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ABSTRACT

In order to ensure a more peaceful global environment, it is critical that all of the world’s countries and cultures are recognized as significant players in our common struggle towards harmony. Nurturing this movement toward an empowering peace, the international community needs to explore new and different ways of handling conflict. While economic and militaristic power nearly always results in “victory” in the way of resource control, it has proved less effective in creating sustainable peace and understanding in our interdependent world. The Western world’s focus on domination and violence as a means of “making peace,” can certainly use a fresh perspective. This study attempted to examine peace and peacemaking from multiple perspectives. The concept of peace and peacemaking was explored in both a Western and Pacific Island cultural context. Two primary research questions were posed: (1) How are the Pacific cultures of Hawai’i and Fiji conceptualizing peace? (2) How do these Pacific cultural concepts compare to a Western conceptualization of peace? To answer these inquiries, three studies are presented: (1) data from a qualitative study on the concept of peace conducted in a Western context were analyzed and concept mapped in order to outline a Western concept of peace; (2) A review of peace and peace practices using the electronic Human Relations Area Files (eHRAF), an anthropological database, was completed. This review focused specifically on the Pacific Island cultures of Hawai’i and Fiji; and (3) The practices of Hawai’i and Fiji are further explored in seven qualitative interviews conducted with cultural informants. These ideas are synthesized with those in the literature, giving a Pacific concept of peace. Finally, an examination and comparison of the groups (Western, non-Western, and Pacific) conclude the study. Future research topics and questions are explored.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The Western world’s history of colonization and aggression has led to a glamorization of war and several countries have been engaged in war and occupations for hundreds of years (Hagan & Bickerton, 2007). The military industrial complex that exists in the United States and other Western European countries has funneled billions of dollars into arms, military strategy and training, as well as products and research related to national defense since its beginnings in the early 20th Century (Coyne, Hall, McLaughlin, & Zerkle, 2014). In Marsella (2011), a detailed account of the United States as a culture of war is presented. An aggressive and violence obsessed nation that seeks domination over others using various means- active occupation and violence in foreign countries, economic sanctions, bribery and financial control of nations’ leaders, to name only a few. Moreover, the U.S. military complex exhibits domination over its own population selling the romantic idea of war heroes and good versus evil storylines. This American “culture of war” has existed through 250 years of continuous fighting and continues to live on today.

Along with the battles that ensue between nations, unrest continues within nations as well. From the family room to the court room to the international stage, peace, conflict prevention and resolution are not just interesting avenues of research, but critical ones both in and across countries. The differences in quality of life amid our own American communities have grown increasingly more disturbing. Levels of homicide are nearly seven times as high in urban areas than rural areas (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2010). Access to proper health care and basic living needs like food and employment vary significantly across these separate locales (Churilla, 2008; Singh & Siahpush, 2014). This discrepancy widens exponentially when one looks outside “first world” nations and compares communities internationally. South Africa, one of the most affluent African nations still has more than half of its citizens (53%) living below the poverty line, meaning they make less than $1.25 dollars a day (The World Bank Website,
2013). The life expectancy in the U.S. is 79 years, whereas there are countries in the world where life expectancy still lingers in the mid 50s, such as Sierra Leone, South Sudan, Mozambique, Angola, and Nigeria (The World Bank Website, 2013).

In order to ensure a more peaceful global environment, it is critical that all of the world’s countries and cultures are recognized as significant players in our common struggle towards harmony. Nurturing this movement toward an empowering peace, the international community needs to explore new and different ways of handling conflict. While economic and militaristic power nearly always results in “victory” in the way of resource control, it has proved less effective in creating sustainable peace and understanding in our interdependent world. As community psychologists and social scientists, we have not thoroughly addressed alternative ideas on peace and peacemaking processes in our research. In fact, in a search of the last 15 years of research in two of Community Psychology’s main journals, Journal of Community Psychology and American Journal of Community Psychology, the articles on violence, trauma, sexual assault, child abuse, and bullying outnumbered those on conflict resolution and violence prevention 14 to 1. Those that specifically highlighted conflict resolution examined the Arab-Israeli conflicts (Even-Chen & Itzhaky, 2007; Kulik & Rayyan, 2003; Levine, 2006) violence in families (Formoso, Gonzales, & Aiken, 2000; Waddell, Pepler, & Moore, 2001), liberation psychology (Lykes, Blanche, & Hamber, 2003; Moane, 2003; Watts & Flanagan, 2007), and intimate partner violence (Walden, Javdani, & Allen, 2014). So, while they did focus on preventing conflict, the subject matter was still in relation to a violent context. There were no articles found focusing on the topic of peace or peacemaking.

Similarly, while peace and peacemaking in non-Western cultures has been examined by researchers, it is often studied in relation to violence and war (Billings, 1991; Bohlken & Sergenti, 2010; Broch and Galtung, 1966; Do & Iyer, 2010; Galtung, 1990; Kabwegyere, 1972; Krippendorff, 1974; Magdalena, 1977; Melko, 1992; Midlarsky & Tanter, 1967; Misra, 1972;
While other topics related to culture are explored such as Gandhi and non-violence (Bose, 1981; Chatterjee, 1974; Hettne, 1976; Pontara, 1965; Sorensen, 1992) and specific studies on the Israel-Palestine conflict (Galtung, 1971; Hilmyy, 1972; Kreitler & Kreitler, 1967; Oren, 2010; Tabory, 1978), there are only a handful of studies which focus exclusively on the examination of peace in other cultures. These studies focus exclusively on cultural differences in peaceful traits (Fabbro, 1978; Ishida, 1969); the concept of peace (Galtung, 1981); public attitudes of peace (Georgiades, 2007); meanings of non-violence (Nakhre, 1976); forgiveness (Nato, Pinto, & Mullet, 2007); and positive peace attributes (Eckhardt, 1979). While these studies do address peace ideas in other cultures, the deep examination of peaceful ideas in specific cultures is not explored in these publications.

To save our environment, our economies, our governments, and our diversifying communities, new and more effective conflict resolution processes should be considered. To begin this journey, it is critical to learn from those who have historically practiced the ways of peaceful and harmonious living for themselves, their families and their communities. Indigenous groups all over the world have been building and maintaining peace in their societies for centuries. A few of the underlying beliefs and principles behind indigenous peace practices are values such as interdependence, relationship preservation over personal gain, and shared responsibility (Wolf, 2012).

In this study, a look at these unexplored areas of peace and culture was investigated. In Study I, a 2007 study on the concept of peace conducted in a Western context is reviewed. Questions not previously addressed are analyzed and an idea of Western peace presented. In Study II, available ethnographic anthropological data are examined using the electronic Human Relations Area Files (eHRAF), focusing on Hawaiian and Fijian cultures and their peacemaking practices. In Study III, cultural experts are interviewed and their ideas analyzed, supplementing the data gathered in Study II. The following research questions were explored: (1) How are the
Pacific cultures of Hawai‘i and Fiji conceptualizing peace? (2) How do these Pacific cultural concepts compare to a Western conceptualization of peace? The three presented studies aimed to answer these questions. General findings of the three studies are compared to established Western ideas of peace and peacemaking, thereby capturing both Western and Pacific Islander worldviews on peace.
CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

There has been extensive research conducted on war and peace (Cheung-Blunden & Blunden, 2008; Cunningham, 2010; Fujii, 2010; Galtung, 1969; Hall, 1993; Oppenheimer, Bar-Tal, & Raviv, 1999; Oren, Rothbart, & Korostelina, 2009; Reardon, 1997; Rinehart, 1995; Sarrica, 2007; Sarrica & Contarello, 2004; Victor, 2010), conflict resolution (Alvik, 1968; Galtung, 1998a; Tjosvold, XueHuang, Johnson, & Johnson, 2008), secular and sacred peace differences (Ferber, 1985; Headley, 2000), and cultures of peace (Boulding, 2000; 2003; Briggs, 1971; DeRivera, 2004; Fogarty, 1992; Groff, 2001; Hammack, 2009). While many studies on peace examine the idea nested in the context of war or conflict, it is also studied singularly, separate from war (Barnett, 2008; Siani-Davies & Katsikas, 2009; Walden, Javdani, & Allen, 2014). In the peace studies community, an exact definition of peace is still debated. While much research is conducted on various aspects of peace or conflict resolution a definitive conception of peace is yet to emerge (Anderson, 2004; Ryan, 2003; Wette, 1992). There have been attempts to separate the concept into various categories, reflecting its deep complexity and cultural relativity (Galtung, 1964; Groff, 2001). One of the critical categorizations of the idea of peace was established by Johan Galtung, sometimes referred to as the “father of peace research.” In Galtung’s (1964) research, he divided peace into two main paradigms, one positive and one negative. Positive peace refers to the degree that various relationships between nations, states, organizations, and individuals are based in mutual harmony, proper communication, cooperation, and tranquility. Positive peace is an active process, consisting of compromise and compassion. Negative peace is the understanding of peace as the absence of war or conflict. It does not describe peace as an active process separate from conflict, but sees it as simply a state or condition of “no war.”

With his initial breakthrough theory of negative and positive peace, Johan Galtung continued to examine the idea from various other angles. As his career went on, he studied and
illuminated separate types of violence and described how the violent nature of our nation states and world orders are a direct result of the way in which we interpret violence and, ultimately, dismiss it (Galtung, 1998). He noted that people posing as “normal” propose mass murder in the form of wars and ethnic extinction. Most of us live in social and economic systems that repress and exploit millions of people. Not only do we do nothing about it, but some of us justify and even glorify the aforementioned as “human nature” (p.1).

He refers to the above examples as direct violence, structural violence, and cultural violence, respectively. By addressing these ideas and also deeply probing and describing his observations of structural violence and cultural violence, Galtung focused intently on a description of peace in relation to violence and conflict. Being such a dominant figure in peace research and its beginnings, Galtung has had a tremendous impact on shaping the field of peace studies.

The negative peace idea is more commonly explored and researched, at least in the Western world. In a review of the last ten years of the Journal of Peace Research, the majority of studies were conducted using a negative peace paradigm. Some of the themes that emerged from the review were the following: civil war (Cunningham, 2010; DeJuan & Bank, 2015; Dyrstad, 2012), ethnic conflict (Smith, 2014), and terrorism (Boutton, 2014; Mousseau, 2001).

Even today, several of the leading journals in the peace research field focus predominantly on peace being the absence of conflict—highlighting a negative peace paradigm. Over the last 11 years (2004-2015), and out of approximately 50 published full-length articles a year, about thirty of those published in the Journal of Peace Research (JPR), Peace & Change, and Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, three of the leading impactful journals in the field, focus on studying conflict (Basedau & Lay, 2009; Benjaminsen, 2008; Harbom & Wallensteen, 2009; Hogenraad & Garagozov, 2010; Kreutz, 2010; Theisen, 2008;), violence (Fujii, 2010), terrorism (Engene, 2007; Gaibulloev & Sandler, 2009; Gray & Wilson, 2006; Kimhi,
Canetti-Nisim & Hirschberger, 2009; Sanchez-Cuenca, 2009), war and warlords (Cunningham, 2010; Gleditsch, 2007; Victor, 2010), Israel-Palestine conflict (Frisch & Hofnung, 2007; Hallward, 2009; Loizides & Antoniades, 2009; Moaz, 2008; Moaz, Freedman, & McCauley, 2010; Moaz & McCauly, 2009; Oren, 2010), militarization and economic sanctions (Bussman, 2010; Escriba-Folch, 2010; Leander, 2005; Paul, 2008; Sullivan & Koch, 2009), torture (Cornejo, Rojas, & Mendoza, 2009), and mass killings and genocide (Verwimp, 2006; Wayman & Tago, 2010).

This is in comparison to the fewer than 20 studies in these journals which focus more directly on positive peace attributes like evaluation of attitudes toward peace (Brewster-Smith, 2008; Georgiades, 2007; Sheafer & Dvir-Gvirsman, 2010), symbols of peace (Knox & Waggaerg, 2009), peace activism (Sarrica & Contarello, 2004; Schwebel, 2005), nonviolent protests (Shaykhutdinov, 2010), democratic peace research (Goldsmith, 2007; Horowitz, 2006), gender empowerment (Gizelis, 2009), empathy (Malici & Buckner, 2008), and forgiveness (Brouneus, 2008; Kosc & Tauber, 2010; Lieberfeld, 2009; Strelan & Lawani, 2010), to name a few. In this example, it is clear that, historically, the idea that the process of peace, separate from war, can be studied and explored on its own is less commonly explored. More recently, this idea is changing, but since the start of peace as a “discipline” in academia in the 1950s, much of the focus has been on an examination of peace in relation to war.

Peace Psychology: Background and Overview

According to a 2008 article in American Psychologist, leaders in the field of peace psychology are not aware of any introductory psychology text which includes a section devoted to the topic of peace psychology (Christie, Tint, Wagner, & DuNann-Winter, 2008). While the first official peace psychologist is noted to have existed in the early 1900s, the end of WWII really was the beginning of the discipline. Several psychologists of various specialties came together to create a “Psychologist Manifesto” in which they claimed, in so many words, that “war
is built, not born “and can be avoided. Prior to this, the idea that human nature was violent and aggressive shaped psychology. Controlling aggressive and negative urges was the basis of much of psychotherapy and clinical work (Christie et al., 2008). Around this time, Allport’s (1954) work addressing the importance of intergroup contact to reduce prejudice and violence contributed to the Court’s decision to desegregate U.S. schools, showing the growing influence of psychologists in this arena.

As the U.S. entered the Cold War era, again the international climate changed. With the American government and its citizens in fear of nuclear attack, ideas of peace and how to broach peace shifted. Morawski and Goldstein (1985) outline how central ideas in the psychological community at this time changed. First, instead of focusing on individual aggression/harmony ideas, there was new attention paid to national interests and positions. Next, prevention of war rather than preparation for war was emphasized. Finally, the work of these few decades tended to be critical of United States policies, rather than supportive. In the 1980s the field of political psychology expanded and much research depicting ideas for nuclear war prevention were published, including White's (1988) publication *Psychology and the Prevention of Nuclear War*, lending psychological rhetoric and analyses to national and international problems.

Peace psychology, along with peace studies is a discipline that is very much influenced by world events and international proceedings. While themes of study have been consistent throughout, other ideas have surfaced due to political dealings and major events such as world wars and prominent non-violent protest figures like Martin Luther King Jr. and Gandhi. For example, the events of September 11th influenced terrorism research and inquiry greatly (Macnair, 2003). While world events influence funding and research in all fields, the subjects of peace studies and peace psychology are arguably more sensitive to these changes. The American Psychological Associations’ Divisions added the Society for the Study of Peace,
Conflict and Violence: Peace Psychology in 1988. Macnair (2003) defined peace psychology as “the study of mental processes that lead to violence, that prevent violence, and that facilitate nonviolence as well as promoting fairness, respect, and dignity for all, for the purpose of making violence a less likely occurrence and helping to heal its psychological effects” (p. 541).

Blumberg, Hare, and Costin (2006) defined peace psychology similarly and showed several examples of the varying research studies that have been published in the field. These studies covered topics like violence prevention, conflict resolution strategies, addressing effects of trauma, and examining the psychology of peace. From a more positive perspective, Christie, Wagner and Winter (2000) provided a definition as well, “Peace psychology promotes the nonviolent management of conflict and the pursuit of social justice, what we refer to as peacemaking and peacebuilding, respectively” (p. 4). Even in these definitions, it is clear that a focus is on conflict and either avoiding or resolving it. The emphasis on absence of war and social injustice depicts peace psychology’s similarities to other peace fields- a prominence of negative peace ideas.

Western and non-Western Peace Ideas

Examining peace from the perspective of non-Western cultures has not yet made it to mainstream research. Those studies that do exist focus exclusively on cultural differences in societal traits and attributes (DeRivera, 2004; Fabbro, 1978; Ishida, 1969; Kurada, 1966), meaning of non-violence (Nakhre, 1976), cosmology and concept of peace (Galtung, 1981), forgiveness (Neto, Pinto, & Mullet, 2007), positive peace attributes (Cardenal, 1981; Eckhardt, 1979), and conflict resolution (Mars, 2001; Shamir & Shikaki, 2002). Of these highlighted studies, only one compares non-Western and Western cultures (Galtung, 1981). Galtung’s (1981) comparison consists of an understanding of the word used for peace in several cultures (peace, shalom, shanti, etc.) and analyzes how peace in the West tends to be an
external trait and experience, while in Eastern cultures, it has historically been experienced and understood internally.

Since the late 1970s, the peace and conflict resolution movement has taken an interest in alternative dispute resolution and, in turn, has focused on the idea of restorative justice which takes place in some non-Western cultures (Mars, 2001; Meernik, 2005; Neto, Pinto, & Mullet, 2007; Olsen, Payne, & Reiter, 2010; Shamir & Shikaki, 2002). Abu-Nimer (1996) specifically compares Western and Middle Eastern conflict resolution approaches. The author traces the movement back to the 1950’s, post WWII era, when citizens and communities were looking for new ways to relate to one another and grow together. Abu-Nimer (1996) outlines the evolution of the field, moving from the industrial and labor relations viewpoint throughout the 1960s into mediation and international relations in the 70s, and finally, the criticism of our adversarial court system and the development of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) programs in the 80s and 90s. The author noted the main processes of conflict resolution as conciliation, facilitation, negotiation, mediation and arbitration (p. 3).

These five processes represent a few cultural assumptions, mainly a belief in individualism and individual equality. Young or old, male or female, wise or naïve- each person involved in the process believes that he or she should personally benefit in some way from its resolution. Abu-Nimer (1996) discussed five distinct assumptions involved in Western conflict resolution, three of which are critical for this research. First, Western society is based on individualism. Social pressures from group leaders or family members have no bearing on resolution processes or accountability. Second, the written, existing, and “objective” legal statutes are used as a basis for placing blame, getting restitution, and deciding who is more right or wrong in the matter. Third, conflict is not necessarily viewed as something negative or shameful. In some cases, it is even regarded as necessary, healthy, and innate to us as human beings (Fisher & Sharp, 2004; Fisher & Ury, 1991; Midgley, 2002). With a strong belief in these
factors- individual needs over others, objectivism, and the inevitability of aggression- the structure of a conflict resolution system was built in the West. These ideas of conflict and the systems in place to resolve and deal with them have been ingrained in Western culture for generations.

Cultural differences between Western and other Nations is captured by what is referred to as high or low context cultural differences. In a high context culture, meaning is communicated not only with words, but with inferences and shared ideas (Hall, 1976; Samovar & Porter, 2004). There is typically less need for direct and thorough explanation because much of what is going on in context is understood by those involved. Many indigenous societies are considered to be high context because they tend to remain in one place for generations and live closely in relatively small, typically rural communities. In this kind of tight knit environment, surrounded by relatives and homogeneity, a common understanding of the world is nourished and shared. In specific reference to conflicts occurring in high context cultures, Earley and Gibson (2002) noted that individuals from these cultures would never openly confront another person. Not only would this be considered an extreme insult, both sides would “lose face” by engaging openly in a dispute. Those from high context cultures do not separate the individual from the context, while people from low context cultures (Americans and most Western countries) separate the individual, which has implications for peace and managing conflict.

To include indigenous practices and their alternate way of viewing conflict and its resolution into our own Western outlook will not only add to the growing body of peace research, but has the potential to better inform and prepare us for the complex communities that exist today. Community psychologists believe in contextualism and multiple truths. Including other viewpoints and beliefs can serve the field of community psychology better. Fostering a distinctive blend of Western conflict resolution ideas and indigenous peacebuilding techniques can help bridge the gap between many communities all over the world.
Concept of Peace Study

Groff (2001) depicts a spectrum, from micro to macro, of the ecological contexts of peace. At the smallest micro level, personal or inner peace exists. This ultimately lies within the individual and most likely has a spiritual component. The next level of context is interpersonal peace which exists among individuals within a group. Social or intercultural peace lies beyond that and encapsulates harmony between social groups. Local, civil peace lies even further away from the individual and implies peace within the community. Even further is national or domestic peace which refers to peace within the nation. Beyond this is international, political peace which exists among nations and finally, ecological, or what is called “Gaia” peace which means ultimate tranquility between beings in the natural world (Anderson, 2004). In the figures below, one can see how these levels of peace align well with Bronfenbrenner’s (1979; 1994) theory of context. Both ideas point out that the individual is part of a series of contexts, and defining or experiencing something, like peace, is different depending on which level of context is examined.

Figure 2.1 Groff (2001) Levels of Peace
Figures 2.1 and 2.2 depict the theoretical underpinnings for a study conducted as part of a master’s thesis project (Mrazek, 2007). Two groups of subjects—experts and laypeople—were qualitatively interviewed regarding their ideas of peace. Interview questions were crafted and selected based on how well they addressed the different levels of context outlined in both Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) study and Groff’s (2001) study. Data were collected, coded, and mapped out in order to determine similarities and differences between groups. The study was conducted at a large West Coast University in the United States, so the data captured were those from a Western perspective. The main findings of this examination were two fold. (1) When asked questions about peace without a stated contextual level (e.g., What comes to mind when you think of peace?), results showed that experts and laypeople often described peace and its attributes at separate contextual levels, with experts more likely to focus on the national/international level and laypeople discussing personal and community relationships. Interestingly, when a particular context was specified, (e.g., Can you describe a peaceful
community?), the answers from the two groups converged. (2) Members of the expert group seemed to hold more diverse responses and beliefs than those belonging to the layperson group. Their depth of response implied that their training and current work involving peace had greatly shaped their ideas. Because the findings for the two groups were so distinct, implications reached beyond just adding to the literature on the concept of peace and community psychology theory. There is a body of research on expert and novice responses and these data contributed to it as well, highlighting a unique area of expert-novice study, pertaining to peace. Moreover, findings only furthered the need for inquiry on the different ways in which Westerners and non-Westerners view peace ideas.

Continuing the examination of distinct cultural groups and their ideas of peace, one goal of the present study was to explore the ways in which Pacific cultures, specifically Hawai’i and Fiji, conceptualize peace. To begin, an overview of the peacemaking practices in both Pacific Islands are reviewed.

Hawai‘i: The Practice of Ho‘oponopono

In the Hawaiian language, ho‘o means “to make, cause or bring about;” pono means “right” or “to make right.” The repetition of this word gives emphasis and underscores its importance (Chun, 2006). One scholar, David Malo, discussed how pono, which has multiple meanings depending on the context, often indicates cultural values and the absolute model of good and/or right behavior in Hawaiian society. To be “pono” is to do right- to honor one’s family, to express humility, to be responsible and trustworthy, etc. This can mean very different things, depending on the situation. The process has been described as the way in which one person is able to understand and change his/her behavior in order to make a situation more “pono,” better for the community, the family and to make it as right as possible (R. Taum, personal communication, January 22nd, 2015). So, the literal meaning of the word ho‘oponopono is to “make very pono;” to make things right again.
The process of *hoʻoponopono* was described by Mary Pukui in *Nana I Ke Kumu, Vol. 1*, a publication put out by the Queen Liliʻuokalani Children’s Center in 1972. She names the stages of the process using Hawaiian terms. The process of *hoʻoponopono* begins with *hala*. *Hala* is equated to a fault, an error, or a transgression. The *hala* lies at the root of what is causing the illness or difficulty for the individual or family. Pukui (1972) suggest that we visualize *hala* as a cord. “It binds the offender to his deed and to his victim. The victim holds on to this cord and becomes equally bound…anger, the wish for revenge, the time-strengthened knots of old grudges…all these are part of the cord that binds and constricts” (p. 71). Interestingly, *hala* is not always the *stated* reason for the transgression. Many times other things erupt as a symbol of larger or deeper problems that exist in a family or between the two parties. *Hala* is the *true* fault, the real and, usually, deep problem that ultimately needs to be let go.

As the *hala* cord becomes stronger and more entangled, others are drawn into the problem, spreading the misdeed and creating an entangled and enmeshed net of emotions, reactions and perspectives, likened to *hihia*, or a Hawaiian fish net. The network of tightly tied cords is viewed as a sort of “emotional climate” which has festered and fed the problem. Hawaiians believed that in *hihia* the victim and the perpetrator are both suffering- from grudges, self-pity, guilt and anger. Several group members are involved, directly and indirectly, and all can benefit from the *hoʻoponopono* process.

After the initial *hala* and then *hihia*, it is decided, typically by an elder in the family- a parent or *kupuna*- that *hoʻoponopono* is needed to resolve the escalating problem. Traditionally, a formal leader (*haku*) would be called in to oversee the process, but more recently, the family elder, such as a parent or grandparent, leads the session. He/she leads the discussion with all parties talking directly thru him, and not to one another. This way, if emotions run high, the *haku* is in control and can either redirect the individuals involved or call *hoʻomalu*, or period of silence, in order to let things cool down.
As with many Hawaiian gatherings, prayer is imperative. *Hoʻoponopono* opens with *pule wehe*, a prayer asking God and the family’s *aumakua* (ancestors) to bless and oversee the problem-solving session. The family is now focused on a serious discussion and the *haku* asks each person to share their truth, beginning with those that are central to the argument (Shook & Kwan, 1991). At this time, ‘*oiaʻiʻo* is shared. ‘*Oiaʻiʻo* is said to represent the absolute and complete truth—the essence of truth. It is a time when the stories of both parties are shared without exaggeration or concern for reputation. As long as the telling is not done with the intent to hurt others, everything must be put out in the open—even if it pains the individual or someone else. Pukui (1972) states, “*Oiaʻiʻo* also means sincerity of feeling. Outside *hoʻoponopono*, this sincerity was a requirement in all of Hawai‘i’s forgiving, freeing, releasing practices...the requirement of sincerity remains a sound basis for successful human relationships” (p. 73).

Each party was required to tell his/her complete truth to all of those in attendance as well as to the ancestors. This truth included past hurt, emotional distress, and any motivation behind the wrongdoing. ‘*Oiaʻiʻo* was not an organized list of facts, but a feeling from the gut—a truth and repentance that came from introspection.

After the truth is told, *mihi*, or confession and apology, is asked for. Traditionally, if someone sincerely apologizes for a wrongdoing, the victim(s) must accept. Pukui (1972) states, “the tradition that a penitent must be forgiven seems to remain unchanged and well-remembered, even though it is not always followed. The obligation to forgive is consistent with the special closeness and interdependence of the Hawaiian family...no one remains uninvolved in the Hawaiian ‘ohana”(p. 74). It is said that if the person is *not* sincere in his/her apology, then the *aumakua* (ancestor god) will punish them accordingly—so it is not up to the person involved to refuse acceptance. The aumakua will take care of any transgressions. After *mihi* is expressed, then the releasing and unbinding of both parties needs to occur—this process is called *kala*.
During the process of *kala* an unbinding or untying of the cord which links the “sinner” and “sinned” must be done by both parties. A sincere apology is offered and forgiveness needs to be granted. It is recognized that this is not a simple process for either party involved, especially if the disagreement is longstanding and emotional. As a result, Hawaiians have created and recited various *kala* prayers, or *pule*, which aim to release these ties and others that need freeing. *Pule kala* are recited to deceased relatives who need to let go of those left behind and vice versa. The prayers are also said during various ceremonies including, but not limited to, *hoʻoponopono*. “*Kala* seeks to strip the incident of its pain-causing attributes. An insult or injustice may be remembered- but if *mihi* and *kala* have been sincere, it is remembered as ‘no big thing anymore’” (Pukui, 1972, p. 75).

As the process of *mihi* and *kala* are practiced, *mahiki* is simultaneously undertaken. The term *mahiki* means to “peel off or pry” as in peeling the bark of a tree to judge the wood beneath. As each successive problem between the two parties comes out during *oiaʻio* or truth telling, each one goes through *mihi* and *kala* separately. This peeling back of the layers of the problem amounts to *mahiki* and eventually, ideally, locates the root of the problem- the true *hala*. Once this root is uncovered, there is a good chance that resolution can be reached and similar issues prevented.

After the root of the problem is found through the *mahiki* process, *hoʻomalu* is sometimes invoked. *Hoʻomalu* is a period of silent and peaceful contemplation. During the time prior to Kamehameha’s rule, when Hawai‘i lived by the *kapu* system forbidding certain things and enforcing strict rules about various social and personal rituals, *hoʻomalu* was sometimes imposed by the chiefs. During this time of silence, no fires were made or dances performed. Sometimes babies and animals were silenced or even left the village in order to insure cooperation with the rule. Presently, these strict actions are not taken, but if *hoʻomalu* is called during *hoʻoponopono*, family members fall silent in contemplation sometimes for a few minutes.
or even several hours. If there is a break between ho’oponopono sessions, observing ho’omalu can mean that for the duration of the break time, the problem is not discussed with outsiders or not discussed at all. Also, drinking or engaging in social activities during this period should be limited. Ho’omalu is similar to Quaker silences, Catholic retreats or a period of meditation. It is part of ho’oponopono in order to allow time for each member involved to sit with his/her thoughts and connect with God and the ancestors present (Pukui, 1972).

Finally, after the period of silence, kukulu kumuhana is practiced. Kukulu kumuhana refers to the “pooling of strengths, emotional, psychological and spiritual, for a shared purpose—a positive goal” (Pukui, 1972, p. 78). Kukulu kumuhana can be a shared and stated prayer, but it can also involve silent thoughts and meditation, with family and community members focusing their energy on a resolution to the problem. This uniting of family members not only helps to support those that are directly involved with the conflict, but it works to emphasize the strength of the immediate and extended family in each other’s lives. This group cohesion and support helps the feuding parties to see their deep connection and motivates them to maintain harmony for the good of the entire family—not just themselves.

Depending on the progress through each stage, the process can maneuver from beginning to end—all the way through, or it can become circular, repeating portions or stages as many times as needed. During the 3rd stage, mahiki, the goal is to assess the root of the problem. While a particular incident has warranted the session, often times, it is not where the problem truly lies. Much discussion and self-exploration is done by the family members as well as both parties involved. Everyone recognizes their role in the conflict as well as their part in the healing process and agreement enforcement. In the 4th stage, ho’omalu is practiced, and silence falls over the family members and parties. In the final stage of kala, the issue is resolved and let go. This allows the family and parties to live again in harmony, restoring balance and acting pono. Because humility and cooperation are emphasized as crucial principles of
Hawaiian culture and the process of *hoʻoponopono*, each party and family member present is committed to resolution of the conflict. If either party begins to revert back to negative thinking or anger, all of those involved are invested in reminding him/her of reconciling with one another and letting the problem go.

Chun (2006) describes his understanding of the process of *hoʻoponopono* as one that is analogous to the making of cordage and then the use of that cordage to make an ‘*upena* or fish net. The analogy is chosen wisely since the terms *hihia* and *kala* that are used as descriptions of the stages of the process emphasize entanglement and, finally, untying - both good descriptors of fish nets. Chun (2006) states that making a fish net involves rolling or binding plant fibers together in order to make cordage- symbolic of the family coming together as individuals, but bound in an effort of strength and purpose. The author describes that making a fish net is a simple task, but one has to be sure that each knot is tied carefully and tightly. If not, and one gets loose, the successive knots need to be untied in order to repair the original one which has come undone. He says this process reminds him of *hoʻoponopono* by emphasizing the care and patience that needs to go into securing not only a well-crafted fish net, but a strong and balanced family.

We all make mistakes every day of our lives. How do we go about ‘untangling’ these problems, big or small? Through *hoʻoponopono* we are given a chance to undo both minor and major mistakes in our lives...back to ‘knots’ that may have been done ‘wrong,’ or at least not completed in a desired manner. By correcting those wrongs or mistakes, we can then proceed towards completing our own ‘net,’ or life itself (p. 27).

Traditional *hoʻoponopono* is described in various ways, typically with the same or similar steps, but sometimes in a mixture of orders. However, overall the process is said to have two aims: "to solve interpersonal disputes, and to resolve conflicts and bad feelings; and to
restructure the family, reintegrate members, and to foster individual role socialization performance" (Mays, 1973, p. 2). Boggs and Chun (1990) reviewed a number of descriptions of the hoʻoponopono process and discuss four elements common to all: 1) discovering the cause of the trouble; 2) curing or preventing physical illness, depression or anxiety by means of the first step; 3) resolving interpersonal problems; and 4) untangling or freeing agents from transgressions against spirits and gods as well as humans. Boggs and Chun conclude that apology and forgiveness are central elements in all the variations (Shook & Kwan, 1991, p. 218).

Chun (2006) emphasizes that the process of hoʻoponopono is not about discovering who is right or who is wrong in a particular dispute; it is a tool used to mend relationships. According to Hawaiian traditional culture, error arises from thoughts that are tainted by painful memories of the past. Hoʻoponopono offers a way to release the energy of these painful thoughts or errors, which cause imbalance and, eventually, disease (Vitale & Hew Len, 2007). In many instances, a family would resort to the hoʻoponopono process to heal physical as well as mental and emotional ailments- putting trust in their God or ancestors instead of medical science or healers (Pukui, 1972). Because the process of hoʻoponopono is in place to preserve and uplift relationships, it is not about blame and punishment. If one party feels compelled to apologize or admit guilt, it is accepted by the other party with compassion and sincerity. The goal of the gathering is to address the depth of the issue, to talk about the problem with family members and create a space for each party to feel comfortable voicing their opinions and grievances. Some of the key elements involved in the hoʻoponopono process include a wise and respected counselor who is familiar with all the parties involved and their family histories- often this job falls in the hands of the kahuna, haku, or genealogist familiar with family histories and deep seated rivalries (Shook & Kwan, 1991). A conference is called to discuss the matter and the parties involved must agree to stop fighting long enough to be willing to sit down and have a discussion. Family members are not only there to serve as witnesses, but to engage in self-exploration and
reconciliation of the larger problem at hand (Chun, 2006). The key element to the *ho‘oponopono* process is the common goal of group cohesion and harmony. Each member present should wish for balance to be restored and has a role in asking him/herself how he/she might contribute to restoring that balance. The process, which can take a few hours or a few days, is meant to restore harmony to relationships and has more to do with self-exploration and interpersonal connection than discussing the specific problem that brought the session to light.

The individuality that is expressed in Western culture and conflict resolution clearly has no bearing in *ho‘oponopono*. Family members, friends, and neighbors are present in the Hawaiian practice, not only to support those seeking resolution, but to discover their role in the transgression as well. Since the core belief is that the community is fully connected, then it is readily accepted that something “I” did has caused the situation. Each person is present to help resolve the conflict in their own way; they are not simply observers (Vitale & Hew Len, 2007). Furthermore, the decisions made on how best to remedy the problem are not found objectively, by referring to written laws that are deemed universal to all citizens. In *ho‘oponopono*, it is quite the opposite. The solution that fits best for both parties, for the families and community, is the one that is recommended. This is unique and dependent on the problem at hand, the relationships present, and everyone’s abilities and strengths. And finally, the overall core belief is *not* that conflict is good, required or unavoidable. While it is not viewed as a terrible thing, peace is the preferred state of being, and *pono* is the way that one should act at all times, as much as possible. Being an argumentative, stubborn, or outspoken person “by nature,” does not fit well with the sense of humility, forgiveness, and contemplation that are required to be *pono*.

**Fiji: The Practice of Talanoa**

Very similar to the indigenous Hawaiian peace practice of *ho‘oponopono*, conflict resolution practices in Fijian indigenous communities center on relationship preservation rather than unilateral agreement as well. “At the core of Native peacemaking is a sense of spirituality,
a respect for ancestors, a focus on balance and harmony” (Nabobo-Baba, 2005, p. 392). There are several ways in which Fijian communities handle disputes - each of them unique from the next. Arno (1993) analyzed the various forms and purposes of “talk” in Fiji. In doing so, he highlights the specific processes that are known for conflict management and resolution. The first of these is called veiwali and primarily consists of villagers joking with one another about different issues that are potential conflicts waiting to arise. For example, Arno (1993) cites that an important value for Fijian males is the ability and aptitude for gardening. Each house or village tends a garden and consistently weeds and manicures. There was one member of the group, Soko, who was known to be lazy in this regard, and as a result was somewhat aggravating to the rest of the men who did contribute to garden tending. One night, during their typical daily yaqona (kava) drinking circle, the men began to joke with Soko about his laziness. They said things alluding to the fact that their young sons or their wives could tend garden more effectively; even commenting that another man whose garden wasn’t doing well that season was more fruitful than Soko’s land was. While the men laughed and no one directly attacked or accused Soko of anything, the author notes that he saw Soko tending to the garden the following weekend (Arno, 1993). In this regard, the social pressure that he received, by knowing that everyone in the village was aware of his laziness and, specifically, the men he was associated with alluding to it being a negative trait, was enough to straighten out Soko’s behavior. While it seems like this is a simple procedure, its description is quite complicated. Those instigating the jokes are men of a certain clan and relation to Soko, and those allowed to laugh are also specifically aware of their roles. Through these kinship ties and social pressure, certain disagreements and social conflicts are acknowledged by the group and conflict is tactfully avoided.

The veitalanoa (or talanoa) process involves disputing parties coming together to talk things out for an extended period of time. It is thought of as a time for sharing stories and
explaining one’s point of view. This process is described as a period to “restore broken links and re-establish good relationships” (Nabobo-Baba, 2005, p. 392). Like the *kahuna* in the *hoʻoponopono* process, the mediator or *dauniveivakaduavatataki in talanoa* is either a well-respected member of the community or clan, or is related to both parties in the dispute. Some of the characteristics that are described of an ideal *talanoa* mediator are: compassionate, hard-working, spiritual, caring for others, reaching out to relatives, generous, speaking frankly and truthfully, and native to the place (Nabobo-Baba, 2005). This is indicative of the family leader in the Hawaiian process- he or she is said to represent *pono* or right actions and words. Not only is this person trusted with counsel for the two parties, but he is a symbol of virtuous action which should be emulated (Boggs & Chun, 1990).

The process begins when parties are invited and gather in the home of the chosen mediator or the community meeting place. The mediator calls for and leads a prayer, asking the ancestors and the Gods to watch over the process and bless it. After the opening prayer, the mediator outlines the tribal relationships present. As was outlined in the previous incident involving Soko and his laziness with gardening, by reminding those present of their kinship ties and relatives, it is more likely that the disputing parties will be motivated to forgive and preserve the relationships of the people present (Nabobo-Baba, 2005).

After calling on the ancestor and acknowledging family ties, the origination of the conflict is shared by both parties. The mediator allows each party to state his/her grievances and both acknowledge the hurt involved with the dispute. These emotions are not explicitly described, but metaphors and stories are shared with the group in order to convey how members are feeling. The mediator then asks the parties to admit their responsibilities and fault in the situation and to describe what their own part will be in the resolution- called *veisorosorovi*. During *veisorosorovi*, each party works to give up anger and bear responsibility in a resolution. They must commit to keeping peace in the clan or village and also between one other.
After a resolution is decided upon and the roles of the parties are explicitly stated, the mediator calls for *yaqona* (traditional kava drink) to be served and drunk together to seal the pledges of forgiveness and cooperation. It is believed that the sharing of drink is done on display for all the relatives and clan members present as well as the deceased ancestors. Breaking the commitment to harmony after this pledge in front of the ancestors is considered a severe insult. Finally, at the end of the ritual, the mediator concludes with a prayer, thanking the parties involved, the village, and the ancestors. After food and drink are shared, the villagers leave with a sense of renewal and a commitment to peace and group cohesion (Nabobo-Baba, 2005).

