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ABSTRACT: Since the 1880s Catalina Island has been developed as a tourist haven that has required a considerable influx of seasonal and longer-term residents to support its business operations. Research on the social dynamics of this tourism economy reveals that residents experience their needs being handled as an afterthought in island infrastructural development. Residents perceive Catalina Island Company as prioritising tourists above employees and residents, and development choices confirm these priorities. 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 analysing perceptions particularly interesting, as residents express a sense of ownership over the island and its future though they lack legal titles to land. This article analyses 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.
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Introduction

Catalina Island is a 195 km² (75 square mile) island located 35 km (22 miles) off the coast of Southern California. Prior to European colonisation and genocide Catalina operated as part of a regional trade network and inter-island community for the indigenous Gabrieleno/Tongva and Chumash peoples (Perry, 2013), who were primarily involved in aquapelagic livelihood activities that focused on water as a connector and resource space; essential to a society’s operation, identity, and residents’ sense of belonging (Hayward, 2012: 5). By the early-mid 1800s, the remnant indigenous population was relocated to the Californian mainland and their subsistence lifestyle was replaced by the commercial operations of established by (primarily) white entrepreneurs and settlers. The current year-round population hovers around 3,800 residents, 90% of whom 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). Avalon is in the 80th to 90th percentile in the country for minority and linguistically isolated populations (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 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2017). It is difficult to fully assess the island’s racial demographics due to the large undocumented population (Dillow, 1996). Since the early 1900s, there has been intergenerational undocumented migration to the island from Central America.
America, specifically Mexico (Saucedo, 2008). The percentage of families living in poverty is slightly above the national average, and 4% higher than average when looking at families with children under 18 at home (U.S. Census Bureau, 2017). The remaining 10% of island residents outside of Avalon live scattered throughout the island, with many residing in Two Harbors, the only other population centre.

An important part of this population that is not accounted for in these statistics is the seasonal residents, both working and vacationing, who spend summers on the island each year. The reason for this seasonal change in population is the primacy of tourism to the island’s economy; visitor-generated revenue comprised 42.5% of the total City of Avalon income for the 2016-2017 fiscal year (OpenGov, 2020; Young, 2017), which is up nearly 100% over the seven years previous (City of Avalon, 2017). In 2018 the island reached one million visitors annually (Young, 2018b). The continual growth of visitation to the island is largely a result of efforts by the Catalina Island Company (CIC), which owns all but 1% of the developable land on the island. One family has privately-owned and managed the company...
and this land since 1918 (Catalina Island Company, 2019a). This century of monopolised ownership and development of the island has led to a tenuous relationship at times, including the past decade, between residents and the Company.

The social dynamics of one company having a long-standing monopoly on the land rights and public image of Catalina Island is the focus of this article. This article uses thematic analysis of interviews (Robson and McCartan, 2016) and content analysis (Maxwell et al, 2018) to explore the connections among marketing the island as an isolated paradise, residents’ sense of self relative to tourists, and the social tensions between residents and the CIC. This article uses data from a mixed-methods social science study conducted from 2017 to 2019 on Catalina Island (Canfield, 2019) that used an interpretivist epistemology (Denzin and Lincoln, 2003; Remenyi et al, 1998) and qualitative thematic analysis (Robson and McCartan, 2016) of 34 formal semi-structured interviews and 50 online surveys. The term “resident” is used throughout to refer to participants, and anyone who lived on the island for at least one tourism season. Questions in surveys and interviews covered demographics, power relations on the island, and access to tourism decision-making (Canfield, 2019). Fifteen participants, 22% of the sample, identified as at least one ethnicity or race that would categorise them as “people of color.” To address this difference in the demographics from the island’s population, increased content analysis of the Mexican and Mexican-American experience on the island was conducted, and two key informant interviews were conducted with community leaders. Participants were identified using a snowball sampling method, beginning with existing contacts on the island. While not all participants shared their occupation, 36% self-identified as working in the tourism industry.

Key findings of the larger study that are discussed in this article include the socioenvironmental impacts of the increasing use of paradise rhetoric over the past century, the perceived lack of managerial concern for democratic inclusion of residents, and the isolating implications this lack of democracy has for residents’ senses of self and resource access. I demonstrate how this has led to different actors on the island operating as increasingly stratified islands of influence. 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 in numerous times and am seen in the Catalina community as 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 likely that my whiteness affected 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 whiteness and intersectional identity that included research funding allowed me to move around tourist spaces in Avalon passing as an ordinary tourist. This provided me more economic and mobility privilege than many residents. As I was a temporary resident, I was not subject to many of the acute participation limitations in decision-making long-term residents 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. 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 vocalise and communicate injustices that residents may feel too at-risk to share.

