

*Response:* JANE C. DESMOND

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

I AM VERY PLEASED to have *Staging Tourism* reviewed and discussed in *Pacific Studies*, and thank the editors and my interlocutors Amy Ku'uleialoha Stillman and Deborah Wong for making this possible. I thank too all those performers, fellow hula students, kumu hulās, archivists, and scholars in Hawai'i who assisted me in my research and who are noted in the book. Without their generous help, and without the talent of the performers, my research, and these discussions, would not have been possible.

I want to add a special thank you to Dr. Stillman who agreed to take on the task of commenting on the book although she notes that writing the commentary was one of her greater challenges recently. I have learned a great

deal about hula from Dr. Stillman in the past as we have exchanged work, visited performances together, and when I had an opportunity to sit in on one of her courses on Hawai'ian music at the UH–Manoa several years ago. To discuss in print the difficult emotional resonances of the book is a generous act, and I thank her for it.

Both respondents clearly articulate the main arguments I attempted in *Staging Tourism* and I will not repeat them here. Rather, I'd like to take up some of the larger issues that emerge from their commentaries regarding the intellectual structure of the book, disciplinary perspectives, and the type of further research I hope this book will stimulate.

I knew that there was a danger in keeping the two halves of the book together. I feared that some readers, especially those outside academia and hence probably unfamiliar with related contemporary scholarship. (or worse, those who never read the book but only heard about it), might assume despite my repeated demonstrations to the contrary, that the book advances the idea that, for tourists, watching hula performances is like looking at animals in a zoo. As a scholar coming from outside Hawai'i, I knew that this danger was magnified due to my positioning given the long history of outsider's primitivizing pronouncements about life in the islands from journalism and travel accounts, as well as anthropologists' long standing interest in the Pacific. Given that history, and its many genuinely problematic instances, I was especially appreciative that so many Native Hawai'ian kumu hulas, as well as local residents involved in the hula scene were willing to help me understand the relationship between hula practice in the islands and the specifics of hula in the tourist industry. In addition, I was greatly helped by advice and critique from academic specialists on the Pacific, due to my work at the East-West Center. Despite this support, I felt at times that a much easier course of action would have been to break the work into two totally separate books, each analyzing one realm of the tourist business.

At several points in the research and writing I was tempted to expand the first half of the book into a comprehensive social and political history of hula in Hawai'i over the last two centuries. Such a book is yet to be written from an academic point of view, yet the importance of the subject demands it. But, time and again I returned to my comparative format placing a case study of "cultural tourism" side-by-side with one on "nature tourism" because only such a comparison would reveal the intertwined roots of such practices.

The profound discomfort that this structure can call forth is, I believe, due to the fact that, as Wong notes, it is still very much in operation. I propose in the book that, based on my archival research, observations, visual and rhetorical analyses, our current structures of visual pleasure and knowledge in the tourist realm are still promoting nineteenth century notions of racial-

ization, now couched in the language of “culture” but still firmly rooted in primitivizing notions of bodily difference. If I am correct, then the tourist industry in Hawai‘i as a whole will continue to serve as a negative influence on Native Hawai‘ian political gains, even while it offers opportunity for employment to many Native Hawai‘ian and local performers in the islands.

As both reviewers note, and Wong articulates in detail, the book is based on an analysis of representational practices (live performance, photographs, newspaper descriptions, postcards, photojournalistic accounts, the visual rhetoric of tourist advertisements, and so on). These are combined with research on Hawai‘ian social history, tourist bureau statistics, economic information, and oral histories to produce an analysis that falls into the categories of several scholarly practices, including American Studies, performance studies, visual studies, and cultural studies. As I note in the introduction, this work takes shape at the intersection of several modes of investigation including the ideological deconstruction of visual images and performances (i.e., how they elicit certain meanings through their visual or kinesthetic structure); ethnography (participant-observation over some period of time or through multiple residencies); and historical analysis (through archival research). As such, it mobilizes the explanatory potential of multidisciplinary work and of course simultaneously falls prey to its shortcomings.

Deborah Wong’s discussion of the book outlines with consummate clarity the situatedness of the work in a variety of scholarly practices and communities. I could not have stated it more clearly myself. She captures what I intended to do in bringing together the research questions and methodologies and writing styles that I have conjoined. But Stillman raises a very important point about disciplinarity that I want to address too. For every book is read not only for what it is or attempts to do, but also for what it does not attempt or might have attempted, and the results are weighed accordingly.

There is a direct link between the questions any scholarly work proposes and the methods it employs to generate answers. Multidisciplinary approaches not only employ different techniques, they do so with different goals in mind. Indeed, certain large issues can only emerge by tracking across disciplinary foci. By the same account, other issues will emerge best from the depths of a disciplinarily-based set of assumptions and methods.

Stillman is right in asserting the lack of disciplinarity in the work. I have purposely chosen a multi-disciplinary focus that draws on dance analysis, performance studies, critical race studies, postcolonial studies, social history, and ultimately on a set of assumptions about representation and ideology derived from Birmingham school-derived cultural studies, feminist theory, and film theory. These tools have enabled me to craft the type of work Wong analyzes with such precision in her review. But they do not, as Stillman says

and I agree, yield other, equally important results. For example, the book does not emphasize close readings of multiple hula performances based on the specifics of choreography and the relation of the vocal and or instrumental sounds to the movement. Stillman's own important work, and that of some other distinguished specialists like anthropologist Adrienne Kaeppler by contrast, sets out in exacting detail the historical development of very specific styles of hula practice. My analyses engage with movement in the broader terms of general historical style, of movement dynamics, of spatial usage, of costuming, of bodily presentation, and so on, as they relate to the larger contours of my argument.