The Hawaiian concept of the fishnet, or *hihia*, is a description not only of the entangled lives of the parties that are involved, but reiterates the holism that is an undercurrent of Hawaiian culture. The connection to the land and its resources is emphasized here to show another motivation of *hoʻoponopono*, which is to make everything right within the holistic view of the world, shared by the community. This attachment certainly plays a role in the *hoʻoponopono* process, but is essentially immeasurable using scientific standards. It is a culturally determined value that underlies the concept of making things “*pono*,” so should be included in observation and analysis.

In both *hoʻoponopono* and *talanoa* the ultimate goal is relationship preservation and restored harmony. Neither practice focuses specifically on determining who was right or wrong in a dispute, and rewarding the “right” person, it is about mending the relationship that has broken and ensuring that the other community members and ancestors are not held back or shamed as a result of the problem. Both Hawaiian and Fijian cultures are considered to be collectivist and high context, often co-occurring cultural traits (Brightman & Subedi, 2007; Earley & Gibson, 2002; Pirie, 2000). Triandis (1995) clarifies a collectivist culture as one harboring a social pattern consisting of closely linked individuals who see themselves as members of
various collectives (family, workplace, tribe, clan, etc.). He/she will put the needs and desires of the collective group above his/her personal needs and emphasize relationship preservation between their fellow group members. An individualist culture, represented by the U.S. and many other Western countries, prioritizes individual needs over group desires. He/she feels autonomous from those around him/her, even detached from the immediate family. To have this mutual accountability and collective orientation gives both cultures a foundation for relationship preservation. Connecting to one another and having a self-concept that is enmeshed with one’s family and community unit means that honoring relationships and maintaining harmony are, of course, first and foremost involved in any peacemaking process. The restoration of balance is the key to both processes.

Following this group orientation, another commonality drawn from the two practices is the importance of kinship ties between parties and salience of the role of ancestors. Because both communities are more collectivist, it is not surprising that kinship relations would be significant, however, from a Western perspective, relationships and emotional involvement cloud objectivity. In fact, in legal proceedings, parties are dismissed from cases due to their personal relationships. In these practices, relationships are crucial to everyone involved so that roles are acknowledged and respected properly. Both Fijian and Hawaiian practices acknowledge the ancestors that have passed on as well. In doing so, there a greater accountability for the parties involved. The belief and acknowledgement that past ancestors are watching and guarding their family reputation is bound to give those involved even more incentive to maintain harmony and make things right again. It is not just the individual’s choice to reconcile; he/she is held accountable by all of those present at the ceremony in flesh and in spirit. The group orientation and reverence of elders in these cultures not only shapes what is important during the conflict prevention ritual, it helps to ensure adherence to the agreement in the future.
There are also logistical similarities between the two processes. Both *talanoa* and *ho'oponopono* begin and end with prayer. The collective acceptance and understanding of a higher power, again, not only helps to ensure future accountability, but contributes to a sense of group cohesion and comfort. Both practices are led by community elders, preferably relatives of those involved, and deeply respected for their embodiment of positive principles such as honor, loyalty, humility, and knowledge. These leaders not only serve as “hosts” for the proceedings, but are acknowledged as role models for those coming together. In *ho'oponopono*, if the goal is to be more *pono* and make right decisions, the *kupuna* leading the session is there as an example. The same concept is upheld in *talanoa* proceedings and is practiced in other places across the globe. In many other indigenous conflict resolution practices, elders are called to oversee the event. For instance, several elders typically mediate disputes among the East Indians of Fiji (Brenneis, 1990), the Indonesian Dou Donggo (Just, 1991), the Limbus of Nepal (Caplan, 1995), and the Abkhazians of the Caucasus (Garb, 1996).

Lastly, both practices are conducted in a circle. While this may seem like a small point, it is very important to the process. By forming a circle, it implies that everyone involved is equally included and can be heard and understood by those surrounding him/her. It instills the notion of relationship building and support over control and competition, implied by the physical separation and hierarchy of more Western proceedings (i.e. judges, attorneys, and parties on separate grounds).

**The Present Study**

The Pacific peacemaking practices described as well as the concept of peace ideas from the Mrazek (2007) study combined to create several important questions about peace, the concept of peace, and peacemaking in both Western and Pacific contexts. These inquiries will be addressed in the present study.
In Study I, the 2007 study on the concept of peace conducted in a Western context is reviewed and new questions are analyzed and concept mapped. After these analyses, an overall Western concept map of peace is presented. In Study II, available ethnographic anthropological data are examined using the electronic Human Relations Area Files (eHRAF). Specific OCM and separate search terms are used to extract relevant data. The located documents and paragraphs are reviewed, categorized, and analyzed, resulting in several themes about Hawaiian and Fijian peace ideas. In Study III, cultural experts from Hawai‘i and Fiji are interviewed in order to analyze and concept map their ideas related to peace. These findings will be used to supplement the data gathered in Study II. In summary, the following research questions were explored: (1) How are the Pacific cultures of Hawai‘i and Fiji conceptualizing peace? and (2) How do these Pacific cultural concepts compare to a Western conceptualization of peace? The three presented studies aimed to answer these questions. General findings are discussed and overall Western and Pacific concept maps are presented. Discussion of the findings follows along with implications and suggestions for future research endeavors.
CHAPTER 3. METHODS

Study I

In Mrazek’s (2007) study, nine questions were analyzed and concept mapped. For the present study, the previously collected data were re-examined and seven additional questions were analyzed. To present a thorough overview of the 2007 study, a description of the methods used to collect those data is provided below.

Participants

A total of 25 participants were involved in the 2007 study, comprising both the expert and layperson groups, respectively. Sixteen undergraduate students at a major West Coast University, recruited from a Psychology 100 class belonged to the Layperson group. Nine affiliated faculty members of the Institute for Peace at the same University, coming from various academic backgrounds were interviewed as Expert group members. They were chosen based on their affiliation with the institute and their background knowledge of peace and conflict resolution strategies.

The average age of the expert group was 61 years while the average age of the layperson group was 20 years. The layperson group had seven males and nine females while six experts were male and the remaining three were female. Participants were given a demographic questionnaire asking their sex, age, ethnicity, political ideology, religious beliefs, military service, and whether English was their first language. The questionnaire can be found in Appendix A. Participant demographics are displayed in Tables 3.1 and 3.2.
Table 3.1: Demographic Survey Results: Layperson Group, Mrazek (2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Political Ideology*</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Belief in Higher Power</th>
<th>Military Service</th>
<th>Lived most of childhood?</th>
<th>1st Language?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Soph</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>Fresh</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>N**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>Fresh</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>Fresh</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Fresh</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Fresh</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Fresh</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Soph</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>Soph</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>N**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Jr.</td>
<td>Secondary Education</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Filipino-Caucasian</td>
<td>Jr.</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Fresh</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>Fresh</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Fresh</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>Fresh</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Jr.</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* D, R, L, I, DK refer to Democrat, Republican, Libertarian, Independent and Don’t Know respectively

** Participants numbered 2 and 9 identified Vietnamese and Samoan as their first language, respectively
Table 3.2: Demographic Survey Results: Expert Group, Mrazek (2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Area of Study</th>
<th>Political Ideology*</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Belief in Higher Power</th>
<th>Military service</th>
<th>Lived most of childhood?</th>
<th>English 1st Language?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>History/Poli.Sci.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y**</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Other-Ecclectic</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Poli. Sci.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chinese-American</td>
<td>Philosophy of Education</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Other-Eastern</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Poli. Sci. and Economics</td>
<td>D and I</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Y and N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*D and I refer to Democrat and Independent, respectively

**Age range 55-64 years.
Recruitment

Participants from the Layperson group were recruited via a Psychology 100 class. Students were given a very brief introduction to the study, told they would be asked questions about peace and were asked to sign up on a sign up form that was passed around. The lecturer for the class awarded students extra credit points for participating.

Expert participants were identified as affiliated faculty with the Peace Institute at the University. Each affiliated faculty member was either emailed or called and a short description of the study was given. If the individual agreed to participate, an interview time was setup, typically based on the Expert participant’s schedule and timeframe. These interviews were conducted in the Expert participant’s office.

Semi-Structured Interviews

A total of 25 questions were written out to be asked (see Appendix B). During the interview, questions were skipped or modified depending on the interviewee’s demeanor, talkativeness, or previous answers. For the most part, all Laypeople were asked the same 25 questions. Each interview was recorded using an mp3 player and took approximately 25 minutes, with the longest lasting over 50 minutes. Of the sixteen undergraduate students comprising the Layperson group, only one had taken a class in the Peace and Conflict curriculum at the University and had completed it over a year prior to the interview.

Expert interviews were also recorded with an mp3 player, typically lasted around 60 minutes, with the longest being 83 minutes. Interviews were conducted over a course of three months, February to April of 2006. Based on the respondent's demeanor, talkativeness, and answers to previous questions, most of the 25 questions were also asked of each Expert. However, because the Expert participants were more knowledgeable, had lengthier responses and had schedules they wanted to adhere to, more questions were skipped during these interviews.
Analysis

After transcribing all of the interviews, the data were analyzed. The first steps were to get a feel for the collective “layperson” opinion as well as the collective “expert” opinion. To do this, all questions were aligned in order and responses cut and pasted beneath, thereby, giving a list format, like the example below.

Question 1: What comes to mind when you think of peace?

E1: ....

E2: ....

By organizing in this way, transcripts could be reviewed without a lot of extra conversation between questions and with the idea of recurring themes in mind. At each read through, more ideas surfaced and codes and keywords were highlighted. For example:

Question 2: How would you define peace?

U1: Ooh, um-, it would be, like, how I said, like no conflict, like, either like in the community or in the world or, you know, like just having no conf-, like, conflict or wars.

U2: No pain, no agony. And no war.

U3: State of being when it’s all happiness (chuckling). (Within) the world-, everybody, everyone getting along.

U4: Well, I think peace is, um, the act of loving, without like holding any grudges or no judgment. Just being like friends with everyone and like ne-, no-, like, w-, world without judgment and like grudges and discrimination, those kinda things. (Like) no barriers.

I think peace is just, um, a feeling that-, like, I think peace would equal happiness and happiness will equal love kinda thing. That’s how I see peace.

U5: I would say it is, kind of, um, a state where there’s no conf-, like, there’s no conflict between anything. Everything’s balanced. Like a-, a s-, not-, not a mental state. Like a, just a-, I guess like, I don’t know, like-, of just-, just a way. I don’t know.
The same procedure was employed in the analysis of expert interviews. Analysis was conducted both within and between subjects.

**Concept Mapping**

Concept mapping is a unique educational tool used to organize conceptual knowledge. It is a schematic visual organization of concepts used to represent meaningful relationships among ideas in the form of propositions (Moon, Hoffman, Novak, & Canas, 2011; Novak and Cowin, 1984, Trochim, 1989). Tavana (1994) used concept mapping in his work conducted on the educational system in Western Samoa and chose themes that emerged within the interviews to categorize each area of the educational system that it covered. Strauss and Corbin (1998) emphasize the importance of visual diagrams when storytelling and sorting out the relationships between concepts. “Diagrams can be valuable tools to integration. Diagramming is helpful because it enables the analyst to gain distance from the data, forcing him or her to work with concepts rather than with details of data” (p. 153). By mapping out the concepts and comparing them, the goal of these analyses was to develop a richer concept of peace beyond a simple verbal definition.

Northcutt and McCoy (2004) described the organization of systems as part of an interactive qualitative analysis. They state, “rationalization is a set of rules, independent of the nature of the elements of the system, by which elements are first sorted into zones and then connected with the minimum number of relationships consistent with the data” (p. 37). According to these authors, through a careful literature review, the researcher is able to construct a schema of the phenomenon under study (Northcutt & McCoy, 2004). It is through the establishment of these relationships among ideas, the understanding of these connections that concept mapping becomes a useful tool (Hay & Kinchin, 2006; Marton, Dall’Alba, & Beaty, 1993; Moon, Hoffman, Novak, & Canas, 2011). For the original nine questions from Mrazek (2007) and the remaining seven questions analyzed in the present study, concept maps were
 created from participants’ coded answers. Responses were grouped around the question, and for the remaining seven questions, Expert and Layperson groups were displayed in a single map, together. The remaining seven questions analyzed for Study I were the following:

1. When peace is studied, it is usually contrasted with war. Why do you think that is?
2. Can there be an active, positive peace separate from war?
3. Do you think humans, by nature, are peaceful beings?
4. Whom do you view as important peacemakers?
5. What types of things do you think have influenced the way you think about peace?
6. Do you think your religion or your belief/non-belief in a higher power affects the way you think about peace?
7. Do you think your religion or your belief/non-belief in a higher power affects the way other people think about peace?

These questions were chosen because they held the remaining data from the Mrazek (2007) concept of peace study. Detailed descriptions of responses and the concept maps created for each of these questions is presented in the Results section.

Grounded Theory

Glaser (2002) described grounded theory in a simple dictum, “All is data” (p. 1). By this, he infers that everything we can possibly gather information on, as researchers, is valuable to the study at hand. He described how it is that grounded theory is built when he stated, “the product, a grounded theory, will be an abstraction from time, place and people that frees the researcher from the tyranny of normal distortion...(it) puts the focus on concepts that fit and are relevant” (p. 1). Grounded theory interviewing involves passively listening to responses to specific interview questions and then pulling out emergent themes during analysis. As the emergent themes are discovered they are coded and categorized. As more interviews are conducted, ideally the data will saturate and unique properties will no longer emerge. Once this
saturation point is reached, interviews are stopped and analysis is conducted (Charmaz, 2011; Corbin & Strauss, 2014). All responses transcribed, coded and mapped came from participants’ own words and ideas. Interviews were stopped when saturation was reached.

**Study II**

**Secondary Database Research**

Because the data collected by the anthropologists and others who were living and working in Hawai‘i and Fiji at the time of their research was interpreted by them and eventually catalogued into the HRAF database, the review and analysis done were considered secondary research. The database was explored and searched using terms related to peace, peacemaking, *ho‘oponopono*, and *talanoa*. The resulting paragraphs and documents were read, coded and analyzed.

In the Human Relations Area Files (HRAF) every paragraph of each document is coded and copies made, based on the number of different codes located. While this process used to be laborious, it has been streamlined efficiently with the use of scanners and computers and other current technology. For example, a user could search for a culture or a topic within the database. By searching for a culture “Kikuyu of Kenya” the user would retrieve a number of ethnographies, in order of publication. Each of these documents would also include line by line numbering and coding, assigning any number of the hundreds of codes from the *Outline of Cultural Materials (OCM)*, a cultural taxonomy. These codes include topics like childrearing, marriage customs and rituals, food sources, war and conflict, etc. Once finding all the Kikuyu of Kenya documents, a user would be able to see what type of things are covered in them by reviewing the codes. Also, if he/she wanted to search a topic, such as “childrearing,” a search for this could be done as well. After entering the search term, hundreds or thousands of documents from various cultures would be retrieved. Within these documents the lines and or paragraphs which cover the topic of childrearing are highlighted. The user can go then go
through these and sort which are most relevant. One can also search using a particular OCM number, assigned to a particular code and all of these lines and paragraphs would be retrieved. Furthermore, a reliability rating is also given to each of the documents, with a rating of “5” being the highest, indicating primary data. Over 20 research institutions all over the world subscribe to the now electronic version of the database and it is updated annually with new data and new coding categories.

The use of eHRAF for this study was chosen because it holds valuable information gathered directly from anthropologists and field researchers who were alive and researching at a time when Hawai‘i was not yet a part of the United States. While some of the data gathered included experiences after statehood, the historical reflection was important. The viewpoint and ideas of people in Hawai‘i at that time would be impossible to gather today. While Fiji is not a state of the United States, it has certainly grown more Westernized over time. Having access to archival anthropological data from a time when both of these island nations were closer to their cultural roots was an important perspective to include in the research.

The HRAF database consists of 890 Outlines of Cultural Materials (OCM) which can be described as codes or labels for information found in the paragraphs. Documents range from 20 pages to hundreds of pages and span from the early 1800s to present day. Each entry by a particular author is coded using one or more of the 890 OCM, paragraph by paragraph. For this study, the search of data within HRAF was conducted using both a geographical search (Hawai‘i and Fiji) as well as a topic search (peace, peacemaking, and related OCM terms). Once the searches were conducted, depending on how long a selected document was, it was either manually read through in its entirety or the key paragraphs were located and read. If a document was 50 pages or less, the entire thing was read and analyzed. If more than 50 pages, the OCM code search was used to identify relevant paragraphs that could be interpreted.
Both Hawai‘i and Fiji belonged to what HRAF categorizes as the “Oceania” region of the world and the “Polynesian” subcategory of this region. The specific islands were highlighted and then a search within these specific cultures was conducted. A total of 6 OCM codes were searched within both the Hawai‘i and Fiji islands along with a few specific search terms not listed as OCM. See Table 3.3 for a list of all relevant OCM used.

Table 3.3 OCM Search Term, Description and Paragraphs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCM CODE NUMBER/SEARCH TERM</th>
<th>OCM CODE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th># OF PARAGRAPHS ASSIGNED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>728</td>
<td>Peacemaking</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>627</td>
<td>Informal Ingroup Justice</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>690</td>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>628</td>
<td>Inter-Community Relations</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>629</td>
<td>Inter-Ethnic Relations</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>578</td>
<td>In-group Antagonisms</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ho‘oponopono</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>talanoa</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i soro</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>588</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above OCM codes were chosen because they focused almost exclusively on the positive side of the peace concept- peacemaking, justice, in-group justice, community relations, etc. Because the Western literature was searched with a positive peace paradigm (peace, peacemaking, conflict resolution, etc.), these data were also searched in that way. All OCM codes were reviewed and the above chosen because of how specifically they captured the topic at hand. Searching using OCM yielded results that were easily quantifiable. The paragraphs were instantly counted and numbered. This created an ease of study, as opposed to searching entirely using my own search terms. The specific peacemaking practices were searched
individually to make sure that information pertaining to them was not missed. While a lot of what was found searching those individual search terms did fall under the other original OCM searches, some did not.

Systematically, each of the OCM was searched against each of the cultures in order to locate specific documents and research in the database. OCM were searched one at a time in order to efficiently review everything. For example, when conducting an advanced search “Hawai‘i” and “Fiji” were chosen as specified cultures and a particular OCM was selected. Once searched, a list of authors and their publications appear as well as the number of paragraphs within that publication that contain the selected OCM code. After each of the above six OCM codes were searched, the search terms “hoʻoponopono,” “talanoa,” and “i soro” were queried specifically. Any paragraphs that were located in these keyword searches that had not already been reviewed using one of the previous OCM codes were also reviewed. Once the publication link appeared and was expanded, each individual paragraph could be clicked on and reviewed. Out of the 588 paragraphs that were reviewed, 367 were relevant, in some way, to the topic of peace and peacemaking in Hawai‘i and/or Fiji. Sixteen different publications were represented in the 367 applicable paragraphs. Once the paragraph was reviewed and determined relevant, notes were made, and it was categorized and coded. Initially, paragraphs were reviewed with a priori codes in mind. Then, upon further reviews, emergent codes were determined.

HRAF Database Validity

The HRAF database was chosen for this study because of its many cultural ethnographies, dating back dozens, even hundreds of years. It was electronically available and searchable. While the HRAF is an advantageous tool for cross-cultural research and examination used by academics and students alike, its objectivity and independence have, at times, been questioned. After launching the first edition of *Cross-Cultural Survey* in 1937, the
project was tightly linked to the military. HRAF was born of this military-academic partnership, highly dependent on financial support from the federal government.

Shweder (2010) comments and expounds upon Price’s (2008) book *Anthropological Intelligence* in which Price discussed the anthropological research done at the end of WWII. Price asserts this research was morally questionable because of data gathered for military intelligence purposes as well as funding sources for various projects. Shweder (2010) specifically notes a section of the book that covers George Murdock’s role in creating HRAF and its impact on this blurred relationship between academia and the federal government. He quotes Price (2008), “Of all the research programs undertaken by the IHR (Institute of Human Relations at Yale)...Murdock’s database of cross-cultural information (HRAF) became a resource used by academic anthropologists and the intelligence community” (p. 90).

In addition to the questionable financial backing of HRAF and Murdock’s affiliation with the FBI, several critics cite the comparative methodology as problematic. Comparing particular aspects of a culture, like “childrearing” for instance, some have argued is in ignorance of a culture’s entire history and context. In essence, they are incomparable (Benedict, 1934; Tobin, 1990). It is said that in the 1970s in particular, this debate turned into one of a view of anthropology as science- objective and quantifiable; versus one of “interpretive art” as extended by Geertz. HRAF was, of course, viewed as the exemplary model of anthropology as science, as it dissected parts of cultures and allowed researchers and students to compare them.

While some may have questioned the reliability and validity of the HRAF database in the past, it contains a wealth of information that is not so closely catalogued and easily searched in other places. Moreover, the use of HRAF data has not been done very often in psychological studies. Conducting a search of Human Relations Area Files in peace research and psychological research databases yields only 6 studies, the most recent one published in 1989. Five out of these six studies focus on conflict in various cultures- Naroll (1978) examines
correlations between conflict theories using cultures in HRAF. Levinson (1989) researches family violence cross-culturally. Aggression (Allen, 1972), crime (Tefft & Reinhardt, 1974), warfare and feuding (Otterbein & Otterbein, 1965) are addressed in the rest of the studies, respectively. In contrast, the present study contributes to the literature by focusing on a positive peace perspective.

Study III

Participants

A total of seven participants were interviewed for Study III, all of whom had experienced a peacemaking practice in either Hawai‘i or Fiji, and many of whom (5/7) conducted the practice themselves and taught others. Five participants identified as Native Hawaiian and discussed the ho‘oponopono practice. Two participants identified as Fijian, and discussed the practices of talanoa, and i soro. See Table 3.4 for a brief description of their backgrounds.

Table 3.4 Cultural Informant Background Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID Number</th>
<th>Background Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>C1 identified as Native Hawaiian and had knowledge of ho‘oponopono. He is a business owner and consultant who specializes in cultural and executive coaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>C2 identified as Native Hawaiian and had knowledge of ho‘oponopono. She is working on a Master’s degree in Social Work and works in social services with Native Hawaiian families. Her grandfather was a traditional Hawaiian healer and ran a business out of the home she grew up in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>C3 identified as Native Hawaiian and had knowledge of ho‘oponopono. He works in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>for-profit sector as a consultant, <em>kahu</em>, and mediator for many of Hawai‘i’s business and state agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>C4 identified as Fijian and had knowledge of <em>talanoa</em> and <em>i soro</em>. He works for the Fijian government providing conflict management and mediation services to individuals, families, communities and state agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>C5 identified as Fijian and had knowledge of <em>talanoa</em> and <em>i soro</em>. He was a student at BYU-Hawai‘i studying mediation and conflict resolution and had moved back to Fiji in the last 3 years. He lives in a rural Fijian village and had experienced indigenous peacemaking practices firsthand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>C6 identified as Native Hawaiian and had knowledge of <em>ho‘oponopono</em>. He is an attorney with criminal and civil experience, being involved in several high profile legal cases. He is a leader in the Hawaiian Sovereignty movement and now runs a non-profit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>C7 identified as Native Hawaiian and had knowledge of <em>ho‘oponopono</em>. He is a Christian pastor who works at a large Christian congregation. He worked for 25 years as a pastor and lead pastor for Kamehameha Schools.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recruitment

Participants were recruited using personal contacts and information. Two cultural informants knew my advisor, Dr. Bhawuk, and one was a contact through a previous position of mine at the University. Other informants were suggested by the initial interviewees and agreed to participate. Fijian respondents were recruited from a contact at a mainland University who does research in Fiji. Participants were contacted via phone and/or email and interviews were conducted in various locations.

Semi-Structured Interviews

Interviews were conducted between January 2015 and May 2015. During the interview, questions were skipped or modified depending on the interviewee’s demeanor, talkativeness or previous answers. Each interview was recorded using an audio recorder and took approximately 60 minutes, with the longest taking 190 minutes. Hawaiian participants were interviewed in person while two of the Fijian participants were interviewed remotely over Skype. Interviews were transcribed using ExpressScribe transcription software. This software still required manually typing out the audio, but allowed for the recording to be significantly slowed so less rewinding was needed. The semi-structured interview consisted of 10 questions, which are listed in Appendix C. Five of the ten questions were concept mapped, as participants gave the most detailed answers to them. The five used for analysis were the following:

1. How do you define peace?
2. How does the experience of peace in your own culture differ from that of Western or American culture?
3. Do you think human beings are peaceful by nature?
4. Tell me about ho’oponopono talanoa i soro. How do you practice?
5. What is your role in the peace process?
Complete maps for each of these questions are presented and analyzed in the Result section. Analysis, concept mapping procedures, and the use of grounded theory for data saturation were employed. The specifics of these procedures were identical to those employed in Study I.
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

Study I: Western Conceptualization of Peace Results

In Study I, in addition to the nine original questions, seven additional questions were studied, analyzed, and concept mapped. This section depicts demographic information for both laypeople and expert groups, descriptions of each of the nine concept maps followed by the concept map figures. For this analysis, expert and novice answers are included in a single map. After each description and map is shown, a discussion of the findings from the seven additional maps is presented.

In response to the first question, “When peace is studied, it is usually contrasted with war, why?”, participants had a variety of answers, some of which overlapped. In Figure 4.1, the bolded answers indicate that three or more participants agreed with the idea. Overwhelmingly, novices discussed how we live in a war/violence-obsessed culture where media as well as personal relationships are often focused around violence rather than peace ($n = 10$). Only one expert (E9) mentioned this idea.

Experts had more of a consensus about the idea that peace was often paired with war because of where and when the modern field was born- in a (Western) European context, during a time of World War ($n = 4$). Overall, experts had more diverse answers and tended to agree less on one particular idea or theme of ideas. These answers, align with the research conducted with experts and novices which states that experts tend to a view a problem more abstractly, being influenced by their expertise, while novices focus more on personal experience and everyday knowledge of a subject in order to arrive at an answer.

These ideas could have implications for teaching the subject of peace and peace studies. It appears that laypeople seem to connect to war and peace at the level of media and media culture. Experts may be relying on their historical knowledge of the field to communicate
lessons or provide content for a course in peace studies. Perhaps a better balance between historical facts and origins as well as current day influences could be more effective.

In response to the second question “Can there be an active, positive peace separate from war?”, overwhelmingly, both groups agreed that “yes,” there could be one. However, their clarifications differed. Nearly half of experts believed that, yes, an active peace can exist if one focuses on individual, internal peace \((n = 4)\). In Figure 4.2, this answer is shown in bolded text, indicating that more than 3 individuals answered similarly. One expert responded that in order to have an active peace, there needed to be a just society present. Another pointed out that peace would need to be more profitable than war as well as start with communication and education of our younger generation. Only one person interviewed stated that “no” there was not an active, positive peace separate from war. This expert (E1) explained that unless the world were perfect (an impossibility), conflict would always exist.

Laypeople did not have faith that a shift would be made from conflict/violence to peace. Similar to experts, several indicated that this peace would be possible if you focused on individual, internal practices, rather than focusing attention at the larger context. It appears as though both novices and experts agree that successful, active peace more easily occurs on an individual, internal basis. Collectively, at the community, national, and international levels it seems that an active and positive peace is viewed as more difficult or impossible.

In response to the third question “Do you think humans, by nature, are peaceful beings?”, it appears that both groups agree that humans are born peaceful, but often times do not act that way. The two groups of participants overwhelmingly agree that context plays a large role in how humans go on to behave. More than half of the expert sample \((n = 5)\) agreed that they did not have a definitive “yes” or “no” answer to the question, that their answer entirely depended on the context. Similarly, half of the novice participants \((n = 8)\) expressed that humans were, by nature, peaceful, but their experiences and context influenced whether they
behaved that way. Only two participants, both belonging to the Novice group, expressed that humans were *not* peaceful by nature, one saying that humans were born judgmental and another relaying that our competition to survive does not allow us to be peaceful beings.

Knowing that both experts and novices seem to conform around the idea that experiences and context play a very large role in our level of peacefulness, this finding aligns with the answers gleaned in the earlier question, *Can there be an active, positive peace separate from war?* In that question, both experts and novices expressed that there could be if the process was individual and internal. When asked *Do you think humans, by nature, are peaceful?*, both groups seemed to also point out that this was an individual process, guided by context and experience. It seems that for these questions, both groups expressed answers at the individual level, believing that every case is unique and different. In this map shown in Figure 4.3, the bolded statements are those that are in agreement between experts and novices, blackened statements are those that answered “no.”

In response to the fourth question “Whom do you view as important peacemakers?” Experts convened on Gandhi and Martin Luther King, Jr., and had a breadth and depth of other suggestions. Novices did not have as many specific names of peacemakers to offer, but also convened on Gandhi. Notable about these responses is the overwhelmingly popular answer from novices of “everyday people, family, and friends.” Nearly half of respondents (*n = 7*) gave this answer, while only two experts espoused similar ideas. The research on experts and novices shows that novices are much more likely to use their everyday experiences and interactions to gather information while experts are more likely to use their expertise. However, this difference also raises questions about everyday peacemaking and the possibilities of creating peace in our everyday communities. Novices believe that those around them are important peacemakers, while it appears, from this sample, that experts view peacemakers as those they are not in contact with every day—rather they are individuals who have committed
their lives to the study or practice of peace. These two notions are divergent, but align with several of the other differences found in answers from the separate groups. In this map, depicted in Figure 4.4, responses that were shared by three or more participants are bolded.

In response to the fifth question “What types of things do you think have influenced the way that you think about peace?”, the most common responses between the two groups matched. Both experts and novices believe that the most powerful influences on their ideas of peace are: education and training and relationships with others (family and friends). While both groups agree on these factors, they place a different emphasis on them.

Nearly half of the experts interviewed ($n = 4$) shared that their education and training affected their ideas about peace. This was only true for a quarter of the novices interviewed. On the other hand, family and relationships as influences were noted by only a third of experts, this answer was given by more than half of the novice participants ($n = 9$). Again, the theme of everyday experiences and relationships is highlighted for novice interviewees while training and expertise is important to those in the expert position. In this map, shown in Figure 4.5, bolded answers are those that were agreed upon by three or more participants.

In response to the sixth question “Do you think your religion or your belief/non-belief in a higher power affects the way you think about peace?”, most laypeople (6/10) and experts (4/7) believed that religion affected the way they thought about peace. However, each group cited unique reasons for their response. Most novices who answered “yes,” said that religion affects peace in that it motivates people to behave a certain way, because they are fearful of the afterlife and want to go to heaven. Juxtaposed to this, most novices who answered “no” explained that religion did not play a role in their life at all. Experts who answered “no” emphasized that religion was not necessary or related to peace, but that other factors were more importantly present- such as justice or morality. Experts who answered “yes” described religion as an effective tool in intervening in behavior, a more abstract response, and one stated
that belief in a higher power was unnecessary, but the striving for “an ideal world” was important. Only one expert mentioned that spirituality personally affected his views of peace.

In these responses, it appeared as though experts disagreed more with the institution of religion over other factors (justice, morality) to influence peace. On the other hand, novices described their personal relationship with religion (religion does not affect my life) and with those of religious background (some religious members are hypocritical, people are concerned about their afterlife). Experts continued to answer more abstractly while novices responded from personal experience. In this map, shown in Figure 4.6, blackened boxes are those that indicate a “no” response.

In response to the seventh question “Do you think religion affects the way other people think about peace?”, all participants agreed that “yes” religion affects the way that other people think of peace. The reasons behind why they may have answered “yes” are slightly unique, but in this instance, both novice and expert answers fell into several similar categories, which are outlined below.

Yes, in a negative way, because religion causes a lot of disagreement and conflict.

Yes, in a positive way, because religion is a motivator for peaceful behavior.

These two categories encapsulated nearly all of the responses by both experts and novices. Of the remaining answers, experts (E3, E7, E9) mentioned that religion is particularly important in particular communities and/or countries and certainly influences peace. Novices pointed out again that because people are particularly concerned about their experience in the afterlife, they are impacted by their religious beliefs. This question is unique in the sense that both novices and experts nearly wholeheartedly agreed on the influence of religion on others’ beliefs about peace. These results are intriguing given that in the previous question several answered that religion or religious beliefs did not affect them personally when formulating peace ideas. The concept map is depicted in Figure 4.7.
When peace is studied, it is usually contrasted with war? Why?

It is an abstract concept that needs a concrete anchor

Male dominance in the field

It is much more tied to politics now than it used to be. This ties it to war

Western culture focuses on violence, war, and conflict.

We live in a violent culture - media, relationships, and within ourselves.

Not sure. In my culture (Samoan), this is not the case.

Figure 4.1 Concept Map: Contrast Peace with War
Can there be an active, positive peace separate from war?

- Yes, with effective communication, education of children, and peace being more profitable than war.
- Yes, but need presence of a just, fair society.
- Yes, with a focus on individual, internal peace.
- Not unless there is a “perfectly ordered” world. There will always be conflict.
- Yes, but think it is unlikely a shift to focus on peace will be made.
- Yes, with more of a focus on religion.

Figure 4.2 Concept Map: Positive Peace
Do you think humans, by nature, are peaceful beings?

- Yes, humans are inherently peaceful, but sometimes do not act that way.
- Yes, people want to connect with others and are not always self-serving.
- It is context specific, cannot say yes or no.
- No, I think people are born to judge others.
- No, in order to evolve, we've had to compete, and that requires humans to strive in sometimes violent ways.
- Yes, they are peaceful by nature, but then context changes them.

Humans are inherently peaceful, but sometimes do not act that way.

Figure 4.3 Concept Map: Humans Peaceful
Whom do you view as important peacemakers?

- Haʻaheo Guanson, Kaleo Patterson, Karen Cross (faculty at SMIP), Mufi Hannemann, Jimmy Carter, Peter Adler, Dalai Lama
- Betty Reardon
- Every day people, mothers
- Martin Luther King, Jr.
- Gandhi
- Albert Schweitzer, Christ, the Buddha, the Aquinos', Oscar Arias, Jean-Bertrand Aristide
- Jimmy Carter (E3)
- Mohammed Alverde
- John Paul Lederach
- Mother Teresa
- William Sloane-Coffin, Ralph Bunch, Nelson Mandela, Malcolm X, Stokely Charmichael

Figure 4.4 Concept Map: Peacemakers

EXPERTS

NOVICES/UNDERGRADS
What types of things do you think have influenced the way that you think about peace?

- Family and relationships
- World events
- Mediation movement in Hawaii
- Nature
- Education/training/theories
- PeaceCorps
- Religion
- Belief in God/Higher Power
- Media
- Friends/peers
- Family and/or upbringing
- School
- World events and war(s)

Figure 4.5 Concept Map: Peace Influences
Do you think your religion or your belief/non-belief in a higher power affects the way you think about peace?

- Yes, religion is one useful tool when trying to analyze or intervene in human behavior.
- Yes, living and working in Hawaii has influenced spiritual beliefs.
- Yes, religion emphasizes positivity and peace.
- Yes, prayer is a very peaceful act. It is comforting to pray at a difficult time.
- Yes, people are motivated by their religious beliefs and act accordingly. He/she may behave a certain way just to "get into heaven" or reach enlightenment.
- No, it is more related to justice than spirituality.
- No, you need a sense of morality but not religion or spirituality.
- No, in fact religion "claims" to be peaceful, but some religious members are hypocritical.
- No, religion does not affect my life.

Figure 4.6 Concept Map: Religion Self
Do you think religion affects the way other people think about peace?

- Yes, in a positive way - motivator for peace.
- Yes, in a negative way - cause a lot of disagreement/conflict.
- Yes, particularly those in religious communities and countries.
- Yes, because of beliefs of what can happen in the afterlife
- Yes, in a negative way - causes a lot of disagreement/conflict.
The two major findings from Study I which inquired about differences between experts and laypeople’s were the following:

1. When asked to conceptualize peace, the Layperson and Expert groups formulated distinct responses. Laypeople tend to conceptualize peace more uniformly and at the personal/small group level while Expert respondents gave examples and ideas from the national/international level much more consistently.

2. This difference in contextual level is less apparent when groups are asked questions in which the context is specified. For example, if asked, “What is your definition of peace?”, groups would give distinct answers at their respective contextual levels (Experts leaning toward national/international and Laypeople personal/small group level). However, if asked, “What kind of attributes does a peaceful person have?”, answers across groups are more similar, and focused on the same level of context outlined in the question.

As was found in the original 2007 study, it appears as though experts and laypeople still differ in their views on peace. As depicted in tables 4.1 and 4.2, there are large differences in the demographics of the two groups, specifically in the areas of study between Laypeople and Experts. Five of the nine experts have studied political science or the law, three of whom held J.D. degrees (E3, E4, and E7). Their professional training seems to have shaped their conceptualization of conflict at the group level or as a component of a larger, for example, system of courts or government. It is not unreasonable to believe this is something that years of training in this system has shaped in their minds. On the other hand, participants in the layperson group, had little, if any, experience in the court or government system and about 63% of the laypeople were first year college students. Having much less exposure to scholarly peace research the examples provided by the laypeople more naturally describe peace at the personal
and interpersonal levels. These contextual level differences held for three of the remaining seven questions that were analyzed.

In Figure 4.1, participants were asked, “Why do you think in peace research peace is contrasted so frequently with war?” Overwhelmingly, laypeople stated this was because we live in culture that promotes and glorifies violence ($n = 11$). A very distant second popular response was that peace is such an abstract concept that it needs an anchor in something tangible and visible, like war or violence. While experts did mention a culture of violence ($n = 2$) in their responses, they tended to believe the research focused on negative peace mostly because the field of modern peace research originated during a time of war and war protesting.

In Figure 4.4, participants are asked “Whom do you view as important peacemakers?” The responses highlight the aforementioned findings showing novices overwhelmingly mentioning family and friends ($n = 7$) and politicians ($n = 5$), who are arguably “everyday people” that one can communicate with and personally connect. Not only did the expert group have a greater breadth of answers, clearly having greater knowledge of the history of peacemakers, but they focused almost exclusively on famous leaders of major peace movements like Martin Luther King, Jr. ($n = 6$) and Gandhi ($n = 4$). The pattern emerged again with experts targeting historical figures they have studied and laypeople choosing those around them in everyday life.

A similar pattern of data is discovered in Figure 4.5. Participants are asked what they believe has influenced their ideas of peace. While the top answers did overlap, they were inversely compared. Experts leaned toward their educational background as the strongest influence on their peace ideas ($n = 5$). Their second largest influence was family and friends ($n = 3$). Laypeople chose family and friends as their greatest influencers ($n = 10$) and education/schooling as a distant second ($n = 4$). This is the third question that supports the findings from the 2007 study.
In addition to these three questions which supported previous findings, four remaining questions were analyzed and interestingly, both groups tended to converge in their answers. While the reasoning behind their responses may have differed, these questions depicted them in alignment. In Figure 4.2, participants were asked if there could be an active, positive form of peace, separate from war. All, except for one participant from the expert group, agreed that there could be. Most novices ($n = 5$) did not see this shift happening anytime soon and felt it was “unlikely,” but still believed it was possible. Four novices agreed that it was possible as long as there was a focus on individual and internal peace. Experts agreed with the latter response. Their most common answer was just this—peace was positive separate from war if a focus was put on internal and personal peace processes. Only one expert (E1) said that “no” peace was not possible separate from war unless and until the world was “perfectly ordered,” and pointed out that it never would be.