While tourism marketers have continually worked to build Catalina Island’s brand as a remote and unique paradise, it is officially part of the eight-island chain of the California
Channel Islands. Operationally now much more isolated than when Native trade routes flourished (Teeter et al, 2013), a nominal connection among the eight islands remains through their official names after Catholic saints (e.g. Santa Rosa, Santa Cruz, San Nicolas). Further, the aquapelagic nature of the system is implicitly emphasised 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. 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 characterisation 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 remnant 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, residents and publicists for the CIC have isolated Santa Catalina Island from the other Channel Islands by dropping the 'Santa' and referring to it by the name 'Catalina' alone (Overholt, 1962; various contributors to the Catalina Discussion Facebook Page, 2018) rather than its complete Spanish name, or its traditional Gabrieleno/Tongva name, Pimu (McCawley, 1996). Recognising, and perhaps intentionally encouraging, the increasing distance of the identity of Catalina as one of the Channel Islands, the major tourism management and development company was renamed in 2017 from Santa Catalina Island Company to Catalina Island Company (Catalina Island Company, 2017b). The name change is just one example of the CIC strategy of framing Catalina not as part of a system, but as a bound, modifiable space for a unique escape from the connections of the real world. Nominally losing this relic of the historic aquapelagic identity of Catalina as part of an island system 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.

The CIC effort to isolate Catalina from both the Channel Islands and the mainland, and residents’ struggle to accept this image of the island makes the literature of Island Studies particularly relevant. In advocating for seeing islands as unique spaces and not simply smaller laboratories for studying operations of larger society, Island Studies can promote 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 recognises the tensions island residents have between maintaining a unique identity, and the connection to the globalised world that they rely on for sustained existence (Baldacchino, 2004; Grydehøj, 2017). Applying the frame of Island Studies to this work allows for the exploration of how perceptions of social justice and power dynamics are further complicated by islandness. The CIC priority of making Catalina a getaway from the mainland promotes a simplistic form of islandness, promoting the island as an accessible space of isolation. A place of relaxation, palm trees, and paradise without thought of the global processes at play. This brand 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.
Tourism acts as an external connection for residents, as some islands are dependent on being accessed by the very mainlanders from whom islandness serves to isolate them (Vannini, 2011). With growing globalisation of littoral societies, tourism is central to transforming the expected interactions of people with coastal areas “into a thriving, civilized, pleasure and recreation-oriented outpost of Western lifestyle” (Lencek and Bosker, 1998: x). On Catalina, interactions with the permeable land-water border have transformed from being directly essential to the livelihood of residents via subsistence fishing and trading (Teeter et al, 2013) to a means for visitors to recreate away from the pressures of their daily lives. These touristic interactions with coastal spaces are still essential to residents in that they sustain the economy. In the 2020 moment of coronavirus, the reliance on external connection for economic sustenance is on full display, as the standstill in the tourism economy has led to 90% unemployment for residents (Markowitz, 2020).

The difference between fishing as a subsistence practice of Native islanders and as a tourist activity is significant. While historically fishing was an essential part of the littoral lifestyle of the Tongva/Gabrielino (McCawley, 1996), and even to European immigrant residents of the island in the early 1900s (Culver, 2010), over the past century, fishing is increasingly for tourist entertainment rather than resident subsistence. The early 1900s exhibited this shift to fishing as a tourist activity with the Flying Fish festival (Holder, 1910), and regional coverage of the large fish tourists caught (Culver, 2010). Today, while some residents have boats which they use for subsistence fishing, fishing in the waters surrounding the island is largely for tourists via recreational fishing trips (Catalina Island Company, 2020). This is a tourist-centred form of aquapelagism that serves to complicate islandness in necessitating connection to mainland visitors, while excluding and ‘othering’ residents from the ocean and its biotic resources through the costs associated with this commercialised interaction with the oceans. Similarly, the proliferation of mermaid image in signage around Avalon characterised by Hayward (2019) as being a manifestation of an “aquapelagic imaginary” on
the island (ibid) is primarily created for tourist consumption rather than being an organic expression of local sensibilities. It is tourists who now experience the ocean as a connector, while residents experience a sense of separation from the littoral space. Tourism activities developed and infrastructures installed to build further this touristic aquapelagism and isolated paradise have emphasised the importance of considering implications of such installations not only on a changing landscape, but also on Catalina Island residents’ subjectivities and identities.

