," in *Ethnicity and Nation-building in the Pacific* (Tokyo: The United Nations University).

Kotani, Roland (1985), *The Japanese in Hawai'i: A Century of Struggle* (Honolulu: The Hawai'i Hochi, Ltd.)

Lind, Andrew W. (1938), *An Island Community, Ecological Succession in Hawai'i* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

Manicas, Peter T. (1994), (ed.) *Social Process in Hawai'i: A Reader* (New York: McGraw-Hill).

Ogawa, Dennis (1981), "Dialogue: What is Local?" in *Humanities News*, Vol 2.

Ogbu, John (1978), *Minority Education and Caste: The American System in Cross-Cultural Perspective* (New York: Academic Press).

Okamura, John (1990), "Ethnicity and Stratification in Hawai'i," in Operation Manong Resource Papers, No. 1 (Operation Manong Program: University of Hawai'i).

Okamura, John (1992), "People of Color Hawai'i's Ethnic Rainbow," paper presented at Hawai'i Sociological Annual Meeting, Honolulu.

Okamura, John (1994), "Why There are no Asian Americans in Hawai'i: The Continuing Significance of Local Identity," *Social Process in Hawai'i*, Vol. 35.

Patterson, Wayne (1992), "Koreans in Hawai'i: An Overview," in *A Festival of Korea: Humanities Guide* (Honolulu).

Stannard, David (1991), *Before the Horror* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press).

Stauffer, Robert (1994), "Real Politics," *Honolulu Weekly*, Oct 19, 1994.

Takara, Kathryn (1992), "African-Americans in Hawai'i," *Ka Leo Hawai'i*, March 11, 1992.

Trask, Haunani-Kay (1984/5), "Hawaiians, American Colonization, and the Quest for Independence," reprinted in Manicas, *Social Process: A Reader*.

Wellman, Carl (1993), *Portraits of White Racism*, 2nd Edition (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press).

Weinstein, Michael, P.T. Manicas and J.L. Leon (1990), "The Portuguese and Haoles of Hawai'i," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 55.

Whittaker, Elvi (1986), *The Mainland Haole* (New York: Columbia University Press).

Yamamoto, Eric (1979), "The Significance of Local," reprinted in Manicas, *Social Process: A Reader*.