While this deviates somewhat from previous findings of laypeople focusing answers at the individual/personal level while experts tend to view things at a greater level of context, maybe the nature of this question brought out more of a consensus in the groups. To imagine peace as a possibility may be too daunting when considering the number of national and international conflicts going on. In this case, experts shifted their focus to the individual/personal level perhaps because that is the only level at which it appears possible to make substantial progress at this point.

In Figure 4.3 participants were asked if they believed human beings to be peaceful by nature. The majority of novices believed that yes, human beings are peaceful by nature ($n = 12$). However, they emphasized that: a) they may or may not behave peacefully, and b) they may be naturally born as peaceful beings, but the context around them shapes and changes them. While they are agreeing that they are peaceful, respondents felt the need to qualify their answers and point out that sometimes behavior may not match a peaceful nature. The bulk of
experts ($n = 5$) answered that they could not decide on a definitive “yes” or “no” response and it depended entirely on the context. While the responses appear different on the map, when reading more closely, both experts and novices agree that context is a key component when deciding the peaceful nature of humans.

The final two questions analyzed have to do with religion and its effect on the concept of peace. First, in Figure 4.6, participants were asked “Do you think your religion or belief/non-belief in a higher power affects the way you think about peace?” While both groups had varied “yes” and “no” responses, their explanations are unique from one another. On the Expert side, there really was not a predominant “yes” or “no” response. Those who answered yes had several reasons behind their responses. Two expert respondents said that religion was a useful tool when trying to intervene and change human behavior. While not the same thing, this response can be likened to the novices response ($n = 4$) that religion was a way to motivate people to behave a certain way, aligned with those religious beliefs. Only one expert respondent commented that living and working in Hawaii had influenced his spiritual beliefs and now affected his peace ideas. Comparatively, two novice respondents commented that they found religion to be something positive and comforting in their lives. While the affirmative responses between groups appear similar, the reasons behind their “no” responses differ. Experts answered “no” stating that, for them, peace was more about justice or morality, which could be elements in religion, but religion was not required in order to have them. Novices, on the other hand, answered either that no, religion was not a part of their lives at all or that religion falsely claimed to be “peaceful” when, in fact, it was not.

In Figure 4.7, participants were asked, “Do you think religion affects the way other people think about peace?” In this instance, all expert and layperson respondents resoundingly said “yes.” Both groups pointed out that some of the ways in which religion affected others was positive and some negative, but overall, it was clear to them that others viewed peace through a
religious lens. This is a unique finding considering the previous question in which answers were quite variable when talking about their own personal experiences. The perception is that the concept of peace for others is greatly influenced by religion and spirituality.

Summary of Study I: Western Conceptualization of Peace

While it was important to analyze the remaining seven questions in order to get a more comprehensive idea of the previous 2007 results, it was also done in order to form a Western conceptualization of peace. This required analysis across groups and across concept maps. No longer viewing the sample in “expert” and “novice” roles, the collection of data is now framed together as respondents from a large University on the west coast of the United States. Organizing the data this way created a new concept map, encapsulating the Western Peace Concept and outlined in Figure 4.8.

To arrive at this figure, the concept map for each of the 16 questions analyzed was re-examined and all the responses that overlapped between the expert and novice group is noted as a category. This final map divides the Western concept of peace into quadrants, with each quadrant representing a series of questions asked. For the “Definition of Peace” quadrant, answers to Questions 1, 2, and 3 were combined. For second quadrant the “Experience of Peace” quadrant, answers to Questions 5, 9, 10, 11, and 12 were combined. For the third quadrant, labeled “Peace and Religion,” Questions 22 and 23 were combined and finally, for the fourth quadrant, labeled “Peace and War Relationship,” Questions 4 and 5 were combined. This includes 12 out of the 16 questions asked and gives a broader picture of the answers that were given by both experts and novices.

In Figure 4.8 shared coded categories appear in capital letters, for example, NATIONAL/INTERNATIONAL and PERSONAL for the Definition of Peace quadrant, GAIA/ABSTRACT, PERSONAL, NATURE for the Experience of Peace quadrant, and so on. When looking at the original concept maps, these are codes that were extracted from the
interview data as themes for each group. Only those that appeared in both expert and novice maps are included in the Western Concept map.

The phrases connected to each of these codes are those that appeared: 1) in both expert and novice concept maps, and 2) had three or more participants agree with the response. These common answers are included in the overall map since they were a consensus within and between groups.

**Definition of Peace**

In Figure 4.8 for the Western participants, these responses fell under two predominant categories- national/international and personal descriptions. At the national/international level, participants discussed no conflict, no war, and a presence of social justice. Personally, they mentioned no pain, a calm space, and something that is both internal and external to them.

**Experience of Peace**

In this quadrant, Western participant responses fell into four predominant categories: personal, nature, presence of, and absence of. At the personal level they talked about being with friends and productively debating. At the nature level, surfing was a common theme. They agreed on the presence of happiness, honesty, communication, structure, and trust as well as the absence of violence, aggression, and selfishness.

**Peace and Religion**

Western participants had a complex view of peace and religion. Their responses fell into two predominant categories of: (1) affecting others, and (2) affecting self in this quadrant. When asked if religion affected others view of peace, some participants said yes. In a positive way, it changes behavior. In a negative way, it can often cause conflict and/or cause others to speak or behave hypocritically. When asked if religion affected the way they personally viewed peace, respondents said yes and no. In a positive way, yes, religion can be comforting at times. Other participants believed religion had no bearing on their views of peace.
Peace and War Relationship

Western respondents described the peace and war relationship according to two predominant categories: national and historical. In the national category, participants talked about the violent U.S. culture and that this violence and culture of violence was unlikely to shift anytime soon. In the historical category, participants noted that the field originated in a time of war and expressed their belief that a positive peace is possible at the individual level.

Given this Western conceptualization of peace, after the analysis of the original 2007 study and its questions as well as the remaining seven questions analyzed for the present study, it was critical to gather more information on the Pacific ideas of peace for comparison. In order to do this, first an anthropological database was consulted and explored (Study II) and then these data were followed up with cultural informant interviews (Study III). With the Western concept formed and mapped, the next steps were to begin analysis of peace and peacemaking in Hawai‘i and Fiji.
Figure 4.8 Western Peace Concept Map
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Study II: Human Relations Area Files (HRAF) Results

As outlined in the Methods section, particular OCM were chosen and searched as well as specific search terms. These searches yielded a list of pertinent paragraphs that were ready for review and analysis. First, codes were constructed and then themes extracted.

Descriptive Coding

A priori codes. Once the paragraphs were organized and prepared for more specific study, a priori codes were created. These are codes conceived before examining the data. They were constructed from background research and literature review on each of the cultural peacemaking practices. While the OCM codes listed previously in the methods section were used to search within the database in order to find relevant material, the following codes were used to organize and interpret the data and information once it was located. Table 4.1 lists the a priori codes, their definitions, and what percentage of the 367 paragraphs examined included that specific code.

Table 4.1: A Priori Codes and Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Handling Conflict</td>
<td>Any reference to group handling of conflict such as a family member or community leader stepping in to communicate between parties.</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Avoidance</td>
<td>Any reference to parties avoiding conflict including avoiding interaction with a person, avoiding discussion of the topic or speaking in a way to minimize disagreement about something.</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Influence</td>
<td>Any reference to Western, American, or “haole” influence on peace practice or peace understanding.</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Violence/Punishment | Any reference to punishment by an authority figure such as parent or elder punishing a child or younger relative or government punishment of jail time or death. Shunning is also included. | 10%
---|---|---
Prayer | Any reference to prayer and peace or using prayer as part of a peacemaking practice. | 4%

**Emergent Codes.** After reading through the paragraphs more carefully and thoroughly, emergent codes were produced. After they were organized, several of them did fit with prior research and review on the topic, but were not first highlighted. Others emerged from the review of the paragraphs and the commonalities that materialized. Table 4.2 again shows the emergent code, its definition and the percentage of paragraphs that received the designation.

Table 4.2: Emergent Codes and Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gods and Spirits</td>
<td>Any reference to a specific god, gods or spirits when using a peacemaking practice or fostering conflict resolution.</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to Land</td>
<td>Any reference to an individual’s relationship to land and its role in peacemaking.</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Responsibility</td>
<td>Any reference to taking personal responsibility for conflict or for its resolution.</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal versus Informal Practice</td>
<td>Any reference to differences or distinctions between formally practicing peacemaking and</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangled Cords</td>
<td>Any reference to entanglement, tangled cords or enmeshed cords in relation to conflict resolution.</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Force Energy</td>
<td>Any reference to inner energy or life force in relation to a conflict resolution practice.</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles and Hierarchy</td>
<td>Any reference to different roles and hierarchy in a family or group of people, specifically in relation to conflict resolution or peacemaking.</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Manifested as Physical Illness</td>
<td>Any reference to physical illness being connected to conflict or unrest.</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and Talk</td>
<td>Any reference to using dialogue, conversation, and communication to facilitate conflict resolution.</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing of food/drink/gifts</td>
<td>Any reference to sharing of food, drink or an exchange of gifts in relation to a conflict resolution practice or protocol.</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once the paragraphs revealed these ideas and, particularly, emergent codes, each was scanned for a third time to see if any of the *a priori* coded material also contained some of the emergent codes. When this was completed, larger themes were extracted from the data. These themes were extracted by examining the connections between several of the codes. Figure 4.9 depicts the themes which emerged from the 15 separate codes.
One of the emergent themes found within the HRAF research was that of protocol surrounding peacemaking practices. The protocol theme encapsulated five individual codes: sharing of food/drink/gifts, talking and communication, tangled cords, formal/informal practice, and prayer. As part of this theme, the individual technical steps involved in a particular peacemaking practice were highlighted. Each code consisted of a particular step that was described as necessary for the appropriate conflict resolution practice.

*Formal/informal practice.* The first stage in either *ho'oponopono* or *talanoa* practice is to decide whether one is practicing formally or informally. Ito (1999) explained that there were two separate types of *ho'oponopono* practice- one which is done by a formal *kahu* or priest, and that which is done by a family member in the home. When *ho'oponopono* is practiced in the home, informally, there was sometimes an informal “leader” such as the head of the household, but sometimes this was not the case and family members could proceed on their own to discuss an issue. The informal type of *ho'oponopono* was practiced frequently and sometimes included...
prayer and/or agreements at the end of discussion, but sometimes did not. Ito (1999) said, “sometimes a session would end with a prayer or a plan of action, but sometimes it would simply end by drifting off into another conversation.” Everyday disagreements were often openly discussed and problems solved using this type of practice.

There was also a more formal *hoʻoponopono*, led by a priest that was used to handle larger disagreements or those that involved more people. These formal sessions included specific prayers at specific times, sometimes fasting on the part of all participants, sometimes dream interpretation and/or a focus on particular Bible readings or ‘olelo readings (Ito, 1999). Howard (1934) noted that often times the formal type of *hoʻoponopono* was used when dealing with an issue with the spirit world or with ancestors who had passed on.

*Prayer.* While sometimes not used in informal settings, ritualistic prayer was a meaningful part of *hoʻoponopono*. Depending on who was leading a session, this prayer could be one to ancestors, Hawaiian god or goddess or to the Christian god or Jesus Christ. If the context was one in which Christianity was blended with Hawaiian culture, which occurred often after Western contact, there was typically a blend of Christian and Hawaiian prayer rituals (Howard, 1934). Ito (1999) describes this particular marriage between Christian and Hawaiian ritual. “Sometimes the Christian God would ask that the victim pray to his/her perpetrator in order to get him to come around and admit fault. At that point, the perpetrator would have a realization and ask the victim for forgiveness. God was believed to have the ability to ‘soften a hard heart,’ and, by doing so, open up the path to forgiveness” (p. 73). The author also explained that Christian congregations would use *hoʻoponopono* practice to cleanse issues between members or to cure illnesses. Some members considered it a “pagan Hawaiian ritual” but included much of their own prayer and Bible verse readings. Whether it was Hawaiian prayer or Christian prayer, often times this was part of the *hoʻoponopono* practice.
Sharing of food/drink/gifts. Offerings made during the conflict resolution practice were common in both Hawaiian and Fijian practices. Ellis (1872) describes how after peace was declared between villages or islands, a pig sacrifice was made and the blood spilled in order to symbolize what would happen if the peace treaty were broken. Dancing and feasting between the two warring sides would ensue and, in this way, peace was established. Ti leaves were also used as symbols of peace and neutrality during a conflict. Handy (1892) describes another pig offering as a symbol of peace and conflict resolution. The offender’s family would sacrifice and bring a pig to the home of the victim, asking for forgiveness. The victim’s family must accept so as not to offend the ancestors. Ito (1999) described a more recent practice in which ho'oponopono is conducted, forgiveness extended and then food and drink shared between parties during the closing ritual called “pani.” The sharing of food and drink indicates festive, positive feelings toward one another and an end to any hostility.

The Fijian practice of i soro similarly uses gifts and the sharing of food and drink to foster positive feelings and forgiveness. One of the critical steps in the protocol of i soro is the offering of a whale’s tooth, called tabua. Once it is decided who is at fault for a particular incident, it is that family’s obligation to offer tabua to the offended party. The victim, again, is obligated to accept and forgiveness is given (Arno, 1993). The traditional Fijian drink, called yaqona, similar to Hawaiian kava or awa is also sometimes offered as a gift when wrongdoing has occurred. When given, it is symbolic of the offender admitting to the offense and humbly asking for acceptance. Hocart (1929) dissects the word i soro, telling how “i” denotes an offering and “soro” means gift, so the literal translation is that of gift offering. It is said that the gift is offered as a form of begging for forgiveness. It is accepted in order to not offend any gods, ancestors, or the victim’s family.

Tangled cords. This emerged as an important code for the ho‘oponopono practice specifically. As was illustrated in the literature review, a belief amongst Hawaiians is that
resolution is needed when energy cords become tangled and knotted. The *ho‘oponopono* practice is a means of clearing this tangled energy and creating an opening and space for order and right-ness to prevail. Ito (1999) mentioned that *ho‘oponopono* is a practice of opening up closed connections. These connections are viewed as tangled and confined and are compared to the ancient *kapu* system which confined and controlled one’s *mana*. When one behaves badly and endangers or hurts others, he is tangling up energy and causing a blockage. One of the important protocols of *ho‘oponopono* is to release and untie, sometimes even cut these tangled cords. The term *hihia* indicates the tangling of the cords and it occurs when one makes poor, hurtful choices. *Mihi* or forgiveness is offered and accepted and then *kala* occurs to loosen the bound cords. If loosening is not sufficient, a cord or cords will *oki* or be severed. The metaphor of a fishnet is used, both by Pukui (1972) and Ito (1999). Relationships are believed to be entangled and bound like fishnets. This arrangement is okay and healthy as long as the energy path between people is open and positive, this enmeshed connection creates support. However, when wrong is done, then these connections can become negatively tangled or, as people described, “all jam up,” and then *ho‘oponopono* is in place to untie them.

*Talking and communication.* This code was used to note any description of communication or discussion as a form of conflict resolution. Both Fiji and Hawai‘i use conversational techniques in order to solve problems. Sometimes simple expression of hurt or anger is used, while other times joking, informal discussion and discussion amongst peripheral individuals are key to solving conflict. Ito (1999) emphasized storytelling as a way in which communication helped to reduce conflict. Families and communities would tell stories, often full of metaphors, which mirrored a conflict occurring in their community. Younger family members and children could relate to the story and ask questions about the characters without having to directly address what may be occurring in their own life. This indirect communication helped to prevent conflict and save face for families as well as give ideas for how a problem may be
solved. Handy (1892) indicated that, depending on a particular problem, family members were asked to confess their sins or wrongdoing in a large group. This was done to clear any tangled or negative energy not only between individuals but between members and ancestors and/or gods. Verbally discussing one’s role in a particular problem or one’s own transgressions was a way in which energy could be cleared and the situation made right. Moreover, in Pukui’s (1972) description of formal hoʻoponopono, there are several steps in the protocol where participants are asked to express their hurt as well as their role in the wrongdoing to the larger group.

In Fiji, the talanoa conflict resolution process consists entirely of talk or “talk story” as a means of working through problems. Arno (1993) described the process of talanoa and how joking or teasing is often used to indicate wrongdoing. While direct confrontation would not be acceptable, especially amongst individuals who are in different hierarchical roles, to joke with one another about an incident is acceptable. Because members know that this type of joking indicates wrongdoing, they are then obligated to ask for forgiveness, sometimes using the aforementioned isoro ritual. Arno (1993) characterized the extent to which talk and discussion govern the conflict resolution process in Fiji. “In other words, the process is dispersed, fragmented, and distributed in time, space, and personnel. There is no specific forum where one can go to hear the case of the stolen watermelons, the rape of the crab hunter, or Tui’s disturbance of the village peace being presented, debated, and resolved. Instead, virtually every social occasion involves disconnected parts of one or more conflict cases at various stages of their management.” In this excerpt, it is clear the important role that conversation and verbal discussion takes when sorting out conflicts in a Fijian context. Typically, a lot of discussion occurs in daily yaqona drinking circles, almost exclusively attended by men. While there was some mention of women’s discussions of conflict during their household duties, most of what was sorted through in discussion happened during yaqona circle talk. Arno (1993) also noted that the formal or informal discussion of community problems was always introduced from the
top down hierarchy. While those living lower in the hierarchical space, children, for example, discussed conflicts in much the same way, they were never brought about for public or community debate or *talanoa* until an elder decided to address it.

*Holism*

The second emergent theme that arose from the separate codes was that of holism. This theme consisted of eight separate codes: life force energy, gods or spirits, personal responsibility, conflict manifested as physical illness, relationship to land, family/community handling of conflict, avoidance of conflict, and hierarchy/roles. A complex connection is made between living human beings, spirits, ancestors, land as well as one within the individual between mind, spirit and physical body. When these connections are believed and understood, certain actions follow like an avoidance of direct conflict, personal responsibility for one’s behavior in the group, a group management or handling of conflict and adherence to roles and hierarchies in relation to others.

*Life force energy.* This code indicated that a particular section affirmed the existence of an internal life force energy that is shared by all beings. This belief not only contributed to the desire for reparation and healing between individuals, but it allowed those in these communities to see a connection between all beings and focus more readily on communion rather than competition. The life force energy references found in the HRAF material were closely aligned with the idea of “tangled cords” discussed under the protocol theme. These cords between people, connecting individuals in various relationships, needed to be taken care of and made sure they did not become enmeshed and “jammed up.” It is in this “jam” that conflict and hurt occurs (Ito, 1947).

Ito (1999) impressed that there was a belief in karma. If an offender refused to admit wrongdoing or a victim refused to accept an offender’s apology, then the energy that surrounded
these stubborn acts and refusals would eventually come back around to them. It was believed that he/she would get sick or hurt by another unless acceptance was achieved.

*Gods and/or spirits.* In both Hawaiian and Fijian conflict resolution, there is invocation and respect for ancestors and gods. Not only are living people connected to one another, but families and communities are connected to those who have come before them (spirits of ancestors) as well as those who created them (gods). Because all are involved in solving conflicts, spirits and gods have a role.

Handy (1892) and Howard (1934) both referred to the idea that conflict was either avoided or resolved so as not to offend ancestors or gods. Communities and families paid reverence to those who came before and in order to maintain harmony with all of them, there was a commitment to keeping peace. Howard (1934) stated “overt conflict was said to upset the ancestors and the gods and this put the entire community and island at risk for disaster” (p. 17).

The respect and fear of gods and ancestors certainly motivated communities to seek peaceful solutions. When the ritual of *hoʻoponopono* was described, Ito (1999) outlined the step called *pule wehe* which means opening prayer. In this initial prayer, gods and ancestors are asked to guide the process and to help create openness and sincerity between those involved. Sometimes, *hoʻoponopono* was used in order to make right and untangle difficulties between ancestors and living beings. It was not necessarily only used to help those in the living world.

Handy (1892) described just one of these instances. He alluded to a *kane o ka po* child, or one that is born half human and half *aumakua*. Aumakua are part of Hawaiian mythology—family ancestors often appearing as animals or representatives in the natural world. When a child is born half *aumakua*, it was believed to have more problems and difficulties than a full human child. Because of these difficulties, often *hoʻoponopono* was used to make things right and relieve the child from his/her troubles. It was believed that most issues having to do with *aumakua* were more challenging than others. The wants and demands of *aumakua* could be
tricky and inconsistent, and one had to get it just right to appease them. They were often called upon and included in the peacemaking ritual.

Hocart (1929) discussed one of the roles of ancestors in the Fiji ritual of *i soro*. During this ritual, a whale’s tooth, a crop, on occasionally a woman was offered to the victim’s family in order to ask for forgiveness. This was requested, in part, so as not to offend any gods or ancestors and to have them view the individual or family as one who acted with integrity and positive cultural values.

*Personal responsibility.* So much of what is ritualized in both peacemaking practices in Hawai‘i and Fiji has to do with the value and tradition of taking responsibility for one’s actions. Because there is such a deep and personal connection to the group and to many living and non-living beings, the energy one brings to a space or to these connections is critical. By expressing humility and personal responsibility for wrongdoing, one is allowing others to accept their wrongdoing and move on.

In the third stage of *hoʻoponopono*, as described by Ito (1999), *mihi* or forgiveness is asked for and accepted. Both the offender and victim ask for forgiveness from one another—taking personal responsibility for their actions. Once this is done, each party must forgive him or herself in order to be completely cleared of the transgression. For both *hoʻoponopono* and *i soro*, personal responsibility comes in the act of asking for forgiveness. By doing this, one party or family has chosen to be vulnerable and admit his/her role in a conflict. This vulnerability has created space for the other party to also be vulnerable and forgive and accept the apology. Arno (1993) highlighted forgiveness as a critical step in the *i soro* process and one that allows everyone to own their part in any conflict.

*Manifesting physical illness.* In both Hawai‘i and Fiji the manifestation of physical illness as a result of conflict or unrest between family members is a commonly held belief. If there is negative energy between people, one or both parties are believed to show physical symptoms of
this energy. This belief is tied to one’s holistic view of oneself. Mind, body, and spirit are connected, so if something is not right in mind or spirit, the body will react.

Ito (1999) discussed how Hawaiians believe in many causes of disease. She stated, “Nohi means that until the hihia is cleared away, a medical remedy to a disease will not cure it. Hawaiians believe in the social and moral causes of disease as well as physical. Children are the connections between generations, so it is believed that they are the primary points were discord in a family manifests itself.” Because of this belief, if something negative happens to a child, then the family would know that really something is going on between generations. There is discord between grandparents and parents or even between family members and ancestors. The physical symptoms are a result of spiritual distress. The author went on to describe how hoʻoponopono was often done before any medical treatment was sought. All of the entangled cords and energy were made right so that if the person did need medical treatment, he/she would be in the best state to receive it.

Handy (1892) detailed the different types of sickness as viewed by Hawaiians. Sickness was believed to be entirely a family matter- from cause to cure. Maʻikino was natural sickness, or that affecting the body. There was also sickness related to the displeasure of an aumakua hoʻopaiʻipaʻi aumakua, or sickness related to a disgruntled relative ʻohumu, or caused as a result of a spoken curse maʻanaiʻia. These were all legitimate and were not a source of difficulty or anxiety for the medical kahuna. Before anything was done, hoʻoponopono was performed, a spiritual cleansing, forgiveness of everyone in the family, a confession of sins. Hoʻomalu or silent reverence time was critical. Family focused on the ill member getting well.

Howard (1934) recounted a similar description of physical illness in relation to spiritual or mental illness in the Hawaiian community. Hawaiians understood physical bodies as divided into male and female parts, in more than the traditional way- in ailments, in the sides of the body (L being female, R being male). Moreover, illnesses were identified by older participants as
belonging to a few specific categories, a) white man or visitor illnesses (*maʻi haole/ ma ʻi malihini*) and b) Native illnesses (*ma ʻi kamaʻaina*). Native illnesses had two further categories; i) supernatural causes (*ma ʻi aumakua*) and ii) physical causes (*ma ʻi kino*), also noted by Handy (1892). *Hoʻoponopono* was often used to solve or prepare an individual for treatment of any of these ailments.

Similarly, in Fiji, Arno (1993) told of the Fijian conviction that misfortune, illness, disease, and death were all thought to be a result of misdeeds. These poor choices did not need to be performed by the individuals; family members who had chosen to act out of line could negatively affect not only themselves but also all of their kin. The ritual of *i soro* was used to clear these misdeeds and set things right again.

*Relationship to land.* Within HRAF, several references were made to the deep connection Hawaiian people have to their land. Notably, one of the critical periods in Hawaiian history, Linnekin (1950) stated that it was a close second to the Queen’s overthrow, is the Great *Mahele* or land division. During this time, land was divided and assigned as “owned” to one individual or another. This system was instigated and organized by colonizers and resulted in a huge loss of land and displacement of many Hawaiian people. Linnekin (1950) described how land was divided, at this time, not based on blood relatives, but based on *pono i* relationships. People could distribute land or leave land in a will to someone who was unrelated to them. This seemed foreign to colonists and was eventually changed. At one point, one of the Westerners involved in the great *Mahele* commented, “My greatest trial everywhere is the extreme indefiniteness of boundaries, and the consequent warm intentions between opposite claimants.”

Westerners assumed Hawaiian people had an understanding and desire for land ownership, even though this was far from accurate. Their relationship to the land and misunderstanding that something they did not create themselves could be owned by anyone caused a great deal of misunderstanding and manipulation between the Hawaiian community.
and the foreigners. These data and description of the confusion and hurt that surrounded the Great *Mahele* was emphasized in the anthropological research gathered at that time.

*Family/community handling of conflict.* Once these connections between the life force energy, the land, personal responsibility, physical ailments, and gods and spirits are made, processes which celebrate these connections are established. In both Hawai‘i and Fiji, many conflicts are managed by families and communities. This particular code aligned well with the OCM 627 known as “informal ingroup justice,” which was one of the OCM searched within HRAF. Informal ingroup justice referred to the colloquial ways in which groups or families handled conflict and came to a resolution. Because of the idea of saving face and bringing shame to the family by discussing problems, informal justice and family/community handling of conflict was popular and routine in both Hawai‘i and Fiji. Ellis (1872) described how when murder occurred in Hawai‘i at the time of his research, families were justified in retaliation. In fact, the community could join in retaliation and support the victim’s relatives if they chose to do so. When conflict occurred in the late 1800s, before statehood, it was often taken care of by the community and the local Chief. Chiefs would hold open discussions on their front lawns about specific problems and all involved were welcome to share their perspectives. Handy (1972) discussed how when forgiveness was sought between families or communities and a sacrifice or gift was offered, community leaders- *kahuna* or chiefs- would go with the offender and ensure that the protocol was enacted. These leaders felt responsible and were believed to be responsible for handling these disagreements in the community.

Furthermore, during *ho‘oponopono* sessions, *all* family members were included and believed to play an important role. Ito (1999) stated that even infants were asked to be present. While they could not verbally express anything, their presence was believed to be important to the ritual and the entire family was necessary to solve an issue. Consistent with this idea, Linnekin (1950) pointed out that it was rare for any Hawaiian village or community to call on an
outsider to help resolve any problem. The responsibility was thought to be one of the families and communities involved.

In Fiji, community handling of conflicts is also prevalent. Arno (1993) pointed out that the *talanoa* process is all about the community handling disagreements. Because there are so many connections between and across families and community members, the discussions and joking sessions that are part of *talanoa* result in working through conflicts and helping parties to see both sides. Arno (1993) went on to describe how negative feelings or feelings of shame associated with a conflict are called *madua* and when these arise in a group of individuals or even between two people who are in disagreement, the other party or parties will create space for the shamed individual to leave the conversation, allowing him to save face. Once this person is gone, the remaining group can discuss the conflict without shaming him and help all involved to come to a resolution. In one description, it is emphasized that there are, in fact, no interpersonal conflicts between only two parties; all conflict is affiliated with a group. “The elders of either kin unit may also intervene directly and initiate an *i soro* from one group to the other, taking the matter out of the hands of the individuals who started it. This kind of action is a clear expression of the accepted idea that a person’s actions are attributable to his group, and that therefore there are no strictly interpersonal conflicts.” Community and church leaders are almost always on the front lines of conflict resolution, only after these members are exhausted are outsiders asked to intervene and assist.

Avoidance of conflict. In order to create safe spaces for connections between people to be made, conflict needs to be prevented. By establishing rituals, communication styles, peacemaking practices and roles in the community, conflict can often be prevented before it begins. As was stated previously by Howard (1934), avoiding conflict was seen as having more benefits than drawbacks. Not only did conflict create rifts between people and their ancestors or gods, but it also divided communities and families. Because this division went against the
cultural values of *ohana* and *aloha*, it was to be avoided. If there was disagreement between two parties, other members of the community would be pressured to choose sides, and this was not ideal for anyone. In 1934, division of the community and families could actually mean a threat to survival. Howard (1934) went on to describe how, within the household, parents had ultimate decision making power and control over children. There was no negotiation. In fact, he depicted the Hawaiian language as a type of “code” in which there was much hidden meaning behind simply what was verbally stated or translatable. Knowing this “code” allowed families and communities to communicate indirectly and avoid conflict before it arose. The practice and value of emotional intelligence allowed for the avoidance of competition.

The value of conflict avoidance dates back to even earlier times, as shown by Kamakau, Barrere, Pukui, and Faher (1968). He chronicled the various places on the islands where one could take refuge during a fight or when one was in danger. These places were called *puʻuhonua* and were respected by everyone. Even if one was under the threat of death, he/she could be spared. These spaces represent the importance of neutrality and pacifism in Hawaiian culture. Another unique way in which conflict was avoided was described by Ito (1999). Several Hawaiian families which she interviewed talked about cutting themselves off (*oki*) from Hawaiian gods and spiritual beliefs, in order to adhere totally to Christian beliefs. They reported this as a way to avoid conflict. Because there were so many Hawaiian spirits and many rules to follow in Hawaiian spirituality so as to not offend or invoke a curse, it was simpler to just denounce this belief than to live life wondering if he/she offended a particular god and their family was in danger. Because Hawaiian belief extended beyond the individual who did wrong, and included family and kin in retribution, several people stated they had to separate themselves from this type of potential unrest.

Fijian communities also value conflict prevention. Arno (1993) expressed how conflict was sometimes just forgotten or ignored altogether, in order to preserve the group harmony. He
told a story of a man who had a cow escape his field and ruin another man’s crop. Everyone knew that the first man did not secure his cow well enough and he was to blame. There was talk in the community about the incident. However, a few weeks later when both men attended a wedding ceremony, all was forgotten or ignored and they both had conversations and shared in festivities with the guests. Arno (1993) described how, depending on the severity of the conflict and who was involved, it was not uncommon for differing parties to move on as if nothing had occurred. Thompson (1940) reiterated what others had said about the laughing, joking nature of a lot of the talanoa practice. This indirect way of speaking about a conflict allows all involved to maintain calm and allows the transgressor to save face.

*Hierarchy and roles.* Another way in which conflict was avoided was by teaching and living everyday life in a particular hierarchy where everyone has their role. Each role has certain obligations and duties and if or when one decided to step outside of this assigned role, conflict was more likely to occur. When roles and hierarchy were maintained, there were relatively few clashes between people. Howard (1934) explained this when he discussed the role of parents and children in the household. Parents were in charge and did not negotiate disagreements with children. Their discipline was quick and sometimes harsh. As a result, children did not learn how to negotiate themselves, but did learn their roles quite well. As they got older, they took on new, more senior roles in the family and community and managed those below them in similar non-negotiable ways.

Occasionally, instead of using a conflict resolution practice like ho'oponopono, those in charge would simply “solve” an issue by telling each party what they should do. This decision could be handed down by a parent or a community level Chief or, depending on the transgression, the King. While this process looked quite separate from everyone having a voice in the discussion, it did serve to extinguish any disagreement that may escalate (Howard, 1934).
Linnekin (1985) depicted the *kapu* laws that existed in Hawaiian communities. These were non-negotiable rules by which everyone had to live. Kings, Queens and their families were especially revered and a story was relayed about how those in one of the highest ranks in society required those of a lower rank to prostrate with their faces to the ground when in their presence. The Chief of Hawaii Island at the time sent his son to Maui to stop a battle. Knowing the soldiers had to prostrate to him, fighting would cease. While this was a literal example of how *kapu* laws could create peace, it can also be seen as a metaphor for how other types of conflict could be stopped or avoided when everyone obeyed these regulations.

In Fiji, the hierarchy of a family and village also prevent many disagreements. When community and family leaders decide who is to blame for an incident, that person is obligated to apologize and make an offering as is laid out in the *i soro* process. Because hierarchy is such an integral part of life, these obligations and rules are very frequently followed, preventing escalation of problems (Arno, 1993). Those of a higher rank in society can make moves to reconcile with other families or communities, if they perceive wrongdoing has occurred. Younger individuals or those with lower status do not have this luxury. If they want to sort out a problem, they are permitted to discuss it amongst themselves, but bringing it to someone of higher status to solve or assist is frowned upon. Through the *talanoa* talking rituals, it is common for any issue to become one that is known to the community. If a disagreement is serious enough and affects enough people, eventually those of higher rank will hear of it and make a move to solve it (Hocart, 1929).

*Outside Influence*

*Western influence.* In both Hawai‘i and Fiji, as time went on, Western influence played a part in their cultures and societies. As more Westerners had contact with the islands and, eventually, as Hawaii became part of the United States, the cultural practices and beliefs of the Western world made their way to these isolated archipelagos. Notably, formal “conflict
resolution” procedures were cited as being brought by Western or haole influence to both Hawai’i and Fiji. Normally, as has been previously explored, the family and community had many ways of preventing conflicts from erupting as well as solving them once they did transpire. With the influence of the West, formal policing, enforcing, and entrance into the legal arena and court system began.

Linnekin (1985) told a story of an older “hippie lady” who lived in a mostly Hawaiian community and often called the authorities for things that Hawaiians believed were unnecessary. She phoned police about a photography business that had opened in a family’s basement. In another instance, she called authorities about firecrackers exploding in a field nearby. The intrusion of an outsider (police) into the community and reprimanding a family was viewed as something shameful and frivolous. In fact, the author herself had a camera stolen from her bag on a particular day when she was in the community and suspected a teenage boy had done it. She approached the boy’s relatives and asked about the missing camera. They thanked her for coming to them and not calling police because of the shame it would bring to the family and also shared that his grandmother was ailing and they did not want her to know about the incident. The camera was returned the following day. In this description of a simple incident, a lot is shared. For outsiders to know about conflict within a family or community was not something “normal” for the Hawaiian community. It was preferable for those in the family and community to handle things that came up. The formality and hassle of the legal system getting involved was only something that increasingly occurred as more and more continental Americans and other haoles settled in Hawai’i’s neighborhoods.

Furthermore, during the Great Mahele or land division, Western influence was highlighted again. Because many local Hawaiian families documented their land “ownership” in stories of family relations or divided up land in unique ways that were not “standardized” as many Western landowners might divide land, their rights to certain land was relinquished.
Because the books contained far more qualitative information about who belonged on the land and much less quantitative information regarding specific plots and square footage, decisions about who owned what were made not by Hawaiian families themselves, but by outsiders who desired mathematical equality and ownership to areas of Hawaiian land (Linnekin, 1985). Furthering this point, one of the requirements made of Hawaiians was to come forth and “claim” land that was yours. The idea of land ownership was not the only obstacle in this instance. Many Hawaiians believed that their tenant-landlord situation would not change after the Great Mahele, regardless of who was stated to have “owned” the land, it would be shared. Moreover, sometimes large families would appoint a spokesperson to go forward and claim the land for all of them, but as a single written name, this person was only awarded enough land for one person and the rest of the family was left out. A portion of the HRAF findings discussed Western influence in the context of land holdings and the Great Mahele, since this was such a critical time in Hawaiian history. The cultural differences are depicted in this great manipulation or, at best, misunderstanding of land ownership. Hawaiians believed land not only could not be “owned” by human beings, but if it was formally divided, it could still be shared, worked and cared for by all. The division that was being pushed on them by Western influences did not appear, at the time, to be stringent or permanent because, in their culture, all would still be shared. Of course, this was not the end result, but it provides a good example of the different cultural assumptions. Hawaiians value of connection is juxtaposed to the Western value of individual achievement over all.

The HRAF findings on Fiji also briefly mentioned Western influence when it came to conflict resolution. Similar to Hawaii, the Western notion of formal justice or outsiders having authority on resolving conflicts was foreign to Fijians. Only after having Western contact and Western institutions established did the idea of liability or negotiated agreements come about.
(Thompson, 1940). Even with Western influence, more often than not, all community level options were exhausted before turning to anyone outside to help resolve an issue.

**Christian influence.** The Christian religious influence in the Hawaiian peace practice of *hoʻoponopono* was emphasized in the HRAF findings. Often there was evidence of a blend of Hawaiian practice and Christian practice including Bible readings, Christian prayer and asking the Christian God or Jesus for forgiveness and guidance (Ito, 1999). In several instances people were asked to sever or *oki* their connection to Hawaiian practice altogether and adopt a Christian practice entirely. While many people did this, it was mentioned that the majority still worried about Hawaiian spirits and whether they were in line with Hawaiian traditions, even if they formally revoked their beliefs outwardly (Linnekin, 1985). Several church groups would use elements of *hoʻoponopono* practice when asking church members to forgive or repent for sins. Particularly the sections of prayer and silence and forgiveness of oneself and others (Ito, 1999).

In some instances, Christian influence and Western influence are intertwined. The cultural values of singularity and individualism, even in religion (one single God) were impressed upon Hawaiian people who had very different views of relationship preservation and a variety of deities.

**Violence and Punishment**

The three emergent themes Protocol, Holism, and Outside Influence did not incorporate the final code of violence and punishment. While these ideas did appear in 10% of the articles reviewed, references tended to be made about old rituals in pre contact or very early contact Hawai‘i and Fiji. This is not to dismiss their importance, since those early times were times when perhaps the cultural beliefs were stronger or more prevalent than they are today. Needless to say, this negative peace concept was not pervasive enough to be awarded its own theme.
Summary of Study II

The key findings from the review of ethnographies in HRAF show that much of the data gathered fit under the three identified emergent themes: protocol, holism, and outside influences. A much smaller percentage of the paragraphs fit under the outlying topic of violence and punishment. These emergent codes describe not only what goes on during a peacemaking ritual (protocol) but the ideas and concepts of peace surrounding these rituals (holism). The philosophy of holism which boasts the interconnection and intimacy of separate parts, unable to exist independently from the whole, encapsulates both Hawaiian and Fijian ideas of peace and conflict resolution. Each of the highlighted subtopics in this Results section is a part that cannot be separated from the whole. Life force energy connects us all to a source and allows all human beings a similar spirit. Gods and spirits relate to this energy and organize how cultures and communities might understand it. Families and communities handling conflict depicted the connection that people feel with one another. Not only do they know the conflicting parties best, but they do not want to burden others with a problem that they see as belonging to them. Personal responsibility involved an individual owning up to his or her actions in an act of humility and vulnerability, allowing the other party the space to do the same. When all take part, no one is to blame. Personal responsibility is actually an invitation to shared responsibility. Hierarchy and roles gives order to community life. Because of the holistic perspective, each person, and their position in society, serves to help or support the other societal positions. The connection between individual roles allows a community or family to be sustainable. Avoidance of conflict speaks directly to the notion of holism and connection. By softening words, making jokes, and asking permission, interpersonal relations will likely run more smoothly. If connection between people is paramount, then threats to that connection- conflict- are to be avoided. Finally, both relationship to land and manifestation of physical illness depict the larger connection outside of oneself. Viewing land as a part of one’s self concept means it cannot be bought, sold, or divided.
The references to the Great *Mahele* discussed this. And having a conflict and believing it can be manifested physically, shows the trust placed in a deeper connection. Mental, spiritual, and physical parts of oneself are not compartmentalized.