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 them. 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, and Wilson, 2013; Jamerson, 2016; Lee, 2017; Sommer and 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 and Carrier, 2010). Complicating previous uses of the Other, I look at how it can be ascribed onto oneself as well as to others, once again from the perspective of the resident (Alvitre, 2005; Blackwell, Briggs, and Chiu, 2015; Higgins-Desbiolles, 2008). I explore the ways in which this ‘othering’ can act as a complex and layered subjectivity (Mohanty, 1991) resulting from how power relations lead residents to relate to themselves, their own identities, tourists, and tourism managers. Here, 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).

Physical and socioenvironmental impacts of paradise rhetoric

As visitors’ desired holiday experience changes, destinations must be transformed to accommodate a growing influx of visitors (Munt, 1994). In this way, tourists visiting Catalina Island over the island’s 140 years as a tourist destination 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 favour of particular ways of developing tourism by spending money on the island – ie in their choice of one destination, hotel, or restaurant over another – which influences managers and decisions. Particularly on a privately managed island, like Catalina, this gives tourists great power to influence development decisions. Their choices can directly influence CIC’s decisions, since it owns all but 1% of the developable land on the island, and CIC can make decisions without needing to incorporate residents’ concerns. Destination marketers curate tourist desires as well, making marketing choices that invite tourists’ ideas of vacation to progress towards a particular idea of the ultimate experience that aligns with developers’ interests (Sommer and Carrier, 2010). When the goal is maximising tourism revenue, achieving such an end goal can only be realised by catering to the island ideals of the tourists, even if at the cost of satisfying year-round residents (West and Carrier, 2004).

1 Although there have been some notable attempts to adapt such imagery for local context and cultural groups. As Hayward also notes (2019: 97-98), Catalina’s contribution to the 2016 national Big Draw competition was a complex skeletal mermaid rendered in the style of Mexican Día de los Muertos imagery and related Mexican and Mexican-American artworks.
One such ideal has been visitors’ idea of the island as akin to a tropical Pacific paradise. This is not an entirely false vision of the island, as Two Harbors, the smaller population centre on the island (see Figure 1), was used as the major terrestrial location for the film *Mutiny on the Bounty* (Frank Lloyd, 1935) 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, characterised by shrubs, oak trees, consistently comfortable temperatures, and mildly wet winters with dry summers (Zanelli and Horn, 2011). While receiving more rain than a desert, the temperate environment of Catalina is much different in annual precipitation and native vegetation relative to the tropical forests of the Pacific.

Tourism managers working to promote the tourist ideal of Catalina as tropical paradise 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 and Carrier, 2004). Processes of virtualism provide an understanding of Catalina through a progressive understanding of place (Massey, 1993). People’s understanding of Catalina as a place change as the political, environmental, and social infrastructures of the island change (Baldwin, 2005). Tourism development to match virtualised understandings of the island has been instrumental in transforming Catalina environmentally and socio-politically. This began with the importation of palm trees in the 1930s (*The Catalina Islander*, 1934), and the idea of Two Harbors as a quasi-Pacific locale also came in the early 1900s (Culver, 2010; Overholt, 1934). Looking across historic content and interviews from this study, the most marked changes to the environmental and socio-political space of the island have occurred under the current CIC owners and their management team.

To create a more idyllic tropical landscape, tourism managers have changed the appearance of some of the island beaches starting in the early 1990s (Taylor, 1992). A naturally rocky beach in Avalon has been transformed into the Descanso Beach Club, a private beach with imported white sand, for-rent chaise lounges and cabanas, and a climbing wall (Catalina Island Company, 2017b). These changes aimed to satisfy the desired luxury tourist. The website for the beach club advertises the tourism infrastructures installed for guest comfort, noting “[o]ur imported beach sand is gentle on feet and gives guests a beautiful and comfortable place to relax in the sun” (Catalina Island Company, 2017a). Harbor Sands, a similar development to Descanso Beach Club that embraces tourist ideals over an authentic experience, opened in Two Harbors in 2017. 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,” (Madans, 2017) 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 (Culver, 2010; Miller, 2017). MacCannell explains these false understandings of what a place naturally looks like as a “staged authenticity” (1973). In the case of Catalina, the development guides tourists to believe Two Harbors is naturally like a tropical South Pacific beach. With the continued development of the beaches in this way, however, we may perceive an “emergent authenticity,” which recognises the ability of something originally viewed as inauthentic to become accepted as an authentic representation of the space (Cohen, 1988).
In Two Harbors, residents are resistant to the more upscale, resort feel Harbor Sands has given the town. Residents and tourists from past seasons continually expressed frustration about how recent developments have minimised the outdoorsy, rugged charm the town used to possess in contrast to the resort feel of Avalon. Being a unique destination and community, in contrast to, Avalon is important to Two Harbors residents. 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, leading to a sentiment that managers are being deceptive (Canfield, 2019).

