2019

Tourism and Justice on Catalina Island: Burdens, Power, and Decision-making

Katherine Canfield
University of Rhode Island, kcanfield@uri.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/oa_diss

Recommended Citation

Canfield, Katherine, "Tourism and Justice on Catalina Island: Burdens, Power, and Decision-making" (2019). *Open Access Dissertations*. Paper 851.
https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/oa_diss/851

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Open Access Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons-group@uri.edu.

TOURISM AND JUSTICE ON CATALINA ISLAND:

PERCEPTIONS OF BURDENS, POWER, AND

DECISION-MAKING

BY

KATHERINE CANFIELD

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE

REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

IN

MARINE AFFAIRS

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND

2019

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY DISSERTATION
OF
KATHERINE CANFIELD

APPROVED:

Dissertation Committee:

Major Professor Jessica Frazier

Amelia Moore

Hilda Lloréns

Nasser H. Zawia
DEAN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND
2019

ABSTRACT

The uneven distribution of the benefits and burdens of tourism development is creating an experience of social injustice for residents today on tourism-dependent Catalina Island, off the coast of California. While there is a great breadth of work covering archaeology and ecology of the island, there is minimal research related to recent human experience on the island (Higgins & Mehta, 2018; Hofmeister & Voss, 2017; Teeter et al., 2013). The island has been developed as a privately owned and managed tourism resort since 1880, and this private status has allowed for fluctuating involvement of island residents in decision-making and prolonged intersectional injustice against communities of color. Environmental justice scholars describe differential access to resources and decision-making processes as forms of participative (in)justice (Whyte, 2010). On the island, participative injustice stems from the lack of opportunity and ability for residents to take part in the process of local tourism development. Tourism managers' prioritization of meeting upper-class White tourists' vacation expectations creates perceptions among locals that tourism development's impact on their needs and views is an afterthought on Catalina Island.

This research employs a qualitative, mixed methods approach to explore how tourism development on the island has created perceptions and experiences of unjust tourism. Through a combination of online surveys, semi-structured interviews, participant observation, and document analysis, this project reveals the centrality of memory-making to the development of Catalina Island as a tourism destination. It also shows how dominant narratives and counternarratives continue to affect residents' lives today. This research integrates an intersectional analysis of identity with

conceptual frameworks of just tourism in analyzing the transformations of justice and power in tourism on Catalina (Biddulph & Scheyvens, 2018; Crenshaw, 1989; Delgado & Stefancic, 1998; Finney, 2014; Jamal & Camargo, 2014).

Through the case study of Catalina Island, this dissertation provides a novel analysis of the justice of tourism development in the Global North. While there have been significant evaluations of issues of justice in Global South tourism destinations, this study provides an important in-depth case to explore how issues of tourism injustice manifest in the Global North. The prevalence of concerns related to legacies of colonialism, property relations, resource distribution, and marginalization of intersectional identities in both Global North and South tourism destinations reveals the applicability and relevance of Global South frameworks to the Catalina Island case (McCarthy, 2002). As such concerns are particularly present on Catalina Island, this case is especially valuable in progressing just tourism and related research in advanced capitalist societies. It finds that residents' access to influence and resources is extremely temporal, and largely dependent on the individuals guiding tourism management at the time. Additionally, it reveals evolving identities of isolation for residents and the island itself that have transformed over the past one hundred forty years in building the island's reputation as an escape. By centering residents' perspectives and recommendations, this dissertation aims to define just tourism for Catalina Island on the terms of the residents and reframe the island's tourism history to include the heterogeneous experiences of living and working in a manufactured paradise.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to acknowledge all of the people who have supported me throughout my graduate school experience here at the University of Rhode Island. Specifically, I want to say thank you to Dr. Jessica Frazier, my advisor, for her continual mentorship and support of my evolving dissertation research. She has funded me through my final year here, has allowed me to independently explore and research through this process, and has let me learn through my own mistakes. I also would like to acknowledge Drs. Sunshine Menezes and Amelia Moore for their support, advice, and mentorship throughout my time here. Melvin Alvarez and Dr. Peter Stempel also deserve acknowledgement for their moral support and scholarly input as I continually reimagined this project. I want to thank Ms. Cindi Alvitre for her time and support in making sure this project appropriately and accurately represents the first residents of Catalina. An additional great thanks goes out to all the people who officially and unofficially supported this research through participation in surveys, interviews, and casual conversations about living on Catalina Island.

Additionally, I would not have been able to complete all of my research nor attended the numerous conferences I traveled to without the support of a number of scholarships and grants. I want to thank the Phi Kappa Phi Honor Society for my scholarship in support of my fieldwork. Thank you to Tourism Cares for awarding me a scholarship that reduced the burden of my student fees. Thank you to the URI Center for Humanities for funding my research trip to the Loyola Marymount Gabrieliño Collection, Avalon Public Library, and Catalina Island Museum. I also want to acknowledge the Loyola Marymount Gabrieliño Collection for the resources which

are housed there. Thank you for being a repository on the history and continued experiences of the “first Angelinos” (McCawley, 1996). Also, thank you to Dr. Frazier, the URI Graduate Assistants United, the Rhode Island Sea Grant, and the CELS Travel Fund for supporting my trips to conferences. And thanks to Ben Morris for ensuring I submit all the appropriate paperwork to make it to and from those conferences.

Finally, I want to say thank you and acknowledge by nonacademic support team of my family and friends. Thank you to all of my family for believing in me, encouraging me, and helping me see the light at the end of the tunnel. Thank you especially to my mother, Rosemary, for your empathy, phone calls, and sweet notes; you really know how to keep me motivated. Also, I want to thank my grandparents, Pat and Bob Wrenn, for sending me news clippings about Catalina Island, giving me a sense of home on the bookends of research trips, and always making me smile. Thank you to Chase Puentes for housing me on Catalina Island, and visiting me here in Rhode Island. You made my summers of fieldwork so enjoyable, and I am always grateful to all you have done for me. Last and certainly not least, thank you to Nick for your continual pep talks and reassurance that I had the ability to make it through. I know I would not have made it to the end of this without you, and I am eternally grateful for the love, support, and confidence you have given me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	viii
CHAPTER 1: Introduction	1
CHAPTER 2: The Place and Players of Building a Destination on Catalina Island	31
CHAPTER 3: Manufacturing Paradise: Othering an Island and its Residents ..	69
CHAPTER 4: Legitimacy in the Twenty-first Century: Reminiscing on a Past Paradise.....	115
CHAPTER 5: Evaluating Frameworks for an Inclusive Paradise: Grassroots Recommendations and Conceptual Implications from Catalina Island	140
CHAPTER 6: Conclusion.....	163
APPENDICES	168
Appendix 1: Interview Questions	168
Appendix 2: Survey Instrument Questions	170
BIBLIOGRAPHY	172

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
Table 1. Participants' self-identified race.	21

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE	PAGE
Figure 1. Map of Santa Catalina Island.....	4
Figure 2. Advertisement for Catalina Island from the 1930s from the “Destination Paradise” exhibit	6
Figure 3. Distribution of employment sectors for participants that volunteered such information.....	22
Figure 4. Map of California missions with San Gabriel and San Fernando circled and Catalina Island identified.	33
Figure 5. Advertisement to tourists from The Catalina Islander, January 1934	39
Figure 6. Public tile artwork of a Mariachi band performing for passersby created by RTK Studios.....	59
Figure 7. Banner at the entrance to public restrooms and showers in Two Harbors posted by the water company, demonstrating the intensity of efforts focused at reducing visitor water use	100

CHAPTER 1: Introduction

Description of the problem

The uneven distribution of the benefits and burdens of tourism development is creating an experience of social injustice for some residents on tourism-dependent islands globally. Differential access to resources and decision-making processes is seen particularly in the form of participative (in)justice¹, stemming from the lack of opportunity and ability for residents to take part in the process for local tourism development. Tourism managers' prioritization of meeting tourists' vacation expectations makes locals feel tourism development's impact on their resource needs and tourism views is an afterthought on Catalina Island, California. Further injustices have been perpetuated against residents and employees of color through cultural commodification, exploitation, and exclusion. The goal of this project is to understand the causes of, experiences with, and perceptions of these injustices of tourism development on an island off the coast of Southern California.

Analyzing residents' perceptions of power relations and processes will contribute to understanding justice of the lived experience of locals that may not hold the power in policy and development decisions. The term "resident" is used to encompass individuals who have lived their entire lives on the island, have moved to the island later in life, or are seasonal residents or employees, and as a way to navigate the contested status of "islander," "local," and "seasonal resident." This distinction allowed for the inclusion of seasonal employees and residents. The major

¹ Participative justice aims to ensure that "all agents who may benefit or be harmed by the outcomes of institutional proceedings and social transactions have the opportunity to veto or formally accept the risks" (Whyte, 2010).

contributions to justice of tourism scholarship will be understanding residents' views of just tourism development in the Global North, especially when faced with monopolized management of resources and property. The prevalence of concerns related to legacies of colonialism, property relations, resource distribution, and marginalization of intersectional identities in both Global North and South tourism destinations reveals the applicability and relevance of Global South frameworks to the Catalina Island case (McCarthy, 2002). As such concerns are particularly present on Catalina Island, this case is especially valuable in calling for more just tourism and related research in advanced capitalist societies. Additionally, it contributes a novel integration of historical and ethnographic methods to document how injustice has transformed over time on Catalina. This research also contributes to island studies literature with the application of a justice lens to concepts of islandness and the local in relation to tourism. This dissertation focuses on how perceived tourism priorities, the opportunity to participate, and tourism impacts on Catalina Island, California from 1900 to 2018 influence perceptions of justice and fairness of tourism decision-making.

Catalina Island, California

Santa Catalina Island, often referred to as Catalina Island or simply Catalina, is a tourism-dependent, water-bound society 22 miles off the coast of Southern California. It is one of the eight California Channel Islands. With an area of 75 square miles (194 km²), 90% of the island's 3,728 residents live in the 2.9 square miles (7.6 km²) that make up the only incorporated town on the island, Avalon (U.S. Census Bureau, 2017). The town of Avalon is in the 80th to 90th percentile in the country for

minority and linguistically isolated populations² (U.S. EPA, 2018). At least 69% of the population is “Hispanic or Latino (any race),” with the majority of the remaining population being of the “White” racial group, though it is difficult to fully assess the islands racial demographics due to the large undocumented population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2017; Dillow, 1996). The median household income is about \$63,000, slightly above the federal median income. Overall, 12.7% of families in Avalon live below the federal poverty line compared to the 12.3% of the national population living in poverty. Looking specifically at families with children under 18 in the household living in poverty, the 21.5% of these families live in poverty in Avalon is well above the federal average of 17.6% (U.S. Census Bureau, 2017). The remaining 10% of island residents live scattered throughout the island, with many residing in Two Harbors, the only other population center (See Figure 1).

The island has been continuously developed as a tourist destination since the 1880s, and now boasts over one million visitors annually (D. Young, 2018b). It was owned by the Banning brothers from 1892 to 1918 and has been owned by the Wrigley family since 1918 (Culver, 2010: 92). From 1863 to 1928, the island also had an industry of soapstone mining (Schumacher, 1878; Perez, 2013). The island has since relied most heavily on tourism, advertising the destination as a pleasure resort and paradise within reach for those living in bustling California cities (Figure 2). With his chewing gum and baseball endeavors bringing him great profit, the first Wrigley promoted tourism without the same focus on profit as there is today. During the 1920s,

² There is a large population of migrants directly from México that do not speak English. The “minority” population is largely Latinx and Hispanic, with very small populations of indigenous, Asian, and African descent.

the island continually operated at a loss for William Wrigley, Jr. (Windle, 1935). Tourism is essential to maintaining the island economy and population today. In the 2016-2017 fiscal year, the \$11.4 million in visitor-generated revenue comprised 42.5% of the total City of Avalon income (OpenGov, 2017; D. Young, 2017). This tourism revenue is up nearly 100% over the past seven years and shows the success of tourism development since the mid-twentieth century when the island regularly operated at a loss (City of Avalon, 2017; The Catalina Islander, 1934).

Figure 1. Map of Santa Catalina Island. The area outlined in green is the community of Two Harbors. The area outlined in blue is the town of Avalon (Catalina Island Conservancy, 2017a).

Residents disagree with the way tourism development decisions have been made in recent years, but agree that tourism is “everything,” “the lifeblood,” and “integral” to maintaining a year-round population on the island. Two Harbors displays this well, as the town has been operated as a private tourism resort under various managers since 1900 (Catalina Island Company, 2017). Without tourism, the

population would shrink immensely; most residents rely on tourism sector jobs for income. Of the few people not employed in tourism that participated in this study, nearly all agreed that they are still indirectly impacted by tourism.

The Catalina Island Company (CIC), commonly called the Island Company by residents, owns virtually all the developable land on the island. About 1% of the island is owned by the city of Avalon and private individuals, 88% of the land is protected by a nonprofit land conservancy, and the remaining 11% belongs to the CIC (Collins, 2014). This property monopoly means island development goes in the direction the CIC desires, without the requirement to consider resident recommendations. The land monopoly of the CIC is further complicated by the fact that the family that owns the CIC is also the family that created the Catalina Island Conservancy. With members of the extended family occupying about a quarter of the conservancy's board and the CIC owner serving as the conservancy's benefactor board member, residents see this single family, the Wrigleys, as effectively having property ownership of 99% of the island. Residents explained that since 1999, when the most recent owners of the company took over, less consideration has been given to residents' well-being in order to increase visitor revenue. The recent initiative includes privatizing more beaches, remodeling or closing local businesses, and increasing cruise ship dockings (Collins, 2014; Kelley, 2014; D. Young, 2017). Such recent experiences and shared anecdotes of perceived injustice provided the initial impetus to conduct this study.

Figure 2. Advertisement for Catalina Island from the 1930s from the “Destination Paradise” exhibit. The artist is unknown (Catalina Island Museum, 2017).

Research questions

This project seeks to answer three research questions:

- Who do residents perceive as having the power³ to influence tourism decision-making on Catalina Island and why?
- What are residents’ perceptions of the actual distribution of the benefits and burdens of tourism development on Catalina Island from 1900 to today, and why?
- If residents identify social injustices, how do residents think the social injustices on Catalina Island should be rectified today?

Research objectives

With these questions, I aim to: (1) identify groups and/or individuals who believe they are/have been left out of the decision-making process and analyze why they are excluded, (2) determine residents’ perceptions of how to correct any locally perceived injustices in tourism development, and (3) understand residents’ perceptions

³ Power in this study is understood as one’s ability to claim influence over or in collaboration with others, with an understanding that rather than power being possessed, who holds it can be constantly changing (Beritelli & Laesser, 2011; Bowen, Zubair, & Altinay, 2017). Additionally, I also work with the understanding that, “power and structure are mutually dependent” and dynamic, such that power (re)distributes and reconstructs a landscape and how people interact with it (Gilmore, 2002).

of the fairness of tourism development on Catalina Island, CA since the first efforts at tourism in the late 1800s.

Literature Review

Justice and Tourism

Sun, sand, sea, and sex are the four “S”s of beach tourism; an “F” for fairness is noticeably absent in this list (Smith, 1977). Fairness, as understood in social justice research and in this dissertation, is an equitable balance of benefits and burdens. While the four “S”s may be central considerations in attracting tourists to visit a destination, the “F” for fairness ought to be added to call for the intentional consideration of the impact of tourism on the residents and environment of a destination. Getting to a point where fairness is synonymous with beach tourism, and tourism globally, requires community-centric work that is driven by identifying and addressing the needs of destination residents (Scheyvens & Biddulph, 2017). In support of such a view, Higgins-Desbiolles wrote in a recent self-reflexive piece on academic activism in tourism that, “in [her] opinion, community rights and needs should override all others because it is they that must live with the impacts of tourism on their community. Tourists have a home to go to and their right to tour is a frivolous luxury in comparison to the local community’s right to survive and secure sustainable livelihoods” (Hales et al., 2017). Rather than this being a call to stop all tourism development, I interpret this as a call for inclusive tourism development and research that ensures residents’ needs and sustainability of their livelihoods rather than prioritizing the luxurious travel of tourists.

Having a community-centered focus in tourism research means paying attention to those whose voices have often gone unheard. Early conversations focused on the “hosts” of tourist destinations looked at residents’ attitudes towards tourism and tourists (Ap, 1992; Doxey, 1975), rarely considering the influence residents should have in how their community is developed as a destination (Cooke, 1982 is a notable exception). While critical tourism research has made an important shift toward understanding how residents are affected by tourism, much of the existing literature pays sole attention to key-informants who are identified as those with power (Barrutia & Echebarria, 2015; Benedetto, Carboni, & Corinto, 2016; Beritelli & Laesser, 2011; Bowen et al., 2017; Bramwell & Meyer, 2007; Cooper, Scott, & Baggio, 2009). This continued focus on the managers and authorities has made necessary another vein of work focused more intentionally around analyzing tourism impacts and rights to influence tourism from the perspective of residents. A shift from early work looking at resident perspectives as a limit to the economic opportunities of tourism for developers, recent community-centered work has brought ideas and analysis to how residents can be empowered by tourism, studying tourism with an environmental justice and equity lens. Scholars in this field point to justice-focused tourism as more responsible and conscientious for the long-term well-being of the destination’s economy, residents, and environment (Camargo, Lane, & Jamal, 2007; Higgins-Desbiolles, 2008; Hughes & Scheyvens, 2018; Jamal & Camargo, 2014, 2017; Whyte, 2010).

This growing field has introduced the terms of inclusive, justice, and just tourism to discuss the more responsible, engaged methods of developing tourism that

intentionally and directly account for the impacts on and benefits to residents (Biddulph & Scheyvens, 2018; Higgins-Desbiolles, 2008; Jamal & Camargo, 2014). Two frameworks based on this idea of just tourism that will be referenced throughout the dissertation are the Just Destination and “inclusive tourism” frameworks. The Just Destination conceptual framework focuses on assessing ecocultural discrimination, ecocultural equity, ecocultural injustice, and ecocultural racism. These terms are the four key issue areas identified by Jamal and Camargo, and they use “ecocultural” to emphasize the human-environmental relationships involved in building a tourism destination that is inclusive of marginalized groups. The Just Destination is “a destination whose tourism planning, policy-making and practices enable the fair treatment of its environmental and social-cultural resources (tangible and intangible), and facilitate the well-being of place, people and pasts” (p.12, 2014). This emphasizes giving influence not just to destination marketers and traditionally understood stakeholders, but also recognizing the varied local population that deserves to be considered in equitable development. Through the case of Quintana Roo, México, Jamal and Camargo highlight the applicability of this framework to post- and neocolonial Global South destinations. The tenets of the Just Destination work to help residents in such destinations reclaim their rights to self-determination in the extant capitalist economy while also navigating the other legacies of colonialism (2014).

As Jamal and Camargo model, most research on justice in tourism has been conducted in communities of the so-called Global South. Global South is a term developed in the 1980s in reference to countries south of the Brandt line. This line created a “North-South divide,” where “richer” countries were located above the line

in the so-called Global North, and “poorer” countries were in the so-called Global South (Horner & Hulme, 2017). It is important to recognize that this categorization of countries is predicated on capitalist and colonial understandings of wealth and development. The North-South divide is itself the result of the historic extractive colonialism that largely took place in nations south of this Brandt line, with settler colonialism happening throughout much of the “Global North,” which also includes Australia and New Zealand.

Thus, just tourism research has largely focused on places that are wrestling with legacies of colonialism and are seen as “less developed” from a Global North perspective. With such a dichotomous categorization of the Global North as “richer” and the Global South as “poorer,” there is an uninformed expectation that the Global South is a homogenous place of injustice and poverty. This expectation and the relative visibility of injustices in the Global South compared to the North are both the result of legacies of colonial and imperial practices, and lead to Global North scholars studying justice of tourism development in such places as well.

While not as immediately evident, the legacies of colonialism are also present in the Global North, and Catalina Island is an excellent example. In the Global North, the injustices of neocolonialism often are masked by the greater apparent “development” that appears alongside them (McCarthy, 2002; Schroeder et al., 2006). These spaces are neocolonial in the quite vertical hierarchy of power and property ownership that settler colonialism and capitalism promote and perpetuate (McCarthy, 2002). Injustices in Global North spaces are not masked for people experiencing the injustices, but rather for people of more privileged backgrounds.

It is also important to explicitly critique the accuracy of these apparently dichotomous terms created in the 1980s that I am electing to use. Environmental justice scholars Newell and Pellow write about how injustices can occur in places that may appear immune to injustice as the “South of the North,” where disenfranchised communities in “more developed” places experience environmental injustice similar to that perpetuated in the Global South (Newell, 2005; Pellow, 2007). These scholars use this idea to complicate the idea of a simple dichotomy between Global North and South, arguing that there is an intersectionality present in these communities that creates a greater burden on some in the Global North than the experience of those that are of “the North of the South.” Political ecologists have also noted that the concerns studied in the Global South, such as property ownership, recognition of experiential knowledge, gendered power dynamics, cultural politics, and understandings of “space,” all are relevant and in need of being researched in Global North places (McCarthy, 2002; Robbins, 2002; Schroeder et al., 2006). I align with these scholars, arguing that the simplified geographical and categorical dichotomy of the Global North and South ignores the very layered experiences and burdens of injustice. In this dissertation, I build out stories of injustice against people with intersectional identities that are living in the figurative South of the North, writing of experiences that are at times subtler than those discussed by Pellow in his use of this terminology. This particularly arises in the dissertation through the examination of how intersectionality⁴ can create experiences for specific communities that are more typical of the “South” in spaces that are more holistically and geographically seen as part of the “North.”

⁴ Intersectionality refers to the fact that social identities are not experienced in isolation of one another, but rather concurrently (Crenshaw, 1989).

In an initial attempt to study and advocate for justice of tourism development in both the South of the North and the Global North, some have argued for an “inclusive tourism” framework that can conceptualize experiences in the Global North and South (Scheyvens & Biddulph, 2017). The goal of these researchers is to achieve transformative tourism that is procedurally just, to recognize the residents of tourism destinations as potential tourists, and to center tourism development on the empowerment of marginalized peoples as consumers and producers of tourism. The inclusive tourism framework does not explicitly include environmental aspects of tourism development in its conceptual categories of how to achieve an inclusive destination. Together, the considerations of the Just Destination and an inclusive tourism approach address many of the initial concerns identified on Catalina, and thus are used as the conceptual ideals in assessing the justice of tourism development on Catalina Island throughout this dissertation. While these concepts are not perfect in their ability to diagnose and correct injustice, they are both valuable in assessing areas of injustice in current and historic practice among tourism developers on the island.

Central to these existing just tourism frameworks is a call for greater procedural justice in tourism development (Jamal & Camargo, 2014; Scheyvens & Biddulph, 2017; Whyte, 2010). As the definitions of procedural and participative justice are operationally identical, and this dissertation largely addresses issues of participation and inclusion rather than legal or business procedural requirements, the term participative justice will be used throughout to describe issues of participation and access in the tourism decision-making process. The goal of participative justice demands a multidimensional understanding of what justice is and who is involved.

Justice in this dissertation will be understood as occurring from a process that equitably addresses power dynamics, when all those who will be impacted by a decision experience fair recognition and participation in the process of the decision, and this results in an experience of fair outcomes (Camargo et al., 2007; Schlosberg, 2004). Such a definition of justice requires evaluating the economic, cultural, and political structures that prohibit participation in a process, or over-determine the way participation occurs such that it perpetuates marginalization. It requires contending with at what scale(s) justice is the goal and at what scale(s) the injustice in question is occurring. Further, it demands understanding who is impacted by the injustice, and what institutional structures are affecting when, how, and if participants' voices are being heard (Fraser, 2005, 2010; Yaka, 2018). On the ground, working for participative justice in both environmental justice and tourism justice looks at increasing the accessibility of decision-making for local residents, which requires understanding and often adjusting the existing sources of power in a place to be more inclusive of residents on their terms.

Intersectionality and the Public Memory

In 1989, Kimberlé Crenshaw coined the term “intersectionality” to describe and push for analyses that looked at how race, class, gender and other social and demographic identities operate simultaneously. This dissertation analyzes sources with an emphasis on the way these interlocked identities shape the lived experiences and perceptions of “justice” for individuals on Catalina Island. Intersectionality addresses how the burdens and privileges of one social identity are balanced (or reinforced) by the differing burdens and privileges of another social identity (Crenshaw, 1989). Of

particular relevance in this dissertation are be the intersectional identities of race, socioeconomic status, and citizenship status. Analyzing and centering the experiences of people whose intersectional identities are most marginalized demonstrates how the island exhibits characteristics of the “South of the North,” and provides for a more nuanced understanding of what shapes perceptions of justice on Catalina Island.

In building a complex understanding of how these identities interact, are experienced, and the heterogeneity that exists within each form of identity, critical race theory provides useful theoretical considerations. Critical race theory (CRT) has developed in the United States legal sphere since the 1970s to explore and explain the fluid understandings of race as used among dominant groups to their own advantage. As this is specific to the United States, the dominant group, or “ingroup,” is the White racial group. CRT demonstrates how fluid construction of race through societal categorization of skin color and repeated systemic acts of oppression privileges people with particular skin colors to determine who constitutes the ingroup and the outgroup at any given moment. This evolving definition of race-based oppression ensures the distribution of power and privilege remains in the favor of those in the dominant group. In this case, that means centering whiteness (Delgado & Stefancic, 1998).

In the case of Catalina Island, the tourism manager-promoted public memory both formally and informally identifies people of Latinx, indigenous, and African descent as people of color regardless of whether they would self-identify as such. This framing aligns with dominant ways of categorizing race and ethnicity over the course of the twentieth century and into the twenty-first in the United States. The use of racial categories and analysis of race-based marginalization in this dissertation serves to

bring to light this historic and continuing racist and intersectional discrimination rather than to reinforce these categories of identity constructed to reinforce settler colonist white supremacy. The U.S. Census categorization that specifies “Hispanic or Latino (any race)” as a form of identity is an example of the settler colonial issues of racial identity categorization in the United States (2017). First off, the masculine status of the term “Latino” makes this term exclusive of female or non-binary gender identities, hence my use of the term Latinx to be inclusive of all gender identities (Blackwell, Boj Lopez, & Urrieta, 2017). The general “Hispanic or Latino” category refers to anyone descended from people born in Latin America, including people of indigenous descent, but the term Hispanic directly addresses the colonial history of Spanish explorers claiming indigenous lands and colonizing indigenous peoples of Latin America (U.S. Census, 2017). That census participants are then expected to select their race(s) within their identity of Hispanic or Latino reifies that the category refers to the potential of colonialism to affect the racial composition of a space, and the fluidity of what makes up a race. Finally, the categorization of “Hispanic or Latino” people as people of color is a prime example of the spatial-temporal fluidity, and colonial history, of racial construction. While many people of Hispanic ethnicity are seen as people of color in the United States, as is the case on Catalina, in Latin America, people with lighter skin who are descendants of Spanish colonizers are seen as White (Tuck & Yang, 2012). Acknowledging the conflation at times of race and ethnicity, my use of the terms of Hispanic, Latinx, and Mexican(-American) is to refer to the way these terms have been used on the island, both by White residents and residents who have self-identified as one of the above ethnic identities.

While the idea of race is constructed, it does have material implications. These implications include people of the current (White) ingroup having access to power and the privilege to ignore the oppressions of race. Such preference for the White body on the island reveals how Catalina Island is not immune to the lasting white supremacy of the United States as a lasting settler space. The social and legal construction of race is discussed here in the ways Catalina Island tourism developers and the community have relied on framing and remembering people of color in ways that best served the White community to maintain the destination as the “white-man’s playground” (Overholt, 1926: 1). Bringing this construction of race in conversation with the intersectional relevance of class and citizenship status, the analysis explores how still today these overlapping burdens further distance residents of color from membership in the ingroup (Crenshaw, 1989; Delgado & Stefancic, 1998; Hylton, 2005; Ladson-Billings, 1998). In this project, application of CRT with an intersectional lens allows me to center the experience of populations that have been continually marginalized, and the public memory and structures that have allowed for such oppression.

The production of public memory on Catalina mirrors that of early New England; thus, the work of historian Jean O’Brien who has analyzed the processes of “firsting,” “replacing,” “lasting,” and “resisting,” is useful to this dissertation (2010). While largely defined in relation to “American Indians,” these terms also are applicable in discussing the stories of Mexican-American and African-American people on the island. Thus, O’Brien’s work is particularly useful as Native, African-American, and Mexican(-American) people have the racial identities that are most marginalized on the island. Firsting refers to the narrative produced by White

Americans that they are the first in producing institutions worthy of the modern social order. Through firsting, “[l]ocal histories claim Indian places as their own by constructing origin stories that cast Indians as prefatory to what they assert as their own authentic histories and institutions.” Replacing refers to how historical monument erection, claims of land rights, and interests in amateur archaeology seek to build the case that White settler colonists (now Americans) replaced the Indians in the physical landscape. This strategy is particularly relevant in telling the story of tourism, as “[h]istorical narratives and relic collecting place Indians in the past, and selective retention of Indian place-names is meant to commemorate Indian peoples and practices that are asserted as extinct. These elements of the replacement narrative participate in the purification of the landscape of Indians” (xxiv). “Lasting” refers to narratives focused on claiming individuals as the last of their kind and painting Indians as extinct, using an evaluation of what rationales of race, blood, and culture are relied on to make such claims. This runs parallel to the ingroup and outgroup ideas coming from CRT as discussed above. Finally, “resisting” refers to the efforts made by marginalized peoples to resist this portrayal of extinction and reclaim their vitality, and the inconsistencies in texts that claim both extinctions of people and refer to the Indian- or Mexican-ness of these people still today. Together, these terms describe efforts to collapse and define the histories of those outside of the dominant ingroup (White) narrative.

This work evaluates how processes of memory-making have resulted in White residents’ lack of recognition of historic and ongoing layered injustices experienced by indigenous people and residents of color and the ways residents of marginalized

communities have resisted these injustices (O'Brien, 2010). Together, ideas from O'Brien and an intersectional analysis support in answering *why* the extant and past power distribution and injustices affect groups of residents on Catalina Island differently based on their intersectional identities. Further, this literature provides tools for reading against the grain of hegemonic archival documents.

Scholar Activism

Many justice scholars in both environmental and tourism fields assume an identity of scholar-activist. Such an identity demonstrates a move from theory to praxis for scholars. These scholars aim to create on-the-ground change for the communities with whom they work. Sociologist David Pellow frames himself as such a scholar, using his literature and research to help influence waste management policy among other activist efforts. A number of tourism scholars also situate themselves as scholar-activists, working with nonprofit organizations and policymakers to change tourism policy so that it more fully centers local priorities and indigenous ways of knowing (Hales et al., 2017; Peters & Higgins-Desbiolles, 2012). Such work has normative goals, moving beyond academic publications or theoretical frameworks to practice engaged scholarship that impacts people's lives (Wibben et al., 2018).

I aspire my scholar activism not only to impact people's lives, but also to democratize research such that I design and conduct my work with the communities in which I work. I enacted such a grassroots and normative approach to my research through writing editorials and letters to the editor in the local newspaper on Catalina Island, developing the questions for my project alongside community members, presenting results to community leaders, and repeatedly consulting community

members on what just tourism development looks like for them in their community (Canfield, 2018a, 2018b). This provides residents with opportunities to define the bounds of the research project, helping refine how scholars can support policy changes and build awareness around issues, and use their academic privilege in ways that are actually relevant to the residents with whom they are trying to build solidarity (Alcoff, 1991). This most directly appears in this dissertation in answering my third research question on how residents want to rectify the social injustices they are experiencing. Although I also bring in my own analysis and ideas on how to enact these recommendations, study participants developed and reviewed the major recommendations to ensure they match localized needs.

Methods

This research was all completed by the author. I was familiar with the island, with experience as a visitor, student, and researcher on the island. I have visited the island innumerable times, first as an elementary school student at a week-long science camp in 2005. In the Catalina community, I am a White female U.S. citizen, raised in an upper middle-class family, and a researcher with multiple years of seasonal residence in Two Harbors. This positionality on the island aided me in understanding the intricacies of the resident experience, along with improving trust between myself and many participants. It is quite possible that my whiteness did affect the number of Latinx participants in my study, particularly as related to personal concerns of documentation status, though I did make efforts to re-assure confidentiality of participation and opportunity to participate in the study in Spanish. My lack of official affiliation with any on-island group potentially reduced my ability to access

participants from some communities, but this lack of affiliation also reassured participants that their contributions were truly confidential. Being located in Two Harbors did limit my availability to meet with Avalon residents, as I did not have a car. My whiteness and intersectional identity that included research funding allowed me to move around tourist spaces in Avalon and Two Harbors passing as an ordinary tourist. This provided me more economic and mobility privilege than many of the residents. As I was only a temporary resident on the island, I was not subject to many of the acute participation limitations long-term residents also experience. In Two Harbors, my consistent visitation of the town situated me as a more familiar and friendly seasonal presence, such that in living quarters, open spaces, and social settings with residents, residents would often greet and include me in activities. As I situate myself as a scholar activist, and I have developed a deep investment in the well-being of the residents of the beautiful island of Catalina, my personal motivations for this study were to gain a better understanding of the residents' views and experiences with tourism decision-making on the island, and to give increased visibility and recognition to residents' views. Rather than studying about the residents, I view this work as an effort to use my distance and lack of residence on the island to vocalize and communicate injustices that residents may feel too at-risk to share. Anecdotes residents had shared during visits and past schooling on the island and observations I had made before beginning this study revealed a dynamic between residents and tourism managers that I believed demanded further investigation.