The category of *Outside Influences* was also a predominant theme. As was described by the data, this primarily referred to both Western and Christian influences in conflict resolution and peacemaking in a Hawaiian or Fijian context. Mostly, these paragraphs described instances where the connection between spirit, people, or land was broken. Hawaiians were asked to *oki* themselves from their traditional spiritual beliefs and focus on a single God. Communities were divided over ways of resolving conflict—staying within the family or calling on the formal legal system. These questions and choices created tension between *haoles* and Hawaiians, according to several sources (Howard, 1934; Ito, 1999). Finally, the Great *Mahele* was discussed in which many Hawaiian families were asked to leave their land and confused about the fact that they could no longer share resources as they once did. In each of these cases, the outside influences were a source of disconnection and separation. While it was a predominant theme in the database, it did not contribute to peace in either the Hawaiian or Fijian communities, rather it often presented conflict or hurt.

Only a small percentage of the data found (10%) related peace to violence and war. The concept of peace and peacemaking had its own breadth and depth, including many critical steps in the protocol and many other community understandings about when to use such peacemaking practices. The similarities between both Hawaiian and Fijian practices were noted. Both contexts align certain parts of their protocols as well as their holistic views of the process. Moreover, the themes of holism and protocol also show the importance of practice when it comes to peace. Instead of peace being an abstract concept or theory, it is believed to be a *practice* for those in Hawaiian and Fijian cultures. The importance of *connection* and *practice* in the idea of peace turned out to be a critical point in many of the informant interviews.
After these archival data were gathered and analyzed, it was crucial to follow these results up with informant interviews. Much of the HRAF research was conducted years ago. While it identified important themes and ideas and was supported by more current literature, to gain personal, real-life perspectives from cultural informants only enriched these findings and created a fuller picture of Pacific ideas of peace. Both Hawaiian and Fijian informants were contacted and interviewed regarding their ideas on peace and peacemaking.

**Study III: Cultural Informant Interview Results**

Study III included seven participants who were interviewed over a course of five months. Interviews were rich with personal stories, family traditions and deep cultural discussion. In this section, concept maps identifying common responses are displayed and overall themes discussed. At the start of an interview, participants were asked their demographic information (See Appendix A for demographic questions), these results are displayed in Table 4.3. More specific, individual interview data and individual themes are provided in Appendix D.

**Table 4.3 Cultural Informant Demographics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Politics</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>2nd Lang</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Hwn, Chin</td>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Hwn Chin</td>
<td>Dem</td>
<td>LDS</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Hwn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Hwn Chin</td>
<td>Dem</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Fijian</td>
<td>Rep</td>
<td>LDS</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Fijian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Fijian</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Fijian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Hwn, Chin, Cauc</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Hwn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All but one cultural informant was male, and there was an average age of 52. A range of political ideologies were found, but participants’ religion tended to be Christian, with two respondents identifying as members of the Latter Day Saints.

**Hawaiian Participant Interview Concept Maps**

After completing the interviews and conducting individual analysis, themes between subjects were identified and appear in the following concept maps. Because interviews were semi-structured, not all questions were asked to all participants, these are noted by N size. Furthermore, these interviews were decidedly different than those conducted and analyzed for Study I. These respondents gave much thicker descriptions, often told elaborate stories, and tied nearly all of the ideas together, making individual analysis of questions difficult at times. What follows are the concept maps for five questions that appeared across a majority of the Hawaiian cultural informant interviews.

In response to the question, “How do you define peace?”, three out of five interviewees included the idea of *balancing opposing forces* in their responses. While each used slightly different language, this process of balance was emphasized. Four out of five respondents mentioned that *a practice or process* was needed to define peace. The last concept that had consensus was that of peace *occurring in relationship*. Some respondents defined this relationship as individual to individual, others discussed a relationship between an individual and his or her context, and another described it specifically as relationship between an individual and his or her culture. Four out of five respondents highlighted this relationship component, as displayed in Figure 4.10.

Other answers were given by each individual participant. C2 mentioned the absence of negative emotions and presence of positive emotions, citing a personal definition. C3 discussed peace needing to be preceded by truth as well as it being an art form. C6 stated there needed
to be an acceptance of conflict as part of understanding peace, while C7 stated there needed to be an acceptance of confusion for the same reason.

In response to the question, “Does the experience of peace in your own culture (Hawaiian) differ from that of Western or American culture? If so, how?”, three out of five interviewees included the idea of historical trauma in their responses. This experience had framed the Hawaiian view of peace and conflict resolution. The hurt that occurred affected relationships between each other, between the land, and with outsiders. Four out of five respondents mentioned a connection to spirit was needed to describe the Hawaiian experience of peace. The last concept that had consensus was that of peace being a reflection of Hawaiian cultural values. While these values were listed differently, all had to do with connection. Some respondents defined this connection as ohana, others defined this connection as one of lokahi. Four out of five respondents mentioned the cultural value of ancestors as critical, as seen in Figure 4.11.

Other answers were given by each individual participant. C1 mentioned the value of non-expansionism as important to peace. C2 discussed both a knowledge and respect for roles in the community as well as a holistic view of health. C3 talked about the importance of practice over preaching as well as the value of storytelling in the concept of Hawaiian peace. C6 mentioned distinct cultural differences between the DIE (Domination, Individualism, and Exclusion) and OLA (ʻolu ʻolu, lokahi, and aloha) cultures and C7 highlighted the connections created by the use of Hawaiian language, and how that shaped the idea of peace uniquely for Hawaiians.

In response to the question, “Do you think human beings are peaceful by nature?”, two out of three interviewees responded with yes. However, both qualified their answers. C1 stated that first, basic needs would be to be met in order for human beings to act peacefully. C2 answered yes, but said that many times, during life, humans learn to behave otherwise,
although we are born peaceful. Finally, respondent C6 answered that no, human beings were not naturally peaceful and we were programmed to survive, no matter the cost. This question was only asked to three out of five respondents due to time restraints. Answers appear in Figure 4.12.

In response to the question, “Tell me about ho‘oponopono. How do you practice?”, four out of five interviewees included the idea of formal and informal practice in their responses. They stated they knew of the formal practice protocol, but all considered their personal practice to be “informal.” Five out of five respondents mentioned a connection to spirit was needed to practice ho‘oponopono. Three out of five interviewees mentioned a Western and/or Christian influence on the practice of ho‘oponopono and that it had affected their view or understanding of it. Finally, two out of five participants noted the need for an internal practice first before facilitating ho‘oponopono with others.

Other answers were given by each individual participant. C1 mentioned a need for a future orientation when practicing. C2 discussed the importance of the family handling the conflict and keeping it private. C3 talked extensively about the marriage between ho‘oponopono and the practice of an ‘aloha response. C6 mentioned how conversation and dialogue were critical components for his practice. C7 highlighted the need for a trusted leader and the steps of forgiveness and prayer as important requirements in the process. These responses are mapped out in Figure 4.13.

In response to the question, “What is your role in the peace process?”, three out of three respondents said that they saw their role as one of practice and example. Two out of three respondents stated that they viewed their role as one of influencing conversation. While C3 spoke of this importance as part of his organization, solving organizational issues, C6 mentioned it in relation to the conversations he fosters on his public radio show.
Other answers were given by each individual participant. C3 mentioned his role as one of a kahu and healer for his organization. He also believed that he provided pause for people, giving them an opportunity to make new decisions. He felt his role in the peace process was a calling. C6 prided himself on being able to bring issues to the public arena that benefited the Hawaiian community. Answers are depicted in the concept map shown in Figure 4.14.
How do you define peace?

- Balancing of Opposing Forces (3)
- In Relationship (4)
- A Practice or Process (4)
- Acceptance of conflict
- Acceptance of confusion
- Absence of Neg; Pres of Pos Emotions
- Truth
- Art form

Figure 4.10: Concept Map Hawaiian Culture: Define Peace
How does the experience of peace in your own culture (Hawaiian) differ from that of Western or American culture?

Figure 4.11: Concept Map Hawaiian Culture: Hawaiian Differences
Do you think human beings are peaceful by nature?

- No (1)
- Yes (2)

When basic needs met

At birth, but learn otherwise

Figure 4.12: Concept Map Hawaiian Culture: Humans Peaceful
Tell me about hoʻoponopono. How do you practice?

- Western and/or Christian Influence (3)
- Internal Practice First (2)
- Connection to Spirit (5)
- Formal and Informal Practice (4)
- Conversation/dialogue
- Family handling conflict
- Trusted leader
- Prayer
- Forgiveness
- Future orientation
- Aloha response

Figure 4.13: Concept Map Hawaiian Culture: Hoʻoponopono
What is your role in the peace process?

Practice and Example (3)

Influencing Conversation (2)

Publicizing Hawaiian issues

Providing pause

A calling

kahu

Figure 4.14: Concept Map Hawaiian Culture: Role in Peace Process
Hawaiian Concept of Peace

In order to combine and compare both the Hawai‘i and Fiji participant interviews, key ideas from the completed concept maps were extracted. For each question asked, there were commonalities across interviews, showing that the data were saturated. Table 4.4 depicts the major findings across all interviews for each of the focus areas: (1) Definition of Peace; (2) Experience of Peace by Hawaiians; (3) Ho‘oponopono; (4) Role in the Peace Process.

Table 4.4: Hawaiian Peace Interview Major Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOCUSED AREA</th>
<th>COMMON THEMES IDENTIFIED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definition of Peace</td>
<td>• Peace as a balance of opposing forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Peace as a practice or process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience of Peace by Hawaiians</td>
<td>• Framed in historical trauma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cultural value of connection/collective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Spirituality and Ancestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Western Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho‘oponopono</td>
<td>• Formal and Informal practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Connection to Spirit and Ancestors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conversation/Dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Western Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role in Peace Process</td>
<td>• Practice and lead by example</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given these four main categories and the coinciding responses, broader themes were identified. Found within all categories, each of the Hawaiian interviews placed an emphasis on the following: (1) connection to a higher power, energy source or spirit; (2) connection to others; and (3) active practice. These themes are displayed in Figure 4.15 below.
Connection to spirit/source. This connection was believed to be included in both the Hawaiian experience of peace as well as the description of what was needed in the hoʻoponopono process. In each of the Hawaiian participant interviews, subjects relayed their strong beliefs about the importance of spirit and spiritual connection to the process of peace.

Cultural Informant 1 commented, “In the practice of hoʻoponopono, it starts with us. And it goes back to an older time when one needs to be in alignment with your deity, your spiritual identity, knowing who you are, which then begins to shift the way you see others. And really begins to move or remove the victim status which most of us carry. So, for me, hoʻoponopono defined that way is being in the right place at the right time for your good as well as the good of others, which may not be where you want to be.” For C1, this trust in and connection to spirit allowed him to be in the right place at the right time for all things in his life. By holding the belief that a higher power is ultimately guiding you in the right direction, even “negative” events are viewed as pono. This connection prepared an individual to see the pono choice and to accept a situation without anger or resentment.

C3 emphasized the similarities across cultures in connecting to spirit source, “In Japanese they know it as ki. In Chinese they know it as qi. In Hawaiian we know it as ha. Our source, our energy. Qi gong, ki ai, ha. All the same thing. So it begins always with ‘ha.’” Once there was recognition and understanding of the energy source, then connection was paramount and knowledge could be shared. This was critical to the peace process.
C6 echoed this sentiment. He discussed how the connection to a higher power was needed for a successful hoʻoponopono session. “In the hoʻoponopono process you begin by calling upon the akua, ke akua, or na akua. Single god or multiple gods, you call upon the lesser gods and the angels, you call upon all the spirits and then you call upon your ancestors and then the ancestors come into the room and they’re all lining up around the room, right? Why you calling upon everybody to come join? It’s not their pilikia! You’re calling them because they are witnessing to the fact that hey, braddah, you gotta tell the truth, cause you got all of these ancestors who know whether or not you’re lying. So, you cannot come in and try to deceive in this hoʻoponopono process and, on top of that, the kahu, who is leading the process, he’ll look at you and he going to understand, you’re throwing us a bunch of bull. So, you come in and you wanna participate wholeheartedly cause your ancestors can give you one spear in your back at any time! (laughs)” C6 points out that one aspect of the importance of ancestral participation is the commitment of all involved in the hoʻoponopono process. The fear and shame involved in lying or misrepresenting in front of gods and ancestors is an added level of pressure, not only to tell the truth, but to complete the forgiveness process.

Not only were Gods and ancestors called to witness the hoʻoponopono session, but sometimes they were active participants. C2 described her experience with a session that happened as a result of family members disrespecting the presence of spirits. Food and drink was shared among all, including the spirits that had been disrupting them in the home. “He said everybody drink. Anybody else in the rooms? No, everybody was present. So we all drank and then he said, ok, now we have Hawaiian food we brought. So, when we ate it there was also a setting for the spirits. For them to partake of food, too.”

Again like the rest of the Hawaiian informants, C7 believed that a connection to a higher power, energy, god or gods was imperative for a sense of peace in the Hawaiian community. This spiritual relationship has been a value passed down through generations. “One of our ‘olelo
noʻeau, our cultural sayings, affirms a very basic understanding of our culture and that’s simply the statement (speaks Hawaiian). *Na mea* means the many many things traditional, *ma mao*, that we have always been accustomed to and one of the things that we always accustomed to is our sense of spirituality. In Hawaiian religion, for example, for every created thing in nature, including human beings, there was also a Creator who was responsible for that thing."

Because this connection to spirit was threaded throughout all of the informant interviews, it was identified as a key theme to the data gathered. Not only was connection to spirit and God needed for the practice of peace- in this case using *hoʻoponopono*, but it was critical for understanding how Hawaiians view peace as a concept. Because of this deep spiritual connection, peace is possible and peace is the preferred condition. The connection to spirit allows for harmony and peace to be something very important to the Hawaiian community. After the connection to a higher power was established and acknowledged, the establishment of connection to others was highlighted.

*Connection to others.* This collectivist worldview showed up in responses on the definition of peace (peace being defined *in* relationship), the Hawaiian experience of peace (cultural values of *aloha*, *lokahi*, ʻ*oluʻolu* and ʻ*ohana*), what was needed for *hoʻoponopono* (conversation and dialogue between participants, connection to ancestors for accountability). Like the theme of connection to spirit, each participant gave examples of how connection to others fit into the Hawaiian concept of peace and the practice of *hoʻoponopono*.

C1 stated, “It’s relationships. So, of course this perspective comes from one that is grounded in connectivity. If you don’t believe that, none of this makes sense. So that’s the condition under which my responses come. It’s acknowledging that we’re all connected, whether we’re consciously aware of that connection or not.” His point continued as he discussed how the island mind was different than the continental mind, primarily for this reason. The connectivity of all things meant that many concepts do not have singular definitions or answers. All things are
entwined, together, and on a spectrum. “They’re entwined, they’re together. Everything’s a
spectrum, now whether it’s a line or a circle, that’s where I think the island mind works differently
from the continental mind. It’s more circular, there iterations of one another, spectrums rather
than definitive singularities.” This difference in cultural values- connectivity versus singularity-
contributed to the separate ideas of peace between Hawaiians and those from the continental
U.S., according to him.

In C2’s interview, she felt that relationships between individuals were exactly what
created peace. When those relationships were understood by all and roles were outlined,
conflict was much more preventable. She described a Hawaiian village that existed before
Western contact, “So for everything-, every dwelling-, there’s a reason and everybody respects
that reason...There’s no conflict because everybody knows their roles and respects what they
should be doing. That village will live in peace.” This relationship and understanding between
people creates a context in which peace can flourish. She viewed this as important to the
Hawaiian concept of peace.

Another informant, C3, discussed how knowledge sharing between generations allowed
for peace. Because storytelling was so ingrained in Hawaiian culture, as well as reverence for
elders, the practice of hoʻoponopono and the Hawaiian values which supported peaceful
communities were passed down in extended families. This connection to other generations
contributed to peacefulness in Hawaii. He continued by emphasizing the key Hawaiian values
that the sage, Auntie Pilahi, relayed to him. These values promoted peace and harmony
amongst Native Hawaiians. “The problem is not Hawaiian, the problem is English. People don’t
know what they’re talking about! (laughs) She said that's not lokahi. Alo-, in the presence of,
kahi. Lo-, connected, kahi. Alokahi, lokahi. Dropped the A. Lokahi doesn’t mean unity, lokahi
means unbroken. We enter this Universe lokahi. But our education, political, economic,
geographic, religious systems teach us we’re all broken and we spend all of our time trying to
hoʻokahi everybody. And what is our method of engagement? Debate! Argument! She said never happen. So, she said you’re going to be a storyteller. But when you tell your stories, you’re gonna tell ‘em the old way. I’m not here to deposit in your cranium. I am here for you to experience this connection.” Her reference to the connection between people as paramount to understanding peace only emphasized the idea that this was a key theme when examining these interview data.

In the interview with C6, he discussed the key components of OLA culture, which is practiced in Hawaii and, according to him, required for peace to be possible. According to C6, the OLA culture is practiced within smaller communities, within families, and within a more traditional Hawaiian context. He contrasts it with DIE culture, or one that is focused on Domination, Individualism and Exclusion. “When you come into communities, usually, countryside, but not only that, even in-, in more metropolitan areas, instead of domination, it’s always ʻolu ʻolu. To work gently with the other side. There’s a softness about it, yeah? There’s an aloha to it, instead of domination. Instead of individualism, it’s lokahi, yeah? You think about the group, the family, the larger community. The way you pick limu as a simple example, you’re thinking of nature as well as the next person who’s gonna pick. You are careful, you only take what is needed. And instead of exclusion, it's always aloha. To include, to welcome, to change the harmony in that relationship. So you have, on the other side, the alternate side, you have ʻolu ʻolu, you have lokahi instead of individualism, and then you have aloha instead of exclusion.” These ideas, also pointed out in the previous interview with C3, are those that are held by many practicing peace in a Hawaiian context. They have a broader view of community and connection to other people, allowing for the prevalence of peaceful relationships.

C6 believed the only way to true peace, was from an OLA perspective. “A person who is successful in his deep culture, that follows OLA, I believe can find peace. A person who is successful in the DIE culture is not gonna find peace cause his constant need for domination, for
exclusion, for individualism is not a peaceful solution. So, he may dominate that system, but he is not at peace. He will try to dominate the peace process and push peace, but he’s still not at peace.” According to C6, and the other informants, a connection to other people, where kindness, group orientation and inclusion are the dominant values allows for peace and conflict prevention.

In the last informant interview, C7 talked about how the idea of connection between people comes out in the Hawaiian language. He stated, “If I would say, and this can be probably understood as being correct too, (speaks Hawaiian) then I’m involving not only you and I, but I’m also involving whoever is involved in your life, as well as whoever is involved in my life so that my family and your family would be considered in the prayer as coming together.” By demonstrating how, with language, Hawaiians communicate a common belief in connection of family members and ancestors, C7 showed how this idea would influence how one might experience peace. When the Hawaiian language was the officially used language before contact, the idea that families, relations, and ancestors would be included in conversations shows how critical these connections are to the culture. This connectedness prevailed many concepts, including the concept of peace.

Each respondent gave examples of how not only being connected to a higher power was critical to peace, but how one’s connection to ancestors, family, and community were also important to forming the Hawaiian peace concept. Interviewees furthered these ideas by discussing how peace was something that was actively practiced, not only discussed.

Active practice. In the informant interviews, Hawaiian respondents believed that the peace is ultimately a practice as opposed to an idea or topic of discussion. By actively practicing peace with oneself and others, it becomes something tangible and real in everyday life. C1 discussed in his interview how his own internal work was paramount to his practice of peace. He needed to align himself first before reaching out to others to try to help situations of conflict. This
personal practice was also part of *ho'oponopono*, according to him. It was the first crucial step in the practice and was something that was ongoing throughout life, if one was in the position of *kahu* or healer.

When asked about her role in the peace process, C2 saw herself as a peacemaker. She stated, “My role is to be an example. Um, and-, anywhere I am, at work, at church, in my other duties that I do, um, I am actually a-, the peacemaker, I feel like, my daughters tell me that, my brothers tell me that. So all-, all I can do is live it by example.” By living her life and making positive peaceful choices, she practices *ho'oponopono*. Again, the idea that personal practice is the way to peace and helping others achieve peace emerged.

Several informants described the differences between a formal and informal practice of *ho’oponopono*. It appeared as though there was a more regular practice involving internal work and everyday situations as well as one in which a formal meeting is conducted with a *haku*. C3 told a powerful story about how his teacher, Auntie Pilahi, explained the key to achieving peace when confronted with several pressing community conflicts. C3 had accompanied his father to a meeting with Auntie Pilahi. Those who called the meeting intended to discuss the issues in Hawaii and how they affected the Hawaiian people. It was an emotionally charged situation. C3 was only a young boy observing in the room, but he described Auntie Pilahi’s advice.

“Boom! Explosion. And the minute they asked the question, I saw almost everyone in the room raise their articles to write with and write on. Because they’re asking the sage for the real question. And she never answered their question. Instead what she shared was a behavior and way to live in the midst of this, and eventually that would lead to a resolution. And I noticed nobody wrote a thing. And then after she was done and kinda calmed the room down, then the next one came. Kalama valley! The eviction! Boom! (pause) She did it again. Overthrow! Did it again. And no one’s writing anything. I’m 13 years old, I have no idea what issues are, I just watching like a colorblind person, this
façade of a dance. What is she doing? She’s shifting the energy in this room. Cause I don’t know the words, I only watch what’s happening. And it’s like, boom! Like a heartbeat. Thump thump. And then the next one, boom! Five hours, I saw this. After five hours she said, pau. We can do this again some other time, we can talk again.”

He mentioned that she shared a “behavior” and “a way to live in the midst of all of this, and eventually that would lead to a resolution.” While those at the meeting were waiting for the answer in the form of an idea, she shared with them how to practice. She greatly emphasized the importance of personal practice over idea exchange. To practice peace, both internally and with others, was paramount to understanding the Hawaiian concept of peace. Informants discussed their own personal practices as well as the teachers they had learned from and observed. While of course ideas were discussed as well, each informant mentioned how peace was something to do rather than discuss.

To gain a full picture of the Pacific peace concept, Fijian informants were also interviewed and their interviews analyzed. The following is a discussion of their interview results, concept mapped and then common themes extracted.

_Fiji Concept Maps_

After the analysis of both Fijian interviews, concept maps of their responses follow. These maps mirror the questions asked of Hawaiian respondents. Commonalities in responses are highlighted and depicted in the maps.

In response to the question, “How do you define peace?”, both Fijian respondents discussed it being an equally internal and external process, with the absence of negative feelings and the presence of positive feelings. C4 believed that a democratic society was most likely to achieve peace, while C5 mentioned that he saw personal responsibility as an important part of his peace definition. These responses are depicted in Figure 4.16.
In response to the question, “How does the experience of peace in your own culture (Fijian) differ from that of Western or American culture?”, both Fijian respondents discussed it being a *traditional culture* in terms of cultural practices and religion. Several of these traditions were in place to create peace and resolve conflict. Also, both respondents pointed out the importance of *relationships and connections* to other people as a reason why peace and conflict resolution was so important.

Individually, C4 believed there were economic disadvantages in Fiji, compared to the U.S., which meant Fijians sometimes did not have the luxury of focusing on peace or peace concepts. C5 mentioned a lack of personal responsibility or dialogue among Americans, in his experience living in the U.S. as an important difference. These ideas are depicted in Figure 4.17.

In response to the question, “Do you believe humans are peaceful by nature?”, C4 responded yes, but this practice of peace is expressed differently by different cultures. C5 was asked the question, but his response was inaudible on the recording. C4’s response is visually depicted in Figure 4.18.

In response to the question, “Tell me about talanoa. How do you practice?”, both Fijian respondents discussed it being *similar to talk story* tradition in Hawai‘i, involving a lighthearted conversation context. Both respondents highlighted that it was more traditionally practiced in rural environments and that there was a *rural/urban distinction* in how the procedure was enacted. *Traditional hierarchical roles* were seen in the process, according to both C4 and C5. Men were leading conversations and only those at the top of the hierarchy had a chance to speak. Both respondents mentioned *talanoa* being paired with the other process *i soro*. This act of repentance involved an offering of forgiveness and the requirement of its acceptance.

Individually, C4 believed that it was important to have accountability for the decisions made during a *talanoa* session. C5 stated that *kava* was required for *talanoa* sessions and
individuals sat in a circle, relaxed, before attending to business. These responses are shown in Figure 4.19.
How do you define peace?

- Absence of Negative Feelings (2)
- Presence of Positive Feelings (2)
- Both Internal and External (2)

Democratic society

Personal Responsibility

Figure 4.16: Concept Map Fijian Culture: Define Peace
How does the experience of peace in your own culture (Fijian) differ from that of Western or American culture?

Figure 4.17: Concept Map Fijian Culture: Fijian Differences

- Lack of dialogue (U.S.)
- Economic disadvantages
- Lack of personal responsibility (U.S.)

- Relationships and Connections (2)
- Cultural and Religious Tradition (2)
Do you think human beings are peaceful by nature?

- Yes (1)

But expressed differently

Figure 4.18: Concept Map Fijian Culture: Humans Peaceful
Tell me about *talanoa*. How do you practice?

- Similar to Hawaiian talk story (2)
- Traditional Hierarchical Roles (2)
- Paired with *i soro* (2)
- Urban/Rural Distinction (2)

Accounts for decisions, relaxed environment, sit in circle, Kava required.

Figure 4.19: Concept Map Fijian Culture: *Talanoa*
Fijian Concept of Peace

In the interviews with Fijian subjects, several themes emerged. For each question asked, there were commonalities across interviews. These commonalities are highlighted in the concept maps, showing that both respondents agreed with certain ideas. Table 4.5 depicts the major findings across all interviews for each of the concept map focus areas: (1) Definition of Peace; (2) Experience of Peace by Fijians; and (3) Talanoa.

Table 4.5 Fijian Peace Interview Major Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOCUSED AREA</th>
<th>COMMON THEMES IDENTIFIED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definition of Peace</td>
<td>• Both internal (individual) and external (in relation to family or community)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience of Peace by Fijians</td>
<td>• Cultural and Religious Traditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cultural value of connection/collective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Monocultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talanoa</td>
<td>• Dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Traditional roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Connection to <em>i soro</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Urban/Rural Distinction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Definition of peace. Fijian respondents identified peace as both internal and external, as well as relating directly to family or community. This response aligned with the Hawaiian idea of connection to others.

Experience of peace. Respondents mentioned that their experience of peace was highly correlated with cultural and religious tradition and roles. Going along with this, one of the reasons their experience of peace differed from those in a different context was their seemingly monocultural environment. Again, the cultural value of connection appears in these responses.

Talanoa. The themes from this section were dialogue, traditional roles, connection to *i soro*, and an urban/rural distinction in the practice.
In addition to the concept map findings, larger themes emerged from these interviews. The overarching themes identified are depicted below in Figure 4.20. Two of these larger themes aligned with those found in the Hawaiian interview data, while one was unique to the Fijian data.

**Figure 4.20 Fijian Interview Themes**

![Diagram of themes: Cultural/Religious Tradition, Connection to Others, Active Practice]

_Cultural/religious tradition_. The one theme gleaned from the Fijian interviews which did not align with the Hawaiian data was that of cultural and religious tradition. Both Fijian informants spoke extensively about how much these traditions affected much of life in Fiji, and certainly influenced peace and peacemaking. When asked about the differences between the U.S. and Fijian ideas of peace, C4 stated, “I think it’s different. More so because of uh, um, I don’t like to say the (U.S.) mainland lacks, but mostly the closeness of the-, the way that people in Fiji are more collectivistic. They’re more collectivistic and more tied to culture and traditions and, you could say, religion.” According to him, religion played a strong role in peacemaking in Fiji, while he saw the U.S. relying more on individual rights and the legal system. “So, in Fiji it would be the church traditional culture would play a lot in bringing about a peaceful situation. While, from my limited experience and being ignorant and not living in the U.S. for quite a long time, I would say that in the-, thinking about peace in the U.S. it’s probably on a more of an individual basis and in most cases, the law comes in to play.”
C4 went on to explain that in Fiji, many people live according to traditional rules and rituals, religious and otherwise. He described how someone from an indigenous Fijian background would introduce themselves. “Indigenous Fijians are dictated by their culture or their tradition and they’ll hold to that. Because in Fiji, when you introduce yourself the first thing you do is give your name and then you let people know which village, which district and which island of Fiji you’re from and that kind of fills those traditional links.” He added to this by mentioning how peace and conflict resolution would play out differently in a Fijian context. Because so many communities and villages follow traditional protocols, the Chief of the village holds the power. If and when a conflict arises, there is typically a set way of working it out, controlled by those in top positions in the hierarchy. He gave an example regarding a few times that his work team attempted to help certain villages with a particular conflict. “We’ll talk but nothing will be done because the Chief will take his same approach, or the village headman will take the same approach. So even though they’re welcoming of visitors and they’d say this and this, sometimes you could see that they really weren’t into the process because they have a preconceived assumption that even though we’re talking and they’re hearing us, it’s pointless. Because in most cases, that’s what’s happened in the past.”

He further explained how religion, namely Christianity, would also dictate peace and peacemaking in Fiji, compared to a more Westernized context. “So, tradition and culture is something that people use and indigenous Fijian code. So, I think even though there are similarities, I think the major difference would be that Fijian families and that peaceful situation would be dictated more on the precepts of religion, of uh, Christianity which is big in Fiji and also tied to their culture and traditions.” He furthered the discussion by stating how critical the religious figure, or pastor, was in the more traditional villages. “Most villages in Fiji, they’re usually practicing one predominant religion. People say, like, oh, that’s a Methodist village of that’s an Assemblies of God village. So the priest or the head reverend of the church in the
village is kind of held in high esteem. They’ll invite him to village meetings, um, they’ll invite him to make decisions that involve the village so he’s kind of the assumed mediator for stuff. And so, they are held in very high esteem. He or she is kind of brought in to resolve any conflicts that come about in the community. Because of they-, they see it as um, how in the Christian sense that um, Jesus built peace so the role of these reverends and priests is to build peace also.” The pastor or religious leader, as C4 explained, was thought to carry on the duties of Jesus as a peacemaker. Because of this, he was often asked to help solve these village or family issues.

Cultural Informant 5 agreed with the importance of these religious and cultural traditions. He pointed out how his experience with hoʻoponopono in Hawaii was decidedly different than what he knows from Fijian peacemaking. “Hoʻoponopono will not stop until all the family members agree on a solution. I felt really honored to be a part of that. Yes. In Fiji, the only time we all speak is at a talanoa session, in hoʻoponopono everybody gets to talk. In Fijian practice there’s only one spokesperson. There are more traditional exchanges. It’s really different that way.”

C5 went on to explain the extent of traditional roles that are followed during a peacemaking practice in Fiji. He shared that only men are involved in the isoro process, even if the offense involved a female member of the family. He said, “My cousin, who is a boy, eloped with a girl. So, he told the dad and my dad and all the uncles, and got together and discussed what to be done and they sent someone over to the other family to accept an appointment. Come on this day to do the bulu bulu. And um, my family went, and so only the men-, only the men go, no women. They say, in case of fighting, eh? So, there’s no women that’s allowed to go, only the men. And so they went, and uh, you know, asked for the girl’s hand in marriage to save the girl’s family’s reputation and also to save our reputation and maintain harmony. And we use kava before the ceremony starts. We present the kava, and we tell them the purpose of why we are there. So we start with the kava and we use the whale’s tooth to show forgiveness. So,
we had to take several whale’s tooth, which is expensive if you have to buy it, and that’s what
we use.” Moreover, in this example, a situation of “eloping,” which denotes premarital sex, the
cultural tradition calls for marriage between the two offenders. This marriage keeps both families
from shame.

Both of the Fijian respondents noted that religious and cultural tradition played an
important role in the Fijian idea of peace. This idea was not supported by Hawaiian respondents,
and so became a separate theme denoting Fijian peacemaking only.

Connection to others. Building on the idea that cultural traditions are certainly meaningful
in Fiji, one of these cultural traditions is the deep connection to other people—namely family and
community members. Because of this inherent connection, roles in the community are outlined
from birth and, if followed, they help to maintain harmony in the group. C4 worked for the Fijian
government, facilitating conflict resolution in various contexts. He mentioned that often conflicts
are solved directly by the Chiefs or headsman in a community, and their services are not
needed. However, at times when they are called in to help with a resolution, typically other
avenues have been exhausted first. “If it can’t be resolved first by the village setting or
sometimes they call in the pastor-, the reverend or the priest from the village to come in and try
and resolve that conflict. So, we’re almost called in when the pastors and the village headmen
can’t get to a particular place, can’t solve it or need help in solving.” He emphasized again the
significant roles of village Chiefs and religious figures in Fijian society. Conflict resolution is
something that they handle on a semi regular basis. If a Chief or pastor cannot seem to come to
a resolution, C4 and his team could be called in to assist. He explained that when they do
intervene in these situations, it looks quite different than it does when they are working with
larger governmental organizations. The process is resolved and followed up on by individuals
who are connected to the players. This connection to others helps facilitate success of the
peacemaking practice. C4 explained, “That process looks different, so the MOU is more used
mainly for the larger organizations, with families it's usually just word of mouth, an agreement kind of thing. Where the-, so if, for example we go in with the pastors, we go in and try to facilitate the process. If it's a small family and we leave it to the pastor to continue the checking in, to continue the visiting afterwards.” Not only does this connection help to prevent conflict, but it plays a role in ensuring that conflicts are resolved and remain resolved over time.

C5 added to the notion that connection to other people was a necessary component to the peace process in Fiji. He described peace as defined within a relationship. “When I hear the word peace I think of family, um, harmony, maintaining uh that relationship, that harmony within that relationship.” He discussed this connection in terms of the ease of forgiveness in a relationship. C5 mentioned that in Fijian culture, the threshold for holding a grudge was quite high. If someone did something to wrong another person, they were almost always forgiven in a matter of hours. At the same time, he discussed how if the line of wrongdoing was crossed, and anger was reached, there needed to be formal reconciliation. “I mean, in Fiji, we’re pretty peaceful. We have our own business, we are communal, when someone does something bad, we will hold a grudge, but it’s hard for us to get angry. Maybe in 2 or 3 hours time we’ll come back and joke with you. Once something hurts a person and their family though, they will hold a grudge until death, unless there is reconciliation and it’s been handled peacefully.” Given this explanation, it appeared as though minor conflicts were often swept easily under the rug, and perhaps did not escalate. These rules of forgiveness were common in Fiji and assumed by most people.

Finally, C5 explained the idea that dialogue and talanoa were ways in which the connection between people was maintained and honored. These talks were performed before any conflict resolution process took place and allowed for that conversation to connect and repair a relationship. “The talanoa session is to go in any situation, before the conflict resolution, before the i bulu bulu (i soro), the talanoa session happens. The offender comes home, tells the
dad. Dad, I did x, and then the Dad will say, okay, we’ll tell him what’s going to happen. We’ll call the uncles and everybody sits down and then we have the *talanoa* session. We talk about what’s going to happen, we ask the boy, why did you do it? We ask the girl, why did you run away with the boy? Then, we come up with a resolution and the resolution will usually be to seek forgiveness from the girl’s family. And, in doing that, we will ask for the girl’s hand. And we will strengthen the relationship between our family and the girl’s family by marriage. So, the *talanoa* session has to happen for any resolutions to come.”

The connection to others was a shared theme between both Fijian and Hawaiian respondents. This connection creates motivation for peacemaking and resolution and establishes a context in which a lot of conflict is prevented. When the relationship precedes the individual, peace is more readily reached.

*Active practice.* The last main theme extracted from the Fijian interviews also mirrored what was found in the Hawaiian interview data. Fijian participants viewed peace as an active process or practice and had specific rituals in which this was done. Both respondents described the peacemaking process of *i soro*. When C4 was questioned about the practice of *talanoa* he mentioned that it was often traditionally paired with another process called *i soro*. *Talanoa* occurred first, with families talking about issues between them, and *i soro* followed when one or more parties was seeking forgiveness as a result of the discussion. C4 described the protocol, “In a nutshell, where the party that seems to be in the wrong takes a whale’s tooth. In Fiji if you have a whale’s tooth and you take it to another person, it is in the sense of building peace. If you reject that, if you reject the party’s coming and bringing this whale’s tooth or what we call *tabua* in Fiji, if you reject that then the wrong is on you now. It’s disrespectful, it’s almost never done to reject it. And that situation is called *i soro* or also called *i bulubulu*. Where they try to-, in a traditional sense where they try to make peace through that, um, through appeasement. The more *tabua*, or the more whale’s tooth you bring, shows how really sorry you are. And so, in
conflict situations, trying to make peace in these village settings, a lot of these kind of ceremonies are done.” Once the whale’s tooth is accepted, then the conflict is resolved and required to be forgotten by both parties, according to C4.

C5 described a talanoa session. “That’s what we do in a talanoa session, we just talk. But in order to do it, we have to have kava. Kava numbs the tongue and kind of prevents fights. There’s always kava. And uh, it’s uh, like a circle process. Everyone can be heard. And that’s what the talanoa session is. You come with your thoughts, and we hear you out, and we expect you to hear our opinion. And, in certain issues, we come up with a common solution to an issue together. They do it, you know, under a tree, and we can relax. We joke and laugh, but then we tend to the issues.” C5 provided a rich description of the process, noting that it was done in a circle, kava was consumed to numb the tongue and makes words a little kinder, and opinions were heard and discussed. He talked specifically about the softness of the process, under a tree, beginning with jokes. In these examples it is evident that in order to reach peace, a practice or ritual is performed. These practices indicated to all involved that resolution was reached and parties should let go of their negative feelings. Comparatively, the Western world, or the United States, in particular, does not have a similar ritualistic process allowing for this acceptance of resolution. Peace is viewed more frequently as an abstract concept, which may even be impossible to achieve, according to some respondents. In Hawaii and Fiji, it is something you do. After these actions are sincerely taken, peace is present.