Along with denouncing the conversion of these spaces to capitalised 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. The spaces that have been capitalised are on land that has always been privately owned, but previously, there was unrestricted access. This led residents to understand their use and rights to the space as a public area. The area now known as Harbor Sands was unfenced, with limited official CIC oversight, many picnic tables, barbeques, and a 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 centre, with a CIC security guard on duty always. In both cases, the changes left the intertidal zone, which is public space, untouched, making the developments legal. While residents of both locales recognise 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 maximise profit by meeting the tourists’ idea of an island paradise.
Access to influence: Catalina and islands of Others

The most visibly influential actors in tourism development on the island are those who manage tourism (Bramwell and Meyer, 2007; Sommer and Carrier, 2010). The land monopoly of CIC means individuals in upper management can sway the development direction of the island significantly. With the CIC having set a goal of revitalising tourism on the island, residents see the company’s priorities resulting in multiple types of Others on the island. Residents perceive the top priority as meeting tourists’ desires. In many residents’ eyes, this makes the resource needs of year-round community members an afterthought. Some accept this as necessary for the CIC to maintain economic viability, but CIC managers having such a focus on tourists without intentional, informed community inclusion minimises the possibility of development having a positive impact on the community (Baldwin, 2005). Without intentional inclusion, resident businesses can easily become ignored or avoided unless they advertise as part of a tourism package (Sommer and 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 the perception is that tourism managers are then treating the remaining locals as ‘neglected others.’ Residents argue 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 (Baldacchino, 2004; Sommer and Carrier, 2010). 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).

The inequitable distribution of resources between residents and tourists on Catalina Island reinforces a sense among residents that managers look out for tourists as ‘preferred others.’ Inequitable distribution of resources can be described as distributive injustice (Jamal and Camargo, 2014). Distributive justice refers to fair access and distribution of resources in a community. In this article, 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” (Garrison, 2018: 3). One way that tourists are perceived to have preferred access to resources is 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 (Catalina Express, 2017; IEX Helicopters, 2019). While these are not cheap methods of transport, the fact that one million visitors frequent the island annually (Young, 2018b) 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. The precedence of easier mobility for visitors and business entities relative to the immobility of residents reinforces as common practice prioritisation of tourist access and profit gain over daily experiences of residents (Sheller, 2009; Vannini, 2011).

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 discounted transportation (personal communication, 2018), leaving seasonal employees, and even some year-round CIC employees, to pay the same price as a tourist. Employees in this position expressed that this cost is prohibitive, which 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). Although managers meet the needs of
tourists, the needs of residents are not met, reinforcing their self-assigned subjectivity as '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 is particularly problematic in how undocumented immigrants are marooned on the island. Although Latinx migrants can purchase commuter tickets for more affordable travel between the mainland and island, they cannot do so without presenting government-issued identification. Thus, discounted transportation is unavailable to residents who lack legally recognised documentation to be in the United States. With many immigrants moving 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 recent policy that requires government-issued documentation to purchase discounted tickets mirrors voter registration laws in some states requiring similar identification at the United States elections. Political science researchers argue that the impact of such laws has been disempowering and discriminatory for people of minority and has marginalised racial identities, with particular burdens on immigrant residents (Barreto, Nuño, and Sanchez, 2007; Rocha and Matsubayashi, 2014). This is particularly problematic in relation to immigrant experiences of identification requirements when considered against the history of the United States as a nation of (colonising) immigrants (Bentele and O’Brien, 2013: 1090). Similar to the discriminatory impact these laws have in voter turnout, the practice of checking identification for passengers on the Catalina Express ferry between the mainland and island since the 1970s has served to intimidate passengers of marginalised identities, particularly immigrants, from traveling on the ferry (Alvarado, 2008; Beronus, nd; Hernandez, 2005; Los Angeles Times, 1976; Rae-Dupree, 1991; Sahagun, 2008, 2010).