Participant description

There was a total of 70 participants in the study, out of 3,728 residents identified in the most recent federal population estimate (U.S. Census Bureau, 2017). Participants completed an interview, a survey, or both. Demographic questions were optional for participants to increase comfort in participation. A total of 15 participants, 22% of the sample population, identified as being of at least one race that makes them people of color (See Table 1 for complete racial breakdown). The average age of participants was 52 and a half years, higher than the island average age of 34.5 years, with participant ages ranging from 23 to 77 years old (U.S. Census Bureau, 2017). The discrepancy between the representation of people of color (in the U.S. context) and the actual breakdown of racial groups on Catalina Island prompted a greater focus on public memory research and document analysis that provided perspectives and memory of people of color. All participants identified as male or female, with 56% identifying as female.

Table 1. Participants' self-identified race. U.S. 2010 racial categories were used, and participants were allowed to identify with as many racial categories as they chose.

Self-identified Race	Number of Participants
African American	2
Alaskan Native or American Indian	5
Asian	4
Hispanic	7
non-Hispanic White	51

Figure 3. Distribution of employment sectors for participants that volunteered such information.

Not all participants shared information on their occupation, but of the 64 that did, 17 were not currently employed on the island (See Figure 3). The largest area of employment was the tourism and service sector, with 25 participants working as business owners and Catalina Island Company employees, among other jobs. Participants averaged having lived on the island for at least ten years, with some having since left the island, and the majority being current residents. The average income of participants was \$75,000 to \$99,000 USD, higher than the average income on the island of \$63,000 USD, though participants reported income from less than \$25,000 USD to over \$200,000 (the highest listed bracket).

Overview of Research Approach

This dissertation uses a qualitative mixed methods approach. It used a combination of online surveys, semi-structured interviews, participant observation, and archival document analysis. Bringing these methods together reveals the centrality

of memory-making to the development of Catalina Island as a tourism destination while also showing how changing dominant narratives and counternarratives continue to affect residents' daily lives. This research integrates intersectional analysis with conceptual frameworks of just tourism in analyzing the transformations of justice and power in tourism on Catalina.

Using an interpretivist epistemology, residents' perspectives and experiences are viewed as valid forms of knowledge, allowing for a complex understanding of what influences residents' experiences and perspectives. Such an epistemology invites a subjectivist ontology, understanding residents' experiences of legitimacy as their personal reality rather than as perceptions of a single universal reality, and accepting that these realities may differ across residents (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003; Remenyi et al., 1998). This research is exploratory, with the goal to "generate new insights and knowledge about contemporary phenomena within real-life contexts" (Bowen et al., 2017; Stebbins, 2008).

To bring an equity and community-centric perspective to tourism research, I worked to become familiar with community experiences prior to finalizing research questions, lived in the community as a seasonal resident, offered the survey and advertised interview opportunities in both English and Spanish, and used open-ended interview questions to allow community members to contribute their stories and knowledge without being limited by the structure of data collection. With a focus on decolonizing methodologies, work focused on the experiences of marginalized community members began with conversations with people of color in the community to identify the scope of this project and appropriate methods to proceed. Decolonizing

methodologies emphasize collaborating with marginalized groups⁵, in this case people of Latinx, undocumented, indigenous, and lower socioeconomic status people, from the beginning of the design process, through the production and communication of results (Smith, 1999).

Using such methods requires continued reflexive questioning of the positioning and power of the researcher relative to the indigenous and marginalized communities with which they work (Peters & Higgins-Desbiolles, 2012; Smith, 1999). In this case, the collaboration involved repeated conversations with community leaders and indigenous researchers of the island. We discussed (1) whether it was appropriate for me, as a White outsider, to conduct this analysis, (2) which stories communities wanted me to share with broader audiences, and (3) whether the results of the analysis aligned with their initial desires and intentions. Moving forward, I will continue to work with community leaders to determine the best ways to continue to communicate the findings with the community at large and how to best use the results to instigate the desired change. I will most likely seek to publish the findings in multiple languages as newspaper articles, among other methods. I have previously communicated my work with the community in this way (Canfield, 2018a, 2018b). I hope to use the privilege of conducting this academic work to counter the postcolonial narratives that reign on Catalina Island and support Mexican(-American), Gabrielino/Tongva, and African-American peoples “claims to humanity, to having a history, and to all sense of hope” (Smith, 1999).

⁵ While some residents may argue that they are all part of a “marginalized group” on the island, here I am referring to residents whose intersectional identities lead to racial and socioeconomic marginalization.

Public Memory Research

Analyses of memory-making often focus on how dominant narratives reduce the ability of particular segments of a population to write their own history. This kind of analysis entails reading how authors of historical narratives portray themselves and others. In this case, select newspaper articles, archaeological studies from the 1920s to present, nonfiction literature, fiction literature, promotional materials, and government documents collected from three southern California archives speak to the creation of a dominant narrative and public memory on Catalina (O'Brien, 2010). Inclusion and analysis of select archival documents was used to complement and supplement the voices and narratives present in semi-structured interviews and surveys. As the majority of survey and interview participants were White, document analysis aims to provide a fuller analysis and additional perspectives of the public memory and experiences of residents and employees of color. I analyze these documents against the grain of the colonial discourse, and rely on O'Brien's aforementioned concepts of "firsting," "lasting," "replacing," and "resisting." Additionally, as no participants were on the island before 1950, using archival materials allows me to analyze the public memory of tourism development on the island over the first half of the twentieth century.

Semi-structured Surveys and Interviews

Questionnaires were developed to evaluate general experiences, power, distributive justice, and participative justice in tourism, as well as demographic characteristics of participants. The questions on the surveys and interviews were similar, with ten consistent questions in the interviews that aimed at getting more in-

depth responses to similar questions asked on the survey (See appendices for survey and interview questions). Meeting with participants on their time and in the most convenient location and language for them also worked to be more just in creating an opportunity for accessible participation. All residents were invited to participate in surveys and interviews, and data analysis included resident voices as much as possible so as to allow them to speak for themselves. Also, concluding recommendations come from both residents and myself in conversation. I prioritized resident voices in these recommendations, referring to their local knowledge as making them better-suited to identify methods to rectify perceived community injustices (Pellow, 2002; Corburn, 2003). To confirm my interpretations were accurate, I presented my concluding recommendations to residents for their comments when I visited the island in fall of 2018.

To understand resident perspectives, I conducted 34 semi-structured confidential interviews and collected 50 confidential online surveys from summer of 2017 through the fall of 2018. There was a total of 70 unique participants who completed a survey, were interviewed, or did both. Island residents and employees made up the population of interest. As stated above, the term “resident” includes people who have lived their entire lives, have moved to there later in life, or are seasonal residents or employees. Because the goal was to understand the diversity of perspectives on the island, even short-term residents provided relevant views and experiences that illustrated the variety of individuals that consider themselves residents.

Participants were identified continually through late spring and summer 2017 using posts to community Facebook groups based on the reputation approach, with the reputation of interest being any person currently or once based on Catalina Island (Cooper, Scott, & Baggio, 2009). Further participants were contacted based on publicly available email addresses for Catalina Island residents. Traditional paper recruitment flyers were also posted in public spaces in both Avalon and Two Harbors, and advertisements were placed in the local newspaper to contact populations without access to the internet. After interviewing initial participants, Facebook and printed advertisements were continually posted around Catalina for further recruitment, and initial participants also recommended other residents appropriate for the study. Interviews lasted 20 to 90 minutes, and the average survey completion time was 10 minutes. Questions on both the surveys and interviews addressed experiences and perceptions of resource fairness, tourism, and tourism decision-making processes on the island. When permitted by the interviewee, interviews were recorded, with notes taken throughout all interviews. Interviews were transcribed and inductively qualitatively analyzed for themes across interviews. Inductive qualitative analysis allowed for maintaining the whole understanding of a person's views compared to parsing views into statistics (Robson & McCartan, 2016). Prior to analysis, participants were sent the transcript of their interview and were invited to provide any commentary and revisions they needed to ensure the script reflected what they intended to say. Interviews and surveys were supplemented with information from island newspapers and Facebook groups (Bowen et al., 2017).

As this work is a case study, it does not seek to produce generalizable theories. The generalizability of the study is limited to the ability to learn from de-centering whiteness and normalizing the centering of marginalized peoples and the inconvenient histories of tourism consumption, production, and operation. Instead, this work shows an example of how intersectional analysis of identities, island studies theories, and conceptual justice frameworks can force the reexamination of the grounds for tourism in this particular context. This story shows the breadth of experiences and perceptions of social injustice, and expands the understanding of how injustice can look in a Global North tourist destination. This work also evaluates the usefulness of existing frameworks that assess justice and inclusion in tourism development.

Significance and justification for the study

This research addresses experts' calls for further studies to understand causes and implications of inequity at tourism destinations (Bramwell and Lane, 2008). Existing research on the role power plays in tourism focuses on key informants' understanding of the power structure, the kinds of power present, how power is used in policymaking, and social network analysis of these results (Beritelli & Laesser, 2011; Bowen et al., 2017; Saito & Ruhanen, 2017; Yasarata et al., 2010). Analyzing residents' perceptions of power relations and processes will contribute to understanding justice of the lived experience of locals that may not hold the power in policy and development decisions. It provides experiential knowledge of tourism industry employees rather than those who often serve as the traditional experts or influencers of tourism development. Defining the real participative and distributive injustices based on how residents perceive them recognizes the legitimacy of resident

voices and needs in tourism destinations. This is essential to make lasting changes to the fairness of local governance and planning processes, and will also advance knowledge about residents' perceptions of tourism development justice.

Additionally, this research is significant in addressing the call for further just tourism research in the Global North (Bowen et al., 2017; Jamal, Camargo, & Wilson, 2013; McCarthy, 2002). Previous studies focus on indigenous populations and the Global South (Camargo, Lane, & Jamal, 2007; Higgins-Desbiolles, 2008; Whyte, 2010; Yasarata et al., 2010). With the recent advent of an "inclusive tourism" framework, this dissertation provides a case study to build on and assess the initial claims that the framework is suitable for the Global North (Scheyvens & Biddulph, 2017). It also builds on past island studies' analyses that have assessed the complexities of tourism on islands (Godenau, 2012; Sheller, 2009; Vannini, 2011). With the mixed historical and ethnographic research approach, the study assesses how the island status of this tourism destination has affected the branding of the destination and the experiences of injustice over 140 years. Through a decolonial lens, the study adds to existing justice tourism theories and frameworks with the on-the-ground complexities of a society that has had monopolized ownership in the hands of White U.S. citizens since 1846. This is the most applicable significance of the study to Catalina residents, as it provides the first thorough documentation of how the burdens of tourism development have been distributed over time through the actual words of residents today.

Chapter outline

This dissertation is organized into six chapters that describe the

transformations of tourism and (in)justice on Catalina Island. The following chapter provides background on tourists and the communities who have been marginalized in tourism on Catalina Island, and an overview of the history of tourism on the island to situate the actors and the place. Chapter 3 details the development of the island as a paradise destination, how this focus on a manufactured paradise has led to perceived inclusion and exclusion in decision-making processes, and how this focus has produced accompanying subjectivities. Chapter 4 outlines the resident memory and nostalgia around participation issues of tourism development on Catalina Island, and the heterogenous resident perceptions of what participative justice and fairness would be for tourism today. Chapter 5 more fully explores the recommendations briefly introduced for addressing injustice across earlier chapters, and addresses the practical and theoretical implications of the dissertation for frameworks of justice tourism. Chapter 6 concludes the dissertation, summarizing key points and contributions.

CHAPTER 2: The Place and Players of Building a Destination on Catalina Island

Santa Catalina Island is one of eight Channel Islands off the coast of California that are the traditional lands of the indigenous peoples of the Chumash and Gabrielino/Tongva tribes. Indigenous people have inhabited Catalina Island for millennia. Archaeological studies suggest residence on the island dates back to at least the middle Holocene, with recent reviews of archaeological evidence suggesting indigenous habitation on the land goes back to 7500 BCE (Fitzgerald & Corey, 2009; Martinez et al., 2014; Meighan, 1959; Raab et al., 1995; Teeter et al., 2013). These indigenous peoples referred to the island as Pimu and to themselves as Pimuvitnam. Today, their descendants refer to themselves as Tongva, and this dissertation uses “Tongva” throughout because it focuses on recognizing these peoples’ continued vitality and as they see themselves today (personal communication, 2018). Archaeologists have found more than 1,500 individual cultural sites on Catalina Island from pre-contact times, with nine major villages located on the island; these sites include the two major population centers on the island today (Teeter et al., 2013). During the thousands of years of Tongva residence on Pimu, the tribe relied on cross channel interaction with mainland tribes for trade, building a robust network across the Southern California coast.

Existing research estimates there were at least 500 individuals and as many as 2,000 to 3,000 Tongva people living on Catalina in 1542, the time of their first encounter with Europeans via explorer Juan Cabrillo (McCawley, 1996; Meighan & Johnson, 1957; Strudwick, 2013). Sixty years later, Sebastian Vizcaino’s expedition spent a couple of days on the island, and his historian documented the religious

ceremonies of the indigenous people of the island. With Vizcaino's visit, the Spanish laid claim to the island by naming it Santa Catalina, because they arrived on the Catholic feast day of Saint Catherine (de Torquemada, 1602). Rather than Pimu, the indigenous name of the island, Santa Catalina is the name that holds in the island's legal and public identity today. After these initial contacts with Europeans, the island Tongva were largely left alone to live uninterrupted until the Spanish colonization of Alta California, and especially the establishment of the San Gabriel Mission in 1771 (McCawley, 1996; Strudwick, 2013).

The history of the Tongva and their removal from Catalina is essential to this study in understanding how White settler colonists set an example of claiming the centrality of White existence at the expense of others. Using the terminology of Potawatomi tribal member and environmental philosopher Kyle Powys Whyte, this depopulation of the island is a loss of "collective continuance." Whyte describes collective continuance as a people's ability to maintain their society and adapt to changes; this is lost when they are not able to engage in the methods of self-determination and preservation due to the pressure of external factors (2018; 2016). Whyte labels settler colonialism an environmental injustice, as the settlers established their own collective continuance at the expense of the Native people to the island. I explore below how the Spanish enacted such an injustice on Catalina Island.

Native Removal

Past ethnohistoric research has concluded that the first wave of emigrations of Channel Islands indigenous peoples to the mainland occurred by 1803. The majority of Catalina Island Tongva were moved to the Spanish Mission San Gabriel in Los

Angeles, but there is also a record of islander baptisms at Mission San Fernando (see Figure 4) (Strudwick, 2013). The population dropped to about 50 individuals by 1807, and “[w]ithin 50 years after the 1769 European occupation of the adjacent coastal mainland, Catalina’s native population was gone.” The major exodus from Catalina Island is thought to have been from 1807 to 1818, though McCawley notes that the last indigenous person was not “removed” by their own will or by Spanish missionaries until 1832 (1996).

Figure 4. Map of California missions with San Gabriel and San Fernando circled and Catalina Island identified. These were the two missions where many Tongva were sent during Spanish colonization. (Allen, 2010).

While writing specifically of the impacts on Catalina, Strudwick’s report on the island’s depopulation states that the European forces that disrupted Native social

relationships and cultural traditions across the Channel Islands were largely disease and violence (2013). Disease significantly reduced Native populations along the California coast. While there are no explicit mentions of the impact of European diseases on Catalina Island Tongva, “the native Catalina population could not have been immune” to cholera, rabies, and smallpox epidemics that swept through the California missions (Perry, 2013; Strudwick, 2013). Much like ethnohistorians doubt the escape of Catalina Tongva from disease, they use the same extrapolation to conclude that violence was a central force of depopulation on this island as it was across the other Channel Islands. Aleut sea otter hunters from Alaska, Kodiak Natives that were brought along by Russian hunters on sea otter hunting expeditions, are known to have massacred populations on San Nicholas Island. The Channel Islands Natives would have had no defense against the guns of these hunters. Scholars suggest that not only is it likely that these hunters killed some of the Catalina Island Tongva, but also that the threat of such attacks led Island Tongva to relocate to mainland Tongva villages and the San Gabriel Mission. At the Mission, they would be better protected, as they were not as coastally located nor as dependent on subsistence fishing and hunting. Whether this relocation was the result of: forced migration by missionaries, involuntary exodus due to lost trading networks with to other tribes, or the threat of Aleut hunters continues to be debated (Culver, 2010; Strudwick, 2013). While some ethnohistorians have claimed there is evidence of forced removal of the last Tongva on Catalina Island, evidence from baptismal records suggests that instead the Natives left the island to protect themselves from Aleut sea otter hunters (McCawley, 1996; Rosen, 1980; Strudwick, 2013). Migration as a result of cultural

shifts, disease, and hunting of traditional resources, however, is arguably forced removal by another name. Settlers involuntarily removed Tongva people from the island by minimizing their ability to subsist through traditional methods and introducing new threats to their safety. This was a loss of adaptive capacity, and thus an environmental injustice to the Tongva according to Whyte's definition (Strudwick, 2013; Whyte 2016, 2018).

This depopulation of the Channel Islands, and specifically Catalina Island, depicts an initial violent act of policing bodies on Catalina Island. Active removal of Catalina Island Tongva from their land, and the forced migration resulting from loss of trade networks due to the enslavement of other mainland tribes through the Spanish Catholic missions, are clear external factors imposed upon this population that interrupted their adaptive capacity. This loss of adaptive capacity reveals the loss of collective continuance the Tongva experienced as a result of settler colonialism (Whyte 2016, 2018). This historic and systematic disenfranchisement has had a lasting impact on Native relationships to their history and their island. Without a presence on the island, their ability to determine how their history and artifacts were protected and marketed, was lost (Alvitre, 2005). This physical removal led to a Western understanding of the island as uninhabited following the removal of Native islanders in the early 1800s. The Tongva ancestors buried on the island and the cultural meaning of the island these people developed were seen as nonexistent through the official Western definition of the landscape. Despite White settlers' portrayal of the Natives as absent, the land was then and is today still home to the ancestors, artifacts, and culture of the Catalina Island Native community. The portrayal of the landscape as vacant

further disrupted the connection of the Natives to their home and ushered in a new era for Catalina (Nixon, 2011).

The above history serves to demonstrate the centrality of settler colonialism, injustice, and whiteness to the story of Catalina Island. While it does not address issues of tourism on the island, I find it essential to provide the history of the Tongva and their violent loss of land as a way to interrupt the narrative of Europeans as the first occupants of the island. Further, I provide this history to recognize the people who first lived on the island, and who are largely left out of touristic narratives of the island today. The remainder of this chapter details the people and the place of Catalina Island during the last 150 years evolving into the tourist destination it is today. It serves to situate the remaining thematic chapters of the dissertation.

The Place: Evolving Island Industries

Following the removal of the indigenous people from their island, there were minimal human inhabitants through the early 1800s. Franciscan monks considered building a monastery on the island but decided it lacked sufficient water (Culver, 2010). The island's status as part of California is still debated by some who see it as still a part of Mexico, but the official granting of the land to a United States resident came in 1846, when Pío Pico, the last Mexican governor of Alta California, signed a deed that granted the island to White farmer Thomas Robbins. The island changed hands many times following this sale and was used for fishing and farming, and briefly as a mining town, until the 1880s. In 1864 it was surveyed as a possible reservation site for indigenous peoples from Northern California, but it was deemed "too agriculturally marginal – even for Indians." Others deemed it "too remote, and its

lands too marginal, to succeed through typical economic means” (Culver, 2010: 87). This is ironic, as while they did rely on trade with other islands and the mainland, the Tongva have called Catalina Island home for thousands of years. The blatant lack of recognition of this Native history reveals the complete disconnect from the past habitation on the island. The concerns that arose in these years before the island became a tourist destination foreshadow issues of water availability that continue today, even as the isolation of the island has become something desirable and a central aspect of creating the island as a “calm paradise” (Culver, 2010).

The first attempt at tourism on Catalina Island came in the 1880s, with the construction of a hotel and pier in the area that is now Avalon while the island was owned by the White American businessman, George Shatto. The island soon changed hands to the White Banning Brothers, who continued with this effort. The Bannings significantly increased the branding of the island as a tourist destination for middle- and upper-class White residents of Southern California. Following a series of unfortunate events, the Bannings were unable to continue running the island, and in 1919 William Wrigley, Jr., the White owner of the Chicago Cubs and of chewing gum fame, became the sole owner of Catalina Island (Culver, 2010; Overholt, 1962; Sierks-Overholt, 1920). Since its founding in 1894 by the Bannings, the Santa Catalina Island Company (SCICO), also referred to as the island company, has been the destination branding and managing company for their monopoly of Catalina Island property holdings. Along with managing these families’ property monopolies, the company has also managed the related tourist activities on the island. References to tourism

managers throughout the dissertation are references to high-level employees of the Santa Catalina Island Company.

Under William Wrigley, Jr., tourism and Santa Catalina Island Company visibility expanded greatly, making it a destination for all people in name, but with some limitations in actuality. Steamboats, sailboats, and seaplanes all became options for making the escape to Catalina. Over two hundred films were made on Catalina Island, with the versatile landscape serving as Tahiti, the South Pacific, and the American Western frontier (Culver, 2010; Pedersen & Catalina Island Museum, 2004). Reinforcing the island as an otherworldly place, one lasting campaign that began in the 1920s, and still continues through reprinting posters, branded Catalina as “California’s Magic Isle” (Overholt, 1962; Pedersen & Catalina Island Museum, 2004). American buffalo, now the flagship species on the island and a tourist attraction, were even brought in to create a more convincing image of the American frontier in the motion picture *The Vanishing American*, filmed on the island in 1924. Upon William Wrigley Jr.’s passing in 1932, the company was handed off to his son, Philip K. Wrigley who would continue the family legacy and further build the island as a destination (Windle, 1935).

Under the direction of Philip K. Wrigley, island development took advantage of a number of themes and previously undeveloped areas of the island as he worked to make his vision of further developing Catalina Island into an island getaway for the nation a reality (See Figure 5). P.K. Wrigley made a lasting impact in the reinvention of the city of Avalon, with a desire quoted in the local independent newspaper to “keep the best, not only in the City of Avalon, but in the modern conveniences that

civilization has developed, and we want to take from the past the things that are best, not only the architecture but the method of living: the friendliness, the spirit and the utilization of leisure time” (The Catalina Islander, 1934). This quote refers to his “Early California” plan to revitalize the city in line with a visually Spanish Colonial theme, but he claimed this early California somehow predated the “Colonial” and he did not want to “borrow from nor imitate” Mexican architecture (Overholt, 1934). What history of Early California he wanted to promote on Catalina Island, then, is unclear. By the 1940s, with its effective advertising, multiple hotels, and recently updated tourist areas, Catalina Island was an “ideal resort community” (Pederson, 2004). While tourism had a hiatus during World War II, visitors were quick to return after the war and experience the new amenities. The “improved” island boasted amenities for visitors including golf, stagecoach rides, boat tours, shopping, swimming, fishing, and more.

Figure 5. Advertisement to tourists from The Catalina Islander, January 1934

One difference between Philip and his father was the areas of the island that were focused upon. While William Wrigley, Jr.'s efforts were centered on developing the resort amenities of Avalon, Philip also focused on the interior of the island in addition to the amenities he improved. He built Rancho Escondido, with the intention of using this ranch that housed Arabian horses as a way to advertise the areas of Catalina beyond the beachfront resorts of Avalon. It is important to note that the goal was to increase the accessibility of these areas of the island for visitors, not residents of the island. Previously, there were no attractions in the interior of the island, and no roads that allowed for easy transport around the island's interior. This points to a priority of expanding visitor experience and island access that continues today. In the early 1940s, the SCICO created the Inland Motor Tour that would bring visitors to the previously inaccessible interior of the island, stopping at Rancho Escondido (Pedersen & Catalina Island Museum, 2004). Interior tours continue to this day, branded as "Eco-tours," that give visitors a safari-like experience on the dirt roads of Catalina Island's interior and showcase the bison and occasional endemic fox (Catalina Island Company, 2017).

Philip's commitment to maintaining the natural beauty of the island was ensured by one of his most significant impacts on the island: development of the private trust of the Catalina Island Conservancy (CC) in 1972. The CC is a non-profit organization, one of the oldest private land trusts in Southern California, and serves to conserve the natural environment, promote recreation, and increase education on the island (Catalina Island Conservancy, 2018). In 1974, Philip and his relatives transferred 42,135 acres of Catalina Island from their ownership to the CC to preserve

this land for visitors to see as the unaltered wild of Catalina Island (Catalina Island Company, 2017). It has been suggested by historians, residents, and journalists alike that this gesture towards preservation that chronologically aligns with the heightened focus on environmentalism in the early 1970s served more as a tax break for the family than as evidence of a commitment to keep the island as lands without twentieth century human development. As evidence (circumstantial, it must be noted) of this theory, folks cite that in the first year of the conservancy, the Wrigley family taxes dropped by over a million dollars (Beronus, n.d.; Culver, 2010). The CC continues to promote conservation, recreation, and education today, encouraging researchers to research and visitors to bike, hike, and camp on the protected lands (with permits), and even provides educational activities in the Wrigley Botanical Gardens and the Jeep “Eco-tours” for visitors. Creation of this protection for the island outside of Two Harbors and Avalon has been Philip K. Wrigley’s lasting legacy. Study participants who lived on the island in the 1970s fondly recalled this effort to preserve the island in its “unaltered form.” The argument that the land is truly preserved untouched is false, of course, as Tongva used the interior of the island for millennia, and the importation of grazing animals for ambiance and sport has altered this “pristine” wilderness (Overholt, 1930; Raab et al., 1995; Rosen, 1980). The CC has stayed in the Wrigley family to this day with four descendants of William Wrigley, Jr. on the current 13-member board of directors, and with his great-granddaughter as a benefactor member of the board (Catalina Island Conservancy, 2018). This allows the extended Wrigley family to continue to wield influence in how this area is protected, studied, and visited by tourists, researchers, and residents.

The SCICO has also stayed in the Wrigley family to this day. After Philip K. Wrigley's passing in 1977, his White son, William "Bill" Wrigley, took over, until he passed in 1999. Bill Wrigley was seen as a charismatic leader who continued to promote tourism on the island. While there was consideration of large developments on the island under Bill's management, the main changes came in updating existing structures and the creation of the private Descanso Beach Club in Avalon. Another White Wrigley descendant, Paxson "Packy" Offield, followed one role behind Bill, serving as President, CEO, and eventually Chairman of the Board of the SCICO. In addition to Packy serving to consolidate authority roles of the SCICO within the family, he also reinforced the family land monopoly through his land holdings in Two Harbors that he operated until his election as Chairman of the Board in 1998. Following Bill's death, his White daughter, now Alison Wrigley Rusack, took over ownership of the SCICO. She does not serve as the chief executive officer, as her father, grandfather and great grandfather did, but publicly she is seen as running the company. She also serves as a benefactor member of the Catalina Island Conservancy, with her husband also serving on the board of directors. Her husband, Geoff Rusack, was elected as Chairman of the Board for the SCICO in 2009 and continues to serve in that position today. Between CC and the SCICO, the Rusacks are seen by most island residents as having ownership of 99% of the land on the island (personal communication, 2017, 2018; Catalina Island Conservancy, 2017).

From 1957 to 1998, private management of Two Harbors, the smaller population center on the island, was contracted out to well-respected and well-liked members of the Catalina Island community. In 1957, it was passed to the Bombard

family as Catalina Cove and Camp Department. Doug Bombard, a White man who had been raised on the island, proposed taking over the operations when Two Harbors (TH) was failing as a tourist destination (Catalina Island Company, 2017). To this day, Bombard is seen as a “living legend” who is intensely committed to the Catalina Island community, as is evidenced with the recent creation and island screening of the documentary, “Douglas Bombard, a Life on Catalina Island” (The Catalina Islander, 2018). Doug Bombard later renamed his operation of TH as Doug Bombard Enterprises and successfully made the isthmus a tourist destination with the opening of a general store and restaurant (The Catalina Islander, 2018). Doug Bombard Enterprises managed TH until it was sold to the SCICO and the Doug Bombard Enterprise holdings became Two Harbors Enterprises in 1998. Packy Offield’s previously mentioned holdings in TH were run through Paxson Offield Enterprises, and in keeping the land within the Wrigley family, were acquired by Two Harbors Enterprises upon his advancement in the SCICO in 1998. Since 1999, Two Harbors Enterprises under the SCICO has managed all commercial operations out of TH. The company officially changed its operating name from Santa Catalina Island Company (SCICO) to Catalina Island Company (CIC) in 2017 (Catalina Island Company, 2017). Due to this change, the company may also be referred to as the Catalina Island Company, or the CIC throughout.

Consistent across all of these tourism identities for the island has been the CIC reliance on the labor of people of color, and a belief of the island’s original inhabitants as extinct since the times of Spanish colonization in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Exploiting this difference between the workers and White

visitors on the island through cultural commodification has been central to tourism promotion on the island since the first tourism efforts.

The People: The “Backbone” of Catalina

In building an escape for Southern Californians, and then for the nation, the sale of the culture of people of color for the White visitor is inextricable from the island’s past. Much like other tourist destinations, exoticizing the communities that are not like the visitors’ proved a lucrative endeavor (Godenau, 2012; Jamal, Camargo, & Wilson, 2013; Lee, 2017; Moore, 2015; Sommer & Carrier, 2010). Along with the commodification of indigenous people and artifacts, this also included performative Mexican culture, and selective performance of African-American stereotypes and talent. All of these tourist products relied on a portrayal of a static history for people of color on the island; a history in line with and created by White-centered life of Catalina Island tourists and tourism managers (O’Brien, 2010). This commodification continually removed the right of people to write their own history and instead defined it in ways that maintained White domination over the narrative (Nixon, 2011). Such a commodification and disenfranchisement of people on the island exposes both ecocultural injustice and racism in line with considerations of the Just Destination framework (Jamal & Camargo, 2014). From the initial development to the marketing and decision to sell indigenous and Mexican culture on the island, the process did not incorporate active involvement of people of color, which is an ecocultural injustice. The ecocultural racism appears in the unfair treatment of African-American, Mexican(-American), and Native peoples and their ecocultural goods, and the disbenefits of problematic advertising and promotion.

Since the beginning efforts at tourism on the island, in addition to reliance on bodies of color for tourist entertainment, Catalina Island managers have relied heavily on immigrants and workers of color to keep the island running for the largely White visitor population. One indicator that the island is still dependent on the labor of residents of color today is the fact that the population of Avalon, the major population center on the island where many workers reside, is in the 80th to 90th percentile for minority populations compared to the rest of the United States of America (US EPA, 2018). The major players that keep the island running, or whose identities have been implicated in the island's tourism activities are people of Latinx, African-American, and Native heritage.

Tourists

Before talking about the people who operate tourism industries, it is first important to frame who the people are that visit Catalina Island. Tourism has been an essential island industry since the early 1900s, making tourists a population that makes up the “backbone” of the island. It has largely been the White tourist that is the visitor of interest. At the turn of the twentieth century, during the Banning era of Catalina Island tourism management, nonwhite visitors were not allowed to ride on Banning-owned vessels to visit Catalina. As the Bannings owned all transportation means to the island, they could effectively ban all people of color from visiting Catalina. Ethnic non-Anglo people who could pass as White, such as Italians, were allowed to visit the island. While a number of the fishers on the island during this era were of East-Asian, Mexican, and Italian descent, people who did not pass as White were “undesirables”

as visitors (Culver, 2010: 95,105). This was in line with race relations in the US at the time.

When Wrigley bought the island in 1919, this policing of who boarded the ferry did not occur in such an explicit fashion as under the Bannings, but visitors of color still experienced limited access to goods and services once they arrived on the island. Wrigley wanted the island to be “within reach of the rank and file of the United States...at such a reasonable figure of expense that all can participate.” Despite the seemingly inclusive language of Wrigley, scholars suggest that he preferred African Americans and “ethnic” Whites to serve as laborers on the island and not vacationers through the 1930s (Berish, 2008). People of color did indeed serve as an essential part of the workforce that has made the island an attractive destination during both the Banning and the Wrigley eras.

This legacy from the early 1900s of the whiteness of the Catalina Island visitor continues to hold on. The inescapable nature of this is clear in one writer recently branding Catalina as “The Whitest Vacation Destination in America” (Schilling, 2012). Instead of the explicit acts of keeping “undesirables” off boats, this Black writer describes how he felt undesirable on the island in his 2012 visit. Schilling describes Catalina as, “the whitest vacation destination that [he] could afford,” and “the safest, most placid place to unwind. It has everything the aspiring white person could want in a getaway” (2012). In a comedic tone, he lists golf carts, boats, cleavage, Tommy Bahama stores, and the Chicago Cubs as essential aspects of the white getaway. In explaining his reasoning, he describes how “nothing is whiter than a golf cart... I’ve never received a greater number of confused looks in my life than

when I drove a golf cart on Catalina Island.”⁶ While there is no explicit policy against Black visitors on the island, his sense of being watched while using the most common vehicular transportation on the island exhibits the lasting racism of who is a desired and expected Catalina Island visitor. Another *Vice* article documents an author’s experience at the “Real-Life Fucking Catalina Wine Mixer,” an event based on a scene from the Will Ferrell film *Stepbrothers*. She similarly describes the whiteness of the modern Catalina visitor. She explains how on the cross-channel ferry to the island, “it was remarkably difficult to distinguish between Mixer attendees and your run-of-the-mill Catalina-goers—both looked like they could be background extras on *The Real Housewives of Orange County*” (Klar, 2015). Contrasting the lasting whiteness of the expected Catalina Island visitor, however, is the populations of color that have been relied upon to create the “Whitest Vacation Destination in America.”