Summary of Study III

Based on the three major themes identified from both Hawaiian and Fijian interviews, two themes are aligned, and one is slightly different between the two groups. In Hawaiian interviews, the connection to spirit or source is indicated. In Fijian interviews, this connection is more specifically stated as Cultural and Religious Tradition. Both interviewees discussed the great influence of Christian beliefs on both urban and rural environments in Fiji. Moreover
peacemaking and conflict resolution are often guided by cultural rules, determining who is allowed to speak and which party is allowed to ask forgiveness first, etc. These societal rules were not emphasized in Hawaiian interviews, and a broader, more inclusive connection to spirit was accentuated. Given these slight differences, both connection to others and peace as an active process ran through Hawaiian and Fijian discussions. After this review and analysis, a Pacific concept of peace was formed in Figure 4.21 below.

In Figure 4.21 for the Pacific participants, responses for the definition of peace quadrant fell under two predominant categories - spiritual level and in relationship. At the spiritual level, participants discussed having a connection to spirit and an acceptance of conflict. In relationship, participants discussed taking peace as a practice or process.

In the experience of peace quadrant, Pacific culture respondents fell into 2 predominant categories: spiritual and community. At the spiritual level they discussed connection to spirit or religion once again. At the community level emphasis was put on connection to others in the environment - family, friends, community members. Moving to the practicing peace quadrant, Hawaiian and Fijian practices were separated because of their differing features. However, the commonality of conversation/dialogue is bolded, indicating it is common between practices. As outlined in Study III, the Hawaiian ho'oponopono practice can be broken down into the following important categories: formal and informal practice; connection to spirit/ancestors; conversation/dialogue; Western influence. The Fijian practice of talanoa is broken down into tradition roles; connection to i soro; dialogue; and urban/rural distinction.

Finally, in the role in peace process quadrant, only Hawaiian participants’ responses were listed, since Fijian participants were not asked about their role. In the Hawaiian sample, all participants agreed that their role was to practice and live by example.
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CHAPTER 14: GENERAL DISCUSSION

This examination consisted of three studies. In Study I, a Western conceptualization of peace was formed from data used in a previous study on the concept of peace (Mrazek, 2007). The further analysis and review of these data showed that findings from the 2007 study were supported by analysis of the remaining questions. Experts tended to respond using national and abstract examples of peace, while novices discussed their own personal experiences and relationships when describing the concept. At the end of Study I an overall Western concept of peace was formed, showing the idea in four separate quadrants. This concept depicted the Western definition of peace, experience of peace, peace in relationship to war, and peace and religion. This map was the conclusion of the data extracted from both expert and novice groups and was used for comparison to a Pacific concept of peace, determined later in Studies II and III.

In Study II, the Pacific cultures of Hawai‘i and Fiji were explored using the Human Relations Area Files (HRAF) online database. Various OCM and search terms were used to extract information about peace in these cultures using anthropological data. After data were categorized and analyzed, three main themes emerged. These themes were protocol, holism, and outside influence. The data extracted from HRAF fell into one of these three categories, showing the importance of these ideas to the Pacific concept of peace. These data were part of the building blocks of the Pacific concept of peace.

In Study III, both Hawaiian and Fijian cultural informants were interviewed. These data were analyzed, concept mapped and major themes extracted. The major themes found in both Hawaiian and Fijian interviews emphasized the importance of connection to others and the understanding of peace as an active practice. These overall themes emerged from both Hawaiian and Fijian respondents. What differed between the two groups was the emphasis in Hawaiian interviews on a connection to spirit or source and the Fijian interviewee responses
about the cultural and religious traditional ties and practices. These findings were combined with those in Study II to form an overall Pacific concept of peace.

While Study II and Study III came up with distinct themes from the data collected, themes were certainly related. In Study II, the theme of *protocol* relates to the overall theme of *active practice* found in the interviews in Study III. Moreover, the theme of *holism* found in Study II relates to both *connection to others, connection to spirit, and connection to cultural and religious tradition* found in Study III. Holism encapsulates the idea that all things are connected- including spirit, energy, other people, and community traditions. With this saturation of ideas, a Pacific concept of peace was mapped in Figure 4.21 identifying the definition of peace, the experience of peace, peace practice, and one’s role in the peace process.

This study focused on two important research questions: (1) how are the Pacific cultures of Hawai‘i and Fiji conceptualizing peace?, and (2) how do these Pacific cultural concepts compare to the Western conceptualization of peace? Studies II and III answered the former question. In this discussion, the latter question is addressed. The Pacific cultures of Hawai‘i and Fiji conceptualize peace differently than those in an American/Western context. These differences are primarily attributed to the following:

- The Pacific cultures of Hawai‘i and Fiji are more collectivistic in nature than an American/Western context. This means there is a focus on the importance of relationships over individuality. This value predominates many aspects of life, and the data suggest that it pervades the concept of peace as well.

- The Pacific cultural respondents viewed peace as a practice or process. It is something *to do*. The American/Western respondents viewed peace as a concept or idea. It is something *to discuss*. 
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Individualism/Collectivism

Triandis (1994; 1995) outlined the facets of both individualist and collectivist cultures. Individualist cultures are those that emphasize personal goals, personal opinions, uniqueness, and individual control. It is a general societal orientation toward personal success and self-reliance. One’s personal well-being and life satisfaction can be measured by the attainment (or not) of personal, individual goals (Diener & Diener, 1995). Many Western cultures, including the United States, are considered individualist societies.

Collectivist societies generally orient toward group membership and identity. There is an assumption that groups connect and obligate individuals to one another (Oyserman, Coon, & Kemmelmeier, 2002). One’s “personal” opinion or idea is part of a social fabric or in-group and personal traits and values often align with group traits and values (Triandis, 1995). One’s well-being and satisfaction can be measured by the successful performance of group obligations and roles (Kwan & Singelis, 1997; Venkataraman & Reddy, 2011). Both Hawaiian and Fijian cultures would fit in the collectivist category. The Western and Pacific conceptualizations of peace reflected these distinctions.

From Study I, when the overall concepts of peace are compared, mapped in Figures 4.8 and 4.21, respectively, these patterns appear. Examining across the categories of Peace Definition and Experience of Peace, the individualist/collectivist separation emerged. Operating from the standpoint of separateness, Western respondents discussed the definition of peace as “no conflict,” “no war,” “no pain.” Juxtaposed to this, Pacific respondents described, “acceptance of conflict,” highlighting their orientation toward inclusion. While conflict may never be pleasant, Pacific respondents recognized it as a part of their experience, much like other parts of their context are included in their ideas of themselves. Western respondents chose to talk about the idea in exclusive terms, eliminating conflict altogether. Pacific respondents went on to highlight their relationship to spirit as the other chief component of their definition of peace. This
relationship emphasizes the way in which they view themselves in the world. A spiritually connected person, according to them, embodies peace. Westerners further described peace as both an internal/external idea and mentioned a calm space as representing peace to them. Neither of these ideas alluded to a relationship. Furthermore, in the Experience of Peace quadrants, Western respondents discuss personal attributes such as “aggression, violence, selfishness, happiness, and honesty,” while those of Pacific cultural background spoke entirely of connection to spirit and others in their family and community.

In Study II, the emergent codes from the HRAF database provide further support for the collectivist mentality of the Pacific cultures studied. These codes were: sharing of food/drink/gifts; communication and talk; life force energy; gods and spirits; roles and hierarchy; tangled cords; conflict manifested as physical illness; formal versus informal practice; personal responsibility; and relationship to land. In each of these categories, which embodied the research on peace in these cultures, relationships dominate. Each category has something to do with either the relationship to spirit, another person, or within an individual (e.g., physical illness manifestation).

In Study III, several of the cultural informants outlined the distinction between the two cultures when asked. C1 talked about a culture of “belongings” versus a culture of “belonging.” The former being a culture that places value outside of him/herself and tries to achieve success and derive self-worth from the value of things. On the other hand, a culture of belonging has rules and obligations of group membership, but that human connection is what is paramount. C3 discussed his experience as an organizational kahu, bringing different community organizations together to discuss issues. He took the stance of refusing to negotiate. He stated that he was interested in advancing the lives of the people of Hawaii, and anyone who tried to put their personal organizational goals or personal gain above this ultimate goal, was asked to leave the
Finally, C7 talked at length about the value of *ohana*. This connection was always forefront in the mind of Hawaiians, according to him, and drove most of the life decisions that they made.

*Cultural Cognition*

Furthering the notion of understanding oneself and his/her relation to others and the world, research has been done on the topic of cultural cognition. Studies focus on how one’s cultural background affects the way in which one understands him/herself and the world. Geertz (1975) outlined the difference between the Western concept of an independent self, contrasted with the more Eastern concept of an interdependent self. While the two groups examined in this study and others done since have primarily focused on American and East Asian cultures, the ideas can be transferred to the study at hand.

The interdependent self changes depending on the context and people around. While he/she has independent opinions and ideas, these are not as “fixed” as they may be with someone who views themselves independently (Kanagawa, Cross, & Markus, 2001). These ideas transfer to those found in this study. Participants from Pacific cultures talked about how their ideas of peace were definitely defined *in relationship* to their context. They saw the idea as constantly fluctuating, sometimes mentioning the concept of *yin yang* or, in Hawaiian, *maluhia*, both indicating opposite concepts coming together in balance. These fluctuations are natural, as indicated by cultural cognition research (Morling & Masuda, 2012). Furthermore, the great emphasis on conflict prevention, relationship preservation, and a strong connection not only to other people, but to spiritual beings or ancestors can all be components of differing cultural cognitive understandings of self.

In fact, C6 described this cultural distinction and differing cultural understandings thoroughly in his outline of the DIE versus OLA cultures (Laenui, 2013). “It is based on three fundamental pillars. The first pillar is domination, the second pillar is individualism, and the third pillar is exclusion” (p.5). An example of how one would behave in the DIE culture, C6 talked
about a man coming to pick *limu*. He takes a rake across the reef and scrapes it up, disturbing the reef and other plant and animal life there. He explained this was a DIE culture mentality, without thought to the next person, or to the other organisms there. The individual goal was most important, much like Geertz (1975) discussed as part of an individual’s cognitive understanding of independence versus interdependence. After he explained the tenets of DIE culture, C6 went on to outline the main ideas of what he has coined the OLA culture.

**OLA Culture**

The OLA culture, in Hawai‘i, is practiced within smaller communities, within families, and within a more traditional Hawaiian context. “On the other hand, when you come into communities, usually, countryside, but not only that, even in-, in more metropolitan areas, instead of domination, it’s always ‘olu ‘olu. To work gently with the other side. There’s a softness about it, yeah? There’s an *aloha* to it, instead of domination. Instead of individualism, it’s *lokahi*, yeah? You think about the group, the family, the larger community. The way you pick limu as a simple example, you’re thinking of nature as well as the next person who’s gonna pick. And instead of exclusion, it’s always *aloha*. To include, to welcome, to change the harmony in that relationship. So you have, on the other side, the alternate side, you have ‘olu ‘olu, you have *lokahi* instead of individualism, and then you have *aloha* instead of exclusion.” These ideas, also pointed out in the previous interview with C3, are those that are held by many practicing peace in a Hawaiian context. They are counter to the DIE culture and have a broader view of community and connection to other people.

**Peace as Practice vs. Idea**

The overwhelmingly prominent response from those of a Pacific background was that peace was viewed as a personal practice, even sometimes called a discipline. The daily choices made, about thoughts and actions, were part of living a peaceful life, living *pono*, as mentioned by Hawaiian respondents, and connecting with others. This idea is tied to the individualism-
collectivism distinction. Because the Pacific culture respondents are coming from a group-oriented background, the concept of peace will be filtered through this lens. Having a peace practice no doubt benefits the group and provides that person a role. Being taught and mentored by some well-respected hoʻoponopono practitioners, several Hawaiian cultural respondents emphasized the idea that peace was a practice. Peace was something one practiced every day, in real time.

C3 explained the distinction between practicing peace and viewing it as an idea, which was something taught to him by his Auntie Pilahi. “She said, relevance by reference looks like this. For me to be relevant, you may need to become irrelevant. For you to be relevant, I may need to become irrelevant and vice versa. She called reference borrowing. We borrow these things for us to be relevant. So it’s the car that we drive, it’s the phones we have, it’s where our kids go to school. You cannot live this way. You don’t talk about the ideas, in reverence you are the value, you live them. In reference, you talk about the culture. In reverence, you are the culture. Over here you have ideas, over here you are the idea. She said, this is to be, that’s to borrow. This is about belonging, that is about belongings. Reverence for relevance looks like this, you are relevant, I am relevant and my reverence should give you the experience of your relevance. That builds connection.”

Based on the Pacific Concept of Peace (Figure 4.21), the most critical part of a peace practice, according to both Hawaiian and Fijian cultures is a form of dialogue or conversation. In Hawai‘i, this practice is called talk story, and in Fiji it is called talanoa. To be willing to talk with someone you have a conflict with is to open up an opportunity for forgiveness and healing.

While many things were mentioned in relation to the idea of peace and the experience of peace by those from the Western cultural background, a peace practice was never one of them. Ideas of peace and peace in relation to war dominated this group’s responses. All Western respondents from the expert group discussed the Iraq War or the Bush Administration, neither of
which were anything they had every experienced or interacted with. Similarly, 81% of respondents from the layperson group talked about the violence in the U.S. and its reputation of violence across the world. These responses are ideas and concepts to discuss and debate, but are unrelated to a daily practice of peace.

Implications

Overall, these data have important implications. When it comes to cultural conflict or cultural miscommunication, it is important to know the different ways in which some cultures view peace and conflict resolution. Perhaps instead of discussing ideas of how to establish peace or resolve conflict, some discussion or activities could be focused on practicing peace. While practices differ greatly all over the world, it is worth an attempt to find a practice that could be suitable for both parties and enlist its protocol. For example, Wallis and Lambert (2013) discuss their Football 4 Peace program which they are using in communities experiencing conflict all over the world. Beginning in Israel, Football 4 Peace (F4P) is a program for youth and young adults that focuses on working together for a common goal. By forming a sports team of people of all types of backgrounds, the daily interaction and practice of communicating with someone from a culture or background that society views as your “enemy,” can help break down barriers. While this practice is different than a formalized cultural peacemaking practice, it does show that taking action toward peace, rather than just forming opinions and discussing them, can help in bridging the gap between differing viewpoints.

One of the ways in which hoʻoponopono and talanoa worked was to give a group a common goal- relationship restoration. While, in this case, the goal was culturally ingrained and not necessarily externally established, it was still something that all group members were aware of and found important. Data show that having a shared goal helps to build rapport, motivates problem solving and reduces conflict (Freeman, 2012).
Two of the Hawaiian cultural informants (C3 and C6) noted that they were in contact with international peacekeepers and international peacekeeping efforts, sharing the ways in which Hawaiian peacemaking and *ho'oponopono* could be used to resolve international conflicts. By creating a space for dialogue among all members, a time for acknowledgment of personal responsibility, and a time for forgiveness, the process allows for new ways of thinking about international conflict resolution. C6’s conclusions regarding the differences between DIE and OLA culture could greatly influence the way in which Western peacekeepers understand the cultural values of those they are working with. If this understanding was practiced and a middle ground was reached, there is no telling what leaps and bounds could be made in areas of conflict resolution worldwide.

As another example, the ideas about peace and peacemaking practices gleaned from this study can be applied to current conflict in Hawai‘i. Currently, in Hawai‘i, a debate surrounds the construction of NASA telescope on top of Mauna Kea summit, a sacred place for Native Hawaiians. While the individualists in the debate believe strongly that construction will bring new data and science advancement to the State and, possibly, the world, many in the Hawaiian community believe that construction is an insult not only to the environment, but to their spiritual, ancestral, and cultural beliefs (Knapp, Forbes Magazine, [www.forbes.com](http://www.forbes.com), 6/12/15; sacredmaunakea.com).

These data highlight the importance of connection to spirit and connection to others as part of a Hawaiian understanding of peace. It is possible that a practical use of this information could assist in the conversation between Native Hawaiian groups and pro-construction groups. Knowing that, for many Hawaiians, viewing conflict resolution as a *practice* instead of a discussion, perhaps some strides could be made toward a mutual decision if both sides were to engage in an active practice of peacemaking. Not only could this show willingness on both sides
to come to a compromise, but it could show a deeper understanding of the Hawaiian concept of peace, displayed by those in support of construction.

Research also shows that spiritual intelligence or spiritual understanding can help individuals to lead more fulfilling lives, and score higher on quality of life indicators (Satish & Anmol, 2015). The data in the present study supports the idea that spiritual connection can lead to greater peace. From a Pacific perspective, this spiritual connection and understanding is vital to practicing and maintaining peace. Perhaps these conclusions can be utilized to aid in improving others’ quality of life or at least to promote more research into these very important questions.

Limitations

The findings in this study do have limitations. First, the interview process for the Western cultural group was different than that used with the Pacific cultural group. Opening the interview by asking, “How do you define peace?” started a nuanced, intricate, patterned, and long series of stories and thoughts, which often addressed most of the other questions listed. As a result, several of the questions that were directly asked to Western interviewees were not asked of cultural informants. Furthermore, a few of the cultural informants knew each other quite well, and this could mean that they are already of like mind and/or learned from the same teacher and therefore viewed peace and *ho'oponopono* similarly.

Second, I am English speaking and from the continental United States. While I remained open, honest, and sincerely fascinated by the information gained from cultural informants, I do not speak Hawaiian or Fijian and, therefore, did not fully understand the meaning behind some of the words they shared. Also, I was the only reviewer and coder of the data. To aide in reliability and validity, I did review the data multiple times and after significant breaks of time, in order to review it with a fresh perspective. Additionally, my advisor was given a lot of the raw data to review and together we discussed the codes that were eventually decided upon. Also,
cultural informants were given a summary of the findings and did not provide any corrections to my interpretations.

Third, a plausible alternative to the conclusions I have made could be a result of the context we are living in. Western peace experts who have settled at the same University and, many, in the same department, may be expressing similar viewpoints, so it is not a totally objective sample. Also, as was evident by Table 4.3, the demographics of cultural informants were somewhat similar ethnically, religiously, and in regards to gender (with an overrepresentation of male respondents). There very well could be an alternate view of peace and peacemaking conceptualized by women in both the Western and Pacific context.

Finally, the cultural informant interviews produced mountains of rich data that could very well become individual case studies or be approached from various angles with different research questions. The depth of their understanding of peace and peacemaking was difficult to categorize in a decidedly Western way, using a concept map and selecting specific ideas for analysis. For this reason, too, there could be future analysis and other unique understandings of this concept.

Even with these limitations the data collected in this study are invaluable. While each of the cultural informants has done work on his/her own and may have even published in various fields on the topics of conflict resolution or peace, to have their ideas together in one document, and to be analyzed together to form overall themes of peace in Pacific communities is something that has not been attempted. The resonance of their words and ideas could potentially help unite the Pacific Island communities around an idea of peace and conflict resolution, and create a movement for these practices and ideas to be used in other contexts as well.
Conclusion

In conclusion, the Western conceptualization of peace is certainly distinct from that of Pacific Cultures. The two groups differ in their orientation toward the collective, with Westemers overall believing in an individualist view and Pacific cultures viewing the world as a member of a group collective, first and foremost. Additionally, those from Pacific cultures assert that peace is, at its core, a practice, and Westemers believe it to be an idea. When coming across intercultural disagreements and differences, these data can contribute to the growing body of literature on conflict resolution, alternative dispute resolution and peace practice. Knowing the core similarities and differences between Western and Pacific ideas of peace gives us a platform to explore other concepts of peace, with the perspective and understanding that ours is not the only one.
APPENDIX A: Participant Demographic Survey: Study I and Study III

Please circle or fill in as appropriate.

Gender:  M  F
Age:  ___________

Area of Concentration in Undergraduate or Graduate School:  ______________________
N/A

Ethnicity/ethnic group(s) most identified with:

Political Ideology:  Republican   Democrat   Independent
                      Libertarian   Don’t Know
                      Other____________

Religious Background:  Buddhist   Hindu   Jewish   Christian-Catholic
                      Christian-Other   Muslim   None   Other
                      _______________

Would you consider yourself a religious person currently?  Y  N

If yes, which religion are you currently affiliated with?  ______________________

Where were you born?  U.S.   Other____________

Where did you spend most of your childhood?  U.S.   Other____________

Years of education completed after high school:  ______________________

Length of time living in Hawaii:  _______________

Is English your first language?  Y  N

Do you speak another language at home or on a daily basis?  Y  N

If yes, please list other language

General Definition Questions/Free Association

1. What comes to mind when you think of peace?
2. How would you define peace?
3. If you had to come up with a way to categorize your idea of peace, what would it be? Something internal or external?
4. In the research that is done on peace, much of it contrasts peace with war or violence? Why do you think this is?
5. Do you think there can be an active, positive form of peace entirely separate from war? What does that look like? How would you describe it?
6. If peace is possible, who is responsible for its establishment?

More Applied, Examples of Peace

7. Can you give me an example of a situation you would describe as peaceful?
8. Do you think our world is peaceful? Why/why not?
9. Do you think our country is peaceful? Why/why not?
10. Please describe a peaceful (person, family, community, society, nation) to me separately
11. What types of things make up a peaceful person, family, community? These are complicated concepts- what things define them for you?
12. Do you think that humans, by nature, are peaceful beings? Why/why not?

Levels of Peace (international, community, individual)

13. What, in your opinion, is our largest barrier to peace? What are some things that could be done to overcome this barrier?
14. Would you define peace differently at the individual level than at the societal or international level? In what ways?
15. What are the main conflicts in communities today? How do these work against peace?
16. Do you think that you are able to do anything to affect international peace? Why or why not?
17. Who do you view as important individual peacemakers? What do you know about his/her ideas of peace?
18. How would you categorize individuals you consider to be peacemakers? Are these religious people or political activists, people you know in your own life?
19. What are the main conflicts between nations today? What is the most salient problem internationally?
20. What are the main personal conflicts between people in relationships (either family, friends, or couples)? What is the most salient personal issue?

Role in Peace Process

21. What types of things influence your ideas of peace?
22. Would you say that you live a peaceful life? What makes your life peaceful/not peaceful? What do you do to ensure this peace/what could you do to bring more peace to your life?
23. Would you say that religion or your belief/non-belief in a higher power influences your idea of peace? Why/why not?
24. Does this belief influence others? Why/why not?
25. What do you see as your role in the peace process?
26. How did you get involved in peace studies/research? (If one of the institute workers)
27. Do you like working here/being affiliated with the Peace Institute? Why?
28. What type of peace are you promoting as an agency/affiliated professor?
29. Do you think you are working for a common idea of peace? Common among whom? Your fellow workers? Your community?
APPENDIX C: Interview Protocol for Study III: Cultural Informants

**General Definition**

1. How would you define peace?

**Applied, Examples of Peace**

2. Would an example of a peaceful situation in your home culture differ than an example of a peaceful situation in the U.S./Western Nations? If so, how?

3. Do you believe human beings are peaceful by nature? Why/why not?

**Peaceful Processes**

4. How would you describe a peacemaking process in your culture? Is there a specific name for the process? Please describe what the process looks like.

**Role in Peace Process**

5. Does religion or spirituality play a role in your view of peace? How so?

6. Does spirituality play a role in your view of peace? How so?

**Hawai‘i: Ho‘oponopono**

7. What is your understanding of the process of ho‘oponopono?

8. What features of ho‘oponopono do you/your family practice?

9. Tell me a story (or several) about how a family used ho‘oponopono to resolve differences?

10. Is there anything else you would like to add?

**Fiji: Talanoa**

11. What is your understanding of the process of talanoa?

12. What features of talanoa do you/your family practice?

13. Tell me a story (or several) about how a family used talanoa to resolve differences?

14. Is there anything else you would like to add?
Cultural Informant 1 (C1)

The following results describe the interview conducted with cultural informant 1 (C1). These responses gave the richest data and were those that were drawn upon to compare and combine with other cultural experts in order to arrive at a culturally grounded idea of peace and peacemaking. The four questions analyzed covered the following topics: peace definition, experience of peace by Hawaiians, humans as peaceful beings, and ho`oponopono.

Definition of Peace

C1 was asked, “What comes to mind when you think of peace?” Two predominant themes emerged from his response: equilibrium and relationship to context. Sub themes were identified as well as several examples from nature used.

Equilibrium

The participant explained how his categorization of “equilibrium” was similar to the tide and its unique rhythm. Each moment is separate from the next, ever changing. “Some people use the word balance, but it’s like equilibrium. Like the tide. Certain times when the tide goes out, as it moves out, very violent. As it comes in, very violent. But once it’s there, everything is calm. Right? So, it’s like everything is in transition and so you’re looking at these moments. You can’t just look at it- that’s peace. That peace is a result of that violence, which is about to be followed by that violence- called a tidal change. But, in this moment, the tide is calm. Let’s enjoy it, let’s do what we can. Because in a few minutes, the tide is coming. And thankfully so.” (C1, personal communication, January 22, 2015).

As part of defining peace, C1 went into great detail to emphasize the idea that peace was the result of a rhythmic push-pull between opposing forces. When these forces were moving equally and in rhythm with one another, peace was present. He went on, throughout the interview, to discuss how when this rhythm is disrupted or is off balance, then war or conflict
occurs. He used many words and ideas to describe this equilibrium, such as “push/pull,” “rhythm,” “alignment,” “in sync,” “balance,” and “harmony.” He believed his idea of peace to be very closely aligned with the Chinese concept yin-yang and used many examples in nature to further emphasize his ideas, such as the tide example described above.

The opposing forces that C1 saw as the concept of peace, he described as a balancing of tension, similar to the concept of yin yang. “I think it’s a fine balance between what I would call, that’s the ying and yang, the tension of push and pull. Peace is when they’re moving and not clashing.” (C1, personal communication, January 22, 2015). Chen (2002) described the Chinese concept of yin-yang as the view of paradox as interdependent opposites, much different from a Western view of paradox as exclusive opposites. In his interview, C1 discussed this paradox exactly, talking about the paradoxical relationship between violence and peace and equating the Chinese yin-yang to the Hawaiian “ma” and “na.” Peace is when these tensions are still moving and war is when this movement has stopped. “In Hawaiian it’s ‘ma’ and ‘na.’ Mana. Oriental system, yin and yang. But it’s not yin and, it’s yin-yang. And so it’s either more or less in any one point in time, but it’s managing the tension between those two-peace is if it’s still moving. War is when they’re fighting and there’s no forward movement.” (C1, personal communication, January 22, 2015).

He brought up tension, push-pull and rhythmic movement as peace again at another point in the interview, he described the rhythmic movement as evidence of peace, and the lack of movement as evidence of conflict. “But you have things that are pulling and things that are pushing. But when they pull and push in the right sequence and the right rhythm, we’re still moving. And when one’s pulling and the other’s aren’t pushing, that’s when war occurs, that’s when I’m at dis-ease or in disorder. So, peace would be my ability to function by managing those tensions of push and pull” (C1, personal communication, January 22, 2015).
While he discussed his definition of peace, C1 highlighted a lot of examples in nature that demonstrated the idea of the constant push-pull of violence and peace. The order of violence and peace keeps natural environments running smoothly. “You know, when you look at a forest, or even the reef, we may be defining it as peace because we don’t see conflict. A lot of people define peace as the absence of conflict. But that’s not necessarily the case. We can look at the reef but, things are eating one another. For us that’s violent. But the water, the space, it looks so peaceful, but there’s violence going on. But that violence is what keeps peace in order” (C1, personal communication, January 22, 2015). Later, he mentioned another relationship in nature that balances the experience of violence peace in a forest. With too many deer, a forest will be ravaged and die, however, if you put a wolf in, the deer may experience violence and death, but the entire forest will be living in peace.

According to C1, peace is not simply the absence of violence, but it is the push-pull relationship between violence and peace. This relationship and tension is key to his definition and, as shown, the complex relationship can be found in nature.

*Relationship to Context*

In addition to the belief that peace is the equilibrium between violence or unrest, C1 believed that context played a large role in how one might view peace. He referred to context as not only the setting one was in, but one’s perspective and relationship to that setting, and ultimately showed that peace is a choice that is made in relationship to one’s setting. First, he broke down the concept and described examples of how peace varies depending on the setting.

“I think it’s relative. It depends on where you are on the spectrum of how you experience and what you’re experiencing of peace. So, someone who is being bombed 24-7, if bombing stops for an hour, that’s peace. How long it lasts? (shrugs) But for that moment, they really cherish that peace” (C1, personal communication, January 22, 2015).
For someone in a war zone, an hour of no bombing may be experienced as peace. At the same time, for someone in a place without active war, he described a different example, and noted that there is a scale for what is considered peaceful and not. “A guy wants to sleep in the middle of the day, a truck’s driving by, not very peaceful, and yet we’re living in a time of peace, it’s not war. But his personal peace is being interrupted. So, it’s all scale” (C1, personal communication, January 22, 2015). After he explained how setting matters when defining what peace is, C1 expounded upon the idea that it is not simply the setting, it is the individual’s relationship to that setting. What he/she chose as their attitude, what was chosen to focus on and how the rhythm between a person and his/her environment determines whether peace is present or not. He gave examples of both attitude and focus.

“It’s raining, I have an umbrella, I’m at peace. It’s raining, you don’t have an umbrella, you’re not at peace. It has nothing to do with the rain at that point, it has to do with my plan, it has to do with my rhythm. Same thing. Person with an umbrella can be standing in the rain and not experience peace because they were expecting sunshine. Where a person who doesn’t have an umbrella is enjoying peace of being in the rain because they don’t ever get to. It’s attitude” (C1, personal communication, January 22, 2015).

C1 further emphasized the importance of attitude in his next example. He had worn a flower lei to our meeting and referred to it. He described how if one chose to focus on peace, successive moments could be found and strung together for a lasting experience. “Like the lei I’m wearing, my focus isn’t on the gaps, it’s on the moments of peace. So if I can collect as many of these moments as possible, then I can focus on that. But if I’m looking for the gaps, I’ll find those too. But at some point in time it’s how many moments can I begin to string together. A minute? An hour, a day, a week, a month, a year, multiple years. So I’m looking for-, or my attitude would be, how can I begin to create a string of these moments which then become periods, becomes millenniums, right? (C1, personal communication, January 22, 2015).
C1 described that making these attitudinal choices to focus on peace an individual could attain a sense of inner peace that allowed them to carry calmness even into turmoil and chaos. Juxtaposed to this, people can exist in a peaceful environment while being in chaos internally. The emphasis is on an individual’s relationship to context. “It’s always going to be internal because that’s what I see. Because I know people who can be at peace in turmoil. They can sit there and be at calm with themselves, in a hurricane. Because they’re not trying to calm the hurricane, it is what it is. What they’ve learned to do is keep themselves peaceful when then conditions are chaotic. At the same time, I know people who are experiencing chaos internally in a completely peaceful environment. So I think it has a lot to do with a person’s own view of their relationship with the world” (C1, personal communication, January 22, 2015). C1 went on and emphasized how this internally peaceful person made choices about his/her environment in order to maintain this steady state of peace. Systems of response are developed in order to maintain this peaceful state with the external world and these responses change, depending on the need and situation. This response system and personal choice is described as a personal discipline. “If we define ourselves with an internal frame of reference, then it doesn’t matter what’s going on outside of us, what we’re always doing is finding an appropriate response to that external stimulus. And if my steady state is peace I’m going to develop systems of response that allow me to stay there regardless of what’s going on, I may have to do something differently-today I have to breathe, tomorrow I sing, whatever it is, but I’ll develop mechanisms to keep me in that steady state of peace, internally. But again, I think that’s a personal discipline, right. So I think peace is a discipline as much as it is a steady state” (C1, personal communication, January 22, 2015). Finally, after making the choice to find peace in our environment, C1 emphasized that we bring this peaceful state and responsibility for peace into the groups in which we are a part. This responsibility added to the idea that peace was a discipline. “So, it starts with me-, thus the song, peace begins with me, right? It begins with me. When I’m
involved in a group setting, each of us takes some responsibility for the peace that we experience because we contribute to it or take away from it” (C1, personal communication, January 22, 2015).

In C1’s view, peace is partially defined by an individual’s relationship to his/her context. If one lived in a warzone, one’s definition would probably differ from another who lived in a comfortable, upper class neighborhood. Complexly, this relationship to context also extended to a more internal view of personal attitude. The ability to choose one thought over another, allowed some people peace and contentment, while it brought others distress. Finally, C1 drove this idea home when he stated the importance of this personal choice. In his view, each person was responsible for the “peace” he/she brought into a larger group setting.

Experience of Peace by Hawaiians

C1 answered the question, “Does the experience of peace in your own culture (Hawaiian) differ from that of Western or American culture? If so, how?” His response was “yes” and his description fell into two predominant categories: framed in historical cultural trauma and based on critical important cultural values.

_Framed in Historical Context_

First, C1 shed light on the complexity of the question and how it depended on the identification of the individual within that culture, mentioning that there was a difference between how someone culturally identified themselves and how they were ethnically identified. “A person who is in a multiethnic family which is part Hawaiian, but is really living in the contemporary Western context, is probably experiencing the same degree of peace as another family from that (Western) culture. So, my ethnicity and my culture can be different. And I think there are people experiencing the same thing (Hawaiians) are culturally, elsewhere, who are experiencing the same degree of dis-ease, access to resources, access to food- those are human conditions” (C1, personal communication, January 22, 2015).
He went on to say that for a Hawaiian person who is identifying as Hawaiian and living in a Hawaiian context, the experience of peace would be different than that of an American/Western individual. C1 relayed his thoughts about how the historical experience of Hawaiians and the overthrow that occurred in Hawaii was still experienced by many today. He explained the experience of the overthrow from both sides—noting that some are still experiencing peace as a result, while others turmoil. “(The overthrow) came at great turmoil for the people of Hawai‘i, you know. Um, so that’s uh, a really good example. And I think the continuation of that tension for many people, they’re still experiencing the peace of that overthrow, while there are generations who are still feeling the turmoil and conflict that were created” (C1, personal communication, January 22, 2015).

In his opinion, many believed that what was lost during the overthrow and subsequent occupation could never be replaced until the Nation was restored to the Hawaiian people. The contemporary society that has emerged, while giving a lot of physical belongings, does not replace what was lost. “I think the Hawaiians-, Hawaiian people who are living with that Hawaiian culture issue, would definite their current space as a result of the historical space. They do not experience peace the same way as others, simply because it’s defined differently. Um, because for them, for us-, the belongings do not replace what we lost. When will that ever be fulfilled? Can you really ever fill that gap? You know so, I think people that have accumulated all of the physical, you know, things of contemporary space, and we have those same things, but there’s something missing. And it has nothing to do with the physical, it has something to do with some spiritual, mental order. So the dis-order we’re experiencing as a community, we believe that’s not going to be remedied until we have our Nation back. Whether that’s true or not, there’s that belief” (C1, personal communication, January 22, 2015).

C1 also provided a larger perspective of the Hawaiian experience being similar to those in other ethnic or cultural backgrounds who have experienced disenfranchisement. He
mentioned that the reaction to domination can be similar across groups. “Hawaiian communities, and any community that has been disenfranchised, um, ties back to these things. I think they all experience similar, not same, but similar feelings. And therefore, react in a similar way to the common dominator. We are the common denominator, responding to the common dominator” (C1, personal communication, January 22, 2015).

C1 shared that he believed part of the Hawaiian experience peace of peace was couched in the history of cultural trauma. While he touched again up on the yin-yang opposing forces at play, and stated that some were still experience the peace of the overthrow, many of those in the Hawaiian community were still experiencing the turmoil of that act. Many minority and/or indigenous communities experienced similar traumatic histories and continue to experience similar community struggles. While certain aspects of American culture are appreciated and accepted, C1 described a spiritual and mental disconnect for many, which cannot be remedied with wealth or belongings.

*Cultural Values*

Connectivity

Throughout the interview, C1 emphasized the importance of connectivity and relationships between all things, not only human beings. When asked about the experience of peace by Hawaiians in relation to Americans/Westerners, he accentuated this idea further. “It’s relationships. So, of course this perspective comes from one that is grounded in connectivity. If you don’t believe that, none of this makes sense. So that’s the condition under which my responses come. It’s acknowledging that we’re all connected, whether we’re consciously aware of that connection or not” (C1, personal communication, January 22, 2015).

His point continued as he discussed how the island mind was different than the continental mind, primarily for this reason. The connectivity of all things meant that many concepts do not have singular definitions or answers. All things are entwined, together, and on a
spectrum. “They’re entwined, they’re together. Everything’s a spectrum, now whether it’s a line or a circle, that’s where I think the island mind works differently from the continental mind. It’s more circular, there iterations of one another, spectrums rather than definitive singularities” (C1, personal communication, January 22, 2015). This difference in cultural values—connectivity versus singularity—contributed to the separate ideas of peace between Hawaiians and those from the continental U.S.

Non-Expansion

C1 continued with the discussion on values differences. “I think, fundamentally, the way we relate to one another and our places has a lot to do with it. Um, the continental view, in my experience, is one of expansion. When you have space, you move. That’s a human trait, regardless of if you’re on an island or continent. Child is born, put him on the ground, they crawl. They don’t sit. Innately, they want to go someplace. How far you go? That’s another story. That’s culture. You can’t go too far on an island. On a continent, you can keep on going til somebody stops you. So-, there’s the tendency to think about away. If I’m not comfortable here, I can just move away. Regardless of who’s already there. Right, so-, we live in a world of expansionists and as a product of expansionists. People not comfortable where they are, are looking for more, expanding their reach for their peace. Encroaching upon other’s peace” (C1, personal communication, January 22, 2015).

Belonging

In addition to differing views on connectivity and expansion, the criteria for “belonging” in the separate cultures differ. He said belonging can foster feelings of peace. “I think every society, every group, whatever that is-, there are-, there’s criteria for membership. For that sense of belonging. And I think sometimes our peace is tied to that. I am not at peace with myself, until I know where I belong” (C1, personal communication, January 22, 2015). Sometimes, within a culture or group that “appears” homogenous, there are fine layers of
difference, affecting the concept of belonging mentioned above. He said these separations mean an individual has to know who he/she is and be comfortable owning their identity. “We have seen and continue to experience that peace or lack of it in skin tone. Even within the group that is considered to be-, homogenous. But even with them, there are scales or tones. Black black, light black, white. Well, you guys are all black-, we have our own turmoil there. Eh, you’re not Hawaiian enough, you half Hawaiian, 50% Hawaiian. We’ve created these distinguishings, these fine layers-, so even where you think there’s belonging-, there are interesting separations. There’s distinctions. So being peaceful in that sense is being comfortable with who I am and where I am” (C1, personal communication, January 22, 2015).

In C1’s answer to the question about the difference between Hawaiian and American/Western experiences of peace, he mentioned how the history behind Hawaiian colonization as well as the differing cultural values between the groups would affect their ideas of peace. From a Hawaiian viewpoint, the overthrow and subsequent colonization is a hurt that has yet to be reconciled. Many feel that gaining independence will heal this trauma, but C1 discussed that this keeps many Hawaiians from truly experiencing peace. Moreover, the Hawaiian cultural values of connectivity, belonging and staying put rather than expanding give those living in an Hawaiian way a different view of peace. By staying on the island, believing in a connection to all beings, and feeling a sense of belonging, an individual can experience peace.