This policing of documentation has created a culture of fear of ferry travel among undocumented residents, forcing weighing the risks of risk losing contact with their family against 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 maroons 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. This immobility is another way the ocean can act as a divider rather than connector for these residents while serving as a recreational feature for tourists.

Another immobility that particularly targets residents of colour 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 (Catalina Island Conservancy, 2018). The rugged and diverse landscape of Catalina Island, however, makes such movement difficult without a car, and 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 petrol prices on island and to purchase a car, one must be long established on the island to have a car, and then still must get a car permit to see the interior of the island. Visitors to the island have
access to the island interior through a variety of tours and buses, costing from $64USD to $114USD roundtrip (Catalina Island Conservancy, 2017; Catalina Island Company, 2017c). 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, 2018). These tours of the interior are not seen as affordable to residents and reinforce the greater island mobilities of tourists over more recent 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 a school-sponsored celebration of his sports team. Lower-income residents, families new to the island, and teenage residents are unlikely 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 most 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.

Nearly all residents also experience the ‘neglected others’ subjectivity due to the distributive inequities they experience from 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). 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 reduced 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. 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 desalinisation 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 penalised usage limits. This reflects MacCannell’s findings that tourists are not held responsible for their behaviours within tourist establishments, but rather enjoy destinations as prepared for them by destination managers (1973). This injustice was perceived with the utility company, managing both electric and water utilities, rather than with the CIC. 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 prioritising tourists’ comfortable experience over the year-round availability of water for residents.

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, these 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 (Stewart, 1986). Building affordable housing requires the CIC to cede its own developable land to a developer or the city. The CIC recognises the need for more housing and is currently constructing new housing for its own employees in Avalon (Young, 2018a). For workers not employed by the CIC, this worsens the divide between the Catalina Island Company and the community. As one white interviewee noted, along with availability of affordable housing, there is a sense that putting all affordable housing in a single area of town would ‘ghettoise’ the neighbourhood. Thus, besides the great need for affordable housing, there is an implicit understanding that such housing will create a segregated community at the intersection of socioeconomic and racial identity of which some white residents may disapprove.

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, as 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 revealed that service industry employees will work three jobs during the summer to afford rent. They also work multiple jobs in the summer to afford to live on the island in the slower winter months when there are less jobs. 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, 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, they create a serious access issue for residents who work serving the very visitors who occupy homes otherwise available to residents.

Residents believe the CIC’s prioritisation of tourists’ needs manifests due to a company culture that is money-driven and sees employees as disposable. In defence 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 support for island infrastructure development that does not consider 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 a tight-knit community to which they are committed as well as an employment opportunity. In Two Harbors, staying on the island becomes nearly impossible if not employed by the CIC or the University of Southern California’s research institute, 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, 2019a, 2019b). Spending a summer working on an island in southern California is an easy sell. Many
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Residents noted the successful destination-branding the CIC has produced. This same persuasive marketing 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 neglected.

Whether they live in Two Harbors or Avalon, interviews revealed residents have a strong connection to the environment in which they live, and this connection gives them a sense of ownership over their community. Living on a tourism-dependent island means nearly everywhere residents go is somewhere they may encounter tourists. This constant interaction gives residents intimate awareness of tourist interests and the areas tourists frequent most. 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 beyond CIC. The connections community members have to these environments create a sense of ownership over their homes and community, though residents rarely can actually own property on the island. Previous anthropological work has recognised 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 (Pulido, 1996). The landscape ownership residents possess reveals itself as an ownership subjectivity.

Perceptions of injustice arise here, as the ownership subjectivity leads residents to argue that they should be contributing to decisions on tourism development. 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. Ownership subjectivities are not recognised in decision-making when not supported by the objective legal title. This frustrates residents who feel that changes to this landscape disrupt the balance of commercial development relative to the undeveloped beach and protected areas to which this ownership subjectivity attaches them. They see tourism as inevitable and necessary on the island, and thus some call for eco-tourism that emphasises growth of visitor education rather than resource use. Residents call here for legitimate influence in tourism decision-making. Legitimising 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 ownership subjectivity reveals another sense of ‘othering’ between residents and managers. Bringing together differences in class status with ownership subjectivity, residents perceive tourism managers as being quite different from residents in 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 managers 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 as ‘outsider others’ 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). Managers are outsiders not only based on physical 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.’