Indigenous Community

Following the depopulation of the Tongva people from Catalina that concluded by the 1830s, there has been a limited presence of this population on their own terms on Catalina Island. Trying to understand the history of these people began with extensive excavations in the 1850s, when unearthing of Native bodies and artifacts on the island was done largely for tourist entertainment. This behavior of “replacing” Native artifacts with tourist activities began with the onset of tourism on the island,

⁶ Additional relevant and comedic quotes I include here to further demonstrate the tone of the piece and the sense of white privilege that pervaded Schillings trip: “White people love boats because they’re expensive and elitist. They also allow for an easy escape from a neighborhood, city, state or nation once the minority population has become too large. And they’re great for carrying slaves.” And “Nothing says ‘white privilege’ like a store full of bastardized tropical-themed clothes. If you like your shirts loose and your khakis pleated, you are in luck on Catalina Island. The enduring fantasy of the entitled white person is to live on a beach free of hassle, to drink to excess and throw up all over a pair of Bermuda shorts. Seek these stores out to get a true island experience. Bonus points if you can find any Margaritaville apparel around town. The natives trade Jimmy Buffet merchandise like prisoners trade cigarettes” (2012).

with residents selling Native artifacts and body parts to tourists. This was not a unique practice to the island; in the United States South in the same time period, people would keep the body parts of lynched and murdered African Americans as souvenirs (H. Young, 2005). In the Catalina version, a number of “pot hunters,” or pseudo-scientists, carried on this tradition as employment and sport through the mid-1900s, exploring the various Native sites and graves on the island. This desecration of the graves of Tongva ancestors continues to go unpunished today.

One of the most illustrious pot hunters on the island was Ralph Glidden. Glidden made a career out of exhuming Native islanders’ skeletons and the various belongings that were buried with them. Glidden moved to Catalina with his parents in 1915 and became interested in digging for artifacts after a trip with an early relic hunter to San Nicholas Island. He was hired by the Heye Foundation Museum of the American Indian in New York in 1919 to investigate sites on the interior of Catalina that were used by Native islanders and to find artifacts to be housed in the museum. With the support of William Wrigley, Jr., Glidden excavated numerous sites on the island, collecting over 50,000 artifacts—including the skeletal remains of hundreds of Native people—that were eventually housed in a museum in Avalon (Martinez et al., 2014; Sahagun, 2012).

The violences of Glidden were also promoted by the Santa Catalina Island Company itself as an activity for tourists. Framing this violent exhumation as proof of the impressive past inhabitation of the island, a company-produced pamphlet from 1926 advertises the hundreds of skeletons exhumed by Glidden, and “the number of skeletons excavated by earlier explorers and curio hunters” (Overholt, 13). Beyond

using grave digging as a way to make the island stand out as a unique place, the pamphlet also directly invites visitors to become gravediggers themselves: “A new pastime at the Magic Isle! Exploring for ‘finds’ in the ancient town sites” (Overholt, 1926: 15). This twenty-one-page pamphlet continually advertised the past relic hunters’ behaviors as a new way to enjoy the island outside of the beachfront activities of Avalon, and shared innumerable conjectures of past uses for artifacts and fictitious declarations of site names. This pamphlet was blatantly enacting a replacement narrative of the actual Native history with White speculations and preferred versions of history (O’Brien, 2010). That the owners and managers advertised these activities reveals an acceptance of the inhumanity of the behaviors; that these acts were not violent but acceptable for the times.

Another activity that has become accepted not only on the island, but across the United States is branding the Catalina Island Tongva as extinct. This is a country-wide practice that has been committed against Natives of North America since the original English settlers first occupied tribal lands in the 1600s (O’Brien, 2010; Whyte, 2016). The lasting legacy of past replacement and lasting narratives that dominated in the early 1900s has led to this “extinction” in the modern day. It is particularly difficult for the indigenous people of Catalina to correct this narrative, as the Tongva tribe is not federally recognized. This lack of official federal recognition further erases their vitality in the eyes of the descendants of settler colonists who have a narrow frame of an “American Indian,” and exacerbates difficulties for the Tongva themselves in having their voices heard (Alvitre, 2005; Martinez et al., 2014). This can also be understood as an issue in the United States of the legal construction of what it

means to be “Indian,” as past courts have held that intermarriage and living away from a reservation (which are perceived as the only ways to keep an “Indian” pure) make Natives “no longer Indian enough” (Delgado & Stefancic, 1998).

A key focus of the work of Native people today has been around treating their deceased ancestors with the respect they deserve postmortem through reclaiming relatives that were sold as souvenirs and trinkets in the early days of tourism on Catalina. Work to reclaim indigenous artifacts is also a method for Catalina Island Tongva descendants to “assert their sovereign right to their past” (Martinez et al., 2014: 201). This is a way to sooth the wounds of past violence, telling their own stories rather than having them dictated by informal anthropologists. Since the Tongva are not a federally-recognized tribe, this act of resistance is quite difficult. While there is legislation that aims to return Native artifacts to their rightful owners, it does not allow Tongva to claim their relatives and ancestors; artifacts not affiliated with a federally-recognized tribe often remain on display until claimed. The inability of non-federally-recognized tribes to claim their ancestors has further contributed to an image of the Tongva people living today as not “real” Natives and their people as extinct (Martinez et al., 2014).

This erasure results from a societally-accepted insistence on a fixed set of “ancient” cultural practices to be truly Native or “Indian.” Historian O’Brien writes of this trend in historic writings of Indians from the early settlers that relied on a romantic idea of “ancient Indians,” which disallowed Natives to have a changing culture that adjusted to changing times. Instead, any changes to their cultures were deemed as evidence of inauthenticity, making it impossible for Natives to coexist as

both modern and “Indian.” Requiring “Indians” to “comply with the expectation that they be persistently ancient” forced them out of a modern identity (O’Brien, 2010: 4). This is well exemplified in the pamphlet Santa Catalina Island Company made about opportunities to explore sites of the “ancient abodes” that belonged to “ancient islanders,” “so long before the white man came.” In this narrative, the Tongva are only primitive people that existed before they were “brought over to the mainland,” after which point, they are seen as not existing due to the way this mixing with mainlanders “destroyed the individuality” of the tribe (Overholt, 1926). This fixed understanding of who the Catalina Island Tongva were pervades through some scholarly work as well as newspapers and public histories that acknowledge the history of the original islanders without recognizing that tribal descendants of original Island Tongva continue to live on and work on the island today.

The lack of deep understanding of the indigenous history of the island is advertised in the local newspaper, *The Catalina Islander*. In a recent article, the paper quoted in entirety the Catalina Island Chamber of Commerce’s account of the island’s precolonial history rather than quoting archaeologists, Tongva currently living on the island, or consulting Catalina Island Museum historians (Kelly, 2018). The main failure in the accuracy of the Chamber of Commerce’s account of the precolonial history that the paper quoted is their subdued account of how European contact impacted the Natives. The discussion of Spanish colonization of the island addresses the impact of diseases in “drastically” reducing populations. It euphemistically claims that the impact of the mission system was not its dislocation, enslavement, and Christian conversion of the Tongva, but rather that the “system altered the economic

landscape of Southern California” which “disrupted” the Natives’ existing social and trade networks. The Spanish California mission system is called “an enormous culture shock” that caused the end of Island Tongva society, and led to Natives being “moved to the mainland” (Kelly, 2018). There is still ambiguity among ethnohistorians in the direct forcefulness of migration from Catalina after 1803, but it is clear that rather than simply being a “culture shock,” the Catholic missions intentionally disconnected indigenous peoples from their culture (Strudwick, 2013).

The final statements about the descendants of the Tongva people are particularly problematic for the Tongva people of today. Rather than recognizing the indigeneity of the descendants of these displaced and colonized indigenous populations, it suggests that there are no longer living members of the Gabrielino/Tongva tribe in stating that “[t]here are people living in Southern California area today who have Gabrielinos among their ancestors” (Catalina Island Chamber of Commerce and Visitors Bureau, 2018). That this was originally posted by the Chamber of Commerce and Visitors Bureau demonstrates a continued violence of erasure of Tongva existence that is on display for tourists. This is a blatant depiction of “lasting”; claiming that Tongva only exist as ancestors perpetuates a narrative that the last true members of this tribe were those subjected to relocation and Christian conversion or those written into history as ‘full-blooded’ Native Americans (O’Brien, 2010). This false narrative is a form of slow violence in erasing the lives of the hundreds of Tongva tribe members still living today (Nixon, 2011). This is a violence in that it erases the reality that the indigenous peoples that were forcibly removed from Catalina are still a thriving culture in Southern California. Further, perpetuating the

view that Tongva are only of the past encourages people unfamiliar with indigenous history to discount the identity of the living Tongva tribal members today.

The lack of consistently recognized and reported vitality is an issue as there is not only a thriving population of Tongva in the greater Los Angeles area, but there are also Tongva scholars actively working on Catalina Island to decolonize the island's history and reclaim their ancestors' artifacts (Alvitre, 2005; Martinez, 2010; Martinez et al., 2014). In the words of Tongva elder and indigenous archaeologist Cindi Alvitre, "Indian people are now taking advantage of the opportunity to reclaim their stories and tell them their own way" (2005:9). Alvitre grew up on Catalina Island and is now a full-time lecturer in the American Indian Studies department at California State University, Long Beach. With her team that includes another Gabrielino/Tongva archaeologist, Desireé Reneé Martinez, Alvitre has worked for over twenty years to draw attention to the continued vitality of her people, reclaim their artifacts, and conduct decolonial and collaborative research. She is the founder of the Ti'at society, which has revitalized the use of the *ti'at* (wooden plank canoe) as traditionally used among Tongva. Also importantly, Alvitre was central in claiming the name Tongva for her confederation as a replacement for the terminology of Gabrielinos or Mission Indians, the Spanish name for the Tongva assigned due to their association with the San Gabriel and San Fernando Missions. Alvitre gets at the dual purpose for such a name change in quoting her father's sentiments at seeing an exhibit to the Gabrielinos in a museum, "No, that's not right – we weren't mission Indians, and we're not extinct!" (2005:10). In speaking with Alvitre in fall of 2018, she explained that Tongva is a verb loosely translated to mean "pulling someone back into their roots."

Her activism, scholarship, and being display that the Tongva are not extinct, but rather they are going back to their roots and continuing to build their culture today.

The renewed use of the *ti'at* canoe exemplifies how today the Tongva visibly continue their traditions while existing in a neocolonial society. They may not be able to live in their homelands due to colonial land seizure, yet they maintain a connection to their indigenous identity that evolves just like the identity associated with any other nationality. In 2005, the first *ti'at* built since the 1800s journeyed along the Catalina Island coast, viscerally displaying how tribal culture remains strong. This is an example of “resisting” the idea that Tongva must practice a fixed set of cultural traditions (Alvitre, 2005; O’Brien, 2010). In addition to pointing out that this is inconsistent with the reality that cultures are “the accumulation of hundreds of changes, sometimes spurred by outside influences, over thousands of years,” current Tongva activists and archaeologists demonstrate how they have continued to evolve their lifeways (at times under force) and continue to represent a vibrant culture (Alvitre, 2005: 9; Martinez, 2010). The construction and paddling of the boat known to be evidence of a highly skilled people signifies the continued commitment to their people and their culture. This demonstration breaks down any colonial ideas of the extinct Tongva people, replacing with it the image of a living Tongva culture. As Alvitre puts it, “We have been pulled out of a sepia-toned romanticism and into a reality that explodes with the colors of realities” (2005: 10).

There is only one Tongva descendant known to be living on the island today, though the 2010 census quantifies forty-one people who identify as having some “American Indian or Alaskan Native” ancestry (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). This

difference likely reflects residents of Mexican heritage that identify with their indigenous roots, as well as less well-known residents with Native heritage from beyond Catalina Island. The current well-known Tongva resident is the son of Alvitre. Regardless of the actual number, the Tongva see themselves as still present on the island because they view artifacts as living members of their community (Alvitre, 2005).

Latinx Community

Although Catalina Island was considered part of Mexico from 1822 until 1846, there are no records of Mexican settlers on the island during that time. Records of Mexican settlers on Catalina go as far back as the 1890s, though the major initial migration is said to have come around 1910, during the Mexican Revolution. One Catalina Island-raised descendant of Mexican immigrants explained that many Mexican citizens who felt unsafe in their home country migrated to the United States in the 1910s (Saucedo, 2008). The initial immigrant families that arrived on Catalina shared with friends and family by word of mouth and mail about their new island life, with such information reaching at least as far as El Paso, Texas (Saucedo, 2008). Many of the well-established families on the island today refer to messages from friends and family on the island as a central motivation for their immigration to the island (Contreras, 2007; Saucedo, 2008). Until after World War II, male Mexican residents had menial day laborer jobs, including but not limited to construction, laundry, quarry work, and unskilled jobs in city maintenance; most women are reported to have stayed home on the island working in the household. Histories of Central and South American immigrants to the island only mention Mexican heritage

families, with the term “Latino” being used in newspapers and books by Latinx authors beginning in the 2000s and still only infrequently being used to describe the Latin American population. Due to the consistent national origin of this population and how they refer to themselves, the terms Mexican and Mexican American are largely used throughout this dissertation. This decision is based on surveys, interviews, and conversations with Latinx participants, who self-identify their racial and ethnic identities as Hispanic, Hispano, and Latino/a as well, but used Mexican or Mexican-American most frequently. Based on extensive conversations with Latinx community members, they do not identify their heritage as indigenous; here, indigeneity will refer to the first residents of Catalina Island rather than those indigenous to the Americas in general.

In the 1920s and especially the 1930s, Mexican culture was a central piece of the island’s tourism branding. Philip K. Wrigley’s development of an island character in line with an “Early California” theme in the 1930s led to a complicated performative culture for the Mexican immigrants and their families. This effort was to remake Avalon as “exotic.” Materially, this involved hiring mariachi bands and Mexican immigrants as dancers and craftspeople to perform for tourists (Culver, 2010; Saucedo, 2008). One shortcoming here is that the architecture and Spanish character of “Early California” is not imagery truly representative of “Early Catalina.” Early Catalina was home of the Tongva people, and colonization did not lead to a new era of architecture on the island, but rather depopulation of the island (Strudwick, 2013). Of course, this history is not what is being memorialized.

For the Mexican immigrants and Mexican-American residents of Catalina, this theme for the island proved an opportunity to stay connected to their heritage, but also relied on stereotypes and a static history of Spanish colonial culture in Mexico. A history of Mexican heritage on the island written by Marcelino Saucedo, a first-generation Mexican-American who grew up on the island, portrays the performative mariachi bands, dancers, and artisans for tourist delight as a positive (2008). He gives no reason to believe the performers were forced into anything. The author seems suspiciously unconcerned about the marketing of a fixed version of history for tourist gain. Instead, he sees these opportunities as, “represent[ing] a gesture to preserve the tradition and culture of Alta California” (41). Young girls and women were hired to dance at *El Encanto*, an outdoor shopping patio, and other members of the community sold their wares and talents to the public starting with the event *Paseo Del Encanto* in 1923. Other residents were hired by the Santa Catalina Island Company in the 1930s, “to put on Mexican costumes and dance for the tourists,” and were paid twenty-five cents an hour (45). These opportunities provided a way for more members of the family to have employment and support their family, but also relied on these “skilled artisans” to “‘ply their craft’ to the general public” (41).

Saucedo frames the Catalina mariachi band, *Los Siete Pitos*, as developing out of the Mexican and Mexican-American community itself in 1930, but the instruments and uniforms for the group came from the Santa Catalina Island Company. That the general manager of the company provided these materials to the band could be portrayed as a simple good gesture to the Mexican community on the island. With the history of paternalism in treatment of Mexican and Mexican-American residents on

the island, this seems unlikely. Saucedo also emphasizes that the same general manager was supportive of the community in times of need, organizing a fundraiser for struggling Mexican and Mexican-American residents during the Great Depression. It seems too simple to view the manager's donation to the band as just a gift. Rather, that these mariachi bands performed for guests and have been painted into the cultural and touristic history of the island reveals that the manager saw his gift as an investment in a potential future marketable activity for tourists (Figure 6).

The sale of goods and performance of traditional music and dance was an opportunity for the immigrants and their descendants to maintain a connection to their Mexican heritage, but one must acknowledge the commodification at work here. Managers have selectively supported Mexican heritage. Tourism managers chose to embrace and amplify Mexican heritage in the 1930s because it was serving a profitable purpose. This demonstrates a construction of race at the will of the tourism managers rather than as a gesture of good will, highlighting aspects of Mexican culture that served tourism goals or as a source of development (Arai & Kivel, 2009; Delgado & Stefancic, 1998; Jamerson, 2016). Further, Saucedo's history details the experiences of poverty for many of the families of Mexican heritage on the island, which brings in the question of whether having the young members of the family perform was really optional at all. Had tourism managers paid a living wage to all workers, children would not have needed to work to help their families make ends meet.

Figure 6. Public tile artwork by RTK Studios on display for tourists on Catalina Island, depicting a scene of a Mariachi Band performing for passersby; notice one tourist is holding a camera (photo 2018; artwork installed 1999).

While the heritage of Mexican immigrants and their descendants has been historically exploited as a benefit for touristic profit, town leaders have also tried to perpetuate a “melting pot” narrative of the shared American identity of all Catalina Island residents to erase connections to Mexico. In August 1972, the Brown Berets, an activist group of Chicanos that arose in 1966 to protest police brutality and racialized treatment of Mexican immigrants and Mexican-Americans, occupied Catalina Island (Correa, 2006; del Olmo, 1997). This month-long occupation aimed to reclaim the island as land that had been illegally seized by the United States from Mexican and indigenous peoples. While the Brown Berets were initially greeted amicably on the island, their presence led to “American” nationalist performance and rhetoric among some island residents. A United States flag was planted and camped at to visibly counter the Brown Berets’ claim to the island. The factuality of the claim of illegal seizure continues to be under debate, as the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, which cedes the rest of California to the United States, does not explicitly state that the Channel

Islands were included in the treaty (Los Angeles Times, 1946). Of course, there is no documentation of the legality of the Spanish claiming the island from the indigenous people who were depopulated from the island through disease, evangelizing, force, and threat of Aleut hunter violence (Strudwick, 2013).

The Brown Berets' occupation of the land they believed was their own led to a particularly aggressive stance of "American" nationalism in the form of a letter by Ray Rydell, the mayor of Avalon at the time. Part of the letter to the residents, published in *The Catalina Islander*, read:

"There are some of us, however, who have been unfairly embarrassed by the presence of the Brown Berets; these are the Islanders of Mexican descent. That is most unfortunate and unwarranted. These islanders are Americans, not Mexican-Americans. In this real democratic community of Avalon there are no hyphenated Americans, no Irish-Americans, no Norwegian-Americans, no Mexican-Americans-just Americans. We all stand under one flag. Don't let these racist Brown Berets confuse you. When the Brown Berets arrived they were received like visitors. Now, with summer guests, who have overstayed their welcome and are still in your house, it's time for them to leave, so leave already."

Rydell's claim that, "there are no hyphenated Americans" exhibits an attempt at erasing the Mexican heritage of residents for the purpose of maintaining power over the island (Rydell, 1972). At that point, the Mexican population was near or more than half of the total population on the island (Los Angeles Times, 1976). Rydell needed to maintain a majority to assert dominance over the perceived invaders of the Brown Berets, and so branded the "Islanders of Mexican descent" as no longer connected to their home, putting in writing this racial construction that served to maintain "American" dominance in the community (Delgado & Stefancic, 1998). While in this

case there is no explicit discussion of whether Mexican-Americans are considered White, the implication Rydell makes is that while the Brown Berets are a member of the outgroup, the Mexican and Mexican-American residents are a part of the ingroup.

Without explicitly stating racial identity, he makes a claim of colorblindness and cultural homogeneity of Catalina residents to assert continued majority status over the Brown Berets. This is an attempted erasure on Rydell's part of the historic Mexican ownership of the island in the 1800s, and the continued vitality of Mexican culture on the island. In response, Saucedo, the Mexican-American author and Catalina Islander, wrote a letter following a revival of the conversation around the Brown Berets in the 1980s. He called out this erasure of intersectional identity, saying the 1972 mayor's report and Rydell's continued stance in 1985 "indicates a lack of sensitivity toward minority ideals and attitude." He continued on to say that, "[t]he minority people are very proud of their origin and ancestry, thus the hyphenated identity. It should be pointed out to the Mayor that this nation is great, not because of the Melting Pot theory, but rather that great men and women of different cultures, nationalities, languages, and religions helped to mold this nation." The mayor attempted to melt away this identity, but maintained the "Mexican food, architecture, [and] Spanish names," parsing the culture and keeping only the parts that worked to support the touristic identity and island economy (Saucedo, 1985). Though White and Latinx residents intermingle in social spaces on the island today, Latinx residents' ability to assimilate does not mean the hyphenated identity of these residents should be ignored or forgotten.

While original Mexican immigrants to the island in the early 1900s planned to return to their homeland after a few years, many have ended up settling their entire immediate family on the island and only returning to Mexico on vacation or for family visits. The initial migrant families now have been on the island for over one hundred years. In the past, a large population of immigrants would come to the island for the tourist season and would return home to Mexico for the winter to bring home money to their families (Saucedo, 2008). Twenty years ago, it was much more typical for Mexican nationals to come over individually, often as a young person, and continue this international commute annually each season. Returning home each year, the seasonal workers, much like their ancestors who migrated before them, share how “calm and beautiful” it is on Catalina, which encourages relatives to join them on the island the next year to find “work and a better life” (Contreras, 2007). Over time, it has become increasingly common for immigrants to bring their families with them to Catalina. They also have increasingly chosen to stay on the island year-round, citing the increased sense of safety for their families and job opportunities on the island compared to Mexico and mainland Southern California (personal communication with Latinx community leaders, 2018; Benning, 1994; Hernandez, 2005). This safety refers both to the dangers of drugs and violence in mainland Southern California and concerns over documentation status. With increased efforts to remove undocumented immigrants, the new island residents are often forced to remain on the island rather than truly having a choice to return home to their families (Benning, 1994; Currie, 1986; Hernandez, 2005; Sahagun, 2008).

Today, the Latinx population is the “backbone of [the] tourism industry labor force” (Contreras, 2007). Their island jobs include all aspects of creating the perfect experience for the visitor: dishwashers, waiters, housecleaning staff, gardeners, taxi drivers, construction workers, and busboys to name a few of the roles. This population is made up of both multigenerational residents and new immigrants to the island. In speaking with community leaders in the Latinx community, there is a great difference perceived in how the new immigrants and their children interact with the island and the experiences of the multigenerational islander Mexican-American families. The two central aspects of the more limited island experience for recent immigrants are the language barrier in serving largely English-speaking tourists and the question of documentation status. A book written by a member of one of the original migrant families states that this struggle and experience is simply the cyclical requirement of being a newcomer to the place, and new migrants must find a way to assimilate to the culture (Saucedo, 2008).

It has long been known in the community that undocumented migrants make up a large portion of the service employees on the island, particularly in summer months (Benning, 1994; Currie, 1986; Dillow, 1996; Los Angeles Times, 1976, 1991; Sahagun, 2010; Spagat, 2010; Taylor, 1991). The tensions around this fact have fluctuated in intensity, with efforts to remove undocumented residents coming and going across the last 50 years. Some White residents have claimed undocumented residents are inhibiting their abilities to find employment on the island, though others argue these undocumented workers “toil long hours in low-paying jobs that citizens often refuse” (Benning, 1994). Further agreeing with the importance of the migrant

population, some recognize that “Hispanics have always been an important – if at times largely unseen – part of Avalon...U.S. citizens and illegal workers alike often labored at the low-paying tourism-oriented jobs that many Americans disdained” (Dillow, 1996). Community members sometimes refer to these jobs as “invisible.” With a population of largely Mexican-American and Mexican residents it is impossible to move through Avalon without overhearing conversations in Spanish, but the island officially operates as a destination for largely English-speaking guests. Thus, these “invisible” jobs are how new migrants who have not assimilated to the English-operating destination can secure employment and maintain a life on the island. The most recent community survey in 2016 stated that 39% of surveyed households identified as “Hispanic” (City of Avalon, 2016). About one quarter of the total Avalon households responded to the survey, explaining why this number is noticeably lower than the 2013-2017 American Community Survey which estimates the “Hispanic or Latino (any race)” population at about 69% of all Avalon residents (U.S. Census Bureau, 2017). Neither of these estimates is perfect, and likely underestimate the actual Latinx population on the island due to the large population of undocumented residents who are likely hesitant to participate in these surveys.

African Americans

The African-American population of Catalina Island has always been an extremely small minority that has come to the island to work in service positions in the tourism industry. The first reported African-American resident on the island worked as a barber during the first attempt at tourism on the island in 1888 (Culver, 2010; Liddell & Leonhardi, 2012). During the Banning era of Catalina Island tourism,

African Americans worked in a variety of service roles on the island but were not allowed to visit. As the Bannings controlled transportation to the island and all tourism on the island, they were able to enforce racialized restrictions (Culver, 2010). As of 1920, there were twenty-one Black residents on Catalina (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1920).

Though Wrigley did away with the explicit racial policing of island visitors when he took over, articles in African-American newspapers on the mainland of the United States make clear that there was still racism in place that worked against Black visitors and residents. One such article describes an African American's visit to the island and their attempts to tally the total population of African-American residents on the island. Anecdotally, the author was told there are "about half a dozen families. They do mostly manual work." The conclusion of the piece reprints a letter to a woman who works in finding employment for "Negro youth" from a Mr. Pollock of the Catalina Island Business Men's Association. It states that as of 1939, Avalon had a total population of about 2,500 residents, with "only six permanent Negro residents, one couple with two small children of two and three years of age, the rest adults." By 1990, the number of residents may have actually dropped, as noted by a Southern California journalist evidently surprised by the scarcity of African Americans: "African-American residents of Avalon numbered five in 1990; not 5 percent, but five people" (Dillow, 1996). As of the 2010 census, twenty Avalon residents identified as solely African American or Black, and forty-six identified as having some Black ancestry (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). The continued lack of presence of Black people on Catalina is evidenced in a Community-Wide Income Survey conducted in 2016.

The survey asked participants to identify whether they were Hispanic or not, and also had residents specify if they identified as White or a racial minority. That the survey did not even have the option for citizens to identify as Black or African American suggests that this population is seen to be such a micro-minority⁷ that it need not be identified as a distinct portion of the population (City of Avalon, 2016).

The fact that few African Americans live on the island should be of no surprise given their explicit exclusion. As Mr. Pollock of the Catalina Island Business Men's Association wrote in the aforementioned letter to an African-American journalist in 1939, "they [African Americans] are not desirable and there has never been any intention on the part of the Santa Catalina Island Company and the City of Avalon to hold out much for the Negro race on the Island," (Lane, 1939). Due to the small number of African Americans who have lived on the island as residents, and having only two survey participants who explicitly identified as such, there are unfortunately no interview quotes from this population in the dissertation. But I provide this history to recognize the contribution people with African heritage have made to the tourism industry on the island, and to highlight that Catalina was (and is) not free of the racism that pervades the United States.

Resisting the White-washed Narrative

White tourism promoters and authors have largely erased the voices, ideas, and vitalities of people of color on Catalina Island in the interest of promoting the constructed centrality and experience of the White body. But there have been some efforts among residents and visitors to resist discrimination and rewrite histories on

⁷ Micro-minorities are ethnic groups that are much smaller in population size than other present minority groups (Nixon, 2011).

their own terms. An early effort to boycott the discrimination against African-American residents and employees is displayed in Lane's 1939 article in the Black periodical *New York Age*. After sharing the unwelcoming letter from a local business association (cited above) that was resistant to African-American employees, the recommendation of resistance to readers was that "we Negroes need not chew Wrigley's gum." The following of this boycott is unclear, but the sentiment stands as a strong demonstration of resistance to racist tourism managers' dislike for African-American workers. Additionally, Marcelino Saucedo's 2008 book provides a novel documentation of Mexican-American history on Catalina Island on the terms of his own cultural and ethnic community. The Tongva community has also demonstrated their continued vitality through the paddling of their *ti'at* along the Catalina Island coast (Alvitre, 2005). Further, since 2007, a team including Tongva archaeologists has developed the Pimu Catalina Island Archaeological Project (PCIAP) on the island to research over 8,000 years of cultural history and rewrite public histories on their own terms (Martinez et al., 2014; Teeter et al., 2013). The central goal of this project is "to dispel the imagined history of Santa Catalina Island and to educate the public about who the Tongva were and are—an objective considered essential by the Tongva community" (Desiree R. Martinez et al., 2014: 202). Along with supporting the two Tongva archaeologists on the team in defining their own past and present, the project has also trained many university students in the methods of collaborative and indigenous archaeology with the hope that this training provided directly from Tongva members will improve understanding of indigenous values and culture in the students' future work.

In spite of these most notable efforts, observation and interviews reveal that discrimination still holds strong on the island today and must be actively resisted to move towards ecocultural justice for residents of color. Residents of Latinx descent continue to live in largely separated areas from White residents, and new migrants are still linguistically isolated (personal communication, 2018; Contreras, 2007). The linguistic and physical isolation and persecution of undocumented residents continue to construct this population as an Other with less power than their White counterparts. There is also still work to be done in recognizing the equal authority of the PCIAP collaborators of color alongside their White collaborator. The dominant cultural discourse of whiteness as possessing greater scientific and witnessing authority continues in island authorities' speaking only to the White collaborator despite the equal experiential credentials possessed by three women of color on the team. Despite the deep cultural connection, the Tongva women have to the island, they are discounted in their authority to this day due to the color of their skin (personal communication, 2018).

A constructed racial and paradise identity have defined the Catalina Island tourism experience to create the best possible experience for the White visitor since the 1880s. Racist performances and exploitations of immigrants and residents of color that affected the United States of America in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century were aggressively present on Catalina. Such exploitation colors the island's history and has an extended impact on the experience of residents of color, and White residents in a less harmful way, today.

CHAPTER 3: Manufacturing Paradise: Othering an Island and its Residents

Developing Catalina Island as a tourist escape has resulted in increasing the distance of the island from the aquapelagic system to which it belongs. The previous relationship between the island and the mainland has been replaced with an identity of isolation for the island and residents. Residents are not entirely isolated from the rest of the world, as residents and tourists have no choice but to interact on this privately-managed island, be it through the infrastructures of service, recreation, or travel between mainland and island. Research on the social dynamics of this tourism economy reveals that residents feel like an afterthought in island infrastructural development. The Catalina Island Company is seen as prioritizing tourists above employees and residents. For evidence, residents point to tourists' virtualized perceptions of Catalina Island as a tropical paradise, a view which tourism managers promote. Beaches have been capitalized, sand has been imported, palm trees have been planted, prices have been raised, and residents have been increasingly limited in their access to influence over tourism and needed resources for year-round life on the island. The discourse of Catalina Island Company managers' perceived exclusion of residents has manifested in an "othering subjectivity" of all players in their relations to each other and tourism. They now exist as isolated groups rather than a cohesive community. Private ownership and management of this island's physical infrastructure make analyzing perceptions particularly interesting, as residents express a sense of ownership over the island and its future though they lack legal titles to land. This chapter analyzes the social tension of tourism development on Catalina Island among

residents, the Catalina Island Company, and tourists through themes of aquapelagic virtualism, ownership, and the “othering” subject position.

An Aquapelagic History

With indigenous peoples on the Channel Islands relying on fishing for sustenance and travel between the islands for trade, the eight-island chain was part of a robust aquapelagic society (Perry, 2013; Raab et al., 1995). Distinct from the archipelago which focuses on the distinct land bodies, an aquapelagic society is, “a social unit existing in a location in which the aquatic spaces between and around a group of islands are utilised and navigated in a manner that is fundamentally interconnected with and essential to the social group’s habitation of land and their senses of identity and belonging” (Hayward, 2012: 5). Evidence of such aquapelagic relations has been documented significantly with an archaeological approach, with a central example being the presence of beads made from Catalina soapstone across the island chain, on mainland southern California, and in the American Southwest (Meighan, 1959; Strudwick, 2013; Teeter et al., 2013). This finding illustrates the connection between the Native people of Catalina Island and other tribes, other islands, and the ocean. Archaeologists point out this aquapelagic reliance explicitly in mapping cultural landscapes of the Gabrielino/Tongva on Catalina, stating that “it is important to recognize that trails and pathways extend beyond the island landscape; they continue into and across the ocean via boats. Thus, acknowledging and integrating seascapes into research about trails becomes imperative to understanding inter- and intra-island relationships.” They go on to say that looking at connections across communities and space in this way “align[s] more squarely with Native

American understandings of how ‘everything is connected’ within cultural landscapes” (Teeter et al., 2013: 160). Scholars of Gabrielino/Tongva culture point to the magnificent *ti’at* canoes as a central characteristic of this tribe, further explaining how the original settlers traveled the connected seascape (Alvitre, 2005; Martinez et al., 2014; Teeter et al., 2013).

Such an understanding of the ocean as a connector rather than as a moat aligns with historian Michael Pearson’s theory of the littoral society. He advocates for understanding this coastal lifestyle in which people fluidly move between land and sea as “amphibious” (Pearson, 2006). This understanding still recognizes the idea of the aquapelago, but also looks at dynamics on individual islands, where the society “is not restricted to the sea. Influences on littoral society of which we must take note can come from far inland. It is always a matter of interaction between the affairs of land and sea” (Pearson, 1985: 6). Operating aquapelagically required the Gabrielino/Tongva to mine soapstone resources on land, and harvest trees so that they could move across the “sea of islands” to trade their resources with other residents of their aquapelagic society (Hau’ofa, 1994).