Humans as Peaceful Beings

In the next question, C1 was asked, “Do you believe humans, by nature, are peaceful beings?” He responded saying that as long as human beings’ basic needs were fulfilled- food and procreation- we had the ability to be peaceful. He expounded upon his answer by giving an example of the differences between two cultural practices for obtaining food, and describing how the actions taken to satisfy these basic needs can also be categorized as peaceful of violent, depending on the cultural understanding of the audience. “I think, by nature, that animal part of
us which wants to eat, procreate-, as long as we can do those things, we’re peaceful. The methods we choose to satisfy that innate thing in us, can be defined as peaceful or violent. In our own society, I know people who are pig hunters. They feed their families-, they’re at peace. They kill the pig with a bunch of dogs, that’s just means to an end. That’s the practice. Guy on the street can’t stand killing animals, violent people live down the street are his thought. And yet, he’ll buy something from the store because it’s a peaceful practice, but that cow that they’re eating was killed with a violent shock to the brain and a bullet to the head. They’re not involved in the practice, therefore they find peace in it. But, their source of food came from something they had nothing to do with. So who’s more culpable? The guy who’s killing the animal, who’s at peace with the animal because he has a protocol. Mahalo, thank you for giving yourself up to me, versus the guy who’s sitting at home thinking while the cow’s getting brutalized” (C1, personal communication, January 22, 2015). C1 viewed humans as innately needing to satisfy basic needs and, depending on their culture, can practice fulfilling these needs in a peaceful way. Once these basic needs are met, we have the ability to be peaceful.

**Ho`oponopono**

C1 was prompted with, “Tell me about ho`oponopono. How do you practice?” He provided a long description which was categorized into five main ideas- internal work, traditional practice, connection to spirit, future orientation, and Western influence.

*Internal Work*

C1 impressed that being a practitioner of *ho`oponopono* starts inside first and eventually works its way out to various settings in which the individual is involved. “This is *ho`oponopono*. It goes back to the idea- it’s an inside job. But there isn't only one inside. So, if I’m by myself, I can create havoc for me, again, because of my expectations. But once I’m part of a group, there needs to be a group rhythm. So now it becomes a collaborative thing, that’s called a community, organization. In the absence of that collaboration or that common peace, what is that-,” we have
discord, dis-ease and disconnect. So, in a group setting, in a communal setting, it's a collective process. But even in that collection of people, it starts with each person. What I bring to this group will either contribute to or diminish the peace that we can experience— the chicken and the egg, right?” (C1, personal communication, January 22, 2015).

*Connection to Spirit*

Building upon the idea of doing “inside work” in order to practice *ho`oponopono*, C1 indicated the importance of first connecting to a higher power, spirit or deity in order to begin that internal work. “In the practice of *ho`oponopono*, it starts with us. And it goes back to an older time when one needs to be in alignment with your deity, your spiritual identity, knowing who you are, which then begins to shift the way you see others. And really begins to move or remove the victim status which most of us carry. So, for me, *ho`oponopono* defined that way is being in the right place at the right time for your good as well as the good of others, which may not be where you want to be” (C1, personal communication, January 22, 2015).

He expanded upon the idea that *ho`oponopono* is a way of being at the right place at the right time for the good of all, even at times when it may feel like something negative has happened. “Several years ago, I damaged my knee. Severely, where I had to have surgery and all that kind of stuff. I could easily have been angry and mad at people and everybody else, but because of the discipline of *ho`oponopono*, I acknowledged quickly that that was *pono*. That was the right thing for me at that time. Because my life at that moment was moving at a pace and a speed that in my little world was where I wanted to be. But in a way, it was disturbing everything else around me. So, that was *pono* for me to have that because it-, it did metaphorically, put me on one knee. It humbled me. It slowed me down. That was *pono*” (C1, personal communication, January 22, 2015).

The belief and trust in God or Spirit allows the *ho`oponopono* practitioner to accept whatever situation is brought before him/her and see it in a larger context, trusting that it is *pono*. 149
“When you pule, pray, or you focus on what's pono, it's not always what you want, it's not always what you expect. Thus the prayer, you know, God works. So I think the process of ho‘oponopono is one that is seeking out to be in that space to make right” (C1, personal communication, January 22, 2015). For C1, this trust in and connection to spirit allowed him to be in the right place at the right time for all things in his life. By holding the belief that a higher power is ultimately guiding you in the right direction, even “negative” events are viewed as pono. This connection prepared an individual to see the pono choice and to accept a situation without anger or resentment.

Future Orientation

C1 continued to explain how the ho‘oponopono practice is one that focuses on the future and cuts ties to past grievances. This disconnection from the past and the old way of doing things creates a new phase in an individual’s life. “Ho‘oponopono is focused on creating the preferred condition, it’s future oriented, recognizing kawamamo, kawama, the past is the future. Therefore, if I let go of the past, or clean up the thing that has created my criteria of thought, practice and decision making, the future will be the same. So, future orientation says if I want that to be different, I need to somehow adjust my connection to the past. Erase it. Those things that don’t support. So ho‘oponopono, that discipline says, how do I begin to eliminate, to disconnect, to erase past grievances so I don’t take them forward to the next phase” (C1, personal communication, January 22, 2015). Cutting ties or cords connected to past events and grievances is one of the main tenets of ho‘oponopono practice outlined by Pukui, Haertig, & Lee (1971). This focus on the future and personal behavior change is a critical concept of the practice.

C1 again described the connectivity between individuals by depicting ho‘oponopono as a process that allowed each person to align with one another and bolster each other's good fortune. He used an example of a knee surgeon who maintained this view of connection and
how it differed from the more external view of “wanting” broken knees to fix. “My vibration sets up other people’s vibrations. If my future is dependent on your discomfort or misfortune, then I’m part of the problem. But if your future good fortune is facilitated by me, which creates my good fortune, that’s perfect! Cause now we’re in alignment. I’m only here because I’m helping you get to your good fortune. I’m not asking for your misfortune or discomfort at any level. It all comes back to us, at some point in time, right? If my peace is based on the number of broken knees, that’s external. If my peace is based on how peaceful everyone else is as a result of my being here? That's internal work. It’s a slight shift, but it’s huge” (C1, personal communication, January 22, 2015).

With a focus on the future, according to C1, *ho`oponopono* practice allows people to let go of past grievances and ties to the past, as well as move forward, in alignment, by supporting one another’s good fortune.

*Formal Practice*

As part of his description of *ho`oponopono*, C1 distinguished between what his personal “informal” practice was and the traditional *ho`oponopono* practice which had specific protocol and individuals involved. “I’ve experienced the traditional *ho`oponopono* which most people know, where there is a mediator or *haku* and then there are protocols that you have to experience and at some point in time, there is mutual agreement for the good of the group” (C1, personal communication, January 22, 2015).

In his previous description of his own practice, C1 described a commitment to internal work and personal growth which allowed one to connect and practice with others as well as connect with spirit. He discussed a personal discipline that meant choosing one thought over another and being open to discovering what was *pono* for all involved. The above described traditional practice of protocols with a *haku* is certainly separate from this one. It appeared as
though there was a more regular practice involving internal work and everyday situations as well as one in which a formal meeting is conducted with a *haku*.

**Western Interpretation and Practice**

C1 characterized some of the Western interpretations and understandings of *ho`oponopono* as part of his discussion of the practice. First, he talked about the perceived differences between Western science and scientific methods and spirituality. “In fact, I think all the cultural practices that have not enjoyed a continuous, open, above group process, somehow fall into the realm of superstition-, innuendo. Cause science has a hard time with it, because they can’t duplicate it, they can’t replicate it. For what those of us in spirituality fall back on, I don’t know that we can prove that scientifically. We’ve done it enough times and can make these observations and that is rooted in science. Therefore, it is-, we can make these arguments. But I think you have to experience a *ho`oponopono* and the end result. If it clears things up, then it probably worked, right?” (C1, personal communication, January 22, 2015).

C1 went on to explain that there are some people in the community who are marketing *ho`oponopono* practice in a way that serves ego and creates revenue, but does not include the internal work that the practice requires. This “capitalistic” view of selling the practice as a quick fix did not come through a spiritual path and is not authentic *ho`oponopono*. “Now, there’s this other group that is fetish you know, and they’re not doing it for themselves, they’re doing it to do to others. I’m a *ho`oponopono* person, I can teach you *ho`oponopono*...it didn’t come through a spiritual path, it didn’t come as a result of that. In fact the man-, the marketing says, do you want to experience a miracle today? In 5 minutes? Read this book. (pause) How did that happen? You wanna be a *kahuna* in 3 hours, take this seminar” (C1, personal communication, January 22, 2015). The work of *ho`oponopono* practice is more significant than what some are doing. There are those in the community, described to be “on the fringes” that are simply using the mantras but not doing the work, C1 stated.
“There are people practicing ho`oponopono who are on the fringes but they’re not doing the ho`oponopono. They’re doing the mantras, they’re doing the sound bites, they’re doing the egotistical stuff. They’re not doing the work of ho`oponopono. You know, um-, (pause), I would say it’s the pharmaceuticals end of spirituality. All these new age stuff like that, that’s the pharmaceutical, manufactured-, they’re no longer doing the work. They’re taking the sleeping pill rather than meditating” (C1, personal communication, January 22, 2015).

C1 chronicled his ideas on the definition of peace, the experience of peace by Hawaiians, humans as peaceful beings, and ho`oponopono during his interview. The richness of his responses showed that he defined peace as a process of finding an equilibrium between opposing forces. He also believed that one’s relationship to his/her environment thoroughly shaped one’s ideas of peace. The Hawaiian community held a complex view of peace, nested in the trauma of its past, and affected by its cultural values- specifically those of connectivity, non-expansion and belonging. C1 believed that humans were peaceful creatures once basic needs had been met and that behaving peacefully is often culturally defined. Finally, he described the peacemaking practice of ho`oponopono as one that required internal work, a connection to spirit, and a future orientation. There is a distinction between everyday practice and formal ho`oponopono sessions. Western and American influence have affected how ho`oponopono is sometimes marketed, taught, and accepted as a legitimate and meaningful peacemaking practice, as opposed to a superstition.

Cultural Informant 2 (C2)

The following results describe the interview conducted with cultural informant 2 (C2). While her entire interview included 11 questions, 8 of these questions are analyzed below. These responses gave the richest data and were those that were drawn upon to compare and combine with other cultural experts in order to arrive at a culturally grounded idea of peace and peacemaking. The eight questions analyzed covered the following topics: peace definition,
responsibility for establishment of peace, experience of peace by Hawaiians (her identified
cultural group), humans as peaceful beings, peace research focusing on war, cultural practice of
ho`oponopono, comparison of Hawaiian peacemaking practices to Western peacemaking
practices, and finally, what she sees as her role in the peace process.

Peace Definition

Internal Feeling

C2 was asked, “What comes to mind when you think of peace?” She described it first
and foremost as something internal. She stated, “(It is an) internal (process) for me, um, it’s how
I feel.” (C2, personal communication, February 12, 2015). As her description deepened, she
referred to peace as not only the absence of negative emotions, but also the presence of
positive emotions.

Absence of Negative Emotion

C2 described her idea of peace by first identifying things that would not be present if she
were to be peaceful. She mentioned anxiety and physical symptoms of anxiety. “Peace..I would
say...not being-, not having anxiety. Not having your heart race. Not having cold sweats. I-, I
think it’s-, peace is a feeling for me. More than words” (C2, personal communication, February
12, 2015).

Presence of Positive Emotion

She went on to describe what would be present if she were at peace. She believed it was
something that involved internal emotions and was part of your whole being. Someone at peace
exuded it and people noticed. “Everything positive in your whole being. The way you feel, how
you speak, um, the way you look. Um, it-, I guess it’s emotions um, that’s how it’s-, it’s a part of
you-, it should be a part of your whole being, that’s what I think. The way you speak, the way
you act, the way you feel cause what-, how you feel exudes it-, stands out and people notice
that. So if you’re trying to live peacefully, it should be shown by people just looking at you” (C2, personal communication, February 12, 2015).

For C2, peace was defined as an internal feeling, emphasized by the absence of negative emotions as well as the presence of positive emotions.

Experience of Peace by Hawaiians

Connection to Spirit

C2 was asked the question, “Does the experience of peace in your own culture (Hawaiian) differ from that of American culture? If so, how?” In her response, she noted that the intent may be the same, but the process of reaching peace is different in the two contexts. “I think the intentions are similar, but the process to get there is different. We feel like everything that’s-, that’s outside of us also has a spirit. So, we respect everything and everyone. I know that Polynesian culture is very grounded in um-, the spiritual aspect which is connected to our culture” (C2, personal communication, February 12, 2015). C2 acknowledged the importance of a spiritual connection in the Hawaiian peace concept. She continued by describing peace as something obtained through the adherence and respect for one’s role.

Knowledge and Respect for Roles

C2 indicated that peace is experienced by Hawaiians in a setting in which everyone has a role, knows the parameters of this role, and behaves accordingly. She gave an example of a kauhale or village from a time before Western influence and emphasized that when everyone knew their responsibilities and there was an order to things, a community or village lived in peace. “I can relate that to maybe a kauhale or a Hawaiian village where everyone born into that family knows their roles, they know their responsibilities. It’s separated by dwellings and-, certain things take place in a certain dwelling other than another. So for everything-, every dwelling-, there’s a reason and everybody respects that reason...There’s no conflict because
everybody knows their roles and respects what they should be doing. And that village will live in peace” (C2, personal communication, February 12, 2015).

Later in the interview, C2 mentioned how she viewed a peaceful Hawaiian family. Along with love and respect, a knowledge of roles and responsibilities surfaced again. For her, those living as part of the Hawaiian culture experience peace partially as a result of adherence to family and community roles. “That’s what I see as a peaceful family. Everybody knowing and doing what they should be doing” (C2, personal communication, February 12, 2015).

*Cultural Values*

Additionally, C2 highlighted the importance of Hawaiian cultural values in determining the experience of peace by Hawaiians. In particular, she mentioned the value of generational connection and connection to ancestors. She expressed her belief to be that because of the disconnection between many Hawaiian people and their ancestors’ traditions and teachings, there is a breakdown of respect and sometimes pain and harm is the result. In her view, the expectation in the Hawaiian community is that one knows their role and their values, and should not inflict harm on others. She gave an example of seeing crime or negativity being reported about those in the Hawaiian community. “What I read and what I see in the world today, especially things on the news. My first thought is, how was that person raised? To think that he could do what he wishes. If it is to inflict pain or harm on someone else. How was he raised? Where is he from? What is his family name? That’s what I’m thinking…because if they are part Hawaiian and if their generation goes back before the missionaries? Then they were born and raised knowing the values. I know that because that’s part of our culture. Our *kupuna* have taught that. And every generation know. And I know with this world how it is-, um the younger generations, maybe even people in my own generation just feel like it’s unimportant. But that’s why they lose their respect for other people and other things” (C2, personal communication, February 12, 2015).
C2 went on to describe the effects of conflict on an individual. If peace was absent and things were not made right in a disagreement, physical sickness would ensue. There is a connection between words spoken, actions taken or not taken, and physical health. This point emphasized the Hawaiian belief in connection between all things—mind, body, and spirit. C2 furthered her point by mentioning a spirit connection in this instance. Her mother passed away in a house that was haunted by spirits, prior to an *ho`oponopono* session which helped to clear the negative energies. “And really, conflict causes sickness. And that’s what my mother died from. There was conflict all around her, and she died of asthma. One lung collapsed. But, in the room that she was put in, was the very back room that was—it had the most spirits in. It was damp. It was freezing cold in there. Not good for an asthmatic at all. Plus, she had to deal with those people there. Yeah, so she was sick because of—, not just that, but other things added to her sickness. The fights, arguments, disagreements, things that were not made right, adding to her sickness” (C2, personal communication, February 12, 2015).

C2 believed that the Hawaiian cultural values of ancestral connection and holistic health were important in describing the Hawaiian experience and concept of peace. These distinct cultural values defined part of her experience with peace and peacemaking.

**Human as Peaceful Beings**

C2 was asked, “Do you believe human beings, by nature, are peaceful beings? She responded by confirming her belief that humans are born peaceful and learn otherwise. “I believe everyone…is born a peaceful person. They don’t know otherwise. But, with…life experience they find that there is opposition in everything. So—, when they act in other ways? That’s learned” (C2, personal communication, February 12, 2015).
Ho`oponopono

C2 was prompted “Tell me about ho`oponopono. What do you know about it and how do you practice?” Her responses fell into the following categories: different types of practice, connection to all beings, Christian influence, and family handling of conflict.

Formal Practice

All cultural informants referred to a “formal” type of peacemaking practice and another, less formal or protocol driven type of practice that was done more casually within a family or community. C2 first referred to her training and knowledge from a Hawaiian non-profit she used to work for years prior. In the following quote she explains her understanding of the ho`oponopono process. “I know what I learned from Alu Like is when the parties that are in conflict, they agree that there’s conflict. I mean, and they’re willing to meet each other face to face, then a ho`oponopono is called. And all-, not just the two, but all the people that were affected by their conflict are present. And there is a mediator. And I think sometimes it’s the-, either the kahu or somebody of authority, and they go around the room and everybody gets to speak their feelings and sometimes it’s-, well, most times there’s lots of emotion. You find that there’s been misunderstandings or something you thought you heard really wasn’t that way” (C2, personal communication, February 12, 2015).

She further explained how after a conflict is discussed and aired out between parties, a resolution is reached and someone who is in a position of authority will follow up to make sure that the resolution is followed. Families or individuals can choose to either remain in the relationship or sever ties. “Then the two, in the end the two who were in conflict, after hearing everything, all the evidence, they come to a decision either to keep the relationship or not. And it depends, I would say, the leader in that particular family to make sure that they hold to true to what-, you said you’re not gonna, you know, fight with that person anymore, then I’m going to
Informal Practice

After C2 described her knowledge and organizational training around *ho`oponopono* and the steps that are included in the practice, she began a decidedly different explanation of the personal experience she had with the process. When she was a young girl, her family home was believed to be haunted by spirits. She later explained that the spirits were upset that they never blessed the home prior to moving in and never asked to respectfully enter the space. She compares this to her prior explanation and what she learned of *ho`oponopono* from her work organization. “It looked very different (in my family)” (C2, personal communication, February 12, 2015). Her description below is of a time when her grandfather, a healer, and his friend, also a healer, arrived at the home after several negative incidents. They were thrown to the ground by something before even being able to enter. “What we have to do is do a *ho`oponopono* and clear this out. So my grandfather was still on the ground, his friend got up, he had the strength to get up and he’s speaking-, by that point they said he could see the people in the house besides us. And he’s speaking to them in Hawaiian. And he says to them, these people-, this is family Kaonohi, Ka`ahanui, they mean no harm. This house was built prior to them moving here, um, you know, he’s trying to explain and make retribution. So, by that point, my grandpa gets up and he joins the conversation. So they’re all speaking in Hawaiian, speaking to these spirits that they-, that we can’t see” (C2, personal communication, February 12, 2015).

She breaks down the process into various steps, however, slightly different than those explained in her training or in other written words about the process. First, an offering or gift was collected. “I remember him bringing this big jug of mountain water. He had to go somewhere-, some falls and get fresh mountain water and he gave us each a thing to drink” (C2, personal communication, February 12, 2015).
Next, food and drink was shared among all, including the spirits that had been disrupting them in the home. “He said everybody drink. Anybody else in the rooms? No, everybody was present. So we all drank and then he said, ok, now we have Hawaiian food we brought. So, when we ate it there was also a setting for the spirits. For them to partake of food, too” (C2, personal communication, February 12, 2015).

Then, although C2 does not speak Hawaiian and was a young girl at the time, she shared that they went through a particular protocol and ended with prayer and blessings. She emphasized the difference between what she experienced and what was later taught to her more formally. Once the ritual was done and blessed, the heaviness at the house was lifted. She described how the house literally lit up. “We don’t’ know what they were saying, that’s the thing, we weren’t Hawaiian speakers back then, you know? Just my grandpa and his friend. But, they must’ve did the ho`oponopono in Hawaiian. And, it wasn’t in a circle, that’s what I mean, it wasn’t like how the routine is. But, once we all partake of the food and the water and we were clear, and they gave a blessing with ti leaf and salt, the house-, which was in the evening, that thing that occurred was in the evening, the house lit up like it was daylight. It was weird. And you could feel the lift, just ‘poof,’ over the house” (C2, personal communication, February 12, 2015).

While C2’s ho`oponopono experience was not as “traditional” as the protocol she later learned in her workplace, it was still drawing upon Hawaiian language, cultural values, and connection to ancestors and spirits in the hopes of repairing the rift that had occurred. Her examples show how both formal and informal practices occur often in the Hawaiian community.

*Connection to All Beings*

Throughout the description of the practice, C2 mentioned a connection to spirits and a belief that spirits are just as important as living people during a practice like ho`oponopono. Furthermore, she mentioned that the connection between the living world and the spirit world is just as strong as what exists between those in the living world. A conflict can arise between the
spirit world and living world just as easily as between any two live people. “Walking about outside, moving things in the yard and my grandma goes and kicked this certain rock. Well, kicking that rock, that foot had to be cut, then her-, was cut to her knee, and then it was cut to her thigh. That foot that hit that rock. Now, in-, in reality she did have diabetes really bad. So, that’s a conflict, yeah? Hawaiians say, oh she kicked that rock. It was a-, a *mana* rock that she shouldn’t have moved, but if sh-, I feel like she didn’t know. Well, that caused conflict. So, came her leg is gone” (C2, personal communication, February 12, 2015).

C2 mentioned that the more distant cousins and relatives in her family believed that they were cursed because of these spirits. To this day, she said, they call them the “cursed” side of the family. The connection between spirit world and live world is so strong that it affects life and death. “And by that point, uh, months later, she passed away, my grandmother. And then my mother passed away five months after that. By the time I was seven. So, one after the other. And it-, still the house was in conflict. Um, you could feel it, uh, at night the winds would blow so strong and the house would move like this and I remember large, large glass windows and a face appeared on the window, like-, as if it was in frost form. And, you know, I’m little and I’m witnessing all these crazy things and not having my own parents there, just my grandpa saying you know, this is what this is” (C2, personal communication, February 12, 2015).

C2 went on to explain how those in the spirit world would sometimes speak or send messages through animals. The connection to all beings is further strengthened in the examples she gives. “I was taught to-, you see an owl, this certain owl, the same owl, everyone has seen that owl, pass, swoop, come down from the mountains, swoop around and look towards the kitchen window. And somebody died aft-, every after. Somebody died after every viewing of that owl. So, my grandpa, when he was live, seen it three times, and three of those people died” (C2, personal communication, February 12, 2015).
She gave another example of how animals are connected not only to humans, but to the spirit world, too. She describes their family dog, whom they left outside often. She said she realized that the dog could see the spirits that were in the house and they never rescued her from her fear. “Even our dog-, our dog, right dogs can see. Our dog was on the front lanai, and she’d be scratching to get in. (whimpers) Crying and crying and I asked my brother too, I said, you remember Mokihana would do-, he goes, oh my gosh, yes! And we didn’t even know better to bring her in! Poor thing, we left her outside. And she left. She left us” (C2, personal communication, February 12, 2015).

For C2, a critical part of the ho`oponopono process was the connection of all beings. Not only was the practice used to repair issues between living people, but it was also utilized to mend conflict in the spirit and ancestral realms. This belief in everything having a purpose and a spirit was emphasized by C2’s earlier comments on the differences between Hawaiian and Western peace ideas.

Western Influence

In C2’s description of ho`oponopono practice, she brought up a lot of instances in which her family was conflicted about the differences between Hawaiian practices and their more recently adopted Christian practices. One of the examples she gave described an instance in which several family members blessed the house using Christian ritual and the conflict with the spirits did not go away. “And so my grandfather held the (Mormon) priesthood, um, my brothers held the priesthood and another uncle held the priesthood. When that face appeared on the glass, I remember them blessing it in the LDS way and then he erased-, he wiped it away. But the house still felt-, it cleared a little, like feeling, but you could still hear things and um, and you could-, you could tell it in people” (C2, personal communication, February 12, 2015).

C2 talked about how the Mormon church would view the rituals involved in a ho`oponopono practice. Her description included the idea that the Christian church often views
those things in the supernatural world negatively. This is different than her earlier description of how Hawaiians view the supernatural as connected to them and do not harbor an exclusively positive or negative view. A spirit relationship can be either positive or negative, depending on the context. C2 described what she thought the Church would say about the *ho’oponopono* practice. “The church would say, oh, no you don’t bless the house with ti leaf and salt water, what does that mean? You bless with the Bible and a certain prayer. They don’t, um, it’s almost like they don’t believe in the supernatural. And, if it is, it’s the Devil” (C2, personal communication, February 12, 2015).

C2 went on to explain that the discussion of this *ho’oponopono* and the preceding conflict with the spirits in their home was a difficult topic to discuss with her family. Since she was so young at the time, she asked her brothers for details about the incident as they were much older. Because of their Mormon beliefs and disconnection from their culture, as she states, they are hesitant to even speak of the practice or of this time in their lives. “The brother above me, number four brother said, it’s best to go to the two older, they were very much older and present. But, I-, I think he said if you ask him, you’re gonna bring up stuff they’re not gonna wanna tell. So, I’m sure it was a conflict personally for them. Um, I say conflict because between the church beliefs and Hawaiian beliefs” (C2, personal communication, February 12, 2015).

C2 made a distinction between what she believes and what they do. She mentioned she feels more like one of her grandfathers who was able to mesh both Christian and Hawaiian beliefs. She considered herself a faithful member of the Mormon Church, but did not see the conflict between her Mormon beliefs and Hawaiian practices. “So, the only brother that I know who respects our culture and lives our culture too is the one on the Big Island and myself. The other two will denounce anything culture. Anything Hawaiian culture or spiritual thing. It’s the Gospel way or no other way. But not to me. I feel like my grandpa Solomon, both can mesh together” (C2, personal communication, February 12, 2015).
C2 reported on the Western influence in the practice of *ho`oponopono*. For her, this influence was primarily religious and involved her family’s membership in the LDS Church. Her own family members who experienced the *ho`oponopono* with her did not want to discuss the topic or give her any details. She talked about a clear distinction, in her family, between Hawaiian practice and their practice of the LDS Christian faith.

*Family Handling Conflict*

Another theme that arose in the interview with C2 was one of the family handling conflict. If *ho`oponopono* occurred within a family, it was rarely spoken of outside that immediate group, even to the larger extended family. C2 discussed how she was sure that other people—both friends and family members—had experienced *ho`oponopono* but she did not know when or for what type of conflict. It was not discussed. She answered the question, “Is the process personal for the family or group who is involved?” “Yes, it would just be personal, I guess. Very personal within that family. I know, I know of some of my older friends and their families had *ho`oponopono*, but I don’t know what that reason was, but I know they’ve used conflict resolution to-, and it wasn’t their first choice, you see. It ended up that it got worse and they decided, okay, we gotta look back at our own selves and use *ho`oponopono*. It’s almost like, my family I would think, they’re like, oh, okay, well, we just keep living. Oh-, things are going on in the house that we can’t see, you know it just build, build, build, build til it got too much. And then my grandpa said, hello, we have *ho`oponopono*” (C2, personal communication, February 12, 2015). In an earlier part of the interview, she emphasized again that she knew of people who had experienced the process, but never discussed it. When asked if she had told many people the story that she shared in the interview, she said no. “I never heard of anyone else, and I’m sure they occurred, but it was never shared between us” (C2, personal communication, February 12, 2015).
C2 pointed out that the *ho`oponopono* practice was often held closely within a family. She, personally, had not shared her own *ho`oponopono* story with many people and even though she knew of other family members and friends who had used the process, they did not discuss what it was used for or what conflict was being resolved.

**Role in Peace Process**

Finally, C2 was asked what she saw as her role in the peace process and her response reflected a belief in action. She felt that she had to be an example, no matter where she was. She felt as if her family saw her as a peacemaker. “My role is to be an example. Um, and-, anywhere I am, at work, at church, in my other duties that I do, um, I am actually a-, the peacemaker, I feel like, my daughters tell me that, my brothers tell me that. So all-, all I can do is live it by example” (C2, personal communication, February 12, 2015).

C2 was asked for her definition of peace, how she might describe the experience of peace by Hawaiians (her identified cultural group), whether humans were peaceful beings, her experiences with the cultural practice of *ho`oponopono* and how it compared to Western ideas and values, and finally, what she saw as her role in the peace process. C2 believed peace to be mostly an internal process, with the presence of positive emotions and absence of negative emotions. She felt that Hawaiians experienced peace through the lens of several important cultural values such as a knowledge and respect for roles, connection to family and ancestors, connection to spirit, as well as an holistic view of health with physical health being affected by spiritual health. Finally, she saw *ho`oponopono* in terms of a formal and informal practice, a connection to all beings and spirits, family handling of the process and a marked Western Christian influence on her experience. As far as her role in the peace process, she believed it was her duty to live by example.

*Cultural Informant 3 (C3)*
The following results describe the interview conducted with cultural informant 3 (C3). These responses gave the richest data and were those that were drawn upon to compare and combine with other cultural experts in order to arrive at a culturally grounded idea of peace and peacemaking. The five questions analyzed covered the following topics: peace definition, experience of peace by Hawaiians, *ho`oponopono*, and what he viewed as his role in the peace process.

**Peace Definition**

C3 was asked, “How do you define peace?” He described peace existing as a result of truth, it was something that occurred constantly, it was often the result of sharing and the process could be considered an art.

*Truth*

C3 mentioned his belief that our filtered view of the world could go so far as to create a war. “Truth brings peace. We don’t tell truth. We tell our opinions of truth. That’s what creates wars” (C3, personal communication, February 27th, 2015).

*Happening Constantly*

C3 emphasized that peace is something that is amongst us all the time, it is not an abstract concept. There are opportunities to create peace in every moment because it is happening all the time. It is not something “out there.” “When you talk about peace, see, a lot of times we think peace is something out there, but it’s something that’s happening right now, all the time, and it’s amongst us” (C3, personal communication, February 27th, 2015).

*Peace as Sharing*

C3 outlined an example of the work that he does with businesses and politicians, not only in Hawaii but abroad. He pointed out that peace can be created simply by sharing something with one another. “It’s not gonna happen because we all come together and we say, yeah, we’re gonna have peace. I have thousands and thousands of stories that illustrate non-
peace and then, something is shared, and then there’s peace” (personal communication, February 27th, 2015).

He furthered this idea by mentioning his strong relationship with the Chairman of the Board of his company. He cited one of the reasons they have such a solid bond as their ability to share their lives with one another. It was not all business between them. “We don’t talk about the company in our weekly meetings, we talk about life, we talk about community, we talk about our families. It’s more than that. Peace” (C3, personal communication, February 27th, 2015).

*Peace as Art*

C3 viewed peace as an art form and, particularly, his art form. It was described as the engagement of a relationship and where a connection occurs. “See, it’s not called the science of war, it’s called the art of war. It’s not called martial science, it’s called martial art. Art is the engagement of relationship, we learn science to hopefully get to a place where we can transform it to art, cause that’s where the connection occurs. But that’s usually where the fallout also occurs. It's in the absence of the art! So, (peace) is my art form” (C3, personal communication, February 27th, 2015).

Cultural informant 3 responded to the question, “How do you define peace?” by saying that he believed it was occurring constantly, it involved seeing the world truthfully, it could be brought about by shared information and he saw it as his own art form.

*Experience of Peace by Hawaiians*

C3 was asked the question, “Does the experience of peace in your own culture (Hawaiian) differ from that of American culture? If so, how?” In his response, he outlined several factors that made the experience of peace by Hawaiians unique. First, it begins with the energy of “our source.” Our energy of being. He told a story of his great aunt who was considered a sage during her life. She taught him a lot of what he knew about peace and *ho`oponopono* and imparted on him a lot of his beliefs and understandings of the concept.
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Beginning with Source, Energy, “Ha”

“She begins with... ahonui. Why? Because she says it all begins here. In Japanese they know it as ki. In Chinese they know it as qi. In Hawaiian we know it as ha. Our source, our energy. Qigong, ki ai, ha. All the same thing. So it begins always with ‘ha.’” (C3, personal communication, February 27th, 2015). This energy source is not only known to the Hawaiian people, but to other cultures as well, as C3 pointed out. Once there was recognition and understanding of the energy source, then connection was paramount and knowledge could be shared.

Another way in which peace was uniquely experienced was in this deep connection and shared knowledge among Hawaiian people. Knowledge was passed on through generations sometimes by physically passing on the breath. C3 told a story of when his great aunt received her knowledge from the teacher and sage before her.

Shared knowledge

“So, this man-, he was-, it was 1961 and he’s about to pass away. So he what he does is he sends two men to Oahu and says, find this lady, you’re gonna find her on the windward side and bring her to me. Put her on an airplane, take her to Kona hospital and on April 13th he does what is known as-, in Hawaiian lore as ‘ha. He breathes his last breath into her. Aunty Pilahi woke up next day, she’s the keeper of the secrets. Now she has it. Things she did not know -, she knew a lot before, but now she knew everything” (C3, personal communication, February 27th, 2015).

Her new knowledge of Hawaiian culture allowed her to become an important leader in the community. She was a resource to people and shared answers with them about various topics. He discussed how she gained access to the frequency of “the cloud” where all knowledge exists. “The cloud has existed since the beginning of time. All knowledge, experiences, and history are in the cloud. I think that there are indigenous people who have
understood frequencies of how to access the cloud. Frequency. And, that’s how I interpret what happened, it’s that he gave her frequency. So now she’s-, she’s just channeling his frequency of knowledge that has existed in the cloud. So she became and incredible resource to people and she starts to share. Many Hawaiians, non-Hawaiians go to her; she’s a sage” (C3, personal communication, February 27th, 2015).

This chain of knowledge sharing- from the dying sage to Auntie Pilahi and then from Auntie Pilahi to the rest of the community- allowed for the understanding of peace and *ho`oponopono* practice to be passed down between generations.

*Peace a Behavior not Idea*

C3 went on to explain a particular instance in which he had accompanied his father to a meeting with Auntie Pilahi. Those who called the meeting intended to discuss the issues in Hawaii and how they affected the Hawaiian people. It was an emotionally charged situation. C3 was only a young teenager observing in the room, but he described Auntie Pilahi’s advice and her ability to shift energy.

“Boom! Explosion. And the minute they asked the question, I saw almost everyone in the room raise their articles to write with and write on. Because they’re asking the sage for the real question. And she never answered their question. Instead what she shared was a behavior and way to live in the midst of this, and eventually that would lead to a resolution. And I noticed nobody wrote a thing. And then after she was done and kinda calmed the room down, then the next one came. Kalama valley! The eviction! Boom! (pause) She did it again. Overthrow! Did it again. And no one’s writing anything. I’m 13 years old, I have no idea what issues are, I just watching like a colorblind person, this façade of a dance. What is she doing? She’s shifting the energy in this room. Cause I don’t know the words, I only watch what’s happening. And it's like, boom! Like a heartbeat. Thump thump. And then the next one, boom! Five hours, I saw this. After five
hours she said, pau. We can do this again some other time, we can talk again” (C3, personal communication, February 27th, 2015).

He mentioned that she shared a “behavior” and “a way to live in the midst of all of this, and eventually that would lead to a resolution.” While those at the meeting were waiting for the answer in the form of an idea, she shared with them how to practice. C3 picked up on this, even as a young adult and emphasized greatly the importance of personal practice over idea exchange. Auntie Pilahi pulled him aside and explained to him his calling as a practitioner.

“She said as long as you think Hawaiian, regardless of the language you use, it will be the language of aloha. And aloha cuts through everything to connect with relevance and significance. It connects. She said most people learn so that they can teach. So they learn something so in that learning, they can exchange that for something. She said, not you. (pause) You practice and in your practice, you will learn. You don’t teach this to people, you only practice and you will learn what you need to know” (C3, personal communication, February 27th, 2015).

Also, in this excerpt from the interview, C3 mentioned that the language of aloha connects, in fact, it cuts through “everything to connect with relevance and significance.” The power of aloha was evident. Later in the interview, C3 talked about how important aloha and an aloha response are to bringing peace.

**Storytelling**

Finally, the Hawaiian cultural value of storytelling is another way in which C3 described the Hawaiian peace experience as unique. The loss of storytelling in the culture is a true loss, he said. This mode of communication is relevant to those of indigenous heritage. “I’m a storyteller, yeah? I believe in indigenous heritage, we’re all storytellers. Today we’re not talking story anymore. So much comes across in story” (C3, personal communication, February 27th, 2015).
He went on to share how effective storytelling can create peace and sees this cultural value as one that has contributed to Hawaiians’ peaceful living. He emphasized that in today’s world where so many organizations and moving parts are coming together to create things—public private partnerships, governments, universities, non-profits, businesses, social services, etc.—there needs to be a way to include all of these entities in the story. If they are not included, division and separation occurs. He described a conversation he had with an associate trying to coordinate one of these collaborations.

“So I said, who are your storytellers? (He replied), ‘Storytellers?! (pause) Guess I’ve been so busy since I got here, I didn’t take the time to find the storytellers. Hmm. (pause) If you have a vision as big as you have, you have to find those individuals who can tell the story large enough that everyone can find themselves in the story. Today, most people have no idea how to do that. So they tell it over here, and they tell it over here, and they tell it over here and all we have is wars. But who is telling the story large enough so everyone fits. He was really intrigued. I give examples of perspectives or stories that can either lead to peace or cause peace, not by telling people what they need to do, but by sharing a story that they find themselves reflected in” (C3, personal communication, February 27th, 2015).

C3 acknowledged that finding yourself in the story is what adds a tremendous value to storytelling. One can be lead to peace simply by finding oneself reflected in a larger vision. This personal connection, rather than disconnection, fosters peace.

*Reference versus Reverence*

C3 was asked, “How do these concepts of peace, these ideas, differ in Hawaiian culture versus the continental U.S. culture?” His response centered around the importance of money and materialism in much of American culture. He explained another concept given to him by Auntie Pilahi- that of “reference” versus “reverence” cultures. In a reference culture, much focuses on material things, income, what school one attended or credentials one has and a lot of
discussion, debate and conversation about beliefs. In a reverence culture, there is focus on living and practicing the beliefs, rather than talking about them. There is even some negativity associated with showing off material things and espousing credentials. He mentioned Auntie Pilahi’s ideas that living and practicing the culture brings connection, trust, and aloha - building blocks of peace.

“She said, relevance by reference looks like this. For me to be relevant, you may need to become irrelevant. For you to be relevant, I may need to become irrelevant and vice versa. She called reference borrowing. We borrow these things for us to be relevant. So it’s the car that we drive, it’s the phones we have, it’s where our kids go to school. She says, you cannot live this way. You cannot live this way. You have to live different from everyone else and you can’t talk about it. You live in reverence. You don’t talk about the values, in reverence you are the value, you live them. In reference, you talk about the culture. In reverence, you are the culture. Over here you have ideas, over here you are the idea. She said, this is to be, that’s to borrow. That builds connection. That’s trust. That’s aloha” (C3, personal communication, February 27th, 2015).