Discussion

The operation and connections of Catalina Island to the ocean and Southern California have transformed since the beginning of European colonisation that displaced indigenous peoples from the island hundreds of years ago. The destruction of historic aquapelagic connections that were necessary for Tongva survival in precontact times has allowed it to become today’s ‘tourist paradise’ today, marketing the island as “a complete change” from daily life (Catalina Island Museum, 2017). In fostering this identity of the island as isolated from the pressures of the mainland, tourism managers have also created isolation of residents within the bounds of the island itself. Now, not only are the Channel Islands functionally isolated, but the subjectivities work to isolate residents into social ‘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 residents self-assign to themselves and assign 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 and Meyer, 2007). Happy visitors mean a greater likelihood of guests returning in the future, and thus the continued growth of tourism revenue. Tourist influence provides a sense of ownership then, 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’ virtualised 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 and Carrier, 2004; Sommer and Carrier, 2010). Meanwhile, residents that have a collective sense of ownership through their connection to the landscape (Strang, 2010) are not able to use this ownership as a tool to access decisions on development. Thus, diverse sources of ownership are differently recognised 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. While tourist influence is not actively recognised as ownership, it does provide an avenue for considering tourist needs that residents feel is not available with their own landscape ownership.

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. Residents experience this as a prioritisation 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 on the island intensifies their interaction with these inequities of resource distribution more so than experienced firsthand by the CIC ‘outsider others.’
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. Making the virtualised paradise of Catalina Island has created an escape from daily life for the visitors to the island but has marooned residents 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 and the tourist-centred version of an aquapelagic society. This is an 'othering' that centres 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 analyse 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 and Carrier, 2010). I define othering subjectivity 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. This othered subjectivity has precedence in other tourism destinations where residents feel their knowledge and well-being is disregarded relative to the well-being of tourists (Sommer and Carrier 2010; West and Carrier, 2004). 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 virtualised authenticity. Further, the differing experiences of island immobility arguably lead to residents with more marginalised identities as even more of a 'neglected other' than well-established, white Catalina residents. 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. Thus, in analysing implications of destination branding and the associated tourism infrastructures, it is essential to include analysis of these islands of Others and consequences the isolation has for destination residents.

Conclusion

Catalina’s current community has largely lost touch with the island’s aquapelagic past, which involved its indigenous peoples accessing marine resources and existing in a complex trading relationship with other California Channel Islands’ communities and those of the Californian mainland. Today, there is only a flow of goods between Catalina Island and the mainland with regard to the products and souvenirs needed for tourists. It is this lost connection and loss of the island’s status as part of a complex system that has allowed creation of a geophysical product that serves tourist demands. Consideration of the aquapelagic aspects of the island’s contemporary tourism culture are also notable in that they contribute to a more nuanced understanding of aquapelagons being created, operated by and accessible to particular groups within societies rather than by societies as a whole. In her 2019 study Guerin describes the situation in 19th Century New York where the poverty and social marginality of African American residents led a number of them to adopt an aquapelagic...
lifestyle around the shores of the rapidly developing metropolis to which they supplied oysters. Drawing on this, she asserted ‘the importance of historicising the liminal space between land and sea, for advancing ideas about race, nature and value’ (2019: 31). On Catalina Island, a socio-economically and politically disempowered local community comprising a substantial Latinx population is largely denied access to aquapelagic leisure spaces dominated by white tourists. While this appears a reverse of the scenario Guerin presents for New York’s foreshores and coastal waters, it reinforces her contention that “it is imperative that we also trace how constructions of racial hierarchies have driven speculative and exploitive treatments of life and land across coastal ecologies” (ibid: 49).

Virtualism is a driving force of tourism development on this island, which puts residents’ access to resources at odds with tourist comfort (West and Carrier, 2004). The priority of increasing luxury visitors influences the direction of tourism development towards a false idea of the island as a tropical paradise, perpetuating this manufactured authenticity (Cohen, 1988; Munt, 1994). Less mediated experiences of the island on non-capitalised and public beaches, which allow visitors and residents to experience local flora and fauna, are increasingly being erased, much like the island’s aquapelagic past.

Focus on increasing tourism infrastructure has come at the expense of equitable access to resources for residents, demanding consideration of how Others are created as a consequence of development when done without intentional community inclusion. The residents are Others in their own community, with many perceived consequences. 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 and sense of self. 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 – and, arguably, resilient – community.
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