With Spanish and American colonization, the islands’ Native populations were decimated and relocated, losing their traditional aquapelagic reliance on the marine world. The Spanish destroyed the aquapelagic society of the Channel Islands, forcefully relocating these populations to the mainland, dismantling the oceanic trade networks that had operated for millennia. While relocated Natives from other Channel Islands are recorded to have named mainland villages after their home islands, no such mainland village existed for the Catalina Island Tongva (Strudwick, 2013). This

absence creates a documentary loss of the unique contribution of the Catalina Tongva to this littoral and aquapelagic society, a loss of a recognized unique identity and past way of life. Additionally, it makes particularly difficult claiming roots on Catalina Island for Tongva tribal members today.

Depopulation of the California Channel Islands began with the Spanish in the late 1700s and early 1800s and is inextricably linked to the breakdown of this aquapelagic society. The overall reduction of indigenous populations reduced demand among Native trade partners on the mainland and other Channel Islands for steatite (soapstone), pelts, and jicama from Catalina Island Tongva (Meighan, 1959; Raab et al., 1995; Strudwick, 2013). Similarly, European diseases that decimated Native populations across the Channel Islands and mainland California also wiped out trading networks. In a dark way, the spread of disease across the Channel Islands demonstrates how even disease operated aquapelagically while Native people lived on the islands. This history illustrates an initial transformation of the islands from an aquapelagic society to isolated islands, and directly implicates European presence as responsible for the breakdown of this aquapelagic society. Over the next two centuries, Catalina found a new identity for itself that relied on rhetoric of isolation, transforming its status as a littoral society and its relationship with the sea and mainland.

Even so, a connection among the islands still exists after they lost their use as an aquapelagic system by Native peoples through their official names after Catholic saints (e.g. Santa Rosa, Santa Cruz, San Nicolas). Hayward's previous work in defining aquapelagos points out that beyond the explicit historic aquapelagic society,

the aquapelagic nature of the system is implicitly emphasized in the naming of the islands in reference to the channel that divides all of them from the coast rather than as an archipelago of land spaces (2012). In the northern area, it is the Santa Barbara Channel, and in the south, it is the Los Angeles Channel. While the Spanish names of the islands remain today in the aquapelagic characterization of this island chain, the indigenous reliance on seascapes for subsistence and existence has largely been erased. Today, the Channel Islands remain connected in name only. Five of the eight islands are included in the Channel Islands National Park, creating a schism in the overall aquapelagic system through dismissal of the connection of the northern islands to the three southernmost islands of Santa Catalina, San Nicholas, and San Clemente (National Park Service, 2018). Further deconstructing the aquapelagic identity, residents and tourism branders have isolated Santa Catalina Island through use of the name “Catalina” rather than its complete Spanish name, or its traditional Gabrielino/Tongva name, Pimu (McCawley, 1996). Losing this last remnant of the aquapelagic identity of Catalina as part of a system of islands further encourages the public memory of the island to exclude the Native and colonial history, not only isolating the island from its past, but from its human-environmental system as well.

Further loss of the aquapelagic identity on Catalina has been a result of increasing dependence on tourism for economic stability. Of the eight California Channel Islands, Santa Catalina Island is the only one with a year-round resident population today. The others are temporally inhabited by humans, with Santa Cruz having a ranger station for visitors to the Channel Islands National Park, and San Clemente Island operating as a Naval testing site (Santa Cruz Island Foundation,

2019). Even the major tourism management and development company on the island has recognized this increasing distance from the identity of Catalina as one of the Channel Islands; the company was renamed in 2017 from Santa Catalina Island Company to Catalina Island Company (CIC) (Catalina Island Company, 2017b). Along with the name change, the CIC focus has been on Catalina not as part of a system, but as a bound, modifiable space that is isolated and allows for a unique escape from the connections of the real world.

The CIC effort to isolate Catalina from both the Channel Islands and the mainland, and residents' struggle to accept the branding of the island makes the literature of island studies particularly relevant. Island studies is "the study of islands on their own terms," such that each island is seen as a unique place that should be approached with curiosity. In advocating for seeing islands as unique spaces and not simply more manageably-sized laboratories for studying operations of larger society, island studies promotes a sense of isolation in the identity of islands. While it is important to remember the uniqueness of the operations and cultures on individual islands, the focus on difference discourages seeing the ways oceans can act as connectors rather than moats. In demonstrating the connections that do exist between isolated islands and the larger world, island studies explores how a sense of "local" is tied to global processes through the study of islandness. Islandness recognizes the tensions residents of islands have between maintaining a unique identity, and the connection to the globalized world that they rely on for sustained existence (Baldacchino, 2004; Grydehøj, 2017). Applying the frame of island studies to this study allows for the exploration of the way in which perceptions of social justice and

power dynamics are further complicated by “islandness.” Island residents like to think of themselves as separate from the mainland: a geographically finite community with accentuated notions of identity and location, a unique expression of flora and fauna, and increased competition for limited resources. But the strategic use of localness highlights islands’ connections to globalized society. The reliance on importing and exporting resources for survival connects the island to the rest of society (Baldacchino, 2004).

Tourism acts as another external connection for residents, as some islands are dependent on being accessed by the very mainlanders that “islandness” serves to isolate them from (Vannini, 2011). Past work examining the globalization of littoral societies has highlighted how tourism is central to transforming the expected interactions of people with coastal areas. Historians writing of coastal areas of Goa, India, describe “the transformation of the beach from an alien, inaccessible, and hostile wilderness devoted to conquest, commerce, exploration, and the primal customs of tribal cultures, into a thriving, civilized, pleasure and recreation oriented outpost of Western lifestyle, where so many sybaritic impulses of culture have been indelibly concentrated” (Lencek & Bosker, 1998: x). Interactions with the permeable land-water border have transformed from being essential to the livelihood of residents to a means for visitors to recreate away from the pressures of their daily lives.

The CIC priority of making Catalina an escape from the mainland promotes a simplistic form of islandness, advertising the island as an accessible space of isolation. A place of relaxation, palm trees, and paradise without thought of the global processes at play. Such advertisement draws more people to the island as visitors, ironically

decreasing the experience of island isolation for island residents, and potentially leading to a reduced sense among residents that they can maintain their unique island subjectivities. The CIC reliance on branding Catalina as an escape has revealed oppositional identities based on island isolation, identities that are distinct from Catalina's aquapelagic past and the increased connection of the island.

The formation of social identities and perceived subjectivities have been central to the experience of residents on Catalina Island. Both identity and subjectivity deal with how people shape and are shaped by their material, political, and social surroundings. Identity is understood to be “the distinctive character belonging to any given individual, or shared by all members of a particular social category or group” (Rummens, 2003). There are multiple aspects that together produce an individual’s identity, such as race, gender, sexuality, and national origin. Rather than operating individually, it is the plurality of these identities operating together, intersecting, that help define one’s interactions with others and the world (Corburn, 2003; Crenshaw, 1989; Lee, 2017; Pellow, 2016; Rummens, 2003). Along with recognizing the important plurality and intersection of characteristics that make up an identity, it must also be recognized that identity is relational and comparative (Pulido & De Lara, 2018). Subjectivity refers to the way one relates to the self in a particular society and situation. Subjectivities are understood in this dissertation as “actors’ thoughts, sentiments, and embodied sensibilities, and, especially, their senses of self and self-world relations” (Holland & Leander, 2004). It is the production of these subjectivities that is of particular interest to this chapter. Also, these subjectivities are understood to be particularly fluid based on the specifics of a context, and are all assigned to the self

and others from the perspective of residents, as they were the population surveyed and interviewed for this research.

In the context of tourism and leisure studies, the concept of the Other is particularly powerful in understanding how one defines and relates to oneself and those around one. Tourism scholars have often written about this Other as the host population in a tourist destination, particularly when the Other is of a different racial and national identity than the guest (Jamal, Camargo, & Wilson, 2013; Jamerson, 2016; Lee, 2017; Sommer & Carrier, 2010). The process of “othering” has been well-established in critical approaches to tourism and environmental justice research in how powerful groups can distance themselves from less powerful identities (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2008; Pellow, 2016; Sommer & Carrier, 2010). Sommer and Carrier write about how tourism managers’ construction of host populations with the Other as a central part of the identity becomes engrained in how visitors see destination residents as well. This “othering” perpetuates the distancing of a host population from the tourist experience of a place, and can create a hierarchy in which tourists both fear the exotic Other of the resident and also see themselves as superior to this Other (Sommer & Carrier, 2010). Critical leisure studies scholars interrogate how to move beyond this categorization of the “Other” and recognize the unique experiences and well-being of the particular subjects that are often erased (Jamal et al., 2013; Kivel, Johnson, & Scraton, 2009). Doing so requires adding a more context-specific analysis and conducting tourism and leisure research that de-centers the tourist experience, as I aim to do throughout this dissertation.

In complicating the idea of the Other as it has been used in tourism studies, cultural studies, and feminist scholarship, I look at how the idea of the Other can be ascribed onto oneself as well as to others, once again from the perspective of the resident (Alvitre, 2005; Blackwell, Briggs, & Chiu, 2015; Higgins-Desbiolles, 2008). I do so by exploring the ways in which this “othering” can act as a complex and layered subjectivity that results from how power relations lead residents to relate to themselves, their own identities, tourists, and tourism managers (Mohanty, 1991). In doing so, I align with the idea that “othering” does not operate because of someone having a particular combination of social identities, but rather how these identities operate in conjunction with the ideologies and social and cultural practices of a society, leading to the affordance or limitation of opportunities for these various others (Kivel et al., 2009).

In this constructed tourist paradise, along with issues of participative justice, the perceived limited opportunities have manifested as issues of distributive injustice. Distributive justice refers to a fair access and distribution of resources in a community. In this chapter, fair distribution is defined as a form of justice “that does not advantage the people who started out with more or disadvantage those who started out with less.” This aligns with ideas of equity presented in social and environmental justice literature, which define equity as “distribution of resources that mitigates disadvantage” (Garrison, 2018; Gustafsson, 2004; Jamal & Camargo, 2014). The distributive issues on the island are discussed relative to tourism and from the perspective of residents.

This chapter explores how building tourism-dependence on Catalina has

shaped residents' islander identity, their associated subjectivities, and the perceived justice of the distribution of available resources. It also shows how the continued dependence on tourism creates a tension between the openness and closedness of the island. With existing research on Catalina focused on the ecology, archaeology, and mermaid iconography of the island, this chapter aims to add to this literature by exploring the human experience of living on tourism-dependent island land that is undergoing redevelopment (Fitzgerald & Corey, 2009; Hayward, 2013; Higgins & Mehta, 2018; Meighan, 1959; Ramirez, Pratt, Jacobsen, & Davis, 2012). It analyzes the social tension of tourism development on Catalina Island among residents, the Catalina Island Company, and tourists through themes of aquapelagic virtualism, distributive justice, and resident perceptions of identity and subjectivity on the island. The goal is to answer the questions who do residents perceive as having the power to influence tourism decision-making on Catalina Island, and why? How does the perceived power distribution influence the direction of tourism development on the island? And, how does this development influence residents' perspective on the distribution of the benefits and burdens of tourism?

Building Paradise

Tourism managers aim to satisfy visitors. This means making possible changes to the island landscape to match the ideal getaway for as many visitors as possible. As visitors' desired holiday experience changes, so must the destination be transformed to accommodate a growing influx of visitors (Munt, 1994). In this way, tourists visiting Catalina Island over the past one hundred forty years have unknowingly influenced the direction of tourism development on Catalina Island. Rather than exerting influence

from ownership of island resources or government power, tourists vote in favor of particular ways of developing tourism by spending money on the island – i.e. in their choice of one destination, hotel, or restaurant over another – which influences managers and decisions. Meeting the needs of the visitors who desire a full-service resort, an alternative backpacking experience, or an affordable island getaway means developing multiple tourism experiences on the island to match these desires. Munt, an anthropologist, notes that while tourists demand different resources and may see themselves as unique from one another in their ideal holiday, they all share the temporal and monetary privilege of taking a holiday from their normal life (1994). Particularly on a privately managed island, this gives tourists great power to influence development decisions, as their choices can directly influence decisions made by the one company which owns all the developable land on the island without needing to incorporate resident concerns. Destination branders curate tourist desires as well, making advertising choices that invite tourists' ideas of vacation to progress towards a particular idea of the ultimate experience that aligns with developer's interests (Sommer & Carrier, 2010). When the goal is maximizing tourism revenue, achieving such an end goal can only be realized by catering to the desires of the tourists, even if at the cost of satisfying year-round residents (West & Carrier, 2004). Having a connection to the Catalina Island community is not what gives one influence over tourism decision-making on the island. Rather, tourists get some influence in managers' tourism development decisions by "voting" with their money.

“Who else can do the advertising like they [the Catalina Island Company] do? That's also something you hear from everybody, 'everywhere I go you just see Catalina Island, come zip at Catalina island' but for years there was nothing

related to advertisement. Now they're just constantly. You can't beat their money" – Avalon resident of color, 2017⁸

Visitors to Catalina Island have an idea of the island as a South Pacific paradise. This is not an entirely false vision of the island, as Two Harbors was used as the major backdrop for the 1935 film *Mutiny on the Bounty*, which was set in Tahiti (McClure, 2013; Miller, 2017). It is, however, an unrealistic expectation for the island to have a landscape of consistently green vegetation, white sand beaches, abundant native palm trees, clear aquamarine waters, and grass-thatched huts. Off the coast of Southern California, the island is a Mediterranean ecosystem, characterized by shrubs, oak trees, consistently comfortable temperatures, and mildly wet winters with dry summers (Zanelli & Horn, 2011). While receiving more rain than a desert, the temperate environment of Catalina is much different in terms of annual precipitation and native vegetation relative to tropical forests of the South Pacific.

Tourism managers working to promote the tourist ideal of Catalina as tropical paradise into a reality reinforce a false idea of what the island naturally looks like. Constructing the environment and activities of a destination to match tourists' desires rather than the actual authentic environment of a place is a form of virtualism. It is the real-world manifestation of an imagined reality, made possible through policies and infrastructure changes to an authentic environment (West & Carrier, 2004). Processes of virtualism call upon understanding Catalina through a progressive understanding of

⁸ Limited identification of interviewees is provided in the interest of their privacy and confidentiality. I am not able to share further categories of identity beyond person of color/White and community of residence (form of employment, socioeconomic status, etc.) without also creating the possibility of participants becoming identifiable. Further, while I do think it is important to understand how race has affected experience and justice on the island, I do not find race to be the only relevant identity category of analysis, hence the examination of the intersectional identities and subjectivities island residents possess. Explanation of why such confidentiality is particularly important on Catalina Island is expanded on in Chapter 4.

place (Massey, 1993). Rather than tourists, managers, and residents experiencing Catalina Island as a static set of political, environmental, and social features, people's understanding of Catalina as a place changes as the previously named aspects of the island change (Baldwin, 2005). Tourism development to match virtualized understandings of the island has been instrumental in transforming Catalina as a place environmentally and socio-politically. This began with Wrigley's importation of palm trees in the 1930s, and the idea of Two Harbors as a South Pacific island also came in the early 1900s. The most cited perceived changes to the environmental and socio-political space of the island have occurred, however, under the current Catalina Island Company owners and their management team, especially as evidenced in the 2017 South Pacific-inspired development of Harbor Sands (Madans, 2017).

Environmental Place

Major touristic development on the island picked up in the early 1920s when Wrigley purchased the island in 1919. He planted eucalyptus trees along the winding hill road entrance to Avalon to increase comfort while riding around the island in a stagecoach (Pedersen & Catalina Island Museum, 2004). After his son, Philip, took control of the company in the 1930s, the start of the tropical island ideal came to life (Overholt, 1934; The Catalina Islander, 1934). Philip was particularly responsible for the branding and continuing to encourage visitors' virtualized view of Two Harbors as a South Pacific paradise. His branding slogans to this effect included that Two Harbors is "informal as a grass skirt." Further exoticizing the experience for White visitors, promotions stated, "This is the place to be yourself – your chance to 'go native' for a while. Trade your city clothes for a coat of tan. Forget the white man's

burden” (Culver, 2010: 130). While these colonialist promotions are no longer so explicit, capitalizing on the idea of the island beaches as reminiscent of tropical paradise remains.

The most commonly expressed sentiments about how tourism impacts the natural environment on Catalina are the changes to the beaches. To create a more idyllic tropical landscape, tourism managers have changed the appearance of some of the island beaches starting in the early 1990s. A naturally rocky beach in Avalon has been transformed into the Descanso Beach Club. Approval was given and initial development began on Descanso Resort in 1992, but the big changes came in the 2010 remodel when the Descanso Beach Club imported white sand, installed for-rent chaise lounges and cabanas, and added a climbing wall (Catalina Island Company, 2017b). These changes made the beach align with the comfortable and typical private beach experience the desired Catalina Island tourist expects today. The website for the beach club advertises this effort to match the beach to tourist expectations rather than allowing tourists to experience the authentic beach as it naturally exists, noting “Our imported beach sand is gentle on feet and gives guests a beautiful and comfortable place to relax in the sun” (Catalina Island Company, 2017a). An authentic experience of the beach would be one with a rocky shoreline and some naturally existing sand on the shore, with minimal human modifications to the waterfront area. Of course, even the existence of tourists on the island relies on creating enjoyable areas for recreating, but the changes of imported sand, cabanas, and a beachfront bar, while increasing comfort, do not provide tourists an authentic experience of a Catalina beach. Arguably, tourists don’t want an “authentic experience.”

Harbor Sands, a similar development to Descanso Beach Club that embraces tourist ideals over an authentic experience, was constructed in Two Harbors over the winter of 2017 and opened summer of 2017. Raised above the intertidal zone, Harbor Sands is a roped off area that features imported white sand, lounge chairs, and six palapas. The CIC president and CEO claims this development is “keeping with [Two Harbor’s] history and authenticity,” but the authenticity Harbor Sands works with is the development brought in to create a South Pacific landscape for filming movies, not the landscape of Two Harbors prior to tourism (Madans, 2017). MacCannell explains this development as a “staged authenticity” (1973). Rather than being a true demonstration of the authentic environment or way of life in Two Harbors, the branding guides tourists to believe Two Harbors is truly like this South Pacific beach attraction. With the continued development of the beaches in this way, however, it may move from being a staged authenticity to “emergent authenticity,” which recognizes the ability of something originally viewed as inauthentic to become accepted as an authentic representation of the space (Cohen, 1988). Both Descanso and Harbor Sands feature dining areas as well, with the company website advertising the “friendly service,” another expectation visitors have of how the employees will treat them during their vacation experiences (Catalina Island Company, 2018a). In both cases, the changes left the intertidal zone, which is public space, untouched, making the developments legal.

The residents unhappy with these developments do not understand why the existing environment had to be altered. In speaking about the Descanso Beach Club, residents expressed frustration with having to pay to go to the beach in their home

town and hinted at the potential ecological problems with using invasive and imported products:

“The aesthetics are all for the tourists. If it wasn’t, then Descanso Beach would still have rocks... you have to pay to just walk on the sand. All the sand was imported. There’s no Catalina there. It’s like Maui or something. Everything was brought in, they didn’t use any of the local fauna or flora to make it better, they just made it pretty.” – Avalon White resident, 2017

In the case of Two Harbors, part of the resistance is to the more upscale, closed-resort feel residents believe Harbor Sands has given the town. Residents and tourists from past seasons continually expressed frustration in casual conversation about how this has minimized the outdoorsy, rugged charm the town used to possess as a way to stand apart from the resort feel of Avalon. Being a unique destination and community from Avalon is important to Two Harbors residents. In residents’ opinions, the main difference between the two developments is in the naming of the sheltered areas available for rent—i.e. “cabanas” or “palapas.” In interviews, residents were eager to share their resistance to Harbor Sands, noting that developers had told them, “this won’t be another Descanso,” but they have difficulty seeing any difference between the two sites:

“We have meetings that we’re mandatorily supposed to show up for, and then they tell us, we’re redoing the beach, we’re not gonna turn it into a Descanso, we promise you guys, it’s gonna be great, and I just had a meeting today, they were comparing the palapas to cabanas. It’s the same thing, they just turned the front beach area into Descanso. They’re like, ‘Oh it’s not gonna be Descanso,’ and it’s like, you just lied to our faces” –Two Harbors White resident, 2017

From an economic standpoint, the development has made the resort town more attractive to a clientele that would be turned off by a less-developed beach, and these new visitors would likely spend more money in the tourist facilities for which many of the residents work (Dunn, 2017). During the summer of 2017, the palapas were almost

entirely empty on the weekdays and were only all occupied on the weekend of July fourth, United States' Independence Day. The Adirondack chairs were more often rented out, but there were also many vacant at most times. The emptiness of these new facilities begs the question of whether Harbor Sands is actually bringing more income to the CIC.

Socio-political Place

Along with denouncing the conversion of these capitalized beaches, residents are frustrated with how the developments have changed their interaction with the beach. In both Descanso and Harbor Sands, the development closed off an area of beach that was previously open for free public use. This change in the customary use of the beach represents a common experience among disenfranchised groups. The spaces that have been capitalized are on land that has always been privately owned, but previously, there was unrestricted access and the spaces were minimally developed. This led residents to understand their use and rights to the space as a public area. The area now known as Harbor Sands was previously unfenced, with limited official oversight by CIC employees or security, many picnic tables, barbeques, and a beach volleyball net all for public use. The space now has fencing to corral Harbor Sands patrons and public moving through the town, limiting the paths available to residents and tourists moving through the town center, with a CIC security guard monitoring behavior at all times.

“It wasn’t as warmly received as the [Catalina Island] company may have liked: they put up the Harbor Sands. There’s a place designated for anybody to go in there and be on the new beach, but the difference in the setting is so great, that many folks aren’t receptive to that.” –Two Harbors White resident, 2017

“The island company is trying to give it a resort like feel, and what it’s going to do is it’s going to push out the residents. They don’t want to pay for a cabana on a beach in the place they live. It’s like going to Descanso” -former Avalon White resident, 2017

Officially, anyone is allowed to sit at the picnic tables or on the sand within the roped off area, but only food from the restaurant connected to Harbor Sands is allowed. In the first season of Harbor Sands, there was only one picnic table available in the unfenced beachfront area of Two Harbors. Following continuous complaints from residents and visitors alike, there are now about six beachfront picnic tables in the unfenced, beachfront area. In Avalon, entering Descanso requires paying a \$2 fee. Different from most other private beach clubs, the Descanso website advertises the club as open to the public, so anyone who wishes to pay the fee is welcome to use the private beach (Catalina Island Company, 2017a). While residents are upset about these changes to the natural environment, they are not so unhappy as to leave the island:

“When I was younger, I didn’t really care so much about work, I was just trying to get my paycheck to go party. And then once I started getting asked to come back, and started working harder, I started to get more interested into what I was doing, and my job, and my wellbeing, here, and living here, and trying to do my part in the community...I try to take care of this place. I honestly don’t care about the company anymore, I’m just trying to make sure everyone else here is happy, and that they’re well taken care of, because this company’s not doing it.” – Two Harbors White resident, 2017

This reveals that while the capitalization of the beaches has changed residents’ sense of place at these beaches, their connection to the island is defined by more than beach access.

While capitalizing the beach is itself frustrating to residents, the change occurring without consultation of the locals has been a greater source of discontent. Residents perceive a right to influence tourism development on the island, and to use

these now capitalized areas of the beach in the ways they have historically. Residents disagree on how much they would like to participate in tourism development, but there is a common sentiment that the process of developing these spaces was inappropriately opaque. In Two Harbors, some workers stated employers alerted them of the upgrade to the beach right as it began, while some residents claim to have not been told of the change at all and only became aware when piles of white sand arrived on the site. While the sand was present in January of 2017, the CIC did not formally announce the Harbor Sands development until the end of February (Madans, 2017). The process of developing Descanso left some residents concerned about how it limits where families can take their children and the expensive prices for making use of the tourist attractions at the resort. The capitalization of the Descanso Beach Club occurred with City of Avalon approval in an effort to increase tax revenue for a city project, though the initial plans actually suggested a more intensive resort development than was eventually produced (Taylor, 1992). While residents of both sites recognize the importance of tourism to the island, they understand the incessant focus on increasing island tourism as not in the resident interest. Rather than seeing efforts to increase tourism as working to better support the well-being of the year-round island population, local perceptions of the tourism development process are of tourism managers working to maximize profit by meeting the tourists' idea of an island paradise. Well-being here is related to the justice of this development, in that development has not provided residents with a sense that they are recognized, allowed to participate, or given fair access to resources.

Residents and the Island's Tourism Identity

The paradise image of Catalina certainly succeeds in bringing tourists to the island. It also attracts seasonal workers who often times become year-round and lifelong residents. For those who become residents of the island, rather than feeling an increasing sense of influence over the island, they instead become the “other” on the island. This “othering” manifests in positive and negative ways, all of which are described below as they relate to the influence various actors have in tourism development on the island.

Influence over tourism development: the tourism managers

The visibly influential actors in tourism development on the island are those who manage tourism (Bramwell & Meyer, 2007; Sommer & Carrier, 2010). With a single company holding all developable land, individuals in upper management of the CIC are able to sway the direction of the island significantly. The priorities of these managers decide not only how development on the island proceeds, but who is considered in such development. Previous research has found that tourism managers' choices can significantly affect how tourism impacts a community (Baldwin, 2005; Bramwell & Meyer, 2007). In work on local peoples and natural resource management, Baldwin's findings emphasize the importance of intentional, informed community inclusion to positively impact a host community (2005). Without such inclusion, resident businesses can easily become ignored or avoided unless they advertise as part of a tourism package (Sommer & Carrier, 2010). Along with reducing revenue for these businesses, guiding tourists toward certain businesses and away from others can lead tourists to see selected residents as tour guides or service

providers, and residents feel the remaining locals are then treated by tourism managers as “neglected others.” This sense of the “other” also exists in the tourism managers’ minds when development choices make tourists the separate, “preferred other,” from the very island community that has been designed to depend on tourists to exist (Baldacchino, 2004; Sommer & Carrier, 2010).

With the Catalina Island Company having set a goal of revitalizing tourism on the island, residents have come to understand how the company’s priorities result in these “others”. Residents perceive the top priority to be meeting the desires of tourists. In many locals’ eyes, this makes the needs of year-round community members an afterthought. Some accept this as a necessary priority for the CIC to maintain economic viability. Rather than managers working to ensure the lower-level employees of the company and year-round residents have the resources they need to exist on the island in and out of the tourist season, managers cater to tourists. This aligns with Sommer and Carrier’s findings that tourism operators see tourists as both needing protection and as separate from locals, and further notes the complexity that it is the operators themselves that create this dynamic based on the manager-created perceptions of tourists and residents (2010).

Injustices

The major issues of distributive injustice on Catalina can be divided into categories of mobility and resource access. Within mobility, there are problems with inequity both in transportation between the island and the mainland and in mobility around the island. Consistent housing availability and water access are major resource concerns for residents. Interviewees across racial and socioeconomic backgrounds raised these

issues; however, certain social identities experience a greater burden from these injustices. Specifically, residents who are first-generation immigrants, have limited English fluency, and/or are of lower socioeconomic status are disproportionately burdened. Families that are well-established as members of the community regardless of racial background are seen as having greater access to resources. This further exacerbates the perception across resident social identities that tourists are the “preferred other” in their greater access to resources for recreation compared to neglected residents’ experience in access to resources needed for daily life.

(Im)mobilities of islandness

On Catalina, managers look out for tourists as “preferred others” in the community through resources that are inequitably distributed between residents and tourists. For example, tourists are cared for in transportation to the island via ferry and helicopter. Residents have the same transportation options available, but these are not affordable methods for commuting between the island and mainland for most workers. The helicopter transport is at least \$270 per person, and the ferry is \$75 per person roundtrip (Catalina Express, 2017; IEX Helicopters, 2019). While these are not “cheap” methods of transport, the fact that one million visitors frequent the island annually using their own boats, the ferry, and the helicopters makes clear that travel to the island is not severely inhibited by the cost of transportation. Previous scholarship in island studies has highlighted this imbalance of the ease of mobility for visitors and business entities relative to the greater immobility of local residents (Sheller, 2009; Vannini, 2011). The precedence of this observation emphasizes the common practice of prioritizing tourist access and profit gain over daily experiences of residents.

For residents, travel between island and mainland is necessary for medical appointments, purchasing perishable groceries, and maintaining relationships with mainland family members. Only islanders that can demonstrate year-round residence receive a discount on transportation, paying \$198 with a subsidy card for ten one-way trips on the Catalina Express ferry (personal communication, 2018). This equates to about a 50% discount from the unsubsidized cost. Seasonal employees, and even some year-round CIC employees must pay the same price as a tourist. Employees in this position expressed that this cost is prohibitive, which has kept many from attending important family functions, has led them to rely on mail to receive supplies not available on the island, and has forced them to purchase groceries from the expensive island grocers compared to mainland prices.⁹ Although managers meet the needs of tourists, without equitable availability of resources for residents, they feel they are the “neglected others.”

While the (im)mobilities of islandness affect all residents, the experience of Latinx migrants highlights the power of nationality, ethnicity, and race in further burdening particular people with a sense of forced immobility in Avalon. This analysis requires consideration of the intersecting factors of citizen status, length of residency, perceived race, and class. The immobility of certain residents on the island is particularly problematic in the way undocumented immigrants are marooned on the island. Although Latinx migrants have the ability to purchase commuter books for more affordable travel between the mainland and island, they cannot do so without presenting government-issued identification. Thus, discounted transportation is

⁹ The residents call this premium they pay for the food to be transported to the island the “boat tax.”

unavailable to residents who lack legally recognized documentation to be in the United States. As the island is home to many immigrants who have moved directly from Latin American countries to the island, this impacts a significant portion of island residents. The exact number is difficult to identify due to the sensitivity of the subject.

The implications of the recent policy that requires government-issued documentation in order to purchase discounted transportation tickets mirrors voter registration laws requiring similar identification at the polls in United States elections. Political science researchers argue that the impact of such laws has been the disempowering and discrimination of people of minority and marginalized racial identities, with particular burdens on immigrant residents of the United States (Barreto, Nuño, & Sanchez, 2007; Bentele & O'Brien, 2013). This is seen as the “de-democratization” of a nation that claims to be the model of democracy, and is particularly problematic in relation to immigrant experiences of identification requirements when considered against the history of the United States as a nation of (colonizing) immigrants (Bentele & O'Brien, 2013: 1090). These laws for voter registration are branded by some as one manifestation of “Jim Crow 2.0,” as they allow for discriminatory actions that do not violate the Fifteenth Amendment (Bentele & O'Brien, 2013; Rocha & Matsubayashi, 2014). Similar to the discriminatory impact these laws have in who shows up to vote, the practice of checking identification for passengers on the Catalina Express ferry between the mainland and island serves to intimidate passengers of marginalized identities, particularly immigrants, from traveling on the ferry. Immigration enforcement officers have continually used the

ferry as an opportunity to identify and deport residents without documents since the 1970s (Alvarado, 2008; Beronus, n.d.; Currie, 1986; Hernandez, 2005; Los Angeles Times, 1976; Rae-Dupree, 1991; Sahagun, 2008, 2010; Spagat, 2010).

This policing of documentation has created a culture of fear of ferry travel among undocumented residents, and forces those who do choose to travel to risk losing contact with their family by making a trip that can be necessary for vital services not available on the island (Hernandez, 2005). As this is something that all United States citizens do not have to face, this particular immobility targets those service workers who are new to the island. Moving between the mainland and island is essential for many residents, and if taking the ferry is unavailable due to cost or deportation fears, this adds an intersectional burden of increased poverty in addition to isolation on the island for some residents.

Another immobility that particularly targets residents of color at an intersection of identities is access to the interior of the island and mobility around the island beyond the borders of the city of Avalon. Officially, residents have access to free permits to walk on Catalina Island Conservancy land, which makes up all the undeveloped land surrounding the city of Avalon. The rugged and diverse landscape of Catalina Island, however, makes such movement difficult without a car, and one resident noted that it is effectively unnavigable for people with physical disabilities. With a limited number of permits available to own a car on the island, the waiting list to have a vehicle is sixteen years (personal communication, 2017). Thus, even if residents can afford to pay the high gas prices on island and to purchase a car, one must be long established on the island to have a car, and then still must jump another

hurdle of gaining a conservancy car permit to see the interior of the island. Conservancy volunteers have much easier access to the interior, as they must go to the interior of the island to visit the Conservancy headquarters at Middle Ranch.

Visitors to the island also have access to the island interior through a variety of tours. The Catalina Island Conservancy operates both the “Wildlands Express” and Jeep “Eco-Tours.” The Jeep tours take visitors from Avalon to the Conservancy headquarters at Middle Ranch and back, with a curated tour hosted by a Conservancy employee, pointing out the American Bison, bald eagles and other various fauna visitors may spot along the way, starting at \$70 for a two-hour tour. The Wildlands Express operates year-round and is advertised as an “inexpensive” way to see the “wildlands” of Catalina at \$64 roundtrip for adults; it tours the interior of the island (Catalina Island Conservancy, 2017b). Another option for visitors to see the interior of the island is the “Safari Bus,” operated by the Catalina Island Company. The Safari Bus transfers visitors between Two Harbors, the smaller population center and tourist destination, and Avalon, stopping at a popular camping destination and the Catalina airport along the way, for a round trip cost of \$114 with additional costs for gear (Catalina Island Company, 2017c). This option only operates during summer months. The new Cyclone boat operated by the Catalina Island Company takes people between Two Harbors and Avalon for \$30 round trip, but does not give any access to the interior of the island (Catalina Island Company, 2018b).