C3 presented a more recent example of an experience he had with U.S. government officials. When he talked about his beliefs and practices around problem solving and peace they responded with surprise. He emphasized again the importance of money in American culture, in this case, military culture. “Six months ago a man was sitting here, he’s an ambassador, a U.S. ambassador, retired now, worked in the Bush Administration. He and his wife were here on vacation, (and we met). I shared this and other things. These things blew the military’s mind. How come we don’t know this? We get trained at the highest levels in conflict resolution and we don’t know this. Cause it wasn’t for sale” (C3, personal communication, February 27th, 2015).
Hawaii as Peace Epicenter

C3 believed strongly that Hawaii was an epicenter for peace and had an opportunity to spread its ideas and beliefs about peace throughout the world. He pointed out that not only was this part of the prophecy made by Auntie Pilahi, but that he had personally spoken with international peacemakers and had felt that more and more people were interested in Hawaiian forms of peacemaking and the message of *aloha*. In this way, he believed Hawaii could be a headquarters for peace in the future. “She made a prophecy. And the prophecy is in the 21st Century, the world will search for peace. You’re looking for peace. And they’ll look to Hawaii because Hawaii is the key and that key is *aloha*” (C3, personal communication, February 27th, 2015).

C3 affirmed that Hawaiian culture is one of reverence, rather than reference and that this differed from continental American culture which focused more on material goods, titles and references to ideas. The key was to *practice* aloha and *practice* peace- to live by example. For him, the Hawaiian sage, Auntie Pilahi, had a lot to do with his calling to become a *kahu* and peacemaker and the calling of Hawaii to become an example to the world. A lot of the examples he called upon were stories she had shared with him and lessons he had learned from her practice.

**Ho`oponopono**

C3 was asked, “Tell me about ho`oponopono. How do you practice?” His answers fell into three predominant categories: formal and informal practice, the *aloha* response, and practicing *ho`oponopono* as a regular and regimented discipline. He described the steps in the *aloha* response as being synonymous with what he viewed as his *ho`oponopono* practice. Each specific step of the *aloha* response is outlined.

**Formal/Informal Practice**
C3 pointed out, like other cultural informants, that there was a difference between a formal family gathering of *ho`oponopono* and those that occur more often, in real time. He told a story about how Auntie Pilahi had pulled him aside as a young child and told him what his destiny was. At another point in the interview, he mentioned that he felt she did this because she saw that the adults in the room were already too invested in the reference culture, they saw things as disconnected. C3 maintained that the old, traditional gatherings of *ho`oponopono* was a thing of the past. “I don’t know that we can have *ho`oponopono* the way that we used to have *ho`oponopono* which is those gatherings of the family. Because the quality is gone. It was already gone in ‘76” (C3, personal communication, February 27th, 2015).

He went on to expound about how the quality of the interactions between people have diminished. In order to have a traditional *ho`oponopono* gathering today, there would be things that need to happen first. “For that type of *ho`oponopono* that used to happen traditionally, (the *aloha* response) has to happen. Because everyone is bringing in all kinds of things today” (C3, personal communication, February 27th, 2015). C3 discussed that, in today’s society, the “old” structure of *ho`oponopono* would not fit. There are too many obstacles or challenges coming at one time and the complexity of conflict has increased. In his opinion, the practice must move to one of real time, choosing peaceful responses consistently.

“See, it doesn’t have the structure that everybody thinks it has. It’s not something out there, it’s something in here (touches chest), happening all the time. Right now. Before practitioners lived lives who were much closer, you could talk, you could convene and deal with issues. So, at the same rate at which everything in life is attacking you for your attention, is the speed with which we need to address this issue of peace. It is happening all the time in real time” (C3, personal communication, February 27th, 2015).

*The Aloha Response*
One of the critical parts of C3’s interview was his description of what he called the *aloha* response. For him, this is the way he created a space for peace during conflict or difficult conversations. He likens it to *ho`oponopono* frequently and uses it as his main tool as *kahu* of his organization. The *aloha* response has several specific steps, and ends in providing a new connection, allowing for relationship reparation. C3 affirmed that he used the *aloha* response regularly during his work, and viewed it as something one could use at any time. First, he outlined the various steps and then went into more specific description.

Active, Real Time

“What does it look like? I’m waiting for the moment and when the moment comes I go empty, and then with white gloves and gentle touches, I grow and connect. How do I establish the connection? How do I bring peace? It is active. It is in real time. It is always happening” (C3, personal communication, February 27th, 2015).

*Waiting for the Moment*

As described by C3, the first step in the *aloha* response is waiting for the moment. The Hawaiian sage, Auntie Pilahi, told him the deeper meanings behind the parts of her *ALOHA* acronym, beginning with *ahonui*. C3 gave an example of a shark or an eagle, who may be quiet, observant animals, but they are waiting for the moment. “She said you are *ahonui*. You’re waiting for the moment, because the moment will come and it may not come in your lifetime, but you are always prepared and are preparing others. You are *ahonui*. A shark and an eagle are never patient. They are always waiting for the moment. Today we have people who are impatient. I am a very impatient man. Although it comes across that I am always patient, I’m not. I’m waiting for the moment” (C3, personal communication, February 27th, 2015).

*Go to Empty*

The second step in the *aloha* response is to go to empty. C3 demonstrated this as literally exhaling breath until your lungs are empty, much like what occurred when the *ha* ritual
was done and information was passed on to Auntie Pilahi. He described it as a moment of emptiness when, even for a moment, both parties are vulnerable and open to something new and one is able to connect with spirit or their higher power. In his work, C3 goes to this moment of emptiness before trying to repair a relationship or create a space for communication. He further described another part of the acronym ALOHA from his Aunt- ha`a ha`a- which has a deeper meaning than its literal translation of humility.

“Most people know ha`a ha`a as humility. I know ha`a ha`a as empty. She said ha`a ha`a is to empty yourself, to go to nothing, to go to zero, to be empty. She said only when you’re empty can you connect with kumu, or kapuna, or ke akua. Only when you’re empty can you hear. Do most people come empty or do they come full? They come full. She said you have to practice being empty. So then what she does is she looks right at me and she “ha” (breathes out extensively). (pause) And with “ha” you go to a moment of emptiness” (C3, personal communication, February 27th, 2015).

C3 furthered his point by giving an example of the Hawaiian practice of honi or touching noses and inhaling simultaneously to share breath. “You’ve seen people honi. Share breath. What is the objective to share breath? To share breath, to connect, that’s the objective. What people don’t recognize is for two people to share breath, you first have to have two people willing to go to a moment of emptiness. If you don’t have two people going empty, they ain’t sharing a breath” (C3, personal communication, February 27th, 2015).

Finally, C3 illustrated the idea that all peace required connection, and connection required a moment of emptiness. The examples he gave were from major life events- conception, birth, and death. “All connection, all connection is preceded by a moment of emptiness. She said ALL. When the sperm and the egg come together, they both have to be willing to go to a moment of emptiness. At that moment of the emptiness, the connection occurs, cause it’s not gonna be a sperm and it won’t be an egg anymore. When the baby is born, mama
and baby have to be willing to go to a moment of emptiness, then (breathes in) when a person dies, you go to a moment of emptiness. All connection is preceded by a moment of emptiness. Foundational for peace. More people are not going to moments of emptiness” (C3, personal communication, February 27th, 2015).

Engage Gracefully

The third step in the aloha response is to engage freely and openly, without forcing any answers or trying to get anyone else to see something “your way.” C3 discussed how in the modern world we consistently try to convince people of our point of view and feel that there is a victory when they finally buy in. He explained that that is not an example of peace, simply because then both parties are the same page. He reiterated that the purpose of the aloha response is to make people see themselves in a new way, not to “win” someone over to our side of things. The specific metaphors he provides for engaging gracefully are using white gloves and handling a baby. The use of white gloves indicated touching without staining, gentleness and carrying a child indicated awareness, carefulness and strength. His story is framed in what Auntie Pilahi shared with him years ago. “‘Ha’akahai people know as kindness. I know aakahai as grace. When I engage, I engage with grace. What that means is white gloves. When I leave I’m not here to leave my fingerprints or to stain you. That it was grace looks like, she said. White gloves. Then she jumps to ‘olu’olu. Pleasant. ‘Olu’olu is gentle, to touch like you are touching a baby. You’re here with gentleness, you’re not here to bruise or scar baby. However, people understand that, but they don’t understand the other side because they understand the gentleness of aloha and the beautiful gentleness of it. But there’s another side- and that gentleness enough to carry a baby, however, strong enough never ever to (mimics dropping). Strong enough to carry a baby, gentle enough not to hurt it. This is the strongest thing I do in my life, it’s the hardest thing I do in my life. I am a very strong man. Cause aloha is strong” (C3, personal communication, February 27th, 2015).
Experience Connection

After finding the moment, going to empty, and engaging gently, then one can experience connection. C3 talked about how this connection experience is what would eventually create peace and resolve conflict. If I can see me in you and you in me, as part of a connection, then the desire to win and to be correct is simply not as strong. C3 explained the underlying definition of ho`oponopono and then went on to describe how the connection experience helps to create unity. “The problem is not Hawaiian, the problem is English. People don’t know what they’re talking about! (laughs) She said that’s not lokahi. Alo-, in the presence of, kahi. Lo-, connected, kahi. Aloka hi, lokahi. Dropped the A. Lokahi doesn’t mean unity, lokahi means unbroken. We enter this Universe lokahi. But our education, political, economic, geographic, religious systems teach us we’re all broken and we spend all of our time trying to ho`okahi everybody. And what is our method of engagement? Debate! Argument! She said never happen. So, she said you’re going to be a storyteller. But when you tell your stories, you’re gonna tell ‘em the old way. I’m not here to deposit in your cranium. I am here for you to experience this connection” (C3, personal communication, February 27th, 2015).

C3 illuminated quite a bit about ho`oponopono and the role of the aloha response in peacemaking. Throughout the interview, he gave several examples of how he has used it in practice. As a person worked in the business world, he mentioned the difficulty of getting certain people in the same room. As a result of past grievances, disagreements and sometimes simply rumor, there were many sectors of Hawaii’s community that were divided. As CEO and kahu of his organization, he used the aloha response to reach a point of unity, and to practice ho`oponopono. He discussed an incident where his boss did not want to attend a particular meeting, but went anyway at C3’s urging. In the example, he recognized the need to practice in
the moment, in real time. “This is my boss. He comes, you know what? It’s uncomfortable. How come? The wound is still there! This is how we clean the wound! Two years later, they’re friends. Now we can talk about economic development. Until that time, there is no economic conversation. There’s only posturing. So, today, it’s not the wise men at the top of the mountain, it’s not-, for me it’s not seeking-, there are places you can do that or we can create that, but it’s in real time. Because it’s making the corrections as they’re happening, the moment it comes, I have to go to empty and white gloves, gentle touches, try to help them reconnect” (C3, personal communication, February 27th, 2015).

Finally, in his last example, C3 explained how finding what is the appropriate *aloha* response is often key to create healing or unity. He told a story of when he offered his kidney to a friend who needed a transplant. Because it was such a huge gift, the friend did not know how to accept. He could not accept and kept ignoring C3’s attempts to contact him. He explained that instead of forcing his friend or “changing his mind” with debate and argument, he had to work inward and, through practice, show his friend that he was strong enough to survive the surgery and that he was prepared for what he was trying to give. He did this by physically training and reported his training sessions and health to his friend. “See, that's what ho`oponopono is. To make one, we have to understand the one. What is the one? He believes his friend cannot put him on the scalpel table cause the burden is too great. So what his friend needs is somebody to help him carry that burden and the only person who can carry the burden is the one who’s gonna give. And so he (physically) trains so that he can be strong enough to carry that burden for his friend so his friend can have confidence that he can carry it for him. He will go and he could die, but he’s going to do everything he can so that he doesn’t have to carry that burden. See? That’s the *aloha* response” (C3, personal communication, February 27th, 2015).

*Discipline/Practice*
C3 discussed how practicing the *aloha* response and *ho`oponopono* is something that takes considerable time. It is not something done in one conversation or speech. “This is like doing body work on people. It doesn’t happen in an instant. In that instant something happens, but then you’ve gotta go back there and massage them again, cause the body has muscle memory. We have learned these behaviors” (C3, personal communication, February 27th, 2015).

He talked about how he lets others know of the work that is involved with creating peaceful exchanges. “There was folks who produced seminars and videos and their motivational stuff and I do so much speaking, but I tell people, I’m not a Red Bull or a shot of an espresso, cause this is work. And, you know, you gotta come back, we gotta work it again. Cause you don’t solve a problem by giving people a dose, oh, I’ll take you up, drop you deep now. You gotta work and work cause we are re-working things we just adopted and learned” (C3, personal communication, February 27th, 2015).

The discipline and practice of *ho`oponopono* is one that occurred inside out, according to C3. His intention and his own behavior change are a huge part of the process. “The issue is me working on me. And that’s where *ho`oponopono* is, it’s about helping to get people to a place where they understand it’s me work on me, it’s not me work on them. And that’s why I never told (my friend who needed my kidney), you need to get better. I will get myself better” (C3, personal communication, February 27th, 2015).

Role in Peace Process

In the last part of the interview, C3 was asked, “What do you see as your role in the peace process?” He responses fell into these categories: chosen, a gift giver, a *kahu*, and one who provides pause and changes the conversation.

*Chosen*

C3 genuinely viewed practicing peace and *ho`oponopono* to be a calling. Auntie Pilahi told him he was supposed to practice and he made life decisions based on her prophecy. In this
quote he talked about why he believed he might have been chosen by her to live this lifestyle. “Why do I think that she took me on the side? Now that people know, some people say, ah, you were chosen. There might be something to that. But what if I’m the only person who (was at the meeting with) empty hands? She talked about a key. What if the only reason is cause I’m the only one who didn’t come with anything. If you’re gonna give me a key, don’t forsake the key for the pen. I came empty. That’s the easy way for me to solve it” (C3, personal communication, February 27th, 2015).

Because he was so confident in her assessment of him, C3 believed in the calling, even before it came to fruition. “Lost my job in 2000, restaurant I was working at closed down, I was offered many jobs, something told me, you can’t take a job. I had no money. I told my wife, I can’t take a job. She asked, why? Something is gonna happen and I can’t explain it” (C3, personal communication, February 27th, 2015). He discussed his feelings when years later he met with a UN peacekeeper about peacemaking practices and the values of Hawaiian peacemaking. “Look! I’m meeting with a UN peacekeeper? And then he’s emailing me, this is what we did, can I do a debrief with you? I mean! I didn’t ask for this, I didn’t seek it out. I believe in the prophecy” (C3, personal communication, February 27th, 2015).

Gift Giver

He was sure to emphasize that this is not a business for him. He works as the CEO of his company and does apply ho`oponopono and the aloha response to issues he may be having, but sharing these ideas are a gift. “I’m not making money off of this. Although, it pays for everything I do. In Hawaii, I don’t collect money for my speeches. It’s not for sale, it’s a gift. When people come from the mainland or I go elsewhere, I will charge, because I wanna bring money home to Hawaii, but this is not for sale. This was not given to me with a price tag. The price tag was time” (C3, personal communication, February 27th, 2015).

Kahu
C3 explained to me that people often understand the Hawaiian word *kahu* to mean “priest,” but he believed it to have the meaning of “guardian” instead. His role as the guardian of his organization came unexpectedly and uniquely. As an organizational *kahu*, C3 felt that his role was one that involved problem solving, conflict resolution and conscience seeking. This position contributed to his role as a peacemaker. “One week before the end of the year in 2008, so it’s like Christmas Eve. C3, we’re gonna put you on staff, now they don’t have any money— we’re gonna put you on staff—, oh yeah? What are you gonna hire me as? I got no credentials, I’m not an economist. We’re gonna hire you as an organizational *kahu*. (pause) You know what you’re doing? Yeah. Do you realize that you will probably be the only economic development organization in the country, if not, the world, hiring somebody to be their guardian? (pause) Yeah! You sure?! Yeah. Okay, as long as you know what you’re doing. But that’s what you become, you become our conscience. So, I was hired on January 1st, 2009, to be the *kahu* of this organization” (C3, personal communication, February 27th, 2015).

*Providing Pause*

C3 talked about his role as a peacemaker in terms of being someone who was able to provide pause for others. This moment of pause could turn into an opportunity for peace, or an opportunity to go in a new, more positive direction. “So what does a pause look like? See, when somebody lives with such extreme discipline, if they’re willing to share this discipline, it provides an opportunity for people to pause. And pause could be a place of reflection or deep, um, insight, um, and what most people are trying to do is impart rather than pause” (C3, personal communication, February 27th, 2015).

He imparted further about how his own discipline and presence allowed for others to have a moment of contemplation. “And I’m not telling you where to go, I’m not telling you how to get there, I’m not telling you to go deep, I’m just sharing my own discipline and reflection and
how I look at life and it will pause you. In that pause, whatever comes up are opportunities for peace” (C3, personal communication, February 27th, 2015).

C3 described how impactful leaders often have this gift of “pause.” It is different than what most others do in leadership positions, which is often characterized as trying to “win” people over or impart their ideas. Providing pause is a way to open space for the other person to connect and find themselves in a new idea or solution. “If you study the greatest leaders in history that we admire and we admonish, now me describing this, you’ll recognize—, they all had the ability to pause. Pause people. Pause audiences. Most people are trying to win an audience. They pause them. They pause them with their own self-discipline, they pause them with their own words which come from their discipline. Today, we’re trying to ho‘okahi everybody. So, what they did is they were willing to be vulnerable with their discipline and when you do that, it provides the opportunity for people to tune into that frequency. So, when I do what I do, it provides an opportunity for pause. Does it affect everybody? No. Does everybody get it? No. For some though, for many, they do” (C3, personal communication, February 27th, 2015).

Reframe Conversation

After providing pause and a space for another person to change their perspective on a conflict, C3 noted that he has worked at reframing conversations. This is critical in practicing ho‘oponopono because all involved need to be invested. Until a conversation is reframed and everyone can see themselves in it somewhere, an organization is often spinning its wheels. “What I do is I reframe conversations to a place where we can be engaged. Then we can start working on the negotiations of peace. We can start working on our relationship, the “our.” Until we get to that point, we cannot. Because all that is a discussion in what we win, what we lose, so we’re just continuously trying to negotiate. Today, that’s where I live. 100 years ago, it was different, but today we work on projects so I can work with people and in working with people I get real time issues coming up. And, hopefully, if we can develop an aloha response, they take
this *aloha* response wherever they go and they start to impact” (C3, personal communication, February 27th, 2015).

C3 answered questions regarding his definition of peace, the experience of peace by Hawaiians, *ho`oponopono* practice, and what he viewed as his role in the peace process. His responses included rich description of his peace definition—peace being possible when truth was present. He believed in opportunities for peace occurring in real time, constantly, and that sharing information was crucial in looking for those opportunities. Peace and peacemaking he considered to be his art form.

C3 saw the Hawaiian understanding of peace to begin with source, or what is referred to as *ha* in the Hawaiian language. This connection to spirit was important and unique compared to common, more Western understandings of peace. Shared knowledge not only from the spirit and ancestral realm, but from storytelling between generations was a pivotal way in which Hawaiians experience peace uniquely. Finally, the differences between what he coined the “reference” and “reverence” cultures. In a reference culture, competition and showmanship exist and ego is dominant. In a more traditionally Hawaiian view, a reverence culture, *behavior* and *practice* come before words. Actions are an integral part of understanding peace. Additionally, in his *ho`oponopono* description, C3 outlined the steps of the *aloha* response and how they play into the problem solving practice of *ho`oponopono*. He used the terms interchangeably and believed that his practice of the *aloha* response was how he saw himself as an *ho`oponopono* practitioner.

Finally, as for his role in the peace process, C3 trusted the words of his Auntie Pilahi and maintained his calling as a practitioner of *ho`oponopono* and the *aloha* response. He felt that he could only gift the information he has and cannot put a price on the experience. He is officially a *kahu* of his organization and worked to provide moments of pause that ultimately reframe conversations. These new conversations provide opportunities for peace.
Cultural Informant 6 (C6)

The following results describe the interview conducted with cultural informant 6 (C6). These responses gave the richest data and were those that were drawn upon to compare and combine with other cultural experts in order to arrive at a culturally grounded idea of peace and peacemaking. The five questions analyzed covered the following topics: peace definition, experience of peace by Hawaiians, contrasting Hawaiian experience of peace to Western ideas, and ho`oponopono.

Definition of Peace

C6 was asked the question, “How would you define peace?” He answered by highlighting the idea of a yin-yang relationship. Peace comes about when balance is maintained between the yin-yang forces. He further discussed the notion of the acceptance of conflict as a part of life, rather than feeling peace is only achieved when all conflict is gone. He expanded on this idea by stating that finding a process to achieve peace is the most important endeavor. To have an active practice that allows the balance between yin-yang is key. And finally, he felt that any definition of peace or representation of peace was indicative of one’s deep culture.

Yin-Yang Balance

C6 described peace as something similar to the Chinese concept of yin-yang, it is always moving and fluctuating. “It’s ever changing-, when after you resolve a conflict, then you have other conflicts and you resolve it. It’s more a Daoistic approach, a yin-yang, ever moving, rather than a Western approach of reaching a crescendo and everything is resolved” (C6, personal communication, April 16th, 2015).

He emphasized his point further by mentioning the Chinese Cultural Revolution as an example. While it was a harsh and horrible time for many, C6 believed this was part of a balancing process to bring greater peace in the future. “So he had his cultural revolution and it certainly was not peaceful, but it was necessary to bring out the yin-yang changes, so that was a
process. Sometimes with violence of unhappiness, or at least among the elites who were writing the history and making the complaints. (laughs) And yet Mao was adamant, no, you have to come back to the villages and understand what it is to be among the people” (C6, personal communication, April 16th, 2015).

Acceptance of conflict

C6 pointed out that many view peace as a place in time when there is no conflict at all. He disagreed with this assessment and felt that part of what defined peace for him, was the ability to accept conflict in your life. “I think peace is a state of being that it is anticipated that there is no more conflict, and I don’t agree with that. I think peace, as a goal, is more developing a process to resolve conflicts, to accept conflicts as part of life” (C6, personal communication, April 16th, 2015). Later in the discussion, he emphasized again the importance of finding a process to resolve conflict. He talked about this being superior to the search or “quest for peace” that was less of a practice and more of an esoteric ideal.

Represents Deep Culture

Finally, and most thoroughly, C6 sees the definition of peace to be driven by one’s deep culture. In fact, he went so far to say that an individual’s personal definition was less impactful than that of the culture that he or she belongs to. “I think more important than the struggle to find peace and whatever you mean by peace is the struggle to understand the deep culture that you speak from. And that deep culture will define peace to a greater extent than one’s individual definition of what peace is” (C6, personal communication, April 16th, 2015).

He expanded upon the importance of deep culture. “The deep culture are things that people don’t even recognize, they don’t know exist, but they carry it with them. And sometimes they carry a split deep culture, when they’re in one community or one society, they operate under certain rules, when they’re in another society, without even thinking of a switch, they
operate under separate rules. Very similar to many of us who speak Pidgin English and have been trained to speak the King’s English” (C6, personal communication, April 16th, 2015).

He believed deep culture and a shift in deep cultural beliefs was the answer to transforming conflict. How a culture defines peace was critical in cultivating peace in that society. “I often say that if you want to create a peaceful society, don’t look necessarily in terms of the ho’oponopono process or the court system or whatever it is to resolve the conflicts, look at the deep culture and within the deep culture people now can transform and find and even avoid conflicts before it becomes conflict. You know, you still have different aspirations, different desires, people see things from a different perspective. But create a softer system, um, within the deep culture, so it can be resolved very quickly” (C6, personal communication, April 16th, 2015).

Experience of Peace

C6 was asked, “Does the experience of peace in your own culture (Hawaiian) differ from that of American or Western culture? If so, how?” In response to this question, he first explained the theory behind his answer. He discussed Galtung’s (1973) ABC Triangle theory of conflict and how this played into his views of the differences in peace from an Hawaiian perspective versus a Western one.

Triangle of Conflict and Peace: ABC

Point A

C6 described the “A” point of the triangle, which Galtung (1973) designated as “attitutude.” “A stands for attitudes, aspirations, awareness, um, it stands for those deep values that people work from without even realizing that they have those deep values. It’s something that they think is normal, natural, all human beings go thru, and yet that’s not necessarily the case” (C6, personal communication, April 16th, 2015).
He went on to describe point B, which Galtung (1973) designated as “behavior.” C6 points out the distinction between feminine and masculine forms of outward behavior. “The second is point B. And point B is your point of behavior. Those are the kinds of stuff that you actually see and sometimes sort of unseen. Usually, the actual violence, the behavior of violence of active action-, punching, stabbing, shooting and all that stuff, in generally it has a tendency of being more masculine rather than feminine. Okay, the feminine side of behavior is more the secretive side, the poisoning, a different way of killing (laughs), but just as dangerous” (C6, personal communication, April 16th, 2015).

Point C

C6 continued by describing point C, which Galtung (1973) designated as “conflict.” C6 views this point more as conditions or context. “At point C is conditions. Or conflicts or contradictions. So we talk about the quality of life for all people in the American society. The great American society. Except, eh, you blacks you get in the back of the bus, this is only for the whitefolks and the schools are discriminated and even the water fountains and all of those things. The discrimination creates the condition and you have a contradiction in society and people living thru such contradictions” (C6, personal communication, April 16th, 2015).

He went on to mention that much of what we describe when we are talking about an experience of peace or violence has to do with behaviors, since they are part of the triangle that is visible to others. “So, when people try to address the issues of peace and violence, they always look at only behavior point. You can draw a line that separates the point B from point A and C. Or you can put a dotted line or a straight line, anything below the line is invisible and anything above the line is visible. So, you call it the visibility-invisibility line. So society normally views only with behavior and it doesn’t look deeper into the internal kind of stuff. But the root of violence or peace comes out of attitudes and conditions” (C6, personal communication, April
These differing attitudes and conditions set the stage for the differences in Hawaiian understandings of peace and Western American understandings of the concept.

Experience of Peace by Hawaiians

C6 continued with his theoretical discussion, by pointing out the deep cultural differences between Western and Hawaiian culture. He has coined these ideas as the DIE culture and the OLA culture. The differences between them were stark and described his view of how each culture may experience peace separately.

*DIE Culture*

He began by pointing out how in Hawaii there is a separation between what is practiced in the formal society, and what is practiced more often in homes, in rural areas, or in places where societal structures are not as prominent. “In Hawaii, we have the deep culture that is governed by the formal society and that affects how we deal with our environment, how we deal with education, how we deal with economics, how we deal with um, social relationship, governmental relationship, how we deal with politics, how we deal with law. It is based on three fundamental pillars. The first pillar is domination, the second pillar is individualism, and the third pillar is exclusion” (C6, personal communication, April 16th, 2015). An example of how one would behave in the DIE culture, C6 talked about a tree that stood shading a bus stop. In the DIE culture’s rule book, the tree was on a particular person’s property, and he had the right to do whatever he wanted with it. It is “his” tree. When the property owner went to cut the tree down, community members kindly asked him not to, pointing out that the tree provided shade for the bus stop and provided fruit for those who needed it. In the DIE culture, the property owner shows his property line and tells the community that he is allowed to do what he wants with the tree. The DIE cultures law and social structure supports his decision.

C6 was an attorney by profession and describes his understanding of the law as being based in the same DIE culture. “Law is based on that same domination, individualism, and
exclusion. You know, you sue, there’s one winner, one loser, the judge may decide, but you fight like cats and dogs. You get your lawyers and they fight it out. You don’t think about the care of the larger community, what the issues that you’re really trying to settle. They claim that well, yeah, you have a certain concern for public policy, but that’s only if you can find a public policy on your side, otherwise, bullshit, I’m gonna try to win. That’s what the law is all about” (C6, personal communication, April 16th, 2015). After this discussion, he noted another example of the right to free speech. In the DIE culture, one can speak his or her mind anywhere and about anything he or she pleases. He could stand outside the grocery store and tell all of his family secrets, with no law being broken. He commented that in an OLA culture, which he explains later, this type of family shaming would be a violation the social norm.

C6 followed up with an example of a recent DIE culture focused leader. “George Bush was an excellent speaker of DIE culture and the concept of exclusion. When he said either you’re with us or you’re against us, you know in the war in Iraq. You’re either with us or you’re against us. That’s the mentality, he’s not wrong, he comes from a culture and he’s expressing that culture. You know? Um, so if somebody says, aren’t there any grays in between? Between right and wrong? No, no more gray, it’s either my way or the highway. You’re practicing exclusion” (C6, personal communication, April 16th, 2015).

After he explained the tenets of DIE culture, C6 went on to outline the main ideas of what he has coined the OLA culture.

OLA Culture

The OLA culture, in Hawaii, is practiced within smaller communities, within families, and within a more traditional Hawaiian context. “On the other hand, when you come into communities, usually, countryside, but not only that, even in-, in more metropolitan areas, instead of domination, it’s always ‘olu ‘olu. To work gently with the other side. There’s a softness about it, yeah? There’s an aloha to it, instead of domination. Instead of individualism,
it’s *lokahi*, yeah? You think about the group, the family, the larger community. The way you pick limu as a simple example, you’re thinking of nature as well as the next person who’s gonna pick. And instead of exclusion, it’s always *aloha*. To include, to welcome, to change the harmony in that relationship. So you have, on the other side, the alternate side, you have *`olu `olu*, you have *lokahi* instead of individualism, and then you have *aloha* instead of exclusion” (C6, personal communication, April 16th). These ideas, also pointed out in the previous interview with C3, are those that are held by many practicing peace in an Hawaiian context. They are juxtaposed to the DIE culture and have a broader view of community and connection to other people.

As an attorney, C6 operated very much in the DIE context when he was practicing. He discussed how it was to move back and forth between the two contexts. “Me, as an attorney, I go into court, the rules are all set out, the rules of court, the laws, statutes, all of that stuff. So I have to operate within that context. To the extent that I can, I will try to find ways of challenging or moving up to the margins that is allowable, but I’m not gonna lose a case for my client based on my wish to do that. I may make some public policy arguments and argue to the court that we really need to look at the larger system, but I’m still limited in that arena. So that’s when I need to jump into the DIE system” (C6, personal communication, April 16th, 2015). He commented that many people who live an OLA lifestyle, in a Hawaiian family, for example, are continually switching back and forth between the DIE and OLA contexts as they interact with the larger formal system.

As these cultural differences related to peace, C6 explained that he believed the only way to true peace, was from an OLA perspective. “A person who is successful in his deep culture, that follows OLA, I believe can find peace. A person who is successful in the DIE culture is not gonna find peace cause his constant need for domination, for exclusion, for individualism is not a peaceful solution. So, he may dominate that system, but he is not at peace. He will try to dominate the peace process and push peace, but he’s still not at peace” (C6, personal
He furthered this explanation by providing an example of how a large scale problem is sometimes handled within the formal, DIE oriented system.

“So, sometimes what people do is they try to change one or another aspect of the system. How are we gonna treat our veterans? Well, we’re gonna remove this head of the department, we’re gonna throw more money in, we’re gonna get more psychiatrists and psychologists and MDs and that’s gonna be the system. So, they only look-, the individualize the issue and they separate it from the rest of the society. So sometimes I gotta ask, where the hell are you gonna find all these psychiatrists and psychologists, cause in the community, no more enough! Oh, we’re gonna pay ‘em more! In other words, you gonna steal my psychiatrists and my psychologists, you’re gonna hire ‘em off and you gonna leave us without? Well, that’s a different problem but we’re gonna solve the veterans problem. See how they individualize the issue? And so, the society itself doesn’t approach it in a holistic manner. You really need that review of the deep culture to press a society or move the society forward to peace” (C6, personal communication, April 16th, 2015).

Along with the DIE-OLA distinction, C6 went on to emphasize that Hawaiians experienced peace uniquely for other reasons as well.

**Historical Trauma**

The peace experience by the Hawaiian community was couched in negative historical experiences, according to C6. He told a story about when he discovered the truth about the overthrow. “I was living the life and doing all the right things according to their rules. 1970, I picked up a book and I started reading Liliuokalani’s story. I was in the military. Okay, that time and the 2 years after that I was court martialed, I refused to salute the American flag, I wanted to blow up buildings, kill Americans, and destroy the system. Now, finding out that essentially all of the prior years I had been tricked. Not only myself, but my parents, the whole society, the theft of a nation up to this point in time and it was still going on” (C6, personal communication, April 16th,
While the adherence to the OLA culture is something that is practiced by many of those in the Hawaiian community, according to C6, the suffering and anger caused by the overthrow and other historical traumas has shaped the Hawaiian experience of peace to the extent that it has left a lot of the community in different stages of grief.

“In the process of decolonization, you have what I call, five stages. The first stage is that of recovery and rediscovery. And that’s the period that we went through, about realizing that we had been overthrown, there was an alien takeover and it was against International law and all of that kind of stuff. The next stage is the mourning stage, the anger, the bitterness, even the racist stage in which we ourselves express our own racism. Oh, you damn haoles go back and all you Japanese go back to Japan and we cut it along the line of racism. That’s part of the mourning stage, but it’s a necessary stage for many people who have suffered traumatic experiences. So, we get into that. The challenge there is not getting stuck in the mourning stage. You have to pull out of that and get in the next stage, which is the dreaming stage” (C6, personal communication, April 16th, 2015).

In C6’s perspective, the Hawaiian experience of peace differed from that of Western American culture in that, in his view, peace is only possible when employing the practices of the OLA culture- ‘olu ‘olu, lokahi, and aloha. In the formal, American cultural systems, the DIE culture is very much alive. By focusing on domination, individualism and exclusion, one could never arrive at peace. Moreover, the Hawaiian community has experienced cultural historical trauma, contributing to their practice and understanding of conflict resolution and peace.

Human Beings Peaceful by Nature

C6 was asked, “Do you believe human beings are peaceful by nature?” He responded, “No. Because there’s no such thing as peaceful by nature, it is the conditions that create and it is also human beings that-, the human beings are inheritors of a culture. They are inheritors of a
history, they are inheritors of the circumstance that they are in; you cannot separate them.” (C6, personal communication, April 16th).

_Ho`oponopono_

C6 was asked, “Tell me about _ho`oponopono_. How do you practice?” His response fell into the following categories: different types of practice, medium of conversation, and connection to spirit.

**Different Types of Practice**

C6 pointed out that there are various ways and styles of practicing _ho`oponopono_ and that no one way is better than another, they are all in place to resolve conflicts. “For me, my understanding of _ho`oponopono_ is that there’s many different techniques, different practices. _Ho`oponopono_- _ho`o_ is a causative-, what do you call it, is it an adverb? To create. _Pono_-appropriateness, righteousness, balance, justice, uh, resolution. So, _ho`oponopono_ is the process by which we cleanse, we create that balance, we resolve conflicts.” (C6, personal communication, April 16th, 2015).

He went on to explain a few of the different ways in which people practice _ho`oponopono_ as well as the different elements they use in cleansing. “They may use a Bible, uh, _pukiwehiwehi_, opening up the Bible and just pointing to a particular passage and then reading from it, etc. You can use water, you can use _la`au_, so many different ways of _ho`oponopono_, banana stump, ti leaf, etc. So, for me, the term _ho`oponopono_ is a generic form of purifying and cleansing or resolving issues” (C6, personal communication, April 16th, 2015). After his explanation of the various forms of the practice, C6 discussed the commonly known and formally described Pukui, Haertig, and Lee (1972) _ho`oponopono_ process, sometimes known as the _Ka`u_ system. In his view, this system is the most effective conflict resolution system he has ever come across.
“I’m also a promoter in the use of Ka’u system. It’s probably the best and most effective system of group facilitation and group resolution. Better than any other system than I have heard of. It’s far better than Roberts rules of order, far better than all of these other procedures, which are all ho’oponopono procedures, ways of resolving conflict. It follows some of the principles that you then find in these Parliamentary rules of order, and yet it can be done in a more effective way to bring about resolution. Um, and I-, and I’ve written a paper or two on how to take the Hawaii ka’u style and transfer it to an international arena where controversies are being conducted or wars are being conducted and the principles are still there” (C6, personal communication, April 16th, 2015).

Medium of Conversation

C6 believed that his practice of ho’oponopono was primarily done through the medium of conversation. He hosted a radio show and discussed how it was the venue in which he considered himself an ho’oponopono practitioner. He told a story about a man who admitted to calling the FBI on him, after hearing him on the show. This particular listener turned from foe to friend. “He told me, I just hated you. But, you carry on the conversation that I cannot avoid listening, I gotta listen to it! Although I disagree, I gotta listen, and you know, the more I listen, the more I think I agree with you! (laughs) And what it shows is not that I’m right or wrong (laughs), yeah, it’s funny! And I said, so what the FBI told you? And he say, well, he has a right to the freedom of speech, so there’s nothing we can do. And so, to me, conversation is the medium by which we conduct a very broad ho’oponopono” (C6, personal communication, April 16th, 2015).

By opening up a dialogue between parties who may not normally speak to one another, C6 noted that he has become a sort of peacemaker, talking between groups who may not be able to converse themselves. “The technique of conversation is very informative. The medium in which you carry your message, your methodology, is important. And yet, I have to realize, that
not everybody can talk to everybody else. You need other people to talk to that group sometimes” (C6, personal communication, April 16th, 2015). The process of having a public conversation allows others to have an opportunity to think another way, or see another point of view. C6 described how an audience mostly listens, even if they do not participate.

“So, by that process of conversation by dialogue, and then people start thinking about it-, they may not be engaged in that dialogue, see, but they think about it. And I conduct these discussions, and on my radio show, it’s an open microphone. Anybody can call in, I don’t ask them for their identification, who they are and all that stuff. You have a question, what is the question and let’s engage in a discussion. So, they may come out with a long spiel about this or that and then I engage in a discussion and just by that discussion, you have two people talking, but you have a thousand, maybe two, maybe ten thousand who are listening. And they think about it” (C6, personal communication, April 16th, 2015).

As a former attorney, C6 discussed how talking with people about their problems became very common for him. Again, his form of ho’oponopono is conversation and dialogue. “I don’t formalize my practice. For me, my medium is conversation. So, someone may come up and say, you know, I’ve had this pilikia man, and whatever the issue may be and my ability to converse, to explore, and to try to resolve or sometimes it’s a process of resolving, it’s sort of connected to my experience of using the law to try and reason with people” (C6, personal communication, April 16th, 2015). In other situations, C6 described how he would try not to get involved in situations that he considered to be not pono. At times, this meant turning down jobs. “I would tell a client, hey, you’re just being selfish, you just wanna do this this and that, maybe I’m not the right attorney for you, go see somebody else. Because I will not participate in this kind of engagement, which is not correct for, let’s say, your granddaughter or for so and so. And sometimes it brings recognition, where the client says yeah, I guess you’re right, and we try to resolve it that way. To me, that’s ho’oponopono” (C6, personal communication, April 16th, 2015).
This conscious choice allowed C6 to practice ho`oponopono on a consistent basis, sometimes even within the DIE oriented legal system that he worked.