But there is another step too which is crucial to my approach and different from Stillman's. Whereas she suggests that much of the analysis focuses on things peripheral to hula (pictorial representations, articles in travel magazines, and so on), from my point of view these other discourses are crucial to understanding the accretion of meanings that attach to tourists' viewing practices. Euro-American tourists from the continental U.S. bring with them to their encounter with hula a whole matrix of associations about the islands, about Native Hawaiians, and about tropical "pleasures" which are encountered over time in numerous discursive fields including travel brochures, old films, prints on Aloha shirts, post cards sent by friends, fashion accessories for tropical wear, etc. Analyzing such materials will not tell us more about specific hula choreographies, but it will help us grasp the presumptions that tourists bring to their viewing and hence the interpretive frames they employ.

By tracing the accrual and change of nuance over time in how the islands have been represented by non-Native Hawaiians in these multiple realms I wanted to chart in detail exactly how this accretion had developed. As Wong notes, in some ways the "hula girl" figure is too easy a target to deconstruct in the Euro-American discourses of primitivized-femininity that circulate around this fictional ideal. But the challenge for me was not only to track those connotations in motion today, and arrange them in counterpoint to living practices in the islands by hula practitioners, but also to demonstrate specifically how such powerful discourses came to be. I wanted, in a sense, to provide a blow-by-blow account of how the 19th century beliefs were built up through quasi-scientific studies of racialized difference and how they continued to reemerge over a hundred year period with renewed power in each new historical context, despite the supposed debunking of such backward ideas.

I see these different types of scholarly works—those that concentrate specifically on performance practices, and those that place those practices in a context of multiple discourses over time—as complementary scholarly

endeavors, not as two separate approaches competing for legitimacy or cancelling each other out. Rather, each approach asks and answers different questions, and does so with different criteria for what counts as evidence. The complexity of expressive practices like hula, their histories, and their multiple meanings over time and for different practitioners and audiences under different political conditions, demands *both* types of scholarship, disciplinary and multi-disciplinary. Combined with the important and in-depth knowledge of kumu hulas (which has its own histories, goals, uses within the community of practitioners, and standards of evidence), both scholarly approaches can serve as a resource for understanding this important cultural practice.

Finally, I would like to turn to the issue of the types of further research I hope my book will stimulate. Both Wong and Stillman emphasize what was one of the main goals of my work: to help us think about how things might be different. I have tried to trace historically the deep imbrication between notions of culturalism/naturalism/racism, and the commodification of physical presence through tourist performances. I have argued that the widespread naturalization of these structures of generating meaning permeates tourist industries. If I am right, this is a formidable foe for all scholars, activists, kumu hulas, and practitioners who would work toward a more just future. My goal has been to make the power of this foe, its historical roots, and its insidious ideology visible. I hope this analysis will not only contribute to further scholarly understanding, but will also prove useful for those who endeavor to change the structure of tourism.

In the book I introduce some possibilities, both in terms of extant shows (like the Cazimero Brothers) and in terms of imagined futures. I hope further research will do two things. First, I hope it will help stimulate extensive ethnographic research among tourists (and different demographics of tourists), particularly in terms of the power of performances to shape their experiences. Scholars produce a miniscule amount of such research compared to the information gathered by tourist bureaus, corporations, and so on, and that commercially-based information is not the same as what we need. Although I attended many, many performances for tourists over a three year period of conducting this research, I analyzed those situations with relatively little formal interviewing or surveying of the audience. I analyzed instead the structures of the performances in concert with my observations of audience responses, and tied this into data from tourist bureaus and corporations. As Wong accurately notes, the actual voices of the tourists themselves are rarely heard in my book with its emphasis on “staging” rather than reception.

This future research must also be broken down carefully in terms of audience demographics. In terms of cultural performances in Hawai‘i, I have

focused on the Euro-American from the so called "mainland" who makes up the majority of the Waikiki visitor population. But the second largest group, Japanese travelers, also deserves separate research, as do minority travelers from the U.S. The ideological underpinnings of any cultural product can shape, but do not ultimately determine, the meanings audiences make of it. Specific reception practices must be analyzed too.

Finally, I hope scholarly work on tourism will provide a useful wedge for use by those who would restructure the public consumption of "heritage." As one of the leading industries on the globe, tourism circulates billions of dollars a year. Rearticulating the meanings of heritage within this juggernaut of commodification is an awesome task. But the increasing political power, in the Pacific at least, of indigenous residents, acknowledged as the culture bearers of that which the industries most want to "sell," can give us some hope that in the long run change is possible. Aggressive campaigns for more politically responsible representations of indigenous cultural practices can use tourism scholarship, when they choose to do so, to help make their case for more local control. It also sets the framework for NGO intervention bringing indigenous activists, indigenous cultural experts, foundations, and scholars together to imagine, and fund, innovative versions of tourism that emphasize rather than mask the imperial histories that so often set the stage for tourism in the first place. I hope *Staging Tourism* will help stimulate further work, debate, and discussion that takes on these challenges.