These tours of the interior are not seen as affordable to residents and reinforce the greater island mobilities of tourists over residents. In speaking with a Hispanic Catalina resident and community leader, he shared that when he took high school

students from Avalon on a camping trip, a lifelong islander of color informed him that it was his first time being to any part of the island outside of Avalon. The only way the teenager was able to have this experience was due to a school-sponsored celebration of his sports team. Lower-income residents, families new to the island, and teenage residents are unlikely to get to experience the interior of the island beyond the confines of Avalon; while this is not an explicit policy, prohibitive costs serve to create spaces that are differentially accessible for residents and visitors (Sheller, 2009). The costs of mobility, the status of the majority of the island as conserved with monitored access, and the lack of access to resident-owned vehicles all act to control resident mobility in seeing the entirety of the place they call home.

While education can be an opportunity for students to see the interior and diversity of the island's ecosystem, and as a way to move off the island through jobs and university opportunities, injustice limits how education serves students in this way. Education is a liberating activity, but only when students have access to quality education (hooks, 1994). On the island, students all attend a single school. The key experiential components of the education are only available to the students that are "at the top of the class" and are able to miss class for a few days. For students who have to work after school, or are taking classes in a nonnative language, being recognized as a student of high achievement is difficult. Personal communication from a White young person who grew up on the island and got to participate in the programs that allow students to explore the rest of the island revealed that such opportunities are largely given to students who are from families that are well-established on the island and are of at least middle class (2018). A recently developed summer program for high

schoolers has served as a key tool to help students see a life moving beyond the island and different than that modeled by parents working in service jobs, as it supports students in applying to university. Immigrant and Mexican-American parents working in the service sector on the island do emphasize the importance of education to their children, but a mental health counselor explained that because many students' parents work three jobs at a time, there is minimal afterschool support to encourage students to complete their homework. Further, many students must attain scholarships or aid to attend college without going into significant debt. In the words of a Hispanic community leader, this leads some students to think, "it doesn't matter if I don't do well in school, I can just get a job where my parents work and I'll be fine." This makes education another source of immobility, as the lack of equitable access to liberating education on the island fixes young residents' status on the island.

Thus, island residents of various identities are challenged with immobility on the island in a variety of ways. This is a form of discrimination in that residents that lack fluency in English and citizen status are significantly more burdened with this immobility than others. It is also an issue of equity, as the resources required for mobility are inequitably distributed across members of particular identities. The abilities to move around the island cater to long-time island residents, island visitors, and citizens. These injustices make it difficult for young residents with marginalized identities to imagine a life beyond that which is modeled for them, and leads to continued disenfranchisement of those residents who are unable to move beyond Avalon.

On-island resource access

Nearly all residents also experience the “neglected others” subjectivity as a result of the distributive inequities they experience due to their lack of power over resource distribution. Scarcity of water has continually been an issue since the inception of tourism on the island (Ahern, 1924; Sahagun, 2015, 2016; Stewart, 1986a, 1986b; Taylor, 1992; Windle, 1924). Beyond transportation, water access and distribution perpetuate the perception that visitors are the “preferred other.” From 2012 to late 2016, the island experienced a severe drought, leading to water restrictions (Kelly, 2013; Ruiz, 2015). Beginning with limited outdoor watering, it escalated to fines for exceeding water allotments based on 2011-2012 household usage. This was seen as unfair, as the allotment did not account for changes in occupancy from 2012 to 2016:

Male partner: “When [tourists] come out here they use a lot of our water, and we don’t get a lot of it out here on the island in general.”

Female partner: “So that in turn, I mean, last year we were paying Stage 3 drought water prices, which are really expensive. At one point, we were only allotted 23 gallons per day for both of us” –Two Harbors White couple, 2017

Multiple residents shared that their 2016 allotment was based on a time before they lived there, when the home was empty, resulting in minimal allocations for their family in the times of water restriction (personal communication, 2017). After the end of the high season for tourism in 2016, use had to be reduced by an additional 10% in areas that did not have access to desalinization plants (Nichols, 2015; Ruiz, 2015; Southern California Edison, 2015; Villegas, 2016). Efforts were made by managers to reduce water use in the Catalina Island tourism industry, with restaurants using disposable cutlery and plates, and hotels shipping their laundry to the mainland to

meet island water usage limits (Nichols, 2015; Sahagun, 2015, 2016). While managers and residents worked to reduce use to meet the water restrictions, the increased reductions following the tourist season bred a sense of distributive injustice among residents towards the utility company and resentment towards tourists. Tourists were asked to use water sustainably without penalized usage limits (See Figure 7). This reflects MacCannell's findings that tourists are not held responsible for their behaviors within tourist establishments, but rather enjoy destinations as prepared for them by destination managers (1973). This injustice was perceived with the utility company, Southern California Edison, rather than with the CIC. Southern California Edison is the company managing both electrical and water utilities for all island customers. Beyond frustration with the lack of economic sanction of tourist overuse of water, residents saw this lack of concern about the sustainability of tourist water use as prioritizing tourists over the year-round availability of water for residents.

"I don't think there's enough being done, when they come over on vacation, they use up a lot of water. I think it's been proven that people on vacation use more water in the given time that they're here than people who live here. [Southern California Edison does] try and put up signs at vacation rentals and hotels, you know, 'be water-wise,' but honestly, they're on vacation, what do they care? So, I don't think that's fair, and I don't think [tourists] think about it the way islanders do." – Avalon resident of color, 2017

"We've been doing such a good job of conserving. The locals, we've done a great job. Even I'd imagine, the [Catalina] Island Company, they're doing their part because they've got to pay for [water] as well. I'd say, anyone who comes here as a tourist, they're the winners as far as the water conservation. Nobody's making them conserve" – Avalon White resident, 2017

Figure 7. Banner at the entrance to public restrooms and showers in Two Harbors posted by the water company, demonstrating the intensity of efforts focused at reducing visitor water use (photo taken September 2018).

Resident efforts to conserve water included collecting condensation from air conditioning vents, reusing water from dishes to water plants, and collecting shower water to flush toilets (personal communication, 2017). Even though the most intense water restrictions ended in March of 2017, residents continue their conservation practices. While residents made extensive efforts to conserve their water use to match the water restrictions without being fined, and worked to ensure the extended availability of water on the island, tourists faced no forced use restrictions. When asked about environmental concerns, residents continually pointed to water as a major concern for both sustainability reasons and fair access. As a way to move forward to increasing fair access to water, residents supported conservation efforts and increased focus on desalinization over drilling new wells for groundwater (D. Young, 2018a). The issue of water has revealed concerns with distributive injustice outside of the CIC's control. Both water and transport to and from the island include resources that are not entirely managed by the CIC. Thus, while the CIC controls what stores exist on the island and limits resident choices among resources, the specific resources that are perceived as being distributed unfairly to residents are not directly due to the CIC's choices.

Housing is another essential resource, that is largely under the CIC's control, to which residents struggle to have consistent, affordable access. With 88% of the island protected under a conservancy, there is limited space to build homes for the island population. Affordable housing has continuously been an issue on the island since the 1980s, with the local newspaper continually reporting on resident complaints and city efforts to address the shortage. With all but 1% of the developable land on the island in the hands of the CIC, gaining the land to build affordable housing requires the CIC to cede its own land to a developer or the city. The CIC recognizes the need for more housing and is currently constructing new housing for its own employees in Avalon. For city employees and service workers not employed by the CIC, this worsens the divide between the Catalina Island Company and the community. As one White participant noted below, along with availability of affordable housing, there is a sense that putting all affordable housing in a single area of town would "ghettoize" the neighborhood. This reveals that besides the great need for affordable housing, the implicit understanding is that such housing will create a segregated community at the intersection of socioeconomic and racial identity that he does not want near his home.

"My thing, that I don't think is fair is the amount of vacation rentals and hotels we have versus the public housing we have, honestly, if I wanted to move today, if my family grew or something happened, I'd have to move over town on the mainland. So, they take care of tourists but they don't take care of residents" – Avalon resident of color, 2017

"There's talk of developing major multi-unit properties around my personal dwelling. I will be very upset and I will fight that. Not because I think we don't need the housing, but what is happening is they're basically ghettoizing part of town and putting all the subsidized housing in one area. I think it should be spread throughout the community more." – Avalon White resident, 2017

The seasonality of the island economy further worsens the housing crisis. Many of the homes on the island are vacation homes that go unoccupied for much of the year or are rented out to island residents until summer comes. During summer, maintaining housing is a difficult feat for renters. Most service workers on the island rent their homes, and in the summer, landlords fill their properties with visitors to the island who can afford up to triple the rent cost charged in the off-season. Tourists will willingly pay the exorbitant rent rates for a week of fun in paradise, but this comes at a great expense to the residents. Personal communication with community leaders on the island revealed that service industry employees will work three jobs during the summer to afford the rent. They also work multiple jobs simultaneously in the summer to afford to live on the island in the slower winter months when jobs are not as plentiful. This inability to gain summer housing on a tourist island is not unique to Catalina; it is a common phenomenon of inconvenience observed across seasonal tourist destinations, and especially islands (Vannini, 2011). If these essential members of the island community could gain ownership of their homes, they could avoid these volatile rent prices, but with the dearth of housing on the island, such an opportunity is rare, and when it does arise, the cost is far beyond the reach of most working island residents. While vacation rentals are great for the companies and individuals on the island that rely on tourist renters for their income, it creates a serious issue of access for residents who work serving the very visitors who occupy homes otherwise available to residents.

The perceived increased accessibility of the resources to tourists and continued focus on the tourist experience above residents' island experience furthers the view

that those who profit most from the island prioritize tourists above islanders. Residents believe the CIC's prioritization of tourists' needs manifests due to a company culture that is money-driven and sees employees as disposable. In defense of the CIC, it is a for-profit tourism company, so maintaining economic viability is important. Additionally, the CIC does not exclusively manage electricity, water, or transportation. Residents, however, see the goal of profit as the sole concern of the company, which leads to development decisions that do not consider the impacts on the people who live in these communities ("Catalina Discussion," 2018; personal communication 2017, 2018). This is an argument that the CIC has a social responsibility to look out for its employees and their well-being, even if it legally has no obligation to do so. Since the CIC provides employees with affordable housing, if an employee stops working on the island, logically they are forced to leave. This is upsetting to employees who see Catalina as more than an employment opportunity. Year-round and returning seasonal employees note that the tight-knit community that developed in both Two Harbors and Avalon encourages residents to remain on the island. Unfortunately, in Two Harbors staying on the island becomes nearly impossible if not employed by the CIC, forcing CIC employees to choose between remaining a part of the community or leaving a job where they feel disposable. The CIC is not concerned about maintaining the same people in the one hundred fifty seasonal jobs that make up over a fourth of all CIC workers from year to year (Catalina Island Company, 2019b, 2019a). Spending a summer working on an island in southern California is an easy sell. Many residents noted the successful destination-branding the CIC has produced. This same persuasive advertising to attract tourists gives the CIC easy access to new

employees to replace those who no longer wish to work in a community where some feel they have inequitable resource access.

Influence over tourism development: the residents

At this point, it is likely clear that residents do not perceive themselves as having significant influence over the direction of tourism development on Catalina Island. Residents feel they should be more included in tourism development, as they have year-round observations and understanding of what would be “best” for the island. As Jamal and Getz point out in explaining differences in understanding legitimacy, there is not a set group understanding of what best means for themselves, their environment, and their community (1995). Some argued that aggressive tourism development is essential to the long-term support of a year-round population, with others arguing such advancements demand building a better infrastructure for employees first:

“And this is the thing I think islanders don’t get: they want the tourists to go, and they say, ‘we’re the real taxpayers.’ No, you’re not. 75% of our taxes come from tourism. You want to impact quality of life? You want to get rid of tourism, or lower it? We’d have nothing. [The city] can’t actually increase your quality of life because we won’t have the money to do it. You actually need infrastructure [of tourism]” – Avalon resident of color, 2017

“I think there are some really good ways that the Island Company could improve not only the facilities, and the town, if you would, but they don’t look at the environment that way, they just strictly want to make profits. As an example, some of the just general infrastructure. If the money was put towards infrastructure rather than put towards increasing tourism, it would make the community nicer, as well as make the tourists more comfortable” –Two Harbors White resident, 2017

Others had their focus on the best future for the island as one which builds tourism around environmental education, emphasizing the history and diversity of species on the island rather than constructing more attractions for tourists.

Regardless of whether residents live in Two Harbors or Avalon, they feel very connected to the environment in which they live, and this connection gives them a sense of ownership over their home. By environment, I mean both the natural environment of the physical environment in their backyards and surroundings as well as the community of people among whom they live and work, including tourists (Pulido, 1996). Living on a tourism-dependent island means nearly everywhere these residents go is somewhere they may encounter tourists. The grocery store, beach, and streets are all spaces shared between residents and tourists. This constant interaction means residents are intimately aware of the areas tourists frequent most and what might be of interest to tourists. Residents see their knowledge as more complete than managers on the island, as the mobility of managers between Two Harbors, Avalon, and the mainland reduces their depth of understanding of the island community outside of CIC interactions.

The connections community members have to these environments create a sense of ownership over their homes and community, though residents rarely have the ability to actually own property on the island. Previous anthropological work has recognized this idea that ownership in a tourist destination is more than a legal title, it is established through connection to the landscape (Strang, 2010). On Catalina, this landscape includes both the protected areas that are undeveloped, as well as the environment in which they live, work, and play. The landscape ownership residents possess reveals itself as an owner subjectivity. Perceptions of injustice arise here, as the ownership subjectivity leads residents to argue that they should be contributing to decisions on tourism development. Sense of ownership without legal title is seen as

injustice in that it not only limits resident ability to contribute to decision-making, it also limits the respect given to resident knowledge. Residents explained that the CIC and other tourism managers use this lack of legal ownership as an argument to ignore residents' experiential knowledge of living on the island in making development decisions.

This reveals that ownership subjectivities are not recognized in decision-making when not supported by the objective legal title. This frustrates residents that feel changes to this landscape disrupt the balance of commercial development relative to the undeveloped beach and protected areas that this ownership subjectivity attaches them to. In working to protect this landscape to which they have grown so attached, some residents hope to contribute to tourism to make it a more sustainable practice on the island, calling for more eco-tourism opportunities and sustainability initiatives to attract the conservation-minded tourist. To these residents, rather than increasing shopping, spa, and high-class dining options, sustainable tourism development should focus on increasing tourists' knowledge of and appreciation for the biodiversity of the terrestrial and marine areas of the island. Residents see tourism as inevitable and necessary on the island, and this call among some for eco-tourism pushes for tourism expansion that emphasizes growth of visitor education rather than resource use. Residents' common desire for legitimate influence in tourism decision-making is based in maintaining tourism on the island, but doing so in harmony with the needs of residents. Legitimizing the residents' landscape ownership would allow for a more just recognition of locals who hope not only to contribute to tourism development to

increase tourism, but also to improve the well-being of the island environment and community.

In addition to the “neglected othering,” subjectivity residents experience relative to tourists, the owner subjectivity reveals another sense of “othering” between residents and managers. Bringing together differences in class status with owner subjectivity, residents perceive tourism managers as being quite different from residents in terms of knowledge of environmental and resident needs, and in their professional identity. Residents often identified managers as being located far away from the activities of the island, which is true regarding some managers, as the CIC has offices on the mainland as well. With managers working in a different setting, residents often noted that along with the isolating distance, these tourism influencers worked in offices rather than the less formal settings in which many of the island residents were used to working. In this way, these self-identified islanders see themselves as “local others” relative to the managers in the way they dress and where they work. The locality of the islander identity and lack of influence they possess lead them to focus more on their isolation on the island than on their connections to the mainland (Baldacchino, 2004).

Taking this idea of the “other” one step further, I would argue that residents see tourism managers as “outsider others” in their physical and social relationship to and understanding of the island relative to residents. This othered subjectivity is not unique to Catalina Island, having precedence in other tourism destinations where residents feel their knowledge and well-being is unimportant relative to the well-being of tourists (Sommer & Carrier 2010; West & Carrier, 2004). Managers are outsiders

not only physically, in the distance between their mainland offices and the island residents, they are also outsiders in their relationships to the community. As a result of the physical distance, managers of the island are not integrated into the activities and experiences of island residents, making it difficult for residents to believe managers truly understand the needs of the “local others;” residents.

This “local other” is also one example of how there is the unusual manifestation of “othering” on Catalina in that it can at times operate as a positive. The limited manifestation of “othering” as a positive occurs in the sense of uniqueness of a particular identity of the Other. On Catalina, this exists mainly for the tourist as the preferred other, but also exists in a more limited sense for residents. While the “neglected other” is definitely not a positive “othering” for residents, the one positive that comes with the “local other” is the sense of exclusivity that comes with being a member of the small group that actually can claim Catalina Island as their residence. When managers see tourists as a separate group, as the “preferred other,” as people to be cared for and catered to, tourists may recognize this process of “preferred othering” as a positive. With “ego-tourists” focused on maximizing the quality of their own experiences with minimal concern for the community in which they vacation, they likely appreciate the preference shown towards themselves. Munt argues that tourists want to see their holiday experiences as unique to themselves and their choices rather than an experience shared across all tourists (1994). In this way, the experience of being different than managers, residents, and even other tourists in their experiences makes the holiday itself more impressive. This “othering” of tourists is something they not only are aware of, but that improves the tourists’ experience.

Discussion

Since Tongva inhabitation of the island thousands of years ago, the operation and connections of Catalina Island to the ocean and Southern California have transformed. The destruction of historic aquapelagic connections that were necessary for Tongva survival in precontact times has made it a tourist paradise today. Through this destruction, Santa Catalina Island has been isolated from its historical use, its nominal connection to other California Channel Islands as it comes to be known as simply “Catalina,” and also from the mainland of Southern California. In fostering this identity of the island as isolated from the pressures of the mainland, tourism managers have simultaneously created isolation of residents within the bounds of the island itself. Now, not only are the islands isolated, but the subjectivities work to isolate residents into social group “islands” based on their access to influence and resources. These isolated groups arise out of multiple understandings of ownership and multiple kinds of “others” and processes of “othering” that are self-assigned by residents and assigned to tourists and managers as well. Together, these subjectivities help explain the power dynamics that exist among tourists, tourism managers, and the host community that make residents experience a lack of justice.

Ownership is expressed in more than simply a legal title to Catalina Island land. Ownership over tourism development decisions comes through legal ownership of land and maintaining visitor happiness (Bramwell & Meyer, 2007). With happy visitors comes the greater likelihood of guests returning in the future, and thus the continued growth of tourism revenue. The influence of the tourist provides a sense of ownership, since the priority of looking out for tourists’ interests collectively means

respecting tourists' ideals for the future of the landscape. Creating real-world versions of visitors' virtualized understanding of the optimal Catalina Island experience gives recognition to tourists' influence over island tourism development, and reinforces residents' understanding that tourism managers put the tourist first (West & Carrier, 2004; Sommer & Carrier, 2010). Meanwhile, residents that have a collective sense of ownership through their connection to the landscape, are not able to use this ownership as a tool to access decisions on development (Strang, 2010). This shows how various experiences of ownership, be it intentional, legally given, or otherwise, are differently recognized in a right to influence development. While legal title to land is not important in giving *tourists* influence over decisions, it is this very lack of a legal title that the CIC and other tourism managers use as an argument for keeping *residents* out of tourism decisions. Of course, tourist influence is not actively recognized as ownership. It does, however, provide an avenue for considering tourist needs that residents feel is not available to those who live and work on the island but lack the perceived money, hierarchical connections, or right ownership to be considered in the CIC's development.

This differential recognition of ownership creates tension between residents and tourists, reinforcing the “neglected” and “local other” subjectivities simultaneously, with residents feeling the focus on giving tourists memorable experiences inhibits their sustainable access to resources. This is a particularly sensitive issue with water restrictions as a recent resident memory. The lack of resource conservation demanded from tourists at this time amplified negative sentiments towards tourists among residents forced to pay fines for using water needed

in their daily life. This has aggravated some residents that see the City of Avalon, the CIC, and Chamber of Commerce and Visitors Bureau as putting tourists ahead of residents and employees. This priority is arguably presented in the connected nature of the chamber of commerce and visitor services in Avalon. The title of the office makes clear that the priority in commerce issues is visitors, not residents. Residents experience this as a prioritization of tourists' short-term experience over the long-term well-being of residents and their environment. While managers may wield influence in tourism development, residents see this as influence from afar. The residents' locality to the island intensifies their interaction with these inequities of resource distribution more so than experienced firsthand by the "outsider others" of the CIC. Considering this in conjunction with the "neglected othering" reveals the layered subjectivities and isolation residents experience. Though island residents are the "local others" in their relationship to managers, they feel separate, as the "neglected other," in tourism development, when these managers ignore community knowledge of islanders' lived experiences and prohibit local access to the process. Making the virtualized paradise of Catalina Island has created an escape for the preferred others that visit the island, but has marooned the local others without resources in their home community. "Othering" separates residents from both tourists and tourism managers on the island, leading to a sense of exclusion from the tourism process. This is an "othering" that centers the tourist as the normal and the resident as different. Here, residents are isolated in a negative sense due to the aggressive touristic promotion of the island.

These processes that create multiple experiences of the "other" among tourists, tourism managers, and residents are what I am calling "othering subjectivity," and

were the most consistently identified sources of lack of recognition for residents. The “othering subjectivity” provides a way to analyze how this process of “othering” affects the Others’ sense of self when they are aware of this othering. The process of “othering” in this case has the tourism managers and tourists as the powerful groups that are intentionally othering themselves from less powerful identities (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2008; Pellow, 2016; Sommer & Carrier, 2010). Othering subjectivity in this chapter is identified from the perspective of the residents, with the descriptors of the processes and Others based on the majority of residents’ sense of difference. This sense of “neglected” and “local” othering of residents relative to the “preferred” tourists and “outsider” managers has created isolating groups that breed resentment due to the difference in access to resources needed for year-round residence on the island. In this way, identifying as the “neglected others” gave name to the reduced opportunities for the residents compared to those afforded to the “preferred others.” With the “outsider” and “preferred” others controlling tourism development, the ownership subjectivities of residents are further disempowered as their home is developed to meet a virtualized authenticity. Rather than collaborative inclusion, this builds these groups as isolated islands of perspective and interest that need to be reconnected to make Catalina a truly sustainable tourism destination.

Conclusion

Catalina has largely lost touch with its aquapelagic past that created a complex trading relationship among the California Channel Islands and the mainland of California. Beginning with the initial disruption of Spanish colonization, this flow of resources between the islands and mainland largely stopped. Today, there is only a

flow of goods between Catalina Island and the mainland in souvenirs and products needed for tourists. It is this lost connection and loss of the island's status as part of a complex aquapelagic system that has allowed creation of a tropical paradise that matches tourist demands. Prioritizing tourists' desires without also incorporating the knowledge of island residents creates the experience of a power structure with tourists at the top and residents at the bottom on Catalina Island. Virtualism is a driving force of tourism development on this island, and that puts resident access to resources at odds with tourist comfort (West & Carrier, 2004). While some tourists do experience the untouched, "authentic" island through trips backpacking across the preserved areas of Catalina, the higher priority of increasing visitors that spend a lot of money influences the direction of tourism development towards a false idea of the island as a tropical paradise. As more tourists seek out the "emergent authentic" experience of the island as a tropical paradise, this manufactured authenticity is perpetuated (Cohen, 1988; Munt, 1994). The experience of ziplining through the eucalyptus trees and sitting on a white sand beach has been created to attract tourists. A truly authentic experience of the island on non-capitalized and public beaches that reflect local flora and fauna is arguably being erased, much like its aquapelagic past. The lower cost restaurants are being replaced, the imported trees and sands are the source of entertainment, and some of the customarily public beach space of Two Harbors has been privatized (Catalina Island Company, 2017a, 2018).

Residents already feel their voices have been pushed out of the conversation on tourism development, and now the change from the more open access and economically accessible island towards a more expensive closed resort is "pushing the

locals out” literally (personal communication, 2017). The residents are Others in their own community, with many perceived drawbacks. The negative associations with this “othering” include decreasing access to once open spaces, recreational activities for tourists that are beyond resident means, and lack of affordable housing and food. The Catalina that is advertised in travel magazines ignores how these changes impact the local environment in terms of resident well-being. Tourism has negative socio-environmental impacts below the surface of white sand beaches, and outside of wild nature. While returning to the past aquapelagic society created by the Chumash and Tongva is nearly impossible, building a more connected and holistic understanding of the flow of knowledge and resources, and a recognition of these subjectivities of the island could return the isolated ‘islands’ of Others to a connected community. To do this will require buy in on the part of tourism managers, incorporating resident perspectives into future plans for tourism development such that residents and their needs become less of an afterthought, or Other. While this will be a difficult sell to managers who today prefer to consider the Other of the tourist, regularly and systematically considering residents in development would create a more united identity for the employees and residents of Catalina Island and create a more allied community.

CHAPTER 4: Legitimacy in the Twenty-first Century: Reminiscing on a Past Paradise

Changing management priorities on tourism-dependent Catalina Island since the late 1990s have minimized resident ability to contribute to decisions. Based on inductive qualitative analysis of surveys and interviews from 2017 and 2018, this chapter evaluates resident perspectives on how participative injustice occurs due to the ability of island owners and managers to decide who is viewed as a legitimate contributor to decision-making. Building on the discussion of who has a say over tourism from the previous chapter, this chapter focuses on defining what gives residents on Catalina Island a sense of fair inclusion, and looks at how the change in who is leading the Catalina Island Company has resulted in a transformed experience and perception of justice on the island for residents. This chapter also specifically aims to build on the existing literature of just tourism and power dynamics, evaluating how the politics of expertise have affected residents' sense of fairness in the tourism decision-making process.

Existing research has explored who tends to hold power in tourism destinations and why (Beritelli & Laesser, 2011; Bramwell & Meyer, 2007; Saito & Ruhanen, 2017; Sommer & Carrier, 2010). Depending on the destination, power may be concentrated in the hands of the local government, state government, landowners, corporations, or all who are impacted if it is a more participatively just destination. Power in this study is understood as one's ability to claim influence over or in collaboration with others, with an understanding that rather than power being possessed, who holds it can be constantly changing (Beritelli & Laesser, 2011; Bowen

et al., 2017). Past research has found that changing funding sources, political structures, and political leaders can all lead to different priorities in tourism development (Bowen et al., 2017; West & Carrier, 2004; Yasarata et al., 2010). As powerholders choose to change the direction of tourism, they can also change what characteristics give an individual influence in the development process (Bramwell & Meyer, 2007; Marzano & Scott, 2009).

The concept of defining what gives one power is formally understood as the politics of expertise (Radaelli, 1999). This refers to the difference in legitimacy that different community members experience. Legitimacy in this chapter will refer to recognition of one's right to have influence over a domain (Gray & Hay, 1986; Jamal & Getz, 1995). If all individuals that are recognized as legitimate participants are included in a decision, it is more likely that all affected parties will identify the outcome as legitimate and enforceable (Gross, 2007). In such a case, it may be perceived as a just process by those deemed legitimate. Excluding legitimate residents or decision-makers will create push back from those who see the process as lacking all needed perspectives. This of course introduces concerns of what leads certain people to be seen as illegitimate contributors. Understanding what defines legitimacy on Catalina Island is one purpose of this chapter. Fraser calls this exclusion that keeps some in a community from participating a "misframing" of the issue (2005). She sees this as a form of misrepresentation in the political sphere that causes a participative injustice in that it excludes legitimate members of the community from political decisions. In her understanding, which I follow, all interested parties have a right to participate in political communities. Misframing is a particular risk in tourism

development, as various publics can have extremely different value orientations, such as preferences for preservation or development. This subjective view leads to diverging ideas on who is a legitimate contributor (Jamal & Getz, 1995). Depending on the qualities that powerholders decide make someone a legitimate contributor, politics of expertise can often result in residents' experiential knowledge being deemed an illegitimate source of expertise (Saito & Ruhanen, 2017; West, 2008; Zhang, Cole, & Chancellor, 2013). Environmental justice literature points out that this local knowledge can be extremely valuable in identifying and collecting data about site-specific issues that would not be easily noticed by outside managers or planners (Corburn, 2003; Sze, 2007). As discussed in the last chapter, in tourism-dependent communities like Catalina Island, residents' familiarity with the context of their home can serve to provide valuable recommendations that may not be obvious to "outsider" managers of a destination.

Studies of powerholders and power sources in tourism have long been central to tourism research (Beritelli & Laesser, 2011; Bramwell & Meyer, 2007; Jamal & Getz, 1995). To date, this work around power in tourism has largely focused around key informants. Further, while inclusive tourism calls for "transforming power relations in and beyond tourism," understanding what residents perceive as the barriers to holding power in tourism development and branding is lacking (Scheyvens & Biddulph, 2017). Though very recent work has introduced the study of inclusive tourism in Global North tourism destinations, the focus of most work around justice in tourism has been focused on the Global South and indigenous peoples in the Global North (Cañada, 2018; Whyte, 2010; Zapata Campos, Hall, & Backlund, 2018). Within

a frame of justice in tourism, there is a gap in understanding of what Global North destination residents of both privileged and marginalized identities need for more participatively just tourism where they live.

Addressing these areas of limited research and responding to a call for increased community-centric study of voices in tourism destinations, the purpose of this chapter is to understand how community members perceive participative justice of tourism in a Global North destination using the case of Catalina Island (Scheyvens & Biddulph, 2017). To achieve this end, this study explores residents' evolving sense of legitimacy, perceptions of legitimacy characteristics, and what fairness is in tourism development on Catalina Island, California. The central questions of this investigation were: What are the characteristics associated with influence over tourism decision-making? And how just do residents perceive the tourism decision-making process to be? In this research, the overall goal was to understand residents' perceptions of fairness of tourism decision-making in their natural setting, which meant also interpreting the interviews as descriptions of residents' subjective realities. As the previous chapters have discussed the place and development of Catalina, this chapter jumps straight to analysis of participative justice. What follows are the analytical findings and implications related to participative justice on Catalina Island.

Residents' Perspectives

The singular influence of the CIC was continually highlighted across a large majority of interviews and surveys. A central finding then became how monopolized ownership of developable land reduces resident ability to gain legitimacy. Results also present structural issues with citizenship and land development, highlighting the

tendency of residents of the United States to associate property ownership as necessary for legitimacy.¹⁰ Discussion of these two central findings fall into three key themes: changes in legitimacy over time, identification of perceived characteristics of legitimacy, and diverse understandings of fairness. Within the first theme of changing legitimacy over time, interview participants stated that in the past they had a sense of legitimacy in tourism decisions, but today that is not the case. Interviews revealed two concurrently held perspectives of resident legitimacy based on the current owner of the CIC: a reminiscent view of the past management among both current and former residents, and a view of current management characterized by fear and disenfranchisement among many current residents. In the second theme of understanding characteristics of legitimacy in tourism decision-making, social, property, and occupational status were identified as the only ways to gain access to influence tourism decisions. This narrow way to gain legitimacy was accompanied by a sentiment that the current politics of expertise disregarded residents' experiential knowledge. Finally, the last theme of diverse views of fairness included findings on who had the right to legitimacy and what a fair outcome was. Residents fell into two major groups: (1) those identifying fairness as equal opportunity for all residents to contribute and (2) those identifying fairness as equitable access that emphasizes the economic contributions and risks taken by the CIC.

These findings are discussed below following the three themes of legitimacy over time, perceived characteristics of legitimacy, and diverse understandings of fairness.

¹⁰ This is not discounting the idea of landscape ownership and ownership subjectivities discussed in the last chapter, but rather reinforces the limited definition of ownership as only coming with influence through a legal title.

Legitimacy over time: how the change has impacted views of management

The central finding under this theme is a reduced sense of legitimacy among residents today compared to their sense of legitimacy under past CIC owners. This reduced legitimacy could result in a less just destination, as residents who are impacted by tourism decisions no longer feel they are adequately included or considered in decisions. Below, the finding of changing legitimacy over time is discussed, including the repercussions this has had for how residents and employees view the management decisions of the CIC.

“The philosophy [of the Wrigley family] was to make Catalina a destination for every man, and that basically quotes their goal. [...] It stayed that way with Bill Wrigley when he was alive and active. I worked during the time that he was there, so I got to know his philosophy, his approach to things, and his two immediate underlings [...] maintained that philosophy. They cared about the island, the island community, and the family, the island family. When they retired and the new management came in, the philosophy changed, and became more corporate and impersonal, it impacted a lot of people including me. [...] It’s a little bit of a political issue [...] I did question some of their approaches and ideologies and they didn’t seem to appreciate it very much.” – White former Two Harbors resident, 2018

This quote from a former resident of the island sums up well the sentiments long-term residents expressed about how the most recent managers of the island have changed the priorities and “philosophy” of the CIC. Phillip Wrigley worked on the island until the late 1970s, and his son, Bill, worked on the island until 1999 (Pederson & Catalina Island Museum, 2004). The “new management” came to Two Harbors and Avalon after Bill Wrigley’s passing, bringing with it the prioritization of “meeting the bottom line” rather than including the island community in decisions:

“In the old days, [...] before the Wrigleys made any major decision in the town, the Island Company, the Wrigleys, they would have town hall meetings where they would want to hear our input. They knew that we lived here and they were only coming up with ideas, but how was it going to impact us? But

they don't do that anymore. We're excluded, we just have to be happy with whatever they come up with." - lifelong Avalon White resident, 2017

Residents frequently stated that they felt more acknowledged under previous managers, although managers may not have acted on residents' views. A White former resident from the 1970s in Two Harbors described this relationship with managers as placation rather than partnership through a metaphor of a "benevolent patriarchy." The manager of Two Harbors was seen as a "benevolent prince" who possessed a great deal of power, but who was also still in touch with his community. He "gave us what we needed to get by." While the resident deemed himself a "serf" in this metaphor, he felt accepting of this paternalism and his place in the social hierarchy, as he was treated with respect: "the prince made all the decisions, but as long as he's a benevolent patriarch, we didn't care." "Living on the prince's property" was fine because the interviewee had a "very close relationship" with the managers, and remains friends with the family to this day. Other residents from the same era similarly noted a friendlier relationship with town managers in the past, stating they felt they were able to contribute "based on merit," and believed that previous managers took residents' concerns into consideration more frequently.