**Connection to Spirit**

Finally, C6 saw an important aspect of ho`oponopono to be the connection to spirit and ancestors. “In the ho`oponopono process you begin by calling upon the akua, ke akua, or na akua. Single god or multiple gods, you call upon the lesser gods and the angels, you call upon all the spirits and then you call upon your ancestors and then the ancestors come into the room and they’re all lining up around the room, right? Why you calling upon everybody to come join? It’s not their pilikia! You’re calling them because they are witnessing to the fact that hey, braddah, you gotta tell the truth, cause you got all of these ancestors who know whether or not you’re lying. So, you cannot come in and try to deceive in this ho`oponopono process and, on top of that, the kahu, who is leading the process, he’ll look at you and he going to understand, you’re throwing us a bunch of bull. So, you come in and you wanna participate wholeheartedly cause your ancestors can give you one spear in your back at anytime! (laughs)” (C6, personal communication, April 16th, 2015). C6 points out that one aspect of the importance of ancestral participation is the commitment of all involved in the ho`oponopono process. The fear and shame involved in lying or misrepresenting in front of gods and ancestors is an added level of connection to the process as well as the outcome.

To summarize, C6 described the most important conditions in ho`oponopono to be the recognition of different types and styles of practice, the importance of conversation as a medium for the practice and the connection to spirit and ancestors in order for all members to be held accountable for their words and actions during the process.

**Role in Peace Process**

C6 was asked, “What do you see as your role in the peace process?” He responded, first and foremost, by saying he never saw himself as having any type of specific role. He did see
himself as a persuasive speaker and someone who was not afraid to take on difficult topics or conversations. “I never saw it as having a role. I just-, if I’m asked to participate or to assist or to lecture or to join in a conversation, then I go. And I have some opinions (laughs), nobody else wants to hear! I think I have a persuasive ability to an audience. And, what I can always rely back on is my radio and my television audience to bring about that process. To the extent that others are willing to hear and, I join in. But I’m not out here and seeing myself as a leader or the leader or the spokesperson or anything like that. I have opinions, I’ve been giving my opinions so long and I’m so old, some people think I am a leader (laughs)” (C6, personal communication, April 16th, 2015).

C6 also mentioned that he impacted the Hawaiian community in the past, during time he spent working on a landmark legal case. In this instance, he did have a role in bringing about conversation around the topic of Hawaiian sovereignty. “On one hand, we had a direction, an advocacy to make to the general public, and on the other hand, I had to try my best to protect this defendant. And many of our people didn’t know about it. We didn’t know that we were an independent Nation and we were overthrown. So, I brought a lot of these materials and facts out into the general public through the trial. My client was a vehicle to bring out these facts” (C6, personal communication, April 16th, 2015).

Cultural informant 6 (C6) expounded upon his own definition of peace, explaining it as a yin-yang balance that was ever changing. He believed that finding an appropriate process to handle and transform conflict was more important than harboring a belief that peace can only exist in the absence of any conflict at all. Also, one’s definition of peace was heavily influenced by the deep culture that one ascribed to. According to C6, the cultural context determined a great deal about one’s ideas and values.

When he talked about the experience of peace by Hawaiians, C6 highlighted Galtung’s (1972) work where he described an ABC triangle of conflict. This triangle depicted how the
majority of conflict erupted from attitudes and conditions, rather than from behavior, which is typically thought to be the culprit. The Hawaiian community’s experience of the overthrow and subsequent colonization impacted their view of peace and conflict, even to this day. These events brought the DIE culture to an environment that used to operate exclusively under the OLA structure. C6 views himself, not as a leader in the Hawaiian peace movement, but simply as an influential speaker who manages difficult conversation well and uses dialogue to practice *ho`oponopono*. He mentioned the important connection to spirit and ancestors during the *ho`oponopono* process as well as described several distinct ways of performing the peacemaking practice.

_Cultural Informant 7 (C7)_

The following results describe the interview conducted with cultural informant 7 (C7). These responses gave the richest data and were those that were drawn upon to compare and combine with other cultural experts in order to arrive at a culturally grounded idea of peace and peacemaking. The five questions analyzed covered the following topics: peace definition, experience of peace by Hawaiians, contrasting Hawaiian experience of peace to Western ideas, and *ho`oponopono*.

**Peace Definition**

C7 was asked, “How would you define peace?” He discussed how he believed the concept to be one of opposing values. The direct translation of the Hawaiian term means to gain clarity from confusion. Both forces are needed for balance.

**Balance of Opposing Values**

C7 stated, “I think in Hawaiian. The word for peace is, as you know is *maluhia*. The two words that are there are *malu* and *hia*, and those two words in and of itself are really antagonistic towards each other, ok? *Hia* means confusion and *malu* means clarity, clearness. And so, uh, peace then is the process where you bring these two values together, yeah? I look
at it that there are always these two opposing values, if you will, the need to be ho`oponopono, that process. Maluhia, mix it in together so that the malu, the peace would be that which will impact the hia and then bring about the resolution and calm" (C7, personal communication, May 12th, 2015). Similar to other cultural experts, the idea of a balance of opposing forces was mentioned. Also, he touched upon the fact that there will always be these opposing forces, in other words, there will always be conflict. Peace is the process by which these opposing forces are calmed.

Experience of Peace by Hawaiians

C7 was asked, “Does the experience of peace in your own culture (Hawaiian) differ from that of American culture? If so, how?” He went on to explain that the strong belief in ohana affected how Hawaiian people viewed peace and conflict resolution. Like other respondents, he also touched upon the historical experiences of Hawaiians and how that trauma has contributed to their outlook on peace today.

Ohana

“The short answer is, yes. As I said earlier, in the subject matter of ohana, we tend and we need to, um, see the ohana, the concept of ohana as being very important with anything and everything that we are involved with, including peace efforts. And these peace efforts are very very important to us with-, by our cultural understanding. It’s the application of what we understand to be culturally, what is said as pono. We have a difficult time expressing it, uh, to others, uh, to non Hawaiians, I think. Often they can’t understand ours” (C7, personal communication, May 12th, 2015).

Kakou

He went on to demonstrate that in the Hawaiian language, there are meaningful words and tenses that point to the idea of ohana and connection as paramount. C7 explained, “One is what is called a kakou part and one is called a makou part, ok? Kakou makou is the Hawaiian
word for the first person, singular is *makou*, first person plural is *kakou*. And, so for example, if I was to say to you, (speaks Hawaiian), *makou* is if there was a third person here, if I was to say that then that means that we’re going to do a prayer that makes us feel good and comfortable about why we have come together for whatever purpose. If I would say, and this can be probably understood as being correct too, (speaks Hawaiian) then I’m involving not only you and I, but I’m also involving whoever is involved in your life, as well as whoever is involved in my life so that my family and your family would be considered in the prayer as coming together” (C7, personal communication, May 12th, 2015). By demonstrating how, with language, Hawaiians communicate a common belief in connection of family members and ancestors, C7 showed how this idea would influence how one might experience peace or conflict resolution.

He ended saying that the differences certainly existed and a recognition of them was important. “In our Hawaiian culture, uh, we need always to allow ourselves that understanding, for example, to this question of peace, that what peace may mean to us as Hawaiians certainly has meaning for us, but it may not be the same as what peace means to people in other cultures” (C7, personal communication, May 12th, 2015).

*Historical Trauma*

In addition to a sense of *ohana* and acknowledgment of *kakou* communication, the history behind the Hawaiian community also affects their concept of peace. “It has to do with conflicts. It seems, you know, as a cultural people, we always seem to be the ones that need to give up, so to speak. Release, you know, our own way or our own understanding. And that means that we’re giving into the non culture part of us. I think that more than anything else is what is an answer to this question. It’s not that they don’t understand us, it’s that we have been hurt so so much and kinda like living in a land that we do not feel is ours as perhaps our parents did and certainly our grandparents did” (C7, personal communication, May 12th, 2015). The relinquishing of land and language altered the way in which Hawaiian people viewed themselves
and their relationship not only to their island, but to the colonists who ultimately settled here. As other respondents have answered, the experience of peace in the Hawaiian community included a sense of hurt and trauma.

*Connection to Spirit*

Again like other informants, a connection to a higher power, energy, god or gods was imperative for a sense of peace in the Hawaiian community. This spiritual relationship has been a value passed down through generations. C7 discussed it. “One of our `olelo no`eau, our cultural sayings, affirms a very basic understanding of our culture and that’s simply the statement (speaks Hawaiian). *Na mea* means the many many things traditional, *ma mao*, that we have always been accustomed to and one of the things that we always accustomed to is our sense of spirituality. In Hawaiian religion, for example, for every created thing in nature, including human beings, there was also a Creator who was responsible for that thing” (C7, personal communication, May 12th, 2015). He gave an example to demonstrate the strong holistic connection between Hawaiian people and their many gods.

“Even the god of wind, we had a name for him. And *la a mau mau*, if you don’t know the religious concept there, *la a mau* would-, I’ll translate for you, it’s a Hawaiian gourd, which is what it is. And *la a mau mau* is the name that we gave to the goddess of the wind because for our people, going all the way back, the gourd, uh, was the instrument that *la a mau mau* literally would-, had all the winds in that he was responsible for. So, whenever a particular `aina needed a particular wind to waft, whatever the purpose is, he would reach into that gourd and thrust it up. And so for everything in nature there was a god or goddess responsible. And it was important for us to understand that first” (C7, personal communication, May 12th, 2015). This connection to the gods and spirituality has carried forth into the present day. C7 mentioned that while many Hawaiians identify as Christians now, the importance of faith in the family is still something that influences ideas of peace.
**Ho`oponopono**

**Connection to Spirit**

C7 described his experience with the *ho`oponopono* practice from a young age. “We always began our days experience, with, um, with *ho`oponopono*. We called it *ohana*. And, just one of the things that I remember that *ho`oponopono*, the process *ho`oponopono*, needs to be understood within the context of *ohana*. It is basically, as a conflict resolution process, it is basically for the good of the *ohana*, the family. So growing up as a child, I remember, we always got together for this, so called, *ohana* practice. And um, to better explain that, the *ohana* practice was kinda like the family getting together to have, spiritual devotions. We always began every morning, it was the first act of the family, and indeed, it was the last family act together before going to bed” (C7, personal communication, May 12th, 2015). The practice was tied to a Christian ritual of devotional reading and prayer, but still remained the conflict resolution process described by many of the other respondents.

C7 elaborated on the protocol which was followed. “We allowed others to express their thoughts and feelings on what the subject matter was, and what we were to have *ho`oponopono* about. As well as for us to listen. And, of course, you also have a chance for yourself, to express yourself. And that other members of the family needed to listen and for you to also do that. And so that's what we did. I remember what we did during *ho`oponopono* and each of us that was there in the family, together shared our thoughts and why there was an issue. I was brought into this conflict resolution process at a very young age” (C7, personal communication, May 12th, 2015). As he furthered his explanation of the steps of the *ohana* practice, as his family called it, C7 discussed how important forgiveness was as the next step for all involved. Forgiveness was needed in order for resolution.

“Another interesting part about the *ho`oponopono* process is that once the focus issue has been resolved, then there is this time for each of us to kind of attach, uh, a focus of
forgiveness into this resolution. If necessary. And to be open with it, uh, but there is a spirituality there. Because in conflict resolution there needs to be that focus of forgiveness in any and all conflicts. And then after we were allowed to make our forgiving statements, we concluded with prayer again and this time we thank God that we had the opportunity to come together as a family to resolve a concern that was important for us” (C7, personal communication, May 12th, 2015).

**Importance of Leader**

C7 emphasized the importance of a leader for the *ho`oponopono or ohana* ritual. As he was growing up, this leader was his father and, as he had his own family, he filled that leadership position for them. He felt that a trusted leader not only ensured that the resolutions were kept, but was there to assist in locating the real issue at hand. “My father, as the head of the household, was always the leader. And that was important, I thought, for us to have this so-called leader. The 204akua, the parents, were the most important people affirming the events of the family, you know?” (C7, personal communication, May 12th, 2015).

As the leader, C7’s father would still allow the children to lead devotional time and speak their minds, but occasionally, as the family leader, he would observe the larger issues and direct their focus there, rather than where they may have begun their initial conversation. “Interestingly, uh, the reason for these so called *kumuhana*, to have this discussion of the subject matter, was that, at times, sometimes my father called us to *ho`oponopono*. In our practice of devotion and *ohana*, when my dad called us to share our thoughts it may be that after all of us were through sharing, uh, that the subject matter for us to *ho`oponopono* would not necessarily have been what my dad had called us to. That is to say that, as we expressed our thoughts on it, my dad made us to realize that maybe this problem that we’re having is not really the problem that we need to focus on. And so we need to focus on this *mana`o*, this thought, um at this time” (C7, personal communication, May 12th, 2015).
C7 points out that Pukui (1972) described this action by the leader as *mahiki*. “And so, in that process that’s called *mahiki*. And *mahiki*, according to Aunty Kawena is that process where, in this case, my dad, would kinda like sift out from all what we had shared, um, to see if the problem that we needed to discuss was there, and determine where our focus should be. And we didn’t even always have these conflicts to resolve everytime we had devotions, but um, maybe once a month? Once or twice a month, yeah? When there was a family concern and my dad thought that we ought to have *ho`oponopono*” (C7, personal communication, May 12th, 2015, pg. 7).

Trusting in the leader of the process also helped to foster a solution and trust that the solution was the best one. “If you don’t trust your leader, uh, then the process may not allow itself to help you, yeah? To a resolution. And, of course, it was simple in our family because, as I said, parents were always the leaders. (The children) were responsible for the devotional part, but our parents were responsible for the *ho`oponopono* part” (C7, personal communication, May 12th, 2015).

*Importance of Prayer*

C7 continued his discussion of *ho`oponopono* practice by impressing that prayer was a vital part of the process. “I taught a course in my religious education on *ho`oponopono*. And when I came-, where I came from to my students, was um, was sharing with them the important Hawaiian practice of prayer or of reaffirming one’s relationship to a higher being. And so, in the process of *ho`oponopono* um, that I was involved in, indeed with our family, and more importantly, in the course that I taught, prayer has a very significant part in that process” (C7, personal communication, May 12th, 2015). The ritual of prayer during *ho`oponopono* was also used in his own family’s practice. “So, the leader is as important as is the coming together in the context of *ohana*. And then, of course, forgiveness is also important, which I just shared. And then the focus of prayer to keep ourselves in tune with the “other,” so to speak, is also important.
And that’s just how I’ve personally been using with my own family, my children, my grandchildren, uh as well as in my profession, with my students” (C7, personal communication, May 12th, 2015).

He concluded by mentioning Pukui’s (1972) description of the process again, and said that this is the protocol that he and his family often followed. “In the book she expresses the idea of prayer having an important part in the ho`oponopono process, and it’s important to begin the process with prayer, and after you have completed the process, to have a prayer of thanksgiving at the end” (C7, personal communication, May 12th, 2015). For C7, these prayers correlated with his family’s Christian faith and their daily devotional practice.

C7 shared his ideas on the definition of peace, which aligned with the translation of the Hawaiian word for peace, maluhia. Malu meaning clarity and hia meaning confusion. He described peace as the process of combining and balancing these values. It is an acceptance of confusion as being part of life, and that clarity can come to balance this confused state. In further discussion on the topic of experience of peace by Hawaiians, C7 again highlighted the indications in the Hawaiian language that allows for a focus on the other, a focus outward, rather than on the individual and individual needs. Kakou tense in Hawaiian, the first person plural, includes ancestors and family in a conversation, even when only 2 people are physically present. By using this language, the importance of ohana in Hawaiian culture is apparent, and is separate from a more Western view of individualism. This connection to others and to spirit, is a crucial factor in how Hawaiian people understand conflict resolution, according to C7. Like other informants, he pointed out the historical trauma and negative experiences that also impact the Hawaiian view of peace. Finally, when practicing ho`oponopono, C7 believed there needs to be a connection to spirit among all involved, a leader to guide the process was helpful and prayer both at the beginning, throughout and at closing were critical. These factors influenced his experience of ho`oponopono growing up and continue to do so in his current practice.
The following results describe the interview conducted with cultural informant 4 (C4). These responses gave the richest data and were those that were drawn upon to compare and combine with other cultural experts in order to arrive at a culturally grounded idea of peace and peacemaking. The five questions analyzed covered the following topics: peace definition, experience of peace by Fijians compared to a Western context, human beings peaceful by nature, and *talanoa.*

### Peace Definition

C4 was asked, “How would you define peace?” He responded by describing an absence of internal conflict, a presence of a free society and that his ideas most likely came from his own personal moral code. He described what he meant by absence of internal conflict, “I would describe it as um, it’s something internal, like you know when you’re at peace with yourself and there’s no internal conflicts going on. And um, you’re kind of uh, content or you’re kind of um just happy in the place” (C4, personal communication, March 20th, 2015). He expanded upon this idea by talking about how he defined peace externally, in society. “When I think about peace, in terms of society, just the situation where people-, where there’s freedom, where there’s, I don’t want to say to turn it into a democratic kind of system, but a situation where you’re not kind of looking over your shoulder. You’re not scared and you’re able to do things. There’s freedom, transparency and accountability and this atmosphere where you are free to express yourself in a way that doesn’t entrench on other people’s rights” (C4, personal communication, March 20th, 2015).

Finally, C4 said his idea of peace originated in the way he was brought up and mentioned the golden rule. “I think, for me it is grounded in my um, the way I was brought up, you know, my morals, and values. I think, in a nutshell, peace is just a situation, an atmosphere,
where people can see each other as people and treat each other as they would like to be treated. And so, as simple as that, and the systems that allow that to take place” (C4, personal communication, March 20th, 2015).

Experience of Peace by Fijians

Collectivistic

C4 was asked, “Does the experience of peace in your own culture (Fijian) differ from that of American culture? If so, how?” He explained that in Fiji there were a lot of ties to traditional practices, religion, and each other. He viewed the Fijian context as much more collectivistic than an American or Western context. “I think it’s different. More so because of uh, um, I don’t like to say the (U.S.) mainland lacks, but mostly the closeness of the-, the way that people in Fiji are more collectivistic. I don’t want to make that judgment, but just more from my personal opinion, they’re more collectivistic and more tied to culture and traditions and, you could say, religion” (C4, personal communication, March 20th, 2015). While C4 admitted he had not lived in the U.S. in awhile, he believed it to be more individualistic and less of a traditional culture. “So, in Fiji it would be the church traditional culture would play a lot in bringing about a peaceful situation. While, from my limited experience and being ignorant and not living in the U.S. for quite a long time, I would say that in the-, thinking about peace in the U.S. it’s probably on a more of an individual basis and in most cases, the law comes in to play” (C4, personal communication, March 20th, 2015).

Cultural and Religious Tradition

C4 explained that in Fiji, many people live according to traditional rules and rituals, religious and otherwise. He described how someone from an indigenous Fijian background would introduce themselves. “Indigenous Fijians are dictated by their culture or their tradition and they’ll hold to that. Because in Fiji, when you introduce yourself the first thing you do is give your name and then you let people know which village, which district and which island of Fiji
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you’re from and that kind of fills those traditional links” (C4, personal communication, March 20th, 2015). He added to this by mentioning how peace and conflict resolution would play out differently in a Fijian context. Because so many communities and villages follow traditional protocols, the Chief of the village holds the power. If and when a conflict arises, there is typically a set way of working it out, controlled by those in top positions in the hierarchy. He gave an example regarding a few times that his work team attempted to help certain villages with a particular conflict. “We’ll talk but nothing will be done because the Chief will take his same approach, or the village headman will take the same approach. So even though they’re welcoming of visitors and they’d say this and this, sometimes you could see that they really weren’t into the process because they have a preconceived assumption that even though we’re talking and they’re hearing us, it’s pointless. Because in most cases, that’s what’s happened in the past” (C4, personal communication, March 20th, 2015).

He further explained how religion, namely Christianity, would also dictate peace and peacemaking in Fiji, compared to a more Westernized context. “So, tradition and culture is something that people use and indigenous Fijian code. So, I think even though there are similarities, I think the major difference would be that Fijian families and that peaceful situation would be dictated more on the precepts of religion, of uh, Christianity which is big in Fiji and also tied to their culture and traditions” (C4, personal communication, March 20th, 2015). The sense from C4 was that Fijians, in general, still live very much by their religious and cultural traditions, including those affiliated with peace.

Finally, when he discussed how peace may differ in Fiji, C4 described the separate economic contexts between Fiji and the U.S. These differences contributed to whether people would focus on peace or even think about it, when it is likely that there are other, more urgent needs to be met. “Obviously in Fiji we often don’t have funds and sometimes we get requests to go and talk to someone, but because of funding, we can’t go out there. And so, I would say the
main difference would be resources because most of the projects that we’ve worked on in Fiji have been in remote areas. So, getting out there has been hard and when you do get out there, we don’t have-, people are more worried about where they’re going to get their next meal from, you know? There are other priorities than coming together and talking about this issue, that might be big, but it might not be putting food on the table. So, we’ll go to communities, we’re ready for a workshop, and then most of the participants or most of one side of the conflict aren’t available. We get there at 9 and they aren’t available until 1 or 2 because they’re on the plantation, pulling taro, or they’re out fishing. So, it’s-, I mean, it comes down to planning, but it also comes down to the resources and the priorities of the people” (C4, personal communication, March 20th, 2015).

Human Beings Peaceful by Nature

C4 was asked, “Do you believe human beings are peaceful by nature?” He agreed that, yes, human beings were peaceful by nature, but sometimes expressed it differently. “I think we are peaceful by nature. We have um, common needs and values but just maybe expressed differently, depending on our circumstances and how we experience things, getting into nature versus nurture. I think deep down we all want peace” (C4, personal communication, March 20th, 2015).

Talanoa

C4 was asked, “Tell me about talanoa. How do you practice?” He explained that his current position was with the Fijian government, affiliated with a University there. He was assigned to go into environments where conflicts arose- villages, organizations, communities experiencing change, and, sometimes, families- and facilitate talanoa sessions.

Dialogue

He explained talanoa as a form of dialoguing. “Most of the peacebuilding processes in Fiji that I’ve been involved with have been more so on the-, we are using methods of dialogue
and bringing the parties together and have them kind of talk and bring about uh-, just kind of see each other’s side" (C4, personal communication, March 20th, 2015). He compared it to the Hawaiian process of “talk story.” “It’s just like in Hawaii when they say talk story, you know? Hey, let’s go talk story. So in Fiji they call it talanoa. Which is almost the same thing as talk story where you’re just talking to each other. So, it’s something that’s caught on because of it’s closeness to the concept of-, the Fijian ideals-, talanoa and talking. So, this is um, this is what’s being used in mostly city-, urban and urban communities. And some rural communities” (C4, personal communication, March 20th, 2015). C4 highlighted that this process was more prominent in urban communities. Rural environments remained more traditional.

He shared an example of a talanoa session that he was recently involved in. “So a recent one was in um, we just did in a province in Fiji called Manroma. So, in this situation, we brought different community leaders together and they brought their issues which they saw were important to address in their communities. And, some of these issues were teen pregnancies, um, substance abuse, in this particular district stray animals was a big issue” (C4, personal communication, March 20th, 2015). Bringing the parties together to talk was the main goal of C4’s organization. They oversaw the conversation and helped each of the stakeholders to find meaning in the end resolution. C4 mentioned that while this practice was on a larger scale, with larger entities, his team worked to mirror the dialoguing that occurred in smaller settings.

C4 talked about how at the end of the session, parties are held to their promises by a document and his team will return to check on their progress. “I won’t say a monthly evaluation, but a check back and they put a timeframe on it themselves. So, as facilitators, what we try and do is let them talk and guide the process and make them come up with the solutions themselves. And, in most cases we try to get them to develop an agreement, we write up an MOU so that they can be held to something” (C4, personal communication, March 20th, 2015).

Rural talanoa
After he explained his larger scale position providing *talanoa* sessions for stakeholders, we discussed what happened in more traditional environments. “In the majority of the rural communities, it’s still very much in that traditional structure where the Chief is the main mediator and what he says goes, it’s kind of a top down approach. And so, even if the Chief or the village headman, even if they are involved in the conflict, they are the ones who are there to solve the conflict. So we’ll go into these conflict situations in the rural areas, we’ll try and get these Chiefs and the rural headsman to see that because of their involvement in the conflicts, they are not in the best situation to make a decision for the benefit of both parties” (C4, personal communication, March 20th, 2015).

He mentioned that often these conflicts are solved directly by the Chiefs or headsman, and their services are not needed. However, at times when they are called in to help with a resolution, typically other avenues have been exhausted first. “If it can’t be resolved first by the village setting or sometimes they call in the pastor-, the reverend or the priest from the village to come in and try and resolve that conflict. So, we’re almost called in when the pastors and the village headmen can’t get to a particular place, can’t solve it or need help in solving” (C4, personal communication, March 20th, 2015). When they are involved, the process looks decidedly different than it does for the larger scale *talanoa* sessions described earlier. C4 explained, “That process looks different, so the MOU is more used mainly for the larger organizations, with families it’s usually just word of mouth, an agreement kind of thing. Where the-, so if, for example we go in with the pastors, we go in and try to facilitate the process. If it’s a small family and we leave it to the pastor to continue the checking in, to continue the visiting afterwards” (C4, personal communication, March 20th, 2015).

**Role of Religious Leader**

He furthered the discussion by stating how critical the religious figure, or pastor, was in the more traditional villages. “Most villages in Fiji, they’re usually practicing one predominant
religion. People say, like, oh, that’s a Methodist village of that’s an Assemblies of God village. So the priest or the head reverend of the church in the village is kind of held in high esteem. They’ll invite him to village meetings, um, they’ll invite him to make decisions that involve the village so he’s kind of the assumed mediator for stuff. And so, they are held in very high esteem. He or she is kind of brought in to resolve any conflicts that come about in the community. Because of they-, they see it as um, how in the Christian sense that um, Jesus built peace so the role of these reverends and priests is to build peace also” (C4, personal communication, March 20th, 2015). The pastor or religious leader, as C4 explained, was thought to carry on the duties of Jesus as a peacemaker. Because of this, he was often looked to to help solve these village or family issues.

Systemized *talanoa*

In fact, C4 discussed how the formalized *talanoa* sessions he does for his job sometimes do not fit into the culture of the rural areas very well. Families or village members are unaccustomed to a process where everyone has a voice to speak their grievances. The traditional *talanoa* practice is still utilized, but on a much smaller scale, and with village members who are in a position to talk freely. He said, “It takes awhile for people to get used to it, eh? Um, especially if they’re from more, what uh, groups in the community that don’t make decisions and, um, that uh, I don’t want to say marginalized, but that don’t sit at the decision making table, you know? So, the youth, um, sometimes the women. And *talanoa*, the-, the good thing about our version of *talanoa* is that they can both talk and talk with each other freely. And the dialogue, when they’re talking, it’s more of expressing kind of their opinions and what they see, you know? And so that’s one of the differences there. The process of talking is something that they’re used to. The actual giving of opinions, putting out what you’re feeling, what you feel that you need, and your perspective on the conflict is a little bit different” (C4, personal communication, March 20th, 2015). The government’s adaptation of the concept for conflict resolution purposes was
something that C4 discussed as a positive thing. The systemized process has helped in large conflict situations involving several stakeholders. He noted the difficulty in applying the same process to smaller villages or family contexts.

**Isoro**

When C4 was questioned about the practice of *talanoa* he mentioned that it was often traditionally paired with another process called *isoro*. *Talanoa* occurred first, with families talking about issues between them, and *isoro* followed when one or more parties was seeking forgiveness as a result of the discussion. C4 described the protocol, “In a nutshell, where the party that seems to be in the wrong takes a whale’s tooth. In Fiji if you have a whale’s tooth and you take it to another person, it is in the sense of building peace. If you reject that, if you reject the party’s coming and bringing this whale’s tooth or what we call *tabua* in Fiji, if you reject that then the wrong is on you now. It’s disrespectful, it’s almost never done to reject it. And that situation is called *isoro* or also called *ibulubulu*. Where they try to-, in a traditional sense where they try to make peace through that, um, through appeasement. The more *tabua*, or the more whale’s tooth you bring, shows how really sorry you are. And so, in conflict situations, trying to make peace in these village settings, a lot of these kind of ceremonies are done” (C4, personal communication, March 20th, 2015). Once the whale’s tooth is accepted, then the conflict is resolved. It is forgotten, according to C4.

He went on to discuss one way in which this traditional *isoro* process can sometimes complicate a situation if and when it is used in combination with the more Westernized court system, which exists in Fiji. C4 explained, “You can probably see that-, you know, it might go head to head with the law, like if somebody raped somebody from one village and they go and do that, the tradition tells you that you have to take that and forgive them, but the law comes in to play and says, hey, no, this happened. There’s a lot of conflict in the different systems, the structures of conflict resolution and building peace in Fiji” (C4, personal communication, March
The notion of culturally “required” forgiveness does eliminate quite a bit of conflict and avoids the build up of larger conflicts. However, C4 pointed out how, in certain situations, it can create complexity that may need to be addressed as well.

C4 discussed his definition of peace as something that was both internal and external. Internally, it included the absence of conflict or negative feelings, while externally, in relation to society, he felt that a democratic and free society had the most potential for peace. When discussing the experience of peace by Fijians compared to a Western context, C4 greatly emphasized the differences in collectivistic and individualistic viewpoints. He thought that Fijians were much more tied to tradition and religion than continental Americans. Moreover, many Fijian villages did not have the resources to focus on conflict resolution or peace issues. C4 discussed his beliefs about human beings as peaceful by nature. He stated that they were, however they may express this peace differently. Finally, his description of the talanoa process ranged from urban to rural environments and included an additional forgiveness ritual called i soro. The important features of talanoa included dialogue, roles of religious and traditional leaders in the rural environment, and the importance of forgiveness during the i soro process.

Cultural Informant 5 (C5)

The following results describe the interview conducted with cultural informant 5 (C5). These responses gave the richest data and were those that were drawn upon to compare and combine with other cultural experts in order to arrive at a culturally grounded idea of peace and peacemaking. The four questions analyzed covered the following topics: peace definition, experience of peace by Fijians compared to a Western context and talanoa.

Definition of Peace

Both Internal and External

C5 was asked, “How do you define peace?” He described his definition as both internal and external. “I think it’s both internal and external. Um, since Fiji is such a communal society, I
think it just-, it’s both. Internally for the individual and externally for the family and the community” (C5, personal communication, April 13th, 2015).

**Part of a Relationship**

C5 described peace as defined within a relationship. “When I hear the word peace I think of family, um, harmony, maintaining uh that relationship, that harmony within that relationship” (C5, personal communication, April 13th, 2015). Similar to some of the Hawaiian respondents, his view of peace had to do with the involvement of someone else, and was part of an individual’s relationship with another.

**Experience of Peace by Fijians**

**Monocultural**

C5 was asked, “Does the experience of peace in your own culture (Fijian) differ from that of American culture? If so, how?” He responded by explaining how experiencing peace in the U.S. would likely be more difficult. “I will say it doesn’t work is because the U.S. is so multicultural and multinational. Too many different cultures exist in the U.S. You implement it in mainland USA, they will have to use and study all the different cultures that are using it, you know, to really have a universal system. But for Fiji, the culture is already here and everybody knows it. So, I think that’s the main difference is that the U.S has so many cultures” (C5, personal communication, April 13th, 2015, pg. 11). He believed one of the main obstacles to peace in the U.S. is the presence of so many different cultures, and a lack of knowledge about what traditional protocol to follow. This traditional knowledge and understanding was commonplace in Fiji.

**Personal Responsibility**

C5 continued by telling a story about when he lived in the United States for a time. He described the way that conflict would unfold and how he felt that personal responsibility could have helped to resolve things sooner. “There were people that would get into conflict. Most of
them didn’t want to own up to the conflict, or talk to the person they were fighting with, they would rather go to court which is so expensive and time consuming. That’s something I noticed, people liked to sue everybody else. When we start bringing other people and they get involved, then you need the system there to help them. But, there is alternative dispute resolution, you know, mediation, which I think is really good. But when it’s still one on one, I think the best thing is to talk without going to court. Own up. Just man up and talk to each other” (C5, personal communication, April 13th, 2015). The process in Fiji involved acknowledgment of wrongdoing, so C5 viewed this as something that was missing in American dispute resolution.

*Spirituality and Religion*

C5 mentioned the important role that spirituality and religion play in the Fijian understanding of peace. “The Bible talks about conflict and talks about how to get peace. The Qaran and (inaudible), they all talk about the same thing. You learn from home before you take it out. I strongly believe religion plays a role in peace because it gives us a sense of hope and when we have hope we can do things that we wouldn’t normally think that we could do, you know, talking to people and trying to understand where they’re coming from and be open enough to accept” (C5, personal communication, April 13th, 2015). He believed an adherence to religious beliefs and faith could help people maintain a sense of hope that things would work out. It created an openness.

*Forgiveness*

C5 mentioned that in Fijian culture, the threshold for holding a grudge was quite high. If someone did something to wrong another person, they were almost always forgiven in a matter of hours. At the same time, he discussed how if the line of wrongdoing was crossed, and anger was reached, there needed to be formal reconciliation. “I mean, in Fiji, we’re pretty peaceful. We have our own business, we are communal, when someone does something bad, we will hold a grudge, but it’s hard for us to get angry. Maybe in 2 or 3 hours time we’ll come back and joke
with you. Once something hurts a person and their family though, they will hold a grudge until death, unless there is reconciliation and it’s been handled peacefully” (C5, personal communication, April 13th, 2015). Given this explanation, it appeared as though minor conflicts were often swept easily under the rug, and perhaps did not escalate. These rules of forgiveness were common in Fiji and assumed by most people.

Talanoa

Talking story

C5 was asked, “Tell me about talanoa. How do you practice?” He answered by comparing the process to talking story in Hawaii, however with a few added required features. “Talanoa in Fijian means to basically talk story. That’s what we do in a talanoa session, we just talk. But in order to do it, we have to have kava. Kava numbs the tongue and kind of prevents fights. There’s always kava. And uh, it’s uh, like a circle process. Everyone can be heard. And that’s what the talanoa session is. You come with your thoughts, and we hear you out, and we expect you to hear our opinion. And, in certain issues, we come up with a common solution to an issue together. They do it, you know, under a tree, and we can relax. We joke and laugh, but then we tend to the issues” (C5, personal communication, April 13th, 2015). C5 provided a rich description of the process, noting that it was done in a circle, kava was consumed to numb the tongue and makes words a little kinder, and opinions were heard and discussed. He talked specifically about the softness of the process, under a tree, beginning with jokes.

Initial Process

C5 went on to say that talanoa was used as the initial process before any other peacemaking ritual was employed. He gave an example of how the process might look if a teenage couple went to their families and admitted to engaging in premarital sex, which was a somewhat common issue in many villages. “The talanoa session is to go in any situation, before the conflict resolution, before the i bulu bulu (i soro), the talanoa session happens. The offender
comes home, tells the dad. Dad, I did x, and then the Dad will say, okay, we’ll tell him what’s going to happen. We’ll call the uncles and everybody sits down and then we have the *talanoa* session. We talk about what’s going to happen, we ask the boy, why did you do it? We ask the girl, why did you run away with the boy? Then, we come up with a resolution and the resolution will usually be to seek forgiveness from the girl’s family. And, in doing that, we will ask for the girl’s hand. And we will strengthen the relationship between our family and the girl’s family by marriage. So, the *talanoa* session has to happen for any resolutions to come” (C5, personal communication, April 13th, 2015).

*Rural Practice*

Like C4 had explained in his interview, C5 reiterated that the traditional *talanoa* and *i soro* processes were more likely to happen in the rural areas of Fiji than in the larger cities. “I think it happens everywhere, but mostly rural areas is where the practice is very very much alive. And uh, in the urban area, the more people (can’t hear), the more people forget about culture and so they don’t practice it as much. And a lot of people just more Westernized, yeah? And um, some have abandoned their language. Once you forget your language, the practice is automatically gone. Because when we go into traditional practices we use a very noble and higher language, formal, eh? And we speak in metaphors that we understand. If you don’t know the language, then you don’t know, you don’t understand it. The people in the rural area, they know it really well” (C5, personal communication, April 13th, 2015). C5 showed that one of the reasons this rural/urban distinction existed was because of the understanding of traditional language and metaphor.

*Cultural Tradition*

C5 expanded upon the idea that Fijians adhere closely to older, more conservative traditions. He discussed it in comparison to *ho ‘oponopono* which he was familiar with from living in Hawaii. “*Ho ‘oponopono* will not stop until all the family members agree on a solution. I felt
really honored to be a part of that. Yes. In Fiji, the only time we all speak is at a *talanoa* session, in *ho`oponopono* everybody gets to talk. In Fijian practice there’s only one spokesperson. There are more traditional exchanges. It’s really different that way” (C5, personal communication, April 13th, 2015). C5 pointed out an important distinction between the Hawaiian and Fijian practices. *i soro*

C5 also explained the additional process of *i soro* which often proceeds *talanoa*, depending on the type of offense. His description was similar to C4’s. “Say, if I eloped with a girl, then I would do *i soro* and ask for forgiveness. So, all it does is aims to restore peace and harmony with the extended family. We use a whale’s tooth, we call it *tabua*. And that’s what we use to present it. And even if-, if I present it to another party and if that party doesn’t accept our apology, then it’s all on them now” (C5, personal communication, April 13th, 2015). Again, there is mention of the requirement to forgive, now placed on the accepting party.

C5 went on to explain that, traditionally, only men are involved in the *i soro* process, even if the offense involved a female member of the family. He cited an example. “My cousin, who is a boy, eloped with a girl. So, he told the dad and my dad and all the uncles, and got together and discussed what to be done and they sent someone over to the other family to accept an appointment. Come on this day to do the *bulu bulu*. And um, my family went, and so only the men-, only the men go, no women. They say, in case of fighting, eh? So, there’s no women that’s allowed to go, only the men. And so they went, and uh, you know, asked for the girl’s hand in marriage to save the girl’s family’s reputation and also to save our reputation and maintain harmony. And we use *kava* before the ceremony starts. We present the *kava*, and we tell them the purpose of why we are there. So we start with the *kava* and we use the whale’s tooth to show forgiveness. So, we had to take several whale’s tooth, which is expensive if you have to buy it, and that’s what we use” (C5, personal communication, April 13th, 2015). He noted again that the family who is presented with the *tabua* is obligated to accept.
“Yes. (The offer of guilt) should be accepted in order to maintain the relationship and harmony within the family and if you don’t accept it, then they are looked down upon and they will say, you know, you’re not trying. You have to forgive and forget. Once the ceremony takes place and the-, we have been forgiven, the victim’s family are not allowed to bring up the issues in the future” (C5, personal communication, April 13th, 2015). C4 highlighted how this forgiveness obligation can be viewed both positively and negatively.

C5 discussed his definition of peace as being both internal and external and saw peace as something that was understood within a relationship. It begins with personal responsibility and acknowledgment of wrongdoing. When asked about the experience of peace by Fijians, C5 illuminated the idea that some of what allowed for peace in Fiji was the fact that it was essentially a monocultural environment. The U.S. had many cultures that needed to be considered and a lack of consistent traditions understood by all. Additionally, Fijians had a strong connection to religion and traditional cultural values that made them motivated to find resolution and live peacefully. When describing the talanoa process, C5 emphasized that it was often used before any other conflict resolution process (such as isoro) and was accompanied by drinking kava. Traditionally, jokes are told and there is a lightheartedness to the meeting, but eventually issues are tended to.
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