While this change in legitimacy is all of course the subjective views of residents, those who lived on the island in the 1970s did note a push for greater development at that time as well. The difference was that the CIC and Catalina Island Conservancy worked together in resisting extensive development (Stewart, 1986b). Residents emphasized that while previous owners and tourism managers on the island remained focused on the tourism economy, this was a more inclusive view of tourism, that created a sense among residents that their needs were also being considered. It is

worth noting that it was only White residents who felt they were heard in the past. In this perceived inclusive tourism approach, managers viewed residents as valuable stakeholders in the long-term well-being of the island. This contrasts with the current experience of residents, with the CIC and Catalina Island Conservancy actively pursuing greater development on the island with the main focus being increased tourism revenues (Jussila, 2017; McManis, 2013; Stewart, 1986).

While it is tempting to see this reference to the past as simply nostalgia, historical documents from as recent as 1990 provide evidence that indeed, there has been a change in the island's major landholders' attitudes toward development and resident inclusion. A 1990 letter from Packy Offield, then President of the Santa Catalina Island Company, to all Catalina residents with a P.O. box detailed the current progress of a fifteen-year plan between the CIC and the City. It tells residents, "we cannot serve the best interests of the community without your input," and "we will be periodically updating you...[b]y doing so we hope that you can let us know in a timely manner what you like and don't like about these plans." This explicitly demonstrates how even in the recent past, residents' local knowledge of Catalina was respected as providing them the politics of expertise needed to be seen as a legitimate contributor to decision-making (Jamal & Getz, 1995; Radaelli, 1999). The note ends with a post script in which Packy apologizes that the letter uses the salutation "Dear Boxholder...which can have an unintended impersonal feel to it." He explains it was done only because it was the most efficient way to alert all residents to the current status of the project (Offield, 1990). Today, residents note the absence of letters like these, and the general sense of secrecy in development. Politics of expertise in this

regime gave White residents power in the process, but today that sense of power has been replaced by fear.

Access to management notably changed in 1999 and the early 2000s. This was when Two Harbors became reincorporated into the CIC, and the CIC management changed hands. Describing both the past practices and the shift to today's fears, one resident who has lived on the island since the 1980s put it this way,

“You at least could’ve gone and voiced your opinion with them about it, whether it was pro or con on a certain subject. People felt they had the ability to at least go and talk with them. Nowadays, if you do that, you’re probably gonna get fired, or you’ll get demoted or moved. People are scared to go voice their opinions now.” – lifelong Two Harbors White resident, 2017

While in the past sharing a contentious view with management was accepted without recourse, today employees risk losing their jobs if they share ideas that differ with those of higher-level CIC management. Thus, residents associate the current exclusion of their voices as also being a result of how managers handle employees who speak out. As a result of this practice, there has been a reduced sense of trust among residents in the operations of the CIC. Residents who moved to the island in the past ten years reiterate this belief that sharing their perspectives comes with the risk of employment ramifications:

“I feel like a lot of people are afraid to say anything or voice their opinion. We’ve seen people get fired over ‘discrepancies’ and things that they felt weren’t right, or ideas that they’ve had. And if [Island Company managers] didn’t like it, it’s like, ‘Oh I’m sorry, your position doesn’t exist anymore.’” - Two Harbors White resident, 2017

“I feel like they inadvertently instill fear into other people because of the way they just drop people. Just all of a sudden, you’re fired.” -Two Harbors White resident, 2017

While these quotes provide beliefs of why this fear exists, interviewees also shared

real life examples of these kinds of ramification that led to these opinions. The details of these interactions are being withheld to protect residents' confidentiality.

The fear of sharing one's perspective extends beyond voicing opinions with the CIC. Throughout the data collection process, some participants expressed concern with being entirely honest about their experiences while on the record, while others asked not to be recorded so that there would be less evidence of participation. The risks of participating as identified by participants led me to conclude that the fragile political relationships on the island played a role in this change. This is of course only the islanders' side of the story, but managers in the Catalina Island Company refused to participate, as they said doing so was a "conflict of interest." This raised the question of why the CIC managers found sharing their views on the fairness of Catalina Island tourism development as a conflict of interest. One White CIC employee suggested that the CIC may be hesitant to participate in this study:

"[the Catalina Island Company assumes] everyone's going to get mad, about change. And everybody gets upset about change, especially when they're happy, they're afraid they won't be when something is different. . . It's just, always trying to get one past us, just trying to make everyone happy, but I'd rather just like the truth. Just tell me what you're doing. Tell me what you're planning." – Two Harbors White resident, 2017

This resident recognized that change is difficult for islanders to accept, but they also name what they perceive as a problem with the management of tourism development today: the lack of transparency and trust between the managers and residents. Another participant who has lived on the island since the 1990s noted that the CIC does a good job of holding extensive meetings before making development decisions. When asked if these meetings were open to islanders, they responded,

“Oh, absolutely not. They have their own internal meetings in developing. [...] They’re getting better at doing stuff, like when they opened [a new attraction], saying ‘Hey, islanders come for free for the first month!’ So, they’re getting better about outreach and making feel people [included] and understand what it is that’s going on. So, I think they’re learning that.” – Avalon resident of color, 2017

While the CIC makes efforts at inclusion according to this resident, the inclusion is not in decision-making processes. Rather, the CIC includes residents as a consolation at the end of developing new activities without resident input. This sentiment resonated throughout interviews, with one resident succinctly stating the popularly held view that, “opinions of the clientele and the community are not taken into account for coastal development.” This leads to another potential conclusion for why CIC managers may have no interest in participating in this study: they have little to gain in sharing their views on fairness in tourism development, because the lack of inclusion residents experience gives the managers’ voices more sway.

The sentiment of exclusion in tourism development decision-making today was a common thread through most interviews, with references to “they” referring to the CIC:

“I would say there’s community exclusion rather than inclusion [...] I think people are being excluded. Because the majority of people are not the big movers and shakers.” – White Avalon resident, 2017

“They’ll put out surveys and stuff, but you don’t feel like you’re really part of the process. But, again, it’s their business. [...] When it comes to business, people who take the risk should have to make the decision. [...] But in a small town like this, in a small microcosm like that, it’s elevated, so everyone takes it personally.” – Avalon resident of color, 2017

“We have exit interviews at the end of every summer, if you’re seasonal. We’ve brought stuff to their attention, like things that managers are doing illegally, and they will not do anything about it. [...] It’s just very evident that they don’t take anything you have to say seriously. It’s not gonna affect them. They’re such a big, powerful company.” – White Two Harbors resident, 2017

“Unless, you’re sitting at a desk, unless you’re wearing a shirt and tie, and you’re talking to the people who actually make decisions, you don’t get to make decisions. Even though you live, and work, and talk to the people, and you know what everybody wants, because you hear it every day. We don’t get to make suggestions. I mean, you can try, but there’s nothing, there’s no system that makes you feel like you’ve been heard.” – White Avalon seasonal resident, 2017

“I think they’re just making decisions for themselves and then just realizing at some point that people want to be consulted, maybe. As far as criteria, I’d say it’s probably like: money, pleasing investors, getting more tourists to come, positive feedback on social media platforms, and not being fair to resident stakeholders.” – Two Harbors resident of color, 2017

Through the interview process, residents revealed sentiments of being effectively excluded from all decisions. While some noted that they have had opportunities to participate in giving recommendations to tourism managers, it is clear that this does not appease islanders. The sense of resident fear in voicing one’s opinion today suggests that a loss of perceived legitimacy can also result in reduced process and participative justice.

Perceived characteristics of legitimacy

Interviews also revealed residents’ perceptions of what characteristics allow someone to legitimately contribute to tourism decisions. Interviewees identified occupational hierarchy and the associated class status as essential determinants of legitimacy for individuals, and identified property ownership as the key source of legitimacy when discussing the Catalina Island Company in general as being a central powerholder. This section will first discuss property ownership as giving the CIC legitimacy and will follow by discussing characteristics perceived as giving individuals legitimacy.

All participants were asked who they saw as having the most influence over

the direction of tourism on the island; 88% of participants identified Catalina Island Company, meaning there is significant agreement that the CIC is a key legitimate decision-maker. Overall, participants named the CIC in some variation of its current or past name much more often than naming specific individuals. When explaining why they believed the company had this influence, over 70% of those who named the CIC answered that this was a result of its property monopoly. The view that property ownership gives the CIC greater influence often came with a begrudging understanding that ownership meant the company could develop and lease land as it wished. Many residents see this influence as misused by current managers of the company, as they fully utilize their authoritative power over whether leases are renewed for local businesses and when to make beach improvements. While such changes are fully within the legal rights of the CIC, and residents recognize this, there is a perception that the current managers and owners of the CIC are not wielding this legitimacy in line with the best interests of the community. Rather than focusing on corporate social responsibility, the CIC's main decision-makers are instead focusing on the highest profits. Previous work looking at inclusive tourism practices has demonstrated the importance of modeling corporate social responsibility from the top-down to have mid and lower-level managers embrace the importance of such inclusive practice (Zapata Campos, Hall, & Backlund, 2018). A minority of participants identified specific individuals in the CIC as pushing an agenda of profits over people, but the general sentiment was that the opaque monolith of the Catalina Island Company uses its property ownership to drive its vision of tourism on Catalina.

In discussing individual legitimacy, occupational hierarchy was a commonly

identified characteristic. While the positions that provided this legitimacy (e.g. Catalina Island Company management, business ownership, or City Council membership) varied, having a publicly visible position was consistently seen as integral in influencing tourism decisions. This was reinforced by interviewees who perceived themselves as currently or once being people with influence, as they had once or presently held the same positions other residents had identified as influential. In Two Harbors, the only person who self-identified as having contributed to tourism decision-making had held a highly visible position in the community. He recognized that his position in the town management hierarchy provided this influence, but also emphasized that with the changing management in the town, even his former position lost its legitimate influence over tourism decisions. In Two Harbors, this reveals that under current management, one must be in a high position in the CIC, not just advising operations for the community, to influence tourism decision-making. As lower-level CIC employees and employees of the research institute unconnected to the CIC, Two Harbors residents “at the bottom of the totem pole” found they were not recognized as actors with agency in tourism development but rather were increasingly excluded from the physical tourism space and the process of developing such spaces. This is in spite of their “experience, knowledge, and working awareness of the island.” Rather than service workers being recognized as essential to the success of the company as a whole, having a title of “manager” or “vice president” was seen as key to legitimate influence, even though many of these title holders are no longer based on the island.

Residents explained that they are not part of the “big movers and shakers,” so they do not have any influence based on hierarchy. A former manager with CIC, who

is still seen by many as holding a powerful position, acknowledged the difference in perceived influence of himself and the general resident population. He stated that although he did not feel excluded from tourism decision-making, “citizens in Avalon would probably feel that they’re excluded from it.” He blamed residents, however, for not taking advantage of the opportunities they have to participate. He, along with other members of the Avalon government, saw City Council meetings as an important opportunity for contributing to tourism decision-making for residents. These meetings were not, however, seen as an effective avenue among study participants. Furthermore, while Avalon City Council meetings may give the public an opportunity to talk on city matters, interviewees felt that what was said in these meetings held little sway over the CIC. The “big, powerful company” of the CIC may try to create the appearance of inclusion and notification, but residents do not “feel heard.”

Referring to decision-makers as wearing “a shirt and tie” and as “movers and shakers,” residents’ language reveals class distinctions between managers and themselves in addition to the hierarchical distinction. Residents perceive themselves as lacking not only a hierarchical status, but also a lack of class status to be recognized as having legitimate expertise even in the City Council opportunities to voice their opinion. Residents find this unfair, because though they may not have the proper office attire, they do have experiential knowledge to contribute to decision-making. Their occupations do not require the same attire as that demanded by office jobs, but residents recognize this should not discredit the experiential knowledge they have acquired from living on the island and working in the very jobs that demand “island style” clothes rather than office attire. Together, social class and occupational

hierarchy as sources of legitimacy reveal that reputation of individuals in the eyes of both residents and CIC managers is key to having influence in tourism decision-making.

This loss of resident legitimacy is also potentially reducing the effectiveness of tourism development on the island. Corburn points out that the local knowledge of claiming residence in a place can contribute an understanding of site-specific nuances that managers new to the destination may not think to consider (2003). In interviews, residents recognized this fact, pointing out that while they may not have the hierarchical and class status needed to be perceived as legitimate, they have the locality to the island that many of the current managers and vice-presidents lack. In this way, residents possess a local status, as the local Other, that they classify as giving valuable expertise in tourism decision-making. Participants highlighted the daily interactions they have with visitors on the island as central to local status and knowledge. Whether this is in a formal work setting or while recreating in the same spaces as tourists, living and working among tourists means residents often get unsolicited opinions about how to improve visitor experience on the island. Under current management of the island though, this localness does not increase resident legitimacy among decision-makers unless accompanied by hierarchical or class status. This shift in the politics of expertise has been accompanied by the shift to a more profit-driven tourism development on the island.

Differing understandings of fairness

During conversations that spoke to legitimacy, residents also described whether they felt their access to the decision-making process was fair. These

discussions included asking residents what fair meant to them, in the sense of access to influence, and access to resources on the island. These conversations revealed that while many feel their lack of influence is unfair, some residents thought the lack of legitimacy that residents have on the island is fair, based on the financial risks taken and economic motivations of CIC. These differing opinions reveal heterogeneous understandings of a fair outcome in island tourism decision-making.

Residents who see the currently experienced exclusion as unfair believe legitimacy should come from more than property ownership or social status. These participants often expressed an understanding of fairness as “equality” or equal opportunity to participate, without reference to economic motivations. Rather than use an economic basis for fairness, those who stated that current practices were unfair explored the moral aspects of what a fair outcome is. They often explained that tourism managers have a social responsibility to include consideration of residents’ views and access to resources in their decision-making. This understanding of fairness emphasized giving those who had a strong opinion on any given tourism decision the opportunity to contribute it, but not an equality where every resident must be consulted in every instance. Others shared an understanding that alongside creating an opportunity to voice opinions, the outcome is fair when “everything comes down to a compromise where everyone is happy.” This understanding of equality does not demand everyone having an equal share in the final outcome, but that the final outcome is arrived at with the input and consideration of all interested and impacted parties.

Those who identified the CIC’s exclusionary practices as fair explained that

they understood fairness as distributing benefits based on the financial investments of the various parties. These individuals emphasized a detached understanding of fairness:

“There’s fairness, and there’s equity, and they’re not the same. So, if you treat everyone equal, is that necessarily fair? [...] The pie has not been carved out into equal slices and everyone gets an equal slice. Fairness, if you base that on one’s investment versus return, I think you end up with an interesting equation that way. And if we were able to look at that dispassionately, you might be able to argue that the folks that got the greatest slice of the pie actually haven’t been treated fairly because they put in the vast majority of the resources that keep the island going.” – White Two Harbors resident, 2017

“I think the person who takes the risk deserves the greatest reward.” – Avalon resident of color, 2017

These residents still recognized that there is a disconnect between the CIC and the residents, but framed the issue from the managers’ perspectives rather than the residents’. They demonstrate an affection for property rights that legitimizes the CIC’s actions. Rather than focusing on fairness as giving a voice to everyone, they emphasized the economic inputs into infrastructure and development on the island, and the need for certain individuals to get the “greatest slice of the pie” in return for putting in the most ingredients and energy into the pie. This understanding is based on economic equity rather than equal or equitable access to the decision-making process. The process is seen as fair here because those having taken the greatest risk are able to have the greatest say. These residents understand the legitimacy of the CIC and other tourism managers in decision-making as a fairly earned reward for their commitments to the island.

While these two understandings of fairness differ in what they emphasize, both do recognize the right of the CIC to have a say in the tourism decision-making

process. The major difference is the emphasis in the former understanding that legitimacy should be gained through more than simply economic investment in the community. With such an understanding, this definition recognizes all residents as having a right to legitimate influence as inherent to their island residence. Noting these different understandings of fairness and legitimacy is important in demonstrating that grouping people together under a shared identity, like “residents,” does not mean shared group membership necessitates shared views.

Discussion

Collecting residents’ views of legitimacy and influence in tourism decision-making provides exploratory understanding of tourism management experiences from the perspective of those not frequently consulted. This study draws attention to how residents’ senses of participative justice in a tourism-dependent community are impacted by changes in destination management and ownership. The broad understandings of fairness and justice emphasize the importance of not assuming a homogenous community view. Talking to only key informants will not give researchers or destination managers an understanding of the various existing views in a community. Rather, tourism developers need to seek out destination residents from various employment sectors and socioeconomic backgrounds intentionally in order to get a more complete understanding of the impacts tourism has on the community.

While Catalina Island residents saw definite characteristics as essential to legitimacy, just tourism frameworks take a more progressive approach in who has a right to contribute to tourism development conversations. Rather than centering around whether a resident has the monetary or hierarchical authority to be a legitimate

participant in the community, these frameworks focus around the theory that if residents are impacted by tourism decisions, a just decision would meaningfully include resident voices (Biddulph & Scheyvens, 2018; Hales et al., 2017; Higgins-Desbiolles, 2008; Jamal & Camargo, 2014). Thus, with the central sources of legitimacy coming from the social and economic capital an individual has rather than investment in the issue, excluding residents based on their incorrect status is an injustice. Further, these injustices are not just perceptions, but rather produce an unjust reality for residents.

In understanding how residents on Catalina want to rectify this injustice, it is important to remember that in the past, White residents found face time with managers to create a sense of legitimacy and inclusion. This form of inclusion was perceived as fair, even though residents had no different access to property ownership, nor official avenues of influence, than today. Looking back to a statement by Philip K. Wrigley from 1934, he acknowledged the various viewpoints shared by residents, but went on to say that his own plans to further island development were not in line with any of the resident opinions (The Catalina Islander). The lasting resident satisfaction with one-time consultation invites the conclusion that while the perceived change is a loss of resident influence with decision-makers in the recent past, the actual change is more of a lost ability to voice an opinion. While legitimacy is formally understood as having meaningful influence over decisions, residents have the perception that having one's voice heard by influential managers also provides a sense of legitimacy to residents (Jamal & Getz, 1995). The absence of official avenues for resident influence does not guarantee a perception of injustice among residents. Rather, if there are informal

opportunities in place that create a space and place for residents' voices and experiential knowledge to be heard, this recognition creates a perception of fairness (Bowen et al., 2017). Providing this recognition gives a perception of legitimacy to residents' input, giving legitimacy to local knowledge and residency as expertise. This sense of recognition fails to address the central issues of misframing, as this recognition does not dissolve the existing politics of expertise that have excluded residents from meaningfully influencing tourism due to their lack of property ownership and social status (Fraser, 2005).

Just and inclusive tourism literature would define a fair outcome as one that provides not solely recognition to the individuals, but also provides for process influence and distribution of resources such that all of those impacted by tourism are involved meaningfully in achieving a fair outcome (Camargo et al., 2007; Scheyvens & Biddulph, 2017). This divergence from literature suggests that perhaps residents on this privately managed island do not perceive the construction and redevelopment of tourism infrastructures as an egregious injustice. This somewhat discouraging finding for a social justice advocate reinforces existing work that finds that residents usually accept outcomes as "legitimate" when all parties are seen as legitimate (Gross, 2007). Unfortunately, empty or one-time consultations can provide tourism managers with residents' acceptance of development plans without providing residents with the knowledge they need to make informed contributions to decision-making processes. When there is a lack of shared knowledge on the impacts of development, residents have no way to know which questions to ask. This lack of information can often result in injustice, as residents do not know how to contribute effectively to decision-making

in a way that ensures their rights, and they lack the information to assess whether the consultation served as a meaningful contribution to the decision-making process (Ottinger, 2012). That residents on Catalina find such one-time consultations a legitimate opportunity is discouraging, in that an environmentally or socially unjust outcome will not always be recognized as such if there is the illusion of fair process inclusion.

This empirical finding suggests that rather than assuming all apparent injustices demand resolution according to social and environmental justice literature, consultation with a community may reveal a different lived experience. On Catalina, the long-lasting monopoly of tourism decision-making and development has likely affected residents' abilities to imagine true justice. This is itself an injustice in limiting residents' ability to desire a socially and environmentally just outcome. As revealed on Catalina, those residents who elevate property rights as the basis for legitimacy do not even perceive the current experience as unfair. Contrarily, residents that argue expertise of lived experience should increase legitimacy did not see the current decision-making process as fair. It is important to note that while best efforts were made in this research to consult people across all identities and experiences on Catalina Island, there are likely some resident perspectives that are missing, particularly the views of those who live on the island undocumented. That White participants felt affected by this lost legitimacy but only desired one-time consultation to correct it reveals how privileged identities can find a sense of legitimacy even with an unjust outcome. The different perceptions of legitimacy and fair processes that have been presented highlight the importance of understanding the nuanced experiences and

desires of tourism-dependent communities, such that the management recommendations come from resident needs, not just literature or legal rights to contribution.

Conclusion

The transition of power of the Catalina Island Company in 1999 on Catalina Island has led to changes in tourism development in regard to perceived justice, inclusion of locals in decisions, and access to decision-makers. Tourism managers no longer recognize the knowledge residents have gained from years of participating, working, and living in a tourism-dependent community as sufficient expertise to contribute. In explaining the future of tourism on Catalina Island, one resident put it nicely, “It’s gonna take a joint understanding between all of us to make it all work, to make tourism continue. To make it the right kind of tourism. To keep it a good experience, and also to make it an environmentally-sound place for all of us to coexist.” This call for collaboration by interested contributors was shared among many interviewees, with many adding that this “joint understanding” needed to include the Catalina Island Company creating a safe venue for residents to voice their opinions, effectively reframing who is a legitimate contributor.

This chapter adds to just tourism literature a case complicating existing frameworks in analyzing participative injustice on a tourism-dependent island. This research aimed to investigate the applicability of asking questions of participative justice and tourism in a community that does not appear as prone to such injustice at first glance. Extended observations and conversations in this community revealed that participative injustices limiting influence over the manufacturing of a tourist

environment provided a novel opportunity to ask questions brought up by Jamal and Camargo's Just Destination in an existing destination that might not appear to most as blatantly unjust. The case used residents' experiences to explore how the existing branding and development of this destination has failed to address major aspects of the framework such as a lack of respect and a focus solely on the material benefits for the industry, both occurring in prioritizing interests of destination managers and government stakeholders (Jamal & Camargo, 2014). Though the nuances of residents' views may be unique to Catalina Island, the important generalizable conclusion is the power of destination managers to create or destroy a sense of resident legitimacy based on how they elect to interact with the community. While tourism managers may argue the results support a less involved community consultation process, the author suggests the opposite is true. The findings on the breadth of understandings of fairness demand more intentional efforts by destination developers to work with the community so that the heterogeneous expectations of fairness and inclusion are understood and incorporated in planning. As Scheyvens and Biddulph note, when the community feels included and empowered by decision-makers, the impact is an overall more attractive tourist destination and more effective workforce (2017).

Applying just tourism frameworks included an expectation for a particular version of justice as the final recommendation. That the resident understanding of a just outcome differs from the just tourism understanding reveals a need to further investigate application of inclusive and just tourism frameworks to Global North tourism destinations, and to reevaluate definitions of justice in tourism along the dimensions of social justice discussed by Fraser and Yaka (Fraser, 2005; Yaka, 2018).

In this case, residents who currently perceive injustice on the island desire consultation from the CIC in development decisions to have a fair process. Giving residents the opportunity to voice their opinions without having influence is not in line with the Just Destination framework for inclusive tourism development, but as this is an interpretive analysis, it is the residents' experience not literature's definitions that matter. It does reveal, however, how the lasting power and structures of the Catalina Island Company have constrained residents' ideas of justice. While the desired justice does not align with academic understanding of a just or inclusive outcome, it reinforces the idea of critically and reflexively questioning what the conceptual frames of a Just Destination and "inclusive tourism" look like to residents in Global North tourism destinations, and how a just outcome varies based on who is asked. Continuing to produce tourism research that emphasizes the resident perspective will provide scholars with a definition of fairness as understood by those most impacted, and specific to the context of their own communities, rather than as defined by academia. Prioritizing the experiential knowledge of the local perspective in coming to recommendations for just tourism development will ensure chosen outcomes meet the needs of the residents rather than needs perceived by the researcher.

CHAPTER 5: Evaluating Frameworks for an Inclusive Paradise: Grassroots

Recommendations and Conceptual Implications from Catalina Island

This chapter uses the case of Catalina Island to discuss the ability of existing frameworks for just tourism development to address fully the justice concerns raised by residents in this case. I provide recommendations based on current and former Catalina Island residents' answers to how they would most like to see the future of their home and workplace evolve, and I compare these recommendations and perceptions of injustice to existing theoretical and conceptual frameworks designed to guide and evaluate the fairness of a tourist destination. The questions I explore include: How do residents think the perceived injustices on Catalina Island should be rectified today? And, what future considerations does the Catalina Island case add to theories of how to build inclusive destinations in the Global North? I find that the existing frameworks for just tourism are largely focused on development in the Global South and do not fully encompass the issues of disenfranchisement experienced on Catalina Island. I suggest further work with communities facing these injustices to more fully integrate interdisciplinary literature and refine empirically-based recommendations to assess and advocate for greater justice in Global North tourism development.

Recommendations for Just Development of Destinations

To identify useful recommendations for building a tourist destination that is just to residents and in line with their interests and expertise, I conducted semi-structured interviews with and collected online surveys from seventy residents beginning in the summer of 2017 until the fall of 2018. I also reviewed historical

documents on the evolution of Catalina Island as a destination and as a hometown, to understand more fully how these multiple uses of the space developed concurrently. All data were assessed qualitatively, with a constructivist worldview that recognizes the residents' unique experiences of their own realities and provides a narrative analysis of perceptions of the justness of tourism development (Gunster & Saurette, 2014; Sovacool, Axsen, & Sorrell, 2018). In assessing existing frameworks for inclusive destination development and management, I used empirical data collected through archival analysis and ethnographic methods to interrogate the existing conceptual frameworks. Building on the ideas of these frameworks and my data, I provide qualitative recommendations for further scholarly activism in support of inclusive tourism development. Using this interdisciplinary approach, I analyze the general theme of justice on Catalina Island.

Case-specific recommendations for building fairness on Catalina

Consultation with residents revealed great heterogeneity in the definition of fairness and image for justice in future tourism development on Catalina Island. The groups within the shared identity of "resident" divided largely along the additional identities of race, class, and employment. Although considering both employment and class may seem redundant, considering the identities as distinct revealed that individuals employed by the same entity often had different opinions based on their perceived class status within the overall community of Catalina Island. Within the category of race, an additional consideration of citizenship status also proved relevant to residents' understanding of their rights, their influence, and their resource access. Overall, most residents identified the decision-making process for tourism as unfair,

with no consensus on the fairness of access to resources. That there were differing personal definitions of fairness and justice should not be ignored, as the recommendations that follow reflect a great breadth of perspectives in what a truly just tourism development process looks like.

Although all of those surveyed or interviewed live on the same island, they have unique experiences that led to many distinct perceptions of how to achieve justice. The most consistent recommendation residents provided across racial, class, and employment identities was a need for greater investment in the community. This manifested differently based on differing identities, but the overall desire did not divide along specific identity lines. Previous work details that residents perceive a great shift in the relationship between the CIC and the community in the past twenty years (see Chapter 4). With this shift has come a change from consistent community updates on the status of company projects, an open-door policy with company managers, and a CEO who lives in the community to a company that operates its holdings as distinct from the people who work in lower-level positions and live on the island. To address this perceived disconnect, one resident suggested having a community liaison whose official role is to provide community perspectives and weigh in on CIC development decisions. Such a recommendation suggests that existing employees who speak at city council meetings and are community residents themselves are not adequately representing the interests of the community or are not being heard. Similarly, as the community of Two Harbors lacks any governing body separate from the CIC, many residents there asked for a community representative to confer community concerns to decision-makers. There are CIC managers directly

dedicated to the Two Harbors operations, but residents see these managers as focused only on the tourist experience.

Multiple recommendations to address this sense of reduced community investment on the part of the Catalina Island Company called for direct monetary reinvestment. One recommendation in this vein that came from community leaders of color was for the construction of a community center in Avalon. Multiple participants suggested such a space, with visions of what would be provided including mental health services for adults, a space for students to safely spend after school hours, exercise equipment for residents, a swimming pool, and/or a nongovernmental and nonreligious meeting space for community groups. While Tremont Hall is a multi-purpose room in Avalon available for community use, and has been categorized in a past news article as a “Community Center,” research participants never named this space as meeting the wide-reaching community services they felt the space should provide (Bartlett, 2014). In the discussion of what this space should look like, only residents of color suggested that the community space address needs for student and mental health services. Another monetary reinvestment suggestion was that the CIC pay a per-employee tax to the city to create a fund to be used to directly benefit community needs. This business owner’s idea was that such a tax would force the CIC to pay for its monopolization of the community and employment. Such a fund could potentially be used to build the aforementioned community center if the CIC made land available for the purpose. With minimal land available for purchase on the island and the CIC as the major landholder of all developable land, no amount of money will lead to new development for the community’s good unless it also comes with a

concession of land from the CIC. These monetary reinvestments in the community draw attention to the injustice perceived due to the lack of necessary resources available for residents and their inability to influence the development of such resources.

Addressing access to resources, another recommendation to consider residents' concerns in tourism development was in connection to Catalina Island Conservancy practices. The Catalina Island Conservancy holds all of the undevelopable land on the island in a private land trust. Multiple community leaders shared that residents of color, particularly recent Mexican immigrants to the island, have a severely limited experience of the island due to Conservancy practices that prioritize tourist access to the island over residents' access. Discussion with a young White adult who grew up on the island revealed that while the Conservancy provides experiential education opportunities to Catalina Island elementary students, these opportunities are reserved only for students who are seen by their teachers as high achievers. Implicitly, this exclusive practice provides such access to students speaking English as a first language, particularly those with historic roots on the island, but not to students who are learning English as a second language or are from families new to the island. Essentially, primarily White students have the opportunity to explore the ecological diversity of the island. To address this imbalance in access to outdoor educational experiences for young residents, a former Catalina Island schoolteacher of color recommended that these experiential opportunities be built into the science curriculum. This would provide all high school graduates with significant skills in understanding the natural science and ecological diversity of the island, allowing them

to be employed as naturalists or tour guides in the ecotourism opportunities provided on the island, or in advising infrastructure decisions through the Chamber of Commerce. This would improve justice in tourism decision-making indirectly by providing greater access to portions of the island many island residents are otherwise unable to visit.

The interior regions of the island in which these proposed educational experiences would occur are primarily accessible by car. With access to a car permit on the island severely regulated, only long-established families on the island are able to see the same sights that tourists experience on Conservancy run tours (see Chapter 3). To address the access issue outside of school, participants recommended giving all residents a card that gave them reduced-cost access to the transportation offered for tourists that are exploring the island. This would address the inequity in access experienced by new families on the island, improving perceptions of the Conservancy's concern for community needs, though intentional methods for identifying "residents" that does not marginalize people based on citizenship and documentation status would still need to be addressed to fully include all residents.

While there are multiple entities on the island directly focusing on ecotourism opportunities, residents also recommended that ecotourism become a more central focus in tourism development. Here, residents recognize the connection between the sustainability of their economy and their nonhuman environment. With an extremely arid climate and tourism that is increasingly focused on luxury, some long-time residents expressed concerns for the longevity of human existence on the island if intentional actions at conservation are not taken. The most specific recommendation

given in this vein was to promote opportunities for visitors to appreciate the nonhuman beauty of the island through physical activities like hiking, paddle boarding, and mountain biking. These opportunities do currently exist on the island, but recent tourism development and promotion have branded the island as more of a beach getaway and less of a space for outdoor adventure. Residents see a greater focus on activities that require minimal water resources and create minimal waste as optimal in maintaining a year-round island population due to the continued decrease in annual precipitation.

The final recommendation to improve just tourism development on the island was to empower residents of color to recognize their majority status. Residents of Hispanic identity make up at least an estimated 69% of the island population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2017). While some self-identified residents of Mexican or Hispanic heritage stated that they attend City Council meetings and share their concerns, previous analysis details the limited effectiveness of such efforts (Chapter 4). For non-English speaking residents or those working multiple jobs, even this (ineffective) opportunity to participate is unavailable. Community leaders see the language barrier and overworking of Mexican and Mexican-American residents as severely hindering their influence in community decisions. Simple ways to improve this participative injustice that multiple residents identified are providing more accessible meeting times outside of working hours and ensuring all communications and announcements from the City and the CIC are available in Spanish. As discussed in Chapter 2, the Latinx population's cultural identity and physical labor have played a significant role in the success of Catalina as a tourist destination. Correcting the past injustices of the CIC

actions demands intentional inclusion of Latinx residents in the production and marketing of tourism to reflect the true history of the space and to have some sort of reparative justice. With these residents as the “backbone” of the island’s tourist industry, their significant investment in the community deserves a significant investment in hearing and accommodating their needs (Contreras, 2007).

Understandings of what needs to change to achieve justice in tourism on Catalina revealed a great difference in the lived experiences of residents, especially focusing on the identities of race and class. While it is true that most residents believe they are excluded from the tourism decision-making process, the steps that need to be taken to achieve justice differed greatly based on race and length of family establishment on the island. White residents desire an opportunity to voice their views to CIC managers, but do not claim a need for significant changes beyond increased access to the procedure in general. Such a change does not actually achieve justice in the sense of providing residents meaningful involvement in decision-making, but it does provide them with a sense of justice. With a constructivist approach, providing this sense of justice as defined by residents is the goal. Residents of color looked at just tourism development as coming as the result of changes beyond direct tourism influence. They saw a need for equitable education, communication, and community resources as essential before true justice could be achieved. This reveals a privileged experience for White island residents and residents of color with a long history on the island. The language barrier and the need to work long hours on the island for new Latinx immigrants leads to an entirely different relationship to the island and to what justice encompasses. Residents with access to cars, with English as a first language,

and with connections in community and CIC leadership do not recognize the resources they have access to that others lack. This very lack of awareness is the evidence of differential privilege provided by extended residence, reputation, and language assimilation on Catalina Island.

One area where these recommendations seem to be taking hold in name only on the island is in community reinvestment. In October of 2018, the Catalina Island Company announced that on the first Monday of each month they will be donating a portion of profits from one of their restaurants to a local charity (Facebook, 2018). While at first glance this appears to be reinvestment in the community, the donation is really coming directly out of residents' pockets. Residents get a 20% discount at CIC-owned restaurants, and the "donation" comes from residents paying full price for their meals and the CIC then donating the residents' 20% discount back to a local organization. Residents have actively complained about the lack of current CIC management's concern for community well-being in their community Facebook group since I began tracking it in early 2016, and interviews confirmed that this sentiment has existed since the early 2000s. The CIC social media account consistently defends CIC actions when resident complaints share false information, but does not provide counterclaims with concern for community identity or well-being. The only evidence of wanting to hear community views prior to the October announcement came with a community forum on housing in early 2018 (D. Young, 2018a). This forum was to discuss "tentative" plans to install more housing for CIC employees. The announcement on claimed community economic support came just two weeks after the second editorial on the results of this dissertation project was published in the local

island newspaper (Canfield, 2018b). While it is unreasonable to claim this study is directly responsible for the claimed reinvestment effort, it does suggest that the repeated engagement with community members and public sharing of residents' sentiments of the CIC's lack of community reinvestment were noticed. As this effort only applies to residents forgoing their discount and visiting a single CIC restaurant on a single day of each month, the impact of this reinvestment is not monetarily significant, and displays a lack of CIC commitment to reinvest in the community itself. It reveals how far there still is to go in changing the Catalina Island Company concern for community opinion and reinvestment.

Empirical Complications for Just Tourism Frameworks

As this is a single case, rather than claiming to provide generalizable recommendations for just tourism, I argue this example can provide a valuable empirical study to test existing frameworks designed to evaluate and create just tourism development. The two most relevant frameworks that aim to describe the necessary considerations in achieving justice and fairness in tourism development are inclusive tourism and the Just Destination. These frameworks emphasize the importance of resident influence in tourism development, which was an assumption central to the focus on justice on resident terms in this dissertation. Key concepts of these frameworks were previously defined and used throughout this dissertation in evaluating the justice of tourism development on Catalina. Here I engage with a critical analysis of the limitations of these frameworks. Both largely are defined with examples of unjust tourism development in the Global South, with the more recent framework of inclusive tourism providing cases from Spain and Sweden (Cañada,

2018; Zapata Campos et al., 2018). As such, the case of Catalina Island provides a new test to the applicability of these frameworks, as it not only is in the Global North, but is also an island. In line with critical environmental justice and tourism efforts to base recommendations on community knowledge, I evaluate below these two frameworks' defining characteristics against the Catalina Island residents' ideas of what creates (in)justice (Pellow, 2016; Peters & Higgins-Desbiolles, 2012).

The Just Destination framework was developed in 2014 by tourism scholars Jamal and Camargo. This framework builds on ideas of environmental justice explicitly, but centers on the marginalized and commodified communities even more through using the term ecocultural instead of environmental. While I would argue that a critical approach to environmental justice would include cultural commodification considerations, they see environmental justice as not adequately centering the cultural implications of tourism development (Jamal & Camargo, 2014; Pellow, 2016). In this framework, a Just Destination meaningfully involves residents in the development, production, and promotion of ecocultural products. They explain such a destination as being both ecoculturally just and equitable to all of a destination's resident stakeholders, which seem to be terms that replicate the existing terms of procedural and distributive justice, respectively, with the nuanced focus on the entire process of creation and selling of cultural and environmental goods. They describe two additional terms of ecocultural discrimination and ecocultural racism as the lack of justice, due to the exclusion or unfair treatment of people due to their social identity. This framework is seen as filling a gap in defining "theoretically informed justice principles of fair and ethical treatment of a destination's inhabitants" (Jamal & Camargo, 2014: 26). The

framework aims to define equity holistically in tourism development. Using a case study in Quintana Roo, Mexico, they demonstrate the localized applicability, claiming it permits context-specific understanding of justice, fairness, and equity that go beyond material and economic impacts. This is a foundational framework in theorizing a vision for just tourism, and exemplifies well the intersection of environmental justice and tourism, but demands further development to fully encompass justice considerations in the Global North.

Evaluating the context of Catalina Island against this framework reveals that Catalina is not a Just Destination. As briefly explored in Chapter 2, cultural commodification has not allowed the communities to develop their cultural products on their own terms. The continued ills accrued by the Native population from Catalina Island also displays ecocultural racism. While the specific terminology of the Just Destination limits what can be considered a lack of justice in tourism development, I argue that Catalina is further removed from being truly just through the exclusion of residents from all procedural decisions on development, even beyond ecocultural goods. Framing ecocultural justice and equity as the aspects needed to have a just destination erases more general injustices that uniquely impact destination inhabitants. In a distributive sense beyond the scope of what is defined as unjust by the Just Destination, the restricted mobilities around Catalina Island and between the island and mainland are applicable to not just those of an ethnic minority identity that has been commodified, but also those who have simply moved to the island more recently or lack the funds for such transportation. Housing and water access also exemplify

distributive injustices that operates beyond the scope of injustices considered in this framework (see Chapter 3).

While the focus on an “ethic of care” makes the Just Destination a more holistic consideration of justice than one that focuses solely on economic equity, it fails to expand the care beyond ecocultural products. This is not to discount the importance of advocating for traditionally marginalized communities, but to highlight the layers of injustice that exist in addition to those identified in the Just Destination framework. This is particularly evident on Catalina where less than 30% of the overall population identifies as non-Hispanic White. The case of Catalina based on the definitions of this framework alone is certainly not a Just Destination, but it is even less so when one looks more holistically at what can manifest as injustice. While this framework provides valuable insights into what is needed to have a Just Destination from production to consumption of cultural products, it is limited in its ability to consider the full breadth of layered injustices that destination managers and governments may impose on inhabitants.

Replicating many of the claims of the Just Destination framework but without a direct focus on environmental justice considerations, the conceptual framework of inclusive tourism was developed in 2017 by human geographers Biddulph and Scheyvens. This framework calls for transformative tourism that engages marginalized populations and considers more than economic well-being. It is intended to apply to both the Global South and North, though it has been minimally applied to the Global North, and only through a special issue on the overall framework organized by the authors (Biddulph & Scheyvens, 2018; Cañada, 2018; Zapata Campos et al., 2018). In

centering the empowerment of marginalized groups, inclusive tourism focuses on the questions: who is included? On what terms? With what significance? From these questions, the framework identifies seven elements of inclusive tourism: marginalized people as tourism producers, marginalized people as tourism consumers, self-representation in dignified and appropriate ways, power relations transformed in and beyond tourism, widening of participation in tourism decision-making, changing the tourism map to involve new people and places, and promotion of mutual understanding and respect (Scheyvens & Biddulph, 2017). This framework identifies many of the shortcomings with current practices on Catalina Island that are keeping residents from perceiving decisions and development as inclusive, as it emphasizes the importance of participative justice, but the overall applicability sits firmly in the conceptual rather than actionable realm.

Major strengths of this framework are the elements identifying lack of representation for marginalized populations in a similar way as the Just Destination framework addresses ecocultural discrimination. If put into action, these elements could help address the historic injustices on Catalina in cultural commodification and false histories. The call for “self-representation in dignified and appropriate ways” encourages host communities to recognize that there are marginalized members of their communities who should get to tell their own stories rather than having them told by others. On Catalina, allowing the indigenous, African-American, and Mexican(-American) communities to define their own forms of representation will ensure true inclusion of their wishes, and will move towards reparations for historic injustice. One case-specific difficulty in achieving self-representation is the lack of current

awareness or focus by the major tourism managers on the need for this progress. With an apparent disinterest in even hearing employees' opinions on tourism decisions, it seems unlikely that the company would want to provide space and time for community members to address racial differences and cultural heritages. While the framework provides examples of how this has been implemented to promote a dynamic and living culture for aboriginal peoples in Australia, there still remains a resistance to recognizing indigenous vitality on Catalina, and in the United States at large, that would make mirroring the examples of Australia difficult. Further, while including indigenous peoples in tourism does increase representation, it does not necessarily correct the tokenization of cultural inclusion. Allowing indigenous peoples to define how they are portrayed in tourism promotional materials is a nod towards their existence, but if their inclusion is not central to the mission of tourism development in a place, one must ask if it is fully and appropriately inclusive of those identities. The framework does not provide warnings or recommendations on navigating implementation of appropriate representation in a truly inclusive way, and instead suggests returning to the original questions of who is included and in what ways.

Along similar lines, the tenet of marginalized people as tourism producers calls for representation in tourism products on the terms of marginalized groups. While the examples given in this framework emphasize difficulties in implementing these practices in the Global South, on Catalina Island it would also be difficult to achieve with the limited access all community members have to influence tourism development practices. The framework suggests creating decision-making roles for staff within tourism businesses, which could potentially align with recommendations

residents previously identified. On Catalina, this could manifest in high-level managers actually incorporating resident ideas, and supporting employees who want to start small tourism businesses as an offshoot of the large Catalina Island Company. Here, the inclusive tourism framework sees all lower level employees and all residents of a community as potentially marginalized through the lack of access to participative justice, overlapping slightly with the tenets on power relations and participation in decision-making.

In calling for broader participation in tourism decision-making, the authors point out the tendency for self-interest and profit to be the main concerns when business actors hold all of the power in tourism decisions. Scheyvens and Biddulph argue this makes sense in terms of the tourism companies achieving their economic goals, but does not lend itself to a reputation of inclusion. As is excessively obvious at this point, this is where all residents agree the greatest improvement needs to be made on Catalina. While different individuals have distinct reasons for desiring more participation, from nostalgia for past management to serious concerns for the lack of community resources, there is a strong agreement that their concerns and needs are not a part of tourism decisions. The framework suggests that changing who has the opportunity to participate in tourism decisions is important for the success of a tourism destination. They provide examples of how including community members in decisions can improve tourists' satisfaction in a destination as evidence of why a more inclusive process for decision-making is important. With the other tenets on inclusion recognizing the inherent importance of representation and recognition of marginalized community members, the focus on the success of a destination while calling for

broader participation seems divergent. Perhaps this is an attempt to make inclusive tourism attractive to business owners, but it strays from the foundational purposes for which it originally calls for this inclusive frame. Here the call for broader participation theoretically aligns with environmental and tourism justice, but the justification for participative justice based on tourist enjoyment strays from the focus on marginalized groups that otherwise seems central to inclusive tourism.

Returning to the recognition of inclusive tourism as inherently valuing social and economic inclusion, the overarching element of this framework turns to a classical consideration in environmental justice and critical tourism literature: transforming power relations. The strong pyramid hierarchy of power on Catalina Island highlights well the social justice issues of power relations in “exclusive” tourism. While recognizing the difficulty of achieving this, the authors promote flattening out such pyramid power structures as benefitting not just the tourism industry in a community, but the overall social relations and well-being (Scheyvens & Biddulph, 2017). On Catalina, many residents suggested that the best way to tackle the existing injustice of tourism decisions is to provide an opportunity for community members to relate to managers of the CIC as partners (King, 2018). These residents recognize how land ownership perpetuates the power relationship that exists in tourism decision-making, giving the CIC a certain amount of brute force over decisions that residents lack with the current valuing of land in the pyramid hierarchy of power. Further, residents can also see how the top-down and profit-driven decisions of the existing powerholders limit the long-term benefits to the local tourism industry, and the distribution of these benefits to the community. Giving tourism industry employees an opportunity to share

their knowledge and have a vote would improve the image of the Catalina Island Company with the communities of both Two Harbors and Avalon, and would likely result in positive impacts for the tourism industry as well. Existing literature has found that providing employees with a meaningful way to contribute to decision-making results in better retention of local employees, preservation of destination branding, and more returning visitors (Timur & Timur, 2016). Looking at the holistic impacts, an employee partnership with CIC would benefit everyone on the island, largely through improving the social relationship that the CIC has with the community, and the community's sense of inclusion in the tourism industry. This tenet of inclusive tourism sums up well the overarching problem residents identify on Catalina, but the usefulness of such identification is limited as the framework only provides power relations as a category for analyzing inclusion rather than providing ways to navigate improvement to such vertical power relations.

The elements outlined in the inclusive tourism framework address many of the issues currently operating on Catalina, but the framework is limited in its consideration of meaningful inclusion. As the elements of this framework address both resident-identified injustices and the historic issues with representation and inclusion, this framework does provide a useful set of considerations to address to build tourism that engages people who are marginalized either as producers or consumers of tourism. It assumes, however, that this is a goal tourism managers are interested in achieving. Based on the sentiments of Catalina Island residents, even bad press does little to make inclusive tourism attractive. For places where tourism is extremely exclusive and powerholders are unconcerned about inclusion, the framework provides

no implementation suggestions; it sits thoroughly in the conceptual realm and provides “a source of critical and innovative thinking” (Scheyvens & Biddulph, 2017: 17). This is not necessarily a shortcoming for those who operate fully in the conceptual sense, but with the authors’ stated goal of impacting the way tourism development operates, it is problematic to suggest concepts without also considering how these concepts could create “inclusive tourism” in name but not practice. For example, while the paper critiques tokenized inclusion of marginalized identities in the introduction, when discussing marginalized identities as tourism producers and appropriate representation, there is no interrogation of how applications of these elements could easily perpetuate tokenization if done poorly.

Also, the framework explicitly does not consider the environmental impacts of tourism, though it aims to achieve “more equitable and sustainable outcomes” (Scheyvens & Biddulph, 2017: 2). This limits the inclusiveness of the framework, as the preservation of the nonhuman environment as livable, let alone recognizing the rights of the nonhuman environment, is essential for inclusive tourism development that considers all aspects of what makes a community marginalized. In considering ecocultural justice, the Just Destination framework is closer to considering the nonhuman environment, but is still focused on the use of the environment for creating a tourism product rather than as inherently having value (Jamal & Camargo, 2014). Lack of consideration for the nonhuman environment in both frameworks fails to recognize how environmental burdens and lack of a clean environment can often be a significant characteristic that marginalizes communities. Also, to use a more critical environmental justice lens in creating this framework, recognizing the nonhuman

environment as something with rights and to be valued would be an even more holistic approach to defining inclusion (Pellow, 2016). More applicable to the current goals of this framework, without a livable environment, there would no longer be people to be conscious of including in tourism development, let alone a tourist destination to analyze. Further work needs to be done in detailing how the inclusive tourism framework can be usefully applied to cases where there is an apparent lack of interest in creating an economy and community that is truly inclusive compared to one that simply appears inclusive.

Both of these frameworks provide valuable considerations for assessing the fairness of tourism development, but are limited in their ability to produce meaningful change. The Just Destination framework provides valuable categories for assessing the intersection of environmental justice and cultural tourism, but is limited in what is considered unjust. In line with the ideas of critical environmental justice, discussing concerns of environmentally just or ecoculturally just tourism does not need to be limited to the direct use of environmental resources, but can extend to looking at how environmental resources and cultural identities are implicated in unjust power structures and decision-making strategies (Camargo et al., 2007; Jamal & Camargo, 2014; Pellow, 2016). The inclusive tourism framework provides valuable questions to consider in understanding the current inclusion status of a destination, but does not significantly interrogate how to implement the various elements of inclusiveness well.

One important area for continued development of these frameworks is in explicitly demonstrating applicability to the Global North, as has been done here with Catalina. In addition to the considerations these frameworks already provide in

designating a tourism practice as not inclusive or unjust, I suggest that in specializing the applicability Global North destinations, analyses of tourism development justice emphasize a greater focus on multiple social identities. As sociologist Pellow points out from an environmental justice approach, understanding the nuanced experiences of environmental injustice is difficult when looking only at a single form of social identity (2016). This is evidenced in the differential experiences of (in)justice on Catalina Island across identities, highlighting the relevance of such considerations in tourism as well. In addition to revealing layered experiences of injustice, such considerations of the plurality of social identities will help assess the heterogeneity of community perceptions and experiences of (in)justice, and their differing recommendations for rectifying issues.

While I do not recommend creating a prescriptive framework to provide a checklist of tasks to achieve justice, these existing frameworks need further development to address the myriad injustices of tourism in classifying destination practices. Further development of how to assess justice and how to act to implement just and inclusive tourism development practices is needed. Achieving participative justice is central to both frameworks, but how currently marginalized populations can successfully counter existing power relations is unclear. Particularly with cases like Catalina where residents are not legally provided the right to participate and can be penalized for sharing local knowledge, community members are limited in ways to change relations from their position. With company executives more interested in profit than community or a reputation of inclusion, rectifying injustices seems impossible to some residents. This case provides a valuable example of how academic

activism can be a valuable tool to identify local applicability and relevant recommended practices of these frameworks, and to raise awareness of the ideals of just tourism. Along with the potential effectiveness of my writing editorials and continued engagement with the community on Catalina, academic activism has also been explicitly utilized already by at least one of the scholars who defined the Just Destination framework (Hales et al., 2017; Jamal & Camargo, 2014). Thus, while not explicitly calling for it in their work that theorizes around what just tourism development looks like, scholars have demonstrated with their praxis the importance of activism in creating a Just Destination.

Conclusion

Catalina Island is certainly not a Just Destination or an example of inclusive tourism. Rather than providing implementable solutions to injustices, the assessed frameworks for inclusive tourism and the Just Destination find their value in helping to define an aspirational destination. Evaluating these frameworks against Catalina reveals that while neither fully encompasses the resident definitions and historic analysis of the island's injustices, together the frameworks define a number of concepts that give a name to many of the shortcomings of current practices on Catalina Island. An important theme from these frameworks that the Catalina case empirically confirms is the centrality of transforming power relations to provide meaningful opportunities for inclusion of all destination residents.

Community-centric research identified a number of injustices in current tourism decision-making, and a number of grassroots recommendations from residents on how to address these issues. Evaluating the issues on the island from a variety of

perspectives reveals how injustice is experienced differently across residents with differing social identities. The privilege of extended family residence serves to provide access to community networks and island resources that are not available to new island migrants, especially those coming from other countries. The diversity of experiences, definitions of fairness, and expectations for justice reinforce the importance of broad consultation of community views, and the importance of considering multiple social identities in assessing the justice of tourism development in the Global North. Implementing the recommendations will be a slow process, but using the methods of scholar activists, continual sharing of resident recommendations with the public and decision-makers can help move the island towards the residents' definitions of an inclusive paradise.

CHAPTER 6: Conclusion

“It’s the community and it’s the guests here, we care a lot about the people that do visit the island. I think we all live and stay here because we have this really deep love for the island itself. I wish that the people that do hold that power in the decision-making would take that into account, the passion we have behind where we come from, because I think we can contribute and work together to do some really great things that would benefit both the tourists who visit the island, and the community that keeps the island going. I think that would be a cool integration for the future. If there was just more involvement between the locals and the people making decisions, that would be great.” – lifelong Catalina Island White resident, 2018

The natural beauty of Catalina Island considered alongside the manufactured landscapes on the island make it easy to understand why tourists and residents alike see it as a paradise. With rolling mountains plunging into the crashing waves of the deep blue ocean, the physical landscape is beautiful with mild weather year-round. With the paradise motif so entrenched in the island’s tourism brand, the minimally altered interior of the island with cactus, shrubs, and dirt roads seems more ‘fake’ than the tropical paradise ambiance manufactured on Catalina’s beaches. Having finally reached one million visitors to the island in 2017, the branding of this paradise seems to have worked for business. With nearly 140 years as a destination, tourism managers have finessed the Catalina brand to sustain the tourism-dependent economy, though not without perceived and real consequences for the workers and residents who keep this paradise operational.

Building Catalina’s reputation as a paradise has relied on the exploitation of multiple populations of residents who have been marginalized in a variety of ways. Most explicitly, this has historically included the performance of Mexican culture and violent treatment of indigenous artifacts and bodies. The initial acts of colonization in

Southern California and the lasting impacts continue to manifest as injustice today in minimizing agency of the first inhabitants of Catalina Island. Today, this racist past remains largely unfronted in the island's tourism products and marketing, but there is a lasting legacy of marginalization of people of color on the island. While operating less explicitly, communities of color, particularly who are monolingual (Spanish-speaking), recent immigrants or of lower socioeconomic status, continue to experience an intersectional burden of exclusion from decision-making and mobility relative to well-established Latinx residents and White middle-class residents. Historic practices of explicit racial monitoring and exhumation of bodies have evolved to policing the documentation status of Mexican and Mexican-American residents on the cross-channel ferry and continued touristic promotion of White pot hunters at the expense of Tongva archaeologists gaining access to the artifacts of their ancestors. In maintaining nostalgia for the island's heyday as a Hollywood hotspot, the retro posters that feature a brown-faced woman and frame Two Harbors as a Tahitian paradise are still sold in souvenir shops. The overarching evidence of the lasting impact of past and continued focus on the White visitor stands out in the promotions, advertisements, and visual depictions of the Catalina Island visitor that reaffirm Schilling's claim that Catalina Island is the "Whitest Destination in America."

For the majority of residents on the island who participated in this project, exclusive decision-making processes have led to a nostalgia for former managers and previous tourism priorities. This has revealed the temporality of experiences and perceptions of justice and injustice on a privately managed tourism island. As the Wrigley dynasty passes Catalina Island Company ownership and management from

one generation to the next, the operation and vision for the island changes. For employees and residents who have lived on the island since the 1960s, the transformation starts with a sense of paternalistic fairness from managers that held control until the late 1990s. When the latest Wrigley took control, she and her husband made choices that have created a perception among residents that money comes first, residents' opinions are unimportant, and employees are disposable. Many see development today as prioritizing managers' profits over the needs of local residents. This has fostered "othering subjectivities" from the perspective of residents, putting residents as an afterthought to the "preferred other" of the tourist. This change has built a sense of camaraderie and nostalgia among long-time island residents, but has also led them to operate in a constant state of fear of losing their jobs, their business leases, and their residency on the island.

The peculiar fact that all but 1% of the island is privately owned and managed makes exclusive decision-making and resource practices permissible legally but provides an important case to analyze the politics of power on the island. The power dynamics on the island shape the landscape, economy, and subjectivities at play, and constrain residents' ideas of the possibilities of justice. The way the performance of power limits residents' ideas of justice is itself an injustice. While previous managers have provided the guise of inclusion for residents in spite of the explicit and implicit marginalization of non-White residents, current management has been less intentional in feigning inclusion. The most stated version of justice that residents of the island desire is a return to the minimal inclusion they experienced up until the late 1990s. Without having ever experienced full participative justice on the island, achieving an

end goal of complete participative justice is not even imaginable. Thus, analyzing perceptions in the current moment on the island has provided the opportunity to evaluate implications for perceived justice and what a goal for justice can look like when even the small privileges some residents were once given have been taken away.

As this research has a normative goal of moving beyond simply diagnosing injustices to providing recommendations to eradicate injustices on Catalina all together, residents' experiential knowledge served as the main source for next steps in achieving this goal. In moving towards justice on Catalina Island, residents' recommendations focus on addressing the lack of opportunity to give input to managers. With recognition that they live in a unique situation of largely privately owned and managed paradise, the numerous ideas they had primarily centered on improving access to managers, improving island opportunities for less privileged residents, and putting some checks on the business operations of Catalina Island Company. The danger of the property and hiring monopoly does not go overlooked. Residents past and present see the main ways to improve the island as allowing for the continued manufacturing of paradise, but with a shift towards community as a priority above profit. The diversity of injustices and how they are experienced on Catalina Island reveals the need to continue developing thorough frameworks of just tourism development for the Global North that aid scholar activists in assessing injustice and supporting context-specific solutions. Addressing the legacies of injustice on the island will take time and gaining a listening ear from the Catalina Island Company. If residents' recommendations become a reality, William Wrigley's hope for the island

to be a destination for everyone may not only be reached, but improved upon to make it a fairer destination for residents to call home.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Interview Questions

This is the template used in conducting interviews. The numbered questions are always asked. Additional questions are asked as appropriate to expand on relevant topics interviewees are discussing

- 1.Name
- 2.What is your age?
- 3.What was your household income last year?
- 4.What do you identify your race as?
- 5.What do you identify your ethnicity as?
- 6.What is your job here on the island?
- 7.How many years have you/did you live on the island?
- 8.How many of the past 12 months did you spend on the island?
- 9.What is your gender identity?
- 10.What language do you speak at home?
- 11.What organizations are you involved in in this community?
- 12.What are the major environmental concerns on the island?
 - How do you feel about how environmental issues are addressed on the island?
- 13.Who have been the winners and losers in resource distribution locally?
 - How do you feel local tourism development impacts your access to resources-
How do you feel your rights to resources and public space use are considered in
development decisions?
 - Overall, how fair is the amount of resources you receive in your community?
 - Would you say there is an emphasis in your community on distributing things
fairly?
14. What does fair mean to you?
- 15.How important is tourism to the island?
 - How do you feel that tourism impacts you?
 - How do you see the importance of tourism evolving in the future?
- 15.Are you involved in decision-making on tourism development locally?
 - Do you want to contribute to decision-making on tourism development?
- 16.Why do you think you are/not involved in the tourism development decision-
making process?
 - Do you feel that decisions processes are made in fair ways in your town
regarding tourism-related development?
 - Do you feel you are excluded from decision-making on development in Two
Harbors for any reason?
- 17.Who do you talk to when you want to contribute to decisions on local tourism
development projects?
 - How could I get in contact with them?
 - Who do you talk to about your views on further local tourism development?
- 18.What do you think the main factors are that influence participation in decision-
making locally?

-How much of an effort is made to be fair to residents when development decisions are being made?

-Do you feel there have been issues with community inclusion in coastal development locally in the past?

-How does trust of decision-makers affect your involvement?

19. Who do you see as having the most power to influence the direction of tourism on the island?

-Why do you think X has this influence?

20. Do you have anything else you would like to share regarding decision-making on tourism and the environment here?

21. Do you have any recommendations of people I should interview that would have valuable insights regarding decision-making processes for tourism development on the island?

22. How can I get in contact with you if I have further questions?

Appendix 2: Survey Instrument Questions

These are the questions answered in the online survey instrument. There was also the option to answer the same questions in Spanish.

- Name
 - Open-ended
- What is your age (please enter whole number)?
- What was your household income last year?
 - Less than \$25,000
 - \$25,000 - \$49,999
 - \$50,000 - \$74,999
 - \$74,999 - \$99,999
 - \$100,00 - \$149,999
 - \$150,000 - \$199,999
 - \$200,000 or more
- What do you identify your race as?
 - African American or Black
 - Alaskan Native or American Indian
 - Asian
 - Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
 - White (Hispanic or Latino/a)
 - White (Not Hispanic or Latino/a)
- What do you identify your ethnicity as (select as many as apply)?
 - American Indian
 - Alaskan Native
 - East Asian
 - Eastern European
 - Latino/a
 - Middle Eastern
 - Native Hawaiian
 - North African
 - Pacific Islander
 - South Asian
 - Sub-Saharan African
 - Western European
 - Not listed (please specify)
- What is your gender identity?
 - Bigender
 - Man
 - Transman
 - Transwoman
 - Woman
 - Not listed (please specify)
- What language do you speak at home?
 - English
 - Spanish
 - Not listed (please specify)

- What is your job here on the island?
 - Open-ended
- What community do you live in (or most often visit if not a resident) on the island?
- How many years have you/did you live on the island?
 - Less than 1
 - 1 to 4
 - 5 to 8
 - 9 to 12
 - 12 to 15
 - 16 or more
- How many of the past 12 months did you spend on the island?
 - Less than 1
 - 1 to 4
 - 5 to 8
 - 9 to 12
- What organizations are you involved in in this community?
 - Open-ended
- Are you involved with decision-making on tourism development in this community?
 - Yes
 - No
- Who do you talk to when you want to contribute to decisions on local tourism development projects (no limit)? (open-ended)
 - Email address or phone number for above named contact:
 - Open-ended
- Who do you see as having the most power to influence the direction of tourism on the island?
 - Why do you think X has this influence?
 - Open-ended
- Overall, how fair is the amount of resources you receive in your community?
 - Not at fair at all
 - Unfair
 - Somewhat unfair
 - Somewhat fair
 - Fair
 - Very fair
- What do you think the main factors are that influence participation in decision-making locally?
 - Open-ended
- Would you be willing to be interviewed on your views regarding the tourism decision-making process on the island?
 - Yes
 - No
- If yes, please provide your email-address to set up a time.
 - Open-ended

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ahern, M. (1924, July 23). Water Water Everywhere. *The Catalina Islander*, p. 1.
- Alcoff, L. (1991). The Problem of Speaking for Others. *Cultural Critique*, 20, 5–32.
- Allen, R. (2010). Rethinking Mission Land Use and the Archaeological Record in California: An Example from Santa Clara. *Historical Archaeology*, 44(2), 72–96. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03376795>
- Alvarado, I. (2008, March 8). Con México en la Isla Catalina. *La Opinión*.
- Alvitre, C. (2005). Into the Mainstream. *Convergence*, Winter, 7–10.
- Ap, J. (1992). RESIDENTS' PERCEPTIONS ON TOURISM IMPACTS. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 19, 665–690.
- Arai, S., & Kivel, B. D. (2009). Critical Race Theory and Social Justice Perspectives on Whiteness , Difference(s) and (Anti) Racism : A Fourth Wave of Race Research in Leisure Studies. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 41(4), 459–470. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.2009.11950185>
- Baldacchino, G. (2004). The coming of age of island studies. *Tijdschrift Voor Economische En Sociale Geografie*, 95(3), 272–283. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9663.2004.00307.x>
- Baldwin, J. (2005). The contested beach: Resistance and resort development in Antigua, West Indies. In C. Cartier & A. A. Lew (Eds.), *Seductions of Place: Geographical perspectives on globalization and touristed landscapes*. New York: Routledge.
- Barreto, M. A., Nuño, S. A., & Sanchez, G. R. (2007). VOTER ID REQUIREMENTS AND THE DISENFRANCHISEMENTS OF LATINO , BLACK AND ASIAN VOTERS. In *American Political Science Association Annual Conference*.
- Barrutia, J. M., & Echebarria, C. (2015). Factors affecting the attitude of tourism-destination local authorities towards sustainable planning tools in a networking context: the Balearic Sustainability Network. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 23(2), 207–233. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2014.934375>
- Bartlett, L. (20 Nov 2014). SCE Volunteers Help Paint Community Center on Catalina Island. Edison International. <https://newsroom.edison.com/stories/sce-volunteers-help-paint-community-center-on-catalina-island>
- Benedetto, G., Carboni, D., & Corinto, G. L. (2016). Governance of Sustainable Tourism in a Vast Area Surrounding a National Park. *Procedia Environmental*

- Sciences*, 32, 38–48. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.proenv.2016.03.010>
- Benning, J. (1994, November 18). Safe Harbor No More: INS Crackdown on Immigrants Divides Catalina Residents. *Los Angeles Times*.
- Bentele, K. G., & O'Brien, E. E. (2013). Jim Crow 2.0? Why States Consider and Adopt Restrictive Voter Access Policies, *11*(4). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592713002843>
- Berish, A. (2008). "I Dream of Her and Avalon": 1930s Sweet Jazz , Race , and Nostalgia at the Casino Ballroom. *Journal of the Society for American Music*, 2(4), 531–567. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1752196308080164>
- Beritelli, P., & Laesser, C. (2011). Power dimensions and influence reputation in tourist destinations: Empirical evidence from a network of actors and stakeholders. *Tourism Management*, 32(6), 1299–1309. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2010.12.010>
- Beronus, G. (n.d.). The three faces of Catalina. *Unknown*.
- Biddulph, R., & Scheyvens, R. (2018). Introducing inclusive tourism. *Tourism Geographies*, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2018.1486880>
- Blackwell, M., Boj Lopez, F., & Urrieta Jr., L. (2017). Special issue: Critical Latinx indigeneities. *Latino Studies*, 15(2), 126–137. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41276-017-0064-0>
- Blackwell, M., Briggs, L., & Chiu, M. (2015). Transnational Feminisms Roundtable. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*, 36(3), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.5250/fronjwomestud.36.3.0001>
- Bowen, D., Zubair, S., & Altinay, L. (2017). Politics and Tourism Destination Development: The Evolution of Power. *Journal of Travel Research*, 56(6), 725–743. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287516666719>
- Bramwell, B., & Lane, B. (2008). Priorities in Sustainable Tourism Research Priorities in Sustainable Tourism Research. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 16(1), 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.2167/09669580803489612>
- Bramwell, B., & Meyer, D. (2007). Power and tourism policy relations in transition. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 34(3), 766–788. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2007.03.009>
- Camargo, B., Lane, K., & Jamal, T. (2007). Environmental Justice and Sustainable Tourism: The Missing Cultural Link. *The George Wright Forum*, 24(3), 70–80.

- Cañada, E. (2018). Too precarious to be inclusive? Hotel maid employment in Spain. *Tourism Geographies*, 6688, 1–22.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2018.1437765>
- Canfield, K. (2018a, May 4). Letters to the Editor: Residents’ insights on the fairness of local tourism decisions. *The Catalina Islander*.
- Canfield, K. (2018b, September 7). Results of a graduate study on Catalina Island residents’ views of tourism decision-making, power, and justice. *The Catalina Islander*.
- Carter, R. G. S. (2006). Of Things Said and Unsaid : Power , Archival Silences , and Power in Silence. *Archivaria*, 61, 215–233.
- Catalina Discussion. (2018). Retrieved from
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1138631529487626/about/>
- Catalina Express. (2017). Catalina Express: About Us. Retrieved November 15, 2017, from www.catalinaexpress.com/about-us.html
- Catalina Island Chamber of Commerce and Visitors Bureau. (2018). Native Americans on Catalina. Retrieved July 18, 2018, from
<https://www.catalinachamber.com/about/catalina-island-history-2/native-americans-on-catalina/>
- Catalina Island Company. (2017a). Descanso Beach Club. Retrieved November 2, 2017, from <https://www.visitcatalinaisland.com/activities-adventures/descanso-beach-club>
- Catalina Island Company. (2017b). Historical Information. Retrieved October 30, 2017, from <https://www.visitcatalinaisland.com/island-company/historical-information>
- Catalina Island Company. (2017c). Safari Bus. Retrieved November 10, 2017, from <https://www.visitcatalinaisland.com/activities-adventures/two-harbors/safari-bus>
- Catalina Island Company. (2018a). Harbor Sands. Retrieved January 10, 2018, from <https://www.visitcatalinaisland.com/activities-adventures/two-harbors/harbor-sands>
- Catalina Island Company. (2018b). Discover Two Harbors. Retrieved March 28, 2019, from <https://www.visitcatalinaisland.com/activities-adventures/boating/discover-two-harbors>
- Catalina Island Company. (2019a). Catalina Island Company. Retrieved from
<https://www.linkedin.com/company/santa-catalina-island-company/about/>

- Catalina Island Company. (2019b). Employment Opportunities. Retrieved from <https://www.visitcatalinaisland.com/island-company/employment/opportunities>
- Catalina Island Conservancy. (2017a). Hiking Map 2017 11x17 (1). Retrieved October 15, 2017, from [https://www.catalinaconservancy.org/userfiles/files/Hiking Map 2017 11x17\(1\).pdf](https://www.catalinaconservancy.org/userfiles/files/Hiking Map 2017 11x17(1).pdf)
- Catalina Island Conservancy. (2017b). Things To Do. Retrieved November 10, 2017, from https://www.catalinaconservancy.org/index.php?s=visit&p=things_to_do
- Catalina Island Conservancy. (2018). About the Conservancy. Retrieved October 10, 2017, from https://catalinaconservancy.org/index.php?s=about&p=about_cic
- Catalina Island Museum. (2013). Ralph Glidden and Native Islanders. Avalon.
- Catalina Island Museum. (2017). Destination Paradise Exhibit. Avalon.
- CBS Los Angeles. (2013). Catalina Island Museum Exhibit Explores Controversial Life Of Dr.Ralph Glidden.
- City of Avalon. (2016). *City of Avalon Community Wide Income Survey*. Avalon.
- City of Avalon. (2018). *Visitor Driven Revenues*. Avalon. Retrieved from <https://4205sz1w6g4r3r9u8ubg171a-wpengine.netdna-ssl.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/Avalon-Visitor-Driven-Revenues-2017-09.pdf>
- Cohen, E. (1988). Authenticity and Commodization in Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 15, 371–386.
- Collins, S. (2014, March 24). Catalina’s Avalon is getting an overhaul. *Fox 5 News*.
- Contreras, A. F. (2007, May 22). Mexican Workers Provide a Resort Island’s “Backbone.” *The New York Times*.
- Cooke, K. (1982). Guidelines for Socially Appropriate Tourism Development in British Columbia. *Journal of Travel Research*, Summer, 22–28.
- Cooper, C., Scott, N., & Baggio, R. (2009). Network Position and Perceptions of Destination Stakeholder Importance. *Anatolia*, 20(1), 33–45. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13032917.2009.10518893>
- Corburn, J. (2003). Bringing Local Knowledge into Environmental Decision Making Improving Urban Planning for. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 22, 420–433. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456X03253694>
- Correa, J. G. (2006). *Chicano Nationalism: The Brown Berets and Legal Social*

Control. Oklahoma State University.

- Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics, 139–168.
- Culver, L. (2010). *The Frontier of Leisure: Southern California and the Shaping of Modern America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Currie, D. (1986, April 5). 36 aliens seized on Catalina: INS suspects 150 remain on island. *Long Beach Press-Telegram*.
- de Torquemada, J. (1602). *The voyage of Sebastian Vizcaino to the coast of California: together with a map & Sebastian Vizcaino's letter written at Monterey, December 28, 1602*.
- del Olmo, F. (1997). Who Remembers the Invasion of Catalina ? *Los Angeles Times*, p. n.p.
- Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (1998). Critical Race Theory: Past, Present, and Future. In M. Freeman (Ed.), *Current Legal Problems 1998: Legal Theory at the End of the Limmennium* (Vol. 51, pp. 467–491). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2003). *The Landscape of Qualitative Research: Theories and Issues*. London: Sage.
- Dillow, G. (1996, May 19). Big-city woes hit little Avalon. *Orange County Register*.
- Doxey, G. (1975). A Causation Theory of Visitor–Resident Irritants: Methodology and Research Inferences. The Impact of Tourism. In the Sixth Annual Conference Proceedings, pp.195-198. San Diego: The Travel Research Association.
- Dunn, S. (2017, July). The Great Escape: Heaven at Two Harbors. *Coast Magazine*.
- Finney, C. (2014). *Black Faces, White Spaces: Reimagining the Relationship of African Americans to the Great Outdoors*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Fitzgerald, R., & Corey, C. (2009). The Antiquity and Significance of Effigies and Representational Art in Southern California Prehistory. *California Archaeology*, 1(2), 183–203. <https://doi.org/10.1179/cal.2009.1.2.183>
- Fraser, N. (2005). Reframing Justice in a Globalizing World. *New Left Review*, 36, 69–88.
- Fraser, N. (2010). Injustice at Intersecting Scales : On ‘ Social Exclusion ’ and the ‘ Global Poor .’ *European Journal of Social Theory*, 13(3), 363–371.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1368431010371758>

- Garrison, J. D. (2018). Environmental Justice in Theory and Practice : Measuring the Equity Outcomes of Los Angeles and New York ’ s “ Million Trees ” Campaigns. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, (February), 1–12.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456X18772072>
- Gilmore, R. W. (2002). Fatal Couplings of Power and Difference: Notes on Racism and Geography. *The Professional Geographer*, 54, 15–24.
- Godenau, D. (2012). Islanders in Community: Identity Negotiation through Sites of Conflict and Transcripts of Power. *Island Studies Journal*, 7(1), 3–18.
- Gray, B., & Hay, T. M. (1986). Political Limits to Interorganizational Consensus and Change. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 22(2), 95–112.
- Gross, C. (2007). Community perspectives of wind energy in Australia: The application of a justice and community fairness framework to increase social acceptance. *Energy Policy*, 35(5), 2727–2736.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2006.12.013>
- Grydehøj, A. (2017). A future of island studies. *Island Studies Journal*, 12(1), 3–16.
<https://doi.org/10.24043/isj.1>
- Gunster, S., & Saurette, P. (2014). Storylines in the Sands: News, Narrative and Ideology in the Calgary Herald. *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 39(3). Retrieved from <http://www.cjc-online.ca/index.php/journal/article/view/2830/2572>
- Gustafsson, M. (2004). On Rawls’s Distinction between Perfect and Imperfect Procedural Justice. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, 34(2), 300–305.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0048393104264925>
- Hales, R., Dredge, D., Higgins-Desbiolles, F., & Jamal, T. (2017). Academic activism in tourism studies: A critical narrative analysis from four researchers. *Tourism Analysis*, 23, 189–199.
- Hau’ofa, E. (1994). Our Sea of Islands. *The Contemporary Pacific*, 6(1), 147–161.
- Hayward, P. (2012). Aquapelagos and aquapelagic assemblages. *Shima: The International Journal of Research into Island Cultures*, 6(1), 1–11.
- Hayward, P. (2013). Englamoured: Mermaid iconography as a contemporary heritage asset for Catalina Island. *Contemporary Legend*, 3, 39–62.
- Hernandez, D. (2005, February 24). For Some, Avalon is Alcatraz. *Los Angeles Times*.

- Herndon, A. W. (2019, February 1). Elizabeth Warren Apologizes to Cherokee Nation for DNA Test. *The New York Times*.
- Herr, C. (1921). *Their Mariposa Legend: A Romance of Santa Catalina* (fourth). Pasadena: Post Printing and Binding Co.
- Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2008). Justice Tourism and Alternative Globalisation. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 16(3), 345–364.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09669580802154132>
- Higgins, B. A., & Mehta, R. S. (2018). Distribution and habitat associations of the California moray (*Gymnothorax mordax*) within Two Harbors, Santa Catalina Island, California. *Environmental Biology of Fish*, 101, 95–108.
- Hofmeister, J. K. K., & Voss, K. M. (2017). Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology Activity space and movement patterns of *Octopus bimaculatus* (Verrill, 1883) around Santa Catalina Island, California. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, 486, 344–351.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jembe.2016.10.024>
- Holder, C. F. (1902). *The Adventures of Torqua*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company.
- Holder, C. F. (1910). The Channel Islands of California.
- Holland, D., & Leander, K. (2004). Ethnographic Studies of Positioning and Subjectivity: An Introduction. *Ethos*, 32(2), 127–139.
- Horner, R., & Hulme, D. (2017). From International to Global Development: New Geographies of 21st Century Development. *Development and Change*, 0(0), 1–32.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/dech.12379>
- Hughes, E., & Scheyvens, R. (2018). Development Alternatives in the Pacific : How Tourism Corporates Can Work More Effectively with Local Communities. *Tourism Planning & Development*, 0(0), 1–19.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/21568316.2018.1478881>
- Hylton, K. (2005). ‘Race’, sport and leisure : lessons from critical race theory. *Leisure Studies*, 24(1), 81–98. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02614360412331313494>
- IEX Helicopters. (2019). Fly to Catalina. Retrieved February 10, 2019, from <http://iexhelicopters.com/catalina-island/>
- Jamal, T., & Camargo, B. A. (2014). Sustainable tourism, justice and an ethic of care: toward the Just Destination. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 22(1), 11–30.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2013.786084>

- Jamal, T., & Camargo, B. A. (2017). Tourism governance and policy: Whither justice? *Tourism Management Perspectives*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2017.11.009>
- Jamal, T., Camargo, B. A., & Wilson, E. (2013). Critical omissions and new directions for sustainable tourism: A situated macro-micro approach. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 5(11), 4594–4613. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su5114594>
- Jamal, T., & Getz, D. (1995). Collaboration Theory and Community Tourism Planning. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 22(1), 186–204.
- Jamerson, W. T. (2016). Race and critical tourism studies : An analytical literature review, (June), 1038–1045. <https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12418>
- Jobe, M. M. (2004). Native Americans and the U.S. Census: A brief historical survey. *Journal of Government Information*, 30(1), 66–80. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jgi.2001.10.001>
- Jussila, N. K. (2017, April 20). Partake in a Tahitian experience in Two Harbors. *The Log: California's Boating & Fishing News*.
- Kelly, C. M. (2013a, February 22). Avalon getting a facelift. *The Catalina Islander*.
- Kelly, C. M. (2013b, June 21). Catalina in Stage 1 water rationing. *The*, p. 5.
- Kelly, C. M. (2018, June 22). “Two Nations” movie actor paddles to Catalina. *The Catalina Islander*.
- Kern, L. (2016). Rhythms of gentrification: Eventfulness and slow violence in a happening neighbourhood. *Cultural Geographies*, 23(3), 441–457. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1474474015591489>
- Kincaid, J. (1988). *A Small Place*. New York, N.Y.: Penguin.
- King, J. (2018, April 6). On the Water: Can't we all just get along? *The Catalina Islander*.
- Kivel, B. D., Johnson, C. W., & Scraton, S. (2009). (Re)Theorizing Leisure, Experience and Race. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 41(4), 473–493. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.2009.11950186>
- Klar, Z. (2015). We Went to the Real-Life Fucking Catalina Wine Mixer. *VICE*.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1998). Just what is critical race theory and what 's it doing in a nice field like education? *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education ISSN:*, 11(1), 7–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/095183998236863>

- Lane, L. (1939, May 27). "Land of The Noble Free." *New York Age*, p. 6.
- Lee, E. (2017). Performing colonisation: The manufacture of Black female bodies in tourism research. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 66, 95–104. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2017.06.001>
- Lencek, L., & Bosker, G. (1998). *The Beach: The History of Paradise on Earth*. New York: Viking.
- Liddell, C., & Leonhardi, J. (2012, June 29). Time Capsule: 1888. *The Catalina Islander*, p. 3.
- Lloréns, H. (2016, December 8). In Puerto Rico, environmental injustice and racism inflame protests over coal ash. *The Conversation*, pp. 1–5. Retrieved from <https://theconversation.com/in-puerto-rico-environmental-injustice-and-racism-inflame-protests-over-coal-ash-69763>
- Los Angeles Times. (1946). Mexico Will Claim Catalina and Other Islands for Tax Levying.
- Los Angeles Times. (1976). 110 Illegal Aliens Seized. *Los Angeles Times*, p. 15.
- Los Angeles Times. (1991, August 23). INS Agents Arrest 15 Aliens, Fine Employers. *Los Angeles Times*.
- MacCannell, D. (1973). Staged Authenticity: Arrangements of Social Space in Tourist Settings. *American Journal of Sociology*, 79(3), 589–603.
- Madans, H. (2017, February 24). Catalina Island adding adventure, amenities to Two Harbors by summer. *OC Register*.
- Martinez, D. R. (2010). (Re)searching for Ancestors through Archaeology. In *Being and Becoming Indigenous Archaeologists* (pp. 210–221).
- Martinez, D. R., Teeter, W. G., & Kennedy-Richardson, K. (2014). Returning the tataayiyam honuuka ' (Ancestors) to the Correct Home : The Importance of Background Investigations for NAGPRA Claims, 57(2), 199–211.
- Marzano, G., & Scott, N. (2009). Power in Destination Branding. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 36(2), 247–267. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2009.01.004>
- Massey, D. (1993). Power-geometry and a progressive sense of place. In T. Bird, J., Curtis, B., Putnam & L. Tickner (Eds.), *Mapping the futures: local cultures, global change*. London: Routledge.

- McCarthy, J. (2002). First World political ecology: lessons from the Wise Use movement. *Environment and Planning A*, 34(1994), 1281–1302.
<https://doi.org/10.1068/a3526>
- McCawley, W. (1996). *The First Angelinos: The Gabrielino Indians of Los Angeles*. Banning, CA: Malki Museum Press.
- McClure, R. (2013, May 5). Santa Catalina’s famous past is felt in its charming present. *Los Angeles Times*, pp. 4–5.
- McManis, S. (2013, July 7). Catalina: an island of contrasts. *The Sacramento Bee*.
- Meighan, C. W. (1959). The Little Harbor Site , Catalina Island : An Example of Ecological Interpretation in Archaeology. *American Antiquity*, 24(4), 383–405.
- Meighan, C. W., & Johnson, K. L. (1957). Isle of Mines. *Pacific Discovery*, 10(2), 24–29.
- Miller, F. (2017). Behind the Camera on Mutiny on the Bounty. Retrieved from <http://www.tcm.com/this-month/article/288489%7C0/Behind-the-Camera-Mutiny-on-the-Bounty-62-.html>
- Mohanty, C. T. (1991). Under Western Eyes. In C. Talpade Mohanty, A. Russo, & L. Torres (Eds.), *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism* (pp. 51–80). Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Moore, A. (2015). Islands of Difference: Design, Urbanism, and Sustainable Tourism in the Anthropocene Caribbean. *Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Anthropology*, 20(3), 513–532. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jlca.12170>
- Munt, I. (1994). Ecotourism or Egotourim. *Race & Class*, 36(1), 49–60.
<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0703993104>
- National Park Service. (2018). History & Culture. Retrieved September 15, 2018, from <https://www.nps.gov/chis/learn/historyculture/index.htm>
- Newell, P. (2005). Race , Class and the Global Politics of Environmental Inequality. *Global Environmental Politics*, 5(3), 70–94.
- Nichols, R. O. (2015). *Schedule 14.1 STAGED MANDATORY WATER CONSERVATION AND RATIONING*. Rosemead, California. Retrieved from <https://www1.sce.com/NR/sc3/tm2/pdf/cew43.pdf>
- Nixon, R. (2011). *Slow Violence and the Environmentalism of the Poor*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

- O'Brien, J. M. (2010). *Firsting and Lasting: Writing Indians out of Existence in New England*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Offield, P. (1990). Dear Boxholder. Avalon, Catalina Island. Catalina Collection: News and Santa Catalina Island Company Box, Catalina Island Newspaper Articles: Avalon Library.
- OpenGov. (2017). City revenue and expenditures. Retrieved January 6, 2018, from https://avalonca.opengov.com/transparency#/7020/accountType=revenuesVersusExpenses&embed=n&breakdown=types¤tYearAmount=cumulative¤tYearPeriod=years&graph=bar&legendSort=desc&proration=true&saved_view=null&selection=5B8BCB56200787E41CD7E75F4590C99E&projections=null&projectionType=null&highlighting=null&highlightingVariance=null&year=NaN&selectedDataSetIndex=null&fiscal_start=earliest&fiscal_end=latest
- Ottinger, G. (2012). Changing Knowledge , Local Knowledge , and Knowledge Gaps : STS Insights into Procedural Justice, 38(2), 250–270.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0162243912469669>
- Oudin, D. (2013). *Between Two Harbors: Reflections of a Catalina Harbormaster*. Bloomington: iUniverse Books.
- Overholt, A. (1926). *Catalina's Yesterdays: A Glimpse into the Life of the Ancient Dwellers on the Magic Isle*. Avalon.
- Overholt, A. (1929, November 13). Tremont. *The Catalina Islander*.
- Overholt, A. (1930, January 26). Giant white indian race stirs scientific research. *Los Angeles Times*, p. F6.
- Overholt, A. (1932a, June 26). "PLAY ISLE" OF PACIFIC BECKONS VACATIONISTS : CATALINA'S CHARMS OFFER. *Los Angeles Times*, p. D4.
- Overholt, A. (1932b, November 6). The Mysterious Children's Graves on Catalina Isle. *Los Angeles Times*, p. J5.
- Overholt, A. (1934, January 18). Early California Proposition Grows. *The Catalina Islander*, p. 1.
- Overholt, A. (1962). The Catalina Story. Avalon: Catalina Island Museum Society, Inc. Retrieved from papers2://publication/uuid/77500B7F-139F-4926-969B-2CCC6E5B5C02
- Pallas, A. (1934, January 25). Basketballing. *The Catalina Islander*.

- Parker, A. C. (1915). The status and progress of Indians as shown by the thirteenth census. *Quarterly Journal of the Society of American Indians*, 3, 185–208.
- Pearson, M. N. (1985). Littoral Society: The Case for the Coast. *The Great Circle*, 7(1), 1–8.
- Pearson, M. N. (2006). Littoral Society: The Concept and the Problems. *Journal of World History*, 17(4), 353–373. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jwh.2006.0059>
- Pedersen, J. L., & Catalina Island Museum. (2004). *Images of America: Catalina Island*. Charleston, SC; Chicago, IL; Portsmouth, NH; San Francisco, CA: Arcadia Publishing.
- Pellow, D. N. (2007). *Resisting Global Toxics: Transnational Movements for Environmental Justice*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Pellow, D. N. (2016). TOWARD A CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE STUDIES Black Lives Matter as an Environmental Justice Challenge. *Du Bois Review*, 13(2), 221–236. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1742058X1600014X>
- Perez, S. (2013). Exploitable Resources. *The Island Naturalist*, 29.
- Perry, J. E. (2013). The Archaeology of Ritual on the Channel Islands. In *California's Channel Islands: The Archaeology of Human-Environment Interactions* (pp. 137–155). University of Utah Press.
- Peters, A., & Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2012). De-Marginalising Tourism Research : Indigenous Australians As Tourists. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 19(6), 76–84. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jht.2012.7>
- Porcasi, J. F. (2012). A “ Cold Case ” Archaeofauna from Torqua Cave (CA-SCAI-32), Santa Catalina Island. *Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly*, 49(1 & 2), 1–12.
- Pulido, L. (1996). *Environmentalism and economic justice: two Chicano struggles in the southwest*. Tuscon, AZ: University of Arizona Press.
- Pulido, L., & De Lara, J. (2018). Reimagining ‘ justice ’ in environmental justice: Radical ecologies, decolonial thought , and the Black Radical Tradition. *Environment and Planning E: Nature and Space*, 0(0), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2514848618770363>
- Raab, L. M., Bradford, K., Porcasi, J. F., & Howard, W. J. (1995). Return to Little Harbor , Santa Catalina Island , California : A Critique of the Marine Paleotemperature Model. *American Antiquity*, 60(2), 287–308.

- Radaelli, C. M. (1999). The public policy of the european union: Whither politics of expertise? *Journal of European Public Policy*, 6(5), 757–774.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/135017699343360>
- Rae-Dupree, J. (1991, June). Avalon and Hawthorne Score Big Gains in Population. *Los Angeles Times*.
- Ramirez, A. R., Pratt, R. B., Jacobsen, A. L., & Davis, S. D. (2012). Exotic deer diminish post-fire resilience of native shrub communities on Santa Catalina Island, southern California. *Plant Ecology*, 213, 1037–1047.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11258-012-0063-z>
- Remenyi, D., Williams, B., Money, A., & Swartz., E. (1998). *Doing Research in Business and Management—An Introduction to Process and Method*. London: Sage.
- Robson, C., & McCartan, K. (2016). *Real World Research*. United Kingdom: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Robbins, P. F. (2002). Obstacles to a First World political ecology? Looking near without looking up. *Environment and Planning A*, 34, 1509–1513.
<https://doi.org/10.1068/a34217>
- Rocha, R. R., & Matsubayashi, T. (2014). The Politics of Race and Voter ID Laws in the States : The Return of Jim Crow ? <https://doi.org/10.1177/1065912913514854>
- Rosen, M. D. (1980). Archaeological Investigations at Two Prehistoric Santa Catalina Island Sites: Roski (SCaI-45) and Miner's Camp (SCaI-118). *Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly*, 16(1–2), 27–60. Retrieved from No. 352, Box 7, Folder 3, Gabrieliño Indians Publications Collection, 065, Department of Archives and Special Collections, William H. Hannon Library, Loyola Marymount University.
- Ruiz, J. A. (2015, March 20). Stage three possible after summer. *The Catalina Islander*, p. 1.
- Rummens, J. A. (2003). Conceptualising Identity and Diversity: Overlaps, Intersections, and Processes. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 35(3), 10–25.
- Rydell, R. (1972, September 14). The Mayor's Report. *The Catalina Islander*.
- Sahagun, L. (2008, March 30). Building bridges in Avalon. *Los Angeles Times*.
- Sahagun, L. (2010, June 24). Official assails Mexican ID Cards. *Los Angeles Times*.
- Sahagun, L. (2012, April 2). Bones flesh out an island's history: Files of man who dug

- up Indian skeletons could change views of early Catalina life. *Los Angeles Times*.
- Sahagun, L. (2015). Building boom and drought collide on Catalina Island. *Los Angeles Times*, 1–4.
- Sahagun, L. (2016). Despite desalinating water, floating it in by barge and taking short showers, Catalina islanders are told to cut back even more. *Los Angeles Times*, 1–3.
- Saito, H., & Ruhanen, L. (2017). Power in tourism stakeholder collaborations: Power types and power holders. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 31, 189–196. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2017.01.001>
- Santa Cruz Island Foundation. (2019). Santa Cruz Island Foundation. Retrieved from <http://www.scifoundation.org/home.aspx>
- Saucedo, M. (1985, April 5). Letter to the Editor: “An Error in Judgment.” *The Catalina Islander*.
- Saucedo, M. (2008). *Dream Makers and Dream Catchers: The Story of the Mexican Heritage on Catalina Island*. Virginia Beach: Donning Company Publishers.
- Scheyvens, R., & Biddulph, R. (2017). Inclusive tourism development. *Tourism Geographies*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2017.1381985>
- Schilling, D. (2012, November 16). The Whitest Vacation Destination in America. *VICE*. Retrieved from https://www.vice.com/en_us/article/kwn5ee/the-whitest-vacation-destination-in-america
- Schlosberg, D. (2004). Reconceiving environmental justice: Global movements and political theories. *Environmental Politics*, 13(3), 517–540. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0964401042000229025>
- Schroeder, R. A., Martin, K. S., & Albert, K. E. (2006). Political ecology in North America: Discovering the Third World within? *Geoforum*, 37, 163–168. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2005.05.003>
- Schumacher, P. (1878). Ancient Olla Manufactory on Santa Catalina Island, California. *American Naturalist*, 12, 629.
- Sheller, M. (2009). The new Caribbean complexity: Mobility systems, tourism and spatial rescaling. *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography*, 30(2), 189–203. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9493.2009.00365.x>
- Sidaway, J. D. (2012). Geographies of Development: New Maps, New Visions? *Professional Geographer*, 64(1), 49–62.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/00330124.2011.586878>

- Sierks-Overholt, A. (1920, February 22). MILLIONS WORK MAGIC ON CATALINA ISLAND .: WRIGLEY BY ADVERTISING MAK. *Los Angeles Times*, p. II10.
- Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. Dunedin: University of Otago Press.
- Smith, V. (1977). *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Sommer, G., & Carrier, J. G. (2010). Tourism and its Others: Tourists, Traders and Fishers in Jamaica. In D. V. . Macleod & J. G. Carrier (Eds.), *Tourism, Power and Culture: Anthropological Insights* (pp. 174–198). Bristol: Channel View Publications. Retrieved from http://books.google.pt/books?id=U_4JIZm5jBIC
- Southern California Edison. (2015). *Catalina Island Stage 2 Mandatory Water Conservation and Rationing Fact Sheet*. Retrieved from https://www1.sce.com/wps/wcm/connect/43666a02-7fc9-40f0-9d27-e25bd18c8044/Catalina+Fact+Sheets+Stage+2_R7_AA.pdf?MOD=AJPERES&attachment=false&id=1450131217344
- Sovacool, B. K., Axsen, J., & Sorrell, S. (2018). Promoting novelty, rigor, and style in energy social science: Towards codes of practice for appropriate methods and research design. *Energy Research and Social Science*, 45(November 2017), 12–42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2018.07.007>
- Spagat, E. (2010, June 13). Catalina caught in immigrant debate. *Long Beach Press-Telegram*.
- Stebbins, R. A. (2008). Exploratory Research. In L. M. Given (Ed.), *The Sage Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods*, vols. 1 and 2. London: Sage.
- Stewart, J. (1986a, November 30). Winds of Change Waft to Catalina in Shape of Dramatic Zoning Plan. *Los Angeles Times*.
- Stewart, J. (1986b, December 11). Concerns Over Water, Access to Interior Raised at Catalina Zoning Plan Hearing. *Los Angeles Times*, p. SB7.
- Strang, V. (2010). Water Sports: A Tug of War over the River. In D. V. L. Macleod & J. G. Carrier (Eds.), *Tourism, Power and Culture: Anthropological Insights* (pp. 27–46). Bristol: Channel View Publications.
- Strudwick, I. H. (2013). The Native Depopulation of Santa Catalina Island. In C. S. Jazwa & J. E. Perry (Eds.), *California's Channel Islands: The Archaeology of*

- Human-Environment Interactions* (pp. 172–189).
- Sze, J. (2006). *Noxious New York: The Racial Politics of Urban Health and Environmental Justice*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Tallbear, K. (2003). DNA , Blood , and Racializing the Tribe. *Wicazo Sa Review*, 18(1), 81–107.
- Taylor, B. (1991, September 1). This Year, INS Means Business in Avalon Raids. *Los Angeles Times*.
- Taylor, R. B. (1992, September 11). \$110-Million Resort Would Be First Project of 15-Year Plan for Catalina. *Los Angeles Times*.
- Teeter, W. G., Martinez, D. R., & Kennedy-Richardson, K. O. (2013). Cultural Landscapes of Santa Catalina Island. In C. S. Jazwa & J. E. Perry (Eds.), *California's Channel Islands: The Archaeology of Human-Environment Interactions* (pp. 156–171). University of Utah Press.
- The Catalina Islander. (1927, February 2). Colored Singers Coming to Community Church. *The Catalina Islander*.
- The Catalina Islander. (1934, March 8). P.K. Wrigley Explains Early California Plan. *The Catalina Islander*, p. 1.
- The Catalina Islander. (1935, January 31). Negro entertainers coming. *The Catalina Islander*.
- The Catalina Islander. (1936, February 27). Nigger or no nigger, they took the picture. *The Catalina Islander*.
- The Catalina Islander. (1937, August 5). Sunshine Psychology: Moving and Breathing. *The Catalina Islander*.
- The Catalina Islander. (2018a, March). “Doug Bombard: A Life on Santa Catalina Island.” *The Catalina Islander*.
- The Catalina Islander. (2018b, May 11). Catalina beaches to get new sand for summer. *The Catalina Islander*.
- The New York Age. (1949, April 16). Record Artists-Top Musicians, All, p. 6.
- The Observer. (1936, August 13). Doings at the Casino. *The Catalina Islander*, p. 6.
- Timur, S., & Timur, A. T. (2016). Employee Ownership and Sustainable Development in Tourism: A Case in North Cyprus. *Sustainable Development*, 24(2), 89–100. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.1610>

- Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 1(1), 1–40.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2010). *Profile of General Population and Housing Characteristics: 2010 Demographic Profile Data*. Retrieved from <https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?src=bkmk>
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2017). 2013-2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates: Avalon city, California. Retrieved April 12, 2019, from https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/community_facts.xhtml
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2018). About Race. Retrieved November 2, 2018, from <https://www.census.gov/topics/population/race/about.html>
- U.S. Department of Commerce. (1920). “Population.” Washington, D.C.
- US EPA. (2018). EJScreen. Retrieved September 5, 2018, from <https://ejscreen.epa.gov/mapper/>
- Vannini, P. (2011). Constellations of (in-)convenience: disentangling the assemblages of Canada’s west coast island mobilities. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 12(5), 471–492. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2011.588803>
- Villegas, R. L. (2016). More Stringent Water Conservation for Catalina Island. Retrieved from <https://energized.edison.com/stories/more-stringent-water-conservation-for-catalina-island>
- West, P., & Carrier, J. G. (2004). Ecotourism and Authenticity: Getting Away from It All? *Current Anthropology*, 45(4), 483–498. <https://doi.org/10.1086/422082>
- Whyte, K. P. (2010). An Environmental Justice Framework for Indigenous Tourism. *Environmental Philosophy*, 7(2), 75–92.
- Whyte, K. P. (2016). Indigenous Experience , Environmental Justice and Settler Colonialism. In B. E. Bannon (Ed.), *Nature and Experience: Phenomenology and the Environment* (pp. 157–174). Lanham, Md: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Whyte, K. P. (2018). Settler Colonialism , Ecology , and Environmental Injustice. *Environment and Society: Advances in Research*, 9, 125–144. <https://doi.org/10.3167/ares.2018.090109>
- Wibben, A., Confortini, C., Roohi, S., Aharoni, S., Vastapuu, L., & Vaitinen, T. (2018). Collective Discussion: Piecing-Up Feminist Research. *International Political Sociology*, 0, 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ips/oly034>

- Wilkins, D. E. (2002). *American Indian politics and the American political system*. Lanham, Md: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Windle, E. (1924, April 2). Avalon Gets Water. *The Catalina Islander*, p. 1,6.
- Windle, E. (1935, July 11). A Tribute to the Late William Wrigley Jr. *The Catalina Islander*, p. 1,4,11.
- Yaka, Ö. (2018). Rethinking Justice : Struggles For Environmental Commons and the Notion of Socio-Ecological Justice. *Antipode*, 0(0), 1–20.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/anti.12422>
- Yasarata, M., Altinay, L., Burns, P., & Okumus, F. (2010). Politics and sustainable tourism development - Can they co-exist? Voices from North Cyprus. *Tourism Management*, 31(3), 345–356. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2009.03.016>
- Young, D. (2017a, October 20). Catalina visitor stats show improvement. *The Catalina Islander*.
- Young, D. (2017b, November 4). Island ramps up tourism effort. *The Catalina Islander*.
- Young, D. (2018a, February 2). Housing on Catalina becomes hot topic at recent forum. *The Catalina Islander*.
- Young, D. (2018b, February 2). It's official: More than one million visitors. *The Catalina Islander*.
- Young, H. (2005). The Black Body as Souvenir in American Lynching. *Black Performance*, 57(4), 639–657.
- Zanelli, R., & Horn, K. (2011). Fact or Fiction: Is Catalina a Desert Island? *The Island Naturalist*, 7.
- Zapata Campos, M. J., Hall, C. M., & Backlund, S. (2018). Can MNCs promote more inclusive tourism? Apollo tour operator's sustainability work. *Tourism Geographies*, 6688(May), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2018.1457074>
- Zhang, Y., Cole, S. T., & Chancellor, C. H. (2013). Residents' Preferences for Involvement in Tourism Development and Influences from Individual Profiles. *Tourism Planning and Development*, 10(3), 267–284.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/21568316.2012.747984>